Alan H. Cadwallader, "Cerberus Bites Back: A Tale with Three Heads—The Syrophoenician and her Imitators," *Relegere: Studies in Religion and Reception* 7, nos. 1–2 (2018): 115–47.

Relegere: Studies in Religion and Reception is an independent, open-access academic journal dedicated to the promotion and dissemination of innovative research in reception history, broadly conceived, within and across religious traditions.

www.relegere.org
ISSN 1179–7231

Relegere: Studies in Religion and Reception 7, nos. 1–2 (2018): 115–47

Alan H. Cadwallader

Cerberus Bites Back

A Tale with Three Heads—The Syrophoenician and her Imitators

Exchanges about dogs operate rhetorically in the stories of the Syrophoenician women in Mark's gospel, the Canaanite woman in Matthew, and the righteous Justa in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies. The three stories are thus analysed with a focus on proverbial form, poetic features, and metre. The variations in the way the dogs are employed in the three stories reflect different periods and contexts within early Christianities, and are variously employed to convey abuse, voice, food practices, ethnicity, and gender.

Cerberus held a fearsome reputation in the ancient world, this Cerberus "whose barking strikes the shades with terror";[1] "take care he doesn't bite you."[2] In most imaginings, the fear of the bite lay in his three-heads,[3] a tri-kephalitic threat that snapped at any unwary

Alan H. Cadwallader is a Research Fellow at the Centre for Public and Contextual Theology, Charles Sturt University, Canberra.

[1] *Palatine Anthology* 7.69.

[2] *Palatine Anthology* 7.319.

[3] Seneca, *Oedipus* 581; Horace, *Odes* 2.27–29; Virgil, *Georgics* 4.483.

traveler into unfamiliar territory. One can barely fathom the horror at confronting the haunting vision of a fifty or hundred-headed canine monster, such as is found in the lurid hyperbole of Hesiod or Pindar.[4] I have no intention of ponderously exhausting an account of a century of dog-heads for the story of a woman's encounter with Jesus, though a sweep of the history of interpretation suggests that such an enumeration would be possible.[5] But I do intend to investigate the three most prominent heads of the story: that of the Syrophoenician women in Mark's gospel, that of the Canaanite woman in Matthew, and that of the righteous Justa in the Ps-Clementine Homilies. Here the intention will be to explore how the exchanges about dogs operate rhetorically in the shape of the stories and how the variations in the way the dogs are used reflect different periods and contexts in the application of the story in the complex picture of early Christianities.

The Syrophoenician Women

The pericope in Mark's gospel has received immense and repeated scrutiny in recent times,[6] in some ways becoming a lodestone of movements in con-

[4] Hesiod, *Theogony* 311; Pindar, fr. 249c.

[5] See especially, Nancy Klancher, *The Taming of the Canaanite Woman: Constructions of Christian Identity in the Afterlife of Matthew 15:21–28* (Studies of the Bible and Its Reception; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013).

[6] For a full bibliography up to 2007, see Alan H. Cadwallader, *Beyond the Word of a Woman: Recovering the Bodies of the Syrophoenician Women* (Adelaide: ATF Press, 2008) and "Dog-throttling: Nineteenth Century Dogmatic/Cultural Constructions of the Syrophoenician Woman," in *Hermeneutics and the Authority of Scripture*, ed. Alan H. Cadwallader (Task of Theology Today 5; Adelaide: ATF Press, 2011), 97–132. Thereafter, see, with the literature cited therein, Pablo Alonso, *The Woman who Changed Jesus: Crossing Boundaries in Mk 7,24–30* (Biblical Tools and Studies 11; Leuven: Peeters, 2011); Elaine M. Wainwright, "Of Borders, Bread, Dogs and Demons: Reading Matthew 15.21–28 Ecologically," in *Where the Wild Ox Roams: Biblical Essays in Honour of Norman C. Habel*, ed. Alan H. Cadwallader with Peter L. Trudinger (Hebrew Bible Manuscripts 59; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013), 114–26; Stephen D. Moore, "The Dog-Woman of Canaan and Other Animal Tales from the Gospel of Matthew," in *Soundings in Cultural Criticism: Perspectives and Methods in Culture, Power, and Identity in the New Testament*, ed. Francisco Lozada and Greg Casey (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013), 57–71; Jeffrey W. Aernie, "Borderless Discipleship: The Syrophoenician Woman as a Christ-follower in Mark 7:24–30," in *Bible, Borders, Belonging(s): Engaging Readings from Oceania*, ed. Jione Havea, David J. Neville, and Elaine M. Wainwright (Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies 75; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 191–207; J. R. Harrison, "'Every dog has its day,'" in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity, Vol 10: A Review of the Greek and Other Inscriptions and Papyri Published between 1988 and 1992*, ed. S. R. Llewelyn and J. R. Harrison (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 126–35.

temporary New Testament interpretation.[7] A single article (or even a three-headed dog of an article) cannot attempt either a full coverage of interpretations nor even a detailed analysis of the entire passage. So, to launch my study I want to restore focus on the actual exchange between Jesus and the Syrophoenician woman in terms of its form, to analyse how the recognition of duelling proverbs not only undermines the universalist assumption carried by the form, especially in the triumph of a proverb spoken by a woman of questionable credentials, but also relinquishes the authority of word (even of the mother) to that of the act of the daughter. To signal the distillation of its argument, the turning point of the story (the acclamation of the proverb of a woman, acclaimed as *logos*) gives way to the climax of the story (the discovery of the movement of the daughter, reclined on the couch). This is repeatedly neglected by recent commentators, even those who assert a desire to draw the daughter from the margins to the centre of the story. They remain bound by the interpretative history that has privileged Jesus as healer and (his) "word" as absolute, with the result that the subtlety of the text continues to be sacrificed,[8] even in the effort to escape from the strictures of that history.

Form has rhetorical potency.[9] The adoption or construction of a dis-

[7] See Kwok Pui-lan, "Reading the Christian New Testament in the Contemporary World," in *Fortress Commentary on the Bible: The New Testament*, ed. Margaret Aymer, Cynthia Briggs Kittredge, and David A. Sánchez (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014), 8–11.

[8] So especially Laura Donaldson, "Gospel Hauntings: The Postcolonial Demons of New Testament Criticism," in *Postcolonial Biblical Criticism: Interdisciplinary Intersections*, ed. Fernando F. Segovia and Stephen D. Moore (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 97–113. In part this has been engendered by an uncritical adoption of Gerd Theissen's class construction of the Syrophoenician woman and the peasant Jesus (*The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991], 60–80), just as she has relied upon the snippet of the Pseudo-Clementines that he provides as the total of what that writing offers (99–100). Oddly, she also claims that Matthew omits the offensive comparison that highlights Jesus's ethnic prejudice (99); in fact Matthew only omits Mark's enthymemic opening (Matt 15:26 cf. Mk 7:27), thus hardening the offensiveness by its rustic reliance on a sententious maxim (note Demetrius, *On Style* 2.108–10). She gives little attention to the importance of dogs to the story, preferring to redeem the child's demonic-possession as shamanistic with Jesus's supposed healing (of the text) as a dehumanising oppression. She admits her reading is speculative, even if informed (105).

[9] Klaus Berger identifies three elements in the rhetoric of form—it carries an appeal at a surface level (that is, as a sensual, rather than a cerebral, communication), it is the first engagement with a communication, it is almost always readily recognisable: "Rhetorical Criticism, New Form Criticism, and New Testament Hermeneutics," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 390.

cernible form—like any reference to a long-standing tradition (whether directly or by allusion)—has the power to generate an authority beyond the words used. Literary, formal and mythological references operate rhetorically to substantiate the claim to the (asserted) universal, "natural" reality. Reflexively, they gain greater authority because of their descriptive applicability in a given observation. If the form should be conventional and freely exchanged amongst the general populace, that reality becomes self-evident. None of this is unfamiliar to the ancient world. As Quintilian observed,[10] "antiquity bears much authority,"[11] himself deploying a general maxim with particular application. The more ancient, the more timeless the "truth" expressed, and the less questionable its argument: assertion becomes description becomes regulation. Herein lies the ground of the appeal to a proverb or an enthymeme for example.

All serious candidates for the categorization of Jesus's words confirm these opening observations: the chreia, the *tobspruch* and the proverb.[12] However, the first two possibilities I think can be dismissed. The chreia has been applied to the story as an example of a double-chreia—that is applied to both Jesus and the mother. But it does not occur at beginning or end of the story—the

[10] And as demonstration of my point!

[11] *Multum auctoritatis adfert vetustas—Education of an Orator* 3.7.26; cf.8.3.24. See, similarly, Cicero, *On the Ends of Good and Evil* 1.20.65; Horace, *Epistles* 2.1; Pliny, *Epistles* 5.15.1; Velleius Paterculus, 2.89.3; cf. Isa 23:7. These citations are merely exemplary; the assertion and appeal are ubiquitous.

[12] Of course other terms have been used, most of which are too general and subjected to too little rigorous literary and rhetorical analysis—"mashal," John P. Meier, "The Canaanite Woman in Matthew 15:21–28 and the Problem of World Religions," *The Mission of Christ and His Church: Studies in Christology and Ecclesiology* (Good News Studies 30; Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1990), 209–15; "parable," "maxim," and "proverb," W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, vol. 2, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (3 vols.; International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 553; "peirastic irony," "riddle," and "witticism," Jerry Camery-Hoggatt, *Irony in Mark's Gospel: Text and Subtext* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 150–51; "wit," Sharon H. Ringe, "A Gentile Woman's Story," in *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. Letty M. Russell (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985), 65, 71 and Dietmar Neufeld, "Jesus' Eating Transgressions and Social Impropriety in the Gospel of Mark: A Social-Scientific Approach," *Biblical Theology Bulleton* 30, no. 1 (2000), 24; "Streitgespräch," Reinhard Feldmeier, "Die Syrophönizierin (Mk 7,24–30)—Jesu 'verlorenes' Streitgespräch?" in *Die Heide: Juden, Christen und das Problem des Fremden*, ed. Reinhard Feldmeier and Ulrich Heckel (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 70; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Siebeck], 1994), 214–15; "a stock piece of anti-gentile polemic," Edwin K. Broadhead, "The Role of *Wundergeschichten* in the Characterisation of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark," PhD thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1986, 283.

usual position found in other assured examples; the question of who is the sage or cynic is left opaque, and if it is the woman then hardly the pristine cynic;[13] the chreia is meant to challenge the values of society not confirm them, as at least Jesus's words appear to communicate; and the chreia is a timely situational intervention rather than an appeal to a timeless convention.

Graydon Snyder isolated instances of an older Hebraic wisdom literary form(ula) surviving in the New Testament.[14] The term *tobspruch* had been applied to the "מן … תוב" formula[15] found in the Wisdom writings (e.g., Prov 12:9, Eccl 7:2).[16] This "better … than" comparative device passed through various stages. It offered a choice to a person who, in exercising it well, demonstrated wisdom. It could also be a more threatening moralism with exaggerated consequences, such as we find in Mk 9:42–47, though here the κρείσσων or ἀγαθόν of the LXX is replaced by καλόν. Snyder also gave examples of what he called "incomplete" *tobsprüche*[17] though he struggled to adduce a New Testament example.[18] Gerd Theissen offered Mk 7:27—the saying of Jesus—but it required a reconstruction based on a hypothetical "deep structure" that flew in the face of the highly polished form already

[13] Crates's utopian vision eliminated women, prostitutes and children: so Sarah B. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity* (New Preface 1995; New York: Schocken, 1975), 117. In any case, as Ross Kraemer points out, the references to the inclusion of women are themselves problematic: *Her Share of the Blessings: Women's Religions Among Pagans, Jews and Christians in the Greco-Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 89.

[14] Graydon F. Snyder, "The *Tobspruch* in the New Testament," *New Testament Studies* 23, no. 1 (1977): 117–20.

[15] W. Baumgartner, "Die literarischen Gattungen in der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 34, no. 3 (1914), 167; Walther Zimmerli, "Zur Struktur der alttestamentlichen Weisheit," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 51, no. 1 (1933), 192–94.

[16] Glendon E. Bryce drew attention to the same formula in other Ancient Near Eastern collections: "'Better'-Proverbs: An Historical and Structural Study," in *The Society of Biblical Literature Book of Seminar Papers*, ed. Lane C. McGaughy (Missoula: SBL, 1972): 2:343–54. He considered Egypt to be the origin of the Hebrew form (348–49). Charles E. Carlston, without distinguishing the *tobspruch* form from either proverbs or maxims, claims the formula is known in Greek (citing Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 4.49) and Latin (citing Petronius, *Satyricon* 61): "Proverbs, Maxims and the Historical Jesus," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99, no. 1 (1980), 100.

[17] Snyder, "*Tobspruch*," 119.

[18] His example of 1 Cor 7:1 failed to deal with the issue that, if this is a slogan of one Corinthian party, it may bear closer parallels to forms more familiar in the Greco-Roman world (e.g., the *sentential*).

visible in the saying (in terms of structure, rhythm and linguistic polish—as will be shown), and the hypothesization of an independent Galilean-Tyrian contest implanted in an original miracle story.[19]

Nevertheless, both these dismissed possibilities remind us to maintain an awareness of socio-historical context(s) and the importance of reference to authoritative literary forms. Both these elements are crucial for entertaining the third possibility—the proverb.

Aristotle held that the proverb involved a transfer from one species to another.[20] Whilst he recognised that some proverbs were virtually indistinguishable from maxims[21]—an observation developed by later rhetoricians[22]—the primary feature of the genre lay with metaphor. Thus, in one part of his *Rhetoric* when he wants to seal an argument on the appeal of like things, he rolls out four proverbs, three of which use metaphor: "mates warm to the same maturity" (ἥλιξ ἥλικα τέρπει) "a beast knows its breed" (ἔγνω θὴρ θῆρα), "jackdaw caws with jackdaw" (κολοιὸς παρὰ κολοιόν).[23] The metaphor in proverbs frequently involved animals and led to a common association with fables. Quintilian described some proverbs as condensed fables.[24] The medieval commentator on Homer, Bishop Eustathius, thought it was the converse, namely that fables were "unfolded proverbs."[25] The connection is significant, for fables and proverbs were the stock literary artifices recommended for teaching to the young, that is, in inculcating conventional social values and behaviour.[26]

The refinement of form by reference to poetic features does far more than serve as a mnemonic device to perpetuate the life of the proverb, though Aristotle recognised how important verse was to memory.[27] Poetic form awakens other associations through devices of assonance, balance, rhythm and

[19] Theissen, *Gospels in Context*, 75.

[20] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.11 (1413a).

[21] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.21 (1395a).

[22] Quintilian, *Education of an Orator* 8.5.4; Demetrius, *On Style* 4.232.

[23] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.11 (1371b).

[24] Quintilian, *Education of an Orator* 5.11.21.

[25] Eustathius, *Commentary On The Iliad* 3.229.10 (ἐξηπλωμένη παροιμία).

[26] See Seneca, *Epistles* 33.6–7. See Thomas Wiedemann, *Adults and Children in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 1989), 146; Mark Golden, *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 20–22.

[27] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1409b. The gnomological collection in *P. Hibeh* 7 (dated to the latter half of the third century BCE) contains selections in iambic and lyric metres.

the like.[28] Lexical and syntactical registers may provide only snippets of the full range of influences being harnessed. Oral performance of a text awakens these dimensions and evokes a consciousness beyond textual literacy.[29] This has become of considerable importance in the reappraisal of the New Testament writings against the demands of an oral environment,[30] and finds ample demonstration in the resonance of the repeated -oo (-ου) sounds at the opening of Mark (1:1). It is not just words in their communicative purpose that have impact; it is the actual utterance and sound of them. Joseph Russo provides a neat summary: "The preferences seem to be for alliteration and word repetition most of all; then for a medium amount (compared to English) of assonance and vowel harmony (with very little rhyme); and not infrequently binary structure in roughly isometric units, to bring out parallelism and sometimes to emphasize oppositional meanings."[31]

There is a further inner resonance of structure to the proverb that delivers psychagogic effect. This is metre. Aristotle observed that metaphor was most suited to be expressed in iambics,[32] just as the iamb was the prime metre of/for common conversation.[33] Even so, he held that the iamb and the trochee were not conducive to dignity.[34] In fact, base language, scornful abuse, bitter tone, and sexual license were so caught into the meaning of

[28] See generally, Margaret E. Dean, "The Grammar of Sound in Greek Texts: Toward a Method for Mapping the Echoes of Speech in Writing," *Australian Biblical Review* 44 (1996): 53–70; Casey W. Davis, *Oral Biblical Criticism: The Influence of the Principles of Orality on the Literary Structure of Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); Gregory D. Alles, "Verbal Craft and Religious Act in the Iliad," *Seminar Papers of the Society of Biblical Literature* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1986), 100.

[29] Plutarch's recommendations that Menander be read at private dinner parties acknowledge the pleasure of hearing the work performed as much as the acquisition of knowledge: *Moralia* (*Table Talk*) 622c, 673b; cf. 712d. Compare Cicero, *Letters To Atticus* 12.4.2, 15.17.2; 16.2.6, 16.3.1; Pliny, *Epistles* 4.16.3, 5.12.

[30] See especially, Margaret E. Lee and Bernard B. Scott, *Sound Mapping the New Testament* (Salem: Polebridge Press, 2009); Dan Nässelqvist, *Public Reading in Early Christianity: Lectors, Manuscripts, and Sound in the Oral Delivery of John 1–4* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 163; Leiden: Brill, 2016).

[31] Joseph Russo, "The Poetics of the Ancient Greek Proverb," *Journal of Folklore Research* 20, no. 2/3 (1983), 125.

[32] Aristotle, *Poetics* 22.19 (1459a).

[33] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.8 (1408b).

[34] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.8 (1408b–1409a). Compare also Longinus, *On the Sublime* 41. Quintilian noted Aristotle's comments, but argued that the iambic was unavoidable at times—what was important was to surround the common with the superior! See *Education of an Orator* 9.4.87–91.

iambic that Douglas E. Gerber has suggested iambic was not just a metre but a style.[35] Comedy was its literary province,[36] and two of its favourite devices were metaphor[37] and diminutive.[38] It is frequent also in prose satire,[39] and the vilification of an enemy in oratory. Plutarch for example describes Cato: "betaking himself to iambic verse, he heaped much scornful abuse upon Scipio, adopting the bitter tone of Archilochus."[40] The epigram in the *Palatine Anthology* which opened the essay picks up the same mentor of iambic vilification, warning Cerberus: "Archilochus is dead. Be on your guard against the pungent iambic wrath engendered by the bitter anger of his tongue."[41]

Metre used in a proverb has an evocative as well as mnemonic function. It arranges and identifies sound.[42] Thus, where a metre is incorporated, a much larger universe is projected. This demands neither developed training nor circumspect attention. The socio-rhetorical world that formed people and enabled them to communicate meant that access to these associations was as close as the air that was breathed.[43] It is significant that many of the Byzantine paroimiographs, that is collections of proverbs, have large sections devoted to proverbs preserved in metrical form. Aristotle could even speak of nature (φύσις) showing the right metre to use.[44] Michael Nagler comments

[35] Douglas E. Gerber, "Introduction," *Greek Iambic Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries* BC (Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); see also Michael Coffey, *Roman Satire* (London: Methuen, 1976), 56–57. The name derives from Iambe, Demeter's (in)famous servant-girl, "remembered" (blamed?) for her cutting and vulgar humour: Hugh Lloyd-Jones, *Females of the Species: Semonides on Women* (London: Duckworth, 1975), 13; Maurice Olender, "Aspects of Baubo: Ancient Texts and Contexts," in *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, ed. David M. Halperin, John J. Winkler, and Froma I. Zeitlin, trans. Robert Lamberton (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 89–91.

[36] "The natural metre for invective is the iambic" (Francis M. Cornford, *The Origin of Attic Comedy* [Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1968], 101–2).

[37] Aristotle, *Poetics* 22.19 (1459a).

[38] Saara Lilja, *Dogs in Ancient Greek Poetry* (Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennicae, 1976), 78.

[39] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophists* 445b.

[40] Plutarch, *Lives* (*Life of Cato*) 7. Plutarch tried to save Cato's standing by adding that he "avoided his [Archilochus's] license and puerility." Archilochus is similarly credited with the pungency of iambics by Horace, *Art of Poetry* 79. Compare the threats of Catullus to unleash his iambics on an opponent (*Poems* 40.2, 54A, Fr. 1).

[41] *Palatine Anthology*. 7.69.

[42] Plato, *Philebus* 17b.

[43] Cicero, *On the Orator* 3.49.191, 195.

[44] Aristotle, *Poetics* 24.12 (1460a). No doubt nature agreed with Aristotle's judgment; after all, Aristotle was nature's speech-writer!

that an audience weaned on the tradition is more likely to appreciate fully the "many dimensional network of potentialities of sound, sense, and even of rhythm which is realised differently and to different effect in each context."[45]

Aristotle however was sanguine about leaving too much to an audience, especially when proverbs were functioning as a moral judgment. Here the boundaries between proverb and maxim or sentence blur.[46] The proverb's metaphorical expansiveness becomes narrowed[47] as the context that the proverb addresses is passed under judgment. The infinitive—frequent in proverbs—facilitates the potential for ethical application. Older commentators called this function an example of the "infinitive of exclamation."[48] Though the rest of the sentence remains unsaid, nevertheless the concluding thought is enticed. William C. Green gives as an example "That I didn't even put a cap on before I came" and the silent addition "[was foolish]."[49] Hence, proverbs were readily turned into maxims.[50] Maxims clearly invest words with a moral purpose rather than leave them floating, potentially subject to the brilliant though vulgar improvisations of an Aristophanes. The proverb, so constrained, becomes more clearly summary, conclusive and dismissive of debate. Collections of gnomic sayings abound in the Hellenistic period,[51] crossing cultural boundaries in both adoption and collection. Fre-

[45] Michael N. Nagler, *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 33. See further Richard Bauman, *Story, Performance and Event* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Richard P. Martin, "The Seven Sages as Performers of Wisdom," in *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*, ed. Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 108–28.

[46] Joseph Russo, "Prose Genres for the Performance of Traditional Wisdom in Ancient Greece: Proverb, Maxim and Apothegm," in *Poet, Public and Performance in Ancient Greece*, ed. Lowell Edmunds and Robert W. Wallace (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 50.

[47] This is both the appeal and the danger of proverbs. Ian Henderson describes this as the "element of antiproverbiality in all proverb use" ("Gnomic Quatrains in the Synoptics: An Experiment in Genre Definition," *New Testament Studies* 37, no. 4 [1991], 496).

[48] See William J. M. Starkie, *The Wasps of Aristophanes* (London: Macmillan, 1897), 283, and Douglas M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes: Wasps* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 243.

[49] William C. Green, *Aristophanes: The Wasps* (London, Oxford and Cambridge: Rivingtons, 1868), 84n. More recent grammarians such as Stanley E. Porter call it a "predicative nominative": *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 195.

[50] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.21 (1395b). Demetrius was a little more cynical. He recognised passing literary fashions and that various authors cast the same idea in different forms. Language, he suggested, perhaps in an allusion to the medium of primary schooling, "was like wax—able to be moulded into different shapes": *On Style* 5.296–98.

[51] See the list compiled by John Kloppenborg in Appendix I (especially section 2) to his

quently, these gnomic sayings combined proverbs and maxims in the same connection, even to the point of adding the sententious judgement ("it is [not] good …," "it is [not] wise …") to a self-contained proverb. In the context of a debate, this was meant to seal and finish an argument.

This conjunction of universal appeal and moral guidance was bolstered by two further elements associated with proverbs, that of antiquity and the proof from nature. In part these are captured in Quintilian's description of language. This first-century Roman lecturer on oratory stated: "Language is based on reason, antiquity, authority and usage."[52] Reason, as the distinguishing mark of the human being (or, as will become clear, the male human being) is that which arranges the world. Hence, the very act of utterance distinguishes man, as man, from the animal, which is a non-articulate participant in that natural world,[53] whilst at the same time requiring the observant human to recognise the rational order imbuing the natural world. When it can register the primeval tones of antiquity, nature and literature become one in witness to the logocentric order of the cosmos. That the proverbs had survived was itself testimony to the truth that they contained. In this sense, proverbs *were* truth, antiquity being its own justification.[54] Aristotle took the weight of antiquity to an extraordinary length, applying the myth of primal lost civilisations to underscore the value, universal veracity and anonymity of proverbs.[55]

The Formation of Q (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 329–41 (esp. 337–40). To this may be added *P. Oxy.* 2661, 3005. Such collections appear to have had a fairly wide currency: see Plutarch, *Moralia* (*Sayings of Spartan Women*) 239a, (*Courage of Women*) 298f, Athenaeus, *Learned Banqueteers* 160b. For the history of the collecting of proverbs, see Anton Elter, *De gnomologiorum Graecorum historia* (Bonn: Programm der Universität, 1893–1897), Karl Ruprecht, "Paroimiographoi,"*Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 18, no. 2(3) (1949), cols. 1735–1738.

[52] Quintilian, *Education of an Orator* 1.6.1: *sermo constat ratione vel vetustate, auctoritate, consuetudines.*

[53] Marcia L. Colish, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 1:56. Quintilian claims the power of speech distinguishes man from animal: *Education of an Orator* 12.1.2.

[54] Note the widely influential essay by Shirley L. Arora, "The Perception of Proverbiality." Originally published in *Proverbium* 1 (1984): 1–38, repr. in *Wise Words: Essays on the Proverb*, ed. Wolfgang Mieder (New York: Garland Press, 1994), 3–29.

[55] Ironically, it too comes to us as a fragment. His "On Philosophy" is no longer extant. The brief quotation is found in Synesius, *Encomium on Baldness* 22, cited in Russo, "Prose Genres," 52, Margaret M. Bryant, *Proverbs and How to Collect Them* (Greenboro: American Dialect Society, 1945), 4, and Carlston, "Proverbs, Maxims," 88.

Much more could be expended on this contextual and literary framing for proverbs, but it is time to turn to the text of Mark itself. The saying of Jesus is proverbial but at the level of a proverb contained within a maxim within an enthymeme that highlights the appeal to the assumed shared ground of understanding. The tripartite structure is this:

a) ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα
b) οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν καλὸν
c) λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν

The γάρ is a crucial indicator that the total construction is an enthymeme. As defined by Vernon Robbins, "A proposition plus a rationale presents an enthymeme (a syllogism with a premise),"[56] or as he prefers to distill it: a rule (as in the proposition) a case and a result, with the result often left unsaid but deduced by an audience.[57] The negative form in the maxim (οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν καλόν) strengthens it, advocating one course of action over against another.[58] The breakdown thus becomes:

Rule: Let the children first be fed
Case: Taking the children's bread and throwing it to the dogs
(is not good … therefore)
Result: The request by a dog for food is (to be) denied.

The proverb, in part c) and in the "Case," encapsulates and, in intent, completes the idea, crowning the argument. It is identifiable as a proverb through its internal conformity to several of the elements mentioned above, given detailed focus in the following.[59]

[56] Vernon K. Robbins, "Progymnastic Rhetorical Composition and Pre-Gospel Traditions: A New Approach," in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, ed. Camille Focant (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 110; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 125.

[57] "From Enthymeme to Theology in Luke 11:1–13," in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*, ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998), 191–214.

[58] Anaximen, *Rhetoric for Alexander* 1430a. See the discussion in Paul Holloway, "The Enthymeme as an Element of Style in Paul," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120, no. 2 (2001): 329–43.

[59] In this section, I have drawn largely on my *Beyond the Word of a Woman*, 81–102.

In the structure, two infinitives (λαβεῖν and βαλεῖν) dominate. Infinitives appeal to the universal.[60] The universal appeal of the general saying is accentuated by the pluralising of terms: τέκνα and the diminutive κυνάρια. Aristotle saw in the use of the plural for the singular a means for adding *gravitas* or impressiveness to a saying.[61] Any particular referent is thereby subjected to a larger claim,[62] precisely the operation of a proverb.

The combination of the two infinitives constructs a remarkable symmetry, assonance and phonemic quality, positioned as a clamp on the whole proverb. The metathesis of λαβεῖν—βαλεῖν has sometimes been noted.[63] Its importance lies in the phonemic quality (*paronomasia*)[64] wrought tensively by the shift of consonants (*metathesis*) and the contribution that it makes to the balance of the saying.[65] According to Demetrius, the impact of words that sound similar generated a sort of clash (σύμπληξις) that arrested attention more vividly than could otherwise be achieved (by a prosaic description).[66]

[60] On the appeal to the universal in proverbs, see especially Peter Berger, *The Sacred Canopy: The Social Reality of Religion* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), 13–14.

[61] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.6 (1407b); cf. Longinus, *On the Sublime* 23.2–4, *Rhetoric for Herennius* 4.33.44–45.

[62] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.7 (1408a)—and see Russell and Winterbottom's comments to this effect: Donald A. Russell and Michael Winterbottom (eds.), *Ancient Literary Criticism: The Principal Texts in New Translations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 144.

[63] See Joachim Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament II/1; Zürich: Benziger, 1978), 1:249; Jean-François Baudoz, *Les Miettes de la Table: Études synoptique et socio-religieuse de Mt 15,21–28 et de Mc 7,24–30* (Études bibliques 27; Paris: Gabalda, 1995), 249–50 (who sees an antithetic parallelism); E. A. Russell, "The Canaanite Woman and the Gospels" (Mt 15.21–28; cf. Mk 7.24–30, in *Studia Biblica 1978, Part II: Papers on the Gospels*, ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1980), 263 (who wonders about its mnemonic value). Robert Gundry thinks that the assonance and chiasm (!) of infinitive placement emphasise the contrast between Jesus's disciples and Gentile children, although how this might occur remains opaque. He finds the disciples to be present (having tagged along from 7:17) and ciphered under the τέκνα of Jesus's saying to the woman: *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 373; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 2; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1980), 199.

[64] A minor argument about definitions runs amongst contemporary grammarians. But the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4.21.29) allowed a wide range of candidates for the category of paronomasia.

[65] This metathesis is a common ornament among Greek writers: Homer, *Odyssey* 21.359; Gregory Nazianzus, *Poems of his own Life* 1270.5 (in a section almost self-consciously full of the device); Aristotle, *History of Animals* 611b; Plutarch, *Moralia* 442d; Ps-Galen 3.461.12–13; Alexander, *Therapeutica* 2.467.24. See the comments on the device by Eustathius, *Commentary on the Iliad of Homer* 3.166.3.

[66] Demetrius, *On Style* 2.105–106; cf. Cicero, *On the Orator* 4.21.29. Mark uses the

Joseph Russo's observation on such constructions is telling:

> A certain amount of jingle or echo may be used here to contribute to the total effectiveness of parallel structure in highlighting similarities or opposites. An apparent word-magic is at work here, in the non-rational suggestion that sheer phonemic parallels help ensure that the realities named will also proceed along the course indicated.[67]

The resonances of the striking letters within the saying have their own force and significance. Within the clamp of the paranomastic infinitives, the dominating sounds are *rho* and *kappa*:

λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν

These letters draw on harsh expulsions of noise. *Beta* and *lambda* in the infinitives contribute to this discharge. *Beta* was long recognised as a rough sound;[68] *lambda* was often tied to the *rho*.[69] *Rho* and Latin *r* were designated the "dog-letter" (*canina littera*)[70] so-called because of the threatening growl that it made.[71]

The emphasised sound-qualities reinforce the linguistic communication of its content.[72] The caustic rasp of a crushing retort demolishes any claim that the woman advances, rendering improbable that Jesus is speaking humorously or even didactically for the woman's encouragement or development. This sonorous denial has another menace. The ethological connections between woman and dog were seemingly supported by the similarities

device elsewhere, in 4:39 (γαλήνη μεγάλη) and perhaps 7:24 (ἤθελεν—λαθεῖν) for example. Here, I suspect, the total segment is pre-formed.

[67] Russo, "Ancient Greek Proverb," 124. Quintilian gives a telling exposé of the psychagogic influence over an audience: *Education of an Orator* 8.3.1–6. The danger however is the loss of the rational—significantly, Quintilian aligns this "fault" with women (ibid. 10.7.12). Herein lies a fissure in the reign of *logos*.

[68] Demetrius, *On Style* 3.176; Quintilian, *Education of an Orator* 12.10.32.

[69] Quintilian, *Education of an Orator* 1.11.5; Lucian, *Court of Vowels* 4. Compare Demetrius's similar analysis of the mimetic qualities of certain words, based on a passage from Homer: *On Style* 4.220.

[70] Erasmus, *Adages* 2.4.34, citing Persius, *Satires* 1.109–110.

[71] *Irritata canis quod 'rr' quam plurima dicat*: Varro, *On the Latin Language* 6; cf. Lucilius, *Satires* 3–4. The same combination of *canis* and *irritate* (note the feminine) is found in Plautus, *Captives*, 485.

[72] See James G. Williams, "The Power of Form: A Study of Biblical Proverbs," *Semeia* 17 (1980): 39, 44–47.

of sound between *kappa* and *gamma*. Γυνή (as in v.26) readily blurred into κύνη/κυνῆ/ἡ κύων.[73] Such word-plays were common-place.[74] Nature provided warrant, it would seem, for the connection of women and dogs.[75]

The final reinforcement of the proverb's application comes in its metrical cast, also conveying a psychagogic effect. Plutarch acknowledged that "poetry adds to the prose meaning, the delights of song and metre and rhythm."[76] This "Aesthetic Field Framework"[77] governs the zone between the idea and its speaking, namely the combinations of rhythm and phonetic sound. The incitement to the aural that is evoked by oral or textual performance elicits "a broader or more abstract reality" that expands the compact content of a few lines.[78] There is a common network of sound, sense and rhythm, whenever a surface structure evokes a certain commonly understood *gestalt*.[79] An audience weaned on a traditional referentiality would appreciate this poten-

[73] The use of the γυνά (the Doric form of γυνή) in epigram 5.433 in the *Greek Anthology* is tied to the name Λάκαινα, deliberately evoking the famous Laconian hound of the *Odyssey*. The further connection with λύκος, "wolf," accentuates the proximity of the wild: see the discussion in Lilja, *Dogs*, 114. A similar connection was forged philologically between the female monster Skylla and σκύλαξ: see Arthur B. Cook, *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion*, vol. 3, part 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925), 414.

[74] So, for example, Menander, makes similar play of an "old woman": Πολὺ χεῖρον ἐστιν ἐρεθίσαι γραῦν ἢ κύνα "It's far worse to stir up a hag than a dog" (my translation). Menander fr. 258 (Meineke) *apud* Stobaeus, *Florilegia* 73.46.

[75] For the detail of this naturalised equation that spans Greek and Jewish texts and is more foundational than any link of dog and gentile, see *Beyond the Word of a Woman*, 3–42.

[76] Plutarch, *Moralia* (*Loving*) 769c; whilst there was always a debate about the extent to which poetic rhythms could be included in discourse before it collapsed into song, there was no question that poetic rhythms had an immense psychagogic power on an audience. See the discussion in Jeffrey Walker, *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 117.

[77] The phrase is taken from Elizabeth C. Fine, *The Folklore Text: From Performance to Print* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 68–72. It is this aspect which makes a substantial addition to Vernon Robbins's "tapestry" of interacting modes of engagement with a text: see generally, his *Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse* (London: Routledge, 1996). And it reinforces and extends the analysis of Mark in terms of its oral patternings made by Christopher Bryan, *A Preface to Mark: Notes on the Gospel in its Literary and Cultural Settings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) and Lee and Scott, *Sound Mapping* (*supra*). The whole field of rhythmical patterns and their rhetorical function in the prose writing of the Gospels awaits general exploration.

[78] See the valuable PhD thesis by Margo Sue Kitts, "Oath-Making in the Iliad," Berkeley: University of California/Graduate Theological Union, 1994.

[79] Kitts, "Oath-Making," 55–56, referring to the work of Michael Nagler, *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).

tial fully. As George Kennedy notes, "all ancient literature was intended to be spoken or read aloud and the ears of the speakers and hearers had become highly sensitive to the various possible effects."[80] The metrical form of a saying therefore augments the sense of order and communication working upon, in and through words, shaping the tone and modulation of the delivery.[81] Dan Ben-Amos neatly sums up the argument: "the existence or absence of a metric substructure in a message is the quality first recognised in any communicative event."[82]

The metre of the proverb is as simple as it is clear, almost rustically trite, and, as to be expected, reinforces the caustic rebuke that has begun to be seen:

λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων[83]
˘ — ˘ — ˘ — ˘ —
(καὶ)
—
τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν
— ˘ ˘ ˘ — ˘ —

Full-scale iambics are displayed here[84]—the first line an iambic dimeter; the second line an iambic trimeter, with the succession of short syllables in κυναρίοις offending Quintilian's desire to avoid "a sound similar to that of children's rattles."[85] The effect is to reinforce the infantilisation loaded into the diminutive, hardly an amelioration as those intent on rescuing Jesus's reputation would suggest. Such neuter diminutives contribute "to a tendency to depersonalize and objectify women, to present them as things—and rather insignificant things at that."[86]

All this goes to the internal indications that a proverb is being deployed here. The question is whether there is external evidence. A search does not

[80] George Kennedy, *Quintilian* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1969), 90.

[81] Quintilian, *Education of an Orator* 1.7.2–3.

[82] Dan Ben-Amos, "Analytical Categories and Ethnic Genres," in *Folklore Genres*, ed. Dan Ben-Amos (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1976), 228. Dio Chrysostom recognises the same: *Orations* 12.71.

[83] The division of the syllables in τε-κνων is recommended by *P. Cair* 65446, col 1, l.8, and supported in a metrical inscription *TAM V.*1–2.991.

[84] For a fuller analysis, see *Beyond the Word of a Woman*, 86–91.

[85] Quintilian, *Education of an Orator* 9.4.66.

[86] Golden, *Children and Childhood*, 24.

disappoint though we need to bear in mind that, even a metrical encoding of a proverb did not guarantee that the formal wording of the proverb would appear identically. In fact one of the marks of literary skill was the ability to manipulate a proverb to increase the punning, comical or flippant effect,[87] though it should be noted that this is not on display here.

The presence of the proverb had in fact been signaled by Erasmus in his sixteenth-century collection of adages and tapped by David Smith at the turn of the twentieth century.[88] But it was forgotten. Erasmus's form reads σεαυτὸν οὐ τρέφων κύνας τρέφεις "Being unable to feed yourself, you yet feed dogs." In the form αὐτὸν οὐ τρέφων κύνας τρέφεις it occurs in the second century(?) paroimiograph of Diogenes among examples in trochaic metre.[89] The servant's cry in Aristophanes's *Wasps* (835), τοιουτονὶ τρέφειν κύνα "fancy keeping such a dog" has been seen as a variant of this form.[90] The Latin equivalent, *Te ipsum non alens canes alis*, is found in Tertullian's exposition on the Lord's Prayer when he draws in the Syrophoenician story to illustrate that the petition for bread will not be met by the father's throwing of the bread to dogs.[91] The question of the proper distribution of food also forms the basis of a declamatory exercise in juridical training, also based on the proverb.[92] If you do not support your own, held Seneca, you go hungry.[93] Possibly the proverb arose out of the hunt where keepers of dogs became so interested in canine maintenance and training that families were deprived.[94] The edge of course is that a Greek proverb in the hands of the Jew Jesus repudiates dogs altogether (Ex 22:31; 1 Kgs 14:11, etc) and the equation is intensified between the little bitches of the proverb and the woman, who is a Greek from Syrophoenicia, who lacks any male embedding and who is likely, in ancient

[87] See Athenaeus, *Learned Banqueteers* 160b-c, Martial, *Epigram* 5.60 and compare the various forms of the same proverb in Lk 9:62, Hesiod, *Work and Days* 443 and Pliny, *Natural History* 18.19.49.

[88] David Smith, "Our Lord's Hard Saying to the Syrophoenician Woman," *Expository Times* 12 (1901): 319–21.

[89] As found in Andreas Schottus, Παροιμίαι Ἑλληνίκαι: *Adagia sive proverbia Graecorum ex Zenobio seu Zenadoto, Diogeniano & Suidae Collectaneis* (Antwerp: Moreti, 1612), 642–43.

[90] See also *Comica Adespota Fragmenta* §639 (Kock ed., *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*); Pollux, *Onomastica* 5.47; *Athenaeus Learned Banqueteers* 3.97a; see Lilja, *Dogs*, 87.

[91] Tertullian, *On Prayer*, 6.3.

[92] Ps-Quintilian, *Declamations* Bk 5; Seneca, *Controversiae* 1.1, 1.6, 7.4; cf. Quintilian, *Education of an Orator* 7.1.52; 7.6.5.

[93] Seneca, *Controversiae* 1.1.16.

[94] This may lie behind the meaning assigned to the proverb by the paroimographer, Diogenes: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπορούντων μέν, ἑτέρους δὲ θρέψειν ἐπαγγελλομένων.

conventional judgment, to be held responsible for the state of her daughter.[95] The proverb has sought to restore the stability of the conventional world and to socialise the woman into due observance.[96]

This should have been the end of the matter, just as when Jerome uses a censorious form of the proverb "dogs must not eat the children's bread" to seal his argument in a letter to Paulinus.[97] The dumping of this proverb in a sententious warning would have left an audience in no doubt. The request is refused; the honour of Jesus, potentially under threat to be soiled by contact with a woman lacking reputational protection, is preserved; Jewish sensibilities about dogs, even in the use of a (probably) Greek proverb, is honoured.

But, just as the warning in the book of Proverbs in its Greek translation has it, Γυνὴ ἄφρων καὶ θρασεῖα ἐνδεὴς ψωμοῦ γίνεται, ἥ οὐκ ἐπίσταται αἰσχύνην "A woman who is foolish and flaunting and who knows no shame, parades poverty to extract a morsel" (Prov 9:13). In the act of refusing to be silenced and rejecting a man's rebuttal, the woman actually confirms the default markers of her reputation.[98] By the end of her reply, however, Jesus is won over! And the warning of the book of Proverbs has been ignored in favour of a breakthrough in recognition of where the gospel can be sourced.

Her response to Jesus leaves behind all traces of the rustic's pedestrian rehearsal of a set piece. Not only is the craft of another known proverb given a superlative, creative flourish, but she deftly posits a challenge to the universal claims of this traditional piece of conventional wisdom.

Firstly her proverb begins with an almost ponderous accent on its importance: ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ—unique in this form of response in Mark,[99] and the only use of the present tense in the pericope.[100] All the agi-

[95] See my *Beyond the Word of a Woman*, 143–46.

[96] On proverbs as a socialising device, see Howard C. Kee, *Knowing the Truth: A Sociological Approach to New Testament Interpretation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 52–53; Arland D. Jacobson, "Proverbs and Social Control: A New Paradigm for Wisdom Studies," in *Gnosticism and the Early Christian World: In Honor of James M. Robinson*, ed. James E. Goehring et al. (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1990), 81–83; John M. Foley, *How to Read an Oral Poem* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 106.

[97] Jerome, *Epistles* 58.

[98] In terms of sharp-tongued—see Menander, *incert*, 259, (Meineke 783); in terms of the association with licentiousness, see Alexis fr. 302, Livy, *History* 34.2.11–3.2 (Cato's speech); in terms of the collation with the animal see Menander *apud* Stobaeus, *Flor* 73.56.

[99] Usually it is the participle combined with main verb (e.g., Mk 3:33 et al.) A few manuscripts have a similar usage in Mk 9:38 (D, f1, 25, it).

[100] Note the assessment of the centralising function of the present in a pericope: Porter, *Idioms*, 31.

tation perceived in the encounter becomes concentrated in the succession of short syllables that open her reply,[101] taking up the clipped ending of Jesus's words:

Τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης
˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ — — ˘ ˘ —

But then the calming waters flow with an aggregation of long syllables rounding off her word, "the concurrence of the same long vowels" which bears the lilt of a song, according to Demetrius, the style merchant:[102]

ἐσθίουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν παιδίων
—˘— ˘ ˘ ˘ — ˘ ˘— — —˘—

The euphonic soothing that rounds off her word brilliantly serves not only to bring calm into a tense situation. Her word also picks up key terms from Jesus's proverb and turns them to her advantage, significantly without any acknowledgement of hierarchy or priority that might be taken from Jesus's accent on "first"/"preeminently" (πρῶτον).[103] Moreover, and this is where context is crucial, the significance of her own background, a Greek from Syrophoenicia, indicates the ease with which dogs can occupy the household, as esteemed hounds—ὑποκάτω can bear the sense of "belonging to."[104] The proverb clearly reflects a cultural practice that Jews eschewed; not even Tobias's companion dog is admitted into the household (Tobit 5:16; 11:4). The proverb, albeit in succulent dress, is familar in various expressions: λείψαν' ἐκβάλλειν κυσίν; *canis vivens e magdalis*.[105]

These all transform the dog from a taker to a partaker. As the dog has won a place in the household, so also the woman claims one for herself and her daughter.

[101] The use of the cretic or even Sotadean rhythms gives way to the lyric dactyl. See further *Beyond the Word of a Woman*, 166–67.

[102] Demetrius, *Eloc* 2.73–74.

[103] I am conscious of the debate over the intent of the word πρῶτον. Most retain a salvation-historical approach to the word, i.e., to the Jew first and then to the Greek: see most recently Harrison, "Every Dog," 132–34. However the tone of Jesus's word to the woman seems more concerned with accenting the pre-eminence of "the children" without any sense that there is a sequential pecking-order (cf. the use of πρῶτοι in Mk 6:21).

[104] So James H. Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1952), 657.

[105] Euripides, *Cress* (fr 469); anon tragedy (fr 118.4 Nauck); cf. Strabo, *Geography* 11.11.31.

So a second proverb is delivered. As we have seen, a key element of the weight of a proverb is its appearance as universal wisdom. But here there are two proverbs, one denying access, one admitting access. The absolute character of a universal has been compromised. The exchange of short, pithy, allusive sayings—called *kommata*—in tragedy show that such a construction would have general recognition.[106] But this is not confined to a Greek background. The Book of Proverbs occasionally provides diametrically opposed couplets in sequence (Prov 17:27–28; 26:4–5). These examples of a counter-proverb, sometimes called *antilogia*,[107] function to erode the easy certitude that a slick, distilled piece of wisdom can provide the basis of decision-making. The focus is restored to the presenting specifics, and in Mark's Gospel, Jesus acknowledges which word, which λόγος, which proverb,[108] is most apt—that of the woman. And it is seen as a powerful word, given that Jesus's use of the perfect (ἐξελήλυθεν, v.29) indicates an announcement of release—*not* his word of healing—for the daughter.[109] And, as a further extension of the critique of logocentric absolutism, Mark climaxes the story with a finding of a younger generation reclined on a couch and released—the delicious irony being that this is the position of readiness for dining (taking βεβλημένον as a middle not passive perfect participle). The daughter is released not just from demonic possession but also from collation with even-household dogs.[110] This is no return of the child to conventional stability. The child has extended the mother's logos-victory into a silent, so-

[106] See J. Barnes, "A New Gnomologium: With Some Remarks on Gnomic Anthologies, II," *Classical Quarterly* (ns) 1, no. 1/2 (1951): 1–19, especially at 3–4. On the philosophical undergirding, see Paul Gordon, *The Critical Double: Figurative Meaning in Aesthetic Discourse* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1995).

[107] Barnes, "New Gnomologium," 2; cf. Stuart Weeks, *Early Israelite Wisdom* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 25–26.

[108] Note that λόγος frequently means "proverb", in the context of an introduction or reference to a paroimic saying: Dio Chrysostom, *Orations* 3.110; Lucian, *Alexander* 13; Athenaeus, *Learned Banqueteers* 4.134c.

[109] A variant in the Old Latin (c, g1; also some vulgate mss) shifts the exorcism of the demon from the past (*exit*) to the future (*exiet*), thereby clawing back the accent on the word of the woman either to that of Jesus now-pronouncement or to her obedience in departing (cf. Jn 4:50).

[110] This is an extremely brief summation of the details and significance of v.30. For a detailed analysis, see Cadwallader, *Beyond the Word of a Woman*, 237–76. For more accessible versions see idem."Of Pets and Pests—Women, Children and Dogs," *Dialogue Australasia* 23 (2010): 12–15; "When 'Word' is Not Enough: The Syrophoenician Encounter with Jesus (Mark 7:24–30)," *FourthR* 25, no. 5 (2012): 3–9, 14.

matic communication of freedom from proverbial reinforcement of position, and in so doing has re-drawn attention to her mother's own bodily initiatives.[111] The daughter has embodied a separation from the equation with dogs under the table even if that was often the place where children were located and even if that is the remainder in her mother's adroit handling of what was supposedly the male, logocentric preserve. This is a far more satisfying and cohesive end to a miracle story than one left exhausted on a bed, as is the usual interpretation. After all, even Peter's mother-in-law immediately launched into providing for guests, once she had been healed (Mk 1:31). And this communication (as indicated through the mother's finding, εὗρεν, v.30) is done by bodily act not word. Given that the collar of a dog was symbolic of reason controlling the irrational animal/slave/female (cf. Jude 10), this is a striking realignment.[112] Jesus's endorsement of the woman's word accepts that dogs belong to the household rather than being separated from it; the daughter's embodied movement extends that word into a recognition, a eureka moment, that dogs and children, contrary to the aggregation of Plato and Aristotle,[113] are not to be blurred into ill-defined inferiority.[114]

From this provocative foundation, we turn to the next head of the story, that of Matthew.

The Canaanite Woman

From the beginning a number of shifts are readily discerned. Jesus is not alone but has his disciples with him, acting as foil or broker of access (Matt 15:23); he does not actually enter Gentile territory but is encountered by a border-breaker (Matt 15:21–22); the intruding woman is now dubbed a Canaanite (15:22a) and her response to Jesus is hailed not as an example of λόγος but of "faith" (15:28). On the assumption of Markan priority, we need to investigate the possible purposes behind these patent adjustments, and along the way discern what other, perhaps more subtle, changes have been

[111] See Jennifer A. Glancy, "Jesus, the Syrophoenician Woman, and Other First Century Bodies," *Biblical Interpretation* 18, no.4 (2010): 342–63.

[112] Plutarch, *Life of Phocion* 754a; Arrian Cynegeticus 11.1; Euripides, *Medea* 54; Tibullus 2.4.32–6; Ovid, *Ars* 1.6; Suetonius, *On Rhetoricians* 3.

[113] Plato, *Laws* 710a; Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1384b.

[114] It is emblematic that, in the theatre, children were deployed to enact dogs: see Lilja, *Dogs*, 74.

made. Here a second "Joshua-Jesus" was being confronted with the failure of the propaganda to deliver the erstwhile reality.[115]

The sheer naming of the woman as a Canaanite ushers in the razor-blades of raw memory. The Canaanites ought not exist.[116] This was clear from the Deuteronomic ban,[117] even if it be understood in its ANE environment as a literary artifice of self-definition and self-aggrandisement.[118] So in addition to all the seamier shades of woman painted in Mark's stereotype,[119] the woman finds her stigmatised identity compounded by being named a Canaanite, and one who intrudes back into territory now coded as Jewish. And just to make sure we catch this fulsome, loathsome creature, Matthew increases her loquaciousness. Twice she is said to "krazo" Jesus and his disciples. Κράζω is an onomatopoeic word—it evokes the cawing of a crow, given added significance because a variation on the "throw to the dogs" proverb was "throw it to the crows" βάλλ'ες κόρακας.[120] The resounding associations were certainly picked up in the Majority Text of Matthew, with the variant ἐκραύγασεν "she bayed,"[121] though the better text also carries the progressive or continuous imperfect sense.[122] Peter Stallybrass distills the signification: "The signs of the 'harlot' are her linguistic 'fullness' and her frequenting of public spaces."[123]

But it is the content of the woman's initial supplication that electrifies this linguistic fullness. Mark had held back on the introductory words of the encounter, summatively using indirect speech (Mk 7:26b), waiting to un-

[115] Josh 3:10, 11:20 cf. 16:10, 17:12–13.

[116] Laura Donaldson attempts to draw a line between the Canaanite (daughter) and the "Ghostwife" (traditionally "witch") of Endor ("Gospel Hauntings," 98, 106–7). Matthew's genealogy is certainly interested in Canaanite women, but she does not figure among them.

[117] Deut 7:1–2, 17:18, 20:17.

[118] This is precisely the tone, for example, of the blanket-bombing-to-oblivion of tribes in Canaan in the Merneptah stele—Israel included.

[119] Confirmed in the Targum to Ezekiel 16.45 where the sexual licentiousness of the Amorites and Hittites, charged against Israel, becomes that of the Canaanites, mother and daughter alike. See Samson H. Levey, *The Targum of Ezekiel* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 53–54.

[120] Lucian, *Life of Demonax* 60; Aristophanes, *Clouds* 133; *Wasps* 852, 982.

[121] C, L, W, 0119, 𝔐.

[122] So Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, trans. James E. Crouch (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 339.

[123] "Patriarchal Territories: The Body Enclosed," in *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy J. Vickers (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 127. For an ancient example, see Aristophanes, *Women in Parliament*, 1101.

leash a single pointed exchange.[124] The Canaanite names Jesus in terms that show her as a secret insider to the knowledge of the Son of David conveyed in Matthew's opening genealogy.[125] But she also demonstrates or claims a sisterhood with the very women that leap from that genealogy into the limelight—Tamar and Rahab in particular.[126] The combination of "Lord" and "Son of David" is presaged only by two blind men (Matt 9:27, 28) and there was no hint that they descended from a despised, indigenous people, although, perhaps significantly, David's ban against the blind and the lame having access to the house of God (2 Sam 5:6–8) burdened them. This is what makes the woman's additional liturgical note so ironic; the call for mercy draws on the Psalms (Pss 6:2, 9:13, 31:9 cf. 51:1). But rather than this ameliorating the situation it potentially curries a higher level of disdain, for, preeminently, this supplication exudes the air of the temple (cf. Lk 16:24), the very place where, explicitly, Canaanites are prohibited from entering (Zech 14:21).[127] And if Carol and Eric Meyers are right, the reference to temple in Zechariah encompasses the whole land, not the confinement of an architectural building.[128] Little wonder then that there is silence in the land. As Silvia Montiglio suggests, silence carried rhetorical force (for a male) as a means of bolstering his virtuous authority making the subsequent utterance an unpleasant necessity.[129]

Now, instead of the Syrophoenician woman beseeching Jesus, it is the disciples (note ἐρωτάω Matt 15:23 and Mk 7:26b). When finally the silence breaks it is to reiterate the inherited response to the Canaanite, as if reminding the disciples—God is for the "lost sheep of the house of Israel." This is where

[124] The accent in the exchange is laid upon the woman's word by the extended double-indicative introduction (Mk 7:27a cf. Mk 2:18; 8:25; Jn 13:21) as compared with the more usual participle and indicative verb of saying (Mk 3:33; 15:9 et al).

[125] Matt 1:6, 16–18. Note the *gematria* symbolism of the name דוד= 14; see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1.161–5, 185.

[126] Matt 1:3 cf. Gen 38 (Tamar); Matt 1:5 cf. Josh 2; 6:17, 22–25 (Rahab).

[127] Note here that the NRSV marginal reading, "Canaanites," is to be preferred: so, Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14* (Anchor Bible 25C; New York, Doubleday, 1993), 489–92. The translators of the main text have turned the Hebrew into the Vulgate's metaphor, "traders" (*Mercator*), rather than follow the literalism of the LXX. Compare Charles L. Feinberg, *God Remembers: A Study of Zechariah* (Portland, OR: Multnomah Press, 1977), 263.

[128] Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, 491.

[129] Silvia Montiglio, *Silence in the Land of Logos* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 130–33.

the undoubted pre-eminence of the Jew finds its gospel foundation.[130] And it is not lost to the story even though many commentators seek to build either a conversion-moment for Jesus or a later retrojection based on the Jesus-movement breaking ethnic and religious boundaries—the harbinger of the Sunday of the Canaanitess celebrated in the Orthodox Church.

The response of the woman recognises this: her plea is simplified into what becomes ubiquitous in pilgrim graffiti in many ancient, sacred Christian sites: κύριε, βοήθει μοι.[131] And she prostrates before Jesus (προσεκύνει), unlike the tripping forward tactic in Mark (προσέπεσεν) which has been labelled a "blocking move."[132] The further rebuke of Jesus subtly changes Mark's version, removing the opening rule and adjusting the precision of the word order. The "Yes Lord" (ναὶ κύριε) of agreement, absent from Mark, does not challenge the dominical response so much as exploit a variation in feeding practice, with the dogs now under their masters' table gaining crumbs (Matt 15:27) rather than hoovering the debris that inevitably falls from children (as in Mark 7:28). The adjustment to the word order of the proverb in Jesus's response, disturbs the balance of the infinitives, making both the lead of its own clause.[133] By ending each clause with the harsh sounds of *kappa* and *rho* (τέκνων and κυναρίοις), there may be an accent of the characterisation of her speech as κράζει (v.23), picking up the *kappa* and *rho* of her barking,[134] as well as accenting the infantilising rattle of the final word. The priority of the Jew is preserved and it is now acknowledged by the Canaanite woman. Yet she has achieved her goal. Whilst something of the clash of proverbs remains, it savours more of an accommodation or negotiated settlement than a

[130] The remarkably consistent accent on the Jew first and then the Greek in the New Testament (almost 30 instances) is only broken in Col 3:11; see Alan H. Cadwallader, "Greeks in Colossae: shifting allegiances in the Letter to the Colossians and its context," in *Attitudes to Gentiles in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. David C. Sim and James S. McLaren (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 224–41.

[131] See as but one example, the prayer of the stone mason, Trophimos, carved onto the side of a pillar at the "Basilica Church", Hierapolis: Alan H. Cadwallader, *Fragments of Colossae* (Adelaide: ATF Press, 2015), 175.

[132] Amy-Jill Levine, "Matthew's Advice to a Divided Readership," in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study*, ed. David E. Aune (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 36.

[133] This conforms more closely to Aristotle's recommendations (Aristotle, *Rhet* 3.8 (1409b) but cf. Plutarch, *Mor* 38e where the infinitives are turned into a hinge holding two clauses together.

[134] See Elaine M. Wainwright, *Towards a Feminist Critical Reading of the Gospel According to Matthew* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 60; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991), 240.

choice *for* the word of a woman. The woman's faith—or does the word πίστις carry the rhetorical flavor of persuasiveness?—is now extolled, but there is no question as to who is the authority. After all, the woman (mentioned as γυνή once in the pericope [Matt 15:22]; cf. twice in Mark [7:25, 26]) calls Jesus "Lord" three times in the short pericope (vv. 22, 25, 27) and substitutes κύριοι for Mark's παιδία in her reply. There is little doubt that a christological affirmation has come from this woman; the use of κύριε in Mark is likely to be little more than a tactical deference.[135]

This moves to the adjusted climax of the story. Again the focus on the child/children is removed, with the barest mention of the recovery (which, by the way, in its assertion of ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης [cf. Jn 4:53], is a proper finish to a miracle account). It is the praise of Jesus for the woman's faith, not her word, that is accented. And there is no question who is the one responsible for the healing of her daughter with the narrator's explicit tying of the release to the word of Jesus not the woman γενηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις (Matt 15:28). Significantly however, just like the Syrophoenician woman, this woman departs the scene, at least in a literary structural sense if not explicitly in the narrative, still a Canaanite but one who, against all expectations, demonstrates faith and gains a healed daughter. The acknowledgement of the Jew Jesus has been properly delivered and ultimately received and she has secured her object,[136] even if, unlike Mark's version, children play a minimal role in the story.[137] Deferential, faithful (at least in the sense of persistent), and adult—these have become the notes struck by the story, albeit in a solo female Canaanite key.

It would seem that the story still has a capacity to bite, but this head seems to have lost a few teeth. And perhaps that is what successive generations in the church have wanted, since Matthew became the means of interpreting Mark, in terms of harmonisations of the text, in reading the woman's word

[135] See Martial, *Epigrams* 2.18, 11.70, 12.66. Kathleen Corley notes that courtesans were adept in turning conventions of address and formalities to their own advantage: *Private Women, Public Meals: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition* (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickssen, 1993), 98.

[136] See my "Surprised by Faith: A Centurion and a Canaanite Query the Limits of Jesus and the Disciples," in *Pieces of Ease and Grace* ed. Alan H. Cadwallader (Adelaide: ATF Press, 2013), 85–100.

[137] See Petr Pokorný, "From a Puppy to The Child: Some Problems of Contemporary Biblical Exegesis Demonstrated from Mark 7:24–30/Matt 15:21–8," *New Testament Studies* 41, no. 3 (1995): 321–37.

as faith, in extending her humility and motherly concern, in ignoring the child and, in some cases, restoring the blend of the feminine and the dog.[138]

Justa, the Righteous Widow

Aristotle commented that the naming of a person signifies importance and aids the preservation of their memory.[139] This no doubt explains the accretion of names to the gospel stories in the course of transmission.[140] But such memorialisation may be a double-edged sword. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza seized upon the name conferred upon the Syrophoenician woman in the third-century philosophical romance dubbed the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*.[141] For her, "Iusta" signaled the breakthrough of a name into the woman's anonymity that she had taken as a silence(ing) of the early (gospel) sources, of patristic commentary and of subsequent interpretation.[142] She harvested the name as redolent with a woman's fight for justice, albeit, in order to do so, having to wrest the name away from the significance given it in the spawning text.

Mieke Bal however has warned that "Naming is part of the strategy of reading that fixes the unfixed"; Mark Golden agrees, seeing in naming a socialising and classificatory function.[143] And in the gendered inequalities of

[138] See Chrysostom, *The Canaanite* 52.457.43; cf. *On the Advance of the Gospel* 51.319.56; similarly Ephraem the Syrian, *Commentary on the Diatessaron* 2.197.

[139] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1414a.

[140] See Bruce M. Metzger, "Names for the Nameless in the New Testament: A Study in the Growth of Christian Tradition," in *New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional, and Patristic* (New Testament Tools and Studies 10; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 23–45.

[141] The *Epitomes* grouped in the Pseudo-Clementine writings also mention the names (§104). On the date of the Pseudo-Clementines, see Hans Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen: Homilien und Rekognitionen: Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904), 60–75 who assigns the *Grundschrift* of the writing to around 220–230 CE, and hence with the extant text (in Greek to Syriac and Latin) thereafter. For the Greek text, I have used Johannes Irmscher, Franz Paschke, and Bernhard Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen I. Homilien* (2nd ed.; Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 42; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1969).

[142] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Beacon, 1992), 100, 103. She is, however, more reserved in *Sharing Her Word: Feminist Biblical Interpretation in Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 125. The name had been noted earlier by Swete but only as a curio from ancient sources: Henry B. Swete, *The Gospel according to St Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1902), 157.

[143] Bal, "Tricky Thematics," *Semeia* 42 (1988): 134n3; Golden, "Names and Naming at Athens: Three Studies," *Echos du monde classique: Classical views* 30 (1986): 246–49.

the ancient world, enforced most especially in literature, onomastic memorial was almost always tied to a male, or to characteristics or virtues prized by a male.[144]

Of course, the name Justa and its male form, Justus, are ubiquitous in the ancient world. In Christian studies, ever since the work of Joseph Barber Lightfoot, it has been taken as an indicator of a Jewish bearer of the name.[145] Even the famous epigraphists Louis and Jean Robert followed this line.[146] And of course there is significant evidence from the New Testament[147] to the epitaphs at Beth She-arim.[148]

Such an interpretation is fraught for two reasons. Firstly, it privileges only a section of the evidence. Henry Alford, writing before Lightfoot, had noted that Justus was a common Roman cognomen.[149] A century and a half later, armed with even more evidence, Thomas Drew-Bear also demurred.[150] Henri Marrou's complaint that names of Christians for too long have been studied as a discrete entity needs to be heeded.[151] The name Justus was in fact "a thoroughly Roman name", remarkably common in military inscriptions

[144] See Jesper Svenbro, *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 64–79.

[145] Joseph B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (London: Macmillan, 1900), 365. For the influence of Lightfoot, see Walter Bauer et al, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 380. Jospeh H. Thayer had early made the same direct reference to Lightfoot on Colossians in his lexical entry on Ἰοῦστος: *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1896), 306. Compare Gary J. Johnson, *Early Christian Epitaphs from Anatolia* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 135; Rosalinde A. Kearsley (ed.), *Greeks and Romans in Imperial Asia: Mixed Language Inscriptions and Linguistic Evidence for Cultural Interaction until the End of* AD *III* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 59; Bonn: Habelt, 2001), 80.

[146] *BE* 1976.798 but cf. *BE* 1979.520.

[147] Acts 1:23; 18:7; Col 4:11.

[148] Baruch Lifshitz, "Prolegomenon" to Jean-Baptiste Frey *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum* (1936; Roma: Pontificio Instituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 1975), 1:86; see also *AE* 1976.82; *CIJ* 583, 928; Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.35, 4.5, Josephus, *Life* 5, 40.

[149] Henry Alford, *The Greek Testament* (London: Rivingtons, 1857), vol. 2, 9.

[150] Thomas Drew-Bear, *Nouvelles Inscriptions de Phrygie* (Zutphen, Holland: Terra, 1978), 86.

[151] Henri-Irénée Marrou, "Problèmes Généraux de l'Onomastique Chrétienne," in *L'Onomastique Latine*, ed. Hans-Georg Pflaum and Noël Duval (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1977), 431.

from Britain,[152] Germany[153] and Bulgaria.[154] Iiro Kajanto noted it as so prevalent—nearly 900 in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* of which barely 60 could be identified as Christian—it could not be viewed as a nickname.[155] This leads into a second criticism. There is a tendency among such Lightfoot-style interpretation to read the instances of Justus/Justa as connotative in function (that is, *Zaddik*) rather than merely denotative.[156] The homophonic naming of Jesus also called Justus in Col 4:11 reflects more of the effort of Jews (and not only Jews)[157] to blend into their imperial environment than making any claim to greater righteousness.[158] It is denotative, as are most of the examples cited by those who then stake a claim upon righteousness. The connotative use of names is however a characteristic of particular genres of writing, such as poetry, comedy, romance. "Names that are appropriate, that speak as well as name," writes Michael Crawford, "are a feature already of Homer and Old Comedy."[159]

And this is precisely the genre of the Pseudo-Clementines,[160] for all its

[152] Lindley R. Dean, *A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions* (Princeton: Intelligencer, 1916), 13, 61–62; see, for further examples, Robin G. Collingwood and Richard P. Wright, *The Roman Inscriptions of Britain* (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1995), vol. 2, fasc. 8, §2503.299; SEG 42.1766.

[153] *AE* 1976.500.

[154] Milena Minkova, *The Personal Names of the Latin Inscriptions in Bulgaria* (Studien zur klassischen Philologie 118; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000), 189.

[155] Iiro Kajanto, *Supernomina: A Study in Latin Epigraphy* (Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1966), 35. The data is from his *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1965), 252.

[156] This distinction in the functions has been helpfully made by Anne Davies, "Greek Personal Names and Linguistic Continuity," in *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence*, ed. Simon Hornblower and Elaine Matthews (Oxford: British Academy, 2000), 21.

[157] For Egyptian use of homonyms see *P. Berol.* 7080B; for Phrygian and Pisidian usage, see Tylor J. Smith, "Votive Reliefs from Balboura and its Environs," *Anatolian Studies* 47 (1997): 3–47 (35 and no. 18).

[158] On the Jewish and Egyptian use of homonyms, as generally for an expansion of the arguments, see my "What's in a Name? The Tenacity of a Tradition of Interpretation," *Lutheran Theological Journal* 39 (2005): 218–34; see also Richard Bauckham, *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels* (London: Continuum, 2002), 182–85.

[159] Michael Crawford, "*Mirabilia* and Personal Names," in *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence*, ed. Simon Hornblower and Elaine Matthews (Oxford: British Academy, 2000), 145.

[160] So, Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 236; James K. Elliott, *The New Testament Apocrypha* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 431; see generally, F. Stanley Jones's introduction to his *The Syriac Pseudo-Clementines: An Early Version of the First Christian Novel* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014).

anti-Paulinist and anti-Gentile flavour.[161] Justa is aptly named. She fulfills all the requirements to be adjudged righteous because, in order to win the healing of her grievously-diseased (no longer possessed) daughter (ὑπὸ χαλεπῆς νόσου συνείχετο 2.19.1), she becomes a proselyte (προσήλυτος 13.7.3).[162] This is particularly focused on the observance of Jewish food laws, the pursuit of the Mosaic commandments, hospitality extended to two youths combining adherence to her adopted religion with apologetic training in "the learning of the Greeks" (13.7–8), the arranging of marriage for her daughter to a poor man of the true faith. She is described as "fashioning her life like the sons of the kingdom" (τῷ ὁμοίως διαιτᾶσθαι τοῖς τῆς βασιλείας υἱοῖς), "adopting a lifestyle in accordance with the law" (αὐτὴ οὖν αὕτη ἡ νόμιμον ἀναδεξαμένη πολιτείαν; 2.19.3; 20.1). This wins the healing. As the homilist, Clement, comments, "He would not have healed had she remained a Gentile" (2.19.4). Indeed for the sake of her daughter "she remains a widow" (αὐτὴ ... χήρα ἔμεινεν 2.20.2) though this is the designation given to her separation from her pagan husband who refuses to convert. Thus, an explanation is provided for the lack of male embedding in Mark and Matthew.[163] In the story, the contrast lies with another woman, Helen, who is the consort of the arch-heretic Simon Magus, and the archetype of the lascivious Hellenes whose lifestyle is repudiated (2.23.3; 25; 4.8). Significantly, Justa is identified as Syrophoenician and Canaanite (2.19.1) but not as an Hellene (her ethnicity in Mark).[164]

[161] On the anti-Paulinist character of the writing, see Jozef Verheyden, "Demonization of the Opponent in the Pseudo-Clementines," in *Religious Polemics in Context: Papers Presented to the Second International Conference of the Leiden Institute for the Study of Religions (LISOR) Held at Leiden, 27–28 April, 2000*, ed. T. L. Hettema and A. van der Kooij (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2004), 330–59.

[162] The *Epitome* expressly retains this designation (§104); the Syriac has her as a Jew all along (see below).

[163] In fact this appears to have intruded into the text of Mark in one strand of the Syriac version (sys); the same apologetic has entered some modern interpretations, reading χήρα for σύρα separated from Φοινίκισσα: Paul-Louis Couchoud, "Notes de critique verbale sur St Marc et St Matthieu," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 34, no. 134 (1933), 121; G. Schwarz, "ΣΥΡΟΦΟΙΝΙΚΙΣΣΑ–ΧΑΝΑΝΑΙΑ (Markus 7.26/Matthäus 15.22)," *New Testament Studies* 30, no. 4 (1984): 626–28.

[164] Compare Acts 4:36; 18:2, 24; for the argument that the woman is Greek by ethnicity and Syrophoenician by location of birth, see *Beyond the Word of a Woman*, 120–22. Curiously the Syriac of the Pseudo-Clementines has Justa as a Jewess and lacks the earlier section of the text. See Joseph G. Gebhardt, *The Syriac Clementine Recognitions and Homilies: The First Complete Translation of the Text* (Nashville, TN: Grave Distractions Publications, 2014), 160–

In this story, the direct speech becomes completely one-sided. Anything that Justa says is indirectly conveyed by Clement the homilist. Jesus's words alone are granted direct speech. And those words no longer operate from a neatly compounded proverb but are turned into a juridical comparison:

> Οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἰᾶσθαι τὰ ἔθνη, ἐοικότα κυσὶν διὰ τὸ ἀδιαφόροις χρᾶσθαι τροφαῖς καὶ πράξεσιν, ἀποδεδομένης τῆς κατὰ τὴν βασίλειον τραπέζης τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ.
>
> It is not lawful to heal the Gentiles, who are like dogs on account of their using various meats and practices, while the table in the kingdom has been given to the sons of Israel. (2.19.2–3)

Here, a clear example of "free alterations/creations of other gospel accounts,"[165] the maxim is legalised: it is not lawful (Οὐκ ἔξεστιν). The extended metaphor, now without the diminutive κυνάρια is turned into a simile (ἐοικότα κυσὶν) and explicitly tied to undifferentiated diet (and practices);[166] elsewhere in the *Homilies* pagan food is explicitly connected with the demonic, as in the case of Simon Magus (4.4). Jesus now explicitly mentions a table as the proper venue for food, and not just any table, but *the* table of the kingdom which is explicitly reserved for the sons, not the children, of Israel (τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ), that is, law-observant (male) followers of Jesus.

Whereas Matthew's Canaanite woman gains an accommodation through a deft and deferential manipulation of Jesus's words, the woman in the Pseudo-Clementines becomes completely compliant, converting to Mosaic requirements, losing her voice and sacrificing her pagan cultural background. Only through this means—"a manner of life according to the law"—is she able to gain her object. And this is demonstrated as no contingent, tactical manoeuvre but a life-changing commitment. Any comparison with the dog receiving crumbs no longer operates as a culturally-specific advantage—her relying on her own Gentile background—but as a display of her willing and humble acceptance of a lowly position. Dogs had been defined by Jesus as

61.

[165] F. Stanley Jones, "The Distinctive Sayings of Jesus shared by Justin and the *Pseudo-Clementines*," in *Forbidden Texts on the Western Frontier: The Christian Apocrypha in North American Perspective—Proceedings from the 2013 York University Christian Apocrypha Symposium*, ed. Tony Burke (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2015), 216–17.

[166] Sometimes, διαφόροις is emended to ἀδιαφόροις "without distinction". The force is the same.

indiscriminate in their eating practices—just like the Gentiles—but she has demonstrated thorough-going discrimination in her eating practices without, nevertheless, seeking the position of the "sons of Israel." All she seeks is access to the table's offerings, even if that means a relegated position. There are shades here of Chrysostom's exposition that accents the metonymy of the dog and woman.[167] But here this probably is based on her proselyte status rather than indicating a gendered ranking;[168] elsewhere Peter's instruction is that "we do not live with all indiscriminately nor do we take our food from the same table as Gentiles because we cannot eat along with them" (13.4)—in a flagrant departure from the Acts 10 account.

Of particular interest is the daughter. The hint of the next generation expanding the liberation won by the mother that was signaled in Mark is now unfolded with a fulsome treatment. She gains a name, Ber(e)nice—probably also a connotative name, with all the associations of "carrying off the victory."[169] This is played out in the narrative. Berenice not only gains the honour of receiving Clement into her house with "great gladness" (ἀσμενέστατα 4.1.2) and "with much honour" (πολλῇ ... τιμῇ 4.1.2). She is also granted a lengthy direct speech in the narrative (4.4; 4.5), albeit only after being invited by a male to speak (because ἀξιωθεῖσα "deemed worthy" 4.4.1). A more potent demonstration of the total efficacy of her healing would be hard to imagine!

So, this last head of Cerberus has become completely tamed by the figure of the Jewish Jesus and his Jewish male followers, especially Clement. Rather than a gospel word being received or permitted from outside Jewish practice, ethnic and legal boundaries have been reinforced. The woman has become bounded, her words have become little more than a compliant echo of those of Jesus. And Jesus himself is completely confirmed in his law-abiding message. The name that the woman has gained encapsulates these changes in the story. But the addition of a name to the daughter, even as pointing to the embellishing of her story, is a powerful indication that the impact of

[167] John Chrysostom, *The Canaanitess* 52.457.42–6; *On the Spread of the Gospel* 51.319.56.

[168] It should be noted however, that woman is regarded as "half a man" (ἥμισυ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς οὖσα ἡ γυνὴ 2.23.3), that feminine prophecy is repudiated (3.22–24, 27) along with the "feminine principle" (especially as personified by Paul! 2.17.3–4).

[169] Βερενίκη is the Macedonian form of Φερενίκη (LSJ sv). The contracted form Βερνίκη is found in Acts 25:13 (wife of Agrippa), an indication of the popularity of the name (as especially from the Ptolemies in Egypt), with or without its connotative force. Some manuscripts return the name to its longer form (for example, 1175, sa).

the message of Jesus, if not that of her mother, reached into a generation beyond that contained in the canonical gospel narrative and addressed new issues being faced in the churches.[170] For the writer of this version of the story, survival lay not in one's own cultural background, nor in the strategic deployment of the conqueror's language but in full-scale assimilation to a minority (Christian) group identity that was substantially under threat of extinction.

Conclusion

We have braved the three heads of Cerberus and perhaps like Hercules have managed to stagger through to the end, only to discover that the feisty woman who extracted an accolade for her word—a word that in the context of Mark's gospel is accorded the status of Gospel—has been transformed into the model of embedded, deferring and demurring righteousness. These transformations are tabulated in Figure 1.

The changes to the story not only point to the malleability of gospel traditions turned to the interests of the (male) writers, but so also, subtly, do the characters of the story become pliable, including the character of Jesus. From being open to a change of direction, he becomes the upholder of the detail of the Mosaic law, particularly as focused in the spread that is laid out on a table (quite contrary to the interpretative comment thrown into the narrative in Mark 7:19b). And perhaps it demonstrates or perhaps cautions, that a story always has a teller whose hand/voice provides the rhetorical shape. Along the way, the dogs have been manipulated in their characteristics for the sake of conveying abuse, voice, food practices, ethnicity and gender. Perhaps the daughter in Mark has secured the separation and distinction that will allow the dog to have its own day, no longer turned into a projection of human fears and prejudices. But that version of the story has yet to be written.

[170] This is clearly signaled in 2.17.4 with a reference to the "destruction of the holy place" (μετὰ καθαίρεσιν τοῦ ἁγίου τόπου).

	MARK	MATTHEW	PSEUDO-CLEMENTINES
WOMAN'S IDENTITY	Greek, Syrophoenician, no embedding	Canaanite, no embedding	Syrophoenician, Canaanite, widow
TERRITORY	Tyre hinterland	Galilee (border)	—
BESETTING PROBLEM	possession	possession	disease
SETTING	secluded Jesus	public Jesus, male companions	Jesus, male companions (incl. Clement)
JESUS'S RESPONSE I	enthymemic rejection	rejection, enthymemic rejection	rejection
DOG COMPARISON	metonymy	metaphor [?]	simile
WOMAN'S RESPONSE	proverb counter accenting children	proverb counter accenting masters	request accented table of the kingdom
EFFECTIVE GAIN	by word	by faith	by food/law observance
DAUGHTER	story climax	story margins	story continuance (naming, speaking)

FIGURE 1