



PhD thesis

**Junia, also called Joanna? An exploration of the historical possibilities regarding the life and ministry of the woman greeted in Romans 16:7**

**Hartmann, A.**

---

Full bibliographic citation: Hartmann, A. 2023. Junia, also called Joanna? An exploration of the historical possibilities regarding the life and ministry of the woman greeted in Romans 16:7. PhD thesis Middlesex University / London School of Theology (LST)

Year: 2023

Publisher: Middlesex University Research Repository

Available online: <https://repository.mdx.ac.uk/item/16521z>

---

Middlesex University Research Repository makes the University's research available electronically.

Copyright and moral rights to this work are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. The work is supplied on the understanding that any use for commercial gain is strictly forbidden. A copy may be downloaded for personal, non-commercial, research or study without prior permission and without charge.

Works, including theses and research projects, may not be reproduced in any format or medium, or extensive quotations taken from them, or their content changed in any way, without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). They may not be sold or exploited commercially in any format or medium without the prior written permission of the copyright holder(s).

Full bibliographic details must be given when referring to, or quoting from full items including the author's name, the title of the work, publication details where relevant (place, publisher, date), pagination, and for theses or dissertations the awarding institution, the degree type awarded, and the date of the award.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Middlesex University via the following email address: [repository@mdx.ac.uk](mailto:repository@mdx.ac.uk)

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated.

See also repository copyright: re-use policy: <https://libguides.mdx.ac.uk/repository>

**JUNIA, ALSO CALLED JOANNA?  
AN EXPLORATION OF THE HISTORICAL  
POSSIBILITIES REGARDING  
THE LIFE AND MINISTRY OF THE  
WOMAN GREETED IN ROMANS 16:7**

**A Thesis submitted to Middlesex University in  
partial fulfilment of the requirements for the  
degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

by

Andrea Hartmann

Middlesex University

Supervised at London School of Theology

September 2023

## **Abstract**

**Andrea Hartmann**

**Junia, also called Joanna? An Exploration of the Historical Possibilities  
Regarding the Life and Ministry of the Woman Greeted in Romans 16:7**

**Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)**

**Middlesex University/London School of Theology**

**2023**

Most studies about Junia so far have focussed on discussing whether she was a female apostle. Though this debate will be addressed, the purpose of this study is not to add another voice to it. Instead, this thesis seeks to explore what else could be deduced about the life and ministry of Junia.

Based on the analysis of the content and function of Romans 16:7, this thesis will construct a biographical sketch that locates Junia in Galilee during the ministry of Jesus, in Jerusalem as a witness of the resurrection, and in Rome shortly after Pentecost as a missionary among the Jews of the capital.

In a second step, this study will examine how Junia's Latin name fits in with her proposed Palestinian origin by evaluating the approaches of Lampe, Wolters, and Bauckham. As the connection of Junia with the female disciple Joanna in Luke, suggested by Bauckham, does add a complete back-story to Junia's biographical sketch, his thesis regarding double names and the presumed sound equivalency of Joanna/Junia will be explored further and tentative solutions for gaps in Bauckham's argument, like the absence of Junia from the Palestinian onomasticon, will be offered.

As there is at least the possibility of a link between the two women, the final chapter of this thesis will establish Joanna's biographical sketch as a follower of Jesus throughout his ministry and as a witness of his death, burial, and resurrection based on her mentions in Luke. Finally, this study will explore whether she might have become the apostle Junia, filling in the silence about what happened to her after discovering the empty tomb.

This thesis will conclude by connecting the biographical sketches of Junia and Joanna, but not because there is definite evidence that they are the same person. Their identification remains possible but tentative. Yet, by using careful historical imagination, both sketches together can provide us with a historically possible and plausible biography of a female disciple becoming a significant figure within the mission of the early church.

*Dedicated to  
my goddaughter Mara.*

*May you grow up to be a follower of Jesus  
as courageous as Joanna and Junia.*

## Acknowledgements

This thesis, spanning over several years and often proving a challenging and lonely task, would not have been possible without the people supporting me on the way, some of them knowingly, some unknowingly. In many ways they have been my Joannas, providing for me out of their resources, some quite literally offering the financial support without which I could not have embarked on this journey, others by being my companions on the way and encouraging me on the journey in various way, some by doing both. Considering that this thesis would not exist without Paul recommending Junia and acknowledging her importance to him and the early Christian movement in Rome, it is important to me to recognise as many people as possible by name:

First and foremost, I thank my family, my parents, Werner and Brigitte Hartmann and my sister Ann-Kathrin Hartmann, for providing the lion's share of my financial needs over the last years despite their initial and continued doubts and worries about my decision to leave my secure life and job in Germany to study theology in the UK.

I sincerely thank my friends Stefanie and Benjamin Fritz, whose prayers and generosity in giving their time and resources have been a fountain of blessings. I could not wish for better friends.

I am grateful for Doris and Hermann Hartmaier, who, for a large part of this journey, provided me with a home during my time spent in Germany and allowed me to be part of their family.

I have been blessed with many financial supporters over the years; the most loyal among them is my former colleague Frank Sitzler, who has supported me the whole way through. Others I want to mention are Rainer and Lena Fritz, who made my first year in England possible with their generosity, and Andrea Brosi and Sarah Walz, whose regular support over the years has given me security.

Most of my time writing this thesis, I have studied, worked, and lived at the London School of Theology (LST), and I would not have made it to the end without the support of the LST community. Representative of the wider staff, I want to thank our Research Programmes Administrator, Sandra Khalil and her husband, our beloved receptionist Rahim Khalil, whose loyalty to LST, hard work, and love for the students has not gone unnoticed. I am also thankful to Kate Marchant, Chrissey Jugmohun, Mark Allen, Sandra Thorpe and the whole catering and housekeeping team of LST, whose service and hard work allowed me to fully focus on my studies.

I am grateful to Dr Matthew Knell, whose love for the LST community has inspired me and kept me going when living in this community was challenging. I am also indebted to him for all the much-needed research breaks he provided through the various events he put on over the years. He is only one example of the dedicated faculty at LST I had the privilege of learning from, being encouraged by and working with.

Throughout my time at LST, many students had an impact on my journey, not least all of my Greek students. Yet, for a thesis about two biblical women, it is only fitting to acknowledge the amazing women I had and have the privilege to journey with: first and foremost, my friends through all the highs and lows until now, Patricia How, Charlotte Ginger, and Lisa Johnson; then Candy (Cen) Zhang, Hannah Brooks, and Hyunjoo Lee whose friendships made LST a home when I first started, Rahel Lampérth one of the many Greek students who have become friends; Lydia Lee, Ruth Bainbridge, Sandy Micklethwait, and Sara Sivyer, my virtual home group, who helped me through lockdown; Friederike Ströhle, Mayanthi De Silva, Claudia (Waner) Chen, and Emily Reid, who were listening ears at important moments; and over the past difficult months trying to finish this massive work, Alice Hunt, Rachel Wilson-Yelverton, Hephzibah Hall, and Adjoa Agbodza, who have been examples of tenacity in the face of adversity to me. From all these women and many other LST students, I have

learned so much about trusting God even in the most challenging circumstances.

The first drafts of this thesis were discussed among another group of women, the members of the Rosina Parker Senior Seminar at LST. I thank them for all their input, encouragement, laughter, and of course cake! I am especially grateful to Dr Chloe Lynch, who organised this seminar during my time as a PhD student, and to Dr Ekaterina Kozlova. Their feedback and support have been invaluable in finding my voice as a woman in academia.

A PhD journey can become lonely, but I had the privilege of sharing mine with inspiring people; first and foremost among them are the three with whom I have travelled longest, discussed the New Testament deepest, prayed with most and from whom I have learned so much: Dr Timothy R. Chen, Dr Oscar Jiménez Quintana, and Dorothy (Yu) Wang. I am especially grateful to Dorothy, who has seen me in my lowest moments and walked with me every step of the way.

This thesis would not have seen the light of day without Dr John Dennis and Dr Conrad Gempf, who had been my teachers long before they became my doctoral supervisors. Their teaching inspired and equipped me to embark on this journey, and their support and belief in my abilities helped me see it through. I am especially indebted to Conrad for his valid suggestions, engaging questions, constant encouragement, and ability to rekindle the passion for my thesis when I thought I had lost it. I could not have wished for a better or more understanding supervisor.

Above all, thanks be to God! May the words written in this thesis be pleasing in his sight!

## Abbreviations

The abbreviations used can be found in Billie Jean Collins, Bob Buller, and John F. Kutsko, *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014). Below is a list of abbreviations not found in *The SBL Handbook of Style*.

AYB	Anchor Yale Bible
AcCl	<i>Acta Classica</i>
BEZG	<i>Berner Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Heimatkunde</i>
BHGNT	Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament
BNP	<i>Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World</i> . Edited by Hubert Cancik et al. Brill Reference Online.
CCC	Crossway Classics Commentaries
CJO	Rahmani, Levi Y. <i>A Catalogue of Jewish Ossuaries in the Collections of the State of Israel</i> . Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 1994.
EBS	Essentials of Biblical Studies
EMC	<i>Echos du Monde Classique/Classical Views</i>
ETL	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
GELNT	Thayer, Joseph Henry. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament</i> . 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1892.
HTA	Historisch Theologische Auslegung
HvTSt	<i>Hervormde Teologiese Studies (HTS Teologiese Studies/HTS Theological Studies)</i>
IJO II	Ameling, Walter. <i>Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis: Band II. Kleinasien</i> . Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
JIGRE	Horbury, William and David Noy. <i>Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt</i> . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
JIWE 1	Noy, David. <i>Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe: Italy (excluding the City of Rome), Spain and Gaul</i> . Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
JIWE 2	Noy, David. <i>Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe: The City of Rome</i> . Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
JSHJ	<i>Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus</i>

LJNLA I-IV	Ilan, Tal. <i>Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity</i> . 4 vols. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002-2012.
LW	<i>Luther's Works</i>
MGS	Montanari, Franco. <i>The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek</i> . Edited by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary
OpTh	<i>Open Theology</i>
PHI	The Packard Humanities Institute - <a href="https://inscriptions.packhum.org/">https://inscriptions.packhum.org/</a>
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentaries
RNJB	Revised New Jerusalem Bibel (2019)
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SHCT	<i>Studies in the History of Christian Thought/Tradition</i>
THGNT	The Greek New Testament, Tyndale House edition
THNTC	Two Horizons New Testament Commentary
WDNTECLR	Aune, David E. <i>The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric</i> , Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
WiC	Wisdom Commentary
ZECNT	Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament

## Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements .....	iii
Abbreviations.....	vi
Contents.....	viii
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1. The Purpose of Study .....	1
2. Issues Raised .....	1
3. Studies about Junia .....	3
4. Jewish Onomastics and the Name Junia.....	5
5. Studies about Joanna .....	7
6. Main Contributions.....	10
7. Method and Procedure.....	11
7.1. Finding a Method for the Question.....	11
7.2. A Note on the Interpreter .....	16
7.3. Steps of the Journey .....	17
II. JUNIA – AN APOSTLE OF CHRIST .....	18
1. Introduction .....	18
2. The Recipients of the Greeting – The Missionary Couple Andronicus and Junia .....	19
2.1. Ἀνδρόνικος - Andronicus .....	20
2.2. Ἰουνία(ς) – Junia(s).....	22
2.3. Apostolic Pair(s).....	29
3. The Descriptive Phrases – Andronicus and Junia’s Credentials .....	33
3.1. Fellow Jews who were in Christ before Paul – Andronicus and Junia’s Origin .....	36
3.1.1. The meaning of τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου (v. 7b).....	37
3.1.2. The implications of πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ (v. 7e) .....	45

3.1.2.1.	<i>Place and Time of their Conversion</i> .....	46
3.1.2.2.	<i>Arrival and Life in Rome</i> .....	56
3.2.	Fellow Prisoners who are outstanding among the Apostles – Andronicus and Junia’s Ministry .....	68
3.2.1.	The meaning of τοὺς συναιχμαλώτους μου .....	68
3.2.2.	The implications of ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις .....	77
3.2.2.1.	<i>Exclusive versus Inclusive Readings of the ἐπίσημος + ἐν + dative         construction</i> .....	78
3.2.2.2.	<i>Contextual Readings</i> .....	81
4.	The Greeting in its Context - Reading between the Lines.....	92
4.1.	Romans 16:7 and the Purpose of the Greeting Section.....	92
4.2.	Romans 16:7 and the Structure of Romans 16:3-7 .....	97
5.	Conclusion.....	104
III.	JOANNA = JUNIA – TWO NAMES – ONE WOMAN?.....	109
1.	Introduction .....	109
2.	‘Jewish Names in Late Antiquity’ .....	110
2.1.	Jewish Naming Conventions in Palestine .....	110
2.2.	Jewish Naming Conventions in the Diaspora .....	117
3.	Origin(s) of the name Junia – Greco-Roman, Jewish or both?.....	121
3.1.	Junia as Name in the Greco-Roman world (Lampe) .....	121
3.2.	Junia as Transliteration of a Hebrew Name (Wolters) .....	125
3.3.	Junia as Sound-Equivalent of a Hebrew Name Used in a Greco- Roman Context (Bauckham) .....	129
4.	Joanna called Junia? – Bauckham’s Thesis Revisited.....	141
4.1.	Joanna/Junia - Sound-Equivalents? .....	141
4.2.	Joanna/Junia – A Double Name? .....	151
4.2.1.	<i>(Double) Names at the Herodian Court(s)</i> .....	151
4.2.2.	<i>Double Names in the New Testament</i> .....	155
4.2.3.	<i>Joanna, also called Junia?</i> .....	161

4.3.	Joanna/Junia – Adopted Name or Given Nickname? .....	165
5.	Conclusion.....	170
IV.	JOANNA – A Disciple of Jesus .....	173
1.	Introduction .....	173
2.	Joanna – Follower of Jesus (Luke 8:1-3) .....	174
2.1.	Joanna’s Life Before Meeting Jesus.....	175
2.1.1.	<i>Chuza’s Role and Status</i> .....	176
2.1.2.	<i>Joanna’s Status</i> .....	179
2.2.	Joanna’s Encounter with Jesus - Turning Point 1 .....	182
2.2.1.	<i>Joanna’s Illness</i> .....	183
2.2.2.	<i>Joanna’s Healing</i> .....	184
2.3.	Joanna’s Life as a Follower of Jesus .....	186
2.3.1.	<i>Joanna the Itinerant Follower or Stay-at-Home Supporter?</i> .....	187
2.3.2.	<i>Joanna the Servant or Benefactor?</i> .....	192
2.3.2.1.	<i>Service or Financial Support?</i> .....	193
2.3.2.2.	<i>Giver or Receiver?</i> .....	194
2.3.2.3.	<i>Wealthy or Penniless?</i> .....	195
2.3.2.4.	<i>Benefactor or Beneficiary?</i> .....	197
3.	Witness of the Empty Tomb (Luke 24:1-11) .....	199
3.1.	Joanna’s Presence at the Crucifixion and the Burial .....	200
3.1.1.	<i>Joanna witnesses the Death of Jesus</i> .....	200
3.1.2.	<i>Joanna knows where Jesus’ Body was Laid</i> .....	201
3.2.	Joanna’s Presence at the Empty Tomb – Turning Point 2 .....	202
3.2.1.	<i>Joanna Remembers and Proclaims</i> .....	203
3.2.2.	<i>Joanna Encounters Disbelief</i> .....	207
3.3.	Joanna’s Presence at the Events After the Empty Tomb .....	209
3.3.1.	<i>Joanna Among the Ones with the Eleven (Luke 24:33)</i> .....	209
3.3.2.	<i>Joanna Among the Women in Jerusalem (Acts 1:14)</i> .....	210
3.3.3.	<i>Joanna’s Disappearance after Pentecost</i> .....	211

4.	Joanna the Disciple and Junia the Apostle .....	213
4.1.	Connecting Some Dots .....	213
4.1.1.	<i>Joanna and Junia's Judaism</i> .....	214
4.1.2.	<i>Leaving Securities</i> .....	214
4.1.3.	<i>Herodian Connections</i> .....	215
4.1.4.	<i>Chuza and Andronicus</i> .....	216
4.1.5.	<i>Luke and Paul</i> .....	217
4.2.	Two Sides of the Same Coin .....	218
5.	Conclusion.....	219
V.	Conclusion.....	222
1.	Junia – The Story .....	223
2.	Joanna/Junia - The Tentative Link .....	228
3.	Joanna – The Backstory .....	231
4.	The Disciple/Apostle Junia – A Full Story .....	234
	Bibliography.....	237
	Appendices.....	264
	Appendix 1 – Junia: A Story.....	264
	Appendix 2 – Joanna: A Story.....	267

# I. INTRODUCTION

## 1. The Purpose of Study

‘For the women of those days were more spirited than lions, sharing with the Apostles their labors for the Gospel’s sake.’<sup>1</sup> This is how an early interpreter of Romans, John Chrysostom (ca. 347-407 CE),<sup>2</sup> summarises the critical role of the first generation of Christian women in spreading the gospel.

This thesis aims to establish a historically possible and plausible biographical sketch of one of these women: Junia, the woman greeted by Paul in his letter to the Romans. Junia features in other studies usually with the focus on whether she was a female apostle. The discussion of her sex and role is often connected to the wider question of women’s roles in Paul and the modern question of female leadership in the church. The purpose of this study is not to add another voice to these discussions but to explore what else we can say about Junia’s life and ministry based on her description in Romans 16:7 and by evaluating the link that has been proposed by Bauckham between Junia and the female disciple Joanna mentioned in Luke 8:3.<sup>3</sup>

## 2. Issues Raised

This thesis is divided into three sections. We will: (1) attempt to understand what information we can glean about Junia’s life and ministry from the text and context of Romans 16:7 establishing the strong likelihood of her Palestinian background; (2) explore the peculiarity and particulars of the Latin name Junia in the Palestinian context, including an evaluation of Bauckham’s proposed link

---

<sup>1</sup> John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistle to the Romans*, NPNF<sup>1</sup> 11:554.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Craig A. Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 275.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. chapter 5 ‘Joanna the Apostle,’ in Richard Bauckham, *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels* (London: T&T Clark, 2002), especially 165-194.

of the name with the Hebrew name Joanna; and (3) explore what can be known of Joanna's life and ministry from Luke's gospel and other ancient sources.

The section on Junia (chapter II) will look at what Paul says about Junia and ask why he describes her and Andronicus in the way he does. Therefore, the rhetorical function of the greeting and the whole greeting section will be addressed. As Junia's life and ministry are intertwined with the Roman Christian community, its beginnings and major events in its development will be highlighted, and Junia's role in them will be discussed.

The second section (chapter III) will be driven by the question of why a Jewish woman, likely from Palestine, would have borne a Latin name. To answer this question, the differences between the Jewish naming conventions in Palestine and the Diaspora will be established, and specific approaches to Junia's name will be evaluated. Two questions emerging from the engagement with Junia's name will be discussed further: 1) Were *double names*<sup>4</sup> a common phenomenon within first-century Judaism? 2) Would Joanna and Junia have been understood as names similar in sound? Both questions will be addressed based on the literary and non-literary evidence available regarding Jewish names in antiquity.

In the last section (chapter IV), the focus will change from Junia to Joanna, establishing how the life of a female follower of Jesus might have looked. Whether the women following Jesus were travelling with him or were stay-at-home patrons financing his mission will be discussed. It will also be explored whether the concept of women travelling with a group of men would have been perceived as scandalous in its historical context in first-century Galilee and in the eyes of Luke's audience. Finally, it will be asked whether Joanna's presence within the discipleship group can be assumed beyond the point of her last

---

<sup>4</sup> Throughout this thesis, the term *double name* is used to describe the specific practice of using an alternative Greco-Roman name in a non-Jewish environment as a substitute name for a (difficult-to-pronounce) Semitic name, e.g. Jason for Yeshua/Yoshua. Double names are subsumed under the wider category of *alternative names*, additional names attached to or replacing birth names (cf. III.2.1).

mention within the account of the empty tomb to establish whether Luke considered her to be a member of the group to whom Jesus appeared and whom Jesus commissioned to be his witnesses.

Putting all considerations together, the final question raised is whether or in what way Joanna's biographical sketch can shed more light on Junia's life and ministry.

### 3. Studies about Junia

The year 1977 was a watershed moment for the study of Romans 16:7. It was the year Junia was reintroduced to the scholarly debate by Brooten's article "Junia ... Outstanding among the Apostles."<sup>5</sup> Up to Brooten's article, the predominant view in 20th-century scholarship had been that IOYNIAN should be read as the male name Junias. Brooten challenged this view, arguing for the female reading Junia. Several studies followed that questioned the validity of the male reading based on the lack of manuscript evidence and the missing evidence for the male name Junias outside of Romans.<sup>6</sup> The discussions culminated in Epp's monograph *Junia: The First Woman Apostle*, the most comprehensive argument for the female reading. He concludes that Junia was indeed a woman and was called an apostle by Paul.<sup>7</sup>

Whereas Epp's first conclusion that Junia is a female name is the majority view today, her apostleship is still under discussion. The phrase in Romans 16:7 that connects Junia with the term 'apostle' is ambiguous and could either mean she was 'outstanding among the apostles' and, therefore, an apostle herself, or she was 'well known to the apostles' and, thus, not included in the apostolic

---

<sup>5</sup> Bernadette Brooten, "'Junia . . . Outstanding among the Apostles'" (Romans 16:7), in *Women Priests: A Catholic Commentary on the Vatican Declaration*, ed. Leonard and Arlene Swidler (New York: Paulist, 1977), 141-144.

<sup>6</sup> Sebastian Fuhrmann, 'Junia,' *EBR* 14:1068-1071, citing 1070. Cf. II.2.2. for an engagement with those studies.

<sup>7</sup> Eldon Jay Epp, *Junia: The First Woman Apostle* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2005), 80f.

circle. Burer and Wallace make the most extensive argument for the latter.<sup>8</sup> Yet, up to date, it is a minority view.<sup>9</sup> That Paul called Junia an apostle is seldom questioned, but scholars understand the word 'apostle' differently. The portrayal of her role in commentaries ranges from being an itinerant missionary<sup>10</sup> to being part of the limited group of people who were commissioned by the risen Christ.<sup>11</sup>

Thus, the focus of studies on Junia has so far been her sex and, more importantly, the role Paul ascribed to her. Other aspects of Romans 16:7 have not received the same attention. The explanation for this is simple: Junia is often discussed with the modern question of female leadership in mind. Brooten's article, for example, was part of a wider argument for the induction of women priests in the Catholic Church. Her conclusion reflects that context: 'If the first century Junia could be an apostle, it is hard to see how her twentieth century counterpart should not be allowed to become even a priest.'<sup>12</sup> In this argument Junia primarily functions as a model for female leadership. This model function naturally is questioned by those who argue for excluding women from certain roles in the church, like Piper and Grudem. In their argument Junia also clearly features with the contemporary context in mind.<sup>13</sup>

However, approaching Junia in light of the modern issues often limits her to her sex and role and overlooks what else Paul says about her. Moreover, it ignores that Romans 16:7 offers us a window into one of the micro-histories of women in antiquity: Junia's life and ministry, which needs to be understood

---

<sup>8</sup> Michael H. Burer and Daniel B. Wallace, 'Was Junia Really an Apostle? A Re-examination of Rom 16.7,' *NTS* 47.1 (2001): 76-91.

<sup>9</sup> Their position, as well as the responses to their argument, will be discussed in II.3.2.2.

<sup>10</sup> E.g. Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018), 939f.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, WBC 38B (Dallas: Word Books, 1988), 894.

<sup>12</sup> Brooten, 'Junia,' 143.

<sup>13</sup> John Piper and Wayne Grudem, 'An Overview of Central Concerns: Questions and Answers,' in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem, 2nd ed. (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2006), 60-92, 79-81, especially question 38.

first and foremost in its own social and cultural context.<sup>14</sup> It is time to ask what the text tells us about the person Junia in the first century rather than using Junia as a prop in a twentieth/twenty-first-century dispute. This thesis sets out to do just that, to explore what we can say about the first-century woman Junia based on Romans 16:7.

#### 4. Jewish Onomastics and the Name Junia

Most of the named persons in the New Testament are Jewish, which shows the importance of studying Jewish names in antiquity for the New Testament and the value of the New Testament as a source for Jewish onomastics. Bauckham, for example, shows that the personal names in the gospels correspond to the pool of names used in Palestine at the time and even reflect the typical ways in which persons of the same name were distinguished, which ‘indicates the general authenticity of the personal names in the Gospels.’<sup>15</sup>

Junia’s name, though Latin, falls under the study of Jewish names as it is borne by a Jewish woman in Romans 16:7.<sup>16</sup> The more specific studies on her name, therefore, draw on both Greco-Roman and Jewish naming conventions for their argument. Based on Roman naming traditions, Lampe suggests that provided Junia was a woman, she most likely was a freed slave who took on the family name of her master as a personal name after her manumission.<sup>17</sup> His explanation of the name within the Roman naming system fits in with the

---

<sup>14</sup> Marcello Del Verme, ‘Christian Women of the Pauline Communities in Their Historical, Socio-Cultural, and Religious Contexts: the “Case of Junia” (Rm 16:7),’ *RivB* 58/4 (2010): 439-468, citing 441f.

<sup>15</sup> Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 84; cf. 67-92 (chapter 4), for the full discussion.

<sup>16</sup> As συγγενής of Paul, Junia either belongs to Paul’s family or is a member of the same people. In each case she would be Jewish. Cf. II.3.1.1. for the discussion of the meaning of συγγενής in Romans 16:7.

<sup>17</sup> Peter Lampe, ‘Iunia/Iunias: Sklavenherkunft im Kreise der vorpaulinischen Apostel (Röm 16 7),’ *ZNW* 76.1 (1985): 132-134, citing 133. Cf. III.3.1. for an evaluation of Lampe’s approach.

general observation that Jews in the Diaspora were not averse to taking on names from their non-Jewish surroundings.<sup>18</sup>

Wolters uses the transliteration principles of the Septuagint regarding biblical names as a basis for his argument that IOYNIAN is a transliteration of the Hebrew name *Yəḥunnī*, a name found in the Jewish onomasticon of Palestine.<sup>19</sup> Thus, he proposes that there is no tension between the name and the ethnicity of the person greeted in Romans 16:7. In his view Andronicus' partner was Jewish and had a Hebrew name.<sup>20</sup>

Bauckham builds his argument for the identification of Junia with Joanna on the sound similarity of both names and the custom that Jews used a Greco-Roman name as an alternative to their Hebrew/Aramaic name in non-Jewish surroundings.<sup>21</sup> In chapter III of this thesis, Bauckham's approach will be discussed in detail.<sup>22</sup> In particular we will question the claim that the 'practice of adopting a Greek or Latin name for the sake of its assonance with a commonly used Semitic name' was prevalent.<sup>23</sup>

Our critique of Bauckham's approach would not have been possible without Ilan's systematic collection of the Jewish names of Palestine and the Greek- and Latin-speaking Western Diaspora in her *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity*.<sup>24</sup> Ilan's conclusion that based on the names found in all literary and non-literary sources, 'second names were not very common among Palestinian Jews,'<sup>25</sup> is in stark contrast to New Testament scholars who, like Bauckham, claim that the use of names from the Greco-Roman onomasticon as alternative

---

<sup>18</sup> More than three-quarters of the names recorded for the Western Diaspora in Ilan's *Lexicon for Jewish Names in Late Antiquity* are Greek or Latin (*LJNLA III*, 61, table 1).

<sup>19</sup> Al Wolters, 'IOYNIAN (Romans 16:7) and the Hebrew Name *Yəḥunnī*,' *JBL* 127.2 (2008): 397-408.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. III.3.2. for an evaluation of Wolters' approach.

<sup>21</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 181-186.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. III.3.3. and III.4.

<sup>23</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 184.

<sup>24</sup> Tal Ilan, *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity*, 4 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002-2012), volume I and III.

<sup>25</sup> *LJNLA I*, 47.

names to Semitic birth names was a common custom among Palestinian Jews.<sup>26</sup> The different aims of study can explain this discrepancy. Whereas New Testament scholars are interested in showing that *double names* found in their *primary source* (e.g. 'John, also called Mark'<sup>27</sup> and 'Saul, also [known as] Paul'<sup>28</sup>) are part of a wider Jewish phenomenon, Jewish onomastic studies are interested in the broader picture, and the New Testament is only *one source* among other literary and non-literary sources. New Testament experts are thus in danger of overstating their case, and Jewish onomastics experts risk overlooking valuable evidence for a practice that might be hidden in other sources. As the concept of *double names* is central to the link between Junia and Joanna, this thesis will explore the reasons for their presence in the New Testament and their absence in other sources.

The engagement with the specific name of Junia, therefore, will also further the discussion regarding Jewish naming conventions in the first century in general by reviewing the evidence for Greco-Roman names that could be understood as sound-equivalents for Hebrew/Aramaic names and by proposing a reason why double names are recorded in some sources and absent in others.

## 5. Studies about Joanna

Studies about Joanna fall into two categories: Usually she is discussed as part of the group of women mentioned in Luke 8, often in the wider context of women in Luke. Yet, there are also several specific studies focusing on Joanna, which offer an insight into the life of the female follower of Jesus.

The third gospel has been the focus of several studies regarding its stance on women, especially in the 1990s: Karris, reviewing the scholarly literature in

---

<sup>26</sup> Cf. III.2.1. for a more detailed discussion.

<sup>27</sup> Acts 12:12.

<sup>28</sup> Acts 13:9.

1993, notes that 'there are two lines of thought: one maintaining that Luke has a positive view of women, the other that his view of women, especially as leaders, is negative.'<sup>29</sup> These opposing views can be explained by the tension present in the Lukan narrative, which, on the one hand, features significant traditions about women and, on the other hand, promotes 'male dominance in positions of leadership.'<sup>30</sup> This aligns with what we hear of Joanna. She is only mentioned by Luke, but despite her contribution to Jesus' ministry and her role as an eyewitness to the events following Jesus' crucifixion, she is not mentioned in Acts. We know about her and the other women pre-resurrection, but there is no record of their involvement in the early church post-resurrection. So we are left to wonder what happened with these women, something that will be explored regarding Joanna in this thesis.

Narrowing down the focus from women in Luke in general to the specific women in Luke 8:1-3, the main points of discussion are laid out by one of the first studies on the passage, Witherington's article 'On the Road with Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, and other Disciples.'<sup>31</sup> The first is the question of whether the women were actually 'on the road' with Jesus or supported him financially as patrons out of their homes, as most recently suggested by Levine.<sup>32</sup> Connected with this issue is the question of whether it would have been 'scandalous' for women to travel with Jesus in the historical context.<sup>33</sup> The kind of service the women provided is also debated, ranging from 'resuming

---

<sup>29</sup> Robert J. Karris, 'Women and Discipleship in Luke,' in *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff, FCNTECW (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 23-43, citing 24.

<sup>30</sup> Turid Karlsen Seim, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 249.

<sup>31</sup> Ben Witherington III, 'On the Road with Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, and Other Disciples - Luke 8.1-3,' in *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff, FCNTECW (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 133-139 (originally published 1979).

<sup>32</sup> Amy-Jill Levine, 'Women Itinerants, Jesus of Nazareth, and Historical-Critical Approaches: Reevaluating the Consensus,' in *Gender and Second-Temple Judaism*, ed. Kathy Ehrensperger and Shayna Sheinfeld (Lanham: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2020), 45-64, citing 55.

<sup>33</sup> Witherington, 'Road,' 135.

their traditional roles' of service<sup>34</sup> to wielding power and influencing the movement as patrons.<sup>35</sup> A last less discussed aspect relates to their second mention in the empty tomb narrative, their eyewitness role in the events leading up to the resurrection,<sup>36</sup> especially highlighted by Bauckham.<sup>37</sup> This is significant for this thesis because a shared experience of the resurrection would establish a further link between Junia and Joanna.

The chapter on Joanna will outline the position of this thesis regarding these matters and thereby add another portrait to the various specific studies on Joanna, summarised in the following:

Moltmann-Wendel presents Joanna as a female courtier married to a high royal official who turns her back on her husband and the court to follow the social revolutionary Jesus, emphasising the independence that Joanna gains through her decision.<sup>38</sup> Spencer also describes Joanna as a wealthy married woman but tones down the scandalous element of her following Jesus independently of her husband by proposing that she did not travel with Jesus but provided financially for the movement from her home.<sup>39</sup>

In the tradition of historical Jesus studies, Sawicki portrays Joanna as a wealthy woman who, together with her business partner Mary Magdalene, financed and promoted Jesus' ministry as a faith healer. She also functioned as a double agent, spying on Jesus for Antipas while at the same time protecting Jesus from the tetrarch.<sup>40</sup> Whereas Sawicki tries to establish a historical portrait of Joanna independent of the 'religious elements,'<sup>41</sup> Price doubts that Joanna

---

<sup>34</sup> Witherington, 'Road,' 138.

<sup>35</sup> Amanda C. Miller, 'Cut from the Same Cloth: A Study of Female Patrons in Luke-Acts and the Roman Empire,' *RevExp* 114.2 (2017): 203-210, citing 206.

<sup>36</sup> Witherington, 'Road,' 138.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. chapter 8 on 'The Women and the Resurrection' in Bauckham, *Women*, 257-310.

<sup>38</sup> Elisabeth Moltmann-Wendel, *Ein eigener Mensch werden: Frauen um Jesus* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn, 1987), 134-148.

<sup>39</sup> F. Scott Spencer, *Salty Wives, Spirited Mothers, and Savvy Widows: Capable Women of Purpose and Persistence in Luke's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 101-144.

<sup>40</sup> Marianne Sawicki, 'Magdalenes and Tiberiennes: City Women in the Entourage of Jesus,' in *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and Women Re-viewed*, ed. Ingrid Rosa Kitzberger, *BibInt* 43 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 181-202.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. critique of Sawicki's approach in Spencer, *Wives*, 134f.

was a historical person associated with Jesus at all.<sup>42</sup> He argues she was the heroine of a chastity story, an early Christian literary form with the aim 'to assert the apostolic liberation of women, through celibacy, from the control of powerful men.'<sup>43</sup> In Luke only traces of the original story can be found as the author adapted it 'to use Joanna as a precedent for wealthy women patrons for the missionary movement,' thereby defying the purpose of the original story.<sup>44</sup>

Finally, there is Bauckham's extensive study of Joanna:<sup>45</sup> Joanna is portrayed as the wife of one of the highest officials in Antipas' realm who followed Jesus with her husband's approval and financed him out of her means. She is also an eyewitness of his resurrection and as such is likely one of the sources for Luke's gospel. The most inventive part of Bauckham's study is his proposal that Joanna might also be Junia. Though closest to Bauckham's portrayal, the picture of Joanna in this thesis, nevertheless, is independent of his. It also comes to different conclusions regarding the overlaps of the women's lives.

## 6. Main Contributions

As we have seen, studies on Junia abound, and there is also a range of studies on Joanna. Moreover, Bauckham's study even looks into the possible connection between the two women, which is also an important facet of this thesis.

However, contrary to Bauckham, whose focus of study is Joanna,<sup>46</sup> the primary focus of this research is Junia. This thesis provides one of the most

---

<sup>42</sup> Robert M. Price, *The Widow Traditions in Luke-Acts: A Feminist Critical Scrutiny*, SBLDS 155 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 127-151. For arguments regarding the historicity of women followers of Jesus, cf. IV.2.

<sup>43</sup> Price, *Widow*, 139.

<sup>44</sup> Price, *Widow*, 139.

<sup>45</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 165-194.

<sup>46</sup> Bauckham's article on Joanna is ninety-three pages long, and only twenty-one deal with Junia.

extensive studies of Romans 16:7, going beyond the usually discussed issues by establishing a historically plausible sketch of Junia's life and ministry in Rome based on the text and drawing on its literary and historical context. Aside from a fuller portrait of Junia, more insights into the relationships of the Roman community and Paul's purpose(s) of the greeting section are gained from focusing on one greeting. Similarly, the discussion of Junia's ministry within the history of the Roman church adds not just to her picture but also sheds more light on the beginnings of the Christian community in Rome.

This thesis is also one of the first in-depth responses to Bauckham's double-name hypothesis regarding Joanna and Junia, reviewing and adding to the evidence, pointing out weaknesses in the argument and developing its own hypothesis regarding the possibility of Joanna being also known as Junia. As the link between the names remains tentative and no further evidence that proves a connection between the two women has come to light throughout the study, this thesis, nevertheless, refrains from an identification of Junia with Joanna. Instead, it highlights the significant overlap of the women's biographical sketches, their presence among the group of people to whom Jesus appeared after his resurrection. It suggests that the women knew each other at the very least and shared (part of) the pre-resurrection journey. Therefore, overlapping Junia's and Joanna's sketches with the resurrection as a hinge, this thesis provides a full pre- and post-resurrection story of Junia, a female disciple (similar to Joanna) who became a significant figure in the early church.

## **7. Method and Procedure**

### **7.1. Finding a Method for the Question**

This thesis started with a question: Who was Junia? Another soon followed this question: Could Junia also be Joanna? Both questions, but especially the

second one, need 'a great deal of detective work' to be answered.<sup>47</sup> This is especially true because the sources for both women are limited; Junia is mentioned once and Joanna twice in the New Testament. If we want to arrive at a complete portrait of the life and ministry of these women, gaps and silences in the 'fragmentary picture' of our sources need to be filled.<sup>48</sup>

Historians fill the gaps in their sources, for example, by drawing inferences, i.e. seeing 'more in evidence than what is explicitly stated in that evidence.'<sup>49</sup> Collingwood writing about 'constructive history' describes it as the process of inserting information that is not explicitly stated but implied in the evidence in between the knowledge gained by the study of the sources.<sup>50</sup> This 'act of interpolation,' called '*a priori* imagination' by Collingwood, is 'in no way arbitrary or merely fanciful: it is necessary,' but the additional information inferred in this way is nevertheless 'essentially something imagined.'<sup>51</sup> When Paul, for example, writes that Andronicus and Junia were in Christ before him, the logical inference drawn based on our knowledge of Paul's encounter with Christ is that they became believers at a very early stage of the Christian movement.

To prevent historical imagination from becoming too fanciful, inferences drawn 'must ... be pegged to evidence,'<sup>52</sup> 'fixed points' provided by the sources between which the 'web of imaginative construction [is] stretched.'<sup>53</sup>

If these points are frequent enough and the threads spun from each to the next are constructed with due care, always by the *a priori* imagination and never by merely arbitrary fancy, the whole picture is constantly verified by appeal to these data, and runs little risk of losing touch with the reality which it represents.'<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Ben Witherington III, 'Joanna: Apostle of the Lord – or Jailbait?' *BRev* 21.2 (2005): 12-14 + 46-47, citing 46.

<sup>48</sup> David J. Staley, *Historical Imagination* (London: Routledge, 2021), 13.

<sup>49</sup> Staley, *Imagination*, 13.

<sup>50</sup> R.G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, ed. Jan van der Dussen, rev. ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 240.

<sup>51</sup> Collingwood, *Idea*, 240f.

<sup>52</sup> Staley, *Imagination*, 60.

<sup>53</sup> Collingwood, *Idea*, 242.

<sup>54</sup> Collingwood, *Idea*, 242.

The 'fixed points' of this study are established by the analysis of Junia's mention in Romans 16:7 and Joanna's mentions in Luke 8:3 and 24:10. Gaps found in our sources will be filled by drawing inferences based on contextual knowledge gained from the literary context; additional data from other sources; rhetorical analysis; studies regarding Mediterranean women in antiquity; studies regarding biblical women; social-scientific studies regarding ethnicity, healing, and patronage in the first-century world; and Jewish onomastics.

Some of the inferences drawn, placed around the established fixed points or pegs like an elastic band,<sup>55</sup> will be stretched further than Collingwood suggested, i.e. they go beyond what is implied directly by the sources. In his monograph on *Historical Imagination*, Staley concludes that 'without imagination, there can be no discipline of history.'<sup>56</sup> Breaking it down to this specific study, constructing a biographical sketch of Junia's life and ministry is also impossible without exploring more imaginative possibilities. How difficult it is to pinpoint the moment when inferences drawn are no longer logical but become fanciful is shown by the different evaluations of Bauckham's hypothesis that the Junia of Romans is the same person as the disciple Joanna mentioned in Luke. On the one hand, Witherington thinks it is 'certainly possible',<sup>57</sup> and Schnabel deems it plausible.<sup>58</sup> On the other hand, Mathew cautions that due to the lack of textual evidence, the identification of the two women is 'very speculative',<sup>59</sup> and Wolter sees all ideas concerning Andronicus and Junia that go beyond the text as suitable only to write fiction but certainly not worthy to be included in a scientifically responsible historiographic

---

<sup>55</sup> Cf. analogy in Staley, *Imagination*, 14.

<sup>56</sup> Staley, *Imagination*, 137.

<sup>57</sup> Ben Witherington III with Darlene Hyatt, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 388f.

<sup>58</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer: Kapitel 6-16*, vol. 2, HTA (Witten: SCM R. Brockhaus; Gießen: Brunnen, 2016), 887, n. 168.

<sup>59</sup> Susan Mathew, *Women in the Greetings of Romans 16.1-16: A Study of Mutuality and Women's Ministry in the Letter to the Romans*, LNTS (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 101.

reconstruction.<sup>60</sup> What seems a logical inference for some, for others already belongs in the realm of fiction. This shows that, as Staley suggests, ‘there is no immutable boundary defining that point at which historical statements are “too imaginative.”’<sup>61</sup>

Returning to our example above, this thesis will not just state that Andronicus and Junia were early Christians, as implied by the source. It will also explore when and where they likely encountered Jesus or the message about him first. As Romans 16:7 does not provide explicit information regarding those questions, nor do other sources mention a conversion story for the couple, answering those questions is only possible by using imagination to fill out the gaps in our sources. To ensure that the imagination applied does not become ‘too imaginative’ or fanciful, it is essential that all explorations stay connected to the evidence and are informed by contextual knowledge. Thus, the approach taken in this thesis could be described as *informed historical imagination*.<sup>62</sup>

As the focus of this research is the life and ministry of one woman (exploring the life and ministry of a second in the process), there are also overlaps with the approach of microhistory. ‘Microhistory as a practice is essentially based on the reduction of the scale of observation, on a microscopic analysis and an intensive study of the documentary material.’<sup>63</sup> In this thesis there is a clear ‘reduction of the scale of observation,’ especially for Junia. Rather than subsuming her under the study of women in the Pauline writings,

---

<sup>60</sup> Michael Wolter, *Der Brief an die Römer: Teilband 2: Röm 9-16*, vol. 2, EKKNT 6 (Ostfildern: Patmos;Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019), 472f., n. 42.

<sup>61</sup> Staley, *Imagination*, 15.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 194, who describes his approach as ‘using *historically informed imagination* to draw possible inferences from the evidence but stopping short of the kind of imaginative speculation that goes far beyond the evidence’ and Spencer, *Wives*, 124, who notes that all approaches to Joanna he critiques use ‘*informed historical imagination*’ as one ‘interpretative tool’ to flesh out Joanna’s portrait (emphases mine).

<sup>63</sup> Giovanni Levi, ‘On Microhistory,’ in *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, ed. Peter Burke, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Polity, 2001), 97-119, citing 99.

she is the sole protagonist in the first half of this research. The main focus regarding the 'documentary material' is also not the whole greeting section but Romans 16:7 specifically. Joanna is more naturally studied within the group of women she belongs to in Luke 8:2f., and there will be more references to the wider study of women in Luke in chapter IV. Yet, it is her individual features, especially her connection to the Herodian elite, that make her an exceptional case to study in more detail in general and more specifically for the purpose of exploring a connection between her and Junia in this research.

This study shares the hope of microhistorical research that by reducing the scale of observation, 'previously unobserved factors' are revealed,<sup>64</sup> not just about the women but also about their wider historical context. It also seeks to make connections that have gone unexplored before. If Paul, for example, points out Junia's Jewishness in a letter presumably addressing ethnic issues between Jews and Gentiles, what might this tell us about Junia's stance regarding those issues? Reducing the scale might also 'work effectively against oversimplification and superficial historical judgement.'<sup>65</sup> The often-found assumption that a woman's life in antiquity was restricted to the private sphere is challenged by the portrayal of Junia and Joanna. Both are found outside the private sphere, likely engaging publicly with men who are not their kin.

Another similarity to microhistory in this thesis relates to its form. 'Microhistory ... gives the reader the experience of a partial and uncertain knowledge.'<sup>66</sup> It is open about 'the limitations of documentary evidence, the formulations of hypotheses and the lines of thought followed.'<sup>67</sup> By its very title, this study explores historical possibilities, meaning its aim is not to arrive at historical certainties but to think through the 'clues and signs in the sources'<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Sigurður Gylfi Magnússon and István M. Szijártó, *What is Microhistory? Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge, 2013), 20; cf. Levi, 'Microhistory,' 101.

<sup>65</sup> Magnússon and Szijártó, *Microhistory*, 76.

<sup>66</sup> Magnússon and Szijártó, *Microhistory*, 44.

<sup>67</sup> Levi, 'Microhistory,' 110.

<sup>68</sup> Magnússon and Szijártó, *Microhistory*, 107.

that might help to paint a fuller picture of who Junia was. It will do so by using historical imagination, which might stretch quite far at points. Yet, the intention is to be as ‘open and transparent about the “stretchiness” of the inferences’ drawn and to ‘indicate via word choice and other linguistic and rhetorical signals’ (for example, the use of modal verb forms) how speculative a statement is to ensure ‘the expanse of imagination beyond what is explicitly stated in the documents is warranted.’<sup>69</sup>

## **7.2. A Note on the Interpreter**

‘In microhistory ... the researcher’s point of view becomes an intrinsic part of the account.’<sup>70</sup> So one element of being transparent is acknowledging my point of view. First of all, this research follows the life and ministry of Junia through the eyes of a woman primarily interested in Junia’s experiences as a member of the early church, conscious of, but not free from, the influence of the modern question of female leadership in the church. Thus, some lines of thought might be driven not just by what is found in the sources but also by having this bigger question in mind.

Another aspect that influences my point of view is my relation to the sources, which for me are more than an object of study; they are part of the Scriptures that are foundational for my faith. As such I believe that they are trustworthy in what they report. This does not prevent me from thinking critically about them but perhaps causes me to stretch the elastic band further than some historians would. From a purely historical viewpoint, the furthest we can go regarding the historicity of the empty tomb and resurrection accounts, for example, may be to state that those who recorded them believed in their

---

<sup>69</sup> Staley, *Imagination*, 80.

<sup>70</sup> Levi, ‘Microhistory,’ 110.

'historical truth.'<sup>71</sup> However, I consider the core of these accounts to be historical<sup>72</sup> and will treat them as a historical possibility throughout this thesis.

### 7.3. Steps of the Journey

The first step in the exploration of Junia's life and ministry will be a detailed exegesis of Romans 16:7, which addresses the main textual issues and establishes *what* Paul says about Andronicus and Junia and *why* he greets them in the way he does. After establishing the fixed points of what we can deduce from the text, the analysis will follow up on the clues and signs found regarding Junia's relation to the Christian beginnings in Jerusalem and Rome, to Paul, and to the Christian community at the time of writing.<sup>73</sup>

We will stretch outwards from Romans 16:7 first (chapter II). Then we will zone in on one piece of evidence, Junia's name, and stretch a bit further to see whether we can include (parts of) Joanna's story in Junia's (chapter III). Enabled by the tentative link between the two women, we will look at Joanna's biographical sketch to identify further overlaps between the women's biographical sketches (chapter IV).

Finally, their shared resurrection experience will be used as a hinge to superimpose the women's biographical sketches. In that way a biographical sketch of Junia will be constructed that locates her in Galilee during the ministry of Jesus, in Jerusalem as a witness of the resurrection, and in Rome shortly after Pentecost as an evangelist among the Jews of the capital.

---

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Levine's position in Amy-Jill Levine and Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Luke*, NCBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 648. Cf. IV.3.2. for a more detailed discussion of the historicity of the accounts.

<sup>72</sup> This is in line with Witherington's position in Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 649.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Magnússon and Szijártó, *Microhistory*, 107.

## II. JUNIA – An Apostle of Christ

### 1. Introduction

Our exploration of the historical possibilities regarding Junia’s life and ministry must begin with the verse in which we encounter her name for the first and the last time in the New Testament – Romans 16:7:

a <sup>1</sup>	ἀσπάσασθε Ἀνδρόνικον καὶ Ἰουνίαν	<i>Greet Andronicus and Junia,</i>
b	τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου	<i>my fellow Jews</i>
c	καὶ συναιχμαλώτους μου,	<i>and my fellow prisoners (of war),</i>
d	οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις,	<i>who are outstanding among the apostles,</i>
e	οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ. <sup>2</sup>	<i>who were also in Christ before me.<sup>3</sup></i>

As the fourth greeting in an extensive greeting section at the end of the letter to the Romans,<sup>4</sup> it is easily overlooked. However, from the earliest interpreters to recent discussions, these words have caught the attention of scholars due to the apparent greeting to a female apostle. Questioning whether the partner of Andronicus could be a woman, some interpreters read the ambiguous form of the name as the male name Junias. Two other debated issues concerning Romans 16:7 are also related to Junia’s role as an apostle; the question of whether Andronicus and his partner *were* apostles or just *known to*

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this chapter, I will refer to specific elements of the verse with the letter attached to it.

<sup>2</sup> The NA<sup>28</sup> text is used for quotations from the Greek New Testament and the NRSV for quotations in English unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>3</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>4</sup> Though it has been proposed that chapter 16 was originally addressed to another destination (e.g. Ephesus), the chapter is considered to be an integral part of the letter to the Romans in current scholarship (cf. Richard N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016, 6-8, who discusses the integrity of the letter under the heading ‘matters recently resolved’).

Convincing arguments for the unity of the letter based on text-critical, literary, linguistic, and rhetorical analyses are found in Harry Gamble, *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism*, SD 42 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977); Peter Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, trans. Michael Steinhauser (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 153- 164; and Jeffrey A. D. Weima, *Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings*, JSNTSup 101 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 215-230.

the apostles, and what kind of role Paul had in mind if he called them 'apostles.'

The debate about the sex and role of Andronicus' partner will be summarised and evaluated in this chapter. Yet, Romans 16:7 offers information beyond the debated issues concerning the origin and mission life of Andronicus and Junia, as well as their relationship to Paul and likely also their ties to the Roman believers. The aim of this chapter, therefore, is to come to a better understanding of the greeting's descriptive phrases and thereby gain a fuller picture of who Junia was. Beyond the detailed analysis of the content of the greeting, possible links with the wider context will be discussed to answer the question of why Paul felt the need to describe Andronicus and Junia in the way he does, a question that has barely received attention so far.

## **2. The Recipients of the Greeting – The Missionary Couple Andronicus and Junia**

Our line a of Romans 16:7 introduces two members of the Christian community in Rome, Andronicus and Junia, who are not mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament.<sup>5</sup> Unlike Epaenetus (v. 5) and Mary (v. 6), they are not addressed individually but greeted as a pair like Prisca and Aquila (v. 3). Whatever their relationship might be, Paul apparently sees them as a unit. Though Junia will be the focal point of the discussion, it must be kept in mind that all findings also relate to Andronicus. Köstenberger rightly states that 'Junia should not be elevated to "apostle" in isolation from ... Andronicus.'<sup>6</sup> This also means her role should not be questioned in isolation from his. Paul

---

<sup>5</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 33 (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 737.

<sup>6</sup> Andreas J. Köstenberger, 'Women in the Pauline Mission,' in *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul's Mission*, ed. Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson (Leicester: Apollos, 2000), 221-247, citing 231.

did not greet a female apostle in Romans 16:7; he did greet Andronicus and Junia, an apostolic pair.

The only specific information about each person in Romans 16:7 concerns their names. Both will be considered with different emphases. The discussion of Ἀνδρόνικος (Andronicus) will establish two preliminary biographical sketches explaining how this Jewish couple living in Rome might have become followers of Christ. These sketches will be adjusted throughout the analysis of Romans 16:7. The section on Ἰουνία/ς (Junia/s) will focus on the debate regarding the grammatical gender of the name, summarising and evaluating the main arguments that led to the majority view of reading the name as Junia. Having established the sex of Andronicus' partner, the nature of their partnership will be reviewed.

## 2.1. Ἀνδρόνικος - Andronicus

Andronicus is only mentioned in Romans 16:7, which might be a reason for the scarce or non-existent discussion of his person.<sup>7</sup> If mentioned, two aspects concerning his name are stated. Firstly, it is often found as the name of freedmen and slaves,<sup>8</sup> which might tell us something about his status. Secondly, his name is Greek, a compound of the nouns ἀνὴρ and νίκος, meaning 'man of victory.'<sup>9</sup> As Paul calls him συγγενής ('relative' or 'countryman'),<sup>10</sup> Andronicus was likely a 'Hellenized Jew.'<sup>11</sup> Luther speculates that he was a Jew converted at Pentecost who preached the gospel to other Jews on his way home to Rome.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Many commentators of Romans offer no specific information about Andronicus; among them are Byrne; Hultgren; Longenecker; Stuhlmacher; Wilckens; and Wolter.

<sup>8</sup> C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: Commentary on Romans IX-XVI and Essays*, vol. 2, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979), 788; cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 737.

<sup>9</sup> GELNT, s.v. 'Ἀνδρόνικος.'

<sup>10</sup> EDNT, s.v. 'συγγενής'; cf. II.3.1.1. for a discussion of the meaning of συγγενής in the context of Rom 16:7.

<sup>11</sup> Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 894; cf. Moo, *Romans*, 937.

<sup>12</sup> Martin Luther, 'Against the Roman Papacy an Institution of the Devil,' LW 41:348.

This would mean Andronicus was among the ‘visitors from Rome’ mentioned in Acts 2:10.<sup>13</sup>

The name Andronicus is found for Jews mainly in the Diaspora<sup>14</sup> but possibly also in Palestine. A Jew called Andronicus, who might have been Judean, is mentioned in Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*.<sup>15</sup> In a debate about the legitimate place of the temple before Ptolemy VI Philometor in Alexandria, this Andronicus represented or spoke for the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the Judeans against the Samaritans.<sup>16</sup> Whether he was an inhabitant of Jerusalem himself or a member of the Jewish Diaspora community in Alexandria speaking for the Jews of Jerusalem is not clear. Like in the case of his namesake in Romans 16, it is known *where he was* in the episode captured by Josephus, but one can only speculate *where he was from* by the group with which he is associated.

The group serving as the reference point for Andronicus in Romans 16:7 is the group of ‘the apostles.’ This led Origen to assume Andronicus was one of the seventy(-two) disciples sent out by Jesus according to Luke 10:1.<sup>17</sup> In the wake of Origen’s interpretation other commentators followed.<sup>18</sup> If he was one of the seventy, Andronicus would have been a Palestinian Jew who was an eyewitness of at least parts of Jesus’ ministry and probably would have followed Jesus on his last journey to Jerusalem. At least Andronicus would have known about the resurrection and been part of the first group of disciples

---

<sup>13</sup> Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 964.

<sup>14</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. ‘Ἀνδρόνικος.’ Of the six undoubtedly Jewish persons listed, three are from Egypt, one from Cyrenaica, and two from Italy (excluding Rome).

<sup>15</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Ἀνδρόνικος’ (the only entry for Palestine).

<sup>16</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 13.74-79.

<sup>17</sup> Origen, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: Book 6-10*, trans. Thomas Scheck (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2002), 293. In later tradition Andronicus is a fixture in various discipleship lists, usually as bishop of Pannonia (cf. Theodorus Schermann, *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae: Indices apostolorum discipulorumque domini Dorotheo, Epiphonio, Hippolyto aliisque vindicate*, BSGRT, Leipzig: Teubner, 1907, 120:12, 137:1, 168:17, 174:10, and 180:24).

<sup>18</sup> Among them are Hraban of Fulda (ninth century) and Atto of Vercelli (tenth century) (cf. Valentin Fàbrega, ‘War Junia(s), der hervorragende Apostel (Rom 16,7), eine Frau?’ *JAC* 27 -28 (1984-1985): 47-64, citing 61-63).

meeting in Jerusalem on Pentecost. This event might have led to his journey to Rome as a missionary.

Looking at the scarce information, we can glean from Andronicus' name in relation to his assumed Jewish origin, his early conversion ('in Christ' before Paul), and his likely missionary activity ('outstanding among the apostles') mentioned in Romans 16:7, two alternative preliminary biographical sketches can be outlined:

- 1) Andronicus was a Diaspora Jew living in Rome, probably of slave descent, able to travel to Jerusalem, where he was converted to faith in Jesus as the Messiah following the events of Pentecost. At some point after his conversion, he returned to Rome, where he preached the gospel in his synagogue.
- 2) Andronicus was a Palestinian Jew, probably with connections to the wider Hellenistic world. He met Jesus and became one of his disciples. At some point after Pentecost, he decided to go to Rome to preach the gospel to fellow Jews in the Diaspora.

In each case, Andronicus would have been part of Roman Christianity from the very beginning.

## 2.2. Ἰουνία(ς) – Junia(s)

Three readings of the second name in Romans 16:7 have been proposed, depending on how IOYNIAN is accented (Ἰουνίαν or Ἰουνιάν).<sup>19</sup> Two of them interpret IOYNIAN as the male name Junias and one as the female name Junia.<sup>20</sup> The latter is the understanding favoured by newer exegetical

---

<sup>19</sup> For an overview of the accents used in Greek editions of the New Testament from Erasmus to NA<sup>27</sup>/UBS<sup>4</sup>, cf. Epp, *Junia*, 62-63, tables 1 and 2. NA<sup>28</sup> and UBS<sup>5</sup>, as well as SBLGNT and THGNT, render the name as Ἰουνίαν. The SBLGNT mentions the alternative form Ἰουνιάν in the footnotes.

<sup>20</sup> Ray R. Schulz, 'Romans 16:7: Junia or Junias?', *ExpTim* 98.4 (1987): 108-110, citing 109; cf. Epp, *Junia*, 23.

discussions.<sup>21</sup> In the following, the issue and the arguments that led to this consensus will be summarised.<sup>22</sup>

If the name is rendered Ἰουνιᾶν with the circumflex on the ultima, the name is understood as an abbreviation of a longer name.<sup>23</sup> In the New Testament these abbreviated forms called hypocoristics usually end in -ᾶς,<sup>24</sup> e.g. Πατροβᾶς (Patrobas short for Patrobios).<sup>25</sup> In analogy, IOYNIAN is read as the accusative form of the male name Ἰουνιᾶς (Junias), a short form of Ἰουνιανός<sup>26</sup> the Greek transliteration of the Latin name *Iunianus*.<sup>27</sup>

Most scholars understand Ἰουνίαν with the *acute on the penultima* as a ‘feminine-accented’ form, the accusative of Ἰουνία, the female name Junia.<sup>28</sup> The tendency to make the accent ‘the ... determiner of gender’<sup>29</sup> (circumflex = male, acute = female) overlooks the third possibility, to read Ἰουνίαν as the accusative form of Ἰουνιάς, a first declension masculine noun.<sup>30</sup> In this case, Junias is not understood as a short form of another name<sup>31</sup> but as a male name in its own right.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Wolter, *Römer 9-16*, 473; cf. Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, vol. 871f.; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, BECNT, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018), 769; and Fuhrmann, ‘Junia,’ 1071.

<sup>22</sup> For a more detailed discussion, cf. Andrea Hartmann, ‘A Woman Lost in Translation: The Name IOYNIAN in Romans 16:7 and its History of Interpretation,’ *OpTh 6* (2020): 646-660, <https://doi.org/10.1515/opth-2020-0138>.

<sup>23</sup> BDF, § 125, 67.

<sup>24</sup> A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914), 172.

<sup>25</sup> BDF, § 125, 68; cf. BDAG, s.v. ‘Πατροβᾶς’ and Robertson, *Grammar*, 173.

<sup>26</sup> Robertson, *Grammar*, 172 (as a possibility next to Ἰουνιάς).

<sup>27</sup> BDAG, s.v. ‘Ἰουνιᾶς;’ cf. GELNT, s.v. ‘Ἰουνιάς,’ where Ἰουνιᾶς is given as an alternative form.

<sup>28</sup> Linda Belleville, ‘Ἰουνίαν ... ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις: A Re-examination of Romans 16.7 in Light of Primary Source Materials,’ *NTS* 51.2 (2005): 231-249, citing 237. Cranfield, *Romans IX-XVI*, 788; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 894; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 737; Arland J. Hultgren, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 574; Moo, *Romans*, 938; and Schreiner, *Romans*, 769 are among those who mention the feminine meaning of the form with the acute explicitly.

<sup>29</sup> Richard S. Cervin, ‘A Note regarding the Name “Junia(s)” in Romans 16.7,’ *NTS* 40.3 (1994): 464-470, citing 464.

<sup>30</sup> Robertson, *Grammar*, 172; cf. GELNT, s.v. ‘Ἰουνιάς.’ This form is mentioned less frequently in the discussion of Rom 16:7 but is found in Epp, *Junia*, 23; Schulz, ‘Junia,’ 109; and Peter Arzt, ‘Junia oder Iunias? Zum textkritischen Hintergrund von Röm 16,7,’ in *Liebe zum Wort: Festschrift für P. Ludger Bernhard Osb*, ed. Friedrich v. Reiterer and Petrus Eder Osb (Salzburg: Otto Müller Verlag, 1993), 83-102, citing 94.

<sup>31</sup> Arzt, ‘Junia,’ 94.

<sup>32</sup> Schulz, ‘Junia,’ 109.

The best and earliest support for the female reading is a comment on Junia by John Chrysostom, one of the Greek fathers writing in the late fourth century: “Βαβαί, πόση τῆς γυναικὸς ταύτης ἢ φιλοσοφία, ὡς καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀξιωθῆναι προσηγορίας”<sup>33</sup> [‘Oh, how great is the devotion (φιλοσοφία) of this woman, that she should be even counted worthy of the appellation of apostle!’] (John Chrysostom, *In Epistulam ad Romanos* 31.2).<sup>34</sup> Chrysostom, as a native Greek speaker, clearly identifies Junia as a woman who is called an apostle. Chrysostom is not an exception: Origen, another of the Greek fathers, also ‘read Rom 16:7 as “Junia, ”’<sup>35</sup> as did Theophylact, who clearly refers to Junia as a woman in his commentary on Romans 16:7.<sup>36</sup>

The only Greek mention of a male Junias in relation to Romans 16:7 is found in an *Index Discipulorum* ascribed to the fourth-century bishop of Salamis, Epiphanius: “Ἰουνίας,<sup>37</sup> οὗ καὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ Παῦλος μέμνηται, ἐπίσκοπος Απαμείας τῆς Συρίας ἐγένετο” [Junias, the same who Paul also has mentioned, became bishop of Apameia in Syria<sup>38</sup>] (Pseudo-Epiphanius, *Index Discipulorum*, 125.19-20). However, the reliability of the *Index Discipulorum* is questionable, as there is doubt about its authorship<sup>39</sup> and date.<sup>40</sup> Moreover, this source is notable for taking another personal name — Prisca — who we know

<sup>33</sup> PG 60:669d-670a.

<sup>34</sup> Chrysostom, *Romans*, *NPNF*<sup>1</sup> 11:555.

<sup>35</sup> Epp, *Junia*, 33f. For a critical evaluation whether the unambiguous mention of Junia in his commentary on Romans (cf. PG 14:1280c) is by Origen himself or was added by his Latin translator Rufinus in the fourth/fifth century, cf. Fàbrega, ‘Junia(s),’ 58-60. If Rufinus is the author, an early Greek witness for the female reading is replaced by an early Latin witness.

<sup>36</sup> Theophylact, *In Epistulam ad Romanos* (PG 124:552c). Other Greek commentators who likely read the name as Junia are Theodoret (PG 82:220c), John of Damascus (PG 95:565c.), and Oecumenius (PG 118:629b). Yet, they all use the ambiguous form Ἰουνίαν without any other grammatical pointers (e.g. articles or pronouns clarifying the grammatical gender). Thus, there is no clear indication of how the respective authors interpreted the name.

<sup>37</sup> On its own, as a masculine first declension noun, as well as in its context, followed by a masculine relative pronoun and personal pronoun, the name is unambiguously male.

<sup>38</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>39</sup> Though some manuscripts attribute the list to Epiphanius, most witnesses remain anonymous (Christophe Guignard, ‘Greek Lists of the Apostles: New Findings and Open Questions,’ *ZAC* 20.3 (2016): 469-495).

<sup>40</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 166f.

to be a female name,<sup>41</sup> and deliberately changing it to a male name (Πρίσκας – Priscas). Thus, we know that this source is not trustworthy on the grammatical gender of names.<sup>42</sup>

Before turning to the Latin fathers, it is necessary to look at the only attested variant reading Ἰουλίαν<sup>43</sup> which is found in some of the Latin-writing commentators as well. As this variant is a transcription of the widely known Latin *female* name Julia, there is usually no doubt about its grammatical gender. Thus, the alternate reading might be another pointer to a female reading of IOYNIAN. However, it must be noted that, even though the female reading is the more natural, the Latin *Iuniam* and even *Iuliam* could be read as male names; this is also true for the forms of the name found in the other early translations (Coptic and Syriac).<sup>44</sup>

This means that whether a Latin commentator refers to *Iuniam* or *Iuliam*, we cannot say for certain how he read the name unless an unambiguous form of the name is used or a clear indication is given that Junia is understood as a woman. Unambiguous forms are found in Jerome's commentary on Philemon ('*Iulia*')<sup>45</sup> and Rabanus Maurus' commentary on Romans ('*Iunia*').<sup>46</sup> Hatto of Vercelli considers Andronicus and Julia to be husband and wife,<sup>47</sup> and Peter Abelard admits that Paul seems to mention a woman apostle.<sup>48</sup>

The first Latin commentator who clearly understood Andronicus' partner to be a man is Giles (Aegidius) of Rome (13th century), who referred to

---

<sup>41</sup> Cf. the unambiguously feminine form Πρίσκα in 1 Cor 16:19.

<sup>42</sup> For a more detailed evaluation, cf. Hartmann, 'IOYNIAN,' 651.

<sup>43</sup> According to the apparatus of the NA28, the variant is found, for example, in one of the oldest papyri P<sup>46</sup>, and in MSS 6, 606, 1718, and 2685, as well as in many Latin translations and the translation into the Coptic dialect Bohairic (cf. Arzt, 'Iunia,' 92f.).

<sup>44</sup> John Thorley, 'Junia, a Woman Apostle,' *NovT* 38.1 (1996): 18-29, citing 20; for Latin cf. Epp, *Junia*, 36-38; for Coptic cf. U.-K. Plisch, 'Die Apostelin Junia: Das exegetische Problem in Röm 16.7 im Licht von Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup> und der sahidischen Überlieferung,' *NTS* 42.3 (1996): 477-478, citing 477f.

<sup>45</sup> Jerome, *Commentariorum in Epistolam ad Philemon liber* (PL 26.617d).

<sup>46</sup> Rabanus Maurus, *In Epistolam ad Romanos* (PL 111.1608b).

<sup>47</sup> Hatto of Vercelli, *In Epistolam ad Romanos* (PL 134.282a).

<sup>48</sup> Peter Abelard, *Expositio in Epistolam ad Romanos* 5 (PL 178.973c).

Andronicus and Julias<sup>49</sup> as ‘these honourable men.’<sup>50</sup> From this moment onwards, the male reading became more common in the West. The most significant move towards understanding the name as ‘Junias,’ however, was Luther’s translation of Romans 16:7 (“Grusset den Andronicon vnd den Junian...”<sup>51</sup>) in his *Septembertestament* of 1522,<sup>52</sup> as it assured the male reading ‘a broad exposure for centuries to come,’<sup>53</sup> especially but not only in the German-speaking world. Other Reformers, like Calvin,<sup>54</sup> retained the female reading. The fact that both the *Geneva Bible* (GB) and the *Authorized Version* (KJV) of 1611 favoured ‘Junia’ over ‘Junias’ ensured that the female reading was not just the main but the only English reading until the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

A significant shift towards the male reading in the English-speaking world occurred in the late 1800s due to the reiteration of the short-form hypothesis in lexicas<sup>55</sup> and commentaries.<sup>56</sup> Lightfoot’s understanding of ‘Ἰουνίαν (or Ἰουνιᾶν)’ as a man’s name<sup>57</sup> underpinned the translation of the name as ‘Junias’ in the RV (1881).<sup>58</sup> The inclusion of the form Ἰουνιᾶν (without mention of an alternative reading) into the 13<sup>th</sup> edition of the Greek New Testament by Erwin Nestle (published in 1927) and subsequent critical Greek New Testament texts up to the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century<sup>59</sup> sealed Junia’s fate. The female reading was

---

<sup>49</sup> This shows that even the variant reading, which for modern interpreters clearly points to a female name, can be interpreted as a male name (cf. Brooten, ‘Junia,’ 141f.).

<sup>50</sup> Aegidius of Rome, *Opera Exegetica. Opuscula I* (Facsimile reprint of the Rome, 1554/55 edition: Frankfurt, 1968), 97, as cited by Brooten, ‘Junia,’ 141.

<sup>51</sup> Martin Luther, *Das Neue Testament Deutzsch* (Wittenberg: Melchior Lotther, 1522), urn:nbn:de:bsz:24-digibib-bsz3517275746 (emphasis mine). The added masculine article makes the name unambiguously male.

<sup>52</sup> For a more detailed analysis of Luther’s translation choice and bias, cf. Hartmann, ‘ΙΟΥΝΙΑΝ,’ 652.

<sup>53</sup> Brooten, ‘Junia,’ 142.

<sup>54</sup> John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*, trans. and ed. John Owen, in vol. 19 of *Calvin’s Commentaries*, 500 years edition (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009), 541 and 545.

<sup>55</sup> E.g. GELNT from 1898.

<sup>56</sup> E.g. Sanday and Headlam’s first edition from 1895.

<sup>57</sup> J. B. Lightfoot, *St Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations*, 5th ed. (London: Macmillan and CO., 1876), 96.

<sup>58</sup> Epp, *Junia*, 25f. and 67.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Epp, *Junia*, 63, table 2.

side-lined until Brooten brought it to the fore again in her article “Junia ... Outstanding among the Apostles.”

Brooten critiqued the short-form hypothesis, pointing out that hypocoristics of Latin names lengthen rather than shorten;<sup>60</sup> Πρίσκα (Prisca),<sup>61</sup> for example, becomes Πρίσκιλλα (Priscilla).<sup>62</sup> Another argument invoked against the short-form hypothesis is that Paul usually refrained from using nicknames or shortened forms.<sup>63</sup> This is true in the case of Prisca, but Paul uses the short form Λουκᾶς (Lucas) in Philemon, a name that is an abbreviation of a Latin name.<sup>64</sup> Consequently, the name in Romans 16:7 could be a shortened Latin name.

Thorley provides a more substantial argument against the short-form hypothesis. Taking a closer look at the formation of hypocoristic names ending in -ᾶς, he argues that in line with the found pattern, the correct short form of Ἰουλιανός should be Ἰουνᾶς (Junas), not Ἰουνιᾶς.<sup>65</sup> Yet, neither of these two suggested short forms is found in Greek literature. As ‘it is ... the *actual* existence of a nickname, not its supposed existence, which is crucial,’<sup>66</sup> Cervin opposes the idea of Ἰουνιᾶς based on mere analogy to other shortened names.

Arzt’s analysis of the most important manuscripts shows that there is nothing more than a ‘supposed existence’ of the short form, even in Romans 16:7 itself. Considering that the only accent found in the manuscripts is the acute on the penultima, the circumflex accentuation must be a later invention.<sup>67</sup> As the accent is not the determiner of gender, a male reading is not disqualified per se, but it is the less likely reading for various reasons:

---

<sup>60</sup> Brooten, ‘Junia,’ 142f.; cf. Schulz, ‘Junia,’ 109.

<sup>61</sup> Rom 16:3, 1 Cor 16:19, 2 Tim 4:19.

<sup>62</sup> Acts 18:2, 18, 26.

<sup>63</sup> Belleville, ‘Ἰουλίαν,’ 239; cf. Arzt, ‘Iunia,’ 85.

<sup>64</sup> Hartmann, ‘ΙΟΥΝΙΑΝ,’ 654f.

<sup>65</sup> Thorley, ‘Junia,’ 24f.; cf. Belleville, ‘Ἰουλίαν,’ 239.

<sup>66</sup> Cervin, ‘Junia(s),’ 466f.

<sup>67</sup> Arzt, ‘Iunia,’ 87-94.

Though Ἰουνία is indeed rare in Greek literature,<sup>68</sup> there is plenty of non-literary evidence for the use of the name,<sup>69</sup> for example, the first-century inscriptions to Junia Theodora, a female benefactor residing in Corinth.<sup>70</sup> Including the Latin evidence,<sup>71</sup> it becomes clear that Junia might not have been a popular Greek name, but it certainly was a popular Latin name. A male Ἰουνίας, apart from the questionable mention in Pseudo-Epiphanius, is unattested in both literary and non-literary sources.<sup>72</sup> With no evidence outside of the context of Romans 16:7, the Junias-theory remains an ‘argument from silence.’<sup>73</sup> Considering that a male counterpart of *Iunia* existed in Latin, the very common name *Iunius*,<sup>74</sup> Thorley is adamant that ‘Ἰουνίας cannot be a male name.’<sup>75</sup> It must be, as Bauckham puts it, the ‘feminine equivalent of Junius.’<sup>76</sup>

In summary, both male interpretations lack evidence to support their existence. The female form Junia, however, is widely attested outside of the New Testament. In light of the evidence, there is no good reason to replace the known female name Junia with a hypothetical male name Junias.<sup>77</sup> This scholarly consensus is reflected in the changes made in critical texts and translations concerning Romans 16:7.<sup>78</sup> The short form is no longer part of the

---

<sup>68</sup> Outside of the context of Rom 16:7, there is only one mention by Plutarch referring to Junia, Cassius’ wife and Brutus’ sister (Plutarch, *Brutus* 7.1.).

<sup>69</sup> Belleville lists several first-century inscriptions from Asia Minor and Rome in which the Greek form appears as a female name (Belleville, ‘Ἰουνίας,’ 241). Cf. III.3.1., for more examples and a discussion of the name in its Greco-Roman context.

<sup>70</sup> Bruce W. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline communities* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 183-191. Winter discusses a connection between Romans 16:7 and these inscriptions but concludes ‘that the arguments on the present evidence are weighted against the identification of Junia Theodora and Junia’ (Winter, *Wives*, 200-204).

<sup>71</sup> For literary examples cf. Cicero, *Letters to Friends* 15.8; Suetonius, *Gaius Caligula*, 4.12; and Tacitus, *Annals* 3.76. Junia also appears more than 250 times in Latin inscriptions found in Rome (Lampe, *Rome*, 176).

<sup>72</sup> Arzt, ‘Junia,’ 83.

<sup>73</sup> Schulz, ‘Junia,’ 109.

<sup>74</sup> The *OCD* lists nineteen men named *Iunius* living between 100 BCE and 100 CE (765-767), most famous among them Iunius Brutus Marcus, who ‘joined, and *ex officio* took the lead in, the widespread conspiracy that led to Caesar’s assassination’ (766). The name is also found frequently in its Greek transliteration Ἰούνιος (most prominently in Plutarch’s *Lives*).

<sup>75</sup> Thorley, ‘Junia,’ 24.

<sup>76</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 167.

<sup>77</sup> Peter Stuhlmacher, *Der Brief an die Römer*, NTD 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 219.

<sup>78</sup> For a more detailed discussion, cf. Hartmann, ‘ἸΟΥΝΙΑΝ,’ 658.

main text in critical New Testament editions,<sup>79</sup> and the female reading has become the main reading in various English translations.<sup>80</sup>

Thus, after extensive scholarly debate, one element of Junia's identity has been widely agreed on: she is a woman. The irony of this conclusion is that for Paul and his audience, her sex was not a debated issue nor something Paul wanted to highlight. Therefore, the scholarly discussion needs to refocus from the excursus to the actual statements Paul makes about Junia and Andronicus, starting with the fact that he mentions them together.

### 2.3. Apostolic Pair(s)

Paul connects Andronicus and Junia's names with the conjunction καί, which leaves no doubt that he considers them a pair. According to Jeremias, the sending of pairs as messengers was common in the New Testament.<sup>81</sup> He lists Andronicus and a male Junias alongside Peter and John (Acts 8:14) and Judas and Silas (Acts 15:22) as paired delegates of the Jerusalem church, who had a unique mandate and authority.<sup>82</sup> D'Angelo agrees that 'missionary pairs seem to have been the norm for the early Christian mission' but adds both women mission partners<sup>83</sup> and male/female pairs like Andronicus and Junia to the picture.<sup>84</sup> Though we cannot be sure of the exact relationship between Andronicus and Junia, the social conventions of the time suggest that Junia

---

<sup>79</sup> Cf. n. 19.

<sup>80</sup> NIV and TNIV (with Junia as the sole reading); and ESV, NET, NLT, NRSV, and RNJB (with Junia in the main text and the male alternative in the footnotes).

<sup>81</sup> J. Jeremias, 'Paarweise Sendung im Neuen Testament,' in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), 136-143, citing 138.

<sup>82</sup> Jeremias, 'Sendung,' 139. For more (male only) pairs, cf. 139-142.

<sup>83</sup> E.g. Tryphaena and Tryphosa (Rom 16:12) and Euodia and Syntyche (Phil 4:2).

<sup>84</sup> Mary Rose D'Angelo, 'Women Partners in the New Testament,' *JFSR* 6.1 (1990): 65-86, citing 75; cf. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*, 2nd ed. (London: SCM, 1995), 169 and 172.

likely lived and travelled with a male relative, whether a father or son,<sup>85</sup> a brother or, in Junia's case, most likely her husband.<sup>86</sup>

Paul's mention of the right of apostles to take an ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα, a 'sister-wife,' along (1 Corinthians 9:5) indicates that apostles were accompanied by their believing 'wives'<sup>87</sup> and that the church communities should support both.<sup>88</sup> Paul's comment supporting a wider argument about apostolic status, however, is not specific enough to decide whether these women only had a subordinate role assisting their husbands<sup>89</sup> or were missionaries in their own right.<sup>90</sup> Based on the examples of named married women like Prisca and Junia, whom Paul portrays as contributing significantly to the spread of the gospel,<sup>91</sup> it can be concluded that at least some were 'equal apostolic partners.'<sup>92</sup> The fact that Junia is both named and her relationship with Andronicus is not defined<sup>93</sup> suggests that she was seen as Andronicus' partner rather than as his assistant.<sup>94</sup> Whereas there might have been unnamed wives of apostles and missionaries who played a less significant part in ministry, Junia was undoubtedly known among the Roman congregations in her own right.

---

<sup>85</sup> Commentators do not mention these relations, although Rom 16:13 contains a child-parent pair, Rufus and his mother.

<sup>86</sup> Christoph Stenschke, 'Married Women and the Spread of Early Christianity,' *Neot* 43.1 (2009): 145-194, citing 155f.; cf. James R. Edwards, *Romans*, NIBCNT 6 (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992), 355. This is also the majority view among commentators (cf. among others Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 894; Jewett, *Romans*, 962; Longenecker, *Romans*, 1068; Moo, *Romans*, 938; and Schreiner, *Romans*, 769).

<sup>87</sup> Some of these relationships might have been celibate partnerships (William S. Campbell, *Romans: A Social Identity Commentary*, London: T&T Clark, 2023, 413).

<sup>88</sup> Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 447; cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 32 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 358.

<sup>89</sup> John Granger Cook, '1 Cor 9,5: The Women of the Apostles,' *Bib* 89.3 (2008) 352-368, citing 358 and 362. Cook takes the anonymity of those women as a sign of their subordinate role. Yet, for Paul's rhetorical purpose, there is no need to name specific women; the common practice is enough to support his argument.

<sup>90</sup> D'Angelo, 'Partners,' 73f.

<sup>91</sup> Stenschke, 'Women,' 189.

<sup>92</sup> Joan E. Taylor, "'Two by Two': The Ark-Etypal Language of Mark's Apostolic Pairings,' in *The Body in Biblical, Christian and Jewish Texts*, ed. Joan E. Taylor (London: T&T Clark Bloomsbury, 2014), 58-82, citing 79; cf. Wilckens, *Römer*, III:136.

<sup>93</sup> Apart from the unnamed mother of Rufus (Rom 16:13) and the sister of Nereus (Rom 16:15), none of the women in Romans 16 is identified by a male relation.

<sup>94</sup> Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 173; cf. Cook, 'Women,' 358.

Yet, the question remains: For what kind of ministry was Junia known? Käsemann emphasises the practical aspect of husband and wife missionary teams, namely the wife's ability to reach women in places to which men had no access, specifically the women's quarters.<sup>95</sup> This suggestion is part of a wider assumption among New Testament scholars that 'there was a longstanding and broad societal consensus on the roles of women.'<sup>96</sup> Köstenberger, for example, claims that concerning the mission and life of the early church, women played an important role, but their influence 'was to a significant extent informal and frequently *centred around their home*' as they 'fully functioned *within the parameters of their Graeco-Roman surroundings*.'<sup>97</sup> In ancient writings, there is, no doubt, an 'idealizing compartmentalisation of "public" and "private,"'<sup>98</sup> or in Roman terms, a division between the political and legal life of the *forum*, the arena of men, and the family life centred on the *domus*, the sphere associated with women.<sup>99</sup> An example of this ideal of male and female spheres is found in the following comment of the Jewish writer Philo:

Market-places and council-halls and law-courts and gatherings and meetings where a large number of people are assembled, and open-air life with full scope for discussion and action—all these are suitable to men [...]. The women are best suited to the indoor life which never strays from the house, [...] A woman, then, should not be a busybody, meddling with matters outside her household concerns, but should seek a life of seclusion. (Philo, *Spec. Laws* 3.169-171 [Colson])

Yet, it is important to note that this quote, along with similar views on women in literary sources of the first century, reflects the idealised view of upper-class men, reinforcing the prevalent gender norms.<sup>100</sup> Other sources, e.g.

---

<sup>95</sup> Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, HNT 8a, 4th ed. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1980), 397; cf. Cook, 'Women,' 365-367; and Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, 219.

<sup>96</sup> Winter, *Wives*, 17.

<sup>97</sup> Köstenberger, 'Women,' 234 (emphasis mine).

<sup>98</sup> Lin Foxhall, *Gender in Classical Antiquity*, KTAH (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 115.

<sup>99</sup> Emily A. Hemelrijk, *Hidden Lives, Public Personae: Women and Civic Life in the Roman West* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 10.

<sup>100</sup> For an evaluation of philosophical writings and letters as sources describing women's life in the first century, cf. Hylan, *Women*, 14-17.

papyri, record women's involvement in a range of tasks that led them beyond their own homes, thereby giving more realistic insights into women's mobility.<sup>101</sup> Thus, the 'gendered use of space' was far more complex than literary sources convey: 'very few spaces were gendered in an absolute sense,'<sup>102</sup> in fact, many spaces were shared, including the seemingly private space of the house. The limited room in lower-class housing did not allow for segregation between the sexes.<sup>103</sup> Therefore, the reality of most lower-class women all over the Roman empire was that they shared their living space with male relatives, worked with them in workshops, lived next door to other families, and shared public spaces like the marketplace with men.<sup>104</sup> Though elite houses allowed for more privacy, most (Roman) elite women also did not lead a secluded life. They would have encountered visitors and clients in the more public rooms of the house, like the *atrium*, and received guests in the more private rooms.<sup>105</sup> Moreover, elite women would have accompanied their husbands to dinner parties and other social events; they would have visited temples, taken part in cultural events in the theatres and amphitheatres, and engaged with family and friends outside their homes.<sup>106</sup> During the Roman Empire, (elite) women pushed boundaries, occupying spaces formerly restricted to men, like the courts or even the *forum*.<sup>107</sup>

The points of contact allowed both male and female voices to be heard in various settings. Consequently, there is no need to restrict women's ministry

---

<sup>101</sup> Susan E. Hylén, *Women in the New Testament World*, EBS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 21f.

<sup>102</sup> Foxhall, *Gender*, 136.

<sup>103</sup> Carolyn Osiek and Margaret Y. MacDonald, *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 4.

<sup>104</sup> Hylén, *Women*, 19.

<sup>105</sup> Hemelrijk, *Lives*, 10.

<sup>106</sup> Hemelrijk, *Lives*, 11.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Winter's discussion of the 'The Appearance of Women in the Public Sphere' (Winter, *Wives*, 173-204). Hemelrijk's study of inscriptions honouring women for 'their contribution to civic life as priestesses, benefactresses, and patronesses and "mothers" of cities and *collegia*' (Hemelrijk, *Lives*, 36) in the Latin-speaking part of the Roman Empire gives ample evidence of women's involvement in the public sphere.

work only to women<sup>108</sup> or men's only to men for that matter. However, there is also no reason to rule out that within the confines of a patriarchal society, women could reach out to women more easily, whereas men would listen more attentively to men. We simply do not know how the mission work of married pairs like Andronicus and Junia looked. Some might have worked alongside each other, reaching out to both men and women; others might have divided their work according to gender.

Regardless of the exact nature of their teamwork, there is no doubt that the descriptive phrases following their introduction relate to both Andronicus and Junia.<sup>109</sup> Both are Paul's συγγενεῖς ('fellow Jews') and συναιχμάλωτοι ('fellow prisoners'), and both are acknowledged by Paul as ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ('outstanding among the apostles') who were ἐν Χριστῷ ('in Christ') before him. What each of these descriptions tells us about Andronicus and Junia, however, has been a matter of discussion, in some cases as hotly debated as the question of Junia's sex.

### 3. The Descriptive Phrases – Andronicus and Junia's Credentials

As much as it is of interest for the modern interpreter to obtain information about the persons in Romans 16, it is essential to keep in mind that in the original context, the descriptive phrases in the greeting section were not meant to give information about the persons greeted, nor did they serve to identify them: Since each person mentioned was known among the Roman Christians, it would have been clear 'who was designated by a given name.'<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>108</sup> Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 173.

<sup>109</sup> All elements of the descriptions, i.e. nouns and relative pronouns, are plural and therefore have both Andronicus and Junia as antecedents.

<sup>110</sup> Gamble, *Romans*, 91; cf. Jeffrey A. D. Weima, *Paul the Ancient Letter Writer: An Introduction to Epistolary Analysis* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016), 190.

Mullins suggests that the function of *elaborating phrases* in greetings was to reveal ‘specific aspects of the writer-reader relationship.’<sup>111</sup> An affectionate *personal description* full of praise was usually meant to convey a special relationship between the writer and the recipient of the greeting.<sup>112</sup> The expression ὁ ἀγαπητός μου (‘my beloved’)<sup>113</sup> is such a description of a personal and affective relationship between Paul and the recipient of the greeting.<sup>114</sup> Other descriptors, however, move beyond the relational. The emphasis of ὁ συνεργός μου (‘my fellow worker’),<sup>115</sup> an expression used by Paul for companions who have worked alongside him,<sup>116</sup> is not so much the personal relationship (which undoubtedly existed) but the common missionary work.<sup>117</sup> If, as in the case of συνεργός, the relational aspect is secondary in specific descriptors, their function must go beyond highlighting a special relationship between Paul and the persons greeted. They are meant to have a rhetorical effect on the audience, likely related to the overall purpose(s) of the greeting section.<sup>118</sup>

Especially the more elaborate descriptions, those containing relative clauses, have a ‘highly laudatory’ character,<sup>119</sup> and thus they seem to ‘possess a commendatory function.’<sup>120</sup> Godet, therefore, is not wrong to note that the greetings ‘might ... be called recommendations’<sup>121</sup> though technically only the

<sup>111</sup> Terence Y. Mullins, ‘Greeting as a New Testament Form,’ *JBL* 87.4 (1968): 418-426, citing 422.

<sup>112</sup> Mullins, ‘Greeting,’ 423. For this reason, the absence of personal descriptions in the greetings (e.g. vv. 14-15) might indicate that Paul did not know these persons but had only heard of them (Jewett, *Romans*, 953; cf. Moo, *Romans*, 934; and Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 868f.).

<sup>113</sup> Rom 16:5, 8, 10, and without the possessive pronoun 12.

<sup>114</sup> Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 880, 889, 890f., and 894.

<sup>115</sup> Rom 16:3 and 9.

<sup>116</sup> Georg Bertram, ‘συνεργός, συνεργέω,’ *TDNT* 7:871-876, citing 871.

<sup>117</sup> Cf. Wolf-Henning Ollrog, *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter: Untersuchungen zu Theorie und Praxis der paulinischen Mission*, WMANT 50 (Neukirchen-Vlynn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1979), 67, who argues that the term is defined from ἔργον (the joint work) not from συν (the being together).

<sup>118</sup> Cf. II.4.1.

<sup>119</sup> Longenecker, *Romans*, 1066; cf. Gamble, *Romans*, 91. Witherington even describes the greeting list as an ‘honor roll’ (Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 380).

<sup>120</sup> Weima, *Paul*, 187; cf. Gamble, *Romans*, 91.

<sup>121</sup> Frédéric Godet, *Commentary on St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans*, Vol. 2, trans. Alex Cusin (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1882), 388.

reference to Phoebe (Romans 16:1-2) is one.<sup>122</sup> Due to the type of greeting Paul chooses – the second person plural greeting ἀσπάσασθε ('greet') – all elements of the structure of Pauline commendations are present in the longer greetings (Romans 16:3-7): Those being commended are identified, their credentials are given, and a 'desired action' is expressed which Paul asks his audience to do,<sup>123</sup> 'to engage in hospitable recognition of [Andronicus and Junia]' (*greet, welcome*)<sup>124</sup> which is not unlike the request 'to receive [Phoebe] favourably' (*receive, welcome*).<sup>125</sup> Besides the structural similarities, there are also parallels in content. Paul's commendation passages emphasise the willingness to serve the gospel and the Christian community 'even to the point of hardship.'<sup>126</sup> In Romans 16 Paul commends Prisca and Aquila for risking their lives for Paul (Romans 16:4), Mary for her toil among the Roman community (Romans 16:6), and Andronicus and Junia as fellow prisoners (Romans 16:7c). Commendation letters also could benefit the writer.<sup>127</sup> So Paul's status in the eyes of the audience might have been raised by his acknowledgement of members of their community.

Considering the 'close connections' between letters of recommendation and praise,<sup>128</sup> another influence on Paul's more detailed descriptions might have been the encomium, a speech of praise.<sup>129</sup> As this kind of speech pervaded the ceremonial and celebratory life of the Greco-Roman world,<sup>130</sup> both Paul and his

<sup>122</sup> Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 886; cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 942; Schreiner, *Romans*, 759; and Wilckens, *Römer*, III:131.

<sup>123</sup> Efrain Agosto, 'Paul and Commendation,' in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World. A Handbook. Volume I*, ed. J. Paul Sampley, rev. ed. (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 143-168, citing 152. There are no complete recommendation letters in the Pauline corpus, but passages within his letters reflect the typical structure, language and, to a certain extent, the contents of such letters (Agosto, 'Commendation,' 163).

<sup>124</sup> BDAG, s.v. 'ἀσπάζομαι.'

<sup>125</sup> BDAG, s.v. 'προσδέχομαι.'

<sup>126</sup> Agosto, 'Commendation,' 163. This is a Pauline twist on the Greco-Roman commendation letters, which ascribe honour based on family relations, status, connection, and wealth (Agosto, 'Commendation,' 163).

<sup>127</sup> Agosto, 'Commendation,' 148.

<sup>128</sup> Laurent Pernot, *Epidictic Rhetoric: Questioning the Stakes of Ancient Praise* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015), 55.

<sup>129</sup> WDNTECLR, s.v. 'Encomium.'

<sup>130</sup> Pernot, *Rhetoric*, 78 and 86.

audience likely were familiar with its rhetorical conventions.<sup>131</sup> According to Pernot, the encomium has a social function: ‘it delineates images and beliefs common to the group; it defines and justifies accepted values; and sometimes it grants currency to new values.’<sup>132</sup> Thus, Paul could have used the praise of those greeted to demonstrate that he and his audience generally shared the same values while introducing new values or his specific take on shared ones.

Even though Paul does not fully develop the literary and rhetorical forms he is drawing upon – the greeting list is neither a recommendation letter nor an encomium – the similarity between elements of the greeting to Andronicus and Junia and these forms might still allow for a comparison that could help to better understand *what* Paul says about the couple and *why* Paul commends or praises them in this way. Therefore, the following analysis will focus both on establishing the *content* of the descriptions in Romans 16:7 and aim at giving answers as to their *function*.

*What* Paul highlights about the couple can be subsumed under two aspects, which will be discussed respectively:

- 1) the couple’s origin, both ethnically and spiritually (7b and 7e) and
- 2) the impact of their ministry indicated by the consequences they suffered and the praise they received for it from Paul (7c and 7d)

### **3.1. Fellow Jews who were in Christ before Paul – Andronicus and Junia’s**

#### **Origin**

The first and last lines of the greeting to Andronicus and Junia give an insight into their origin, both ethnically and spiritually. They are Jews like Paul, who were in Christ before him. This combined information leads us to the early

---

<sup>131</sup> Even Porter and Dyer, who are generally cautious about the extent of Paul’s intentional and formal use of ancient rhetoric, allow ‘that there probably were elements of ancient rhetoric that were picked up and used ... regardless of [the] level of education and training’ a person had (Stanley E. Porter and Bryan R. Dyer, ‘Paul and Ancient Rhetoric: An Introduction to a Continuing Discussion,’ in *Paul and Ancient Rhetoric: Theory and Practice in the Hellenistic Context*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Bryan R. Dyer, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016, 2).

<sup>132</sup> Pernot, *Rhetoric*, 98.

beginnings of Christianity and the likelihood that Andronicus and Junia were either Roman Diaspora Jews converted in the wake of Pentecost or Palestinian Jews converted even earlier.<sup>133</sup> A closer look at these descriptors might make it possible to decide which of these biographical sketches is the more likely.

### 3.1.1. *The meaning of τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου (v. 7b)*

The first descriptor Paul uses for Andronicus and Junia is συγγενής, an adjective used for ‘one who has the same γένος,’<sup>134</sup> meaning someone who belongs to the same family or the same people or nation.<sup>135</sup> Andronicus and Junia consequently are either in the most literal sense ‘related to’ Paul<sup>136</sup> or, as fellow Jews, his ‘kin’ in a wider sense,<sup>137</sup> a usage found outside of the New Testament, for example in Josephus.<sup>138</sup>

In the Pauline corpus, the term occurs only in the letter to the Romans. Aside from Andronicus and Junia, there is one other person of the Roman congregation who is identified as συγγενής: Herodion (Romans 16:11), who might have been a slave or freedman of one of the Herodians.<sup>139</sup> Of those sending greetings to the Roman Christians, Jason and Sosipater, and possibly Lucius, are also referred to as συγγενεῖς μου (Romans 16:21).<sup>140</sup> As the term in each case is also used for specific persons without any other indication of their relationship to Paul,<sup>141</sup> there is the same ambiguity as in Romans 16:7b. Due to the significant number of people with the attribution συγγενής, commentators

---

<sup>133</sup> Cf. biographical sketches in II.2.1.

<sup>134</sup> Wilhelm Michaelis, ‘συγγενής, συγγένεια,’ *TDNT* 7:736-742, citing 736.

<sup>135</sup> BDAG, s.v. ‘γένος.’

<sup>136</sup> BDAG, s.v. ‘συγγενής,’ 1.; cf. EDNT, s.v. ‘συγγενής;’ L&N, s.v. ‘συγγενής,’ 10.6.; and LSJ, s.v. ‘συγγενής,’ II.1.b.

<sup>137</sup> BDAG, s.v. ‘συγγενής,’ 2.; cf. EDNT, s.v. ‘συγγενής;’ L&N, s.v. ‘συγγενής,’ 11.57; and MGS, s.v. ‘συγγενής,’ B. BDAG, EDNT, and L&N list Romans 16:7 under this meaning.

<sup>138</sup> E.g. Josephus, *Ant.* 7.262 and *J.W.* 7:364.

<sup>139</sup> Cranfield, *Romans IX-XVI*, 792; cf. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 896; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 741; Moo, *Romans*, 941; and Lampe, *Rome*, 177f.

<sup>140</sup> Due to the Greek syntax, the term could be applied to all three names or only the last two (Moo, *Romans*, 950, n. 327; cf. Brendan Byrne, *Romans*, SP 6, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996, 459).

<sup>141</sup> Identifications of Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater with persons of the same name in Acts are worth consideration but remain speculative (cf. Hultgren, *Romans*, 597).

doubt that it is used in the sense of ‘related to’ because it would mean an unlikely high number of believing relatives of Paul were located in Corinth<sup>142</sup> and Rome.<sup>143</sup>

The more relevant reference for the interpretation of συγγενής is found in Romans 9:3,<sup>144</sup> where Paul clearly uses the term in the broader sense of ‘kin.’ He expresses his close relation to his people with two familial terms, referring to his Jewish compatriots as his brothers (τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου) and his kin according to the flesh (τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα). Yet, if the meaning of the word is taken in this wider sense, the question arises as to why Paul does not highlight the ‘ethnic origin’ of Aquila and other Jews<sup>145</sup> in the greeting list.<sup>146</sup> To assume that Paul omits the Jewish background of the others because he ‘simply has other things to say’ about them is too simplistic.<sup>147</sup> The greeting to Andronicus and Junia is almost as long as the one to Prisca and Aquila, so Paul obviously had other things to say about them as well. There was no need to mention their ethnic identity, unlike in the case of Herodion (Romans 16:11)

---

<sup>142</sup> Corinth is the most likely location for the writing of Romans (cf. Michael Wolter, *Der Brief an die Römer: Teilband 1: Röm 1-8*, vol. 1, EKKNT 6, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlagsgesellschaft; Ostfildern: Patmos, 2014, 28f., for a discussion of the evidence within Romans).

<sup>143</sup> William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, ICC, 5th ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902), 423; cf. Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 884; and Frank S. Thielman, *Romans*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018), 719; contra John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1967), 238, who thinks six is ‘not too large a number for the hypothesis that they were related to Paul.’ The same argument could be made regarding the suggestion that they were all ‘natives of Tarsus’ (Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, xxxvii). Yet, without other evidence these approaches remain speculative and cannot add additional information to Andronicus and Junia’s biography or Paul’s (cf. Klaus Haacker, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, THKNT 6, 2nd ed., Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1999, 321).

<sup>144</sup> Commentators point to the usage of the word in this verse for the interpretation of its occurrences in chapter 16 (e.g. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 894; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 738; and Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 884).

<sup>145</sup> Though the ethnic in Acts 18:2 refers only to Aquila, it is likely that Prisca, as his wife, was also Jewish (Wolter, *Römer 9-16*, 468; contra Jewett, *Romans*, 954, who assumes she was a Roman freedwoman in a ‘mixed marriage’). Other people for whom a Jewish origin seems probable are Mary and Rufus, as both names are common ‘among urban Roman Jews’ (Lampe, *Rome*, 75), likely because of their similarity to the Hebrew names Miriam and Reuben (cf. III.3.3.).

<sup>146</sup> Andrew D. Clarke, ‘Jew and Greek, Slave and Free, Male and Female: Paul’s Theology of Ethnic, Social and Gender Inclusiveness in Romans 16,’ in *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*, ed. Peter Oakes (Carlisle: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 103-125, citing 112.

<sup>147</sup> Contra Bauckham, *Women*, 170 and Lampe, *Rome*, 74, n. 25.

and those sending greetings (Romans 16:21), where συγγενής is the only descriptor.

The question remains why, if the term is used in the wider sense here, it was only attributed to some Jews and not others. Michaelis resolves this issue by assuming Paul uses the term in Romans 16 with ‘a primary Christian orientation.’<sup>148</sup> Unlike in Romans 9:3, where he spoke about his συγγενεῖς κατὰ σάρκα (‘his kin according to the flesh’), a clear ethnic relation, Michaelis supposes that Paul now speaks about fellow Christians as his συγγενεῖς κατὰ πνεῦμα (‘his kin according to the Spirit’),<sup>149</sup> meaning his ‘true kin’ forming the ‘true Israel.’<sup>150</sup> Yet, the addition of κατὰ σάρκα is only necessary for clarification in the context of Romans 9:3. Paul’s anguish is explicitly about his Jewish brothers and sisters who have failed to grasp that Jesus is the Messiah, not Jewish believers who are *both* his συγγενεῖς κατὰ σάρκα *and* κατὰ πνεῦμα. Consequently, the term should not be reduced to the meaning of ‘close companion,’ ‘intimate,’ or ‘friend.’<sup>151</sup>

Whether in the closer sense of ‘relatives’ or the wider sense of ‘fellow Jews,’ Paul singles out some Jewish Christians in the closing section of the letter and not others. The Roman Christians knew that Andronicus and Junia, as well as Herodion, were Jews, and they would have known who else of those greeted was Jewish. So what reason is there to point out their Jewishness? In her study on Jewish names in antiquity, Ilan observes that if the Jewishness of a person is referred to in a literary text, it ‘often plays a major role in the purpose of the episode related.’<sup>152</sup> Admittedly the greeting list in Romans is not an “episode,”

---

<sup>148</sup> Michaelis, ‘συγγενής,’ 741.

<sup>149</sup> Translation and emphasis mine.

<sup>150</sup> Michaelis, ‘συγγενής,’ 741f. There are overtones of replacement theology in Michaelis’ argument. His analysis should be taken with a grain of salt considering his active support of National Socialism as a German professor in Bern during the 1930s (cf. Catherine Arber, ‘Frontismus und Nationalsozialismus in der Stadt Bern: Viel Lärm, aber wenig Erfolg,’ *BEZG* 65 (2003): 3-62, citing 48). For an evaluation of antisemitic tendencies in the *TDNT* in general, cf. Johan S. Vos, ‘Antijudaismus/ Antisemitismus im theologischen Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,’ *NedTT* 38 (1984): 89-110.

<sup>151</sup> Contra Michaelis, ‘συγγενής,’ 742.

<sup>152</sup> *LJNLA III*, 27.

but the principle might still be applicable, provided the letter is not only an exposition of Paul's gospel to an unknown church but also addresses a specific situation in the Roman church of which Paul was aware.<sup>153</sup>

As the Jewishness of Andronicus and Junia is referred to in the closing section, its role is likely related to discussions in the body of the letter. Jewett asserts 'that problematic relations between a gentile majority and a Jewish minority [within the Christian community] are in view throughout the letter.'<sup>154</sup> Already at the outset of the letter, the Jew/Gentile topic features prominently: 'For I am not ashamed of the gospel; it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith, to *the Jew first and also to the Greek*' (Romans 1:16).<sup>155</sup> Walters sees three ethnic issues being touched upon in the remainder of the letter, 'the impartiality of God; the priority of Israel; the coexistence of the weak and strong' discussed in chapters 1-4, 9-11, and 14-15 respectively.<sup>156</sup> In each section elements of judgment (cf. Romans 2:1; 14:4 and 10), pride, and condescension (cf. Romans 3:27; 11:13-20; 14:10) are addressed. This could indicate that negative perceptions of "the other" (be it Jew or Gentile) might have prevailed within the Roman community of Christ followers.

Chapters 14 and 15, however, are phrased in a way that calls a reading along mere ethical lines into question. Paul speaks of 'weak' and 'strong' rather than 'Jew' and 'Gentile,' and the highlighted topics of dissent are expressed vaguely. He touches on the abstinence from meat and the observance of special days rather than speaking about *kashrut* laws and the observance of the sabbath,

---

<sup>153</sup> Cf. Colin G. Kruse, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Nottingham: Apollos, 2012); 6-11, for an overview of the different positions regarding the purpose of Romans subsumed under three headings: positions locating the occasion of Romans in an existing situation in the Roman church or Paul's situation, as well as approaches combining both positions.

<sup>154</sup> Jewett, *Romans*, 70.

<sup>155</sup> Emphasis mine.

<sup>156</sup> James C. Walters, *Ethnic Issues in Paul's Letter to the Romans: Changing Self-Definitions in Earliest Roman Christianity* (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1993), 68. For the full discussion of all three points, cf. 68-92. Cf. John M. G. Barclay, "'Do we undermine the Law?' A Study of Romans 14:1-15:6," in *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 37-59, citing 40.

indicating an apparent Jew-Gentile problem. Karris, therefore, suggests that Paul does not address an actual situation in the Roman church; instead, he has 'adapted and generalized' an earlier discussion (1 Corinthians 8-10) to form a general paraenesis to an unknown congregation.<sup>157</sup> By addressing a 'typical instance' likely found in any Christian community, he could deal 'with principles' rather than concrete situations.<sup>158</sup>

Another, more compelling explanation for the generality of the passage is the specific relationship between Paul and his addressees. As he has neither founded nor visited the Roman Christian community, there are rhetorical reasons to address difficult matters tactfully, especially as there might be mixed feelings concerning Paul and his message among the groups involved.<sup>159</sup> Addressing problems among the Roman community head-on could not only endanger Paul's welcome in Rome but also add to the existing tensions and 'polarize and crystalize conflicting views.'<sup>160</sup> Even though Paul's description of the issues remains vague, there are hints that they are connected to matters of Jewish law, like the mention of 'clean' (14:20) and 'unclean' (14:14).<sup>161</sup> Moreover, Barclay argues that in light of the literary context, it is only 'natural to interpret the paraenesis' as related to 'the ethnic and cultural issues discussed throughout the letter.'<sup>162</sup> Consequently, the 'weak' and the 'strong' most likely

---

<sup>157</sup> Robert J. Karris, 'Romans 14:1-15:13 and the Occasion of Romans,' in *The Romans Debate: Revised and Expanded Edition*, ed. Karl P. Donfried (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 65-84, citing 84.

<sup>158</sup> Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 385f.; cf. Hultgren, *Romans*, 503, who speaks of 'a scenario of possible conflict' set up by Paul. Jewett, who assumes conflicts existed in the Roman church, concludes 'that Paul intentionally formulated the matter so that a number of controversies would be covered' (Jewett, *Romans*, 71).

<sup>159</sup> Barclay, 'Law,' 41; cf. Edwards, *Romans*, 16, who argues that Paul had to keep a 'lower profile' as he did not have 'the benefit of a firsthand relationship' with his audience.

<sup>160</sup> Walters, *Issues*, 87.

<sup>161</sup> Barclay, 'Law,' 40; cf. Walters, *Issues*, 88; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 800; Moo, *Romans*, 845f.; and Schreiner, *Romans*, 688.

<sup>162</sup> Barclay, 'Law,' 41; cf. Moo, *Romans*, 845 and Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 800.

represent 'Christians with differing perceptions of the Jewish law,'<sup>163</sup> those observant to the Torah and those no longer holding to the Jewish law. Though it seems obvious to equate the former with Jews and the latter with Gentiles, the split might not be as clear-cut. On the one hand, Paul, as a Jew, counts himself among 'the strong' (Romans 15:1), and others of Jewish background (like Prisca and Aquila) might fall into the same category; on the other hand, there might be gentile God-fearers who kept observing the law when they became Christians.<sup>164</sup>

Despite 'the ethnic origin of the convictions,'<sup>165</sup> the problem was not simply an ethnic issue but a theological one: Does faith in Christ need the addition of Jewish practices to be valid or not?<sup>166</sup> From the theological disagreement regarding this question, the practical issue arose of how to live, or more specifically, eat together if some congregation members thought the observance of food laws and special days was essential and others did not.<sup>167</sup> It is easy to imagine that 'the weak' (similar to Daniel and his friends at the Babylonian court),<sup>168</sup> in order to ensure the observance of food laws, retreated to only eating vegetables in meetings<sup>169</sup> and, at the same time, secretly (or openly) judged those who enjoyed all the communal meal had to offer, whereas 'the strong'

---

<sup>163</sup> Barclay, 'Law,' 41. For Barclay these perceptions manifest in the weak's and strong's 'specific behaviour when they meet and eat together.' Thus, table fellowship within the communal setting rather than general eating habits of individual believers are the focus of Paul's paraenesis (Barclay, 'Law,' 41; cf. Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, KEK 4, 5th ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978, 421 and Schreiner, *Romans*, 687). For an overview of alternative propositions regarding the identity of 'the weak,' cf. Moo, *Romans*, 844f.

<sup>164</sup> Barclay, 'Law,' 43; cf. Walters, *Issues*, 87; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 802; Moo, *Romans*, 847; Schreiner, *Romans*; 686f.; and Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 334.

<sup>165</sup> Walters, *Issues*, 87.

<sup>166</sup> Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 798.

<sup>167</sup> Wilckens, *Römer*, III:86.

<sup>168</sup> Dan 1:8-16.

<sup>169</sup> Barclay's assumption that Paul is not referring to a 'principled vegetarianism or dietary asceticism, or a specially stringent form of Jewish practice' but the specific behaviour regarding table fellowship is compelling (Barclay, 'Law,' 41, cf. 42f. for his arguments against alternative reconstructions).

took offence that some of their contributions to the table were frowned upon by 'the weak.'<sup>170</sup>

Such a scenario, where tensions arose within the communal setting, presupposes that 'the weak' and 'the strong' still met together<sup>171</sup> rather than being divided into two congregations without common worship.<sup>172</sup> It is, therefore, more likely that Paul calls those thinking differently *within* house churches to stop their divisive behaviour and work towards unity.<sup>173</sup> There is no indication that the conflict in Rome had reached breaking point yet when Paul wrote his letter. However, tensions seem to have been rising. So Paul felt the need to address them, even though he did so carefully, as the issue was not a small matter but could develop into a major split between the two groups<sup>174</sup> which could eventually lead to separate "Christianities" in the capital.

Paul's exhortation to 'the strong' to welcome 'the weak' indicates that those who had a more liberal approach regarding the gospel and the law were the dominant group in Rome.<sup>175</sup> Jewett proposes that Paul affirms those Jewish Christians in Rome who are 'currently being discriminated against by the Gentile majority.'<sup>176</sup> As seen above, there is evidence of a gentile attitude of looking down upon Jews in general and, more specifically, Christians holding on to Jewish customs within the letter. Thus, the request to greet members of the latter group would be a practical outworking of the exhortation 'Accept

---

<sup>170</sup> Barclay argues that 'choosing separate or select food did not accord with common notions of sociability' (John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 435.

<sup>171</sup> Bernard Green, *Christianity in Ancient Rome: The first three Centuries* (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 34.

<sup>172</sup> Francis Watson, 'The two Roman Congregations: Romans 14:1-15:13,' in *The Romans Debate: Revised and Expanded Edition*, ed. Karl P. Donfried (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 203-215, citing 206.

<sup>173</sup> Cf. Moo, *Romans*, 847.

<sup>174</sup> Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 812.

<sup>175</sup> Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 812.

<sup>176</sup> Jewett, *Romans*, 962.

(προσλαμβάνεσθε) the one who is weak in faith' (Romans 14:1),<sup>177</sup> for 'to greet is to honor and welcome one another.'<sup>178</sup>

Moreover, by identifying Jewish Christians in Rome as συγγενής, a term using the prefix συν, Paul associates himself closely not just with these individuals but with all other Jewish Christians in the audience who might be looked down upon by the group of 'the strong' due to their continued observance of Jewish customs. Thereby, he not only shows his solidarity with the Jewish Christian minority in Rome but reminds them that even though they might have different views on Torah observance, he still is one of them and is not ashamed to state that publicly, despite anti-Jewish tendencies both within the Christian community and the Roman society in general.<sup>179</sup> In this way, Paul does not just affirm Jewish Christians to the gentile majority, but he also recommends himself to the Jewish minority by alluding to his 'respectful, collegial relationships with Jewish leaders'<sup>180</sup> in Rome as well as in Corinth (Romans 16:21).<sup>181</sup> Considering his controversies regarding the place of Torah observance in the East, such a recommendation might have been necessary to ensure a welcome for him among *all* Christians in Rome.

If συγγενής is read in light of the issues highlighted above, there is a specific reason to emphasise the Jewishness of some and not others. Andronicus and Junia's Jewishness could have been more obvious than Aquila and Prisca's, meaning they probably had a more conservative stance regarding matters of

---

<sup>177</sup> The Greek word for accept is προσλαμβάνω, defined as 'to extend a welcome, receive in(to) one's home or circle of acquaintances' by BDAG, s.v. 'προσλαμβάνω,' no. 4.

<sup>178</sup> Jewett, *Romans*, 952; cf. Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 376.

<sup>179</sup> Evidence for anti-Jewish sentiments can be found in critiques by Tacitus, Juvenal, and other Roman authors of the time who 'censure the Jews for their strangeness, exclusivity, or proselytizing.' (Walters, *Issues*, 37). The presence of such sentiments among the gentile Christians in Rome can be inferred from Paul's argument in Romans 11 directly addressed to the gentile audience (Rom 11:13) (Walters, *Issues*, 79). In light of gentile boasting, Paul establishes that God's story with the broken-off natural branches is not yet finished and that they, as Gentiles, are mere wild shoots unnaturally grafted in a Jewish root which they share with a remnant of natural branches. Thus, there is no reason to be arrogant or look down upon their fellow Jewish believers (cf. Walters, *Issues*, 383f.).

<sup>180</sup> Jewett, *Romans*, 952.

<sup>181</sup> It might be deliberate that three persons among the greeted and three among the greeters are identified as 'fellow Jews.'

Torah observance than the couple who worked alongside Paul in the gentile mission and probably shared his outlook on these matters.<sup>182</sup> For gentile Christians this might have been a cause to look down upon them and deny them the respect they deserved. Yet, the following credentials are indicators that they might have been leading figures in the beginnings of Christianity in Rome, which likely started in the Jewish setting of the synagogues of Rome. Therefore, it is only natural to assume they had a special standing among the Jewish and Jewish-leaning Christians.<sup>183</sup>

### 3.1.2. *The implications of πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ (v. 7e)*

In the case of the last descriptive phrase of the greeting to Andronicus and Junia, there is no discussion about its meaning: They were in Christ before Paul, meaning they became Christians before Paul. As Paul encountered the risen Christ not long after Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection,<sup>184</sup> Andronicus and Junia must have been 'among the earliest of all believers.'<sup>185</sup> The contentious issue is how far back their attachment to Christ can be taken. Were they eyewitnesses of Pentecost as visitors to or inhabitants of Jerusalem? Or were they already followers of the earthly Jesus before the resurrection? Once these questions are discussed, another question comes to the fore: How far back does their

---

<sup>182</sup> Cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 957, who states that the couple shared Paul's 'theological and congregational orientation.' This is also expressed in the assumption of commentators that they, like Paul, would have been counted among 'the strong' (cf. n. 164).

<sup>183</sup> Though Watson's assumption of two separate congregations goes too far, his evaluation of Andronicus and Junia's status among the Jewish and Jewish-leaning Christians is probable: they likely had a certain importance and influence among this section of the community (cf. Watson, 'Congregations,' 210).

<sup>184</sup> Most scholars date Paul's call within a short period after the resurrection (within two years). As there is a dispute regarding the date of the crucifixion of Jesus, Paul's Damascus experience is also dated differently. Those who argue for an early date of the crucifixion (30 CE) date Paul's call to 31/32 CE (Rainer Riesner, *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus*, WUNT 71, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994, 63; cf. Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer: Kapitel 1-5*, vol. 1, HTA, Witten: SCM R. Brockhaus; Gießen: Brunnen, 2015, 37). Those who date the crucifixion later (33 CE) also argue for a later date regarding Paul's calling at 34/35 CE (George Ogg, *The Chronology of the Life of Paul*, London: Epworth, 1968, 30; cf. Robert Jewett, *Dating Paul's Life*, London: SCM, 1979, 29f.).

<sup>185</sup> Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988), 534; cf. Thielman, *Romans*, 720 and Witherington, 'Joanna,' 14.

attachment to the Christian community in Rome go, and how long were they part of it? These two biographical stages, their conversion and their Christian life in Rome, will be discussed in the following.

### 3.1.2.1. *Place and Time of their Conversion*

Some think it possible that Christianity came to Rome via Roman Jews who came to faith after witnessing the events of Pentecost in Jerusalem (Acts 2:10).<sup>186</sup> If Andronicus and Junia were converted in Rome by one of these believers before Paul had his Damascus Road experience, this would mean Christianity reached the capital within the first two years after the resurrection. Two things make this scenario unlikely. Sanday and Headlam argue that the Pentecost converts would not have been prepared to evangelise others 'unless they attended very diligently to the teaching of the Apostles' for some time in Jerusalem.<sup>187</sup> Another reason that makes it likely that those who came to faith in the wake of Pentecost would stay rather than return to their home countries is the early church's expectation of an imminent return of Christ. If 'the first Christian hope was for Jesus to return to the Temple,' as Dunn suggests, this could explain why the disciples settled in Jerusalem after the ascension and why there seems to have been an initial 'unreadiness to evangelize beyond the boundaries of Jerusalem.'<sup>188</sup> If visitors from Rome unlikely returned quickly to the capital, an early conversion of Andronicus and Junia in Rome is rendered improbable.

It is also debated whether οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες, describing the Roman part of the Pentecost crowd (Acts 2:10), is used for temporary visitors to Jerusalem

---

<sup>186</sup> Cf. Hultgren, *Romans*, 9; Kruse, *Romans*, 2; Michel, *Römer*, 34; Moo, *Romans*, 4; and F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, NICNT, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 57f.

<sup>187</sup> Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, xxviii; cf. Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 175, who argues that the audience Luke had in mind must be residents of Jerusalem rather than pilgrims because it does not make sense from a narrative perspective to let these first converts '[stream] off to the four corners of the world within a week of conversion.'

<sup>188</sup> James D. G. Dunn, *Christianity in the Making Volume 2: Beginning from Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 225f.

related to the feast<sup>189</sup> or for foreign residents living in the city.<sup>190</sup> The people coming together in verse 5 are called εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ κατοικοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι ('in Jerusalem dwelling Jews'<sup>191</sup>), using a verb that more clearly denotes residing in a place for an extended period.<sup>192</sup> Therefore, it is likely that the audience of Peter's speech consisted mainly of Diaspora Jews who had taken up residence in Jerusalem.<sup>193</sup> Yet, this does not solve the problem of whether οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες is used in the same way as κατοικοῦντες<sup>194</sup> or whether it functions in contrast to the first participle and thereby indicates that the Roman Jews and proselytes were simply pilgrims present for the feast.<sup>195</sup> Thus, sketch 1) remains a possibility. Andronicus and Junia could have witnessed the events of Pentecost as Jewish pilgrims from Rome and came to faith in Jerusalem.

The focus of commentators regarding the couple's Christian origins, however, is a group 'most likely' consisting of Diaspora Jews living in Jerusalem,<sup>196</sup> 'the Hellenists' (οἱ Ἑλληνισταί) mentioned in Acts 6:1. In contrast to the group referred to as 'the Hebrews' (οἱ Ἑβραῖοι), the language the Hellenists used in daily life as well as in synagogue worship was presumably Greek rather than Aramaic and/or Hebrew.<sup>197</sup> Acts 6:9 indicates that at least some of the Diaspora Jews who resided in Jerusalem had their own

<sup>189</sup> According to BDAG 'the main idea in the use of this verb is the fact that the subject is in transit w[ith] regard to a place to stay' (BDAG, s.v. 'ἐπιδημέω'; cf. Hultgren, *Romans*, 9.)

<sup>190</sup> According to MGS, the word is used 'often of foreigners' in this way (MGS, s.v. 'ἐπιδημέω'; cf. Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, SP 5, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992, 44).

<sup>191</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>192</sup> BDAG, s.v. 'κατοικέω,' 1.; cf. LSJ, s.v. 'κατοικέω,' 2.; cf. MGS, s.v. 'κατοικέω,' 1A and C. Cf. also its usage in Acts 2:9 which indicates that those who reside in Jerusalem have been residents in areas of the Diaspora in the past.

<sup>193</sup> Johnson, *Acts*, 43; cf. Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Vol. 1: Introduction and 1:1-2.47* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 833; Rudolf Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte: 1. Teilband: Apg 1-12*, EKKNT 5 (Zürich: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 1986), 104; and Gerhard Schneider, *Die Apostelgeschichte: Erster Teil: Einleitung, Kommentar zu 1,1-8,40*, HthKNT 5, ungekürzte Sonderausgabe (Freiburg: Herder, 2002), 250f.

<sup>194</sup> Johnson, *Acts*, 44; cf. Pesch, *Apostelgeschichte 1-12*, 105.

<sup>195</sup> Schneider, *Apostelgeschichte 1-8*, 253, n. 87; cf. Keener, *Acts 1-2*, 834.

<sup>196</sup> Dunn, *Christianity*, 246. Ἑλληνιστής primarily refers to someone 'who uses the Greek language' (BDAG, s.v. 'Ἑλληνιστής').

<sup>197</sup> Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), 242.

synagogue(s).<sup>198</sup> Of special interest in the discussion of Andronicus and Junia's origin is the mention of those 'from the so-called synagogue of the *libertini*'<sup>199</sup> (ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης Λιβερτίνων). Wilckens assumes those *libertini* ('freedmen') were descendants of prisoners of war brought from Palestine to Rome after Pompey's campaign in 63 BCE.<sup>200</sup> Many of these Jewish slaves settled in Rome after their manumission,<sup>201</sup> but some might have returned to their homeland, where they founded their own house of prayer known as the synagogue of the freedmen.<sup>202</sup> Whereas some from this synagogue seem to have strongly opposed the early church's preaching (Acts 6:9), others might have joined the Jesus movement after Pentecost. It is plausible that these believers would go (back) to Rome<sup>203</sup> if tensions like those described in Acts 8:1 arose, which led to the scattering of the Jerusalem church.<sup>204</sup> In addition to the push factor, the persecution that forced them out of their home, there would have been a pull factor that encouraged those believers to choose Rome as the destination of their flight:<sup>205</sup> There likely still existed (familial) ties between the *libertini* in Rome and Jerusalem which would have provided the refugees with a social network that was able to help them start over in the capital.<sup>206</sup> Once

---

<sup>198</sup> The series of genitives in the sentence could refer to one synagogue whose members came from different areas or allow for up to five different synagogues (Johnson, *Acts*, 108).

<sup>199</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>200</sup> Wilckens, *Römer*, I:38; cf. James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, vol. 1, WBC 38A (Dallas: Word Books, 1988), xlvii.

<sup>201</sup> Lampe, *Rome*, 38f., based on Philo, *Embassy* 155-157; cf. David Noy, *Foreigners at Rome: Citizens and Strangers* (London: Duckworth, 2000), 256.

<sup>202</sup> Schnabel, *Römer 1-5*, 23.

<sup>203</sup> Due to his geographical outline (cf. Acts 1:8), Luke is unlikely to mention other destinations than Judaea and Samaria at this point in his narrative, especially not Rome, where his story is set to culminate.

<sup>204</sup> Wilckens, *Römer*, I:38; cf. Schnabel, *Römer 1-5*, 23 and Andrie Du Toit, "'God's beloved in Rome" (Rom 1:7): The Genesis and Socio-Economic Situation of the First Generation Christian Community in Rome,' in *Focusing on Paul: Persuasion and Theological Design in Romans and Galatians*, ed. Cilliers Breytenbach and David S. du Toit (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 179-202, citing 188.

<sup>205</sup> Noy states that 'a decision to migrate will be influenced by push and pull factors' which encourage people to leave their homes and to choose a particular destination (Noy, *Foreigners*, 87).

<sup>206</sup> In the process of chain migration, 'people at the destination provide help and encouragement for new migrants from the same place of origin' (Noy, *Foreigners*, 54). Noy assumes that in antiquity 'Jewish migration in general may have been facilitated by contacts' between Diaspora communities and between the Diaspora and the homeland (Noy, *Foreigners*, 262).

settled in Rome, they would have shared their new faith with the Jewish community surrounding them and faith in Jesus as the Messiah would 'almost certainly be talked of in the synagogues in Rome within a few years of the beginnings in Jerusalem.'<sup>207</sup>

Thus, a third biographical sketch can be outlined for Andronicus and Junia: They might have been (descendants of) Diaspora Jews living in Jerusalem who encountered the Christian message on or after Pentecost and became members of the early church. Once they had to leave Jerusalem due to rising tensions, they turned to Rome, a city where they likely had connections. There they would have naturally shared their new faith with the Jewish community around them. This sketch aligns with assumptions that

Christianity made its way to Rome the same way other foreign religions did, as the personal baggage of individuals who journeyed to Rome because they were involved in trade or commerce, or they were imported as slaves, or *because they were emigrating to the capital*.<sup>208</sup>

Consequently, Andronicus and Junia could have been part of a spontaneous rather than a direct evangelisation of Rome.<sup>209</sup>

Du Toit, however, thinks that the arrival of Christianity cannot be ascribed to this 'spontaneous witness of ordinary Christians' alone. Even though there is no evidence that the Roman congregation was founded by an apostle, he points to Romans 16 to argue that there were 'more active and purposeful "missionaries"' involved in the beginning of Christianity in Rome.<sup>210</sup> He is not alone in assuming that Andronicus and Junia were among 'the pioneer missionary workers in Rome.'<sup>211</sup> The assumption that their evangelistic activity

---

<sup>207</sup> Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, xlvii.

<sup>208</sup> Walters, *Issues*, 6 (emphasis mine); cf. Du Toit, 'Genesis,' 187; Kruse, *Romans*, 2; and Morris, *Romans*, 4.

<sup>209</sup> Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 30; cf. C. E. B Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: Introduction and Commentary on Romans I-VIII*, vol. 1, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975), 17.

<sup>210</sup> Du Toit, 'Genesis,' 189f.

<sup>211</sup> Du Toit, 'Genesis,' 189; cf. Schnabel, *Römer 1-5*, 26; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, 12; Thielman, *Romans*, 28; and Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 9.

might have been intentional rather than spontaneous is rooted in Paul's statement that they are ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις (7d). The meaning of the phrase is debated, but one possible reading is that Andronicus and Junia were 'outstanding among the apostles.'<sup>212</sup> At the very least, this would indicate that they were among 'those itinerant missionaries who were recognized by the churches as a distinct group' tasked with spreading the gospel.<sup>213</sup>

If Paul uses ἀπόστολος 'in the titular sense,' he even counts them among those apostles who were 'commissioned by the risen Lord Jesus to proclaim the gospel.'<sup>214</sup> Dunn suggests Andronicus and Junia were part of this 'closed group' of people.<sup>215</sup> This would mean there is a possibility that the couple was part of the wider discipleship group and they were eyewitnesses to Jesus' ministry, passion, and resurrection.<sup>216</sup> Consequently, Andronicus and Junia would precede Paul not only in faith but also in their apostleship. In Galatians Paul acknowledges that there were apostles before him,<sup>217</sup> using the same prepositional phrase found in Romans 16:7e.<sup>218</sup> Wolter rightly cautions against equating their being in Christ before Paul with being among the apostles before him,<sup>219</sup> as there are different referents of πρὸ ἐμοῦ in each verse. Yet, denying even the possibility of a connection between the group in Galatians 1:17 and Andronicus and Junia ignores the link between the two descriptions in Romans 16:7d and e. There is only a limited list of people who were both Christ's followers before Paul and would have been acknowledged by him as apostles;

---

<sup>212</sup> The alternative reading is 'well known to the apostles.' For a detailed discussion of this issue, cf. II.3.2.2.

<sup>213</sup> Cranfield, *Romans IX-XVI*, 789; cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 739; Moo, *Romans*, 939f.; and Schreiner, *Romans*, 770.

<sup>214</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 'Apostle,' *DJG* 34-45, citing 34.

<sup>215</sup> Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 894; cf. Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 885f.; Thielman, *Romans*, 720; and Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 390.

<sup>216</sup> Stenschke, 'Women,' 158; cf. Steven Croft, 'Text Messages: The Ministry of Women and Romans 16,' *Anvil* 21.2 (2004): 87-94, citing 90.

<sup>217</sup> J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 33A (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 169.

<sup>218</sup> ...οὐδὲ ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους – ... nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles *before me* (Gal 1:17). translation and emphasis mine.

<sup>219</sup> Wolter, *Römer 9-16*, 477.

the Jerusalem apostles are undoubtedly first and foremost on that list.<sup>220</sup> So it is not surprising that Martyn, commenting on Galatians 1:17-24, includes Andronicus and Junia in the group of the 'Jerusalem apostles.'<sup>221</sup>

Provided the couple was part of the 'circle located in Jerusalem and occupied with the leadership of the Jerusalem church,'<sup>222</sup> they might have been part of 'the Hebrews' (οἱ Ἑβραῖοι) rather than 'the Hellenists' (οἱ Ἑλληνισταί), i.e. Palestinian Jews rather than Jews with a Diaspora background. Their affiliation to the Hellenists is argued based on their Graeco-Roman names,<sup>223</sup> but we know of at least two of Jesus' disciples who also bore Greek names and did not come from Jerusalem, Ἀνδρέας (Andrew) and Φίλιππος (Philip).<sup>224</sup> According to John 1:44, they were from Bethsaida, a town on the northern shores of the Sea of Galilee.<sup>225</sup> Hellenistic influences were present in all of Palestine,<sup>226</sup> yet they were especially prevalent in and around Galilee.<sup>227</sup> So the occurrence of Graeco-Roman names among Jews in this area would not be surprising.<sup>228</sup> If Andronicus and Junia were early disciples, they would have joined Jesus during his Galilean ministry, making it likely that they originated from Galilee or its surrounding areas.

Andronicus and Junia, therefore, could be Palestinian Jews who followed Jesus on his last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem (sketch 2). After Jesus' resurrection and ascension, they were among the group of Jesus followers,

---

<sup>220</sup> Cf. the list of resurrection witnesses in 1 Cor 15:5-8.

<sup>221</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 179; cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 94f.

<sup>222</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 179.

<sup>223</sup> Wilckens, *Römer*, III:136; cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 739.

<sup>224</sup> E.g. Mark 3:18.

<sup>225</sup> Rainer Riesner, 'Archaeology and Geography,' *DJG* 45-59, citing 51.

<sup>226</sup> Craig C. Hill, 'Hellenists, Hellenistic and Hellenistic-Jewish Christianity,' *DLNT* 462-469, citing 463.

<sup>227</sup> Galilee was surrounded by Hellenistic neighbours, and in Sepphoris and Tiberias it had two Hellenistic centres (Willibald Bösen, *Galiläa: Lebensraum und Wirkungsfeld Jesu*, Freiburg: Herder, 1998, 158). Even though Galilee 'seems to have been quite thoroughly Judaized' by the time of the New Testament, it still had a sizeable gentile population due to its history (Harold W. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, SNTSMS 17, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972; repr., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980, 53f.).

<sup>228</sup> For an analysis of the onomasticon used by the Jewish population in Palestine, cf. III.2.1.

consisting of the eleven and other disciples, who stayed in the city (Acts 1:12-15), and they were present at Pentecost (Acts 2:1). The open questions in this sketch compared to the Hellenist hypothesis are when and why they decided to go to Rome. They might have been envoys of the Jerusalem church like the messengers of the churches sent to Corinth (2 Corinthians 8:23) or Epaphroditus, the messenger of the Philippians to Paul (Philippians 2:25).<sup>229</sup> This would mean they arrived in Rome at a time when a Christian congregation (to which they were sent) was already present in the capital. Yet, there is no indication of a sending church in Romans 16:7d<sup>230</sup> or a specific mission they were tasked with. On the contrary, the couple's appearance in the greeting list makes it unlikely that their presence in Rome was only temporary or limited to a specific task. They seem to have been established members, maybe even 'foundational members'<sup>231</sup> of the Christian community in the Roman capital.

So if they were not sent, why did the couple decide to go to Rome? The rising tensions with the authorities in Jerusalem might well have been a push factor in this scenario as well.<sup>232</sup> However, they lacked the natural ties the *libertini* would have had with Rome. For Andronicus and Junia, returning to Galilee would be the obvious choice when leaving Jerusalem. Their migration to the Roman capital, therefore, likely would have been influenced by their *sense of mission* rather than being the result of typical push and pull factors. Martyn suggests Andronicus and Junia, along with the other Jerusalem

---

<sup>229</sup> Michel, *Römer*, 475f. In this case ἀπόστολος would have the general meaning of 'delegate, envoy, messenger' (BDAG, s.v. 'ἀπόστολος,' 1.)

<sup>230</sup> Jewett, *Romans*, 963.

<sup>231</sup> Byrne, *Romans*, 451; cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 181 and Longenecker, *Romans*, 1069. Watson even suggests that they were probably 'the founders of the Roman congregation' (Watson, 'Congregations,' 210, emphasis mine).

<sup>232</sup> It has been argued that the persecution specifically targeted the Hellenists since F.C. Bauer (for an overview of Bauer's argument and its impact on New Testament scholarship, cf. Craig C. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992, 5-17, who opposes this view). However, Luke's wording in Acts 8:1 does not indicate a limitation to a specific group; the persecution breaks out against 'the church in Jerusalem' (τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις) (Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Vol. 2: 3:1-14:28*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013, 1468).

apostles, felt 'called by the resurrected Lord to the apostolate that would evangelize the Jews.'<sup>233</sup> Yet, did this *missionary call* include the Jewish Diaspora?

According to Acts, evangelism beyond Jerusalem only began when the opposition the church faced in Jerusalem became so severe that believers left the city (Acts 8:1).<sup>234</sup> Even after the scattering of the church, the outreaches beyond Judaea portrayed in Acts are not spearheaded by 'the apostles' or other Hebrew-speaking Jews but by Greek-speaking Jews: Philip in Samaria (Acts 8), Saul in Damascus (Acts 9),<sup>235</sup> and likely the ones who 'traveled as far as Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch' (Acts 11:19).<sup>236</sup> It seems those with roots in Palestine remained in the vicinity of Jerusalem, some probably returning to their home towns,<sup>237</sup> whereas those who had roots in the Diaspora naturally (re)turned to Jewish communities in Hellenised cities<sup>238</sup> within<sup>239</sup> or outside of the Jewish heartland.<sup>240</sup>

Rome might have been one of these cities. Yet, unlike Damascus, Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, located within a 300-mile radius of Jerusalem, it was much further away, in the Western part of the Mediterranean. If there was 'an initial attempt by the Jerusalem apostleship to assert leadership or supervision' over the expanding movement,<sup>241</sup> as the sending of Peter and John to Samaria

---

<sup>233</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 179.

<sup>234</sup> By this point it also had become evident that Christ's return was not as imminent as expected, making the decision to leave easier.

<sup>235</sup> Acts portrays Saul as the one proclaiming Jesus among the Jews of Damascus (Acts 9:20-22). The narrative does not explain how Ananias and the other disciples in the city had come to faith and whether they had begun spreading the gospel before Saul's arrival.

<sup>236</sup> At least those who started to speak to the Hellenists in Antioch, as opposed to Jews only, are identified as Diaspora Jews from Cyprus and Cyrene (Acts 11:20).

<sup>237</sup> Acts 8:32 indicates that there were believers outside of Jerusalem that Peter visited. All episodes that feature him during this time outside of Jerusalem (Acts 8 and Acts 9) take place in towns located in Judaea (Lydda, Joppa, and Caesarea).

<sup>238</sup> Keener, *Acts 3-14*, 1469.

<sup>239</sup> Philip settles in Caesarea (Acts 8:40, 21:8).

<sup>240</sup> All areas outside of Judaea reached by those scattered had significant Jewish communities (cf. Keener, *Acts 3-14*, 1629f., 1834, and 1834-37, regarding the Jewish population of Damascus and the Jewish communities in Phoenicia and Antioch; and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 31, New York: Doubleday, 1998, 475, regarding the Jewish colony on Cyprus).

<sup>241</sup> Dunn, *Christianity*, 284; cf. Bruce, *Acts*, 168.

(Acts 8:14) and Barnabas to Antioch (Acts 11:22) seems to indicate,<sup>242</sup> Rome could not be reached as quickly as the other areas.<sup>243</sup> Even though there is evidence for ‘a constant interchange between Palestinian Judaism and Roman Judaism’ in the first century,<sup>244</sup> it would take some time to get news about developments in the Roman capital and even longer to respond to issues arising. Moreover, as Brown asserts, it is likely that ‘the planting of Christianity in the capital city of the empire would not have been left to chance,’<sup>245</sup> not just because of the emphasis of the early church on mission but also because there was a real danger of encountering the same resentments that led to the Jerusalem persecution<sup>246</sup> in a setting that would likely alert the Roman authorities to the Jesus movement.<sup>247</sup>

To safeguard the apostolic teaching and avoid unnecessary confrontation with Jewish and Roman authorities in Rome, it needed someone in place who ideally was an eyewitness to the ministry of Jesus<sup>248</sup> and could handle the

---

<sup>242</sup> Dunn argues that Jerusalem might have intervened in Samaria to ‘draw into their own circle what well might otherwise become splinter movements diverging from the Jerusalem-directed mainstream’ (Dunn, *Christianity*, 284). Following Keener this thesis supposes that the task of Jerusalem’s emissaries was more about ensuring that ‘the movement remained faithful to its founding vision’ (Keener, *Acts 3-14*, 1844) than about bringing the new converts under the authority of Jerusalem.

<sup>243</sup> All areas mentioned above could be reached by foot in around fifteen days, whereas travel to Rome involved a sea voyage that depended on weather and seasons and could take up to three months (cf. L.J. Kreitzer, ‘Travel in the Roman World,’ *DPL* 945-946).

<sup>244</sup> Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983), 96f. The political interchange was established already by the Hasmoneans, and there were close relations between the Herodians and the Caesars. Evidence that there was spiritual guidance from Palestine (via the teaching of Palestinian rabbis in Rome) postdates the fall of Jerusalem but is also reflected in Acts 28:21 (the absence of letters from Judaea indicates that this kind of communication between Rome and Judaea existed).

<sup>245</sup> Raymond E. Brown, ‘Further Reflections on the Origins of the Church of Rome,’ in *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul & John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. Robert T. Fortana and Beverly R. Gaventa (Nashville: Abingdon, 1990), 98-115, citing 104 (emphasis mine).

<sup>246</sup> Brown speaks of a ‘close ... intellectual affiliation’ of the Jewish community in Rome with Jerusalem (Brown and Meier, *Rome*, 95), which indicates that their religious outlook was aligned with that of the Jerusalem authorities and, therefore, their reaction to the gospel would likely be similar.

<sup>247</sup> This seems to have happened later, cf. the discussion of the Claudian edict in II.3.1.2.2.

<sup>248</sup> According to Bauckham, eyewitnesses would naturally be the most important among the ‘authorized tradents of tradition’ within Christianity (Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 306). An eyewitness presence in Rome would allow more direct oversight of the passing on of tradition than relying on the second-hand contacts established through travel back and forth between Rome and Jerusalem, as Bauckham proposes.

specific mission field in Rome with tact. If they were disciples joining Jesus during his Galilean ministry, Andronicus and Junia would fit that description: They were eyewitnesses and likely had experience in dealing with non-Jewish surroundings, like most Galilean disciples. Unlike most of them, however, Junia bore a Latin name which, if not adopted later in Rome, could indicate that already in Palestine, she moved in circles with a more positive outlook on Rome than most of her fellow disciples would have had.<sup>249</sup> This could have made her and Andronicus the perfect candidates for the mission<sup>250</sup> to accompany those who chose to go to Rome after fleeing Jerusalem.

In summary, two plausible biographical sketches expound on Paul's description of Andronicus and Junia as before him in Christ:

- 1) They were Hellenists with a Roman background residing in Jerusalem who became Christians at or after Pentecost but left the city during a time of persecution. They travelled to Rome because of their connections there and started to share their faith spontaneously with the Jewish community in the Roman capital.
- 2) They were Hellenised Palestinian Jews, probably from Galilee, who had witnessed Jesus' ministry and had come to Jerusalem with him. They were likely eyewitnesses of the resurrection and belonged to the circle of disciples present at Pentecost. When some of the Hellenists expressed their intention to move (back) to Rome, they were commissioned by the Jerusalem church to accompany the believers and head up the mission efforts in the Roman capital as guarantors that the message preached (spontaneously and/or purposeful) would be in line with the apostolic teaching.

---

<sup>249</sup> Bearing a Latin name in first-century Palestine could have shown allegiance to Rome (cf. III.2.1.).

<sup>250</sup> It also cannot be ruled out that the couple felt a calling to this specific mission. This does not mean that there was no sending by the Jerusalem apostles. Similar to the role of the Antioch church for Paul and Barnabas' mission (Acts 13:1-3), the Jerusalem church could have been the sending body for Andronicus and Junia's mission to Rome. In both cases the ones sent, nevertheless, would have understood their calling to these missions to come ultimately from Christ.

A decision on this matter is dependent on the interpretation of ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, especially the meaning of ἀπόστολος, which will be discussed below.<sup>251</sup> For now, the critical observation is that in each sketch the move from Palestine to Rome must have happened at a relatively early stage of the Christian movement, which poses the question of whether this can be aligned with the little that is known about the origins of Christianity in Rome.

### 3.1.2.2. *Arrival and Life in Rome*

If the catalyst for Andronicus and Junia's move to Rome was the persecution in Jerusalem, we encounter a 'chronological problem.'<sup>252</sup> Their arrival in the mid-30s would predate the earliest presumed evidence for the presence of Christianity in the capital by over a decade: Suetonius' record of the banishment of Jews from Rome under Claudius (49 CE) due to disturbances breaking out *impulsore Chresto* ('at the instigation of Chrestus').<sup>253</sup> Most commentators assume that *Chrestus* should be understood as a reference to *Christos* which would mean that Suetonius' comment points to debates 'concerning the messianic status of Jesus' within the Jewish community at the close of the 40s.<sup>254</sup> These debates must have disturbed the peace of the capital in a way that led to a rather drastic response of the Roman authorities,<sup>255</sup> the banishment of 'all' Jews from Rome (cf. Acts 18:2) or at least the

---

<sup>251</sup> Cf. II.3.2.2.

<sup>252</sup> Du Toit, 'Genesis,' 188.

<sup>253</sup> Suetonius, *Claudius* 25.4 [Rolfe, LCL].

<sup>254</sup> Byrne, *Romans*, 11; cf. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 1; Jewett, *Romans*, 60; Moo, *Romans*, 4; and Schreiner, *Romans*, 12. Others refer more generally to the preaching of Christ in the synagogues as background to the disturbances (cf. Cranfield, *Romans I-VIII*, 16; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, xxi; Schnabel, *Römer 1-5*, 25; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, 12; and Thielman, *Romans*, 29). Fisk cautions against 'declaring the *Chrestus/Christos* connection firmly established' and using it 'as the cornerstone of one's historical reconstruction of Jewish-Christian relations in Rome' (Bruce N. Fisk, 'Synagogue Influence and Scriptural Knowledge Among the Christians of Rome, in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley, *SymS* 50, Atlanta: SBL, 2008, 157-85, citing 163) as Suetonius' comment indicates a 'personal presence' of the instigator in Rome (Fisk, 'Synagogue,' 161; cf. Erich S. Gruen, *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004, 39).

<sup>255</sup> Walters highlights the 'stimulus-response nature of Roman administration,' requiring a catalyst like the 'destabilizing behavior' by a non-Roman religious group for the authorities to intervene in such a manner (Walters, *Issues*, 45).

troublemakers.<sup>256</sup> If Andronicus and Junia and others arrived and began to evangelise the Roman Jews in the capital over ten years before these events, as others also have suggested,<sup>257</sup> why does the conflict with the Jewish community come to a head at this point and not much sooner?

After the violent reactions of the authorities in Jerusalem, it seems likely that Jewish Christian missionaries like Andronicus and Junia would have 'kept a low profile within the synagogal context, cultivating their specific beliefs' in meetings outside of the synagogue<sup>258</sup> to avoid similar confrontations in Rome. The organisational structure of the synagogues of Rome would have helped in this regard because there is no evidence of a 'single, controlling organisation supervising the individual synagogues.'<sup>259</sup> The believers could have shared the gospel of Jesus as the Christ in individual synagogues, and 'whether they were welcomed or shunned, embraced or punished, would depend on dynamics and relations within each synagogue rather than on city-wide policies.'<sup>260</sup> Even if there was a central board of authority, as Williams suggests,<sup>261</sup> the small scale of this early mission might not have raised red flags with the authorities for some time.<sup>262</sup> Factoring in the ban on Jewish meetings mentioned by Dio Cassius in the early years of Claudius' reign (41 CE),<sup>263</sup> Jewish religious life might have

---

<sup>256</sup> Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, xlix. Dunn points especially to the silence in Josephus to argue for a much smaller scale of the ban. According to Wolter, Suetonius' comment itself could be translated explicatively ('all Jews') or restrictively ('those causing trouble') (Wolter, *Römer 1-8*, 34, n. 68). Jewett, *Romans*, 59; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, 12; and Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 12f. are also among those who argue for a limited expulsion.

<sup>257</sup> Dunn suggests Christianity arrived in Rome 'within a few years of the beginnings in Jerusalem' (Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, xlvii). Following Fitzmyer, Jewett assumes that there was a Jewish Christian presence already 'in the 30s' (Jewett, *Romans*, 58; cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 29).

<sup>258</sup> Du Toit, 'Genesis,' 188.

<sup>259</sup> Wolfgang Wiefel, 'The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity,' in *The Romans Debate*, rev. and exp. ed., ed. Karl P. Donfried (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 85-101, citing 91; cf. Fisk, 'Synagogue,' 174.

<sup>260</sup> Fisk, 'Synagogue,' 175; cf. Wilckens, *Römer*, I:38.

<sup>261</sup> Margaret H. Williams, 'The Structure of the Jewish Community in Rome,' in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*, ed. Martin Goodman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 215-228.

<sup>262</sup> Du Toit proposes that the small number of believers was 'not seen as a threat to more orthodox Jewish views' (Du Toit, 'Genesis,' 188).

<sup>263</sup> Dio Cassius, *Rom. Hist.* 60.6.6. Dio and Suetonius likely refer to two separate actions relating to the Jewish community rather than the same event (cf. E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations*, 2nd ed., Atlanta: SBL, 2014, 215; followed by Walters, *Issues*, 52).

been even more decentralised and discussions about Christ limited to private meetings for some years,<sup>264</sup> which might further have minimised possible tensions.

Moreover, it needs to be questioned how much tension there was to begin with. Barclay suggests that within Diaspora Judaism, 'hermeneutical unanimity was unnecessary so long as the web of custom was preserved intact,'<sup>265</sup> meaning the differing messianic belief of the Jesus followers could well have been tolerated provided they remained Torah-observant.<sup>266</sup> It is very likely that Christianity in Rome, shaped by Jewish believers of the first hour like Andronicus and Junia, would be 'appreciative of Judaism and loyal to its customs.'<sup>267</sup> Traces of this loyalty to the Jewish way of life can be found in Romans 14-15,<sup>268</sup> and it has been suggested above that Andronicus and Junia were among those who still observed the sabbath and food laws when Paul wrote to Rome. Thus, Roman Judaism might not have been threatened in its identity by a movement that kept the key Jewish practices and thereby could be seen as a Jewish sect.<sup>269</sup>

If there was a tolerated Christian presence within the Jewish community of Rome before the disturbances in 49 CE, something must have changed in the lead-up to the Claudian edict. Du Toit suggests that the Jewish community 'began increasingly to experience the Christian presence and activity as a

---

<sup>264</sup> Jewett suggests that private Christian meetings 'evolved quickly' after the ban on assemblies (Jewett, *Romans*, 59).

<sup>265</sup> Barclay, *Diaspora*, 443.

<sup>266</sup> Cf. Walters, *Issues*, 61, who argues that claims that Jesus was the Messiah 'would have prompted little concern or resistance from the Jews.' Cf n. 254 for commentators who assume messianic claims led to the conflicts.

<sup>267</sup> Brown and Meier, *Rome*, 110. Ambrosiaster's fourth-century commentary on Romans is quoted in support of the Jewish shape of Roman Christianity (cf. Michel, *Römer*, 35; Moo, *Romans*, 4; and Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, xxv). Yet, the phrase that the Romans received the Christian faith *ritu licet iudaico* ('according to a Jewish rite') only appears in one codex (Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 30f.) and one of the three *recensiones* by Ambrosiaster (Theodore S. de Bruyn, *Ambrosiaster's Commentary on the Pauline Epistles: Romans*, Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017, 4, n. 8). So it can be questioned how much weight the evidence should be given.

<sup>268</sup> Michael Theobald, *Römerbrief Kapitel 1-11*, SKKNT 6/1 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1992), 19.

<sup>269</sup> Walters, *Issues*, 6.

menace.<sup>270</sup> He lists three possible reasons: a rapid increase in numbers, a more distinct theology threatening the orthodox position, and a 'more active and vocal' proclamation of the gospel message.<sup>271</sup> Yet, he fails to explain what caused the changes in theology and mission strategies. It is hard to imagine that the Roman Christians would have given up a strategy that had ensured them a relatively protected existence within the Jewish community of Rome without cause.

So what if the changes were not caused by the original Roman believers but were due to a new Christian presence? Rome continued to draw immigrants from the East in the years after the arrival of the first Christians in Rome, which is rarely considered in discussions about the origins of Roman Christianity.<sup>272</sup> Towards the end of the forties, it is likely that among those immigrants were Christians from the East who were converted through the Pauline mission.<sup>273</sup> Unlike the first Christians in Rome who had remained part of the Jewish community, these presumably gentile converts whose 'self-identity [had not been] shaped in a Jewish context' were 'less likely to conform to Jewish practices.'<sup>274</sup> Any attempt to integrate these new arrivals into the Jewish

---

<sup>270</sup> Du Toit, 'Genesis,' 185.

<sup>271</sup> Du Toit, 'Genesis,' 185.

<sup>272</sup> Exceptions are Fitzmyer, who attributes the growth of the Christian community to the *immigration of Jewish Christians* from the East (Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 30, emphasis mine); and Walters, who mentions the *immigration of Christians without attachment to the Jewish community* as one reason that 'may have prompted Christian assemblies outside the synagogues prior to the Claudian edict' (James C. Walters, 'Romans, Jews, and Christians: The Impact of the Romans on Jewish/Christian Relations in First-Century Rome,' in *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*, ed. Karl P. Donfried and Peter Richardson, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998, 175-195, citing 177, emphasis mine).

<sup>273</sup> According to Wright's biography of Paul, Paul had been in Damascus, Arabia, Tarsus, and Antioch, and had finished his first missionary journey to Cyprus and South Galatia by the year 49 CE, and he was on his second missionary journey in Greece in the same year (cf. Chronological Table in N. T. Wright, *Paul: A Biography*, London: SCPK, 2018, 433f.). Campbell's reconstruction of Paul's life based on his letters assumes an even wider missionary reach before 49 CE with activities in the region of Damascus, in Arabia, Syria and Cilicia, the mission to Macedonia and Achaia, missions to Illyricum and Galatia, as well as possible missions to Moesia, Thrace, Bithynia, Pontus, and Cappadocia (cf. *Appendix: The Pauline Letter Frame* in Douglas A. Campbell, *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Biography*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014, 412f.).

<sup>274</sup> Walters, *Issues*, 60. Though Walters has gentile Christians in mind who became part of the Roman congregation after the Claudian edict, the same can be said about many of Paul's converts.

Christian way of life within the synagogues would have been problematic. Their non-conformity to 'the boundaries that maintained the integrity of the Jewish community' would have caused a more vigorous opposition than messianic claims, as the abandonment of common customs put Jewish identity at stake.<sup>275</sup> If these new arrivals formed their own house congregations separate from the synagogues, they might have attracted some of the proselytes and God-fearers who struggled with aspects of the Jewish way of life.<sup>276</sup> For the Jewish community, this could have meant the end of financial support and protection of patrons who decided to join Christian groups.<sup>277</sup> This would not just constitute a matter of inconvenience but one of survival. During a time when there was a 'heightened sense of concern for the preservation of Roman religion and the Roman way of life,' the loss of advocates made life for Jews more precarious, as the authorities were already 'poised for action' against them.<sup>278</sup> Moreover, as Christianity was not yet perceived as an entity distinct from Judaism,<sup>279</sup> any mission attempts among Roman citizens by Christians would have brought the Jewish community as a whole under scrutiny.<sup>280</sup> With both its identity and its standing within Roman society on the line, orthodox Judaism would have felt the urge to separate from the Christian element.

Yet, Jewish and Jewish-leaning Christians would not have easily severed their ties with the Jewish community to which they felt they belonged. So discussions surrounding their faith in Jesus as the Christ and their place within Judaism would have been sparked anew. However, the tone would have changed, especially if they did not forego communion with those Jesus

---

<sup>275</sup> Walters, *Issues*, 61. The question of Torah observance was not only a bone of contention between Christianity and Judaism; based on Rom 14-15 it seems to have remained an issue between Roman Christians as well (cf. II.3.1.1.).

<sup>276</sup> If even Jews were tempted to discard dietary laws due to social obligations (Barclay, *Diaspora*, 435), pagan converts, probably feeling the social pressure even more, would likely be attracted to a Jewish sect that allowed them to partake in meals without avoiding certain food.

<sup>277</sup> Schnabel, *Römer* 1-5, 28.

<sup>278</sup> Walters, *Issues*, 53.

<sup>279</sup> This had changed by the time of Nero's persecution in 64 CE, the targeting of Christians as a group shows they had become a distinct entity within Roman perception (Walters, *Issues*, 62).

<sup>280</sup> Walters, 'Impact,' 182.

followers who did not hold to the law.<sup>281</sup> What once had been a tolerable hermeneutical disagreement regarding the identity of the Messiah would have turned into a heated argument about the Jewishness of faith in Christ, considering there were believers who abandoned the customs that kept Jewishness intact. It might have been the continued presence within the synagogues of those who did not want to part ways with Judaism that repeatedly sparked these debates until some eventually turned to the violent outbreaks that endangered the peace of the city in a way that the Roman authorities felt the need to put them down.

Whatever circumstances led to the Claudian edict in 49 CE, it is plausible that Christianity was involved somehow. Consequently, Andronicus and Junia would have been affected by the edict and maybe even have had a part in the events that triggered it. As Jewish Christians, they were likely among those who wanted to preserve the status quo within the Jewish community. Due to their seniority, they presumably also had leading functions and would be spokespersons of those who did not want to break with the Jewish ways. If they were 'apostles,' they must have been involved in the proclamation of the gospel in some way, which made them public figures, at the very least among the Jews of Rome on whom their evangelism was probably focused.<sup>282</sup> Therefore, they were recognisable enough to be identified by the Roman authorities and probably among those banned from the capital.<sup>283</sup> As they immigrated from Palestine, they were *peregrini*, free foreigners in Rome without Roman

---

<sup>281</sup> As argued above (cf. II.3.1.1.), the Christians of Rome were meeting together when Paul wrote to Rome even though the debate on Torah-observance was still ongoing. Lampe even suggests that the tensions that arose between law-abiding and non-law-abiding Christians about how to celebrate communion and have meals together also became an issue in the conflict with the synagogues (Lampe, *Rome*, 70).

<sup>282</sup> Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, xlvi.

<sup>283</sup> As there probably were no records of foreigners, the expulsion of a whole group was difficult. Noy suggests that 'expulsions would have involved a mixture of deliberate targeting of figures already well-known to the authorities ... and denunciation of individuals by their neighbours and customers' (Noy, *Foreigners*, 47; cf. A. Andrew Das, *Solving the Romans Debate*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007, 174, who assumes Rome would have turned to the synagogue authorities for information about the less 'outspoken and active troublemakers').

citizenship.<sup>284</sup> This meant they could easily be removed from the city.<sup>285</sup> It is possible that they, like Prisca and Aquila,<sup>286</sup> left Rome for the East, where they met Paul. Yet, unlike Prisca and Aquila, Andronicus and Junia are not mentioned in Acts. Consequently, there is no evidence of a move to the East or a meeting with Paul. If they felt a specific calling to mission in Rome, it is also conceivable that they remained in the vicinity of Rome, waiting for an opportune moment to return to the capital and their ministry.<sup>287</sup>

Usually it is argued that the Jewish Christians returned to Rome after the lapse of the edict in the year of Claudius' death (54 CE).<sup>288</sup> Cranfield is right to state that 'those who had been expelled will probably have lost no time in returning, once return became possible.'<sup>289</sup> This possibility, however, might have come sooner than 54 CE. Though the edict banned 'all' Jews from the city in principle, only a part of the Jewish community was likely forced to leave Rome in practice, the identified troublemakers and those that could be removed from the city without trial.<sup>290</sup> If it was already hard to enforce people's departure on the first implementation of the edict,<sup>291</sup> it would have been all the

---

<sup>284</sup> Cf. Noy, *Foreigners*, 1.

<sup>285</sup> Whereas citizens could not be expelled without a formal hearing, foreigners could be banned from the city without a trial (Leonard Victor Rutgers, 'Roman Policy towards the Jews: Expulsions from the City of Rome during the First Century CE,' in *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*, ed. Karl P. Donfried and Peter Richardson, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998, 93-116, citing 98).

<sup>286</sup> Cf. Acts 18:2.

<sup>287</sup> In the narrative of Acts, the apostles stay behind in Jerusalem despite the persecution (Acts 8:1). According to Fitzmyer, this is 'a historical recollection' included in Luke-Acts to show 'the unflinching apostolic reaction to persecution' as a pattern to follow (Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 397). Andronicus and Junia might have followed in their footsteps, returning to Rome as soon as circumstances allowed.

<sup>288</sup> Cf. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, liii; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 77; Jewett, *Romans*, 59; Moo, *Romans*, 5; and Schnabel, *Römer 1-5*, 25.

<sup>289</sup> Cranfield, *Romans I-VIII*, 18.

<sup>290</sup> Förster highlights this difference between the normative validity of an imperial edict in principle and its implementation in practice (Hans Förster, 'Der Aufenthalt von Priska und Aquila in Ephesus und die juristischen Rahmenbedingungen ihrer Rückkehr nach Rom,' *ZNW* 105.2: 189-227, citing 210). Green states that it was 'effectively impossible' to expel all Jews (Green, *Christianity*, 26; cf. Wolter, *Römer 1-8*, 36), pointing to Dio Cassius' comment that the barring of Jews from the city would have been difficult due to their multitude (Dio Cassius, *Rom. Hist.* 60.6.6). So the edict likely was never 'rigorously enforced' (Thielman, *Romans*, 29; cf. Noy, *Foreigners*, 47; and Rutgers, 'Policy,' 110).

<sup>291</sup> Fisk, 'Synagogue,' 164.

more difficult to keep track of them and prevent their return to the city. Therefore, it is likely that 'some Jews ... remained in Rome, and others filtered back to Rome in the last year of Claudius's reign (AD 49-54).'<sup>292</sup> Besides, the execution of the edict might have been stopped once uprisings had died down. Förster argues that even though action was taken, the comprehensive implementation of the edict was less important than its general preventative function: The aim was not to completely eradicate the Jewish community but to keep the Jews of Rome in check by demonstrating the empire's will to end Jewish life in the capital if necessary.<sup>293</sup> It was a measure to restore and keep order and likely did not prevent Jews from taking up residence in Rome (again) in the years to follow.<sup>294</sup> This means Jewish Christians could have returned as soon as the situation in Rome had calmed down.

Even if we are not looking at a prolonged exile of those expelled from the city, the situation in Rome would have massively changed in the aftermath of the edict as the events 'played a decisive role in detaching Roman Christianity from synagogue communities.'<sup>295</sup> Left in a vulnerable position after the edict, it became necessary for the Jewish community 'to clarify their distinction' from Christianity to avoid further clashes with the authorities.<sup>296</sup> As a consequence, synagogue doors would have been closed to everyone confessing faith in Jesus as the Christ. Whereas Christians without a Jewish background would have quickly adjusted to this new situation,<sup>297</sup> it must have been difficult for those

---

<sup>292</sup> Schreiner, *Romans*, 12.

<sup>293</sup> Förster, 'Aufenthalt,' 209f. Förster demonstrates this concerning the expulsion of the Jews under Tiberius (19 CE) but also assumes it to be true for the Claudian expulsion. Thielman sees another 'rhetorical purpose' at work addressed to the Roman citizens: Claudius wanted to be seen 'as Rome's strong bulwark against foreign influences' and was less interested in the actual execution of the edict (Thielman, *Romans*, 29f.).

<sup>294</sup> Wolter, *Römer 1-8*, 36; cf. Smallwood, *Jews*, 216.

<sup>295</sup> Walters, *Issues*, 62; cf. Lampe, *Rome*, 15. Even though the separation process had already begun with the conflicts leading to the edict, the imperial measures accelerated the parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity (Du Toit, 'Genesis,' 185; cf. Moo, *Romans*, 5).

<sup>296</sup> Walters, *Issues*, 60.

<sup>297</sup> As suggested above, they might already have formed house groups without connections to the synagogues before the edict.

who had lived among the Jews of Rome for years. They found themselves excluded from their ethnic and/or worship community.

The separation from the synagogues also impacted the composition of Roman Christianity. Before the edict the proclamation of the gospel would have taken place in Jewish settings, attracting Jews, proselytes and Godfearers who were accustomed to the Jewish way of life. This meant Christianity retained a distinctly Jewish character.<sup>298</sup> As a consequence of the edict, mission in the Jewish context would have become almost impossible (at least for some time). Mission among Gentiles, however, would have become easier outside of this setting, and there would have been a growing number of converts from a gentile background.<sup>299</sup> With the increase of 'the ratio of gentile Christians without Jewish socialization,'<sup>300</sup> the character of Roman Christianity must have changed: adherence to the law, once a natural expression of faith for Roman Christians, was no longer the norm. Though 'the shift was more socio-religious than ethnic'<sup>301</sup> at first, over time, the ethnic composition of the Roman congregation would have changed as well. In the direct aftermath of the edict, Jewish Christians could have still been in the majority despite their decimated number due to the expulsion. Yet, by the time of Romans, there likely were more gentile believers.<sup>302</sup> This meant that those who had initially formed the core of Roman Christianity slowly moved to its periphery.

Reactions to this development would have been different. Faced with a growing number of gentile Christians who would not have been willing to accommodate their behaviour to foreign practices,<sup>303</sup> it is easy to imagine that, over time, some of the Jewish adherents would have given in to the pressure and compromised on, if not wholly abandoned, the Jewish way of life. Others

---

<sup>298</sup> Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 33; cf. Kruse, *Romans*, 2; Longenecker, *Romans*, 9; and Moo, *Romans*, 10.

<sup>299</sup> Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, liii; cf. Edwards, *Romans*, 10.

<sup>300</sup> Walters, *Issues*, 60.

<sup>301</sup> Walters, *Issues*, 60.

<sup>302</sup> Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, liii; cf. Edwards, *Romans*, 10; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 33; and Kruse, *Romans*, 3.

<sup>303</sup> Walters, 'Impact,' 179; cf. Das, *Romans*, 197f.

who remained within mixed house group settings might have sought to find a middle ground, maintaining at least some Jewish customs, like the observance of dietary laws and the sabbath.<sup>304</sup> This naturally would have led to the kind of friction discussed above regarding Romans 14-15.<sup>305</sup> Still, others would have avoided these conflicts by forming their own house groups with like-minded believers.<sup>306</sup>

So where would Andronicus and Junia be found in all of this? Considering they likely had been identified as some of the instigators of the conflicts by the authorities, a quick return might have been dangerous. Probably, they were not among the first to come back to the capital, and the change both in Jewish-Christian relations and the Roman-Christian landscape was well underway when they returned to the city. Like all Jewish and Jewish-leaning Christians, they must have felt the separation from the Jewish community deeply. Most of the social networks that had guaranteed them a haven within the capital when they first arrived would have been broken down on their second arrival in Rome. Moreover, their welcome in the forming network of Christian house churches was not guaranteed either. Reactions to their return likely were mixed.

Undoubtedly, they would have been received warmly by those holding on to the Jewish way of life. For that section of the community, Andronicus and Junia had been leading figures for most of their Christian journey, so their authority would have quickly been re-established. It is conceivable that a house church formed around them that was Jewish in character and that Jewish-leaning circles looked to them concerning the defence of their position in the wider Christian community. In these circles Paul's acknowledgement of Andronicus and Junia's seniority and ministry would have been heard as an affirmation of their authority and taken as a further sign that Paul's impending

---

<sup>304</sup> Walters, 'Impact,' 179.

<sup>305</sup> Cf. II.3.1.1.

<sup>306</sup> Moo ponders the possibility that the Roman house churches were divided among theological lines (Moo, *Romans*, 5).

visit was not meant to be a threat to their way of life nor did he come to champion the gentile section of the community.

The matter would have been different among the growing number of congregations with a gentile majority. New converts would not have experienced Andronicus and Junia's role in the early beginnings of Christianity in Rome. So they might have seen them as just another pair of Jewish returnees holding on to outdated beliefs and practices. Provided they were eyewitnesses of the ministry of Jesus, Andronicus and Junia would not have been completely sidelined but must have retained some standing even within these communities. Their reputation as apostles, however, would certainly have suffered. With the synagogue doors closed to them, Andronicus and Junia would have lost their primary mission field. If they wanted to continue their proclamation of the gospel among Jewish compatriots, they had to move cautiously to avoid any conflicts that would draw the authorities' attention again. Mission success would have been meagre, especially compared to the growing number of Gentiles attracted to house churches without a Jewish background. If, as Jewett suggests, there were 'fierce competitions' within and between house churches 'for superior honor,'<sup>307</sup> Andronicus and Junia would have been on the losing side. For the Romans, they were foreigners belonging to an ethnic group that had recently caused unrest. In their ethnic community, they were no longer welcome, and in the Christian community, they were increasingly sidelined due to their continued loyalty to Jewish customs. Moreover, their main enterprise had not just turned into a failure but also had the potential to bring all Christians into disrepute with the Roman authorities.

Once honoured as leaders by the original Roman Christian community, Andronicus and Junia might have been considered notorious Judaizing troublemakers, at least among parts of the congregation(s), by the time Paul's letter arrived in Rome. Paul's recognition of their seniority in faith might have

---

<sup>307</sup> Jewett, *Romans*, 72.

been a timely reminder for all who 'were not inclined to acknowledge their accomplishments and status.'<sup>308</sup> Andronicus and Junia had an advantage not just over him but also over them regarding their Christian beginnings and the length of their work for the gospel. Neither their Jewishness nor their apparent failure in mission was an excuse to withhold the honour they deserved as Christians of the first hour, who had presumably proclaimed Jesus as the Messiah in and around Rome for almost a quarter of a century by the time Paul asks for them to be greeted.<sup>309</sup>

Such a commitment to the proclamation of the gospel can hardly be explained without a firm conviction of being called to this specific work by Christ himself. Therefore, it is also unlikely that Andronicus and Junia would have given up their mission to the Jewish population of Rome even if it became increasingly harder to do so. Probably clandestine at first to avoid further clashes with both Jewish and Roman authorities, the couple might have become more confident in their evangelism again during the first years of Nero's reign. Unlike his predecessor Claudius, Nero was less interested in protecting Roman tradition and more open to Eastern religions.<sup>310</sup> Consequently, Roman policy regarding Judaism changed once more under his rule. As the risk of Roman intervention decreased, Andronicus and Junia's ministry among Jews became easier again. Nevertheless, the potential for conflict with the Jewish authorities remained. There might have been public clashes due to the couple's proclamation of Jesus as Christ that caught the eyes of the authorities. Yet, in the changed climate, they possibly were dealt with differently. Instead of a collective measure, the preventative or punitive measures might have been limited to the instigators, who would have been pointed out gladly by the Jewish community. The personal consequences for Andronicus and Junia in such a case would have been direr than their exile. Paul indicates that their

---

<sup>308</sup> Jewett, *Romans*, 964.

<sup>309</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 180; cf. Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 886.

<sup>310</sup> Walters, *Issues*, 53; cf. Michel, *Römer*, 35.

ministry led to their imprisonment (v. 7b). However, from Paul's description of the couple as 'outstanding among the apostles' we might deduce that even the risk of loss of freedom, bodily integrity, and status, which incarceration in the first century entailed,<sup>311</sup> did not prevent them from continuing the work to which they felt called.

### **3.2. Fellow Prisoners who are outstanding among the Apostles – Andronicus and Junia's Ministry**

Paul acknowledges Andronicus and Junia's work indirectly by calling them his fellow prisoners (συναιχμαλώτους μου) and by placing them among the apostles (οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις). There is no indication that they worked with him like in the case of Prisca and Aquila,<sup>312</sup> nor any reference to their toiling for the Roman church like in the case of Mary.<sup>313</sup> Yet, Paul leaves no doubt that their ministry is worthy of being praised despite or maybe even because of the consequences they faced for it.

#### **3.2.1. *The meaning of τοὺς συναιχμαλώτους μου***

Συναιχμάλωτος is the second συν-compound in Romans 16:7, another term that shows Paul's close association and solidarity with the couple, this time not due to shared ancestry but due to shared circumstances, namely imprisonment. In a wide sense, αἰχμάλωτος can be used as 'prisoner.'<sup>314</sup> However, the term refers quite literally to someone 'taken by the spear,'<sup>315</sup> a military image used to describe a 'captive'<sup>316</sup> or 'prisoner of war.'<sup>317</sup> As Paul never was a prisoner of war, early commentators read the term figuratively in

---

<sup>311</sup> Cf. II.3.2.1.

<sup>312</sup> They are identified as co-workers (τοὺς συνεργούς μου) of Paul (Rom 16:3).

<sup>313</sup> Paul mentions that she has worked hard among the Roman Christians (Rom 16:6).

<sup>314</sup> MGS, s.v. 'αἰχμάλωτος;' cf. L&N, s.v. 'αἰχμάλωτος,' 37.118.

<sup>315</sup> LSJ, s.v. 'αἰχμάλωτος.'

<sup>316</sup> BDAG, s.v. 'αἰχμάλωτος;' cf. GELNT, s.v. 'αἰχμάλωτος.'

<sup>317</sup> MGS, s.v. 'αἰχμάλωτος;' cf. L&N, s.v. 'αἰχμάλωτος,' 55.25.

the sense of being ‘*exiles* from their own home’<sup>318</sup> or being ‘continually *in the midst of enemies*.’<sup>319</sup> These readings reflect the uses of the term in the Septuagint for the Hebrew roots שָׁבַח (‘to capture in the course of battle, deport’<sup>320</sup>) and גָּלָה (‘to go into exile’<sup>321</sup>).<sup>322</sup> In modern days, Kittel read Paul’s description of Andronicus and Junia with the language of war as a reference to their participation in a spiritual ‘higher warfare.’<sup>323</sup>

Most commentators oppose these figurative readings and emphasise that the term should be understood as referring to an actual (civil rather than military) detention.<sup>324</sup> As the other two occurrences of συναιχμάλωτος (Philemon 23; Colossians 4:10) are directly connected to Paul’s own prison experience,<sup>325</sup> there is no discussion about the reality conveyed by the term: Epaphras and Aristarchus are in prison with Paul at the time the letters are written.<sup>326</sup> The situation in Romans is slightly different. Unlike Epaphras and Aristarchus, who *send greetings with Paul from prison*, Andronicus and Junia *receive greetings from Paul* and, therefore, are not *together with him* in prison at the time of writing.

---

<sup>318</sup> Peter Abelard, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, transl. Steven R. Cartwright (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2011), 389 (emphasis mine); cf. PL 178.973b-c for Latin. Abelard quotes Haymo (cf. PL 117.505A).

<sup>319</sup> Chrysostom, *Romans*, NPNF1 11:555 (emphasis mine).

<sup>320</sup> HALOT, s.v. ‘שָׁבַח.’

<sup>321</sup> HALOT, s.v. ‘גָּלָה.’

<sup>322</sup> Philo uses αἰχμάλωτοι for those ‘having been brought as captives to Italy’ (Philo, *Embassy*, 155 [Colson, LCL]). As many of the Jewish community would have been descendants of those prisoners of war brought to Rome in 61 BCE in the wake of Pompey’s conquest of Palestine (Brown and Meier, *Rome*, 93), the term might well have evoked such connotations for some of the audience (cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 963).

<sup>323</sup> Gerhard Kittel, ‘αἰχμάλωτος, αἰχμαλωτίζω, αἰχμαλωτεύω, αἰχμαλωσία, συναιχμάλωτος,’ *TDNT* 1:195-197, citing 196f.

<sup>324</sup> Cf. Cranfield, *Romans IX-XVI*, 789; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 894; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 739; Jewett, *Romans*, 962; Käsemann, *Römer*, 398; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 423; and Schnabel, *Römer* 6-16, 884.

<sup>325</sup> Paul’s chains are mentioned in Phlm 13 and Col 4:18.

<sup>326</sup> The only discussion concerning the Colossians passage is whether Paul wrote the letter. However, even if Paul is not the author, the term in context assumes a shared imprisonment of Aristarchus and Paul.

In Philemon and Colossians, the prepositional prefix *σὺν* is used in its basic spatial sense, referring to Epaphras and Aristarchus' 'literal accompaniment'<sup>327</sup> of Paul in prison. It can and has been interpreted this way regarding Romans 16:7: Andronicus and Junia had 'a particular prison experience *with Paul*'<sup>328</sup> albeit *in the past* rather than in the present. Following this line of interpretation, the focus of interest naturally shifts to the question of when and where this detention might have occurred within the Pauline chronology. Yet, as there is no indication in the text or elsewhere in the New Testament that they were with Paul in one of his known imprisonments, most commentators refrain from speculating about possible dates and locations.<sup>329</sup> Nevertheless, there is some information to be gained from this approach: Junia, at an unknown time and place (somewhere in the East),<sup>330</sup> was in prison with Paul and thereby personally known to him.

The alternative interpretation is to read *σὺν* less literally: Andronicus and Junia were imprisoned *like Paul*, not *with him*.<sup>331</sup> Rather than referring to shared imprisonment in the past, the prefix describes imprisonment *for the same cause*. It is not unusual for Paul to use *σὺν* in this way.<sup>332</sup> In 1 Corinthians 3:9 Paul calls Apollos and himself *συνεργοὶ θεοῦ* ('fellow workers of God'). Regardless of their separate ministries, 'they work unitedly toward a common goal.'<sup>333</sup> They

---

<sup>327</sup> Harris sees this as the original use of the preposition *σὺν* (Murray J. Harris, *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament. An Essential Reference Resource for Exegesis*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2012, 199).

<sup>328</sup> Jewett, *Romans*, 962 (emphasis mine); cf. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 894; Käsemann, *Römer*, 398; Longenecker, *Romans*, 1069; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, 219; and Wolter, *Römer 9-16*, 475.

<sup>329</sup> The following are the exceptions: Bauckham and Schnabel propose the Antiochian or Arabian/Nabatean mission as background for shared imprisonment (Bauckham, *Women*, 171; Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 885). Longenecker deems Caesarea a probable option (Longenecker, *Romans*, 1069).

<sup>330</sup> As Paul has yet to go to Rome, a shared imprisonment could have only taken place in the East.

<sup>331</sup> Cranfield, *Romans IX-XVI*, 789. Both alternatives are found in Bauckham, *Women*, 171f.; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 739; Moo, *Romans*, 938f.; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 423; Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 884; Schreiner, *Romans*, 769; Thielman, *Romans*, 719; and Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 387f.

<sup>332</sup> Cranfield, *Romans IX-XVI*, 789.

<sup>333</sup> David E. Briones, 'Fellow Workers with God and One Another: Toward a Pauline Theology of Mission,' *CBQ* 81.2 (2019): 277-301, citing 290.

are joined with each other in their work for and with God.<sup>334</sup> In the same way Andronicus and Junia are joined with Paul in bearing imprisonment as a consequence of spreading the gospel, no matter whether they were actually in prison with him or not.<sup>335</sup>

The appeal of this reading is that questions about Pauline chronology fade from the spotlight. Andronicus and Junia's circumstances take centre stage, more explicitly, the reasons that led to their imprisonment and the consequences of their detainment. Unsurprisingly, these aspects receive little to no attention in commentaries. If grounds for the couple's incarceration are given, they are usually quite general: Andronicus and Junia were imprisoned 'for the allegiance to the gospel,'<sup>336</sup> 'for Christ's sake,'<sup>337</sup> or 'for the faith.'<sup>338</sup>

But is there more that can be said about the reasons for their arrest based on a single term? To answer this question, it is important to consider Paul's choice of words again. He opted for *συναϊχμάλωτος* over *δέσμιος* ('prisoner'),<sup>339</sup> meaning he chose a term with clear military connotations instead of the common term for someone in civil detention.<sup>340</sup> Jewett sees the context of *αϊχμάλωτος* in the *conflict* between Christ and opposing powers, in Andronicus and Junia's case the very real authorities of the Roman empire.<sup>341</sup> Taken within this context, *συναϊχμάλωτος* is not a passive term but denotes someone who was captured while fighting for Christ against powers and principalities.

Salamito interprets it as the flip side of *συστρατιώτης* ('fellow soldier'), another

---

<sup>334</sup> Briones convincingly argues that *συνεργοί θεοῦ* should be read 'both *vertically* and *horizontally*' as "fellow workers with God and one another" (Briones, 'Workers,' 279).

<sup>335</sup> Paul's description of Prisca and Aquila as his *συνεργοί* ('fellow workers') in Rom 16:3 certainly is also not limited to their work alongside him in the past but acknowledges their own continued work for the spread of the gospel independently of him.

<sup>336</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 172; cf. Moo, *Romans*, 938.

<sup>337</sup> Cranfield, *Romans IX-XVI*, 789; cf. Byrne, *Romans*, 453.

<sup>338</sup> Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 739; cf. Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 388.

<sup>339</sup> Paul uses this term to describe himself as a 'prisoner of Christ' in Phlm 1 and 9 (cf. Eph 3:1 and 4:1, and 2 Tim 1:8).

<sup>340</sup> Nijay K. Gupta, 'Reconstructing Junia's Imprisonment: Examining a Neglected Pauline Comment in Romans 16: 7,' *PRSt* 47.4 (2020): 385-397, citing, 388. *δέσμιος* and its cognates referring to imprisonment appear over thirty times in the New Testament, whereas (*συν*)*αϊχμάλωτος* and its cognate noun occur only six times.

<sup>341</sup> Jewett, *Romans*, 963.

military term Paul applies to fellow workers.<sup>342</sup> He argues that those whom Paul calls *fellow soldiers* in the fight for the spread of the gospel naturally would be called *prisoners of war* in case of their arrest.<sup>343</sup>

Moreover, the term fits in with other military terminology Paul uses concerning his mission work,<sup>344</sup> and it is used in a passage in which he recommends other members of the Roman church for their missionary efforts.<sup>345</sup> Choosing this term in this context indicates that Paul wants to convey more than information about Andronicus and Junia's past prison experience, even more than that they were in custody because of their faith. Andronicus and Junia, like Paul, were not arrested because they were Christians but because they were 'Christ-proclaiming' Christians.<sup>346</sup> It was their missionary activities that brought them into conflict with the authorities and consequently led to their imprisonment.<sup>347</sup>

As civil detention was, among others,<sup>348</sup> a means to preserve public order, their proclamation of the gospel in one way or another must have disturbed the peace and thereby made them 'a civic nuisance' in the eyes of the authorities.<sup>349</sup> If Andronicus and Junia continued to focus their mission on Jewish compatriots

---

<sup>342</sup> Phil 2:25, Phlm 2.

<sup>343</sup> Jean-Marie Salamito, 'Συναιχμαλωτοι: Les "Compagnons de Captivité" de l'Apôtre Paul,' in *Carcer I: Prison et Privation de Liberté dans l'Antiquité Classique. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg (5 et 6 Décembre 1997)*, ed. by Cecile Bertrand-Dagenbach, Alain Chauvot, Michel Matter and Jean-Marie Salamito (Paris: De Boccard, 1999), 191-209, citing 203; cf. Kittel, 'αἰχμάλωτος,' 197.

<sup>344</sup> Wolter, *Römer 9-16*, 475; cf. D. G. Reid, 'Prison, Prisoner,' *DPL* 752-754, citing 754 and Kittel, 'αἰχμάλωτος,' 197.

<sup>345</sup> Salamito, 'Συναιχμαλωτοι,' 204. Prisca, Aquila and Urbanus are commended as 'fellow workers' (v. 3 and 9). Tryphaena, Tryphosa, and Persis are all mentioned for their work in the Lord (v. 12), and Mary for her work among the Romans (v. 6).

<sup>346</sup> Ryan S. Schellenberg, 'The Rest of Paul's Imprisonments,' *JTS* 69.2 (2018): 533-572, citing 538 (emphasis mine).

<sup>347</sup> Salamito, 'Συναιχμαλωτοι,' 204; cf. Stenschke, 'Women,' 157 and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Missionaries, Apostles, Coworkers: Romans 16 and the Reconstruction of Women's Early Christian History,' *WW* 6.4 (1986): 420-433, citing 431.

<sup>348</sup> For the various other purposes of custody, cf. Brian Rapske, *The Book of Acts and Paul in Roman Custody*, vol. 4 of *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Pater Noster, 1994), 10-20.

<sup>349</sup> Schellenberg, 'Imprisonments,' 567; cf. Gupta, 'Imprisonment,' 391.

after their return to the city, as suggested above,<sup>350</sup> conflicts with other Jews likely flared up again, similar to the ones in the lead-up to the Claudian edict. This time, however, the Jewish community would have been keen to deflect the blame for the disturbances and point the finger at the couple as the sole cause of the trouble. In the changing political climate under Nero,<sup>351</sup> a much more limited measure than the banishment of a whole group could have been used to restore public order, e.g. the imprisonment of Andronicus and Junia, ‘the ringleaders of the “notorious” Christian sect.’<sup>352</sup>

No matter which exact circumstances led to her imprisonment, the fact that Junia was detained with Andronicus indicates that Junia’s participation in their mission activities was active and likely public enough to justify her incarceration.<sup>353</sup> Stepping into the public sphere and proclaiming Christ as Lord as a woman certainly would have drawn attention to herself and Andronicus.<sup>354</sup> Yet, was this notorious or notable enough to arrest her rather than to put her under house arrest, which, according to Witherington, was the usual action taken regarding criminal women at this time?<sup>355</sup> The mentions of women in prison in the literary sources<sup>356</sup> show that some women faced capital punishment for political reasons, e.g. their perceived involvement in plots against Tiberius<sup>357</sup> and Claudius.<sup>358</sup> Other women were judged and/or punished by their male relatives in private settings.<sup>359</sup> Some elite women were held as

---

<sup>350</sup> Cf. II.3.1.2.2. Witherington, though arguing for an imprisonment with Paul in the East, sees the ‘witness in the synagogue’ as a possible background of Andronicus and Junia’s arrest (Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 388).

<sup>351</sup> Cf. n. 310.

<sup>352</sup> Witherington, ‘Joanna,’ 14.

<sup>353</sup> Stenschke, ‘Women,’ 157.

<sup>354</sup> Cotter asserts that despite the degree of freedom Romanized women had within society, ‘they were not supposed to bring attention to themselves by public speeches or any overt political demonstrations’ (Wendy Cotter, ‘Women’s Authority Roles in Paul’s Churches: Countercultural or Conventional?’, *NovT* 36.4 (1994): 350-372, citing 366).

<sup>355</sup> Witherington, ‘Joanna,’ 14; cf. Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 390.

<sup>356</sup> Rapske, *Custody*, 279.

<sup>357</sup> Dio Cassius, *Rom. Hist.* 58.15.3.

<sup>358</sup> Dio Cassius, *Rom. Hist.* 60.16.1.

<sup>359</sup> Livy, *Hist. Rom.* 39.18.6; Tacitus, *Ann.* 8.32.

captives for political reasons,<sup>360</sup> but there is also evidence that common women were imprisoned as punishment.<sup>361</sup>

Junia most likely was among the latter, incarcerated as punishment for causing unrest by proclaiming the gospel and/or as a means to hinder the spread of this subversive message.<sup>362</sup> It was not uncommon that magistrates used confinement as a means 'to compel the obedience of ... foreigners, slaves and women.'<sup>363</sup> Junia was both a woman and, as συγγενής of Paul, a foreigner.<sup>364</sup> Thus, her arrest might have been an attempt not just to stop her deviant behaviour but also a coercive measure to prevent further missionary activities. As her husband was guilty of the same crimes, handing her over to be judged and punished by her family was not an option the officials could take.<sup>365</sup> Therefore, Junia had to endure public custody for the sake of the gospel.

This meant being incarcerated in the same space as men.<sup>366</sup> All prisoners in the often overcrowded Roman prisons faced conditions that some understood as a 'foretaste' of Hades:<sup>367</sup> It was dark, hot and poorly ventilated. Prisoners' mobility was often further restricted by chains and stocks. Rations were poor, just enough to survive. With no access to water and wearing the same clothes night and day, it was impossible to care for one's hygiene.<sup>368</sup> Consequently, sickness and diseases were widespread.<sup>369</sup> As a female prisoner, Junia was also

---

<sup>360</sup> Both the sister and wife of Dion, tyrant of Syracuse, were imprisoned after his assassination (Plutarch, *Dion* 57.3). Josephus' mother was held in prison during the siege of Jerusalem (Josephus, *J.W.* 5.544).

<sup>361</sup> Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 7.121f.

<sup>362</sup> According to Acts, Junia was not the first woman incarcerated to stop the spread of the gospel. It is emphasised twice (8:3 and 21:4) that Paul himself imprisoned both men and women while persecuting the Way.

<sup>363</sup> Rapske, *Custody*, 15.

<sup>364</sup> Cf. II.3.1.1.

<sup>365</sup> Livy claims that for those women for whom 'there was no suitable person to administer the punishment, the penalty was applied in public custody' (Livy, *Hist. Rom.* 39.18.6 [Yardley]).

<sup>366</sup> Rapske, *Custody*, 279; cf. Craig S. Wansink, *Chained in Christ: The Experience and Rhetoric of Paul's Imprisonments*, JSNTSup 130 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 56.

<sup>367</sup> Wansink, *Imprisonments*, 34f.

<sup>368</sup> For women this also included their menstrual hygiene.

<sup>369</sup> Rapske, *Custody*, 195-225; cf. Wansink, *Imprisonments*, 33-40 and Jewett, *Romans*, 962.

especially vulnerable to sexual abuse,<sup>370</sup> though the presence of her husband might have offered some protection.<sup>371</sup>

In addition to the dire prison conditions, those imprisoned also suffered degradation of status.<sup>372</sup> Being a prisoner was ‘closely associated with shame and dishonour’<sup>373</sup> in a Graeco-Roman context. Due to the stigma associated with imprisonment, there was social pressure ‘to withdraw from or abandon the prisoner.’<sup>374</sup> Such withdrawal was devastating for prisoners as it robbed them not just of contact with the outside world but of basic provisions like food and clothes, which family and friends were allowed to provide.<sup>375</sup> The exhortation ‘to remember those who are in prison’ in Hebrews 13:3<sup>376</sup> proves that early Christians were not exempt from considering the abandonment of imprisoned believers to avoid shame by association.<sup>377</sup> If, as Bauckham suggests, Junia and Andronicus were in prison at the time of writing,<sup>378</sup> asking the Roman congregations to greet them could imply an exhortation to associate with the couple despite their degradation in status in public opinion.<sup>379</sup> In the eyes of her fellow believers, Andronicus and Junia’s ‘faithful confession of Christ should outweigh the shame associated with [their] bonds.’<sup>380</sup>

Yet, especially among fellow believers, Andronicus and Junia’s ministry might have been perceived negatively due to their imprisonment. In the eyes of

---

<sup>370</sup> Rapske, *Custody*, 280; cf. Wansink, *Imprisonments*, 57. Peeler also highlights that ‘if Junia experienced such horrors and survived them, she resisted the great temptation of suicide in prison and remained faithful to continue her witness after her release’ (Amy Peeler, ‘Junia/Joanna: Herald of the Good News,’ in *Vindicating the Vixens: Revisiting Sexualized, Vilified, and Marginalized Women of the Bible*, ed. Sandra Glahn, Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2017, 273-285, citing 280).

<sup>371</sup> Arminta Fox, ‘Decentering Paul, Contextualizing Crimes: Reading in Light of the Imprisoned,’ *JFSR* 33.2 (2017): 37-54; citing 46.

<sup>372</sup> Rapske, *Custody*, 289.

<sup>373</sup> Rapske, *Custody*, 288.

<sup>374</sup> Rapske, *Custody*, 293; cf. Matthew L. Skinner, ‘Remember My Chains: New Testament Perspectives on Incarceration,’ *Int* 72.3 (2018): 269-281, citing 273.

<sup>375</sup> Rapske, *Custody*, 209; cf. Wansink, *Imprisonments*, 65.

<sup>376</sup> Cf. the explicit mention of visits in prison as a service done to the Lord in Matt 25:36.

<sup>377</sup> Rapske, *Custody*, 294f.; cf. Skinner, ‘Chains,’ 274.

<sup>378</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 172.

<sup>379</sup> Cf. the exhortation to ‘associate with the lowly’ in Rom 12:16.

<sup>380</sup> Rapske, *Custody*, 295.

Paul's opponents in Galatia and Corinth, his sufferings (including detentions)<sup>381</sup> were proof of God's judgement on Paul, and they called 'the legitimacy of his ministry and message into question.'<sup>382</sup> Likely Junia and Andronicus' mission work was already disqualified by the growing numbers of gentile Roman Christians due to their ministry among Jews, which did bear fewer results than the ministry among Gentiles.<sup>383</sup> Their incarceration might have cast further doubt on the validity of their mission if their critics took the same stance as Paul's in Galatians. 'Shameful insinuations,'<sup>384</sup> questioning Junia's sexual purity and Andronicus' ability to defend her and his honour in prison,<sup>385</sup> might have added insult to injury and could have been disastrous for their standing within the Roman congregations. It is not hard to imagine how their imprisonment could have become a cause to challenge their position and status.<sup>386</sup>

Paul, however, does not call them συναιχμαλώτους μου ('my fellow prisoners') to disqualify or shame them. On the contrary, he turns a term associated with shame and humiliation into a 'title of honor,'<sup>387</sup> a 'noble proclamation.'<sup>388</sup> Paul re-interprets a situation that is perceived as shameful and degrading into one that commends him and those who suffer like him as true θεοῦ διάκονοι (2 Corinthians 6:4-5) and διάκονοι Χριστοῦ (2 Corinthians 11:23-29), servants of God and Christ. Rather than letting himself or his ministry be defined by the stigma of incarceration,<sup>389</sup> he understands his imprisonment as

---

<sup>381</sup> Cf. the tribulation list in 2 Cor 11:23-29.

<sup>382</sup> Scott J. Hafemann, 'The Role of Suffering in the Mission of Paul,' in *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles*, ed. Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 165-184, citing 172f. Though Hafemann refers to suffering in general, Paul's captivity as one aspect of this suffering would have been perceived in this way.

<sup>383</sup> Cf. II.3.1.2.2.

<sup>384</sup> Fox, 'Crimes,' 47.

<sup>385</sup> As 'the sexual purity or exclusiveness of the female is embedded within the honor of some man' in the first-century Mediterranean world, both lose their honour if the male fails to protect the honour of the female (Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, 3rd rev. and exp. ed., Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001, 48).

<sup>386</sup> Fox, 'Crimes,' 45.

<sup>387</sup> Byrne, *Romans*, 453; cf. Reid, 'Prison,' 754.

<sup>388</sup> Chrysostom, *Romans*, NPNF<sup>1</sup> 11:554.

<sup>389</sup> Skinner, 'Chains,' 275f.

necessary ‘part of the divine plan for the spread of the gospel’ (cf. Philippians 1:12-14).<sup>390</sup>

In calling Junia his *συναιχμάλωτος*, Paul does more than merely state that she was in prison with or like him at one point in her life. By binding her and Andronicus’ experience to his own using *συν*,<sup>391</sup> he likely highlights that he does not see her imprisonment (or more likely her imprisonments)<sup>392</sup> as a sign of failure but as a necessary consequence of her ministry. Rather than being tainted by their incarceration, Andronicus and Junia’s ministry is enhanced by their willingness to suffer for Christ’s sake. Read in this light, *συναιχμάλωτος* seems to set the stage for the following descriptive phrase *οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις*. Comparable to Paul, who understands his own sufferings as an essential part of his apostolic ministry,<sup>393</sup> Andronicus and Junia are also among the apostles who, by no other than God himself, have been put ‘on display at the end of the procession, like those [captives of war] condemned to die in the arena’ (1 Corinthians 4:9, NIV).<sup>394</sup> Maybe it is precisely their willingness to be ‘dishonoured’ for the sake of Christ (1 Corinthians 4:10, NIV) that makes them ‘outstanding’ in Paul’s eyes.

### 3.2.2. *The implications of ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις*

As already indicated, a key tenet in this thesis is that context should be the decisive factor in deciding how to translate Romans 16:7d, and it is especially the mention of Andronicus and Junia’s imprisonment that sheds light on the meaning of the description *ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις*. However, past discussions of its meaning, which will be outlined in the following, have

---

<sup>390</sup> Hafemann, ‘Suffering,’ 177. For Paul’s apologetic in Philippians, cf. Reid, ‘Prison,’ 753.

<sup>391</sup> Wolter, *Römer 9-16*, 474.

<sup>392</sup> It can be assumed that Andronicus and Junia, like Paul, did not refrain from proclaiming the gospel, so they also might have been incarcerated more than once. Cf. Gupta, ‘Imprisonment,’ 396, who emphasises the courage it must have taken to return to their ministry and risk another imprisonment.

<sup>393</sup> P. W. Barnett, ‘Apostle,’ *DPL* 45-51, citing 50.

<sup>394</sup> Cf. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 190, for an interpretation of the metaphor ‘in terms of the Roman triumph’ displaying prisoners of war at the end of the procession.

primarily focused on ‘philological/morphological details,’<sup>395</sup> particularly the precise meaning of the adjective ἐπίσημος in combination with the preposition ἐν plus the dative. Does the phrase mean that Andronicus and Junia were ‘outstanding’<sup>396</sup> among the apostles and thus important persons *within* the apostolic circle (*inclusive* reading)<sup>397</sup> or ‘well-known’<sup>398</sup> to the apostles and hence not part of the apostolic group themselves (*exclusive* reading)?<sup>399</sup>

While the interpretation of the phrase has replaced the gender debate as the new hot potato concerning Romans 16:7, the driving question remains the same: Could a woman be an apostle? Admittedly, the exclusive reading is not new,<sup>400</sup> yet it certainly is interesting that there is a renewed interest in this interpretative option *after* the scales within scholarship have tipped in favour of IOΥΝΙΑΝ as a feminine name.<sup>401</sup>

### 3.2.2.1. *Exclusive versus Inclusive Readings of the ἐπίσημος + ἐν + dative construction*

The most vocal proponents of an exclusive reading of ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις and Junia’s *non*-apostolic status are Michael Burer and Daniel Wallace. In their own words, they offer a more ‘substantive discussion’ on the

<sup>395</sup> Yii-Jan Lin, ‘Junia: An Apostle before Paul,’ *JBL* 139.1 (2020): 191-209, citing 192.

<sup>396</sup> NIV, NASB, NJB (‘outstanding apostles’); cf. similar NRSV (‘prominent among’) as well as RSV, KJV, and NKJV (‘of note among’).

<sup>397</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 172-180; Belleville, ‘Ιουνίαν,’ 242-249; and Epp, *Junia*, 69-78. Byrne, *Romans*, 453; Cranfield, *Romans IX-XVI*, 789; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 894f.; Hultgren, *Romans*, 582; Jewett, *Romans*, 963; Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 885; Wilckens, *Römer*, III:135; and Witherington with Hyatt *Romans*, 390 are among the commentators who assume Junia to be a woman and read the phrase inclusive.

<sup>398</sup> ESV and NET.

<sup>399</sup> Burer and Wallace, ‘Junia,’ 76- 91; Michael Burer, ‘ΕΠΙΣΗΜΟΙ ἘΝ ΤΟΙΣ ἈΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΙΣ in Rom 16:7 as “Well Known to the Apostles”: Further Defense and New Evidence,’ *JETS* 58.4 (2015): 731–755; cf. Murray, *Romans*, 230.

<sup>400</sup> Hodge, for example, argues for an exclusive reading in his *Romans* commentary, first published in 1835 (Charles Hodge, *Romans*, CCC. Wheaton: Crossway, 1994, 392).

<sup>401</sup> Kruse, *Romans*, 562; cf. Hultgren, *Romans*, 583. Käsemann, *Römer*, 398; Michel, *Römer*, 476; and Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 423, are among those who hold to a male reading and consequently seem to have no problem with an inclusive reading of the construction.

question of 'Junia's apostolic status.'<sup>402</sup> Analysing the use of the adjective ἐπίσημος in constructions parallel to Romans 16:7, they conclude that there is a distinctive grammatical pattern. Whereas the adjective is 'almost never' followed by a *dative* construction (simple dative personal modifier or ἐν-plus-dative construction) to convey an *inclusive* meaning, this meaning is 'consistently' expressed by a *genitive* personal modifier.<sup>403</sup> Based on this analysis, one would expect that Paul, if he had wanted to make an implied comparison within the group of apostles, should have used the genitive rather than the ἐν-plus-dative construction.<sup>404</sup> Burer and Wallace's view has been challenged by Bauckham,<sup>405</sup> Belleville,<sup>406</sup> and Epp,<sup>407</sup> who criticise their claims as being made based on an insufficient number of texts,<sup>408</sup> which, in many cases, also could be interpreted contrary to their hypothesis. Belleville convincingly argues that most examples claimed as exclusive can be read with an inclusive meaning, leaving Burer and Wallace only one clear example to support their argument, but it is one which predates the letter to the Romans by five centuries.<sup>409</sup>

In his response to the critics, Burer attempts to affirm their original interpretations<sup>410</sup> and to address 'the charge of paucity' by adding 108 new texts that, in his view, support their original thesis (ἐπίσημος plus genitive = inclusive meaning and ἐπίσημος plus dative = exclusive meaning).<sup>411</sup> However, only a third of these new passages actually have what he calls an 'ἐπίσημος plus (ἐν plus) dative'<sup>412</sup> construction. Furthermore, Lin rightly points out that

---

<sup>402</sup> Burer and Wallace, 'Junia,' 76. The issue is discussed more or less in detail in commentaries and reflected in different translations. Some of the discussion is highlighted in Burer and Wallace, 'Junia,' 78-85.

<sup>403</sup> Burer and Wallace, 'Junia,' 90

<sup>404</sup> Burer and Wallace, 'Junia,' 84.

<sup>405</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 172-180.

<sup>406</sup> Belleville, 'Ιουνίαν,' 242-249.

<sup>407</sup> Epp, *Junia*, 69-78.

<sup>408</sup> Epp, *Junia*, 70; cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 174.

<sup>409</sup> Belleville, 'Ιουνίαν,' 242-248.

<sup>410</sup> Burer, 'Defense,' 736-745.

<sup>411</sup> Burer, 'Defense,' 735f.

<sup>412</sup> Burer, 'Defense,' 748. For the listed passages, cf. 748-754.

Burer was forced to use parentheses because not all of the evidence is “‘exactly parallel” to the ἐπίσημος + ἐν + dative construction of Rom 16:7.’<sup>413</sup> This is especially noteworthy as Burer himself emphasises the importance of viewing the whole construction ‘as a semantic unit.’<sup>414</sup>

Lin states that only eleven of the thirty-six examples are labelled as including the ἐπίσημος + ἐν + dative construction. Yet, one of those uses παρά instead of ἐν,<sup>415</sup> and another<sup>416</sup> uses ἐν without a direct connection to the adjective.<sup>417</sup> Besides, two examples are parallel texts with almost identical constructions.<sup>418</sup> Therefore, they should be considered as a single text, which would deduct another example from the already shrunk list given by Lin. Concerning the remaining eight examples, Lin’s assessment persuasively challenges the exclusive interpretation of several texts based on a more thorough analysis of the historical background, context, or rhetorical structure of the passages.<sup>419</sup>

Based on this evaluation, it is evident that Burer and Wallace’s original thesis – to understand ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις as ‘well known to the apostles’ – is far from being ‘strengthened considerably.’<sup>420</sup> There certainly is a grammatical pattern concerning the adjective in combination with mere genitive and dative modifiers (inclusive vs. exclusive), as shown by Burer’s examples. However, such a clear pattern for the ἐπίσημος + ἐν + dative construction is lacking. There are examples of exclusive and inclusive uses of the construction.<sup>421</sup> All sides of the argument, for example, agree that Euripides

---

<sup>413</sup> Lin, ‘Junia,’ 195.

<sup>414</sup> Burer, ‘Defense,’ 732.

<sup>415</sup> *Scholia in Euripidem, Scholia in Euripidem (scholia vetera)* (date varia) (Burer, ‘Defense,’ 754).

<sup>416</sup> Theodoretus Theol. et Scr. Eccl. (AD 4–5), *Historia religiosa (= Philotheus)*. Vita 2 sec. 6 line 7 (Burer, ‘Defense,’ 754).

<sup>417</sup> Lin, ‘Junia,’ 195.

<sup>418</sup> *Prolegomena de Comoedia, De comoedia* (date varia). Line 22 (ἐν ἅπασιν ἐπίσημος ὀφθεις) and *Comoedia, De comoedia (Anonymus Crameri i)* (date varia). Line 66 (ἐν ἅπασιν ἐπίσημος φανεις) (Burer, ‘Defense,’ 750 and 753).

<sup>419</sup> Lin, ‘Junia,’ 195f., nn. 24 and 25. Burer only comments on the first ten examples and lists the others with translation and data (Burer, ‘Defense,’ 748).

<sup>420</sup> Burer, ‘Defense,’ 755.

<sup>421</sup> Cf. Wolter, *Römer* 9-16, 475f.

uses the construction with an exclusive sense:<sup>422</sup> The goddess Aphrodite is σεμνή γε μέντοι κἀπίσημος ἐν βροτοῖς – ‘revered and renowned among mortals’ (Euripides, *Hipp.* 103 [Dovacs]). However, it is not the construction that makes this sentence exclusive but its content:<sup>423</sup> a goddess does not belong to the group of humans. If the sentence were not about Aphrodite but the hero Achilles, the same construction could mean he was ‘well-known to’ or ‘outstanding among’ his fellow men. This ‘ambiguity of ἐπίσημος + ἐν + dative’ is demonstrated by Lin.<sup>424</sup> Rephrasing Burer and Wallace’s conclusion,<sup>425</sup> it can be said that if Paul had wanted to express that Andronicus and Junia were well-known to the apostles, he should have used a simple dative modifier rather than an ambiguous prepositional construction. Though giving stylistic advice to Paul is indeed tempting, the fact is, rather than choosing a clear-cut expression, he used one that is open to interpretation. If the meaning of the phrase cannot be established on grammatical grounds, interpretations need to move on to what Lin calls ‘the neglected in-between’<sup>426</sup> of Romans 16:7d, its *context*.

### 3.2.2.2. Contextual Readings

In his article on Andronicus,<sup>427</sup> Huttar is one among the few who discusses ‘contextual considerations’<sup>428</sup> in addition to the traditional lexical-grammatical analysis. However, his study of contextual areas that might bear on the interpretation of Romans 16:7d shows insufficient engagement with the conventions of Greco-Roman rhetoric<sup>429</sup> and the specific situation of Romans. For example, he argues that there is no rhetorical reason for Paul to call

<sup>422</sup> Burer and Wallace, ‘Junia,’ 88; Burer, ‘Defense,’ 742; Bauckham, *Women*, 177; and Belleville, ‘Ἰουνίαν,’ 247.

<sup>423</sup> Lin, ‘Junia,’ 197.

<sup>424</sup> Lin, ‘Junia,’ 197.

<sup>425</sup> Cf. n. 404.

<sup>426</sup> Lin, ‘Junia,’ 192.

<sup>427</sup> David Huttar, ‘Did Paul call Andronicus an Apostle in Romans 16:7?’ *JETS* 52.4 (2009): 747-778. Huttar limits his evaluation of Rom 16:7 to the first person greeted ‘to bypass the thorny question of whether Andronicus’s companion was male or female’ (Huttar, ‘Andronicus,’ 747).

<sup>428</sup> Huttar, ‘Andronicus,’ 756-760.

<sup>429</sup> Lin, ‘Junia,’ 200.

Andronicus (and thereby Junia) an apostle because, if they were indeed apostles, the Roman Christians would know that and ascribe them the honour they are due.<sup>430</sup>

Though it is justified to assume that the apostolic status of any member of the Roman congregations must have been known, this does not mean that Paul would not reiterate such a status in his letter. Even though Huttar uses the term encomium concerning the descriptors,<sup>431</sup> Lin rightly highlights that his 'arguments overlook the value and effectual power of [this kind of] ritual or rhetorical praise, wherein known accolades are pronounced'<sup>432</sup> and qualified.<sup>433</sup> Regarding the function of such praise, Pernot points out that it not just 'conferred upon [the objects of praise] the honor owed them' but also 'accomplished what was necessary for their merits to be recognized.'<sup>434</sup> It has been argued above<sup>435</sup> that Andronicus and Junia's ethnicity, their involvement in the clashes with the authorities, and their imprisonments might have prevented some members of the Roman congregations from honouring them or from acknowledging the merits of their long-standing ministry. This might have also impacted the resolve of others who still held them in high esteem. Paul's praise of Andronicus and Junia, therefore, could have been an exhortation for the former to reevaluate their assessment of the couple and encouragement for the latter to persevere in their support of them.<sup>436</sup>

Aside from this, Huttar has not considered whether Paul is deliberately demonstrating his willingness to recognise *their* status in order to raise *his* status among parts of the Roman congregation. In other letters Paul commends known associates who can strengthen his position among the local believers.<sup>437</sup>

---

<sup>430</sup> Huttar, 'Andronicus,' 757.

<sup>431</sup> Huttar, following the church fathers, uses the word concerning the greetings but does not elaborate on what he understands by it (Huttar, 'Andronicus,' 756).

<sup>432</sup> Lin, 'Junia,' 200.

<sup>433</sup> Pernot, *Rhetoric*, 87.

<sup>434</sup> Pernot, *Rhetoric*, 92.

<sup>435</sup> Cf. II.3.1.1. and II.3.2.1.

<sup>436</sup> Cf. Pernot, *Rhetoric*, 96, regarding advice given within an epideictic speech.

<sup>437</sup> Agosto, 'Commendation,' 164.

It is argued that one purpose of the greeting list is to single out persons who could function as 'his advocates within the community,'<sup>438</sup> showing that he already has a 'wide basis of support' in Rome.<sup>439</sup> This is undoubtedly true for those mentioned first in the list, his close friends and co-workers Prisca and Aquila,<sup>440</sup> who can vouch for the trustworthiness of his person and the validity of his message due to their own experience working with Paul in the East. But what about those among the persons greeted who were not known personally to Paul?<sup>441</sup> Their inclusion in the list indicates that Paul was aware that the influence of his associates would not reach into all circles of the Roman congregations.<sup>442</sup> If he wanted his message to be heard among all Roman believers, he needed a wider group of supporters<sup>443</sup> including influential members of the various Christian groups in Rome.<sup>444</sup> Andronicus and Junia likely were people with influence, at least among the Jewish-leaning believers of Rome. If they were not personally known to Paul,<sup>445</sup> the couple and their close supporters were precisely the kind of people Paul would have wanted 'to win to his cause'<sup>446</sup> to ensure a positive reception of his letter and, upon his

---

<sup>438</sup> Gamble, *Romans*, 92; cf. Edwards, *Romans*, 353; Hultgren, *Romans*, 576; and Wilckens, *Römer*, I:33.

<sup>439</sup> Byrne, *Romans*, 446; cf. Moo, *Romans*, 933; Campbell, *Romans*, 415; and Edwards, *Romans*, 353.

<sup>440</sup> Longenecker, *Romans*, 1067.

<sup>441</sup> Whether or not Paul knew a person on the list is usually based on the modifier accompanying the name (cf. n. 112): Dunn generally splits between those who, as personal acquaintances, receive a laudatory remark (vv. 3-13) and those unknown to him who are only named (vv. 14-15) (Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 890f.; cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 734). Wilckens structures the list even more, differentiating between those who, as close associates, are important for his mission (vv. 3-7), those with whom he had some personal connection (vv. 8-13), and unknown persons (vv. 14-15) (Wilckens, *Römer*, III:133; cf. Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, 218).

<sup>442</sup> Contra Byrne, *Romans*, 450, who assumes that Paul was 'a familiar and loved figure for a large section of the community,' and Longenecker, *Romans*, 1069f., who thinks that the first six persons greeted were "heroes of the faith" that 'were most likely still respected by the Christians at Rome.'

<sup>443</sup> Jack Barentsen, 'Pre-Pauline Leadership and Pauline Constitution in the Roman Church: An Alternative Interpretation of Romans 12 and 16,' in *The Letter to the Romans*, ed. Udo Schnelle (Leuven: Peeters, 2009): 595-616, citing 609.

<sup>444</sup> Barentsen, 'Leadership' 599.

<sup>445</sup> Admittedly, the first two descriptors could indicate a personal relationship between Paul and Andronicus and Junia if read as 'relatives' and 'fellow prisoners' in the sense of being in prison *with* Paul. However, if they are read as 'fellow Jews' (cf. II.3.1.1.) and 'fellow prisoners' in the sense of being in prison *for the same reason* (cf. II.3.2.1.), none of the descriptors is personal enough to indicate an acquaintance between them.

<sup>446</sup> Byrne, *Romans*, 451.

arrival in the capital, a warm welcome for himself and his gospel among those who might be suspicious of him due to reports of his conflicts regarding Torah-observance in the East.<sup>447</sup> So even though Paul might not ‘ingratiate himself to a community of believers by aligning himself with ... any apostle,’<sup>448</sup> he is aware of and can use ‘the power of social recognition’<sup>449</sup> provided it aids his message.<sup>450</sup>

It can be questioned whether the alternative reading ‘well-known to the apostle’ could not have the same rhetorical effect.<sup>451</sup> Andronicus and Junia’s reputation among the apostolic circle certainly would have weight among the original Roman believers, considering the presumed links to the Jerusalem church. Yet, why should Paul rely on the ‘approval of other authorities’<sup>452</sup> here when he is perfectly able to commend them himself?

Rather than pointing to other apostles, Lin suggests Paul’s reference to Andronicus and Junia as apostles ‘not only praises Andronicus and Junia but also underscores Paul’s claims to a unique apostleship,’<sup>453</sup> more specifically his role as the *last* eschatological apostle bringing in the full number of the Gentiles.<sup>454</sup> Central to the understanding of ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, in her eyes, is the following πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ placing Andronicus

---

<sup>447</sup> Barentsen, ‘Leadership,’ 609; cf. Moo, *Romans*, 19; and Hultgren, *Romans*, 19. There are indications in the letter (cf. Rom 3:8) that Paul’s message was ‘misrepresented by some’ (Christopher Zoccali, ‘Romans,’ in *T&T Clark Social Identity Commentary on the New Testament*, ed. J. Brian Tucker and Aaron Kuecker, London: T&T Clark, 2020, 257-291, citing 258).

<sup>448</sup> Huttar, ‘Andronicus,’ 757; contra Byrne, *Romans*, 451, who describes Paul’s remark about the couple being ‘outstanding among the apostles’ as fulsome, which leads him to doubt that Andronicus and Junia were personally known to him.

<sup>449</sup> Lin, ‘Junia,’ 203.

<sup>450</sup> Unlike in the Galatian and Corinthian correspondence, in which he emphasises his ‘divinely appointed status’ (Lin, ‘Junia,’ 202; cf. 1 Co 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:1) and rejects any ‘fame-by-association’ with the apostles, (Lin, ‘Junia,’ 200), Paul does not need to defend himself against opponents who attack his message and apostleship in Romans. Due to this less antagonist nature of Romans, Paul can acknowledge other leaders ‘without endangering *the authority of his message*’ (Lin, ‘Junia,’ 203).

<sup>451</sup> Huttar, ‘Andronicus,’ 757f.

<sup>452</sup> Lin, ‘Junia,’ 208; cf. Haacker, *Römer*, 320.

<sup>453</sup> Lin, ‘Junia,’ 206. Lin cautions that her argument ‘steps into the realm of authorial intent and, ..., is fully interpretive and nonabsolute’ (Lin, ‘Junia,’ 202).

<sup>454</sup> Lin, ‘Junia,’ 206f.

and Junia's apostleship before his own.<sup>455</sup> After mentioning other apostles, Paul deliberately adds this temporal reference to underline his claim to have the 'last, and thereby first, place' among the apostolic group.<sup>456</sup> As argued elsewhere, it is doubtful that the Roman audience would have been able to make these connections:<sup>457</sup>

It is much more likely that what the original audience heard was an acknowledgement of both Andronicus and Junia's ministry as apostles and their seniority due to their longer involvement in the life and mission of Christian congregations.<sup>458</sup>

Both 7d and 7e reflect 'rhetorical patterns that were widely known' among Paul's audience:<sup>459</sup> the use of language that implicitly compares the person praised to other persons of the same group ('outstanding among the apostles')<sup>460</sup> and the 'prestige of seniority' ('before me in Christ').<sup>461</sup> In the context of praise, therefore, the most natural reading of ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις must be the inclusive reading 'outstanding among the apostles,'<sup>462</sup> which first and foremost commends the couple to the audience.

Having established the most likely reading of Romans 16:7d, it is necessary to return to a debated issue already touched upon,<sup>463</sup> the meaning of

---

<sup>455</sup> Lin points to the only other use of πρὸ ἐμοῦ in the Pauline literature (Gal 1:17) which also is connected to apostles (Lin, 'Junia,' 208). For a discussion of the link between Romans 16:7d and 7e and its relation to Gal 1:17, cf. II.3.1.2.

<sup>456</sup> Lin, 'Junia,' 208.

<sup>457</sup> The Roman believers, unlike modern scholars, might not have had access to Paul's other correspondence (like the letters to the Corinthians and Galatians on which Lin bases her argument) and, therefore, had to rely on the references to his apostleship within Romans (Romans 1:1, 5, and 11:13) which display the uniqueness of his calling to the Gentiles but lack an emphasis on him being 'last' or 'least.'

<sup>458</sup> Hartmann, 'IOYNIAN,' 648, n. 22.

<sup>459</sup> Christopher Forbes, 'Paul and Rhetorical Comparison,' in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, vol. 1, ed. J. Paul Sampley, rev. ed., London: Bloomsbury, 2016, 143-168, citing 215.

<sup>460</sup> Pernot, *Rhetoric*, 88. Though Pernot points to superlatives specifically, the positive ἐπίσημος fulfils a similar function in the context of comparison.

<sup>461</sup> Pernot, *Rhetoric*, 89.

<sup>462</sup> As seen above, this was also the reading of the native Greek speaker Chrysostom in the fourth century (cf. n. **Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.**).

<sup>463</sup> Cf. II.3.1.2.1.

ἀπόστολος in this specific context.<sup>464</sup> Are Andronicus and Junia apostles in a wider sense, i.e. itinerant missionaries tasked with the spread of the gospel,<sup>465</sup> or are they apostles in a more ‘solemn’ sense, i.e. messengers commissioned by the risen Christ?<sup>466</sup> The question once again is whether Paul would have acknowledged a woman in a role comparable to his own. Brooten, arguing for female leadership, suggests the term implies that ‘Andronicus and Junia were persons of *great authority* in the early Christian community’<sup>467</sup> and Moo, on the other side of the argument, cautions against equating ἀπόστολος with ‘an *authoritative* leadership position’ comparable to the Twelve or Paul himself and consequently opts for a reading that makes the couple lesser apostles.<sup>468</sup> Without further developing his statement, Morris claims that Paul ‘does call them apostles in such a way as gives us no justification of downgrading them.’<sup>469</sup> So are there indicators that point towards an understanding of ἀπόστολος in the solemn sense rather than a wider understanding as missionaries in the case of Romans 16:7?

Firstly, it is important to note what the text does not say. There is no indication of any association with a congregation other than their mention in a letter addressed to those called to be saints in Rome (Romans 1:7). So they are not ‘sent ones’ (apostles) of a specific church,<sup>470</sup> nor is there any mention of any particular congregation founded or led by them. This silence is in stark contrast to Paul’s mention of the gratitude of ‘all the churches of the Gentiles’ towards Prisca and Aquila (Romans 16:4), who, according to Paul’s own witness, worked with him in his ministry, even risking his life for him (Romans 16:3f.),

---

<sup>464</sup> For a general overview of the possible origins of the term and its usage in the New Testament, cf. Karl H. Rengstorf, ‘ἀπόστολος,’ *TDNT* 1:407-447. For a more recent and specific overview of the Pauline usage of the term, cf. Barnett, ‘Apostle,’ 45-51.

<sup>465</sup> Cf. n 213 for proponents of this interpretation.

<sup>466</sup> Barnett, ‘Apostle,’ 47. Cf. n. 215 for others reading the term in this way regarding Andronicus and Junia.

<sup>467</sup> Brooten, ‘Junia,’ 143 (emphasis mine).

<sup>468</sup> Moo, *Romans*, 939f. (emphasis mine).

<sup>469</sup> Leon Morris, *Ministers of God* (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1964), 44.

<sup>470</sup> This ‘nontechnical’ use of the word is found in 2 Corinthians 8:23 and Philippians 2:25 (Barnett, ‘Apostle,’ 47).

and at the very least established a house church in Rome (Romans 16:5) and Ephesus (1 Corinthians 16:19).<sup>471</sup> The appellation ἀπόστολοι in the sense of missionaries, therefore, seems at least equally fitting for Prisca and Aquila. Yet, Paul refrains from using the term for his co-workers and instead chooses to call an otherwise unknown couple 'apostles' for whose ministry we only have tentative evidence. This begs the question of whether there is more to the term in Paul's mind than missionary work.

Looking at 1 Corinthians 9:1, 'the first and most basic test of apostolicity' for Paul seems to be an encounter with the risen Lord ('Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?'); this would also mean that there was a limited number of people who belonged to that circle, and Paul was the last of them (1 Corinthians 15:8).<sup>472</sup> Schnackenburg doubts that 'Paul did [...] know of a uniform concept of apostleship which had clear-cut criteria' like an encounter with the risen Christ.<sup>473</sup> Whereas there were certain circles located in or around Jerusalem for whom 'an appearance of the Lord was ... a qualifying, confirming, identifying, and perhaps also authorizing fact for an apostle,' Paul also saw successful mission work as a mark of apostleship as evidenced by the last question in 1 Corinthians 9:1 ('Are you not my work in the Lord?').<sup>474</sup> According to Schnackenburg, Andronicus and Junia would fall into this missionary category, as it 'seems highly improbable that they had seen the risen Lord.'<sup>475</sup>

Herron, however, suggests that there were 'certain widely acknowledged criteria' in early Christianity which defined an apostle of Christ.<sup>476</sup> These criteria

---

<sup>471</sup> According to Acts, they also worked with Paul in Corinth (Acts 18:2f.) and went with him to Ephesus where they stayed behind (Acts 18:18f.).

<sup>472</sup> Barnett, 'Apostle,' 48; cf. Rengstorf, 'ἀπόστολος,' 422f.

<sup>473</sup> Rudolf Schnackenburg, 'Apostles before and during Paul's Time,' in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday*, ed. W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin, transl. Manfred Kwirán and W. Ward Gasque (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970), 287-303, citing 301.

<sup>474</sup> Schnackenburg, 'Apostles,' 292f.

<sup>475</sup> Schnackenburg, 'Apostles,' 294.

<sup>476</sup> Robert W. Herron, 'The Origin of the New Testament Apostolate,' *WTJ* 45 (1983): 101-31, citing 118.

come to the fore in the Corinthian and Galatian correspondence as Paul's apostleship is challenged. Especially his late and 'untimely' encounter with the risen Christ (1 Corinthians 15:8) seems to have been 'a source of difficulty in establishing the legitimacy of his apostolate to those who questioned it.'<sup>477</sup> So Paul is at pains to demonstrate that he was the last to whom the risen Christ appeared and that his commission for the gentile mission came directly from him and not from any human authority.<sup>478</sup> In light of 'the seriousness with which he defends his own claim to apostleship,' Brooten rightly questions whether Paul would recognise any person as an apostle without being 'convinced that their own apostolic charge had also come from the risen Lord.'<sup>479</sup>

It has been demonstrated above<sup>480</sup> that due to Paul's acknowledgement of their seniority in faith, it is not at all improbable that Andronicus and Junia were among the group of eyewitnesses of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection and their longstanding ministry might indicate the sense of a 'personal commissioning by Him.'<sup>481</sup> In addition to their possible encounter with the risen Christ, the preceding reference to their imprisonment also touches on an essential criterion of Paul's apostleship: They accept 'suffering as a divinely

---

<sup>477</sup> Herron, 'Apostolate,' 117.

<sup>478</sup> Galatians 1:1 ('Paul an apostle ... through Jesus Christ'), Galatians 1:11 ('a revelation of Jesus Christ'), Galatians 1:14f. (God, ..., was pleased to reveal his Son to me'), 1 Corinthians 1:1 ('Paul, called to be an apostle of Christ Jesus'), 1 Corinthians 9:1 ('Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?'), 1 Corinthians 15:8 ('Last of all, ..., he appeared also to me.'). 2 Corinthians 1:1 ('Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus').

<sup>479</sup> Brooten, 'Junia,' 143; cf. Hultgren, *Romans*, 584. Paul's understanding might have developed in that direction due to the controversies surrounding his person. This could explain why Paul in 1 Thessalonians, one of his early letters, has no qualms referring to his co-senders Silvanus and Timothy as 'apostles of Christ' (1 Thessalonians 2:7) despite the fact that at least Timothy cannot be part of the group who encountered the risen Lord before Paul. In later letters, however, Paul refrains from calling Timothy ἀπόστολος. This is especially obvious in 2 Corinthians 1:1 where Paul uses the same terminology as in Thessalonians for himself but refers to Timothy simply as 'the brother' (Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ... καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός).

<sup>480</sup> Cf. II.3.1.2.1. (biographical sketch 2).

<sup>481</sup> Rengstorf, 'ἀπόστολος,' 431, cf. also 422. Rengstorf rightly points out that though all apostles were witnesses of the resurrection, this does not necessarily mean that all who encountered the risen Christ were apostles (Rengstorf, 'ἀπόστολος,' 430).

willed element' in their life.<sup>482</sup> Schnackenburg's description of Paul's understanding of the apostolic ministry (as seen in his defence against the super-apostles in 2 Corinthians) reads like a description of Andronicus and Junia's decades-long ministry in Rome outlined above:<sup>483</sup> 'Instead of self-honour, presumptuous behaviour, and proofs of power, there is labour and suffering, weakness and misery.'<sup>484</sup> Thus, Paul's reference to them as fellow prisoners of war combined with their seniority in faith seems to be indicative of them being apostles of Christ, like himself.

To be more precise, Paul seems to say that they are not just like him; they are even 'better' than him. They precede him in faith and are 'outstanding' among the circle of apostles to which he himself belongs. This touches on the last puzzling aspect of Romans 16:7d, Paul's use of ἐπίσημος in this context. In general, the adjective describes something or someone 'of exceptional quality',<sup>485</sup> hence the translation as 'outstanding.' Yet, what does Paul mean by 'outstanding'? Longenecker proposes that their longstanding Christian ministry in Rome and before that in Judaea presumably makes them exceptional apostles in Paul's eyes.<sup>486</sup> Schnabel argues that their involvement in the foundation of the first Christian congregation in the Roman capital would certainly distinguish them from other apostles.<sup>487</sup> Byrne questions whether Paul's comment is anything more than a flattering remark as it has 'the ring of a studied attempt to be gracious.'<sup>488</sup> In light of his knowledge about their imprisonment(s) and their longstanding ministry, however, Paul's praise likely is sincere and not just flattery, even though he might not have had any exceptional status or special

---

<sup>482</sup> Rengstorf, 'ἀπόστολος,' 440; cf. Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Missionaries,' 431; Epp, *Junia*, 70; and Barnett, 'Apostle,' 50.

<sup>483</sup> Cf. II.3.1.2.2.

<sup>484</sup> Schnackenburg, 'Apostles,' 297.

<sup>485</sup> BDAG, s.v. 'ἐπίσημος,' 1. Its meaning is also given as 'splendid, prominent' (BDAG, s.v. 'ἐπίσημος,' 1.), 'distinguished, distinct, notable' (MGS, s.v. 'ἐπίσημος,' A.), 'remarkable' (LSJ, s.v. 'ἐπίσημος,' II.3.), and 'of note, illustrious' (GELNT, s.v. 'ἐπίσημος,' 2.).

<sup>486</sup> Longenecker, *Romans*, 1069.

<sup>487</sup> Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 886.

<sup>488</sup> Byrne, *Romans*, 451.

authority in mind when he used ἐπίσημος in a comparative sense. Walters concludes that ‘Andronicus and Junia were “outstanding among the apostles” by virtue of their Jewish background, their apostolic sufferings, and the years they had been in Christ,’<sup>489</sup> thereby highlighting similarities with the other early apostles<sup>490</sup> rather than exceptional qualities that differentiated Andronicus and Junia from them.

Nevertheless, there might be more to Paul’s use of ἐπίσημος, especially within the rhetorical setting of praise. Both the reference to their Jewishness, pointing to their foreignness, and the reference to their imprisonment, highlighting their dishonour, would have been perceived as qualities to shame rather than to commend them by a Roman audience. Starting his recommendation of the couple in this way shows his ability to turn a rhetorical convention on its head. He *praises* them for the very things that make them obnoxious and *shameful* in the eyes of the gentile Greco-Roman audience. Moreover, Paul’s choice of ἐπίσημος might play on their prejudices against the couple. In addition to the positive sense of ‘outstanding,’ the adjective can also be understood negatively as ‘notorious.’<sup>491</sup> The only other time it is found in the New Testament, it is used with a negative connotation to describe Barabbas as ‘a notorious prisoner’ (δέσμιον ἐπίσημον).<sup>492</sup> Thus, following the description as fellow prisoners (συναιχμαλώτους μου), it seems quite natural to understand ἐπίσημος in the negative sense. This could also explain why Paul chooses the ambiguous ἐπίσημος + ἐν + dative construction over a more clear-cut expression. The way Romans 16:7d is phrased allows the audience to hear ‘my fellow prisoners who are notorious in the eyes of the apostles,’ yet only for a moment. Paul’s following acknowledgement of Andronicus and Junia’s

---

<sup>489</sup> James Walters, “Phoebe” and “Junia(s)” – Rom. 16:1-2, 7, in *Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity*, vol. 1, ed. Carroll D. Osburn (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2007), 167-190, citing 190.

<sup>490</sup> Peeler, ‘Junia/Joanna,’ 282.

<sup>491</sup> BDAG, s.v. ‘ἐπίσημος,’ 2. Its meaning in the negative sense is also given as ‘infamous’ (MGS, s.v. ‘ἐπίσημος,’ A.; cf. *GELNT*, s.v. ‘ἐπίσημος,’ 2.) and ‘conspicuous’ (LSJ, s.v. ‘ἐπίσημος,’ II.3.).

<sup>492</sup> Matthew 27:16.

seniority in faith unequivocally reminds those critical of the couple that Paul has never left the realm of praise. Paul commends them because they embody what it means to be a fully committed apostle of Christ. What makes them 'outstanding among the apostles' is their willingness to become notorious in the eyes of the world,<sup>493</sup> even to the point of forsaking their own honour for the sake of Christ's name. Considering that praise can function as an exhortation to imitate the object of praise,<sup>494</sup> Paul might challenge the audience not just to rethink their attitude towards the couple but also to emulate their exceptional and longstanding service to Christ.

Presenting Andronicus and Junia as models to imitate would be all the more exceptional if, unlike often assumed, they were not part of Paul's missionary associates proclaiming the gospel among Gentiles but apostles to the Jewish community of Rome. Paul, by acknowledging them and their ministry despite their possible differences on matters of the law, might do what he asks the Roman Christian community to do: He does not 'pass judgment' (Romans 14:13) but indicates that when he comes, he will welcome them as he hopes to be welcomed by them (Romans 15:7). In this way, he also urges those who are strong not to 'despise'<sup>495</sup> Andronicus and Junia either and encourages others to give him, who might be perceived as 'dangerous antinomian,'<sup>496</sup> the benefit of the doubt. Therefore, the greeting in Romans 16:7 might represent a microcosm of the issues in the Roman congregations and the challenges Paul might have faced in asking an unknown group of believers to welcome and support him. This aligns with Weima's analysis; he argues that the commendatory function of the greetings 'supports Paul's larger purposes in the letter.'<sup>497</sup> Thus, we might be able to correct, confirm, or even contribute new

---

<sup>493</sup> Cf. 1 Corinthians 4:13.

<sup>494</sup> Pernot, *Rhetoric*, 94; cf. Agosto, 'Commendation,' 164, who argues that Pauline commendation 'identifies models to be emulated.'

<sup>495</sup> Cf. Romans 14:3.

<sup>496</sup> Lin, 'Junia,' 208.

<sup>497</sup> Weima, *Paul*, 187.

layers to the discussion about who Junia was by looking at the place of Romans 16:7 within the greetings section and how this section relates to the wider letter.

#### 4. The Greeting in its Context - Reading between the Lines

So far we have zoomed in on the one verse in which Junia, the focal point of this investigation, is mentioned. Changing the scales from the analysis of the whole pericope to one verse has enabled us to have a detailed look at *what* Paul says about Junia specifically. Moreover, it has allowed us to ask *why* he describes *her* and Andronicus in this specific way without losing sight of the couple in general discussions about the purpose of the greeting section. It is now time to zoom out and place the verse within those wider considerations regarding this passage, which, due to the large number of people listed, as well as Paul's extensive use of the second person plural greeting ἀσπάσασθε (repeated fifteen times throughout the pericope),<sup>498</sup> is unique within the Pauline corpus.<sup>499</sup>

##### 4.1. Romans 16:7 and the Purpose of the Greeting Section

Throughout the analysis of Romans 16:7, it was evident that interpreting the verse in isolation from its wider context and its socio-historical background would only reap meagre results. The sketch of Junia's life and ministry has become richer by linking what Paul says *about her* to the purpose behind his greeting *to her* and by placing her within the history of the Christian community in Rome. One of the major findings was that Junia might not have been personally known to Paul<sup>500</sup> and, even more significantly, might not have

---

<sup>498</sup> Apart from the common exhortation 'to greet one another with a holy kiss' (cf. 1 Corinthians 16:20; 2 Corinthians 13:12; 1 Thessalonians 5:26) which is also found at the end of the greeting section of Romans, ἀσπάσασθε is used only once in Philippians 4:21 (the only comparable occurrence in an undisputed letter) and once in Colossians 4:15.

<sup>499</sup> Jewett, *Romans*, 951; cf. Thielman, *Romans*, 705 and Wilckens, *Römer*, III:133.

<sup>500</sup> Cf. 3.2.1 for the argument regarding an imprisonment like Paul rather than with Paul.

shared his outlook on the place of the law within the Christian faith.<sup>501</sup> In light of these findings, it is hard to see her as an advocate of Paul's person and gospel within the community of Rome. This runs counter to suggestions that all people addressed in Romans 16:3-16 are acquaintances of Paul who could act as character references for him.<sup>502</sup> These people would not only know him but also agree with his teaching.<sup>503</sup> Thus, the purpose of the greeting section would be to promote Paul's credibility<sup>504</sup> and the validity of his gospel to the wider Christian community in Rome.<sup>505</sup> Listing his associates in this way could also serve as a reminder of Paul's wide support among the Roman Christian community<sup>506</sup> and the bond he already shares with them through his associates despite not having met them so far.<sup>507</sup>

Though the principle that "'common acquaintances'" more easily convert strangers to confidants'<sup>508</sup> might have been on Paul's mind, it cannot apply to those in the greeting section who were only known to him by reputation. Byrne argues that another aim of the greeting section was 'to win over further supporters to his cause.'<sup>509</sup> This would explain why Junia, even though unknown to Paul, is mentioned early in the greeting list. Due to her longstanding ministry and her link to the very beginnings of the Jesus movement, she might have been revered by many within the Roman community and, therefore, would have been an excellent ally for Paul. Yet, there are reasons why Junia, who likely belonged to the Jewish Christian minority in Rome, 'might... have been less than overjoyed at the prospect of a

---

<sup>501</sup> Cf. 3.1.1 for the argument that their description as *συγγενεῖς* emphasises their Jewishness in a way that might indicate a more conservative stance on the law.

<sup>502</sup> Hultgren, *Romans*, 576; cf. Lampe, *Rome*, 156

<sup>503</sup> Schreiner, *Romans*, 765.

<sup>504</sup> Longenecker, *Romans*, 1064; cf. L. Ann Jervis, *The Purpose of Romans: A Comparative Letter Structure Investigation*, JSNTSup 55 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991), 151.

<sup>505</sup> Schreiner, *Romans*, 765; cf. Campbell, *Romans*, 415.

<sup>506</sup> Cf. n. 439.

<sup>507</sup> Hultgren, *Romans*, 576; cf. Wilckens, *Römer*, III:134; Lampe, *Rome*, 156; and Wolter, *Römer* 9-16, 483.

<sup>508</sup> Lampe, *Rome*, 156.

<sup>509</sup> Byrne, *Romans*, 446.

visit' from Paul, who was rumoured to be 'a dangerous and even reckless innovator'<sup>510</sup> doing away with Jewish customs. Even among the gentile majority, his interference might not have been appreciated, considering 'Paul's history of difficulties with provincial authorities and repeated imprisonments and the involvement with riots and other public disturbances.'<sup>511</sup> Honouring highly respected people in the Roman Christian community could increase his own reputation within the respective congregations, especially if Paul manages to associate 'himself so closely with such persons that he himself shares in the commendation they receive.'<sup>512</sup>

In the case of Junia, however, the analysis has shown that Paul's commendation might have had another function located in the situation of those greeted and the wider Roman community rather than Paul's situation. Though respected in some segments of the Christian community in Rome, Junia might have encountered condescension rather than respect from other believers. So instead of being a possible supporter for Paul, she might have needed assistance herself. Schreiner suggests that 'Paul allies himself with [her]' by honouring her in a way that encourages others to do the same.<sup>513</sup> Based on the tensions described in chapters 14 and 15, Witherington argues that the main aim of the greeting section is to urge the gentile majority of his audience to welcome the marginalised Jewish minority back into the community after they have returned from their exile.<sup>514</sup> His approach depends on two factors: 1) All persons greeted are Jewish Christians<sup>515</sup> and 2) at the time of writing, 'Jewish Christians, and in particular their leadership, are just beginning to reestablish

---

<sup>510</sup> Calvin J. Roetzel, *The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context*, 6th ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2015), 137.

<sup>511</sup> Jewett, *Romans*, 90. Even if the evidence of Acts is discounted (Acts 16:19-25, Acts 17: 6-9; Acts 18: 12-17; Acts 19: 28-41), Paul lists imprisonments, floggings, lashes, and beatings in 2 Corinthians 11:23-25 and implies his own imprisonment(s) when calling Andronicus and Junia his fellow prisoners.

<sup>512</sup> Weima, *Paul*, 190.

<sup>513</sup> Schreiner, *Romans*, 763f.; cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 952.

<sup>514</sup> Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 379.

<sup>515</sup> Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 395f.; cf. Longenecker, *Romans*, 1066.

themselves in Rome.<sup>516</sup> Yet, only three of the persons greeted are identified as Jewish (Andronicus, Junia, and Herodion). Moreover, it has been argued above<sup>517</sup> that despite the Claudian edict, there was never a period without a Jewish Christian presence in Rome. Therefore, the marginalisation of Jewish Christian returnees is unlikely the immediate historical background that occasioned the greeting section. Nevertheless, in light of Paul's elaboration of Israel's continued role in God's plan and his exhortation to the Gentiles to remember their Jewish root in Romans 11, as well as the indicators in chapters 14 and 15 that there were tensions based on different opinions regarding Jewish customs, one of Paul's aims was to encourage the gentile majority to embrace their fellow Jewish believers.

However, considering that Paul phrases the preceding paraenesis not specifically along ethnic lines, a more general application seems plausible for the greeting list as well. Mathew concludes that the greetings are meant to be a 'first practical step towards the fulfilment of the exhortations ... to practice love, welcome, and honour to one another (Romans 12-15).'<sup>518</sup> Considering that Paul seems to be aware that there were several Christian congregations meeting separately in different places throughout the city rather than together in a central place of worship,<sup>519</sup> his aim might have been to promote unity among them.<sup>520</sup> It is likely that even without disagreements over theological or ethical matters, like the tensions mentioned in Romans 14-15, 'the practicalities of space created ... divisions.'<sup>521</sup> In light of these divisions, a central goal regarding

---

<sup>516</sup> Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 12.

<sup>517</sup> Cf. II.3.1.2.2.

<sup>518</sup> Mathew, *Women*, 165; cf. Thielman, *Romans*, 704.

<sup>519</sup> Lampe, *Rome*, 359f. Lampe assumes that in Romans 16 alone 'at least seven separate islands of Christianity' are indicated (Lampe, *Rome*, 359; cf. Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 867). More cautious approaches identify five groupings in vv. 5, 10, 11, 14, and 15 (Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 891; cf. Hultgren, *Romans*, 578 and Thielman, *Romans*, 708).

<sup>520</sup> Eduard Lohse, *Der Brief an die Römer*, KEK 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 2003, 406; cf. Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 871.

<sup>521</sup> John Ziesler, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, TPINTC (London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity International, 1989), 349.

Paul's letter to the Romans might have been 'to unify the church in Rome'<sup>522</sup> so that all, Jews and Gentiles alike, could 'live in harmony with one another' and 'with one voice glorify the God and Father of [their] Lord Jesus Christ' (Romans 15:5).

Aside from Paul's genuine pastoral concern for the unity of the Roman community, there also might be a practical reason for Paul's desire to bring the Roman congregations together. He was hoping that the Romans would support his mission west to Spain (Romans 15:24) and that their support would be more effective if the congregations were not 'torn apart by strife.'<sup>523</sup> This interplay between his concern for the Roman community and his need for their support in the mission that lay ahead of him shows how complex and multifaceted the reasons behind the greeting section as a whole and each individual greeting could be. Moreover, the persons greeted are not a homogenous group, nor is Paul's audience to whom they belong.<sup>524</sup> One greeting, therefore, could communicate different things to different groups, as suggested for the greeting to Junia. It could be a call to honour Junia for her sacrificial service to the gospel for those who might have despised her for her Jewishness and/or her run-ins with the Roman authorities. For others Paul's acknowledgement of Junia's seniority might have calmed fears regarding his visit and helped prepare a welcome for him among the Torah-obedient segments of the Roman church. This double function relating both to the situation of those within the community, as well as Paul's situation trying to win the Romans for his gospel and mission, can also be found in the immediate context preceding Romans 16:7, the greetings to Prisca and Aquila, Epaenetus, and Mary (Romans 16:3-6).

---

<sup>522</sup> Schreiner, *Romans*, 24f.

<sup>523</sup> Schreiner, *Romans*, 25.

<sup>524</sup> Though Paul uses the second-person greeting ἀσπάζασθε which is usually used to greet a third party (Mullins, 'Greeting,' 420), Weima convincingly argues that in the context of Romans it 'functions virtually as a surrogate for a first-person greeting' (Weima, *Paul*, 184; cf. Gamble, *Romans*, 92f., who has no doubt that 'the recipients of the greeting stand within the circle of readers;' contra cf. Campbell, *Romans*, 415, who argues those greeted 'have not been included among the specific addressees of the letter').

#### 4.2. Romans 16:7 and the Structure of Romans 16:3-7

Paul asks his audience to convey greetings to twenty-four named and two unnamed individuals, two households, and three other groups of believers. Yet, not all of them receive the same attention as the first six persons (Prisca, Aquila, Epaenetus, Mary, Andronicus, and Junia).<sup>525</sup> Whereas descriptive phrases are found for almost all people greeted, the first six are also described with relative clauses.<sup>526</sup> Moreover, the four greetings at the beginning seem to be a closed unit with a specific order<sup>527</sup> compared to the seemingly arbitrary series of greetings following.<sup>528</sup> A first schematic outline of the verses could look like this:<sup>529</sup>

*A married couple (Prisca and Aquila) and the church in their house*  
*a single man (Epaenetus)*  
*a single woman (Mary)*  
*A (married?) couple (Andronicus and Junia)*

Two observations regarding Junia can be made from this outline. First, the similarity between the greeting to Prisca and Aquila, whom we know to be husband and wife, and the one to Andronicus and Junia makes it more likely that they were also married.<sup>530</sup> Second, there is no greeting to a church meeting in Andronicus and Junia's house, which is noteworthy considering the other parallels with the greeting to Prisca and Aquila. In contrast to the groups mentioned later (vv. 14f.), there is also no indication that others are *σὺν αὐτοῖς* ('with them'). Thus, it should not be assumed lightly that 'they too were the focus of a house church.'<sup>531</sup> Instead, it should be asked why there is no mention of any congregation in their greeting, even though it seems likely that at least

---

<sup>525</sup> Paul spends 79 words on the first six people compared to 113 for the remaining 20.

<sup>526</sup> Outside of Romans 16:3-7, only Persis (Romans 16:12) is described with both an apposition and a relative clause.

<sup>527</sup> Wolter, *Römer 9-16*, 466f.

<sup>528</sup> Jewett, *Romans*, 952, who suggest the order of all greetings including Romans 16:3-7 is arbitrary.

<sup>529</sup> Adapted from Michael Theobald, *Römerbrief Kapitel 12-16*, SKKNT 6/2 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1993), 220.

<sup>530</sup> Theobald, *Römerbrief 12-16*, 229.

<sup>531</sup> Contra Byrne, *Romans*, 451.

Torah-observant believers would have flocked around those pillars of the faith. If they were itinerant missionaries,<sup>532</sup> the absence of a greeting to a house church might be explained by their temporary involvement in the Roman community. Yet, it is unlikely that Paul would address them in this section if they were only passing through. The lack of mention regarding a community around them, even though they presumably were foundational members of the Roman community,<sup>533</sup> more likely reflects their waning influence among the gentile segments of the community and their disrupted presence among the Jewish-leaning believers due to their imprisonment(s).

Regarding the purpose of the greeting section, the first four greetings might also be instructive. Theobald suggests that within the greeting section, Jewish and gentile Christians are listed next to each other, and in the first four greetings, two Jewish couples embrace the two individual gentile Christians Epaenetus and Mary:<sup>534</sup>

*Prisca and Aquila (Jewish, cf. Acts 18:2f.)*

*Epaenetus (gentile)*

*Mary (gentile, due to name<sup>535</sup>)*

*Andronicus and Junia (Jewish, cf. Romans 16:7)*

Such a structure could demonstrate the unity between Jews and Gentiles to which Paul calls the Roman Christians. However, the ethnicity of those greeted is only highlighted in Andronicus and Junia's case. Paul's focus regarding Prisca and Aquila is their role in the gentile mission, and the descriptors given about Epaenetus and Mary do not clearly indicate whether they are Jews or Gentiles.<sup>536</sup>

---

<sup>532</sup> Cf. n. 213.

<sup>533</sup> Cf. n. 231

<sup>534</sup> Theobald, *Römerbrief 12-16*, 228.

<sup>535</sup> Theobald suggests the variant reading Μαρίαμ (transliteration of Hebrew Miriam) which is found in several manuscripts is secondary and the name, therefore, reflects the female form of the Latin *Marius*, a Roman name (Theobald, *Römerbrief 12-16*, 228).

<sup>536</sup> Cf. n. 545 for the possibility of Epaenetus being a Diaspora Jew, cf. n. 145 and III.3.3. for Maria as a common name among Diaspora Jews (in Rome).

A more likely approach is that of Bauckham, who suggests that out of the six people greeted, the first three (Prisca, Aquila, and Epaenetus) are persons ‘of special personal significance to [Paul], owing to their role in the Aegean mission,’ whereas the other three (Mary, Andronicus, and Junia) ‘had pioneered and led the Christian mission in Rome.’<sup>537</sup> The indicators for this reading are found in the summary of the descriptors in the following outline of Romans 16:3-7.<sup>538</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Ἀσπάσασθε Πρίσκαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν Greet Prisca and Aquila,	Greeting to Prisca and Aquila
τοὺς συνεργούς μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, my fellow workers in Christ Jesus,	Apposition: Relation to Paul
<sup>4</sup> οἵτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν, who risked their own necks for my life,	Relative clause 1: Role in <i>Paul's life</i>
οἷς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστῶ ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν, to whom not only I give thanks but all the churches of the Gentiles,	Relative clause 2: Role in <i>gentile mission</i> in general
<sup>5</sup> καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν. and [greet] the church in their house.	Greeting to the church in their house
ἀσπάσασθε Ἐπαίνετον Greet Epaenetus,	Greeting to Epaenetus ( <i>gentile</i> )
τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου, my beloved,	Apposition: Relation to Paul
ὅς ἐστιν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς Χριστόν. who is the first fruits of Asia in Christ.	Relative clause: Role in <i>Paul's ministry</i>
.....	
<sup>6</sup> ἀσπάσασθε Μαρίαν, Greet Mary,	Greeting to Mary ( <i>Jewish?</i> )
?	No apposition

<sup>537</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 181.

<sup>538</sup> Translation mine.

ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ὑμᾶς. who worked hard among you.	Relative clause: Past role in <i>Roman Church</i>
ᾧ σπᾶσασθε Ἀνδρόνικον καὶ Ἰουνίαν Greet Andronicus and Junia,	Greeting to Andronicus and Junia
τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου καὶ συναιχμαλώτους μου, my fellow Jews and my fellow prisoners (of war),	2 appositions: in common with Paul <i>Jewish</i> and Prisoners due to <i>ministry</i>
οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, who are outstanding among the apostles,	Relative clause 1: Praise of <i>their ministry (likely in Rome)</i>
οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ. who also were in Christ before me.	Relative clause 2: Acknowledgement of their seniority
?	No greeting to a church in their house

Following this outline, the first three undoubtedly are people who could vouch for Paul and his gentile mission. Prisca and Aquila are ‘a couple of long acquaintance and association’<sup>539</sup> with Paul, and they have worked with him in the East. Dunn even suggests they are ‘two of the most important people in Paul’s missionary enterprise.’<sup>540</sup> As his friends and coworkers, they ‘can testify to the Roman Christians from firsthand experience about Paul’s apostleship and the success of his gospel.’<sup>541</sup> However, their standing within the Roman community might have suffered<sup>542</sup> due to the memory of their involvement in the events that led to the Claudian edict and their prolonged stay in the East after their expulsion. Paul’s insistence that they ‘earned the gratitude of all the Gentile churches’ could hint at the lack of such gratitude in Rome and thus be an exhortation to give them the respect and welcome they deserve.<sup>543</sup>

<sup>539</sup> Hultgren *Romans*, 580.

<sup>540</sup> Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 891; cf. Edwards, *Romans*, 354.

<sup>541</sup> Weima, *Paul*, 190.

<sup>542</sup> Contra Longenecker, *Romans*, 1068, who suggests they were ‘highly respected’ in Rome.

<sup>543</sup> Cf. Byrne, *Romans*, 451.

As the ‘first convert in Asia’ (Romans 16:5), Epaenetus might have come from Ephesus to Rome with Prisca and Aquila.<sup>544</sup> Even though he was likely a gentile Christian,<sup>545</sup> the Romans might not have welcomed him with open arms, considering he was a foreigner from the East following two troublemakers. Though it is not clear what kind of relationship Epaenetus had with Paul, his description as τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου (‘my beloved’) indicates that he was personally known to and treasured by him. The metaphor Paul uses to express Epaenetus’ conversion (ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας – ‘the first fruits of Asia’<sup>546</sup>) might reflect Paul’s understanding of his mission as bringing in the Gentiles ‘as an acceptable and holy offering [to God]’ (Romans 15:16).<sup>547</sup> Epaenetus thereby would not just be ‘living proof of the genuineness and effectiveness of Paul’s gospel’<sup>548</sup> but also of the divine approval regarding his mission. Even if he was not Paul’s<sup>549</sup> but Prisca and Aquila’s convert,<sup>550</sup> he likely was intrinsically linked with the Pauline mission through the couple, and like them he could bear witness to its impact on both Jews and Gentiles.

Mary (Romans 16:6), however, is not linked to Paul’s ministry in any way. There is no personal description indicating a special relationship with Paul.<sup>551</sup> Moreover, the descriptive relative clause focuses on Mary’s hard work for the Roman community, not any work for or with Paul.<sup>552</sup> Therefore, it is likely that Paul has only heard about her.<sup>553</sup> Rather than being one of his associates, she might be one of the people Paul tries to win as supporters of his mission.

---

<sup>544</sup> Byrne, *Romans*, 451; cf. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 893 and Jewett, *Romans*, 960.

<sup>545</sup> Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 893; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 736; and Wolter, *Römer 9-16*, 472; contra Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 386, who argues that in light of Paul’s mission strategy to preach in synagogues first (cf. Acts), Epaenetus might be a Diaspora Jew.

<sup>546</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>547</sup> Thielman, *Romans*, 717f.

<sup>548</sup> Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 386; cf. Weima, *Paul*, 190.

<sup>549</sup> Cf. Weima, *Paul*, 190.

<sup>550</sup> Moo, *Romans*, 937; cf. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 893.

<sup>551</sup> Cf. n. 112.

<sup>552</sup> The variant reading εἰς ἡμᾶς (‘for us’) instead of εἰς ὑμᾶς (‘for you’) is only ‘weakly supported in the textual tradition’ (Longenecker, *Romans*, 1060; cf. Cranfield, *Romans IX-XVI*, 787).

<sup>553</sup> Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 733; cf. Lampe, *Rome*, 168; contra Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 883.

Though it cannot be deduced from the verb κοπιᾶω<sup>554</sup> what kind of work Mary did among the Romans,<sup>555</sup> the fact that Paul uses the verb and noun for his own mission work and the congregational work of others<sup>556</sup> at least allows for the possibility that Mary ‘worked hard to advance the gospel in Rome’<sup>557</sup> and might have had an important,<sup>558</sup> if not leading role<sup>559</sup> within the Roman community. If she was ‘one of the earliest members of the church at Rome,’<sup>560</sup> she was more likely a Jewish than a gentile Christian.<sup>561</sup> Like (or even with?)<sup>562</sup> Andronicus and Junia, she might have come to Rome from Jerusalem<sup>563</sup> and might be well respected among the Jewish-leaning segment of the Roman church. Yet, she also could have faced a break or even end of her ministry. The aorist verb form Paul chooses to describe her work (ἐκοπίασεν) indicates ‘some past endeavor.’<sup>564</sup> Though she might have gotten too old or sick to be actively involved in mission or congregational work,<sup>565</sup> she could be another Jewish person, alongside Andronicus and Junia, whose ministry suffered due to the growing “law-free” gentile element within the Roman Christian church.

---

<sup>554</sup> It generally means ‘to toil, work hard, labor’ (MGS, s.v. ‘κοπιᾶω’) and can refer to physical, mental, or spiritual exertion (BDAG, s.v. ‘κοπιᾶω’).

<sup>555</sup> Wolter, *Römer 9-16*, 472; contra Adolf von Harnack, ‘Κόπος (Κοπιᾶν, Οἱ Κοπιῶντες) im frühchristlichen Sprachgebrauch, *ZNW* 27.1 (1928): 1-10, citing 4-6, who sees a clear usage of the term in Paul for mission and church work; cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 961 and Mathew, *Women*, 109f.

<sup>556</sup> Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 894; cf. list of verses in Harnack, ‘Κόπος,’ 2.

<sup>557</sup> Thielmann, *Romans*, 718; cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 961; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, 220; and Wilckens, *Römer*, III:135.

<sup>558</sup> Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 883.

<sup>559</sup> Hultgren, *Romans*, 581.

<sup>560</sup> Murray, *Romans*, 229.

<sup>561</sup> Cf. Haacker, *Römer*, 320; Jewett, *Romans*, 960f.; Stuhlmacher, *Römer*, 220; and Thielman, *Romans*, 718.

<sup>562</sup> This would constitute a parallel with Epaenetus and his probable relation to Prisca and Aquila. Alternatively, but as speculative, Mary could have been one of the first Roman converts of Andronicus and Junia. This would mean the two missionary pairs are greeted together with the fruit of their labour representing both Jews and Gentiles.

<sup>563</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 181; cf. Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 882.

<sup>564</sup> Morris, *Romans*, 533. Especially in comparison to the present participle used to describe the likely ongoing work of Tryphaena and Tryphosa (Romans 16:12), the verb form indicates that her hard labour has come to an end like that of Persis (Romans 16:12) who also ‘has worked hard (ἐκοπίασεν) in the Lord’ (cf. Haacker, *Römer*, 322 and Morris, *Romans*, 536).

<sup>565</sup> Cf. Morris, *Romans*, 536 and Murray, *Romans*, 231, regarding the reasons for Persis’ past work.

Based on the suggested order of the preceding greetings, Andronicus and Junia, like Mary, are connected more to the Roman Christian community than to Paul. Thus, the immediate context of Romans 16:7 suggests that the couple, like Mary, might not have been personally known to him. It has already been established that neither of the appositions in their greeting necessitates a personal relationship with Paul.<sup>566</sup> Thus, it is feasible to see the couple and their work independently of Paul and his gentile mission. Andronicus and Junia could have had a ministry centred on Rome, which did not focus on Gentiles but on Jews. Thus, it is likely that they were significant figures (maybe even founders and leaders) of the Torah-observant section of the Christian community in Rome.<sup>567</sup> Paul must have known that he could not bypass them, nor is it likely that he wanted to,<sup>568</sup> so he tried to win their support.

This, however, cannot fully explain their prominent place in the greeting list, which seems to be deliberately paralleled with his co-workers Prisca and Aquila. It is not hard to imagine why Paul put this couple at the head of his greetings. Prisca and Aquila had been his co-workers in the past and might have returned to Rome as his 'vanguard' to prepare his visit.<sup>569</sup> They indeed were 'in the best position to mediate Paul's ministry to the church in Rome.'<sup>570</sup>

---

<sup>566</sup> Cf. II.3.1.1. and II.3.2.1.

<sup>567</sup> Other people who might belong to this section of the community within the greeting list are the members of the household of Aristobulus (Romans 16:10), who presumably were 'Jewish Christian slaves belonging to a descendent of Herod the Great' (Thielman, *Romans*, 722f.; cf. Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 394) and Herodion (Romans 16:11) who might have been a member of this household (Thielman, *Romans*, 723; cf. Morris, *Romans*, 535). Even without the identification of Rufus with the Son of Simon of Cyrene in Mark 15:21, he and his mother possibly were Jewish and had a connection to Jerusalem due to their relationship with Paul (cf. Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 895f.).

<sup>568</sup> In Romans 15:20, Paul states that it is not his way 'to build on someone else's foundation' but to reach territories 'where Christ has [not yet] been named.' The way Paul praises the couple's apostleship indicates that he acknowledges the foundation they have laid in Rome. Contra Klein, who argues that 'Paul can consider an apostolic effort in Rome because he does not regard the local Christian community there as having an apostolic foundation' (Günter Klein, 'Paul's Purpose in Writing the Epistle to the Romans,' in *The Romans Debate: Revised and Expanded Edition*, ed. Karl P. Donfried, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991, 29-43, citing 39).

<sup>569</sup> Peter Lampe, 'The Roman Christians of Romans 16,' in *The Romans Debate. Revised and Expanded Edition*, ed. Karl P. Donfried (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 216-230, citing 221; cf. Byrne, *Romans*, 452; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 735; and Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 383.

<sup>570</sup> Moo, *Romans*, 935.

Andronicus and Junia, however, unlikely knew him personally, and their influence did no longer reach beyond a minority group within the Christian community of Rome. In addition, their reputation likely was tarnished, and they might not even be free to welcome him in the capital due to their latest imprisonment. They do not seem to be in a place to advocate for him but rather need an advocate themselves. Paul seems to fill that role by turning their imprisonment into a badge of honour and praising them as ‘outstanding among the apostles’ even in light of the difficulties they encountered throughout their ministry. But maybe he does more than that. Lin suggests that Paul ‘never fails to return to his own role’<sup>571</sup> when mentioning other apostles. Perhaps he does not do so to emphasise his uniqueness as the last apostle, as suggested by Lin.<sup>572</sup> Romans 16:7 reveals first and foremost something about Andronicus and Junia. Still, in his greeting to them, Paul paints a picture of the couple's ministry and role that represents his own mission better than any of his co-workers could: Whereas Prisca and Aquila *had worked with him*, Andronicus and Junia *were like him*. They did not just share a common ancestry or similar experiences of hardship; they also went to the same length to fulfil the calling they were given despite the obstacles put in their way by Greco-Roman and/or Jewish authorities and by the mistrust and conflicts endured from within their own community. Defending the validity of Andronicus and Junia’s apostleship to the Roman Christian community, therefore, might also be a defence of his own.

## 5. Conclusion

At the end of our journey through Romans 16:7, there can be no doubt that the verse entails much more that can be said about Junia than that she is a woman and most likely an apostle, at least in the eyes of Paul. By giving room

---

<sup>571</sup> Lin, ‘Junia,’ 208.

<sup>572</sup> Cf. Lin, ‘Junia,’ 206f.

to each of the descriptors as well as reading the greeting within its literary and historical context, the portrait of Junia has gained some contours:

Andronicus and Junia presumably were a married couple and worked together as a missionary pair in Rome. Paul greets them as 'fellow Jews' and 'fellow prisoners,' commends them as 'outstanding among the apostles' and acknowledges their seniority in faith due to their being 'in Christ' before him.

Based on Paul's reference to her ethnicity in connection with her early conversion, Junia was likely not a native of Rome but an emigrant from the East, more precisely Palestine. The two most plausible scenarios for Junia's origin are:

- 1) Junia was a Diaspora Jew with roots in Rome but residing in Jerusalem. She heard the message about Jesus on the day of Pentecost and became a believer in the aftermath of the events. She left Jerusalem with her husband Andronicus and turned to Rome when the tension with the Jerusalem leadership erupted into persecution. On their arrival, the couple began to share their faith with the Jewish community among which they lived.
- 2) Junia was a Hellenised Palestinian Jew, probably from Galilee, who had been a follower of Jesus already before his last journey to Jerusalem. Together with Andronicus she was among the group of disciples to whom the risen Christ appeared and later also present on the day of Pentecost. When tensions rose in Jerusalem, Andronicus and Junia did not return to Galilee but accompanied some of the Hellenists to Rome. Perhaps they were commissioned by the Jerusalem church to ensure that the message preached in Rome would align with the apostolic teaching.

In each of these sketches, Andronicus and Junia's move to Rome would have happened shortly after the events following the crucifixion. This means their ministry among the Jews of Rome started in the mid-30s. As the couple continued to adhere to Jewish laws, the Jewish community likely tolerated their proclamation of a Jewish messiah. In the lead-up to the year 49 CE something

must have changed. Suetonius's report about the Claudian edict banning Jews from Rome is likely connected to conflicts involving Christians. The arrival of gentile Christians from the East (maybe influenced by Paul's gospel) who no longer thought that adherence to Jewish customs was necessary might have incited new debates about the Christian message, which were no longer centred on a theological disagreement. With some of its adherents abandoning the Jewish way of life, Christianity would have been perceived as a threat to the core of Jewish identity. The altercations must have become so heated, some erupting into uproars, that the Roman authorities felt the need to intervene to restore public order. Andronicus and Junia, as leading figures of the Christian community, likely were involved in the events and might have been considered ringleaders behind the tumults by the authorities. So they would have had to leave Rome.

Independent of the time of their absence, things in Rome would have changed on their return. Afraid of another Roman intervention, the Jewish community likely had distanced itself from Christian believers. Separated from the Jewish community, Christian gatherings with a less Jewish outlook would have developed, and the Christians holding to the Jewish customs slowly might have become a minority. Andronicus and Junia likely belonged to the latter, as Paul's emphasis on their Jewishness in the greeting suggests. Within this group they would have been welcomed back, but their relationship with the gentile believers might have been strained. Though they presumably acknowledged the couple's authority as eyewitnesses to the earthly life of Jesus, they would not have appreciated their emphasis on adherence to certain Jewish customs.

Andronicus and Junia's mission among Jews must also have become much more difficult and was likely more exposed as it could no longer happen within the synagogues. In the event of further altercations, it would have been easy to point the finger at the couple as the culprits responsible for any unrest. The fact that Paul refers to them as 'fellow prisoners' strongly suggests that they did not

shy away from the risk of further confrontations with the Roman authorities. As the incidents were probably more localised, Andronicus and Junia could have been incarcerated rather than banished. Paul's reference to them as his 'fellow prisoners,' therefore, need not point to shared imprisonment but likely highlights the common experience of being imprisoned for the proclamation of the gospel.

That Junia was imprisoned together with her husband, even though the imprisonment of women was rare, indicates that her involvement in their ministry warranted an arrest. This suggests Junia's active and likely public participation in the couple's mission activities. By detaining them the authorities likely hoped to not just stop the couple's activities but also to prevent them from further breaks of the public order.

Prison conditions were dire. Apart from physical hardship (lack of fresh air, light, space, hygiene, and food), Junia was held in the same space as male prisoners and so might have also faced the danger of sexual assault. This would add to the loss of honour generally associated with imprisonment. The fear of shame by association would have prevented many from supporting them during their time in prison. Even after their release, the social consequences of their loss of honour would have remained. Some might have started to question the validity of their ministry in light of their incarcerations and the presumably limited success of winning Jewish converts. Despite their link to the earthly Jesus and their longstanding ministry, it is possible that their reputation suffered across all sections of the community.

Thus, Andronicus and Junia's standing was likely questioned by at least some parts of the Roman Christian community when Paul's letter arrived in Rome. In it, he requests to greet his fellow Jews and prisoners of war, Andronicus and Junia. Likely aware of their situation, Paul commends them to his audience. By highlighting that he shares their Jewishness and that he also has been a prisoner in the past, he probably wants to show his solidarity with

them (and possibly also with all Jewish believers who were looked down upon by the gentile majority). Moreover, in his eyes, their imprisonment is not a reason to doubt but to honour them. In light of his understanding of suffering as a natural consequence of faithful service to the Lord, the most natural reading of the third descriptor is that Paul considers them as 'outstanding among the apostles' because of their willingness to forsake their own honour and safety for the glory of their Lord Jesus Christ. Through his praise, Paul presents them as models of what it means to be an apostle of Christ.

On the one hand, this commendation could be a call to honour Andronicus and Junia, reminding those who questioned their ministry of their faithful service to the Lord, which should be emulated. On the other hand, by acknowledging their role and authority, Paul might have hoped to win the support of the couple and, with them, the support of those in the Roman community who considered him a dangerous antinomian. Finally, defending Andronicus and Junia's apostleship, considering their apparent suffering and failures, might have been a defence of his own apostleship, also marked by hardships, failures, and conflicts with fellow believers.

Considering that Paul saw the encounter with the risen Christ as a central criterion for his apostleship, he would not have referred to Andronicus and Junia as apostles had he not believed them to be witnesses of the resurrection. This suggests the second sketch outlined above is the more likely: Junia was a witness of the resurrection and, therefore, likely already a follower of Jesus during his Galilean ministry. This would make her a Galilean Jew with a Latin name, a bit of an oddity in first-century Palestine, as we will see in the next chapter.

### III. JOANNA = JUNIA – Two Names – One Woman?

#### 1. Introduction

The previous chapter concluded with a biographical sketch that traced Junia's origin to Palestine and Jesus' ministry in Galilee and considered whether her Roman name fits into this scenario. In this chapter we will discuss the origin of the name in relation to the presumed Palestinian origin of Junia. The explanations offered by scholars fall into two categories: 1) the origin of the name is explained within a Greco-Roman context, which makes a Roman origin for Junia more likely, or 2) it is explained from a Jewish context, focusing on a Palestinian origin of the person which would align with the findings of chapter II.

Described by Paul as συγγενής, Junia is likely Jewish, and since she is an addressee of a letter to a city outside of Palestine, we must consider her a Diaspora Jew. The question is whether she was a first-generation Diaspora Jew, i.e. an emigrant from Palestine, or a descendant of emigrants from Palestine, i.e. a Jew born in the Diaspora. From an onomastic point of view, her place of birth might make a difference. If the onomasticon of the Jewish Dispersion differs from the onomasticon of Jewish Palestine, that could help us understand the background of her name. Therefore, the general naming conventions of these two areas will be discussed before looking at the specific hypotheses concerning Junia's name. Lampe's commonly accepted approach<sup>1</sup> and the approaches by Wolters<sup>2</sup> and Bauckham<sup>3</sup> will be summarised and evaluated concerning their linguistic validity and their possible implications for a biographical sketch of

---

<sup>1</sup> Lampe, 'Junia/Iunias,' 132-134.

<sup>2</sup> Wolters, 'IOYNIAN,' 397-408.

<sup>3</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 165-186; cf. also Richard Bauckham, 'Paul and other Jews with Latin Names in the New Testament,' in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J. M. Wedderburn*, ed. Alf Christophersen, Carsten Claussen, Jörg Frey and Bruce Longenecker, JSNTSup 217 (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 202-220.

Junia. The former explains Junia's name within the naming conventions of the Roman world. The latter two emphasise the Palestinian background of the name or its bearer.

## 2. 'Jewish Names in Late Antiquity'<sup>4</sup>

'Names regularly operate as social, cultural and, on occasion, political indicators.'<sup>5</sup> Consequently, naming customs and trends can tell us something about a society at a given time. Sometimes, they can also give us a glimpse into a specific name-giver's approach to their world. In the following section, general trends in the naming conventions of Jewish Palestine between 330 BCE and 200 CE will be summarised and compared to the naming conventions of Diaspora Jews before turning to the specific question of Junia's name.

### 2.1. Jewish Naming Conventions in Palestine<sup>6</sup>

More than 70% of Palestinian Jews recorded in the sources between 330 BCE and 200 CE bore names either mentioned in the Hebrew Bible or derived from such names.<sup>7</sup> With an additional 10% of Semitic names,<sup>8</sup> four out of five Palestinian Jews bore names reflecting their native culture. This does not mean, however, that Hellenisation did not impact the Jewish onomasticon of Palestine. 14.5% of the population bore Greek names,<sup>9</sup> and almost 30% of the names recorded in Ilan's lexicon are of Greek origin (compared to 19.8% of biblical

---

<sup>4</sup> The heading follows the title of the *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity* by Tal Ilan.

<sup>5</sup> Margret H. Williams, 'Palestinian Jewish Personal Names in Acts,' in *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, ed. Richard Bauckham, vol. 4 of *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995), 79-113, citing 80.

<sup>6</sup> Following *LJNLA I* this section will focus on the time between 'the Hellenistic conquest of Palestine' and 'the close of the mishnaic period' (*LJNLA I*, 1).

<sup>7</sup> *LJNLA I*, 4 and 55, table 3.

<sup>8</sup> Most of these names in *LJNLA I* are Aramaic, but Arabic, Palmyran, Nabatean, and Egyptian names also fall into this category (*LJNLA I*, 14). For the percentages, cf. *LJNLA I*, 55, table 3.

<sup>9</sup> *LJNLA I*, 55, table 3.

names and 36.1% of Semitic names).<sup>10</sup> Numbers suggest that Jews were more resistant to the influence of the Roman onomasticon; only one out of ten names is Latin,<sup>11</sup> and the number of people bearing these names is tiny (3%).<sup>12</sup> As choosing a name from a foreign onomasticon could reflect the identification with a foreign cultural milieu, the scarcity of Latin names borne by Palestinian Jews might indicate a reluctance to identify with the foreign power occupying their land. Unlike adopting Greek names which reflected the general impact of Hellenistic *culture* on Palestine, taking on Latin names in first-century Palestine might have been understood as a *political statement*, an expression of a person's 'alignment with Roman political rule'<sup>13</sup>

That political considerations, like anti-Roman sentiments, might have influenced name-choice could be inferred not just from the avoidance of Latin names but more so from the choice of specific Hebrew names during the Roman occupation. The most popular ones (John, Simon, Judah, Eleazar, and Jonathan) did not derive their popularity from biblical namesakes but from the Maccabees.<sup>14</sup> According to Ilan, 31.5% of the male population (excluding members of the Hasmonean family) bore a Hasmonean name,<sup>15</sup> and three of the most popular female names are also recorded for Hasmonean women.<sup>16</sup> That these names were favoured can be seen as 'a glaring indication of ... the widespread support for the Hasmonean revolt.'<sup>17</sup> Due to the patriotic connotations of these names, this way of remembering the past was an

---

<sup>10</sup> *LJNLA I*, 54, table 1.

<sup>11</sup> *LJNLA I*, 54, table 1.

<sup>12</sup> *LJNLA I*, 55, table 3.

<sup>13</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 182.

<sup>14</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 74f.; cf. Rachel Hachlili, 'Hebrew Names, Personal Names, Family Names and Nicknames of Jews in the Second Temple Period,' in *Families and Family Relations as Represented in Early Judaism and Early Christianity: Texts and Fictions*, ed. Jan Willem van Henten and Athalyah Brenner (Leiden: Deo, 2000), 83-115, 85.

<sup>15</sup> *LJNLA I*, 7. The percentage might be even higher (39.9%) if Joseph, a possible sixth brother (2 Maccabees 8:22), is also considered.

<sup>16</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 74; cf. *LJNLA I*, 9.

<sup>17</sup> *LJNLA I*, 7.

expression of hope for a renewed political independence in the present.<sup>18</sup> Aside from the Hasmonean names, Bauckham suggests that the meaning of other popular names might also reflect Jewish hope for an end of pagan rule,<sup>19</sup> and he concludes that 'several of the most popular male names were popular because of their association with the nationalistic, religious expectations of national deliverance and restoration by God.'<sup>20</sup>

As Jews in Palestine usually only had one personal name, the concentration on a few popular names meant that this name often needed qualification to distinguish a person from another person with the same name. Consequently, a 'considerable variety of ways' to identify a person developed in Palestine.<sup>21</sup> The identification by family relations was most common among them.<sup>22</sup> Usually the father's name was added for men and unmarried women and the husband's name for wives. The personal name, along with the patronymic or andronymic ('X son of Y' or 'X wife of Y'), was considered a person's full or formal name, used for official purposes (e.g. on legal documents).<sup>23</sup> However, the full name as an identifier had its limitations due to the customs of naming sons after their grandfather (paponymy) or their father (patronymy),<sup>24</sup> which meant it was not unlikely that more than one person bore the same full name. Patronymics as sole identifiers, therefore, are mainly found when the father's name is

---

<sup>18</sup> Williams, 'Names,' 107f. Williams also notes that the decline in popularity of the Hasmonean names in the later stages of Roman occupation indicates that the hope of independence was given up and replaced by a 'weary acceptance of Roman rule for the indefinite future' (Williams, 'Names,' 108f.).

<sup>19</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 75-77. Among these names are Joshua, possibly linked to the hope of a reconquest of the land, and John and Hananiah, both imploring God's favour for deliverance from Roman rule.

<sup>20</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 77.

<sup>21</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 78.

<sup>22</sup> *LJNLA I*, 32.

<sup>23</sup> Joseph Naveh, 'Nameless People,' *IEJ* 40.2-3 (1990): 108-123, citing 117; cf. Hachlili, 'Names,' 84.

<sup>24</sup> Hachlili, 'Names,' 88; cf. *LJNLA I*, 32f.

unusual,<sup>25</sup> e.g. Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου – James son of Alphaeus (Matthew 10:3).<sup>26</sup>

Using *alternative names*, i.e. names ‘other than the one conferred ... after birth,’<sup>27</sup> was another way of distinguishing ‘between the large number of homonymous individuals in Palestinian Jewish society at the time.’<sup>28</sup> In line with Williams, the term *alternative names* in this thesis is understood as a hypernym describing the *general usage* of additional names attached to or replacing birth names. Most common among these alternative names were *nicknames*,<sup>29</sup> which were either used affectionately to express closeness with a person or mockingly to disgrace them.<sup>30</sup> Following Naveh,<sup>31</sup> *nicknames* are understood as names designating the origin, occupation, or characteristics (physical features, character traits, etc.) of a person, e.g. Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρηνός – Jesus the Nazarene (Mark 10:47), Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής – John the Baptizer (Matthew 3:1), and Σίμων ὁ λεπρός – Simon the Leper (Mark 14:3).

Nicknames could replace a person’s personal name in their social circles. An example among the Twelve is Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος – Thomas, also called Didymus (John 11:16). As the Greek translation name means ‘twin,’ this is most likely also the meaning of the Aramaic name *Toma*.<sup>32</sup> It then would be a nickname, not a personal name, to differentiate this disciple from another disciple bearing the same personal name.<sup>33</sup> Another example in which a nickname has replaced a personal name is Paul’s use of Κηφᾶς – Cephas (e.g. 1 Corinthians 1:12; Galatians 1:18) and Πέτρος – Peter (Galatians 2:7f.)

---

<sup>25</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 80; cf. Tal Ilan, ‘Names and Naming,’ *EDSS* 2:596-600, citing 597.

<sup>26</sup> Alphaeus, understood by Ilan as a transliteration of the Hebrew name Halfai (*LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Halfai,’ n. 6), is among the ninety-nine most popular male names in that period (rank sixty-one) (Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 87, table 6).

<sup>27</sup> Margaret H. Williams, ‘The Use of Alternative Names by Diaspora Jews in Graeco-Roman Antiquity,’ *JSJ* 38.3 (2007) 307-327, citing 307.

<sup>28</sup> Williams, ‘Use,’ 307f.

<sup>29</sup> Williams, ‘Use,’ 308. Ilan interprets 188 names as nicknames (*LJNLA I*, 58, table 10).

<sup>30</sup> Naveh, ‘People,’ 117; cf. Hachlili, ‘Names,’ 95.

<sup>31</sup> Naveh, ‘People,’ 117; cf. Hachlili, ‘Names,’ 98-109, who also subsumes titles under the term *nicknames*.

<sup>32</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Toma,’ n. 2.

<sup>33</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 105f.

respectively. Though Simon's first name and his patronym were remembered in the gospels, the name he was known by in the early church seems to have been the nickname given to him by Jesus either in its original Aramaic form or in its Greek translation.<sup>34</sup>

Some nicknames, particularly those of members of elite families, were passed on as family names.<sup>35</sup> One such family name is recorded in the gospels as an apparent personal name, Καϊάφας ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς – Caiaphas the high priest, who, according to Josephus, was called Ἰώσηπος ὁ [καὶ] Καϊάφας – [Joseph who was called Caiaphas] (*Jewish Antiquities* 18.35 [Feldman]).<sup>36</sup> This is another example of a personal name substituted by a nickname, which probably means 'the jelly or crust that forms on boiled meat.'<sup>37</sup> That this strange nickname was borne by a prominent priestly family exemplifies that nicknames often 'are incomprehensible to people outside the circles in which they originated.'<sup>38</sup> In other cases, an unusual nickname like the one shared by Yeho'ezer, son of El'azar, *Goliath* and Yeho'ezer, son of Yeho'ezer, *Goliath*, names inscribed on ossuaries of a family tomb in Jericho,<sup>39</sup> can be explained due to a common characteristic. Goliath's stature was remembered as outstanding, making his name the perfect nickname for a family with exceptionally tall members.<sup>40</sup> Due to its connection to an archetypal enemy of Israel, the nickname might have been derogative when it was first attached to an ancestor of the

---

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Mark 3:16 (ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον – He gave the name Peter to Simon); and John 1:42 (σὺ εἶ Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάννου, σὺ κληθήσῃ Κηφᾶς, ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται Πέτρος. – You are Simon, son of John; you will be called Cephas which is translated as Peter). Translations mine.

<sup>35</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 82; cf. Hachlili, 'Names,' 93. Ilan interprets thirty-five names as family names (*LJNLA I*, 58, table 10).

<sup>36</sup> For a detailed discussion of Joseph Caiaphas, cf. Richard Bauckham, 'The Caiaphas Family,' *JSHJ* 10.1 (2012): 3-31.

<sup>37</sup> Bauckham, 'Caiaphas,' 16; cf. *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Qaifa,' n. 1.

<sup>38</sup> Bauckham, 'Caiaphas,' 16. Bauckham's assumption that the name is derived from the handling of sacrificial meat is nevertheless plausible.

<sup>39</sup> *CJO* 783 and *CJO* 799.

<sup>40</sup> Hachlili, 'Names,' 103; cf. Gerard Mussies, 'Jewish Personal Names in some Non-literary Sources,' in *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy*, ed. Jan Willem van Henten and Pieter Willem van der Horst (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 242-276, citing 254.

Goliath family. However, by the time of the name bearers above, the name had lost its sting and had become a respected family name within their social circles.

Sometimes patronymics could substitute a personal name and thereby function as a nickname; this was especially common with Aramaic patronymics, e.g. Βαρτιμαῖος – Bartimaeus (Mark 10:46),<sup>41</sup> meaning son of Timaeus. Not each *bar*-construction is a patronymic though; some are nicknames ‘masquerading as father’s name.’<sup>42</sup> Ἰωσήφ ὁ καλούμενος Βαρσαββᾶς – Joseph called Barsabbas (Acts 1:23) either was known by a patronymic meaning ‘son of Sabba’ or by a nickname meaning ‘son of the old man’ or ‘son of the Sabbath.’<sup>43</sup> Another nickname masquerading as a patronymic probably is Βοανηργέες – Boanerges, understood as the transliteration of an Aramaic composition reflecting the Hebrew בני רגל translated by Mark as ‘sons of thunder’ (Mark 3:17).<sup>44</sup> The reason why Jesus gave this nickname to the sons of Zebedee was undoubtedly known within the discipleship group, but it is lost to us.<sup>45</sup> Common to all New Testament examples of personal names above is that they are among the most popular of the time.<sup>46</sup> These names and other New Testament examples<sup>47</sup> correspond to the variety of nicknames found in Palestinian sources used to distinguish between persons of the same personal name.<sup>48</sup>

In contrast to the consensus on the common use of nicknames as alternative names, there is a discrepancy in the evaluation of the commonness of *second names*, i.e. additional personal names, especially from the Greek or Latin

---

<sup>41</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 79f. Ilan points out that the New Testament is unique in taking the *bar*-element as an ‘integral part of the name,’ perhaps indicating that the name was understood as a nickname (*LJNLA I*, 18).

<sup>42</sup> *LJNLA I*, 46; cf. Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 81.

<sup>43</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 81; cf. *LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Sabba,’ n. 1, supporting the second use proposed by Bauckham.

<sup>44</sup> BDAG, s.v. ‘Βοανηργέες.’

<sup>45</sup> Thayer suggests it denotes ‘a fiery and destructive zeal that may be likened to a thunderstorm’ and points to Luke 9:51-55 as possible background (*GELNT*, s.v. ‘Βοανεργέες’).

<sup>46</sup> James, Jesus, John, Joseph, and Simon are among the twenty most common names in Ilan’s ranking (*LJNLA I*, 56, table 7) and Bauckham’s ranking (Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 85, table 6).

<sup>47</sup> For more examples, cf. Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 78-83.

<sup>48</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 84.

onomasticon that could be used together with (as second or third names) or as substitutes for first names. Bauckham argues that ‘it was not uncommon for Palestinian Jews to have both Semitic and Greek (or, much less commonly, Latin) names,’ pointing to examples from both the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament.<sup>49</sup> Williams considers combining a Greek name and an ethnic name as a ‘practice that was becoming increasingly common’ among the Jewish elite of Palestine based on examples found in Josephus’ writings.<sup>50</sup> Mussies even assumes that most Jewish persons in and outside of Palestine for whom only a foreign name is recorded in the sources had a Hebrew name that was suppressed for unknown reasons and not recorded.<sup>51</sup> However, Hachlili does not mention the phenomenon of second names, and Ilan suggests it is a minor phenomenon.<sup>52</sup> Her view is supported by the evidence presented in her record of the names of Palestinian Jews. For the 2826 Jewish persons listed in *LJNLA I*, only 99 second names are recorded, and only 36 of them are Greco-Roman names.<sup>53</sup> Nonetheless, Ilan admits that foreign naming conventions might have impacted the adoption of second names among Palestinian Jews.<sup>54</sup>

The imitation of a foreign naming practice such as the Roman *tria nomina* (or its actual use as a Roman citizen) needs to be differentiated from the practice of *double names*,<sup>55</sup> i.e. the adoption of an alternative Greco-Roman name as a *substitute name* for a Semitic name in a non-Jewish environment.<sup>56</sup> The former practice could describe name combinations in which both names came from the same ethnic background,<sup>57</sup> like the Greek-Greek combination Ἡρώδης ὁ

---

<sup>49</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 83.

<sup>50</sup> Williams, ‘Use,’ 308.

<sup>51</sup> Mussies, ‘Names,’ 244 and 275.

<sup>52</sup> *LJNLA I*, 47.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. *LJNLA I*, 55, table 2, for the total number of persons and *LJNLA I*, 58, table 10, for the number of second names.

<sup>54</sup> *LJNLA I*, 47.

<sup>55</sup> Contrary to Horsley who defines ‘double names’ generally as ‘additional names adopted by an individual or bestowed on him by others’ (G. H. R. Horsley, ‘Names, Double,’ *ABD* 4:1011-1017, citing 1011), the term ‘double name’ in this thesis is used for this specific practice.

<sup>56</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 83; cf. Williams, ‘Use,’ 320 and Leonard Victor Rutgers, *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora*, Leiden: Brill, 1995, 163f.

<sup>57</sup> Horsley, ‘Names,’ 1015.

κληθεὶς Ἀντίπας – Herod who was called Antipas (Josephus, *Jewish War* 2:167).<sup>58</sup> These name combinations were often a sign of cultural assimilation to the surrounding Greco-Roman world,<sup>59</sup> and they were used in the Jewish *as well as* in the Greco-Roman context.<sup>60</sup> The latter practice describes name combinations drawn from different onomastica (e.g. Hebrew-Greek). Here, *each name* was used *separately* in the Jewish *or* Greco-Roman context. These combinations allowed Jews living in a Greco-Roman world to maintain ‘a dual cultural identity.’<sup>61</sup> The best-known example of such a name combination in the New Testament is Σαῦλος ... ὁ καὶ Παῦλος – Saul, who was also Paul (Acts 13:9).<sup>62</sup> He most likely used his Hebrew name in Jewish circles (e.g. in Jerusalem) and his Latin name in Greco-Roman circles (e.g. in the Greco-Roman cities he visited). Saul/Paul,<sup>63</sup> however, was not a Palestinian Jew. Born in Tarsus in Asia Minor, he belonged to the large Jewish community dispersed throughout the Roman Empire to whose naming practices we now turn.

## 2.2. Jewish Naming Conventions in the Diaspora<sup>64</sup>

‘The choice of personal names by Jews during their long history has always been influenced by two opposing tendencies: faithfulness to national tradition and the wish to conform to the usages of their environment.’<sup>65</sup> Diaspora Jews would have felt these opposing tendencies more strongly than their Palestinian compatriots. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that contrary to the Palestinian findings, names from non-Jewish onomastica were more common in the

<sup>58</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. Ἀντίπατρος, n. 1 and s.v. Ἡρώδης, n. 1.

<sup>59</sup> Horsley, ‘Names,’ 1015.

<sup>60</sup> Yet, one of the names might be dropped in the sources. Herod Antipas is usually referred to as Herod in the New Testament (in Matt 14:1, Mark 6:14, and Luke 3:19).

<sup>61</sup> Williams, ‘Use,’ 321.

<sup>62</sup> Williams, ‘Use,’ 320. The specific case of Saul/Paul, who would also have several Latin names due to his Roman citizenship, will be discussed in more detail in III.3.3.

<sup>63</sup> In the following double names are noted in this format (Name A/Name B).

<sup>64</sup> Following *LJNLA III* the focus of this section will be the Western Diaspora in the time between the Hellenistic conquest and ‘the conquest of Jewish Palestine and other parts of the Jewish Diaspora ... by the Muslims’ (330 BCE – 650 CE), a ‘period in which most Jews... lived under the rule of a western power’ (*LJNLA III*, 1f.).

<sup>65</sup> *CPJ 1*, 27.

Diaspora in general<sup>66</sup> and even more common than biblical names.<sup>67</sup> More surprising is that Diaspora Jews were not averse to taking on pagan theophoric or mythological names,<sup>68</sup> like Ἀπολλῶς – Apollos<sup>69</sup> (Acts 18:24).<sup>70</sup> That almost two-thirds of the Diaspora population took names of foreign onomastica reflects a trend towards assimilation to the broader culture.<sup>71</sup> By contrast, only one-fifth of the Palestinian population used non-Semitic onomastica.<sup>72</sup> This evidence suggests that ‘the assimilatory tendencies in Jewish onomastic practice’<sup>73</sup> among Diaspora Jews of late antiquity were much stronger than traditionalist tendencies.

Another area of assimilation to the broader culture was adopting a second or even third name according to Roman naming conventions. Rutgers, analysing the Jewish names found in the catacombs of Rome, concludes that ‘Jewish onomastic practices tended to follow general trends in contemporary non-Jewish onomastic practice exceedingly closely,’<sup>74</sup> i.e. Jewish names reflect the stages in the ‘historical development of the Roman *tria nomina*-system.’<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Rutgers, *Jews*, 157.

<sup>67</sup> *LJNLA III*, 3. 47.3% of names recorded for Jews in *LJNLA III* come from the Greek onomasticon, 29.8% from the Latin onomasticon, and only 7.1% are biblical names (*LJNLA III*, 61, table 1).

<sup>68</sup> *LJNLA III*, 6f. Greek names including a pagan element borne by undoubtedly Jewish persons add up to 5.5% of the Jewish Diaspora population. Not included in this percentage are names with the element ‘theos,’ which could be understood as referring to the Jewish God (*LJNLA III*, 7; cf. Mussies, ‘Names,’ 245f.).

<sup>69</sup> Though Apollos is not commonly used by Jews, several other names derived from the god Apollo borne by Jews are listed in *LJNLA III*, 218-221.

<sup>70</sup> Mussies tries to relativise the findings, arguing that Jews interpreted these gods as ‘being identical with’ holy men or women from Jewish history (Mussies, ‘Names,’ 246) but must admit that in many cases the names ‘cannot be explained in this particular way’ (Mussies, ‘Names,’ 247).

<sup>71</sup> 40.0% of Jews in the Western Diaspora bore Greek names, another 20.5% Latin names, and 3.4% other non-Jewish names (*LJNLA III*, 62, table 3). Broken down into different areas, the percentage of persons bearing foreign names varies: 82.6 % in Rome, 75.8% in Asia, 74.4% in Cyrenaica, 70.5% in Italy, 66.2% in Greece, and only 44.5% in Egypt (*LJNLA III*, 68f., table 10). Nevertheless, a trend towards a wider onomasticon, including especially Greco-Roman names, is present everywhere. Since bearing a Jewish name is used as a criterion to identify someone as Jewish, biblical names are likely ‘over-represented’ (*LJNLA III*, 3). So the percentage of Diaspora Jews bearing non-Jewish names might be even higher.

<sup>72</sup> *LJNLA I*, 55, table 3 and *LJNLA II*, 46, table 2.

<sup>73</sup> Williams, ‘Use,’ 313.

<sup>74</sup> Rutgers, *Jews*, 163.

<sup>75</sup> Rutgers, *Jews*, 159.

This consisted of 1) the *praenomen*, a first name ‘identifying the individual within the family,’<sup>76</sup> 2) the *gentilicium* (*nomen*<sup>77</sup> or *gentile*<sup>78</sup>), a hereditary family name indicating membership to a *gens*,<sup>79</sup> and 3) the *cognomen*, a surname originally ‘complementing the function of the praenomina’ before becoming a hereditary name to designate ‘a branch of a larger *gens*.’<sup>80</sup> From the beginning of the imperial period, *cognomina* gradually replaced the function of *praenomina* and became de facto the individual name of a Roman citizen.<sup>81</sup> This meant that Jews and other enfranchised peoples could retain an individual ethnic name as *cognomen*<sup>82</sup> and thereby express their dual identity. A later development also serving as a means to express different cultural identities was the so-called *supernomen*, the addition of indigenous personal names with the Latin formula *qui et* or the Greek formula ὁ(ς) καὶ to a Roman name, which in the second century CE started to spread from east to west.<sup>83</sup>

Alternative names, except those influenced by a foreign naming system, were less widely used than in Palestine.<sup>84</sup> As there was a wider name pool to choose from,<sup>85</sup> the problem of differentiating persons of the same name was less present in the Diaspora. Therefore, *nicknames*, common in the ‘close-knit homogenous nature’ of Palestine society, are seldom found in the Diaspora.<sup>86</sup> However, according to Williams, Hebrew/non-Jewish name combinations that

<sup>76</sup> Heikki Solin, ‘Names, personal, Roman,’ *OCD* 1024-1026, citing 1024.

<sup>77</sup> Rutgers, *Jews*, 158.

<sup>78</sup> Helmut Rix, ‘Gentile,’ *BNP*, 25 November 2019, doi:10.1163/1574-9347\_bnp\_e421690.

<sup>79</sup> Solin, ‘Names,’ 1024.

<sup>80</sup> Solin, ‘Names,’ 1024.

<sup>81</sup> Solin, ‘Names,’ 1025; cf. Helmut Rix, ‘Cognomen,’ *BNP*, 26 November 2019, doi:10.1163/1574-9347\_bnp\_e302870, and Benet Salway, ‘A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700,’ *JRS* 84 (1994): 124-145, citing 130.

<sup>82</sup> *LJNLA III*, 8. Greek and ‘Barbarian’ (Semitic, Celtic, and Illyrian) *cognomina* are found for the imperial period (Rix, ‘Cognomen;’ cf. Solin, ‘Names,’ 1025).

<sup>83</sup> Helmut Rix, ‘Supernomen,’ *BNP*, 10 September 2019, doi:10.1163/1574-9347\_bnp\_e1126060; cf. Solin, ‘Names,’ 1025.

<sup>84</sup> Williams, ‘Use,’ 323.

<sup>85</sup> Whereas only 831 different names are recorded for Palestine (*LJNLA I*, 54, table 1), for the Western Diaspora 1917 different names are listed (though for a more extended period) (*LJNLA III*, 61, table 1).

<sup>86</sup> Williams, ‘Use,’ 323. For the 2531 Jewish persons listed in *LJNLA III*, only ten nicknames and eleven family names are recorded (*LJNLA III*, 61, table 2 and 66, table 9).

might have been used as double names are commonly found outside of Palestine.<sup>87</sup> The evidence in Ilan's lexicon on the Western Diaspora supports this view. Ilan records 625 second names for 2531 Jewish persons. 603 of them bear an additional Greco-Roman or an Egyptian name. However, most of these names are Latin (545), likely reflecting the Roman naming customs discussed above.<sup>88</sup>

Though sometimes the combination of names was based on a similar meaning, for most Hebrew/non-Jewish combinations a connection of meaning is absent.<sup>89</sup> Yet, foreign names were not always chosen only with the foreign cultural setting in mind (e.g. due to their popularity). Cohen suggests that the popularity of a specific indubitably Jewish name in antiquity 'not only reflects a Jewish identification on the part of the name-giver but provides an indication of the specific non-Jewish cultural milieu to which the name-giver wished to belong.'<sup>90</sup> By implication, a foreign name fitting into a non-Jewish cultural milieu might still reflect Jewish identification. Some foreign names might have been understood as translations of Hebrew names, e.g. the Greek Theodorus for the Hebrew Nathaniel, both meaning 'Given by God.'<sup>91</sup> Other names were attractive because they were similar in sound to Hebrew names, e.g. the Greek Mnason for Manasseh.<sup>92</sup> Whether or not such names were used instead of or in addition to their Hebrew counterparts, they enabled the name giver to hold the tension between their Jewish roots and their Greco-Roman environment.

The variety of names and possible name combinations of Jews in the Diaspora 'reflects the cultural heterogeneity of the world in which they lived

---

<sup>87</sup> Williams lists fifty-four instances in her appendix in which a second name occurs in the sources. Twenty-five of these name combinations consist of a Hebrew and a Greek, Latin or Egyptian name that might have been used interchangeably according to context (Williams, 'Use,' 324-327).

<sup>88</sup> Cf. *LJNLA III*, 61, table 2, for the total number of persons and *LJNLA III*, 66f., table 9, for the number of second names.

<sup>89</sup> *JIGRE* 6, 11.

<sup>90</sup> Naomi G. Cohen, 'Jewish Names as Cultural Indicators in Antiquity,' *JSJ* 7.2 (1976): 97-128, citing 97.

<sup>91</sup> Mussies, 'Names,' 244f.

<sup>92</sup> Mussies, 'Names,' 249; cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 182.

and the various ways in which ... they responded to it.<sup>93</sup> There is no doubt that a Jewish woman with a Latin name like Junia fits naturally into this culturally diverse world.<sup>94</sup> Yet, the question of what Junia's name can tell us about her response to the world in which she lived and proclaimed the gospel has been answered quite differently.

### 3. Origin(s) of the name Junia – Greco-Roman, Jewish or both?

#### 3.1. Junia as Name in the Greco-Roman world (Lampe)

Peter Lampe is a rare exception in the Junia/Junias debate as he is more interested in the person's social class than her/his sex. Both names, Junia on its own and Junias via the long form Junianus, can be explained within the context of slavery in Roman society.<sup>95</sup> As the short-form hypothesis was already dismissed as an unlikely background for the name, the focus of this section will be the origin of the female name Junia, according to Lampe.<sup>96</sup>

*Iunia* is the female form of the *gentilicium Iunius*, the name of a plebeian *gens*, 'derived from the name of the goddess Iuno.'<sup>97</sup> The form *Iunia* was used 1) as the name of female members of the *gens Iunia*<sup>98</sup> and 2) for women who were either freed by a master called *Iunius* or the descendants of freedmen once owned by a member of the *gens Iunia*. For Lampe, the second option is more likely, as it is hard to imagine that a Jewish-Christian woman from the east

---

<sup>93</sup> Williams, 'Use,' 323.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. II.2.2., for a discussion of the text-critical issues regarding Junia's name in Romans 16:7 and the reception history of the verse.

<sup>95</sup> Lampe, 'Iunia/Iunias,' 132.

<sup>96</sup> The long form of Junias, *Iunianus*, would be a so-called *agnomen*. When sold to a new master, slaves could add the *agnomen* after the *gentilicium* to indicate their relationship with a former master of an important *gens*. These names were mainly found among the slaves of the imperial household and in public positions. (Lampe, 'Iunia/Iunias,' 133f.; cf. Lampe, *Rome*, 176f., where Lampe's focus of the discussion is still the -anus ending despite identifying Junia as a woman, 165f.).

<sup>97</sup> Karl-Ludwig Elvers et al., 'Iunius,' BNP, 28 August 2019, doi:10.1163/1574-9347\_bnp\_e602780.

<sup>98</sup> Daughters usually did not have a praenomen but were called by their *gens* (Lampe, 'Iunia/Iunias,' 132; cf. Solin, 'Names,' 1025 and Salway, 'Survey,' 126).

could be a member of a Roman *gens*.<sup>99</sup> He arrives at his conclusion by drawing an analogy to the name *Iulia*. As in the case of Junia, he dismisses the possibility that the Christian Julia mentioned in Romans 16:15 could be an elite member of the Julian *gens* and offers as ‘most probable alternative that she was one of the many freed persons or a descendant of a freed person of the Julian family.’<sup>100</sup> He lists epigraphic evidence to prove that *Iulia* was a frequent name among freedwomen in Rome.<sup>101</sup> In his discussion of *Iunia*, however, he merely lists the number of occurrences of *Iunia* in general,<sup>102</sup> even though there are examples that indicate a slave background for the name Junia in Rome in the *CIL* corpus.<sup>103</sup>

Within the naming conventions of Rome, Junia’s origin can easily be located in the capital of the Roman Empire, even if the additional information of her ethnicity, given in Romans 16:7, is considered. Though some are tentative, there are examples of the name Junia borne by Jewish women in Rome.<sup>104</sup> Even though all examples are dated later than the first century CE,<sup>105</sup> they indicate the name Junia was borne by Jews in antiquity. Considering that from the first century CE onward, Junia became a more common name found regularly in

<sup>99</sup> Lampe, ‘Iunia/Iunias,’ 132f.; cf. Lampe, *Rome*, 176.

<sup>100</sup> Lampe, *Rome*, 175.

<sup>101</sup> Lampe, *Rome*, 175, note 69.

<sup>102</sup> Lampe, *Rome*, 176.

<sup>103</sup> The *Index Nominum* of *CIL* VI lists thirty inscriptions in which *Iunia* is mentioned in connection with the letter *l*, indicating that the person mentioned was a *liberta*, a freedwoman (Martin Bang, ed., *Inscriptiones urbis Romae Latinae: Pars VI: Fasc. I: Index Nominum*, Part 6.1 of *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 6. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1926, 111f.)

<sup>104</sup> In *LJNLA* III, s.v. ‘Junia,’ three entries are recorded, all for Rome (Rom 16:7, *CIJ* 9\* and *CIJ* 68\*). Ilan labels no. 1. and 3. as possibly not Jewish, the Junia of Rom 16:7 because the ‘kinship language’ might be ‘rhetorical’ (which is unlikely, cf. II.3.1.1.) and Sabatis Junia because she was not buried but cremated which was customary for pagans. Not recorded are the more tentative examples *CIJ* 10 and *CIJ* 303 which Belleville lists as evidence (Belleville, ‘Ιουνία,’ 241). As both inscriptions are incomplete, there are different ways to interpret the remaining sequence of letters; reading Ιουνία is only one of the options (cf. Harry Joshua Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome*, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960; repr., Whitefish: LLC, 2012, 265 for *CIJ* 10 and 309 for *CIJ* 303).

<sup>105</sup> Studies of the Jewish catacombs in Rome usually suggest that the inscriptions date from the third or fourth century CE. For an overview, cf. Silvia Cappelletti, *The Jewish Community of Rome. From the Second Century B.C. to the Third Century C.E.* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 177. For an earlier dating between the first and third century CE, cf. Leon, *Jews*, 65f. and Margaret H. Williams, ‘The Organisation of Jewish Burials in Ancient Rome in the Light of Evidence from Palestine and the Diaspora,’ *ZPE* 101 (1994) 165–182, citing 171.

papyri and inscriptions in and around Rome,<sup>106</sup> the local Jewish community, who generally followed Roman naming customs, likely followed this trend also.<sup>107</sup> The growing popularity of the name might be connected to the rise in prominence of the family of the *Iunii Silani* during the early principate.<sup>108</sup>

This family also features in Lampe's explanation of a less easily solved issue concerning his manumission hypothesis: Junia's assumed eastern origin. Reasoning along similar lines to those presented in this thesis, Lampe argues that Junia did not just visit the East but 'with some certainty' was born there,<sup>109</sup> as she was part of the apostolic group in Jerusalem and was converted before Paul.<sup>110</sup> So again, we must ask why *a Jewish woman from the East* would bear a *typical Latin name* connected with *the Roman convention of naming* freed slaves after their former masters. Lampe's answer is simple; he lists prominent members of the Junian family who resided in the east to indicate that a manumission could have occurred there.<sup>111</sup> This is also proposed by Thorley, who assumes that the name was acquired 'through manumission (perhaps a generation or two ago) from slavery in the household of a member of the Junius family resident in Syria.'<sup>112</sup>

Several of the persons listed by Lampe belong to the *Iunii Silani*; two of them, C. Junius Silanus and M. Junius Silanus, the proconsuls of Asia in 20/21 and 54 CE, were contemporaries of Junia. The name Ἰουνία and its male equivalent Ἰούνιος are found regularly in inscriptions of Asia Minor,<sup>113</sup> the area of influence of these members of the *Iunii Silani*. This might be significant in connection with an alternative explanation to Lampe's manumission theory

---

<sup>106</sup> Belleville, 'Ἰουνία,' 241f.

<sup>107</sup> Rutgers, *Jews*, 163; cf. Williams, 'Use,' 313.

<sup>108</sup> Ursula Weidemann, 'C. SILANUS, APPIA PARENTE GENITUS. A Note on Tac. Ann. 3, 68, 3,' *AcCl* 6 (1963): 138-145, citing 138.

<sup>109</sup> Lampe, *Rome*, 168.

<sup>110</sup> Lampe, 'Christians,' 226.

<sup>111</sup> Lampe, 'Junia/Iunias,' 133.

<sup>112</sup> Thorley, 'Junia,' 20.

<sup>113</sup> Belleville, 'Ἰουνία,' 241, lists eight examples of Ἰουνία from the first century CE, and there are also several examples of Ἰούνιος (twenty-nine for Asia Minor on PHI).

given by Belleville: 'Junia was born into a Diaspora Jewish family that acquired Roman citizenship and adopted the *gens* Junius.'<sup>114</sup> Once citizenship was granted, it was common for the new Roman citizen to adopt the reigning emperor's name, but sometimes names of intermediaries like provincial governors were also taken on.<sup>115</sup> A likely origin for such a Jewish Diaspora family taking on the name *Iunius* would have been the Roman province of Asia, a province governed by Junian proconsuls at various points and an area where Junia could have easily encountered Paul on one of his missionary journeys.

Both Lampe's theory and Belleville's alternative certainly reflect Roman naming conventions. Belleville's approach in connection with the presence of prominent members of the Junian family in the province of Asia even fits with the assumption of an eastern origin of Junia. However, neither theory can be used to argue for the Palestinian origin of Junia convincingly.<sup>116</sup> Even though Lampe gives evidence for members of the Junian house residing in the east, none can be located in Palestine directly, nor in its surrounding province Syria.<sup>117</sup> Moreover, there is no evidence for the usage of the name Junia in Palestine<sup>118</sup> and only scarce evidence in Syria.<sup>119</sup>

If Junia bore a name connected to the *gens Iunia* acquired in her lifetime or by an ancestor through manumission or due to granted citizenship, she was

---

<sup>114</sup> Belleville, 'Ἰουνία,' 242.

<sup>115</sup> Solin, 'Names,' 1025; cf. Colin J. Hemer, 'The Name of Paul,' *TynBul* 36 (1985): 179-183, citing 179, who explores which *gentilicium* Paul might have used, and Ilan, who highlights Jews bearing the *gentilicium* of Roman emperors (*LJNLA III*, 8).

<sup>116</sup> Unlike Lampe who argues that Junia was a Palestinian apostle (cf. n. 110), Belleville leaves open whether Junia was of Palestinian origin (Belleville, 'Ἰουνία,' 233).

<sup>117</sup> This is true for male members of the *gens Iunia* whose names would be taken on in both cases. There is evidence of a female member of the Junian family closer to Palestine. The wife of G. Cassius Longinus, the governor of Syria from 41-49 CE, called simply Lepida in Tacitus, *Ann.* 16.3, belonged to the *Iunii Silani*. Her full name was Junia Lepida (cf. Jackson, LCL 322, 347, n. 4).

<sup>118</sup> The name is not mentioned in *LJNLA I*, nor are there entries for Ἰουνία in Palestine on PHI.

<sup>119</sup> There is one second-century CE mention in Antioch (SEG 32:1424). While the absence of evidence for Jewish women with the name Junia could be explained by the limited database of Jewish names in antiquity, the fact that the name is also absent from Greek inscriptions in Palestine and scarce in the surrounding areas in general, especially in comparison to its regular occurrence in Asia Minor (cf. n. 113), suggests that the name was not well known or even unknown in those areas.

most likely a Diaspora Jew. As such, Junia cannot be connected with Palestine beyond the occasional visit to Jerusalem for the festivals unless she or one of her ancestors returned to the Jewish homeland for good. Thus, both Lampe's thesis and Belleville's addition work better within the framework of the first biographical sketch.

### 3.2. Junia as Transliteration of a Hebrew Name (Wolters)

Wolters offers an entirely different approach to the name found in Romans 16:7. He questions the Latin origin of the name and proposes that IOYNIAN 'reflects a Semitic, specifically a Hebrew, personal name.'<sup>120</sup> Contra Thorley, who dismisses the possibility of a Semitic background for the name due to the 'initial vowel combination,'<sup>121</sup> Wolters demonstrates convincingly that the letter combination  $\iota\omicron\upsilon$  is used to transliterate Hebrew names into Greek. An example found is  $\text{Ιούδας}$  (Judah/Judas) as a transliteration of  $\text{יהודה}$  (Yehudah).<sup>122</sup>  $\iota\omicron\upsilon$  often represents the Hebrew letter combination  $\text{יה}$ . Following common transliteration habits, the guttural  $\text{ה}$  drops out as there is no equivalent in Greek,<sup>123</sup> and what remains is phonetically similar to  $\iota\omicron\upsilon$  in Greek.  $\iota\omicron\upsilon$  is also used as an exact phonetical representation of  $\text{י}$ , as in  $\text{Ιουβάλ}$  for  $\text{יובל}$  (Yubal).<sup>124</sup> It also is found occasionally as the transliteration of the theophoric prefix  $\text{-יה}$  representing YHWH,<sup>125</sup> e.g.  $\text{Ιουάχ}$  for  $\text{יואח}$  (Yoah) and  $\text{Ιουήλ}$  for  $\text{יואל}$  (Yoel).<sup>126</sup>

Wolters' second argument centres around another theophoric element representing the tetragrammaton, the suffix  $\text{-יה}$ .<sup>127</sup> Together with its longer form  $\text{-יהו}$ , it is the most common theophoric element, found 507 times on biblical

---

<sup>120</sup> Wolters, 'IOYNIAN,' 398.

<sup>121</sup> Thorley, 'Junia,' 20.

<sup>122</sup> Wolters, 'IOYNIAN,' 398.

<sup>123</sup> BDF, § 39 (3), 22; cf. Wolters, 'IOYNIAN,' 398.

<sup>124</sup> HRSC, 'Appendix 1,' 85.

<sup>125</sup> Jeaneane D. Fowler, *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew: A Comparative Study*, JSOTSup 49 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988), 35-38.

<sup>126</sup> HRSC, 'Appendix 1,' 85 and 87.

<sup>127</sup> Fowler, *Names*, 33-35.

compound names.<sup>128</sup> In the Septuagint these suffixes and their abbreviated form *-î* are often ‘Hellenized by the adoption of the old termination *-ίας*,<sup>129</sup> which makes the name a first declension masculine noun ending in *-ίου* in the genitive and in *-ίαν* in the accusative, as in *Ἰουνίαν*. Following the ‘linguistic precedent set by the Septuagint translators’ there is high number of names in the New Testament ending in *-ίας*, like *Ἀνανίας* (Ananias, Acts 5:1), *Ζαχαρίας* (Zechariah, Luke 1:5), *Ὀζίας* (Uzziah, Matthew 1:9), and *Οὐρίας* (Uriah, Matthew 1:6).<sup>130</sup>

Combining these two observations, Wolters proposes the name *יהוני* (Yehunni) or its assumed long form<sup>131</sup> *יהונייה* (Yehunniah), meaning ‘May YHWH be gracious,’ as the most likely Hebrew name behind *Ἰουνίαν*.<sup>132</sup> The unpointed short form is inscribed on two ossuaries found in Gezer and Jerusalem dating back to the first century CE.<sup>133</sup> However, the vocalisation of the form is debated, especially ‘the phonetic value of the *waw*,’ which could be either *ô* or *û*.<sup>134</sup> If Wolters is right in his well-argued assumption that the name was pronounced with *û*,<sup>135</sup> *Ἰουνίαν* could be the transliteration of the long form into Greek. As in the case of *Ἰούδας*, the guttural drops out, the double consonant can be transliterated as a single consonant due to transliteration

<sup>128</sup> Fowler, *Names*, 35.

<sup>129</sup> Henry St. John Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek: According to the Septuagint*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 161.

<sup>130</sup> Wolters, ‘IOYNIAN,’ 399, cf. n. 9 for all fifteen instances, though *Λυσανίας* and *Λυσίας* should be excluded as they are not Hebrew theophoric names.

<sup>131</sup> Wolters lists Cook, Dalman, Eissfeldt, Zadok and tentatively Fowler among those who assume that the unpointed *יהוני* is the short form of *יהונייה* (Wolters, ‘IOYNIAN,’ 403, cf. especially n. 43).

<sup>132</sup> Wolters, ‘IOYNIAN,’ 406f.

<sup>133</sup> Wolters, ‘IOYNIAN,’ 402f.; cf. *LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Honi,’ no. 9 and 10. The third debated find, a jar handle, is dated much earlier and, therefore, should not be used to demonstrate the usage of the name in the first century CE.

<sup>134</sup> Wolters, ‘IOYNIAN,’ 403f. Wolters quotes Zadok in support of *יהוני* contra Eissfeldt, who assumes that the form is vocalised as *יהוני*, as do Hachlili, ‘Names,’ 101 and Ilan, who interprets the name as a form of the name Honi with a theophoric prefix (*LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Honi,’ n. 25).

<sup>135</sup> For the full discussion, cf. Wolters, ‘IOYNIAN,’ 403-406.

variations,<sup>136</sup> and the theophoric suffix is represented by -ίας. יהוניה becomes Ἰουνίας, a male first declension personal name.

However, only the short form of the name is attested for the first century CE. Like its Greek counterpart Ἰουνίας, the Hebrew long form is not found in literary or epigraphical evidence.<sup>137</sup> As Fowler cautions against ‘the pronounced uncertainty of assigning any abbreviated name to a specific full form, unless we have textual or other evidence on which we can base such an assumption,’<sup>138</sup> the unabbreviated form cannot be used in the argument. Wolters addresses this problem and demonstrates that there are examples in the manuscripts of the Septuagint where the -ίας ending is used for abbreviated forms, e.g. the declinable forms Ἀνανίας for הַנַּנִּי (Ḥanani),<sup>139</sup> Ζαχαρίας for זִכְרִי (Zichri),<sup>140</sup> and Οὐρίας for אֹרִי (Uri).<sup>141</sup> He even lists one declinable form, Ναμεσσίας for נַמְשִׁי (Nimshi),<sup>142</sup> which is used for a name ending in -î without indication for a long form.<sup>143</sup>

What Wolters fails to mention is that these examples are the exceptions rather than the rule. The abbreviated names are usually transliterated phonetically with either -ι or -ει,<sup>144</sup> a common variant.<sup>145</sup> As biblical names are usually not declined in the Septuagint, such a phonetic transliteration is common.<sup>146</sup> Contrary to the Septuagint, the New Testament ‘usually declines the names it transliterates,’<sup>147</sup> so Ἰουνίας could still be the transliteration of יהוניה?

---

<sup>136</sup> *LJNLA I*, 22; cf. BDF, § 40, 23, concerning ‘the uncertainty’ in the matter of double consonants, and Wolters, ‘IOYNIAN,’ 407.

<sup>137</sup> Wolters, ‘IOYNIAN,’ 406.

<sup>138</sup> Fowler, *Names*, 154.

<sup>139</sup> HRSC, ‘Appendix 1,’ 17.

<sup>140</sup> HRSC, ‘Appendix 1,’ 66.

<sup>141</sup> HRSC, ‘Appendix 1,’ 124.

<sup>142</sup> HRSC, ‘Appendix 1,’ 118.

<sup>143</sup> Wolters, ‘IOYNIAN,’ 400. Whether or not such a long form existed, it is an example of the use of the -ίας ending for a Hebrew name ending in -î.

<sup>144</sup> Ἀνανί is found ten times compared to the four times the name is transliterated with the -ίας ending. For Ζαχαρί and Ζεχρί it is twelve times to one. Οὐρί is the only exception where both transliterations are found in equal numbers (each four times). Yet, the only transliteration of עֲזִי is Ὀζί (HRSC, ‘Appendix 1,’ 17, 66, 124, and 123).

<sup>145</sup> BDF, § 38, 20f.; cf. Ilan, *LJNLA I*, 21, who interprets this ‘iotacism’ as a Greek variation.

<sup>146</sup> *LJNLA I*, 18.

<sup>147</sup> *LJNLA I*, 18.

(in analogy with Ναμεσσίας). Yet, most of the other Hebrew names in the New Testament ending in -ίας are derived from existing unabbreviated forms of biblical names,<sup>148</sup> or it is assumed by the translations that they represent a long form.<sup>149</sup> Moreover, the genealogy in Luke 3 contains a name that most likely is an example of an indeclinable phonetic transliteration of the abbreviated form of מלכיה (Malkijah), Μελχί (Melchi, Luke 3:24).<sup>150</sup> This would make a phonetic transliteration of יהוני by Paul more likely, mainly because he was accustomed to the Septuagint transliteration of names,<sup>151</sup> and he would have known enough of the Latin onomasticon to avoid a transliteration of a male name which could easily be confused with a familiar female Latin name.<sup>152</sup>

Anticipating objections to his alternative reading of IOYNIAN due to the lack of evidence for Ἰουνίας in Greek, Wolters argues that it can be expected that a rare Hebrew name might not be found in its transliterated form and gives examples of other names ending in -ίας from the Septuagint that are *hapax legomena*.<sup>153</sup> However, this defence cannot obscure the fact that despite the possibility of a Hebrew name as background, it is much more likely that IOYNIAN represents the Latin name Junia. It is better supported by external literary and epigraphical evidence<sup>154</sup> and internal New Testament evidence. Including Ἰουνία, there are five personal names with the initial letters ιου in the New Testament. Only one of them is transliterated from Hebrew (Ἰούδας). In contrast, there are three of Latin origin (Ἰουλία – Julia in Romans 16:15, its male equivalent Ἰούλιος – Julius in Acts 27:1 and three mentions of Ἰοῦστος – Justus

<sup>148</sup> Hannaniah, Berekiah, Hezekiah, Zechariah, Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Josiah, Mattithiah, Uzziah, and Uriah.

<sup>149</sup> Jeconiah/Jechoniah, Matthias.

<sup>150</sup> Only the long forms Μελχίας and Μαλχίας are found in the LXX (HRSC, 'Appendix 1,' 111).

<sup>151</sup> According to Stanley, the LXX was 'his primary text' concerning the use of Scripture references (Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, 254).

<sup>152</sup> Lin also questions the choice of a transliteration, which is 'nearly identical and in some cases indistinguishable from a feminine Roman name' (Lin, 'Junia,' 194, n. 13).

<sup>153</sup> Wolters, 'IOYNIAN,' 407f.

<sup>154</sup> Two hundred and fifty mentions of Junia are found in Roman inscriptions alone (cf. n. 102), against two mentions of Yehūnni in Palestine.

in Acts 1:23, Acts 18:7, and Colossians 4:11). Thus, it is much more likely that IOYNIAN reflects another Latin name, the common female name Junia, than the less common transliteration of the rare Hebrew name יְהוּנִי (Yehūnni).<sup>155</sup> As Wolters' approach cannot convincingly prove the origin of the name in Hebrew, it also does not provide support for a Palestinian origin of Junia.

### 3.3. Junia as Sound-Equivalent of a Hebrew Name Used in a Greco-Roman Context (Bauckham)

Bauckham recognises the tension between the Latin name and the assumed Palestinian origin of Junia by asking the same question posed at the end of our chapter II: 'Why should a Palestinian Jewish woman bear the Latin name Junia?'<sup>156</sup> Though Latin names generally were seldom used by Palestinian Jews,<sup>157</sup> a few examples can be located in certain Romanised circles. According to Bauckham, these circles fall into three 'exceptional categories:' 1) members of the Herodian royal family, 2) members of the Herodian court, and 3) members of the elite of Tiberias, the capital of Antipas' tetrarchy.<sup>158</sup> If Junia had Palestinian roots, she would most likely be part of either category 2) or 3). Thus, Bauckham links her with a female disciple of Jesus bearing a similar name: 'Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward' (Luke 8:3). As 'manager of the estates and finances of Antipas's whole realm,'<sup>159</sup> Chuza and his wife Johanna would not just belong to the Tiberian elite but also to the Herodian court, 'the most romanized place in Jewish Palestine.'<sup>160</sup>

To bridge the gap between the two different names, Bauckham points to a Rabbinic source, *Midrash Rabbah* (ca. 450 – 1110 CE), which indicates that the

---

<sup>155</sup> Contra Wolters, 'IOYNIAN,' 408, n. 70.

<sup>156</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 181.

<sup>157</sup> Cf. III.2.1.

<sup>158</sup> Bauckham, 'Paul,' 215.

<sup>159</sup> Bauckham, 'Paul,' 220. For the discussion of Chuza's role cf. IV.2.1.1.

<sup>160</sup> Bauckham, 'Paul,' 220.

changing of names from Hebrew to a Greco-Roman name might have been a common custom.<sup>161</sup>

Israel were redeemed on account of four things, viz. because they did not change their names,... "They did not change their name, having gone down as Reuben and Simeon, and having come up as Reuben and Simeon. They did not call Judah "Leon," nor Reuben "Rufus," nor Joseph "Lestes," nor Benjamin "Alexander." (*Leviticus Rabbah* 32:5 [Slotki])<sup>162</sup>

The quote is also found in *Canticles Rabbah* 56:6 with slightly adjusted names 'They did not call Reuben "Rufus," Judah "Julianus," Joseph "Justus," or Benjamin "Alexander."' <sup>163</sup> Cohen suggests the saying would be pointless if these names were not used as substitutes of Hebrew names.<sup>164</sup> It is clear from the context that these names were not given at birth but were changed later, most likely in the foreign setting of the Diaspora. Ng agrees that 'the rabbis were indirectly referring to the prevalent practice of Jews changing to Greek and Roman names' but cautions to take the dating of these sayings into account, as the words of two third-century scholars might not reflect first-century practice.<sup>165</sup> Nevertheless, it is interesting that the names Rufus, Justus, and Alexander *are* found for Jews in the New Testament, possibly indicating that these foreign names were seen as appropriate substitutes for Hebrew names.<sup>166</sup>

Reuben/Rufus, Judah/Julianus, and Joseph/Justus, as well as the already mentioned Manasseh/Mnason, are among the fifteen sound-equivalents Bauckham lists in support of his argument that the 'practice of adopting a Greek or Latin name for the sake of its assonance with a commonly used

---

<sup>161</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 183, n. 315.

<sup>162</sup> *Leviticus XX-XXVII*, transl. Judah H. Slotki, in *The Midrash Rabbah*, ed. H. Freedman and Maurice Simon, vol. 2 (London: Socino, 1977), 413f.

<sup>163</sup> J. Neusner, *Song of Songs Rabbah: An Analytical Translation*, vol. 2, BJS 196 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 73, as adapted by Bauckham, *Women*, 183, n. 315; cf. Mussies, 'Names,' 249.

<sup>164</sup> Cohen, 'Names,' 119.

<sup>165</sup> Esther Yue L. Ng, 'Did Joanna become Junia?,' *JETS* 65.3 (2022): 523-534, citing 525.

Considering the two commentaries quoted of the *Midrash Rabbah* date even later (*Leviticus* ca. 550 CE and *Song of Songs* ca. 600-650 CE) (cf. Evans, *Texts*, 238), this caution is well founded.

<sup>166</sup> Rufus, the son of Simon of Cyrene (Mark 15:21); Joseph Barsabbas Justus, the second candidate for Judas Iscariot's place (Acts 1:23); and Alexander, a member of the high priestly family (Acts 4:6).

Semitic name' was prevalent.<sup>167</sup> Analogous with these foreign sound-equivalents, Bauckham argues that it is justified to suggest that Junia might be understood as a Latin sound-equivalent to the Hebrew name יוֹחָנָה (Yoḥana) or יְהוֹחָנָה (Yehoḥana),<sup>168</sup> which a Jewish woman might have used in the Romanised setting of the Herodian court.

There are also several other persons mentioned in the New Testament with both a Hebrew or Aramaic name and a homophone Latin name, e.g. Saul/Paul (Acts 13:9), Joseph/Justus Barsabbas (Acts 1:23), and probably Silas/Silvanus<sup>169</sup> (Acts 15:22 / 2 Corinthians 1:19). Bauckham proposes that early Christian missionaries used Greco-Roman sound-equivalents of their names during their mission in the Diaspora because they were 'more culturally appropriate and user-friendly for non-Semitic speakers' than their Hebrew ones.<sup>170</sup> Paul, for example, uses only his Latin name in letters,<sup>171</sup> which strongly suggests that this was his preferred name outside of Palestine. Bauckham argues that the same applies to Silas/Silvanus<sup>172</sup> and Joseph/Justus Barsabbas.<sup>173</sup> Especially interesting for the case of Joanna/Junia is the example of John, also called Mark (Acts 12:12). In line with Bauckham's argument, Williams proposes that John Mark used his Latin name on his missionary journeys as it was easier to pronounce than 'the outlandish and unfamiliar Yehoḥanan,'<sup>174</sup> the same would be true for Yehoḥanah its female equivalent. In analogy to the case of John Mark, who outside of Palestine is only called Mark,<sup>175</sup> Joanna, if greeted in a letter, would

---

<sup>167</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 183f.

<sup>168</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 184.

<sup>169</sup> BDAG, s.v. 'Σιλᾶς,' states that 'it is hardly to be doubted that this Silas is the same pers[on] as the Σιλουανός who is mentioned in Paul; cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 184, n. 322.

<sup>170</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 184.

<sup>171</sup> Cf. Rom 1:1, 1-2 Cor 1:1, Gal 1:1, Phil 1:1, 1 Thess 1:1, and Phlm 1:1.

<sup>172</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 184f.

<sup>173</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 185. As this person is remembered by Papias, Bauckham suggests, despite lacking New Testament evidence, that 'Joseph/Justus was later known as travelling missionary.'

<sup>174</sup> Williams, 'Names,' 105.

<sup>175</sup> If the Mark found in several greetings (Phlm 24, Col 4:10, 2 Tim 4:11, 1 Pet 5:13) is the same person as John Mark, he left his Jewish name behind once he left Palestine (Bauckham, *Women*, 185). Notably, on the brink of leaving Palestine for Cyprus with Barnabas (Acts 15:39), he is no longer referred to by his double name.

only be referred to as Junia (Romans 16:7), the name she could have adopted during her missionary journeys or already at the Herodian court,<sup>176</sup> knowing that it was 'a distinguished, aristocratic Roman name.'<sup>177</sup>

Undoubtedly, Bauckham's approach to the name Junia as the sound-equivalent of the Hebrew Joanna is the most elegant way of combining both the name and the additional descriptive sentences found in Romans 16:7, namely Junia's Jewish identity, her Palestinian origin, and her name fitting the Greco-Roman context she worked in. Yet, his argument stands and falls by the actual prevalence of the practice of homophone double names.

Looking at extra-biblical evidence, Horsley states that homophone alternative names are 'not especially common' in the Greco-Roman world.<sup>178</sup> Ilan reaches a similar conclusion concerning the assumed Palestinian Jewish practice of choosing Greek homophones as alternative names for Hebrew names.<sup>179</sup> Among the large Jewish community in Egypt, for instance, there are no examples of name combinations for which a correspondence between the Hebrew and the Greek name exists whether in meaning (translation names) or sound (homophones).<sup>180</sup> Moreover, the evidence for names that are not homophonous, like 'Alexander' as a replacement of Benjamin in *Leviticus Rabbah* and John/Mark (rather than John/Junius as could be expected in analogy with Joanna/Junia) in Acts, show that assonance might not have been the primary or even preferred factor in choosing a substitute name.

---

<sup>176</sup> Though Bauckham states that he 'cannot decide between these two possibilities,' he only follows up on the second, stating that Joanna adopted the name Junia in Tiberias 'to signal her identification with Roman culture and Herodian loyalties' (Bauckham, *Women*, 186 and 198).

<sup>177</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 186.

<sup>178</sup> Horsley, 'Names,' 1015. Horsley labels some of the sound-equivalents as 'substitute names' replacing a Hebrew name completely rather than assuming them to be additional names used in a different setting (cf. Horsley, 'Names,' 1016 and G. H. R. Horsley, *New Documents illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1976*, Sydney: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1981, 93).

<sup>179</sup> *LJNLA* I, 11.

<sup>180</sup> *CPJ* I, 28.

It is conspicuous that not all the Greco-Roman sound-equivalents Bauckham proposes<sup>181</sup> are attested in combination with their Semitic equivalent in literary or epigraphic sources. Some of his propositions are only found as single personal names of Jews and are not common enough to prove a pattern.<sup>182</sup> Though the Latin name *Annia* is similar in sound to the Hebrew name Hannah, it is not found as a name for Jewish women in Palestine despite Hannah being quite a common name.<sup>183</sup> Its Latin origin<sup>184</sup> might account for its absence in Palestine but not its rarity in the Western Diaspora.<sup>185</sup> Even less common is the Latin name *Lea*, the female form of *Leo*, for the Hebrew Leah (only one example found in Rome).<sup>186</sup> In addition to the scarce evidence, it is also impossible to differentiate between the actual Roman name and the transliteration of the Hebrew name into Latin.<sup>187</sup>

One is faced with the same problem concerning two other proposed sound-equivalents, i.e. the Greek name Simon and the Latin name Maria (Mary), clearly similar in sound to the commonest male and female names in Palestine, Shimeon and Mariam (Miriam).<sup>188</sup> The names could be mere transliterations of the Hebrew names<sup>189</sup> or Greco-Roman names used in their own right without

---

<sup>181</sup> Cf. list in Bauckham, *Women*, 183f.

<sup>182</sup> Bauckham himself indicates doubt for Hannah/Annia and Leah/Lea (Bauckham, *Women*, 183f.).

<sup>183</sup> There are no entries for *Annia* in *LJNLA I* and *II* despite six entries for Hannah in the earlier period (*LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Hannah') and ten entries in the later period (*LJNLA II*, s.v. 'Hannah').

<sup>184</sup> *Annia* is derived from the masculine *gentilicium* *Annius* (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Annia,' n. 1).

<sup>185</sup> There are only two undoubtedly Jewish mentions in Rome (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Annia') compared to eleven occurrences of Hannah (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Hannah'). Hannah is mainly found in its Greek or Latin transliteration, which are both easily pronounceable for Greek- and Latin-speakers.

<sup>186</sup> *CIJ* 212; cf. *JWE* 2 377.

<sup>187</sup> Ilan interprets the spelling *Leae* as an unknown transliteration of the Hebrew name and consequently lists the inscription above under the biblical name (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Leah;' cf. Leon, *Jews*, 107).

<sup>188</sup> *LJNLA I*, 56f., table 7 and 8; cf. Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 85-89, tables 6 and 7; and Williams, 'Names,' 90 (for Mariam/Mary) and 93 (for Simon).

<sup>189</sup> All forms of Simon and all forms of Mary are understood as different spellings of the biblical Hebrew names שמעון and מרים by Ilan (*LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Simon' and s.v. 'Mariam;' cf. Williams, 'Names,' 90f. for Mariam and 93f. for Simon).

connection to their Hebrew counterparts.<sup>190</sup> Bauckham argues that Shimeon/Simon is ‘the perfect instance of the practice of those Jews in this period who adopted a Greek OR Latin name that sounded similar to their Semitic name’ and that the popularity of the name is partly due to the existence of a Greek sound-equivalent.<sup>191</sup> This view is supported by Cohen, who defines Simon as ‘a full fledged Jewish-Hellenistic name – fully Hellenistic, but no less Jewish’<sup>192</sup> and argues that the Hebrew name Shimeon was re-introduced into the Jewish onomasticon only due to Hellenistic influence as there is ‘no internally Jewish explanation for the reappearance.’<sup>193</sup> Therefore, a close connection between the two names is likely, but it is impossible to say whether the Greek spelling is used as a transliteration of the Hebrew name or meant as the Greek name. The same is true for Mariam/Mary, as the Greek Μαρία, especially common in the New Testament, could be ‘a feminine form of the name Marius’ (Latin) but also a transliteration for Miriam.<sup>194</sup> The closeness to the Latin name might influence the popularity of Mariam (Miriam) in the Western Diaspora.<sup>195</sup>

Other name combinations, though never found together, can be connected tentatively to the same person in the New Testament, e.g. Clopas/Cleopas (John 19:25 and Luke 24:18)<sup>196</sup> and the already mentioned Silvanus/Silas.<sup>197</sup> Whereas

---

<sup>190</sup> Mussies, ‘Names,’ 244, who states that ‘the ambiguous Σίμων... may be the transliteration of the Hebrew Shim’ôn, but also a Greek name meaning “Flat-Nose;”’ cf. Ilan, who states that ‘many Jews used this name, but whether they did so because they wanted a biblical name, or because they wanted a name that sounded both biblical and Greek, or they chose it as a Greek name with no idea of its biblical etymology, remains unknown’ (*LJNLA III*, 3).

<sup>191</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 74.

<sup>192</sup> Naomi G. Cohen, ‘The Names of the Translators in the Letter of Aristeas: A Study in the Dynamics of Cultural Transition,’ *JSJ* 15 (1984): 32-64, citing 42.

<sup>193</sup> Cohen, ‘Names,’ 112. She sees the homophony as a reason for the popularity of both names in Hellenistic times.

<sup>194</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Mariam,’ n. 14. The Hebrew form מַרְיָה is also found in Palestine and could be interpreted both as ‘the Hebrew version of Μαρία’ or, more likely, as ‘a Hellenized variation of מַרְיָם’ (*LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Mariam,’ n. 59).

<sup>195</sup> In the Western Diaspora the Greek form Μαρία constitutes 50% of the entries for מַרְיָם (*LJNLA III*, s.v. ‘Mariam’).

<sup>196</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 211; cf. Ilan (*LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Cleopas’), who interprets both spellings as different variations of the same name and adds concerning the New Testament persons that it is ‘accepted in Christian circles’ that they are the same person (*LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Cleopas’, n. 2).

<sup>197</sup> Cf. n. 169.

the connection between Clopas and Cleopas (both disciples of Jesus) and Silas and Silvanus (both missionaries connected to Paul) can be easily established, it is harder to prove the link between the Palestinian disciple Joanna and the apostle Junia living in Rome decades later.

Rufus<sup>198</sup> Annanius,<sup>199</sup> Aster,<sup>200</sup> and Mnason/Mnaseas,<sup>201</sup> also found in Bauckham's list,<sup>202</sup> are more or less common Greco-Roman names among Jews, which also might reflect Hebrew names (Reuben, Hananiah, Esther, and Manasseh). None of them is attested in combination with their Hebrew counterpart. Still, their similarity in sound to Hebrew names might have made them attractive to Jews in the tension between tradition and assimilation.

Other names are found as homophone double names in literary or epigraphical sources:

- 1) Alkimos/Yaqim<sup>203</sup> introduced in Josephus with 'the most common formula' to indicate an alternative name:<sup>204</sup> Ἀλκιμος ὁ καὶ Ἰάκειμος (*Jewish*

---

<sup>198</sup> There are two valid entries in *LJNLA* for Palestine (*LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Rufus') and eight entries for the Western Diaspora (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Rufus'). Ilan mentions that the name is 'interpreted as a popular transliteration of רִבְעִי' with 'no concrete example to prove it' (*LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Rufus,' n. 1). Mussies assumes it is a 'phonetically resembling substitute' of Reuben (Mussies, 'Names,' 273). Cohen argues that Rufus was understood as a 'translation' of Reuben, pointing to *Leviticus Rabbah* 32:5 and the commonness of the name Rufus 'among the Jews of the Roman diaspora' (Cohen, 'Names,' 118f.).

<sup>199</sup> There are twelve valid entries in *LJNLA* for Palestine (two in *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Annianus' and ten in *LJNLA II*, s.v. 'Annianus'), and ten entries for the Western Diaspora (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Annianus'). According to Ilan 'there is a similarity between this name and the transliteration of the biblical-Semitic אַנְיָנָא / אַנְיָנָא name into Greek and Latin' (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Annianus,' n. 1); cf. Noy, *JWE* 1, 237, who points to a possible connection between Annianus and Ananias.

<sup>200</sup> There is one entry for Aster for Palestine, interpreted as a Latin transliteration of Esther by Ilan (*LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Esther'). For the Diaspora, Ilan differentiates between Greek transliterations of the Hebrew name Esther (with theta) and the Greek names Asteria and Aster (with tau) found two and five times (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Asteria' and s.v. 'Aster'). As the form of the Hebrew name 'resembles closely the name Ἀστερία in Greek ... and the name Astrius in Latin' (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Esther,' n. 1), these names were 'reminiscent of the biblical Jewish queen – Esther' (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Asteria' and 'Aster,' n. 1); cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 183, n. 308.

<sup>201</sup> There are no entries for Mnason or Mnaseas for Palestine; all Greek forms are interpreted as transliterations of the Hebrew name Manasseh (*LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Manaseh' and *LJNLA II*, s.v. 'Manaseh'). For the Western Diaspora, there are two valid entries for Mnason and one for Mnaseas (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Mnaseas' and 'Mnason'). Mussies interprets Mnason and Mnaseas as names that 'performed a double task' as either a translation name of Zechariah (same meaning) or a homophone of Manasseh (Mussies, 'Jewish Names,' 249).

<sup>202</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 183f.

<sup>203</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 183; cf. Mussies, 'Names,' 249.

<sup>204</sup> Horsley, 'Names,' 1013.

*Antiquities* 12.385), a high priest also mentioned in 1 and 2 Maccabees.<sup>205</sup>

These are the only sources in which the name Alkimos is found for a Jewish person.<sup>206</sup> Considering Yaqim is among ‘the 99 most popular names among Palestinian Jews, 330 BCE – 200 CE’ (though only ranked 50),<sup>207</sup> the one mention of a homophone seems to be an exception rather than the rule.

- 2) The combination of the Greek Jason with Jesus, the transliteration of the Hebrew Yeshua/Yoshua,<sup>208</sup> is mentioned in Josephus in a name change scenario (*Jewish Antiquities* 12.239):<sup>209</sup> The high priest Jesus took on the name Jason under Antiochus Epiphanes IV. Though the combination is not found elsewhere, Jason is a common name in Palestine, specifically from the beginning of the Hellenistic period to the rabbinic era,<sup>210</sup> understood by many as ‘the Hellenized form of Joshua (= Jesus...).’<sup>211</sup> It is also a popular name choice in the Western Diaspora.<sup>212</sup> The fact that the two names are even more similar in sound in the Ionic dialect in which Jason is pronounced Ἰῆσων might be a reason why Jason was ‘one of the very early Greek names to achieve popularity in Jewish circles.’<sup>213</sup> This supports the idea of sound similarity to a Hebrew name as one factor in choosing foreign names. However, apart from the example above, there is again no indication that the equivalents were regularly used as double names.<sup>214</sup>

---

<sup>205</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Alcimus.’

<sup>206</sup> There are no entries for ‘Alcimus’ in the other volumes of *LJNLA*.

<sup>207</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 87, table 6; cf. the seven valid entries in *LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Yaqim.’

<sup>208</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 183; cf. Mussies, ‘Names,’ 249.

<sup>209</sup> Cf. *LJNLA I*, ‘Jason,’ no. 5; cf. Mussies, ‘Names,’ 273.

<sup>210</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 86, table 6 (rank twenty-seven). Including the mentioned Jesus/Jason, sixteen entries are found for this period (*LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Jason’ and *LJNLA II*, Addendum vol. I, s.v. ‘Jason’) and another two for the later period (*LJNLA II*, s.v. ‘Jason’).

<sup>211</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Jason,’ n. 12.

<sup>212</sup> There are fourteen valid entries in *LJNLA III*, s.v. ‘Jason.’

<sup>213</sup> Cohen, ‘Aristeas,’ 46-48; cf. Williams, ‘Names,’ 87 and BDAG, s.v. ‘Ἰάσων’ (‘It was a favorite practice among Jews to substitute the purely [Greek] name Ἰάσων for the Hebrew-[Greek] Ἰησοῦς’).

<sup>214</sup> Even in the case of Jesus Jason, it is not clear whether he kept using his Hebrew name after he took on his new name.

- 3) Another combination, Mousaios/Moses, is found together in a quotation of Pseudo-Eupolemus by Eusebius:<sup>215</sup> ... δὲ Μώϋσον ὀνομάσαι· ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν Ἑλλήνων αὐτὸν ... Μουσαῖον προσαγορευθῆναι (*Praeparatio Evangelica* 9.27.3) [... and she named him Moses; but by the Greeks he ... was called Mousaios].<sup>216</sup> Williams, defending the use of Moses as a personal name by Jews in antiquity, also assumes that Jews used Mousaios as an equivalent of Moses.<sup>217</sup> Though both names are not common in Palestine, they are relatively common in the Diaspora,<sup>218</sup> presumably because the messianic overtones of the name that prevented Palestinian Jews from giving it to their children<sup>219</sup> were not as pronounced among their compatriots in the Diaspora.
- 4) The Julius/Judah (or Julianus/Judah) pair in Bauckham is only based on *Canticles Rabbah* 56:6.<sup>220</sup> Yet, there is another occurrence of the combination of Julius/Judah in an inscription referring to a possibly Jewish man in Italy (*Juda Iulius CIJ* 636).<sup>221</sup> There are only four mentions of Julius in Palestine for the Hellenised/Roman period.<sup>222</sup> Apart from one, all have two Latin names<sup>223</sup> and belong to Romanised circles (no. 1.-3.). Two fictitious persons called Julianus are also connected to the Romanised circles of the Herodians.<sup>224</sup>

<sup>215</sup> Mussies, 'Names,' 246. Bauckham does not include this equation of the names in his argument.

<sup>216</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>217</sup> Margret H. Williams, 'Jewish Use of Moses as a Personal Name in Graeco-Roman Antiquity - a Note,' *ZPE* 118 (1997): 274; cf. Hannah M. Cotton and Jonathan J. Price, 'A Bilingual Tombstone from Zo'ar (Arabia) (Hecht Museum, Haifa, Inv. No. H-3029, Naveh's List No. 18),' *ZPE* 134 (2001): 277-283, citing 278, who equate Mousios and Moses.

<sup>218</sup> There is only one entry for Moses in the earlier period in Palestine (*LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Moses') and three valid entries for the later period are recorded (*LJNLA II*, s.v. 'Moses'). There are no entries for Mousaios. For the Western Diaspora, three valid entries are listed for both Moses and Mousaios (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Moses' and s.v. 'Mousaios'). Concerning Mousaios Ilan agrees that 'the name is reminiscent of the biblical Moses' (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Mousaios,' n. 1).

<sup>219</sup> Cf. Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 78.

<sup>220</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 183, n. 315.

<sup>221</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Julius,' no. 12.

<sup>222</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Julius.' We can add four mentions of the female equivalent Julia (*LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Julia'). Especially interesting for our discussion is no. 3, an ossuary inscription referring to 'Julia, Judah's daughter.' If she was named after her father, this could be another example of a connection between Judah and Julius.

<sup>223</sup> In two cases Julius as the second name is used in its proper position as a *gentilicium*.

<sup>224</sup> *LJNLA II*, Addendum vol. I, s.v. 'Julianus.'

With growing Roman influence, both names became more popular in later Palestine.<sup>225</sup> Unsurprisingly the names are most popular in the Western Diaspora.<sup>226</sup> However, this is more likely due to Roman naming customs than sound similarity. Connected to the famous *gens Iulia*, the names would have been borne by many Jewish slaves, freedmen and provincials who gained citizenship. That Jews called Julianus or Julius, if they had an additional name, more likely took either a second Latin name or the full Roman *tria nomina* than an alternative Hebrew name is corroborated by the evidence.<sup>227</sup>

- 5) The Latin name Justus is combined with two different Hebrew names in the New Testament, Joseph (Acts 1:23) and Jesus (Colossians 4:11), both different in sound from Justus but close enough to make a connection. In both cases the double name is indicated by a formula, a) Ἰωσήφ ... ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰουῆτος and b) Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰουῆτος.<sup>228</sup> Both persons were known by these two names. Ilan doubts that Justus is a ‘popular transliteration of יהוֹסֵט’<sup>229</sup> and ignores the New Testament evidence.<sup>230</sup> Aside from *Midrash Rabbah*,<sup>231</sup> another example of the likely connection between Joseph and Justus is found in Josephus, *The Life* 5. Joseph(us)’ second son, who was ‘born, named, and reared in Rome,’<sup>232</sup> was named Justus, probably after his father and great-grandfather.<sup>233</sup> It is also one of the rare Latin names

<sup>225</sup> Eight valid entries for Julianus (*LJNLA II*, s.v. ‘Julianus’) and six valid entries for Julius (*LJNLA II*, s.v. ‘Julius’) are recorded for the later period in Palestine. We can add one valid entry for Julia (*LJNLA II*, s.v. ‘Julia’).

<sup>226</sup> Twelve valid entries for Julianus (*LJNLA III*, s.v. ‘Julianus’) and sixteen valid entries for Julius (*LJNLA III*, s.v. ‘Julius’) are listed for the Western Diaspora. We can add three valid entries for Juliana (*LJNLA III*, s.v. ‘Juliana’) and seventeen valid entries for Julia (*LJNLA III*, s.v. ‘Julia’).

<sup>227</sup> For a second Latin name, cf. *LJNLA III*, s.v. ‘Julianus,’ no. 4 and s.v. ‘Julius,’ no. 8, 24, and 31; for complete *tria nomina*, cf. *LJNLA III*, s.v. ‘Julianus,’ no. 8 and s.v. ‘Julius,’ no. 2, 10, 27, and 28; and for the only Latin/Hebrew combination, cf. *LJNLA III*, s.v. ‘Julianus,’ no. 16.

<sup>228</sup> Horsley, ‘Names,’ 1013.

<sup>229</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Justus,’ n. 1.

<sup>230</sup> The additional name Justus is not part of the entry for the biblical Joseph Barsabbas (*LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Joseph,’ no. 31).

<sup>231</sup> Cf. n. 163.

<sup>232</sup> Williams, ‘Names,’ 104.

<sup>233</sup> Bauckham, ‘Paul,’ 213.

found in Palestine up to the rabbinic era,<sup>234</sup> which makes a connection to a Hebrew name likely. Aside from a sound-equivalent for Joseph, it could be a translation name for Zadok, meaning ‘just.’<sup>235</sup> As with Julius and Julianus, the popularity of the Latin name Justus increased in Palestine with the widened influence of Roman culture in the period from 200 – 650 CE.<sup>236</sup> Because Justus is a common *cognomen* without connection to a *gens*, its popularity in the Western Diaspora is more likely due to the similarity with Joseph than because of Roman naming conventions.<sup>237</sup>

- 6) The most famous Jewish double name, Saul/Paul (Acts 13:9), has already been mentioned.<sup>238</sup> Due to its formula, the Hebrew name Saul is often interpreted as *supernomen*,<sup>239</sup> an additional ethnic name used alongside the *tria nomina*. As this custom only came into use from the second century CE onwards,<sup>240</sup> Saul is unlikely a *supernomen* but rather an alternative Hebrew form of the *cognomen Paulus*,<sup>241</sup> which was the distinctive part of Paul’s *tria nomina*, his Latin ‘individual name.’<sup>242</sup> It seems logical that someone able to boast about his Jewish heritage as a Benjaminite (Romans 11:1, Philippians 3:5) was named after Saul, the first king of Israel, who was also from the tribe of Benjamin (1 Samuel 9:21) and was given a Latin *cognomen* resembling this kingly name. The two names reflect his Greco-Roman and Jewish identity, and he ‘operated under either name ... according to context.’<sup>243</sup> Paul is an ideal example of a person using a double name, but his

---

<sup>234</sup> There are five valid entries in *LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Justus.’

<sup>235</sup> Mussies, ‘Names,’ 249, who sees Justus as another name performing a ‘double task’ as homophone and translation name; cf. Williams, ‘Names,’ 104, who connects Justus with קִיָּדָק ‘one of several honorific nicknames’ in the Jewish onomasticon; contra Bauckham, ‘Paul,’ 212f., who sees only evidence for the sound-equivalency.

<sup>236</sup> There are sixteen valid entries in *LJNLA II*, s.v. ‘Justus.’

<sup>237</sup> There are fourteen valid entries, including Jesus Justus of Col 4:11 (*LJNLA III*, s.v. ‘Justus’). Only one Jew bore the Latin *tria nomina* (no. 14), and another a second Latin name (no. 11).

<sup>238</sup> Cf. III.2.1.

<sup>239</sup> G. A. Harrer, ‘Saul Who Also Is Called Paul,’ *HTR* 33.1 (1940): 19-33, citing 21f.; cf. Hemer, ‘Paul,’ 181.

<sup>240</sup> Cf. n. 83.

<sup>241</sup> Bauckham, ‘Paul,’ 211.

<sup>242</sup> Solin, ‘Names,’ 1024f.; cf. Salway, ‘Survey,’ 128.

<sup>243</sup> Hemer, ‘Paul,’ 181f.; cf. Horsley, *Documents*, 94.

name combination is not found for anyone else in the sources. Generally, Paul as a name for Jews is rare, both in Palestine<sup>244</sup> and the Diaspora<sup>245</sup> and thereby unlikely to be used as a substitute for Saul.

As *all* examples of homophonous Graeco-Roman and Hebrew double names are only attested once or twice, their usage might not be as prevalent as Bauckham argues. Nevertheless, the many instances of names like Simon, Mary, Rufus, Annianus, Jason, and Justus, which are all similar in sound to popular Hebrew names, could be an indication that names were not chosen because of their popularity in the cultural milieus Jews lived in but due to their reminiscence of Hebrew names. Thus, homophony seems to be at least one factor when choosing a name. Yet, this cannot be proof of the regular usage of homophonous Greek or Latin names as substitutes for Hebrew names in a Greco-Roman milieu. As most of these names are merely attested as single personal names, it remains speculation to 'reckon with the possibility that many, if not all of [their bearers], had a Hebrew name as well.'<sup>246</sup>

This is also true for Bauckham's proposal that Junia had a Hebrew name as well, and the most obvious choice of name would be Joanna. Mathew rightly calls this hypothesis 'very speculative,' pointing to the lack of literary evidence for a connection between the two women in the New Testament.<sup>247</sup> The two names appear only as single personal names, never as double name. Moreover, Bauckham fails to provide 'exact parallels to a potential equivalence between Joanna and Junia.'<sup>248</sup> His argument rests solely on the analogy to other rarely attested homophonous double names and the assumption that the choice of a homophonous Greco-Roman name as a substitute for a Hebrew name was a common practice of Jews in the first century CE. Despite supporting

---

<sup>244</sup> There are three entries, including Paul, in *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Paul.'

<sup>245</sup> Only three valid entries, including Paul, are listed in *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Paul.'

<sup>246</sup> Contra Mussies, 'Names,' 244, who applies this to foreign names of Jews in general.

<sup>247</sup> Mathew, *Women*, 101.

<sup>248</sup> Mathew, *Women*, 101.

Bauckham's thesis concerning Junia/Joanna,<sup>249</sup> Witherington admits that based on the 'small linguistic link' of sound equality alone, more 'detective work' needs to be done to identify Joanna with Junia.<sup>250</sup>

This detective work needs to close the gaps in Bauckham's argument concerning the relation of the two names: 1) the missing evidence that Junia and Joanna were understood as sound-equivalents, 2) the question of the prevalence of double names in general and more specifically in the circles in which Joanna and Junia moved, and 3) the missing explanation for the lack of internal New Testament evidence for Joanna/Junia as a double name. These missing links in Bauckham's thesis will be addressed in the following, and a development of his thesis will be suggested.

## 4. Joanna called Junia? – Bauckham's Thesis Revisited

### 4.1. Joanna/Junia - Sound-Equivalents?

At first glance, there seems little assonance between the Hebrew יהוחנה (Yehoḥanah) or יוחנה (Yoḥanah)<sup>251</sup> and the Latin *Iunia*.<sup>252</sup> Yet, it is important to remember that the sound-equivalents proposed by Bauckham are not transcriptions that stay as close as possible to the original pronunciation; they are names that already exist in another language and are similar in sound to the Hebrew original. Junia, an existing Latin name sharing at least three sounds (/j/, /n/, /a:/) with its Hebrew counterpart, fits into this category.

---

<sup>249</sup> Witherington with Hyatt, *Romans*, 388, who calls Bauckham's argument for the identification of the two women 'helpful, intriguing, and complete.'

<sup>250</sup> Witherington, 'Joanna,' 14 and 46, emphasis mine.

<sup>251</sup> As 'the name has no standard spelling in Hebrew,' several other variants are recorded aside from the long and short form mentioned above (*LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Joanna,' n. 4).

<sup>252</sup> There is also no link in meaning between Joanna, a theophoric name based on the root ḥnn, meaning 'to be gracious, to show favour' (Fowler, *Names*, 82), and Junia, associated with the Roman goddess Juno.

Considering Wolters' argument,<sup>253</sup> it could be asked whether Ἰουβία might be a transliteration of the Hebrew Yehoḥanah into Greek or Latin rather than being a sound-equivalent. The New Testament evidence is sufficient to dismiss this thought. The author of Luke uses the transliteration Ἰωάννα for the female Hebrew name (Luke 8:3), and Ἰωάννης is the standard New Testament transliteration for Yehoḥanan (John),<sup>254</sup> its male equivalent. If Paul had understood the name of the person in Romans 16:7 to be the name Joanna, he would have used the transliteration Ἰωάννα as he uses Ἰωάννης for John (Galatians 2:9). Looking at the evidence outside of the New Testament, variations of Ἰωάννα and Ἰωάννης were also the common transliterations of Joanna<sup>255</sup> and John<sup>256</sup> into Greek and seem to have been carried over into Latin as well.<sup>257</sup> The fact that common Greek/Latin transliterations for both the female and male name existed might render the use of sound-equivalents redundant.<sup>258</sup> Even though the names are still foreign, their transliterated forms are no longer as outlandish as the original Hebrew names.<sup>259</sup>

The existence of a common Graecised transliteration, however, did not prevent the use of a Greek sound-equivalent for the same Hebrew name. Both Ἰησοῦς (Jesus) and Ἰάσων (Jason) are found in the sources of Palestine and of the Western Diaspora for the popular name Joshua. In Palestine the name Joshua is mainly found in its Hebrew form but also in its Greek

---

<sup>253</sup> Cf. III.3.2.

<sup>254</sup> Luke 1:13; cf. Matt 3:1, Mark 1:4, John 1:6, Acts 1:5, Rev 1:1.

<sup>255</sup> Besides the Ἰωάννα mentioned in Luke 8:3, Ilan lists several contemporary Jews called Ἰωάνας for Palestine (*LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Joanna'). Three entries for the name Ἰωάννα and one for the variation Ἰοάννη are recorded for the Western Diaspora (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Joanna').

<sup>256</sup> Excluding the mention of Ἰωάννης in the New Testament, this form is recorded nineteen times as the name of Palestinian Jews in literary sources, whereas Ἰωάννης is found sixteen times in non-literary sources (*LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Yohanan'). Concerning the Western Diaspora, there are several Greek variations of the name, adding up to fourteen entries (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Yohanan').

<sup>257</sup> The Latin *Iohan(n)a* is found on a first-century ossuary in Palestine (*LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Joanna,' no. 3) and a sixth-century inscription in Sicily (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Joanna,' no. 1). *Ioannes* is the Latin rendering of the name of John of Gischala, a Jewish leader in the first Jewish-Roman War, in Tacitus (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Yohanan,' no. 12).

<sup>258</sup> Cf. Ng, 'Joanna,' 527, who, based on the appearance of the Greek and Latin transliterations, concludes that 'there seems to have been no real need for [Joanna] to adopt the Latin name Junia.'

<sup>259</sup> Cf. n. 174.

transliteration.<sup>260</sup> There are also fifteen occurrences of its sound-equivalent Jason, the majority in Hebrew script.<sup>261</sup> This peculiarity shows that it was an accepted name among Palestinian Jews in general and not just among Greek-speaking Jews, which makes it more likely that the name was understood as the Greek equivalent of Joshua. Considering the numbers for the Western Diaspora, the Hebrew form of Joshua is only recorded twice, meaning the name is almost exclusively found in either its Greek or Latin transliteration.<sup>262</sup> The name is overall less common than in Palestine.<sup>263</sup> Jason, however, seems to have been quite popular,<sup>264</sup> and like Joshua it is almost exclusively found in Greek.<sup>265</sup> This is another indication that the name was understood as the sound-equivalent of Joshua. Similar tendencies can be seen for Joseph-Josephus/Justus and Hananiah-Ananias/Annianus:

---

<sup>260</sup> Cf. table 1, s.v. 'Joshua.'

<sup>261</sup> Cf. table 1, s.v. 'Jason.'

<sup>262</sup> Cf. table 2, s.v. 'Joshua.'

<sup>263</sup> Joshua is still among the twenty most popular male names in the Western Diaspora (*LJNLA III*, 63, table 6) but far away from its sixth rank in Palestine (*LJNLA I*, 56, table 7).

<sup>264</sup> Jason is among the twenty most popular male names even if only the valid entries are counted (*LJNLA III*, 63, table 6).

<sup>265</sup> Cf. table 2, s.v. 'Jason.'

<i>Table 1: Palestine (330 BCE – 200 CE)</i> <sup>266</sup>			
Hebrew	Joshua: <sup>267</sup> 55x	Joseph: <sup>268</sup> 126x	Hananiah: <sup>269</sup> 67x
declinable transliteration	Jesus: 41x	Josephus: <sup>270</sup> 42x	Ananias: 19x
bilingual inscriptions	Joshua/Jesus: 6x	Joseph/Josephus: 3x	Hananiah/Ananias 1x
sound-equivalent	Jason: 15x <sup>271</sup>	Justus: 5x <sup>272</sup>	Annianus: 2x <sup>273</sup>

Considering the more significant impact of Hellenistic culture on Palestine compared to Roman culture, it could be expected that Latin names are less common than the Greek Jason. It is, nevertheless, significant that they are present at all.<sup>274</sup>

The significant changes concerning the occurrences of these names in the Western Diaspora can be summarised as the decline of the Jewish element and the increase of the Greco-Roman element. Greek or Latin increasingly replaces Hebrew, and the biblical names lose popularity, whereas their Greco-Roman sound-equivalents become more common:

<sup>266</sup> The numbers reflect persons listed in the respective entries of *LJNLA I* who are undoubtedly Jewish. As *LJNLA II* 'resembles a Diaspora volume much more than vol. 1 of Palestine' (*LJNLA II*, 4), entries of this period are not included.

<sup>267</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Joshua' and *LJNLA II*, Addendum vol. I, s.v. 'Joshua.'

<sup>268</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Joseph' and *LJNLA II*, Addendum vol. I, s.v. 'Joseph.' In addition to doubtful entries, all forms of the shortened name Joses are excluded.

<sup>269</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Hananiah' and *LJNLA II*, Addendum vol. I, s.v. 'Hananiah.' In addition to doubtful entries, all forms of the shortened name Hanani are excluded.

<sup>270</sup> Compared to fourteen entries for the indeclinable transliteration Ἰωσήφ.

<sup>271</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Jason' and *LJNLA II*, Addendum vol. I, s.v. 'Jason.' Eight entries are Hebrew, six are Greek, and one is bilingual.

<sup>272</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Justus.' All entries are found in Greek literary sources.

<sup>273</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Annianus.' Both entries are found in Greek epigraphic sources.

<sup>274</sup> As assumed for Junia, many of the persons bearing these Latin names belonged to Romanised circles. A son of Josephus and his bodyguard were called Justus (Josephus, *Life* 5 and *Life* 397). Another example is Justus of Tiberias (Josephus, *Life* 34), involved in the Jewish revolt but originally pro-Roman and later private secretary of Agrippa II (Tessa Rajak, 'Justus of Tiberias,' *ClQ* 23.2 (1973): 345-368, especially 351-354). Annianus is found as graffiti at the Herodium, one of the palaces Herod the Great built (*LJNLA I*, 'Annianus,' no. 1).

<i>Table 2: Western Diaspora (330 BCE – 650 CE)</i> <sup>275</sup>			
Hebrew	Joshua: <sup>276</sup> 1x	Joseph: <sup>277</sup> 3x	Hananiah: <sup>278</sup> 3x
declinable transliteration	Jesus: 17x	Josephus: <sup>279</sup> 50x	Ananias: 10x
bilingual inscriptions	Joshua/Jesus: 0x	Joseph/Josephus: 0x	Hananiah/Ananias 0x
sound-equivalent	Jason: 13x <sup>280</sup>	Justus: 14x <sup>281</sup>	Annianus: 9x <sup>282</sup>

These examples show that 1) there seem to be two ways of adapting a Hebrew name to a Greco-Roman surrounding a) using a declinable transliteration of the name or b) finding a Greco-Roman name that is similar in sound to the name; 2) the more popular a biblical name is in Palestine, the more likely is the appearance of its Greco-Roman equivalent in the onomasticon of Palestine and even more so in the onomasticon of the Diaspora; and 3) the use of the Greek or Latin forms (transliterations or sound-equivalents) is favoured in the Diaspora, as the massive decline of the Hebrew forms in the sources indicates.

<sup>275</sup> The numbers reflect persons listed in the respective entries of *LJNLA III* who are undoubtedly Jewish. As there is a lack of evidence from Roman sources (which are especially interesting for this thesis) before the third century CE, all entries are included rather than only entries of the period overlapping with volume I.

<sup>276</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Joshua.'

<sup>277</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Joseph' and *LJNLA IV*, Addendum vol. III, s.v. 'Joseph.' In addition to the doubtful entries, all forms of the shortened name Joses are excluded, though it needs to be noted that apart from one Hebrew entry, the Greek name Ἰωσήφ is the only form of the name Joseph found in Rome.

<sup>278</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Hananiah' and *LJNLA II*, Addendum vol. III, s.v. 'Hananiah.'

<sup>279</sup> Compared to fourteen entries for the indeclinable transliteration Ἰωσήφ.

<sup>280</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Jason.' Only one of the entries is Hebrew; twelve are Greek. Only one entry originates from Rome.

<sup>281</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Justus.' Ten entries are Greek, and four are Latin. Most finds (nine entries) are located in Rome.

<sup>282</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Annianus.' Five entries are Greek, three are Latin, and one is bilingual.

If the same observations can be made about Yehoḥanah -Joanna/Junia, it becomes more likely that Junia was understood as a Latin sound-equivalent of Yehoḥanah. According to Ilan, Joanna is one of Palestine's ten most popular female names (ranking five to six).<sup>283</sup> As expected, the Hebrew form of the name is more common (seven occurrences) than its mainly Greek transliterations (four occurrences).<sup>284</sup> All of the names belong to Jewish persons, but not all are certainly female;<sup>285</sup> only four entries can be definitely attributed to women due to context. Therefore, Joanna might be a less popular female name than assumed. A lesser popularity of Joanna, in combination with the rarity of Latin names in general, might account for the complete absence of the name Junia from the Jewish Palestinian onomasticon.<sup>286</sup>

As there is an underrepresentation of women's names in the Palestinian sources (only about 11% of persons mentioned),<sup>287</sup> a comparable sample to the names above can only be provided by including occurrences of the popular male name Yehoḥanan.<sup>288</sup> Concerning the Hebrew form and the Greek transliteration, the findings are comparable; over two-thirds of the names are Hebrew, and less than one-third are found in Greek transliteration.<sup>289</sup> Despite the popularity of Yehoḥanan and its Greek transliteration Ἰωάννης, its assumed sound-equivalent Junius is not found as a name in Palestine<sup>290</sup> and only tentatively one time as the name of a Palestinian Jew in the Diaspora. In one of

---

<sup>283</sup> *LJNLA I*, 57, table 8.

<sup>284</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Joanna.' There is one Latin transliteration, 'one of the rare cases of a Latin inscription found in Palestine.' (*LJNLA I*, 'Joanna,' n. 6)

<sup>285</sup> Even though Yehoḥanah was 'a popular Jewish woman's name in Palestine during the Greco-Roman period,' it was also used as the Aramaic form of Yehoḥanan (Tal Ilan, 'Yohana bar Makoutha and Other Pagans Bearing Jewish Names,' in *These are the Names: Studies in Jewish Onomastics*, vol. 3, ed. A. Demsky, Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2002, 109-119, citing 110).

<sup>286</sup> There are no entries in *LJNLA I* or *LJNLA II*. That Junia is absent even from the later period despite the growing Roman influence might be another indication that the name was not, or only rarely, used among Jews.

<sup>287</sup> *LJNLA I*, 3.

<sup>288</sup> *LJNLA I*, 56, table 7, rank five.

<sup>289</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Yohanan.' Ninety names are Hebrew, and thirty-two are Greek transliterations (some are listed in two languages (Hebrew/Greek or Hebrew/Latin). Of the possibly male names under 'Joanna,' five are Hebrew, two are Greek, and one is Latin.

<sup>290</sup> There is no entry in *LJNLA I*.

the Jewish catacombs of Rome, an inscription was found, including a name that resembles the Latin Junius closely (Ἰώνιος instead of Ιούνιος).<sup>291</sup> As the interchange of ω and ου is one of the typical Greek spelling variations found in Jewish inscriptions,<sup>292</sup> the name mentioned in the inscription might be a variation of Junius or simply the misspelt name itself. Generally, it is interpreted as either a Greek name<sup>293</sup> or a transliteration of a Hebrew name<sup>294</sup> followed by either the wrongly transliterated Jewish title הכהן – ‘the priest,’<sup>295</sup> a transcription of הקנה – ‘the zealot,’<sup>296</sup> or the transliteration of the Latin *gentilicium* Aconius.<sup>297</sup> This name is especially interesting because Klein identifies its bearer with a Palestinian figure called Bar-Yohannis, known from rabbinic literature.<sup>298</sup> This identification would be a perfect parallel to Joanna/Junia, a Palestinian Jew in the Roman Diaspora who chose the Latin name Junius, similar in sound to his patronymic or nickname Bar-Yohannis. Yet, Ilan is very sceptical about Klein’s ‘over-enthusiastic’ identifications and deems them speculative.<sup>299</sup> As the only connection between the literary figure and the inscription, apart from similar names, is Rome as a common place of living, the identification is not just tentative but doubtful (especially if the second name is read as a Latin name). Nevertheless, by identifying the two figures, Klein, a Hebrew speaker, acknowledges a similarity between the Latin Junius and the Hebrew Yehoḥanan.

Turning to the Western Diaspora, the biblical names are still quite common (Yehoḥanah is still among the twenty most popular names, and Yehoḥanan is ranked eleven).<sup>300</sup> The trend away from the Hebrew name towards its

<sup>291</sup> *CIJ* 362; cf. *JIWE* 2 60.

<sup>292</sup> *LJNLA III*, 16.

<sup>293</sup> In *JIWE* 2 60 it is transcribed as ‘Ionius.’

<sup>294</sup> *LJNLA II*, s.v. ‘Yonah,’ no. 5.

<sup>295</sup> Leon, *Jews*, 118, n. 3.

<sup>296</sup> Horsley, *Documents*, 92, following Frey and Juster.

<sup>297</sup> *LJNLA II*, s.v. ‘Aconius;’ cf. *JIWE* 2, 53.

<sup>298</sup> S. Klein, ‘Bar-Yohannis of Sepphoris at Rome,’ *BJPES* (1940): 47-51, citing 50 and 51, n. 8., who reads the name as the Latin *Iunios* and proposes that the second name reflects יהֹפֶהָן.

<sup>299</sup> *LJNLA I*, 35.

<sup>300</sup> *LJNLA III*, 63f., table 6 and 7.

transliteration is also present.<sup>301</sup> What is not reflected in the sources, despite the popularity of the names, is a wider usage of the assumed Latin sound-equivalents Junia and Junius.

As was already stated, Junia might have been a name used among Jews in Rome,<sup>302</sup> but it is not recorded as the name of a Jewish woman outside of the Roman capital. Considering that there is a perfect explanation for its usage in the Greco-Roman world other than its similarity with the Hebrew Joanna, especially in Rome, where it was a prestigious name, and taking into account that the biblical name Joanna itself is not once recorded as the name of a Jewish woman in Rome,<sup>303</sup> the written evidence we have to establish a link between the two female names is limited. John was a common name in the Western Diaspora, mainly found in the Northern African provinces of Egypt and Cyrenaica, but it is also not found in Rome.<sup>304</sup> However, the Jewish inscriptions with the name Junius were all found in Rome.<sup>305</sup> Moreover, the name is never found as a person's first name but always as the second. For two names it is used within the Roman naming system as the *gentilicium* of a *tria nomina*; therefore, it cannot be understood as a sound-equivalent.<sup>306</sup> The third mention of Junius,<sup>307</sup> the Latin-Latin combination Justus Junius, resembles Roman naming conventions but could be interpreted as combining two Greco-Roman sound-equivalents standing for the Hebrew-Hebrew combination Joseph Yehoḥanan. This sole example of a possible sound equivalency seems insufficient to justify a general connection between John and Junius or Joanna

---

<sup>301</sup> There are only Greek and Latin transliterations for Joanna (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Joanna'), and fifteen of the twenty-three valid entries for John are Greek transliterations. (*LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Yohanan').

<sup>302</sup> Cf. n. 104.

<sup>303</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Joanna.'

<sup>304</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Yohanan.' Sixteen of the twenty-three valid entries were found in Egypt and five in Cyrenaica.

<sup>305</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Junius.'

<sup>306</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Junius,' no. 2 and 3., both *CIJ 10\**; cf. *JJWE 2 610*. The brothers on this inscription bear the same *praenomen* and *gentilicium* (Marcus Junius) and two different Greek *cognomina* as 'individual signifiers' (Salway, 'Survey,' 130).

<sup>307</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Junius,' no. 1.

and Junia, especially compared to the other examples where numbers support such a connection.

Nonetheless, there are sufficient reasons that could explain the scarce evidence for Junia and Junius in the Jewish onomasticon of the Western Diaspora despite the popularity of their Hebrew counterparts:

Whereas Joshua, Joseph, and Hananiah were popular names throughout the Western Diaspora,<sup>308</sup> the names Joanna and John were mainly located in Northern Africa, especially Egypt, where 'the Jewish community ... dwindled to an insignificant entity' after 117 CE, the year Rome put down Jewish uprisings.<sup>309</sup> The later evidence for names related to John is extremely rare because 'with the advent of Christianity,' the name John 'became especially associated with the new religion and, as a result, Jews refrained from using it.'<sup>310</sup> This could explain the absence of Joanna and John and the scarce evidence for the usage of Junia and Junius in the Roman sources, which mainly date from the third and fourth centuries CE. With the decline of the Hebrew name, the usage of a sound-equivalent would have also dwindled.

Unlike the Latin names Justus and Annianus, which were *cognomina*, Junius is a *gentilicium* used in specific ways within Roman naming conventions. Considering the tendency of Diaspora Judaism to follow the non-Jewish naming practices closely, there might have been more scruples to use it as a personal name contrary to Roman conventions. Ng argues that due to their connection to the prestigious *gens Iunia*, the names Junia and Junius were 'not adopted by Jews with ease.'<sup>311</sup> She also points to a legislation by Claudius mentioned in Suetonius which prohibited *peregrini*, foreigners without Roman citizenship, from using *nomina gentilicia* (Suetonius, *Claudius* 25.3).<sup>312</sup> In light of

---

<sup>308</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Joshua;' *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Joseph;' and *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Hananiah.'

<sup>309</sup> *LJNLA III*, 59; cf. G. H. R. Horsley, 'Name Change as an Indication of Religious Conversion in Antiquity,' *Numen* 34.1 (1987): 1-17, citing 9.

<sup>310</sup> *LJNLA III*, 5.

<sup>311</sup> Ng, 'Joanna,' 530f.

<sup>312</sup> Ng, 'Joanna,' 528f.

this, she suggests that ‘it would be foolish and reckless for [Joanna] to start or continue to use the name Junia in Rome.’<sup>313</sup> Yet, this legislation was likely executed only in Rome and might have been as short-lived as the banishment of Jews from Rome mentioned shortly after (Suetonius, *Claudius* 25.4). This is supported by the fact that there is ample evidence for names connected to the even more famous *gens Iulia* among Jews in Palestine and the Western Diaspora. As not all of them adhere to Roman naming conventions, some might have borne the names without being Roman citizens.<sup>314</sup> Furthermore, customs for female names were different. Women often bore the feminine form of the *gentilicium* of their father or master as a personal name.<sup>315</sup> Concerns regarding citizenship in the case of women were also less likely. Therefore, Junia could have been used as a homophonous Latin name for Yehoḥanah without deviating from Roman naming conventions or breaching any Roman sensitivities or laws in Rome or Palestine.

Cohen proposes that sound-equivalents were especially attractive for Jews who transitioned from one cultural *era* into another.<sup>316</sup> This might also be true for Jews transitioning from one cultural *area* to another. In Joanna’s case the world she left behind when marrying Chuza presumably was less Romanised than the world she entered as the wife of Herod’s steward unless she was already part of the court before her marriage.<sup>317</sup> In analogy with the other sound-equivalents attested only once as double names, it is not impossible to assume that the Lukan Joanna, in her specific circumstances, would have chosen the Latin sound-equivalent Junia as a substitute name already in Palestine. There are two main factors we must bear in mind when estimating the probability of this scenario: the prevalence of (homophonous) double names

---

<sup>313</sup> Ng, ‘Joanna,’ 531f.

<sup>314</sup> Cf. n. 221-227.

<sup>315</sup> Cf. III.3.1.

<sup>316</sup> Cohen, ‘Aristeas,’ 42, emphasis mine.

<sup>317</sup> Cf. IV.2.1.2.

at the Herodian court and a plausible explanation for the choice of the otherwise unattested name Junia in Jewish Palestine.

## 4.2. Joanna/Junia – A Double Name?

### 4.2.1. (Double) Names at the Herodian Court(s)

Based on the evidence in Josephus,<sup>318</sup> Bauckham argues convincingly that Latin names were found predominantly in the Romanised circles of Palestine connected to the Herodians.<sup>319</sup> However, during the reign of Herod the Great, the primary language concerning names was Greek. Though Latin names are found among the courtiers, Greek names predominate for family and court members. Most of Herod's wives bear Greek names,<sup>320</sup> as do most of his sons<sup>321</sup> and two of his daughters.<sup>322</sup> Among his friends, Greek names are also prevalent.<sup>323</sup> Whereas Latin names *are* common for military officials, Greek names are often found among court officials and slaves.<sup>324</sup> Several persons did not use Greco-Roman names but were known by their ethnic names. Two of Herod's wives are called Mariamme (Graecised Hebrew name), one son is named after his brother Phasaël (Hebrew name) and his daughters Shelamzion, Salome, and Roxane bear names that are not of Greco-Roman origin (Hebrew, Graecised Hebrew, and Persian). His friends Costobarus (Idumean name) and Soaimus (Ithurian name) used their birth names rather than Greco-Roman

---

<sup>318</sup> The references in Josephus to the names of the persons listed in the following are found in Abraham Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus* (Leiden: Brill, 1968). For the English transliteration and the origin of the names, see the respective entries in *LJNLA I* (excluding non-Jewish persons).

<sup>319</sup> Bauckham, 'Paul,' 215f. Focussing his examples on Palestinian Jews, Bauckham lists seven family members and eight courtiers with Latin names. In addition to these persons, several military officials bearing Latin names (Gratus, Rufus, Sulla, Volumnius) and another friend of Herod the Great (Gemellus) might be Jews or non-Jews.

<sup>320</sup> Cleopatra, Doris, Elpis, Malthace, Pallas, and Phaidra.

<sup>321</sup> Alexander, Antipatrus, Archelaus, Aristobulus, Herod, Herod Antipas, and Philip.

<sup>322</sup> Cyprus and Olympias.

<sup>323</sup> Alexas, Andromachus, Antipatrus, Lysimachus, Nicolaus of Damascus, Olympos, and Ptolemy.

<sup>324</sup> Corinthus and Tyrannus, Herod's bodyguards; Diophantus, Herod's scribe; and Tryphon, Herod's hairdresser.

substitutes. Even more significant is that Herod felt no need to change the name of his eunuch Bagoas (Persian name).

During the reign of the later Herodians, more Latin names are found, which indicates an increasing Romanisation. Yet, Greek names are still common among both family and court members. Agrippa I's wife Cyprus, his daughter Berenice, his relative Antipas and his nephews Aristobulus and Berenicianus, as well as two of his freedmen (Phoibus and Stoicheus) and his friend and servant Ariston, bear Greek names. Greek names are also found among the court and military officials of Agrippa II (Ptolemy and Philip). Names other than Greco-Roman names are also commonly found. Agrippa I's friend Helcias probably bears the Hebrew name Helkiah,<sup>325</sup> and the name of his friend Silas is a Graecised form of the Aramaic Sheila.<sup>326</sup> Two named relatives of Agrippa II (Costobarus and Saulus, i.e. the Hebrew Saul) bear their name of birth rather than a Greco-Roman name, and his general Darius also kept his Persian name.

Turning to the court to which Joanna might have belonged, the court of Herod Antipas, the overall evidence in Josephus is scarce compared to the courts of Herod the Great and the later Herodians Agrippa I and II.<sup>327</sup> Only one friend of Antipas is mentioned, Eirenaius (Greek name). Other than that, we know that Antipas was married to a daughter of the Nabatean king Aretas IV, probably named Phasaelis (Semitic name),<sup>328</sup> and later to Herodias (Greek name), the sister of Agrippa I.<sup>329</sup> The New Testament adds three more names to the list: Antipas' steward Chuza (Semitic name) and his wife Joanna (Hebrew name) in Luke 8:3, and Manaen, i.e. Menahem (Hebrew name), who was brought up with Antipas according to Acts 13:1. None of the persons

---

<sup>325</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Helkiah,' n. 7.

<sup>326</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Sheila,' n. 2.

<sup>327</sup> Kokkinos argues that Josephus' knowledge of the period from Archelaus to Agrippa I, including the reign of Herod Antipas, is very limited (for the years 26-36 CE) or almost non-existent (for the years 6-26 CE) (Nikos Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse*, repr. and enl. ed., London: Spink, 2010, 195).

<sup>328</sup> Kokkinos, *Dynasty*, 229-231.

<sup>329</sup> Kokkinos, *Dynasty*, 264-271.

mentioned in relation to Antipas above bears a Latin name. In light of the evidence from the courts of Herod the Great and the later Herodians, it is nevertheless plausible that persons bearing Latin names were also found at the court of Antipas, especially once Antipas 'gained a closer relationship with Rome' after Tiberius became emperor.<sup>330</sup> Yet, it is also obvious from the literary sources that there was no need to replace Hebrew or other ethnic names with a Greco-Roman name because many court members were known by their ethnic birth name.

The evidence for name combinations with a Semitic and Greco-Roman element is much smaller than for ethnic single names. There are only two attested Greek-Semitic combinations in Josephus, Herod's friend Antipatrus Gadia<sup>331</sup> and Alexas Helcias,<sup>332</sup> the husband of Cyprus, granddaughter of Herod the Great. Concerning the former, the Aramaic name Gadia is a nickname used to differentiate this Antipater from other court members of the same name (e.g. Herod's firstborn son). The latter combination is more interesting for our purpose. Abraham Schalit proposes that the second name was originally introduced with the standard formula ὅς καὶ.<sup>333</sup> Though they are no clear sound-equivalents, the names are quite similar.<sup>334</sup> Considering that Alexas is also described as τοῦ Ἀλεξᾶ, 'the son of Alexas,' it is likely that he was named after his father and was given an additional Hebrew name to differentiate father and son, or he adopted the name for an unknown reason.<sup>335</sup>

---

<sup>330</sup> Kokkinos, *Dynasty*, 234.

<sup>331</sup> The second name is Aramaic, meaning 'kid,' alternatively, the name is 'derived from the Aramaic god of fortune' Gad (*LJNLA I*, s.v. Gadia, n. 1).

<sup>332</sup> Cf. n. 325 for a connection between Helcias and Helkiah.

<sup>333</sup> Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch*, s.v. 'Ἑλκίας,' 43f, no. 2. His argument is based on the variant reading Selcias, which, in his view, is a combination of the remaining sigma of ὅς and the original name while καὶ was dropped.

<sup>334</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Alexander,' n. 29. This similarity leads Ilan to assume that Alexas is a corruption of the transliteration of Helkiah, meaning only the Hebrew name originally existed.

<sup>335</sup> Kokkinos suggests that Alexas Helcias is the father of the treasurer Helcias (Josephus, *Ant.* 20.194-195), who oversaw the temple money during the reign of Agrippa II. (Kokkinos, *Dynasty*, 200f.). If Kokkinos is correct, Alexas Helcias might have held the same position at one point and took on a Hebrew name to suit this specific office connected to the centre of Judaism, the temple.

The possibility of taking on a Hebrew name in addition to a Greco-Roman birth name is something Bauckham has not considered for Joanna/Junia. If pagans in Jewish surroundings took on Jewish names,<sup>336</sup> there is no reason to doubt the possibility that Jews bearing a Greco-Roman name adopted a Hebrew name in specifically Jewish circles. Could Junia have used Joanna among the followers of Jesus to avoid a possibly problematic association of her name with the hated Roman occupation?<sup>337</sup> It would mean she came from a family with no qualms about giving their daughter a Latin name. Such a family would be most likely found in the Hellenised and Romanised circles of Tiberias.<sup>338</sup> However, the evidence for Latin names of members of the Tiberian elite dates from the Jewish War, likely two generations after the presumed Junia/Joanna would have been named. Moreover, even then, Romanisation was far from complete. Aside from Crispus, Julius Capellus, and Justus, Josephus mentions three Tiberians with Greek names (two Herods and Compsus).<sup>339</sup> From the patronymics given by Josephus, it is also known that the fathers of these men bear Greek<sup>340</sup> or Hebrew names.<sup>341</sup> Thus, the turn towards Latin names seems to have happened in a later generation. Yet, there is evidence that 'foreign names were more easily adopted for women than for men,'<sup>342</sup> so the practice for women *might* have been already present a generation earlier.

In summary, the presence of Latin names in the Romanised circles of first-century Palestine allows for the use of the name Junia at the Herodian court. However, double names, let alone homophonous ones, were a minor

---

<sup>336</sup> Ilan, 'Yohana,' 116.

<sup>337</sup> Cf. III.2.1 for the possibility that political factors like anti-Roman sentiments might have impacted the choice of names in first-century Palestine.

<sup>338</sup> Bauckham, 'Paul,' 215f. Bauckham suggests members of the Tiberian elite gave Latin names to their sons due to Antipas' Roman associations (Bauckham, *Women*, 141).

<sup>339</sup> Josephus, *Life* 33-36.

<sup>340</sup> Compsus, the father of Compsus and Crispus; Pistus, the father of Justus (Josephus, *Life* 33-36); and Antyllus, the father of Julius Capellus (Josephus, *Life* 69).

<sup>341</sup> Following the reading of Ilan (*LJNLA I*, s.v. 'Gamaliel,' no. 3 and s.v. 'Meir,' no. 2). Gamaliel, the father of one of the Herods and Meir, the father of the other Herod (Josephus, *Life* 33).

<sup>342</sup> *LJNLA I*, 8. The percentage of foreign names among Palestinian women (25%) is higher than among men (19%) (*LJNLA I*, 55, table 3).

phenomenon in those circles. Thus, Joanna's past among the Herodian elite is not enough to argue for the Joanna/Junia connection. Yet, it can be used as corroborating evidence should proof of a connection between the women or their names be found elsewhere. Therefore, it is time to turn to the New Testament, where double names seem more common than in other sources.

#### 4.2.2. *Double Names in the New Testament*

In the first century CE, long before it became customary in the East to add an indigenous name to the Latin *tria nomina*,<sup>343</sup> Semitic/Latin name combinations are recorded in Acts.<sup>344</sup> This does not mean that all these names were used as double names, i.e. alternative names used as single names in different cultural contexts. Indigenous names were often retained as a *cognomen* (the third name of the *tria nomina*) when *peregrini* (non-Roman citizens) received Roman citizenship and were thus allowed to use the full Roman name.<sup>345</sup> We know of Saul/Paul's Roman citizenship but have already established that he likely used Saul as an alternative name for his *cognomen* Paul.<sup>346</sup> The Latin names of John Mark, Simeon Niger and Joseph Justus might also *not* have been part of a complete Roman name but *were* used as replacements for their Hebrew names in Greco-Roman contexts. Justus and Niger can also be interpreted as nicknames ('the just' and 'the dark').<sup>347</sup> In the case of the Diaspora Jew Simeon, this might be the preferable option. For Joseph, however, an Aramaic nickname (Barsabbas) is also recorded. This is significant because it shows that Justus was very likely a Greco-Roman substitute name in this case since it would not have been needed as an identifier.<sup>348</sup> Therefore, Acts alone records at least three name

---

<sup>343</sup> Cf. n. 83.

<sup>344</sup> Joseph also called Justus (Acts 1:23); John also called Mark (Acts 12:12); Simeon called Niger (Acts 13:1); Saul also Paul (Acts 13:9).

<sup>345</sup> Salway, 'Survey,' 128; cf. *LJNLA III*, 8, for Jews retaining their Hebrew or Greek names as a *cognomen*.

<sup>346</sup> Cf. III.3.1.

<sup>347</sup> For Justus, cf. Keener, *Acts 1-2*, 770f.; Mussies, 'Names,' 249; Williams, 'Names,' 104; and Bauckham, 'Paul,' 212f. For Niger, cf. Keener, *Acts 3-14*, 1984-1987 and Bauckham, 'Paul,' 216.

<sup>348</sup> Cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 185.

combinations that were likely used as double names. Another possible double name, Jesus Justus, is found in Colossians 4:11.

Due to the limited evidence found in the sources,<sup>349</sup> this thesis, contrary to Bauckham, is cautious regarding the prevalence of the custom of double names in the wider culture. Nevertheless, it also takes the New Testament evidence for double names seriously. As it reflects other naming practices quite accurately,<sup>350</sup> the New Testament should also be trusted as a source for the usage of double names among Jews in Palestine and in the Diaspora. This begs a question that is opposed to previous approaches to double names in the New Testament. Rather than asking *how they fit into* the socio-cultural context, the question should be *why they are exceptional* evidence for Jewish onomastic studies. It might be worth considering whether their appearance in the New Testament is an exception that can prove a wider usage of double names among Jews in antiquity than is evident from the other sources. Considering the sparse evidence, the matter of under-reportage must be addressed. Williams, who doubts that 'Diaspora Jews practised alternative naming on a grand scale,' nevertheless admits that 'a degree of under-reportage [likely] occurred.'<sup>351</sup> However, she questions the explanations given by Mussies and Ameling.<sup>352</sup> This is certainly justified concerning Mussies vague statement that 'for some reason or other' Hebrew names were not mentioned in sources.<sup>353</sup> Yet, Ameling points out the inherent problem regarding double names in the sources when stating that Jews assimilated to the customary form of epitaphs of their urbane Greek surroundings.<sup>354</sup> The very reason for using double names, i.e. providing appropriate names for each cultural setting in which their bearers operated, obscures their existence in the sources. As each name is used only in its specific

---

<sup>349</sup> Cf. n. 53 for Palestine and n. 88 for the Western Diaspora.

<sup>350</sup> Cf. I.4.

<sup>351</sup> Williams, 'Use,' 312.

<sup>352</sup> Williams, 'Use,' 312.

<sup>353</sup> Mussies, 'Names,' 244.

<sup>354</sup> *IJO II* 14 and 103.

context, it naturally follows that only the name appropriate to this context is remembered and recorded.

An example that exemplifies such a separation of cultural backgrounds is the bilingual tombstone of Zo'ar (fourth century CE). Only one name is given in each part of the inscription (Moses in Aramaic, Mousios in Greek), and different systems of dating are used (the year since the destruction of the Jerusalem temple and the year of the sabbatical cycle in Aramaic, and the year of the era of the province of Arabia in Greek) which reflect the different cultural settings of a Jew living in a Roman province.<sup>355</sup>

Probably the most prominent examples of double names outside of the New Testament are found among the Hasmoneans. We know of six members of this Jewish dynasty who had both a Hebrew and a Greek name. For five of these persons, the actual combination of names is found in the sources.<sup>356</sup> Both names of Mattathias Antigonus are found on coins; the same is true for Jannaeus Alexander.<sup>357</sup> Josephus in *Jewish Antiquities* introduces John Hyrcanus,<sup>358</sup> Jannaeus Alexander,<sup>359</sup> and possibly Jannaeus' wife Shelamzion Alexandra,<sup>360</sup> with their Hebrew names and a formula indicating their Greek names. The same formula is found for Judas Aristobulus.<sup>361</sup> The only exception is Jonathan Aristobulus, whose names are both found in Josephus but never together.<sup>362</sup>

---

<sup>355</sup> Cotton and Price, 'Tombstone,' 278-280.

<sup>356</sup> For mentions in Josephus, cf. respective entries in Schalit's *Namenwörterbuch*, for further mentions in other sources cf. respective entries in *LJNLA I*. For an overview of the names of the Hasmoneans as given in different sources, cf. Tal Ilan, 'The Greek names of the Hasmoneans,' *JQR* 78.1-2 (1987): 1-20, citing 17, table II.

<sup>357</sup> Ilan, 'Hasmoneans,' 8.

<sup>358</sup> 'John... who is also Hyrcanus' (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:228).

<sup>359</sup> 'Jannaeus who is also Alexander' (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:320).

<sup>360</sup> 'Salina ... called by the Greeks Alexandra' (*Ant.* 13:320). Whether Salina Alexandra, the wife of Judas Aristobulus, can be identified with Shelamzion Alexandra is debated (cf. Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch*, 7 for such an identification; for arguments against this identification, cf. Tal Ilan, 'Queen Salamzion Alexandra and Judas Aristobulus I's Widow: Did Jannaeus Alexander Contract a Levirate Marriage?' *JSJ* 24.2 (1993): 181-190).

<sup>361</sup> 'Judas who is also Aristobulus' (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:240).

<sup>362</sup> Jonathan in *J.W.* and Aristobulus in *Ant.* (Ilan, 'Hasmoneans,' 4f.).

The names of the Hasmoneans tell us something about their self-perception. The first generation of Hasmoneans, who threw off the yoke of pagan rule,<sup>363</sup> all bore Hebrew names. Yet, from the second generation onwards, double names and Greek names became common, showing the impact of Hellenism on these Jewish rulers.<sup>364</sup> Nevertheless, their ancestry and the religious office they held as high priests made it difficult to give up Hebrew names completely. Double names were ideal for straddling their dual role as rulers in a Hellenistic world and Jewish high priests.

The way the Hasmonean names are recorded in the literary sources is also telling. In Rabbinic literature, which was addressed to a Hebrew/Aramaic-speaking audience, no name combinations are used; the Hebrew names are always preferred.<sup>365</sup> Josephus, writing for a Greek-speaking audience, uses mainly the Greek names of the Hasmoneans but also records the Hebrew names at various points of his narrative.<sup>366</sup> The record of the Hebrew names might reflect his desire to show his thoroughness as a historian, but more likely it says something about his self-perception. He also straddled two contexts, being born a Jew and recording not just any history but his Jewish history while writing for a Greco-Roman audience in a Greco-Roman setting.

Following the analysis of the Hasmonean names, two aspects seem important in the discussion of double names: 1) the actual reasons for a person to use a double name, and 2) the reasons that led to the documentation of both names instead of recording only the name most appropriate to the source. Two further non-literary instances of double names can help to exemplify these points:

---

<sup>363</sup> 1 and 2 Maccabees.

<sup>364</sup> Ilan, 'Hasmoneans,' 15.

<sup>365</sup> Ilan, 'Hasmoneans,' 6-8.

<sup>366</sup> Ilan convincingly argues that in *Jewish War* Josephus might have used Jewish sources at points, which would explain the preference for the Hebrew names in these passages. In contrast, in *Jewish Antiquities* the Hebrew names are mainly used to introduce a person (Ilan, 'Hasmoneans,' 4-6).

- 1) An inscription on a sarcophagus in Hierapolis, Asia Minor (second-third century CE),<sup>367</sup> belonging to Ἰκέσιου τοῦ [καὶ] Ἰουδα<sup>368</sup> (Icesius who is [also] Judah). The second name of the inscription (which might have been the given name) identifies the person as a Jew,<sup>369</sup> whereas the rest of the epigraph tells us he was deeply immersed in Greek culture, participating in Greek games. Icesius probably was his ‘professional name’ used in the Greco-Roman context of the games.<sup>370</sup> The Greco-Roman names of his sons, his wife, and his father-in-law<sup>371</sup> also indicate that the family was highly assimilated to the surrounding culture. Whereas Judah might have had to suppress his Jewish roots by becoming Icesius for the sake of his career during his lifetime, the epitaph was a possibility to honour and preserve his Jewish identity beyond his death. He might not have been known as Judah by many, but he wanted to ensure he was remembered by this name.
- 2) A first-century inscription from Italy<sup>372</sup> referring to *[Cl]audia Aster | [H]ierosolymitana | [ca]ptiva*. (‘Claudia Aster, prisoner from Jerusalem’).<sup>373</sup> As a prisoner from Jerusalem, Claudia was most likely a Jewish woman with the given name Esther, who ‘acquired her Roman name from the imperial freedman Ti. Claudius Proculus,’ presumably her owner, patron, or even husband, who is also mentioned in the inscription.<sup>374</sup> Her involuntary arrival in Italy is sufficient to explain why she retained her Jewish name and made sure that it would be remembered after her death, together with her history.

Concerning the double names in Acts, it has been argued that Jewish Christian missionaries outside of Palestine used Greco-Roman names to replace

---

<sup>367</sup> *LJNLA III*, s.v. ‘Icesius,’ no. 1.

<sup>368</sup> *IJO II* 189.

<sup>369</sup> Further indications for his Jewish background might be the theophoric name of his father (Theon) and the meaning of his Greek name, which was used as a title for gods, meaning ‘protector (or protectress) of supplicants’ (MGS, s.v. ‘ἰκέσιος’).

<sup>370</sup> Williams, ‘Use,’ 321.

<sup>371</sup> Antoninus, Icesius, and Olympias, the daughter of Theocritus, are all identified as Jewish by Ilan due to their relation to Icesius Judah (cf. respective entries in *LJNLA III*).

<sup>372</sup> *LJNLA I*, s.v. ‘Esther.’

<sup>373</sup> *JIWE 1* 43; cf. *CIJ* 556.

<sup>374</sup> *JIWE 1* 43 and 45.

difficult-to-pronounce Hebrew names. However, that does not mean their Hebrew names were not known outside of Palestine. Paul constantly moved from one cultural area to another, from the synagogue to the *agora*, from Jewish to Greco-Roman contexts. He and others proclaiming the gospel would have used their names interchangeably.<sup>375</sup> Among the Jewish and gentile members of the newly founded congregations would have been some who remembered the Jewish names even though the Greco-Roman names became the commonly used ones. Therefore, the double names of Acts might reflect not just the mission strategy of these early missionaries reaching out to the Gentiles but also the make-up of the communities they founded, including Gentiles and Jews.

The double names in the New Testament, alongside the examples from Josephus and the epigraphic sources, are exceptional evidence for Jewish onomastics, as they prove that double names were used and remembered *in specific circumstances*. Yet, none of these examples can prove that double names were *generally* used. Some of the Hasmonean rulers had only Greek names,<sup>376</sup> and even in Acts single names of either Greco-Roman or Semitic origin prevail.<sup>377</sup> As double names among Christian missionaries are not the rule but a phenomenon among others, it cannot automatically be assumed that Joanna would have taken on another name when becoming a travelling missionary, even though it might have been the case. This leads to another obvious question that Bauckham has not answered: If Joanna was also Junia, why is it nowhere indicated in Luke's gospel?

---

<sup>375</sup> Simon Peter, for example, is addressed as Συμεών (the Greek transliteration of שמעון rather than the usual Graecised form Σίμων) by James in the narrative of the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem (Acts 15:14). This might reflect the continued use of the Hebrew name in Jewish circles (Horsley, *Documents*, 94). Paul's use of both versions of Simon's nickname, the Aramaic Κηφᾶς and the Greek Πέτρος, in one letter (Galatians 1:18 and 2:7) also indicates that at least in Galatia, both names were known and used for Simon Peter.

<sup>376</sup> For Ilan the Greek names used in Rabbinic literature indicate that these Hasmoneans had no Semitic names. (Ilan, 'Hasmoneans,' 7).

<sup>377</sup> Examples of Hellenised Jews probably bearing a single Greek name are Philip (Acts 8:12), Timothy (Acts 16:1), and Apollos (Acts 18:24). Two of the Antioch church leaders are mentioned by only a single name as well, Lucius of Cyrene (Latin name) and Manaen (Hebrew name) (Acts 13:1). The usual name for Peter in Acts is the Greek translation of his Aramaic nickname (Acts 1:13), Barnabas is also known by his Aramaic nickname (Acts 12:25).

#### 4.2.3. *Joanna, also called Junia?*

The most obvious conclusion regarding the absence of the double name formula in Luke is that Joanna *was not also* Junia. Thus, if one wants to argue for a connection between the two women, the absence of such a formula must be explained, especially in light of the author's use of other name combinations in Acts that might have been used as double names. It is unlikely that Luke would not know that Joanna used the name Junia outside of Palestine, considering that Junia seems to have been a well-known, if not outstanding, apostle in the early church, more specifically in Rome, where Luke's narrative ends. If he knew her second name, there must have been a reason to leave out the probably better-known name Junia.

Considering the animosity any connection to the Roman occupiers must have evoked among the crowds that followed Jesus, a Latin name would have been a prominent reminder of an association with the foreign ruling forces. If Joanna used Junia as a name in court, it is almost certain that she would have left that name behind when she joined the group around Jesus. Joanna was a more fitting name for someone following a Jewish teacher, so it was most likely the name she was known by the disciples. It must have also been the name that was remembered by the early church regarding her place among the female followers of Jesus who witnessed the empty tomb and very likely the name in the source(s) Luke used for his gospel.<sup>378</sup> Thus, it would be the name an author who wants 'to set down an orderly account' (Luke 1:1) would use. Yet, this does not fully explain why the author of Luke chose not to identify Joanna with Junia, who might have been more widely known under this name by the time the gospel was written. He introduces her with the more common identification via a male relation, 'Joanna, the wife of Chuza,' rather than the more exceptional double name formula, 'Joanna, who was also Junia.'

---

<sup>378</sup> Cf. IV.3.2.1.

Within his narrative Luke uses the full name (A son/daughter/mother/wife of B) to introduce a person<sup>379</sup> and/or to differentiate them from other persons of the same name.<sup>380</sup> Joanna's case falls into the first category. Whereas she is introduced with her full name at the beginning of the gospel (Luke 8:3), only her personal name is mentioned in the empty tomb account (Luke 24:10). There is no narrative need to differentiate her from the other two women in the second passage. It is quite likely that there was also no need for differentiation within the wider circle of disciples. Unlike James, Judas or Mary, Joanna is a name only attached to one person within the gospels, so she might have been the only disciple of that name. This means it would have been enough to mention her personal name.<sup>381</sup> Instead, the author gives her full name and adds a descriptor to Chuza's name, connecting him and his wife to the ruling elite. Though the exact reasons behind this addition are debated,<sup>382</sup> there is agreement that Luke does not introduce Joanna as 'the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward' by accident. The mention of her husband and his function seem to have been more important than anything else the author might have been able to say about her (e.g. her illness or a possible second name). In the later reference to Joanna (Luke 24:10), her second name could be introduced, but such an addition at this point of the narrative would divert attention away from the focus of the pericope, the report of the empty tomb given by the women.<sup>383</sup>

Joanna's name disappears from Luke-Acts after the events of the empty tomb, likely subsumed under generic references to other disciples (Luke 24:33)

---

<sup>379</sup> At the beginning of his ministry, John the Baptist is introduced as 'John son of Zechariah' (Luke 3:2); elsewhere he is only referred to as John or John the Baptist. For James and John, their patronymic 'sons of Zebedee' is only mentioned when they first appear on the scene (Luke 5:10). After that they are referred to by their personal names only.

<sup>380</sup> In the list of the Twelve (Luke 6:14-16), two disciples are identified by their patronymics, James, son of Alphaeus and Judas, son of James. Both of them bear personal names present more than once in the group of the Twelve. Another case of differentiation between persons who share the same name is found in the resurrection account (Luke 24:10); Mary is identified as the mother of James, whereas the other Mary is remembered by her nickname 'Magdalene.'

<sup>381</sup> Like in the case of Susanna mentioned after her in Luke 8:3; cf. Bauckham *Women*, 119.

<sup>382</sup> For an overview and discussion of the reasons proposed, cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 119f.

<sup>383</sup> The identification of the women by name already interrupts this report and its reception (cf. IV.3.2.1.).

and women (Acts 1:14) who were with the Eleven. Whether she was present at the events following the empty tomb will be discussed in the next chapter.<sup>384</sup> At this point it suffices to note that neither Joanna nor Junia is mentioned by name in Acts.<sup>385</sup> This is unsurprising, considering that Acts sidelines better-known disciples in its focus on Peter's and Paul's missions.<sup>386</sup> So even if Joanna became Junia, Luke would not have recorded it unless it would fit into its narrative strategy. A female disciple, heading up an early Jewish-based mission to Rome, as proposed in chapter II, unlikely fit into his geographical schema of Acts outlined in Acts 1:8 (from Jerusalem to the ends of the world, i.e. Rome).<sup>387</sup>

Looking at Romans and Junia, it is also plausible that Paul would only use one name in the greeting, even if he knew of another. Her relation to Andronicus clearly identifies Junia, so no further name is needed to distinguish her from other women called Junia. It is less obvious why Paul used her Latin name in the greeting if there was a Hebrew one for Junia. Paul's reference to Junia's Jewishness would have been aided by using her Hebrew name or its transliteration. Moreover, if Junia's ministry was not aimed at Gentiles but primarily at Jews, there was no reason to use an alternative Greco-Roman name. She could have and likely would have used her Hebrew name in Jewish circles, and therefore, Paul could have and should have used it as well in Romans 16:7. However, by the time of Paul's letter, the main part of the Roman Christian community and thereby the majority of his addressees was no longer Jewish but gentile.<sup>388</sup> Thus, it is conceivable that Paul chose a name that was not

---

<sup>384</sup> Cf. IV.3.3.

<sup>385</sup> Cf. IV.3.3.3. for possibly reasons why the women named in the gospel play no role in the narrative of Acts.

<sup>386</sup> It is not just the female disciples who disappear from the narrative after being mentioned generically in Acts 1:14; most of the twelve play no significant part after their introduction in Acts 1:13 (cf. Greg W. Forbes and Scott D. Harrower, *Raised from Obscurity: A Narratival and Theological Study of the Characterization of Women in Luke-Acts*, Eugene: Pickwick, 2015, 147). Moreover, no member of the Roman congregation is mentioned by name at the end of Acts, instead there is a generic reference to 'the believers from there' (Acts 28:15).

<sup>387</sup> Keener, *Acts 1-2*, 575; cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 119.

<sup>388</sup> Cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 33; Moo, *Romans*, 11; and Schreiner, *Romans*, 13.

just familiar to the Jewish minority of his audience but to all.<sup>389</sup> This was more likely a Greco-Roman name like Junia than a Hebrew name like Yehoḥanah. Thus, both Luke and Paul had reasons to prefer one name over the other, and there was no need to mention both names. So Joanna/Junia might be among those whose double name is lost to us due to the composition of the sources in which she is mentioned.

It has to be noted at this point that rather than filling gaps in Bauckham's argument, i.e. making the identification of Junia with Joanna more likely, the discussion so far has shown only that the lack of explicit evidence is understandable and not as damning as might be thought. Junia could have been understood as a sound-equivalent of Joanna, although there is not enough evidence for a general link between the two names. Joanna could have used a double name both at court and/or later as a missionary outside of Palestine, but neither of these contexts seems to have demanded the use of an alternative name.

For this reason, the Joanna/Junia hypothesis, at this stage of the argument, is best described as *possible* rather than *likely*. Moreover, a piece of the puzzle still does not quite fit. Junia seems to be a name that was not widely known in Palestine in the early first century CE, based on the evidence we have to date.<sup>390</sup> Considering this, it is valid to ask the question of how or why Joanna should have chosen this name, if it was uncommon or even unknown in Palestine. So whether the balance regarding the Joanna/Junia hypothesis tips towards *less*

---

<sup>389</sup> Rufus in Rom 16:13 might be another Latin name functioning as a substitute name for a Hebrew name (Reuben) (cf. Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 894f.).

<sup>390</sup> Cf. n. 119 and n. 286. The name Junia may be found in Palestine as more non-literary sources are discovered and published, but until then, its presence in the Jewish onomasticon of Palestine remains hypothetical, not unlike the supposed existence of a male Junias (though the likelihood of finding evidence for the former is much higher than finding evidence for the latter).

*possible or remains likely* depends on establishing how Joanna and her surroundings might have encountered the name Junia.

### 4.3. Joanna/Junia – Adopted Name or Given Nickname?

Besides discussing sound equivalency, Bauckham briefly mentions the fitting nature of the name at court as ‘a distinguished, aristocratic Roman name.’<sup>391</sup> It is noteworthy that despite a known ‘predilection (common to Jew and non-Jew) to bestow the names of famous contemporary personages upon their children,’<sup>392</sup> Bauckham fails to mention such prominent namesakes of Junia who might have inspired Joanna to take on the name. To find such a person becomes even more critical after Bauckham’s central argument that the two names fit into a prevalent phenomenon of homophonous double names had to be adjusted. Even if Joanna took on a Greco-Roman name, she could have chosen it not due to its sound-equivalency but its popularity, meaning, or connection with a well-known person.

Moreover, while evidence for the name Junia is found in Asia Minor, an area with strong connections to the Junian family, the name is absent from the Jewish onomasticon in Palestine and rarely found in inscriptions in the surrounding area of Syria, areas with no such connections at the time of Herod Antipas.<sup>393</sup> Considering this, the name might have been unfamiliar not just to the wider Jewish population but also to the circles to which Joanna belonged.

Yet, one member of the Junian family was likely talked about at the court of Herod Antipas, a woman called *Iunia Torquata*,<sup>394</sup> known from literary<sup>395</sup> and epigraphic sources.<sup>396</sup> As a member of the *Iunii Silani*, she belonged to a distinguished family which had ‘ascended into the social stratosphere during

---

<sup>391</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 186.

<sup>392</sup> Cohen, ‘Aristeas,’ 54.

<sup>393</sup> Cf. n. 117.

<sup>394</sup> Meret Strothmann, ‘Iunia,’ BNP, 5 November 2019, doi:10.1163/1574-9347\_bnp\_e602670.

<sup>395</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.69.

<sup>396</sup> *CIL* VI 2127, 2128, 20788 and 20852.

the Augustan period.<sup>397</sup> Two of her brothers held the office of consul (C. Junius Silanus in 10 CE and M. Junius Silanus in 15 CE),<sup>398</sup> and her niece married the later emperor Gaius. In addition to her family's prominence, she was 'a woman of great influence in her own right.'<sup>399</sup> *CIL* VI 2127 and 2128 document that she was one of the six Vestal Virgins, tending the undying fire of the goddess Vesta, whose cult 'expressed and guaranteed Rome's permanence.'<sup>400</sup> She was still in office at sixty-four and even became *Vestalis maxima*, the chief Vestal.<sup>401</sup> She was undoubtedly a known figure in Rome in the first half of the first century CE, but did her reputation reach as far as Palestine and Antipas' court? Tacitus' mention of Junia Torquata might shed light on this question. She appears as a petitioner in the trial of her brother C. Junius Silanus, who, after his proconsulate in 20-21 CE, was accused of extortion by the province of Asia and in the following trial also of lese-majesty by members of the Senate in 22 CE. C. Silanus was condemned and banished.<sup>402</sup> Due to the intercession of his sister, he was not relegated to the bleak island Gyarus but the larger island Cythnus.<sup>403</sup> Tacitus seems to mention Junia's petition in passing as a mere afterthought, presenting the change in location of banishment as the emperor's idea. The fact that she is mentioned at all, however, indicates her active involvement in securing a less disastrous outcome for her brother.

Even though the trial took place in Rome, news of the outcome and rumours about Junia's involvement certainly spread throughout the Empire (at least to the province of Asia). It is very likely that they also reached the court of Antipas due to his connection to Tiberius, the emperor who presided over the trial of Junia's brother. Antipas' ties with Rome reached far back; he and his brothers were reared 'in the imperial court as personal friends of the future

---

<sup>397</sup> James Rives, 'The Iuno feminae in Roman society,' *EMC* 36 n.s. 11 (1992): 33-49, citing 33.

<sup>398</sup> For their respective times as proconsuls in Asia, cf. III.3.1.

<sup>399</sup> Rives, 'Iuno,' 33.

<sup>400</sup> Richard Gordon, 'Vesta, Vestals,' *OCD* 1544-1545, citing 1544.

<sup>401</sup> Strohthmann, 'Iunia.'

<sup>402</sup> Elvers et al., 'Iunius' II 32.

<sup>403</sup> Cf. Weidemann, 'SILANUS,' 139 and Rives, 'Iuno,' 33.

emperors.<sup>404</sup> Josephus even states that ‘the tetrarch Herod, ... had gained a high place among the friends of Tiberius...’ (*Jewish Antiquities* 18.39 [Feldman]).

Tiberius’ intervention on behalf of Antipas in the war against Aretas, Antipas’ father-in-law,<sup>405</sup> supports the assumption that Antipas’ was favoured by the emperor.

In the fickle political world of the Roman Empire, it was necessary for Antipas’ survival as a ruler to ensure that he was close to the emperor and informed about political changes in Rome.<sup>406</sup> He must have had informants near Tiberius who reported back to him, and the news about the downfall of a high-standing Roman politician like C. Junius Silanus would have been among these reports. The involvement of Junia in his trial might have only been a small side note. Still, the episode of a woman contending with the emperor might have easily become part of the gossip at court, especially among the Herodian women who seem to have been ‘deeply involved in imperial Roman intrigue and affairs.’<sup>407</sup> The name of the Junians, particularly the name Junia, thereby could have been introduced to Herodian circles. It would unlikely have had a positive connotation due to its connection to a family that had just fallen out of favour with the emperor. So it was not a prestigious name at this time.

This is where this thesis parts way with Bauckham’s suggestion that Joanna adopted the name Junia as a substitute name due to its prestige. It is possible that she did not herself *take on* the name as an additional *personal name*; instead, the name *was given* to her by others as a *nickname*. A scenario in which the name was attached to her while the story of Junia Torquata was present in the minds of court members can easily be envisaged. The assonance between the two names could have been recognised and combined with a character trait Joanna

---

<sup>404</sup> Brown and Meier, *Rome*, 95; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 17.20.

<sup>405</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 18.114-115.

<sup>406</sup> After Tiberius’ death Antipas failed to ensure the same level of friendship with his successor Caligula, which finally led to his downfall and banishment to Gaul.

<sup>407</sup> Ross S. Kraemer, ‘Jewish Women and Women’s Judaism(s) at the Beginning of Christianity,’ in *Women & Christian Origins*, ed. Ross Shepard Kraemer and Mary Rose D’Angelo (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 50-79, citing 70.

seemingly shared with Junia or an episode of Joanna's life at court, which showed similarities to the events at C. Junius Silanus' trial. Once the connection had been made, the Herodian court would have its "very own Junia."

In light of the evidence that nicknames were very common in first-century Palestine, it is a plausible, though not unproblematic, approach. The personal name Junia is not a classical nickname. There is nothing inherently affectionate or derogative about personal names. However, many Greek personal names are descriptive and could be understood as nicknames, as in the case of Joanna's namesake, Joanna Euphrosyne, mentioned in an epigraph in Alexandria.<sup>408</sup> Her second name is derived from a noun or adjective meaning 'joy, gladness, cheerfulness'<sup>409</sup> and could have been a nickname meant to reflect her cheerful spirit.<sup>410</sup> The potential of descriptive personal names to be used as nicknames is easily understandable, but Junia, as a Latin name, does not belong in this category. This thesis proposes that a person's personal name might unlock its potential as a nickname due to a specific characteristic or behaviour of said person that can also be attached to another. The association of an exceptionally tall ancestor of the Goliath family with the stature of Goliath mentioned above<sup>411</sup> shows that a personal name in specific circumstances could be given to a person by others as a nickname in first-century Palestine.<sup>412</sup>

Whereas the physical resemblance in the case of the Goliath family is obvious, the question of what might have triggered the association of Joanna and Junia Torquata can only be assessed by looking at what we know about Joanna from Luke's gospel. Based on her connection to the group around Jesus

---

<sup>408</sup> *CIJ* 1429; cf. *LJNLA III*, s.v. 'Joanna,' n. 5. She is the only woman bearing Joanna as part of a Hebrew/Greco-Roman name combination in *LJNLA I* and *LJNLA III*.

<sup>409</sup> *BDAG*, s.v. 'εὐφροσύνη.' It is also the name of one of the Greek Graces (*MGS*, s.v. 'Εὐφροσύνη').

<sup>410</sup> Williams argues it was chosen due to its popularity among the Greek elite of Alexandria (*Williams*, 'Use,' 318f.).

<sup>411</sup> Cf. n. 40.

<sup>412</sup> Ilan dates all ossuaries before 70 CE because this 'burial custom was unique to the region of Jerusalem' and would have ended with the destruction of the capital (*LJNLA I*, 52). According to Rahmani, the main production phase of ossuaries was between 20 BCE and 70 CE (*CJO*, 21-25).

(Luke 8:1-3), which will be discussed in more detail in chapter IV, it can be hypothesised that Joanna was searching for a more authentic way of living her Judaism than she found at the Romanised court of Antipas. Joanna 'may have been part of a circle of devout Jewish women at the court who practiced their religion more strictly and took an interest in the movements of religious renewal in the Palestine Judaism of their time.'<sup>413</sup> Such piety would have set Joanna apart from most other women at court and could easily have led to contempt and mockery, which often 'engendered nicknames.'<sup>414</sup> Giving her the name of a religious figure known for her virginity might have been a way of calling her a prude.

The association would be even more apparent if Joanna, like Junia, interceded on behalf of a family member. Alternatively, she might have intervened on behalf of a religious group comparable to Pheroras' wife who paid a fine inflicted on the Pharisees for not swearing allegiance to Herod the Great.<sup>415</sup> One of the possible scenarios would be an intervention on behalf of family members/acquaintances who were forced to move to Tiberias from the surrounding countryside.<sup>416</sup> As the city was built on a destroyed cemetery, devout Jews would have considered it unclean and refused to settle in Tiberias.<sup>417</sup> Joanna might have used her role at court to prevent the forced resettlement of people known to her. According to Hoehner, Tiberias was founded between 18 and 23 CE, most likely in the year 23 CE, the year Tiberius, after whom the city was named, celebrated his 65<sup>th</sup> birthday and the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his becoming emperor.<sup>418</sup> If this date is correct, there would be a close proximity between the events involving Junia Torquata at the Tiberian court (22 CE) and a possible intercession of Joanna at Antipas' court (23 CE).

---

<sup>413</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 195.

<sup>414</sup> Naveh, 'People,' 117.

<sup>415</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 17.42.

<sup>416</sup> Hoehner, *Antipas*, 96.

<sup>417</sup> Hoehner, *Antipas*, 96; cf. Kokkinos, *Dynasty*, 234f. and Bauckham, *Women*, 142.

<sup>418</sup> Hoehner, *Antipas*, 94f.; contra Kokkinos, who assumes an earlier foundation date in 18 CE (Kokkinos, *Dynasty*, 234).

Memories of the earlier event might have sparked an association of Joanna with Junia Torquata, especially because the names were also similar in sound. In this way Joanna might have become the “Herodian Junia.” Joanna would have gladly left this nickname behind when she joined the group around Jesus. After she came to Rome, where Junia was a common personal name, the once unpleasant nickname could be used as a Greco-Roman substitute for Joanna. Thus, *this specific woman* might have been known as Joanna, who was also called Junia.

## 5. Conclusion

According to Junia’s biographical sketch outlined in chapter II, Junia was most likely a Hellenised Jew from Palestine. One piece of information about her does not fit well into this scenario, her Latin name. Easily explained within the Greco-Roman context of Rome as the name of a female member of the *gens Iunia* or a slave or freedwoman of this Roman family (which for Junia would be more likely), it is harder to locate the name in the Jewish context of Palestine. Whereas Roman Diaspora Jews followed the Roman naming trends, Palestinian Jews seem to have been averse to Latin names, which might have been perceived as a sign of alignment with the hated foreign power occupying their country. Moreover, neither the name Junia nor its male equivalent Junius is found in the Jewish onomasticon of Palestine in the first century and there is no record of members of the Junian family in Palestine at the time.

Of the approaches to Junia’s name evaluated, only Bauckham’s double-name hypothesis that Joanna used the name Junia in the Greco-Roman contexts of the Herodian court and Rome, could establish a link between Junia’s Latin name and her Palestinian origin. However, neither the *prevalence* of double names nor the *preference* for sound-equivalents in choosing a foreign name is

supported by the evidence. Both the custom of double names and homophonous Greco-Roman names used by Jews are found in the sources but rarely in combination. Moreover, neither of Joanna/Junia's contexts demands a double name; single ethnic names are found both among the members of the Herodian court and among Jewish-Christian missionaries. Thus, even though it could be shown that Junia probably would have been understood as a sound-equivalent and there are reasons for the under-reportage of double names in the sources which also might have prevented Luke and Paul from naming her as Joanna/Junia, the link between Joanna and Junia based on their similar names is tentative. It becomes almost impossible to connect both names when we factor in the finding that the name might not have been known in Palestine.

The proposal made in this thesis is that the missing link might be the vestal virgin Junia Torquata, a contemporary namesake of Junia who likely featured in Herodian court gossip due to her role in her brother's trial before the emperor Tiberius, a close friend of Antipas. Due to the sound similarity between their names and possibly shared characteristics between them, Joanna could have been associated with the Roman Junia. In this scenario 'Junia' would become Joanna's nickname in her social circles, an ironic name given to her and likely used in a derogatory way. Left behind when joining her new community around Jesus, Joanna could have taken on the name again while evangelising outside of Palestine.

The proposed association between Joanna and Junia Torquata is tentative, perhaps speculative, but her introduction into the equation Joanna = Junia is a possible explanation of how the name Junia could have been known in Palestine, at least in the Herodian elite. So these are the social circles where we would probably find Junia if she was not also Joanna.

An exploration of what we know about Joanna, therefore, at the very least, may give us an insight into how her life might have looked before and after she joined Jesus in Galilee. Moreover, it may yield overlaps between Junia and

Joanna beyond their name similarity, making an identification *more likely*. Thus, the next step in the quest for the identity of Junia paradoxically is to ask: Who was Joanna?

## IV. JOANNA – A Disciple of Jesus

### 1. Introduction

Joanna is mentioned twice in the New Testament, near the beginning and the end of the third gospel. She is introduced as a married woman healed by Jesus (Luke 8:3) who later also is present at the empty tomb (Luke 24:10). As we have seen in the previous chapter, there is no indication within the gospel narrative that Joanna is also Junia. Yet, as ‘the wife of Herod’s steward Chuza,’ she belonged to the elite circles in which the name Junia might have been known. Thus, the information provided about Joanna’s involvement in the Jesus movement after her healing (Luke 8:2f.) might give us a glimpse into the life Junia might have led pre-resurrection if she was a Galilean disciple, as proposed in chapter II, or Joanna herself, as proposed by Bauckham.

Whereas most studies about Joanna focus on her first mention in Luke and thereby, her life as a female follower of Jesus,<sup>1</sup> the engagement with her second mention in the empty tomb narrative is less detailed. For this study, however, Luke 24:10 and its aftermath are important as further pieces of the puzzle in exploring whether Junia might have been Joanna. If Joanna was present at the empty tomb and encountered the risen Lord, she would qualify as an apostle in Paul’s eye, like Junia. This would make a connection between the two women more probable. After looking at the first turning point in Joanna’s life, her encounter with Jesus in Galilee, it is therefore essential to establish that the second turning point in Joanna’s life, the witness of the empty tomb, was followed by an encounter with the risen Lord, before turning to the question what happened to Joanna post-resurrection once she disappears from the Lukan narrative. Finally, we should be able to see whether the picture of Joanna

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. I.5. for a summary of these studies.

in Luke bears enough resemblance with the portrait we have established about Junia to add her biographical sketch to Junia's.

## 2. Joanna – Follower of Jesus (Luke 8:1-3)

Luke 8:1-3, the passage that introduces Joanna and other women as followers of Jesus in Galilee, is unique to Luke.<sup>2</sup> The other synoptic gospels also mention women who followed Jesus in Galilee (Mark 14:40f.) or from Galilee (Matthew 27:55), but we only learn about their existence in the passion narrative. Moreover, the lists of names in Mark and Matthew do not include Joanna, nor is there any indication that the women provided for Jesus and his disciples from their resources. Therefore, it is justified to address the question of historicity. The general motif of women following Jesus 'is firmly fixed in the tradition'<sup>3</sup> and likely historical. The specific Lukan motif of women financing Jesus' ministry, however, might have been 'coloured by a later situation,' portraying these women as wealthy benefactresses supporting religious movements in the Greco-Roman world.<sup>4</sup> Though disagreeing with the understanding that the Galilean women are 'the retrojection of the later patronesses,'<sup>5</sup> Price also concludes that the *Sitz im Leben* of their story is the

---

<sup>2</sup> Darrell L. Bock, *Luke: Volume 1:1-9:50*, vol. 1, BECNT 3A (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994), 710.

<sup>3</sup> I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Exeter: Pater Noster, 1978), 315; cf. James R. Edwards, *The Gospel according to Luke*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Nottingham: Apollos, 2015), 233; Martin Hengel, 'Maria Magdalena und die Frauen als Zeugen,' in *Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel: Festschrift für Otto Michel zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Otto Betz, Martin Hengel, and Peter Schmidt (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 243-256, citing 243; and David C. Sim, 'The Women Followers of Jesus: The Implications of Luke 8:1-3,' *HeyJ* 30.1 (1989): 51-62, citing 51.

<sup>4</sup> Seim, *Message*, 38; cf. Luise Schottroff, 'Women as Followers of Jesus in New Testament Times: An Exercise in Sociohistorical Exegesis of the Bible,' in *The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics*, ed. Norman K. Gottwald and Richard A. Horsley (Maryknoll: Orbis Books; London: SPCK, 1993), 453-461, citing 451, who points to several examples of such women in Acts like Lydia (Acts 16:14f.), 'the leading women' in Thessalonica (Acts 17:4) and the 'Greek women ... of high standing' in Beroea (Acts 17:12).

<sup>5</sup> Price, *Widow*, 130. In support of his understanding of Joanna as the heroine of a chastity story, he sees 'the travelling *suneisaktoi* or celibate partners or sisterwives of the itinerants of the early church' as background (Price, *Widow*, 130).

church, not the life of Jesus.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, Joanna would be a Lukan invention rather than a historical figure. However, after comparing the names of Jesus' followers with the Palestinian onomasticon, Ilan concludes that their distribution 'certainly fits into a very specific historical situation' and therefore, 'the names commemorate real women.'<sup>7</sup> Moreover, the name Chuza is also found outside of Luke and thereby fits into the historical situation as well.<sup>8</sup> So it is not just likely that Joanna existed; it is also plausible that she was married to Chuza and, therefore, had a link to the Herodian court.

Based on this information, we can explore how Joanna's life might have looked before she encountered Jesus. That she was healed of an evil spirit or an illness is another piece of information (Luke 8:2) that will be discussed in the following as it might shed light on her reasons for seeking Jesus out and supporting him afterwards. What her support might have been will then be established based on the Lukan summary, taking the historical setting of first-century Palestine into account.

### **2.1. Joanna's Life Before Meeting Jesus**

Whereas Mary and Susanna are introduced without any male relations in Luke 8, Joanna is linked to two men, her husband Chuza and his employer, the tetrarch Herod Antipas. Nevertheless, Joanna is portrayed as following Jesus independently of her husband and her social circles. Thus, the following will look at both Joanna's role and status as embedded in her husband's, as well as independently of him.

---

<sup>6</sup> Price, *Widow*, 136.

<sup>7</sup> Tal Ilan, 'In the Footsteps of Jesus: Jewish Women in a Jewish Movement,' in *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and Women Re-viewed*, ed. Ingrid Rosa Kitzberger, *BibInt* 43 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 115-136, citing 123.

<sup>8</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 157; cf. 150-157 for the occurrences of the name.

### 2.1.1. *Chuza's Role and Status*

Luke identifies Chuza as ἐπίτροπος Ἡρώδου (Luke 8:3). In its broadest definition ἐπίτροπος means 'one to whom the charge of anything is entrusted.'<sup>9</sup> So it is unsurprising that the term has been 'applied to various officials and functionaries,'<sup>10</sup> including high state officials, like governors, procurators,<sup>11</sup> and viceroys,<sup>12</sup> and people in supervisory or administrative roles, like stewards,<sup>13</sup> supervisors<sup>14</sup> or managers of estates.<sup>15</sup> This range of meaning is the reason why 'the precise office of Chuza cannot be ascertained.'<sup>16</sup> It is doubtful that Luke uses ἐπίτροπος as the 'Greek equivalent of *praefectus* or *procurator*,'<sup>17</sup> even though it is used in this way by Josephus<sup>18</sup> and there is a likely reference to Joanna as '*uxor regis procuratoris*' ('the wife of the king's procurator') in the gospel of Marcion (quoted in Tertullian's *Against Marcion*).<sup>19</sup> Chuza was not a high-ranking Roman official but served under a client ruler of the Roman Empire.

Bauckham points to three other ἐπίτροποι in Josephus who have positions under a (client) ruler,<sup>20</sup> the freedman Thaumastus, who was appointed by Agrippa I as 'steward of his estate,'<sup>21</sup> Ptolemy, 'the overseer' or 'finance officer' of Agrippa II and Bernice,<sup>22</sup> and Syllaeus 'the procurator' or 'viceroy' of the

---

<sup>9</sup> LSJ, s.v. 'ἐπίτροπος.'

<sup>10</sup> BDAG, s.v. 'ἐπίτροπος.'

<sup>11</sup> MGS, s.v. 'ἐπίτροπος;' cf. LSJ, s.v. 'ἐπίτροπος,' 2. and 3.; and BDAG, s.v. 'ἐπίτροπος,' 1.

<sup>12</sup> LSJ, s.v. 'ἐπίτροπος,' 3.

<sup>13</sup> LSJ, s.v. 'ἐπίτροπος,' 1; cf. BDAG, s.v. 'ἐπίτροπος,' 1.

<sup>14</sup> MGS, s.v. 'ἐπίτροπος.'

<sup>15</sup> BDAG, s.v. 'ἐπίτροπος,' 1.

<sup>16</sup> Marshall, *Luke*, 317; cf. Sabine Bieberstein, *Verschwiegene Jüngerinnen – Vergessene Zeuginnen: Gebrochene Konzepte im Lukasevangelium*, NTOA 38 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 49.

<sup>17</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke (I-IX): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, vol. 1, AB 28 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981), 698.

<sup>18</sup> E.g. Josephus, *J.W.* 2.169 (Πεμφθεῖς δὲ εἰς Ἰουδαίαν ἐπίτροπος ὑπὸ Τιβερίου Πιλάτος – 'Pilate, being sent by Tiberius as procurator') and 2.253 (εἰς δὲ τὴν λοιπὴν Ἰουδαίαν Φήλικα κατέστησεν ἐπίτροπον – 'he appointed Felix to be procurator of the rest of Judaea') [Thackeray, LCL]. Cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 135, n. 89 for more examples.

<sup>19</sup> Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.19.1 as quoted in Carla Ricci, *Mary Magdalene and Many Others: Women who Followed Jesus*, trans. Paul Burns (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 154, emphasis mine.

<sup>20</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 135f.

<sup>21</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 18.194 [Feldman, LCL].

<sup>22</sup> Josephus, *J.W.* 2.595 [Thackeray, LCL].

Nabatean king Obodas III.<sup>23</sup> All of them seemingly occupy a high office, most likely that of ‘the finance minister of the kingdom, administering all the revenues of the realm as well as the royal domains and household.’<sup>24</sup> Bauckham suggests this was also the position of Chuza, which would put him ‘in charge of [all of] Antipas’s property and revenues.’<sup>25</sup> Yet, as the different translations of the term above indicate, the roles of the three men might not have been the same. Syllaeus undoubtedly was in a powerful position that allowed him to reign over the kingdom instead of the actual king.<sup>26</sup> Thaumastus, however, might have overseen only the Roman estate of Agrippa I.<sup>27</sup> Kokkinos classifies Thaumastus, Ptolemy *and* Chuza as agents, members of the outer rather than the inner court of the Herods.<sup>28</sup> These agents held positions outside of the palace, managing estates of the Herodian rulers both in the country and abroad.<sup>29</sup> Similarly, Arlandson places Chuza as ‘Herod’s estate or financial manager’ in the group of retainers ‘who carried out the policies, laws, and day-to-day business ... of the ruling class.’<sup>30</sup> Thus, rather than being *the* steward of Herod, the finance minister of the realm, Chuza was likely *a* steward of Antipas, either the manager of a royal estate in the Galilean countryside<sup>31</sup> or an administrator at Antipas’ court in Tiberias.<sup>32</sup> No matter his exact role, he still

---

<sup>23</sup> Josephus. *J.W.* 1.487 [Thackeray, LCL].

<sup>24</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 135f.

<sup>25</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 137; cf. Tal Ilan, ‘The Attraction of Aristocratic Women to Pharisaism during the Second Temple Period,’ *HTR* 88.1 (1995): 1-33, citing 23, who identifies Chuza as ‘Herod Antipas’s treasurer.’

<sup>26</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 16.220; cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 136.

<sup>27</sup> Nikos Kokkinos, ‘The Royal Court of the Herods,’ in *The World of the Herods: Volume 1 of the International Conference The World of the Herods and the Nabataeans held at the British Museum, 17–19 April 2001*, ed. Nikos Kokkinos (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2007), 279-303, citing 297.

<sup>28</sup> Kokkinos, ‘Court,’ 297.

<sup>29</sup> Kokkinos, ‘Court,’ 292.

<sup>30</sup> James M. Arlandson, ‘Lifestyles of the Rich and Christian: Women, Wealth, and Social Freedom,’ in *A Feminist Companion to the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff, FCNTECW (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 155-170, citing 167.

<sup>31</sup> C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, TPINTC, 2nd ed. (London: SCM, 2008), 366. That there is ‘no evidence for “royal estates” in Galilee’ (Richard A. Horsley, *Galilee: History, Politics, People*, Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995, 214) does not necessarily mean that Antipas did not have any. Though it is difficult to establish how much land was in royal possession, Hoehner is certain that Antipas ‘owned much of the land in his realm’ (Hoehner, *Antipas*, 70).

<sup>32</sup> Bock, *Luke 1-9*, 713.

belonged to the upper 10% of the population with access to wealth and power.<sup>33</sup> This is even the case if he was a slave, as Kraemer suggests.<sup>34</sup> His position and connection to the ruling class would have 'provided [him] with substantial economic and social freedom' despite his possibly unfree state.<sup>35</sup>

Chuza could also be a free man who was part of the court administration in Tiberias, even though it is unlikely that he was a member of one of the influential elite families dominating the life of Antipas' capital.<sup>36</sup> Though members of this Herodian elite were Romanised/Hellenised, Horsley suggests they likely had a Judean background, while most inhabitants were Galilean.<sup>37</sup> Chuza, however, bearing a name found in Nabatean and Syrian inscriptions,<sup>38</sup> very likely was 'a Nabatean by birth.'<sup>39</sup> As Antipas' first wife was the daughter of the Nabatean king Aretas IV,<sup>40</sup> it is plausible that Chuza arrived as part of her entourage, either as one of her courtiers<sup>41</sup> or as a slave serving the princess. As Antipas likely sought this marriage in the aftermath of his father's death (4 BCE) to secure his eastern and southern borders and to forge a political alliance with his Nabatean neighbour,<sup>42</sup> Chuza might have been part of the Herodian court for more than three decades by the time Joanna encountered Jesus.<sup>43</sup> So he certainly would have had enough time to rise through the ranks, gain his freedom (if he was enslaved), and ensure a position within the royal

---

<sup>33</sup> Arlandson, 'Lifestyles,' 167.

<sup>34</sup> Kraemer, 'Women,' 56.

<sup>35</sup> Arlandson, 'Lifestyles,' 168. There is also a likelihood that he could be a freedman like Thaumastus (cf. n. 21).

<sup>36</sup> Horsley, *Galilee*, 173.

<sup>37</sup> Horsley, *Galilee*, 173.

<sup>38</sup> Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 698; cf. François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*, trans. Christine M. Thomas, vol. 1, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002), 301. Cf. n. 8.

<sup>39</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 157.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Josephus. *Ant.* 18.109.

<sup>41</sup> Bauckham. *Women*, 158.

<sup>42</sup> K. C. Hanson, 'The Herodians and Mediterranean Kinship Part 2: Marriage and Divorce,' *BTB* 19.4 (1989): 142-151, citing 146; cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 157.

<sup>43</sup> Josephus recounts that Antipas 'had ... been married to [his first wife] for a long time' (Josephus, *Ant.* 18.109 [Feldman, LCL]).

administration, first in Sepphoris and then in Tiberias,<sup>44</sup> if he played his cards right.

In the aftermath of Antipas' divorce from his Nabatean wife and his marriage with Herodias, which caused tensions with the Nabatean kingdom,<sup>45</sup> life as a Nabatean at court might have become precarious. Chuza likely knew that he needed to prove his loyalty to Antipas to ensure the continuation of his career. A wife supporting an itinerant preacher who endorsed John the Baptist (Luke 7:24-28),<sup>46</sup> a man who had publicly rebuked the tetrarch's new marriage (Luke 3:19),<sup>47</sup> would not have helped his situation.<sup>48</sup> Thus, in the absence of evidence of how Chuza responded to Jesus,<sup>49</sup> it is more natural to assume that he would not allow his wife to make 'a decision that would put his career in jeopardy'<sup>50</sup> than that he 'supported, or at least tolerated, his wife's actions'<sup>51</sup> risking her reputation and thereby his.

### 2.1.2. *Joanna's Status*

Joanna's status as a wife was embedded in that of her husband.<sup>52</sup> So it seems there is not much to add to the picture already painted above. Chuza's position within the royal administration would have given Joanna access to (parts of) the Herodian court and secured her economic security. However, her marriage to Chuza might tell us something about her family's status as well. Enhancing social connections and status was an important factor in marriages,

---

<sup>44</sup> The royal administration moved from Sepphoris to Tiberias when it became Antipas' new capital (Horsley, *Galilee*, 175).

<sup>45</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 18.110-113.

<sup>46</sup> Fitzmyer argues that vv. 24 and 25 'undoubtedly play on John's relation to the tetrarch Herod' (Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 674). Levine and Witherington see an 'implicit critique of Herod' Antipas in those verses (Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 206; cf. David E. Garland, *Luke*, ZECNT, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011, 313), while Spencer interprets especially v. 25 as a direct attack on the tetrarch (F. Scott Spencer, *Luke*, THNTC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019, 190).

<sup>47</sup> For an overview of Antipas' relation to John and a discussion of the differences between the gospel accounts and Josephus, cf. Hoehner, *Antipas*, 110-171.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Witherington, 'Joanna,' 14.

<sup>49</sup> Spencer, *Wives*, 110f.

<sup>50</sup> This answers a question posed by Ricci, *Mary*, 155.

<sup>51</sup> Spencer, *Wives*, 111.

<sup>52</sup> Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 224; cf. Bieberstein, *Jüngerinnen*, 49.

especially in wealthier families.<sup>53</sup> With a position as the manager of a royal estate or within the royal administration, Chuza would belong to ‘the highest echelons of society’<sup>54</sup> in first-century Galilee, and it would only be natural that he would seek an advantageous marriage. Thus, the status of Joanna’s family at least needed to match his own. Bauckham, assuming that Chuza held one of the highest offices in Antipas’ realm, deems it ‘most likely’ that Joanna was either a ‘a member of one of [the] leading families of Tiberias, or of another powerful Galilean family of Herodian supporters.’<sup>55</sup> Joanna and Chuza, therefore, would be quite the power couple forging ‘an alliance between an elite Jewish family ... and the Herodian court.’<sup>56</sup>

As we have seen, Chuza, and thereby Joanna, are probably found not as high up the social ladder as Bauckham suggests. Moreover, it is possible that their marriage took place before Chuza reached the position to which Luke refers. His marriage to a woman from an elite Jewish family might have helped his career as a foreigner in Antipas’ court. Her family might have seen his prospects in the royal administration, and they hoped to gain more influence within or first access to court circles. If parts of her kin were critical of Antipas, an alliance with a court official might have been a way for her family to contain any damages caused by the deviant(s). This would fit in with the scenario imagined in chapter III that Joanna interceded at court on behalf of a family member at odds with a Herodian policy and so gained her name as the “Herodian Junia.” It might also explain why Joanna’s family agreed to a

---

<sup>53</sup> Tal Ilan, *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine: An Inquiry into Image and Status* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995; repr. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 79. The Herodians, for example, used marriages outside of their kinship group – like that of Antipas to the Nabatean princess – ‘for the advancement of the family’s honor and power by establishing links with political and religious leaders throughout the Levant’ (Hanson, ‘Marriage,’ 144f.).

<sup>54</sup> Edwards, *Luke*, 234.

<sup>55</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 142.

<sup>56</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 144. Sawicki also sees the possibility of a political marriage ‘intended to form an alliance between an elite Judean family and one of the first families of neighbouring Idumea or Perea’ similar to Antipas’ own marriage (Sawicki, ‘Magdalenes,’ 195).

marriage with a non-Jew rather than seeking 'the Jewish ideal' of an endogamous marriage.<sup>57</sup>

Joanna herself would have had little say in the choice of her husband. The first marriage of a daughter was arranged by her family, more specifically her father, in negotiation with the groom's father or the groom himself.<sup>58</sup> According to rabbinic literature a father 'had absolute control over' a daughter until she reached adulthood, therefore, she could not object to marriage.<sup>59</sup> Girls would be betrothed before puberty<sup>60</sup> and married at an early age (between twelve and eighteen), often to an older man.<sup>61</sup> This is a likely scenario for Joanna: As Chuza would have needed to establish himself in the Herodian circles first, he might already have been in his twenties or thirties when he married Joanna. It is also realistic to assume that their marriage might have been difficult due to the age gap and differing views on faith. Ilan suggests that generally, 'marriages arranged by parents did not always succeed, even though many women in the end will have agreed to them'<sup>62</sup> and then learned to live with them.

After their wedding, Chuza would have had control over Joanna's property and finances. As her husband he had 'the privilege of usufruct,'<sup>63</sup> which means he was allowed to use Joanna's dowry,<sup>64</sup> 'her portion of the family's goods, money, and property,'<sup>65</sup> for his purposes as long as all would be refunded to her in case of his death or a divorce without fault on the wife's

---

<sup>57</sup> Hanson, 'Marriage,' 147. As the Herodians required exogamous husbands to be circumcised (Hanson, 'Marriage,' 150), Bauckham suggests this was also the practice of the Herodian aristocracy and Chuza probably 'had become fully Jewish' before the marriage (Bauckham, *Women*, 160f.).

<sup>58</sup> Kraemer, 'Women,' 58; cf. Ilan, *Women*, 79 and Horsley, *Galilee*, 199.

<sup>59</sup> David Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and Literary Context* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 118; cf. Ilan, *Women*, 79, who assumes that 'such rigorous control over the marriage of children was exercised more in wealthy families' while for the bigger part of the population it was not as absolute 'in reality.'

<sup>60</sup> Instone-Brewer, *Divorce*, 117. The age of puberty given in the rabbinic literature is twelve and a half years or 'whenever the signs of puberty appeared' (Instone-Brewer, *Divorce*, 117).

<sup>61</sup> Kraemer, 'Women,' 58.

<sup>62</sup> Ilan, *Women*, 84.

<sup>63</sup> Sim, 'Women,' 54.

<sup>64</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 127.

<sup>65</sup> K. C. Hanson, 'The Herodians and Mediterranean Kinship Part III: Economics,' *BTB* 20.1 (1990): 10-21, citing 11; cf. Instone-Brewer, *Divorce*, 5.

part.<sup>66</sup> However, it seems plausible that in the case of a marriage to a foreigner, a father would want to ensure that some of the property bestowed on his daughter would not fall under the privilege of usufruct. A way to do this was to confer property by a deed of gift.<sup>67</sup> Bauckham gives several examples of such deeds found in the Babatha and Salome Komaise archives, which show that a daughter retained the right 'to manage and dispose' of the given property even after marriage.<sup>68</sup> If Joanna received such a deed of gift from her father or another member of her family, she would have had independent means and thereby greater economic freedom than most of her female contemporaries, which often went hand in hand with greater social freedom in Romanised circles.<sup>69</sup> Leaving Tiberias to seek out the help of an itinerant preacher and miracle worker, therefore, would likely have been within her power, even if Chuza disapproved. However, there might have been a price to pay once she started supporting Jesus. But before discussing the consequences of her following Jesus, we first need to examine the reasons for her encounter with Jesus.

## 2.2. Joanna's Encounter with Jesus - Turning Point 1

The only indication we have for Joanna's encounter with Jesus is Luke's description of Mary, Joanna, and Susanna as 'some women who had been healed from evil spirits and illnesses' (Luke 8:2).<sup>70</sup> There are no healing stories of these women recorded in the third gospel<sup>71</sup> or elsewhere in the New Testament so our information about their condition and their restoration is minimal. Even that Jesus healed them can only be implied by the context.

---

<sup>66</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 127; cf. Horsley, *Galilee*, 200 and Instone-Brewer, *Divorce*, 5f.

<sup>67</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 123.

<sup>68</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 123f.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Cotter, 'Authority,' 362-366, for the role of Roman women in society.

<sup>70</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>71</sup> John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, vol. 1, WBC 35A (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 366. Within the Lukan narrative, the women's healing could be included in the summaries in Luke 4:40-41 and 6:17-19 (Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 697; cf. Edwards, *Luke*, 233).

Nevertheless, it seems important enough to Luke to include this piece of information.<sup>72</sup> This allows us to explore two defining factors of Joanna's life: her illness and her liberation from it.

### 2.2.1. *Joanna's Illness*

Though the syntax is ambiguous regarding the question of whether only the three named women or all women (including the ἑτέραι πολλαί of verse 3) are among those who experienced healing,<sup>73</sup> Joanna is undoubtedly one of those healed. Yet, unlike in the case of Mary, we have no indication whether she was freed of evil spirits or healed from sickness.<sup>74</sup> Even if we knew, it would not help us establish 'the nature of [her] afflictions.'<sup>75</sup> However, there is no need to diagnose her exact disease to understand how it might have affected her life. In the first-century world of Luke, health was considered 'an example of *good fortune*,' and its absence in any form would have constituted 'one example of a wide range of *misfortunes*.'<sup>76</sup> Joanna could have encountered 'different measures of social ostracism'<sup>77</sup> depending on her illness. Moreover, Chuza and her family were likely also affected by her illness and its social implications.<sup>78</sup> Would Chuza have been a help in her time of need, or would he have distanced himself from her? Would her family support her, or had her marriage and life

---

<sup>72</sup> This information is unique to Luke in the Synoptics; neither Mark nor Matthew mentions the healing of the women who followed Jesus from Galilee (cf. Seim, *Message*, 28).

<sup>73</sup> Esther A. De Boer, 'The Lukan Mary Magdalene and the Other Women Following Jesus,' in *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff, FCNTECW (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 140-160, citing 146, who opts for the former reading, as do Evans, *Luke*, 366 and Nolland, *Luke 1-9*, 364; cf. Barbara E. Reid and Shelley Matthews, *Luke 1-9*, vol. 1, WiC 43A (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2021), 252, who opt for the latter reading, as do Martin M. Culy, Mikeal C. Parsons, and Joshua J. Stigall, *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. BHGNT (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010), 256 and Garland, *Luke*, 337.

<sup>74</sup> Plummer, on the one hand, thinks it is possible that only Mary experienced an exorcism while the others were cured of diseases (Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke*, 5th ed., ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922, 215). Reid and Matthews, on the other hand, accuse Luke of 'painting *all* of the women ... as having once been possessed of demons' (Reid and Matthews, *Luke*, 252).

<sup>75</sup> Spencer, *Wives*, 113.

<sup>76</sup> John J. Pilch, *Healing in the New Testament: Insights from Medical and Mediterranean Anthropology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 90.

<sup>77</sup> Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 318.

<sup>78</sup> Pilch, *Healing*, 97.

in Tiberias disconnected Joanna from them? Would she have had a social network among the Herodian elite ready to provide the emotional and economic support needed?<sup>79</sup> Considering that Joanna possibly already was (or at least felt) isolated, trapped in an arranged marriage with a man who did not share her beliefs, and marginalised by her social circles, who likely were more 'flexible in their attitude to Jewish religion' than she was,<sup>80</sup> it is possible that her illness exacerbated her (feeling of) marginalisation.<sup>81</sup> If she also believed her illness came from God,<sup>82</sup> her sense of abandonment would be total.

No matter her exact circumstances, Joanna could have desired something more than a cure for a physical ailment. Pilch argues that healing 'involves the provision of personal and social meaning for the life problems that accompany human health misfortunes.'<sup>83</sup> Thus, Joanna was unlikely 'lured ... into Jesus' movement' because he provided a remedy for her illness.<sup>84</sup> What she sought might have been a change of her situation, a 'restoration to integrity and wholeness'<sup>85</sup> and a 'movement from social marginalisation... to social integration.'<sup>86</sup> However and whatever she heard about Jesus and his healing ministry,<sup>87</sup> the news must have sparked enough hope for her to set out and see for herself.

### 2.2.2. *Joanna's Healing*

As indicated above, Joanna's meeting with Jesus was unlikely a chance encounter. There is no evidence in our sources that Jesus ever came to

---

<sup>79</sup> Pilch, *Healing*, 97.

<sup>80</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 142.

<sup>81</sup> Alternatively, her marginalisation might have been the root of her illness.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Pilch, *Healing*, 104, who states that for a first-century person '...every event must have a personal cause ... if no human or malevolent spirit has caused it, one might presume that the other misfortunes should be ascribed to God.'

<sup>83</sup> Pilch, *Healing*, 94.

<sup>84</sup> Contra Spencer, *Wives*, 113.

<sup>85</sup> Pilch, *Healing*, 112.

<sup>86</sup> Seim, *Message*, 251.

<sup>87</sup> It is easy to imagine that the Herodian circles abounded in rumours about the 'successor' of John.

Tiberias,<sup>88</sup> the city where Joanna presumably lived. Therefore, she had to leave the world of the Herodian court and seek him out among ‘the ordinary people of Galilee.’<sup>89</sup> She might have stood out among the crowds due to her ‘fine clothing’ (Luke 7:25), representative of the luxurious life of the Herodian elite Jesus criticised in his statements about John.<sup>90</sup> Did Luke refrain from telling her healing story because she was bolder and did come ‘openly and courageously to Jesus with [her] request for help’ even though it was considered indecent for a woman to speak to an unknown man?<sup>91</sup> Or did she send a servant to ask on her behalf or hide within the crowd waiting to be noticed by Jesus like the women in the healing narratives who appeal indirectly to Jesus?<sup>92</sup>

Luke does not tell us, but he gives us an inkling that her healing story, along with the ones of the other (named) women in Luke 8, had a different outcome than most others. So far there has been no indication in the Lukan narrative that those healed started to follow Jesus.<sup>93</sup> On the contrary, their healing by Jesus restored them to their communities.<sup>94</sup> The women in Luke 8, however, are found as part of a new community forming around Jesus. Green suggests that

the experience of healing among some of these women may have been accompanied not by a return to their own communities and families, to the extent that these might have existed for them, but by incorporation into this new community being formed around Jesus.<sup>95</sup>

It is imaginable that Joanna was one of these women who, due to the ostracism faced in their communities, decided to stay with Jesus and his followers.

---

<sup>88</sup> Tiberias is not mentioned in the synoptic gospels. In John it is used twice in reference to the lake (6:1, 21:1) and once to the city itself (6:23).

<sup>89</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 150.

<sup>90</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 149.

<sup>91</sup> Seim, *Message*, 55.

<sup>92</sup> Seim, *Message*, 55.

<sup>93</sup> Spencer, *Luke*, 203f.

<sup>94</sup> The most obvious examples are the leper who is sent back to show himself to the priest (Luke 6:12-14), the paralytic who is sent home (Luke 5:17-26), the centurion’s servant who is found healed at home (Luke 7:1-10), and the widow’s son who is given back to his mother (Luke 7:11-17).

<sup>95</sup> Green, *Luke*, 318.

Alternatively, her healing experience had such a strong impact on her that she made the life-altering decision to give up her secure and privileged life as Chuza's wife 'to follow Jesus in a situation of uncertainty and precariousness.'<sup>96</sup> Even if she wanted to return to her husband and he tolerated her support of Jesus (which, as noted above, is less probable), her double life would have sooner or later become untenable. Considering that Antipas had an interest in being informed about Jesus and his movement, it is quite probable that there would have been Herodian spies among the crowds, and her support would not have gone unnoticed.<sup>97</sup> Joanna would have to choose a side, and her presence at the empty tomb (Luke 24:10) is a sure sign that she chose her new community over the old. We now should turn to this community and Joanna's role and life within it.

### 2.3. Joanna's Life as a Follower of Jesus

Luke 8:1-3 is a so-called summary passage<sup>98</sup> describing a typical situation<sup>99</sup> in a way that gives 'the impression of an extended and open-ended duration.'<sup>100</sup> This means whatever Luke describes in this scene needs to be considered as continuing in the following.<sup>101</sup> The question of what ongoing role Luke pictures for the women in the pericope, however, is a debated issue. The passage consists of one long sentence, which, due to its ambiguous syntax,<sup>102</sup> allows for different interpretations regarding the women's presence and role in the group

---

<sup>96</sup> Ricci, *Mary*, 154f.; cf. Moltmann-Wendel, *Mensch*, 142f., who describes Joanna's decision to leave her husband as radical.

<sup>97</sup> John P. Meier, 'The Historical Jesus and the Historical Herodians,' *JBL* 119.4 (2000): 740-746, citing 745f. Sawicki proposes Joanna herself was a Herodian spy using her influence to protect Jesus and suggests that she 'walked a thin line in Herod's court' as a 'double-agent' (Sawicki, 'Magdalenes,' 195 and 198).

<sup>98</sup> Bovon, *Luke 1-9*, 299.

<sup>99</sup> Green, *Luke*, 316.

<sup>100</sup> M. A. Co, 'The Major Summaries in Acts: Acts 2,42-47; 4,32-35; 5,12-16: Linguistic and Literary Relationship,' *ETL* 68.1 (1992): 49-85, citing 56f.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 110. This is also underlined by the two imperfect forms διώδευεν (v. 1) with Jesus as the subject and διηκόνουν (v.3) with the women as the subject (cf. Bovon, *Luke 1-9*, 299).

<sup>102</sup> Nolland, *Luke 1-9*, 364.

around Jesus.<sup>103</sup> The major question is whether the women travelled with Jesus through Galilee or supported him and his disciples financially from their homes. A second related issue is how to understand the service they provided for Jesus (and the Twelve). The following will discuss both issues with a specific focus on Joanna.

### 2.3.1. *Joanna the Itinerant Follower or Stay-at-Home Supporter?*

The conceptual background to the question above is Theissen's classic *Sociological Analysis of the earliest Christianity*, which divides early Christians into two groups:<sup>104</sup> *wandering charismatics* who left their homes and families to travel from place to place<sup>105</sup> and less radical *sympathizers*, who received the itinerant preachers into their homes and supported them financially.<sup>106</sup> For him, the women of Luke 8 represent the latter group, providing for the movement from their homes.<sup>107</sup> The mother-in-law of Peter (Luke 4:38f.), serving Jesus and those with him after her healing, and Martha and Mary (Luke 10:38-42), who received Jesus in their home, would be other female examples of sympathisers.<sup>108</sup>

Contrary to Theissen, most scholars assume that the women of Luke 8 were not sympathisers but 'part of the permanent retinue of Jesus in Galilee' as itinerant followers.<sup>109</sup> Sim even claims that the Lukan picture of women travelling with Jesus 'is not seriously open to question' as it 'preserves a historical reminiscence of Jesus' ministry.'<sup>110</sup> Ricci's summary is the perfect example of the image evoked by Luke 8:2f.:

---

<sup>103</sup> Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 224.

<sup>104</sup> Gerd Theissen, *The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christianity*, transl. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1978).

<sup>105</sup> Theissen, *Followers*, 8-16.

<sup>106</sup> Theissen, *Followers*, 17-23 (emphasis mine).

<sup>107</sup> Theissen, *Followers*, 17.

<sup>108</sup> Theissen, *Followers*, 17.

<sup>109</sup> Séan Freyne, 'Jesus, the Wine-Drinker: A Friend of Women,' in *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and Women Re-viewed*, ed. Ingrid Rosa Kitzberger, BibInt 43 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 162-180, citing 162; cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 315; Forbes and Harrower, *Obscurity*, 82; Bock, *Luke 1-9*, 712; and Bieberstein, *Jüngerinnen*, 41

<sup>110</sup> Sim, 'Women,' 51.

[the women] sat out with him, leaving home, family, relations, their village, their everyday life, and stayed with him, listening, speaking, travelling, offering goods and services, living with him, in short.<sup>111</sup>

This image is countered by Levine, who concludes regarding the consensus view that it 'is a possibility, but it cannot be demonstrated on the basis of the Gospel evidence.'<sup>112</sup>

Only the hermeneutics of imagination has [the women] on the road with Jesus, day after day and night after night, after having fully divested of their homes, goods, and biological and marital relations.<sup>113</sup>

Her interpretation of Luke 8:1-3 is based on the assumption that 'the women grammatically are distanced' from Jesus and the Twelve.<sup>114</sup> This means Levine thinks there is neither a connection of the women with the main verb of the sentence, which highlights the itineracy of Jesus' ministry (διώδευεν - 'he was travelling about'<sup>115</sup>), nor with the prepositional phrase, which indicates the constant presence of his followers with Jesus (σὺν αὐτῷ - 'with him').<sup>116</sup> It is valid to question the connection with the main verb. Both διώδευεν and the following participles κηρύσσων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος ('preaching and goodnewsing') are singular and relate only to Jesus. This means neither the Twelve nor the women are portrayed as wandering preachers like Jesus.<sup>117</sup> So even 'the Twelve are not yet ... coworkers here, but companions.'<sup>118</sup> Yet, what about the women? They are most likely the subject of a 'verbless equative

---

<sup>111</sup> Ricci, *Mary*, 53.

<sup>112</sup> Levine, 'Itinerants,' 47.

<sup>113</sup> Levine, 'Itinerants,' 53.

<sup>114</sup> Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 223.

<sup>115</sup> All translations in this paragraph are mine.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. Levine, 'Itinerants,' 54, for her translation of the passage.

<sup>117</sup> Contra Quentin Quesnell, 'The Women at Luke's Supper,' in *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*, ed. Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983), 59-79, citing 68. This fits in with Reid's conclusion regarding the speaking and silence of characters in Luke: 'Once Jesus begins his public ministry in chap. 4, he is the primary one who articulates God's word,' and thus, 'women are not any more silent than men' in the third gospel (Barbara E. Reid, 'The Gospel of Luke: Friend or Foe of Women Proclaimers of the Word?' *CBQ* 78.1 (2016): 1-23, citing 18.

<sup>118</sup> Bovon, *Luke 1-9*, 300; cf. Green, *Luke*, 317 and Bauckham, *Women*, 112.

clause with  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$  implied'<sup>119</sup> ('... and the Twelve [were] with him, as also [were] some women ...'). Regarding their relation with Jesus, this places the women on a par with the men, at least syntactically,<sup>120</sup> both groups *are with* Jesus during his tour throughout Galilee.

According to Witherington, such a presence of women among the itinerant group of Jesus' followers was not just something 'unheard of, it was scandalous' in its historical context.<sup>121</sup> Though there are dissenting voices,<sup>122</sup> many have followed this assessment.<sup>123</sup> Levine rightly questions whether there was any scandal as 'no Gospel finds the presence of women supporters shocking, embarrassing, or even unusual.'<sup>124</sup> However, she draws the wrong conclusion by assuming that the absence of scandal disproves the itineracy of the women. There might have been no scandal because the group of women travelling with Jesus was not perceived as scandalous. Kraemer critiques Witherington's approach to use the rabbinic context as a background for his evaluation of the women's behaviour: The rabbinic writings should not be retrojected uncritically onto Judean and Galilean life in the first century because it is neither assured that they are contemporary to the New Testament, nor that the different opinions presented in them reflect 'normative views or social practice.'<sup>125</sup> One of Schüssler Fiorenza 'rules for a feminist hermeneutics of

---

<sup>119</sup> Culy, Parsons, and Stigall, *Luke*, 255, who also suggest that the women are mentioned 'after  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$  because of the lengthy modifier that follows.'

<sup>120</sup> Marshall, *Luke*, 316; contra Nolland, *Luke 1-9*, 366.

<sup>121</sup> Witherington, 'Road,' 135f.

<sup>122</sup> Reid, for example, admits that '[...] we cannot say with certainty [that women traveling with an itinerant preacher was an unprecedented practice].' (Barbara E. Reid, *Choosing the Better Part? Women in the Gospel of Luke*, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996, 131; cf. Arlandson, 'Lifestyles,' 168 and Stevan Davies, 'Women in the Third Gospel and the New Testament,' in "Women like This" *New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine, SBLEJL 1, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991, 185-197, citing 186).

<sup>123</sup> Cf. among others, Forbes and Harrower, *Obscurity*, 82, who find it 'a little surprising, and possibly even scandalous, that women, whose cultural location was normally within the home, were part of an itinerant charismatic preacher,' and Ricci, *Mary*, 85, who states that 'the fact that Jesus accepted women among his following was for his time and its historical-cultural environment both unusual and scandalous.'

<sup>124</sup> Levine, 'Itinerants,' 47; cf. Davies, 'Women,' 188.

<sup>125</sup> Ross S. Kraemer, 'Jewish Women and Christian Origins: Some Caveats,' in *Women & Christian Origins*, ed. Ross Shepard Kraemer and Mary Rose D'Angelo (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 35-49, citing 37.

suspicion' also highlights the discrepancy between law and practice: '*The formal canons of codified patriarchal law are generally more restrictive than the actual interaction and relationship of women and men and the social reality which they govern.*'<sup>126</sup>

Horsley describes the social reality of Galilean villagers as follows: 'The gendered division of labor was not highly developed in Galilean villages and reciprocal social relations persisted among families in the very structure of daily and yearly local social-economic life.'<sup>127</sup> This means that most people in Jesus' following would have been used to working side by side in the fields during harvest time or at the seashore sorting fish, with not just their male and female family members but also other families from the village.<sup>128</sup> Moreover, though some of the women might be independent women without a male relative within the discipleship group,<sup>129</sup> others could well be mothers,<sup>130</sup> wives,<sup>131</sup> or sisters of male disciples.

It is also important to note that Luke's portrayal of the discipleship group is that of two distinct entities, the (male) Twelve and the women. Seim correctly highlights that even though the women are included, there still seems to be some segregation,<sup>132</sup> which reflects 'a world divided by gender ...in which men and women, within the same community, nevertheless keep each to their own sphere of life.'<sup>133</sup> It was probably natural for the women to journey together as a group. Looking at modern Mediterranean societies, Pizzuto-Pomaca argues that 'relationships by women with unrelated women and kin are a part of women's survival networks from which they gain advice, support, and enthusiasm to

---

<sup>126</sup> Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 108f.

<sup>127</sup> Horsley, *Galilee*, 201.

<sup>128</sup> Cf. Horsley, *Galilee*, 200.

<sup>129</sup> Ricci, *Mary*, 179.

<sup>130</sup> In Matthew 20:20, for example, we encounter the mother of the sons of Zebedee.

<sup>131</sup> It is imaginable that Peter's wife already travelled with her husband during the ministry of Jesus (cf. 1 Corinthians 9:5).

<sup>132</sup> Seim, *Message*, 19.

<sup>133</sup> Seim, *Message*, 24.

care for their husbands, families and home.’<sup>134</sup> She suggests that the same is true for their ancient sisters.<sup>135</sup> Ilan imagines such a situation for women leaving mainstream Judaism; when joining a sectarian movement, they ‘probably found support groups of other females who had acted likewise and who were now happy to render assistance.’<sup>136</sup> Considering that in a group-oriented society like that of first-century Palestine, ‘the responsibility for morality and deviance is not on the individual alone, but on the social body in which it is embedded,’<sup>137</sup> the women might also have held each other accountable regarding any temptation to mix the male and female spheres in improper ways.

As Levine does not consider it improper for women to ‘travel together in groups’ to the festivals in Jerusalem,<sup>138</sup> it is hard to see why the women *travelling as a group* with Jesus should be problematic or scandalous. This is not to say that all women (or men) were constantly with Jesus; the *extent* of their following [might have been] variable, reaching from a permanent presence in the group to travelling ‘with Jesus more intermittently.’<sup>139</sup> Yet, Joanna unlikely belonged to the latter group. Once she had committed to supporting Jesus openly, there would be no way back. And her presence among a group of peasants as a married elite woman travelling without her husband might well have scandalised elite Greco-Roman readers of Luke.<sup>140</sup> So maybe the ambiguities in the syntax regarding the women’s being with Jesus are deliberate

---

<sup>134</sup> Julia Pizzuto-Pomaco, *From Shame to Honor: Mediterranean Women in Romans 16* (Lexington: Emeth Press, 2017), 38.

<sup>135</sup> Pizzuto-Pomaco, *Shame*, 57.

<sup>136</sup> Ilan, ‘Footsteps,’ 127f.

<sup>137</sup> Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, ‘First-Century Personality: Dyadic, not Individual,’ in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 67-96, citing 76.

<sup>138</sup> Levine, ‘Itinerants,’ 55.

<sup>139</sup> Spencer, *Wives*, 141f.

<sup>140</sup> Reid and Matthews suggest that the audience of the third gospel is ‘Greek-speaking, urban, predominantly Gentile Christian, with a significant number of prosperous members, including rich women patrons’ (Reid and Matthews, *Luke*, lvii). Other commentators locate Theophilus, for whom Luke writes his gospel (Luke 1:3), among the elite (Bock, *Luke 1-9*, 63; cf. John T. Carroll, *Luke: A Commentary*, NTL, Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 22; Edwards, *Luke*, 27; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 300; and Garland, *Luke*, 56).

to allow the audience to make up their own minds about the role of Joanna and the others. 'Women financially supporting Jesus and the Twelve, independently from male relatives or guardians, would not set off alarm bells for Theophilus'<sup>141</sup> as female patronage was a known practice in the Greco-Roman world.<sup>142</sup> Yet, Theophilus might have imagined Joanna's role in a way that did not necessarily reflect the role she had among the discipleship group. So we now need to turn to the question of what kind of support the women provided for the group around Jesus.

### 2.3.2. *Joanna the Servant or Benefactor?*

Having established that Joanna likely was part of the group travelling with Jesus rather than a patron financing the movement from afar, this section focuses on her role and status within the discipleship group. Other than that they were with Jesus, and Jesus had healed some of them, Luke adds a third piece of information about the women: they 'provided for them out of their resources' (διακόνουν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς). Several aspects of this short clause are debated:

- 1) What is the meaning of the verb διακονέω in the context of this verse?
- 2) Which group of women is the antecedent of the relative pronoun in v.3?
- 3) What is the meaning of the prepositional phrase following the verb?
- 4) For whom did the women provide and why?

Depending on how these questions are answered, different pictures of the role of the women in general and of Joanna in particular emerge, which span from

---

<sup>141</sup> Reid and Matthews, *Luke*, 249f.

<sup>142</sup> Cf. Cohick's discussion on the patronage of New Testament women in light of Greco-Roman examples of female benefactors like Junia Theodora (cf. II.2.2. n. 70), featuring Joanna and Mary Magdalene, two of the women mentioned in Luke 8 (Lynn H. Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians: Illuminating Ancient Ways of Life*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009, 285-320). For an extensive discussion of women as benefactors and patrons in the Latin-speaking West, cf. Hemelrijk, *Lives*, 109-180 and 227-269.

the women providing traditional acts of service to them financing the whole movement as patrons.

### 2.3.2.1. *Service or Financial Support?*

The verb διακονέω is used ‘of unspecified services’ and can mean to ‘perform duties, render assistance, [or simply] serve.’<sup>143</sup> It also has ‘a strong connotation of waiting on someone,’<sup>144</sup> and this is the meaning of the verb in its first occurrence in the Lukan narrative. Luke writes that after her healing, Peter’s mother-in-law ‘began to serve’ those present (Luke 4:39), which involves preparing and serving food as part of ‘the obligations of hospitality.’<sup>145</sup> Assuming the same meaning for διακονέω, Via has the women of Luke 8 buying and preparing food for Jesus and everyone else present.<sup>146</sup> Witherington, in his first analysis of the passage, also interprets διακονέω in connection with ‘traditional roles of hospitality and service’ (including cooking and sewing); however, these roles are given new importance as services to Jesus and their new community.<sup>147</sup>

Though it is plausible that the women would have continued to fulfil some of their traditional roles while travelling with Jesus,<sup>148</sup> this is not the meaning intended in Luke 8:3.<sup>149</sup> In this verse διακονέω is intrinsically linked with the following prepositional phrase and cannot be interpreted on its own.<sup>150</sup> We will

---

<sup>143</sup> BDAG, s.v. ‘διακονέω,’ 2.a.; cf. MGS, s.v. ‘διακονέω,’ 1.

<sup>144</sup> Seim, *Message*, 58; cf. BDAG, s.v. ‘διακονέω,’ 2.b.

<sup>145</sup> Seim, *Message*, 60; cf. E. Jane Via, ‘Women, the Discipleship of Service, and the Early Christian Ritual Meal in the Gospel of Luke,’ *SLJT* 29.1 (1985): 37-60, citing 38.

<sup>146</sup> Via, ‘Women,’ 38; cf. Hengel, ‘Maria,’ 47f., who widens the meaning from table service to the general care for ‘das leibliche Wohl,’ i.e. the provision of food and drink.

<sup>147</sup> Witherington, ‘Road,’ 137f.; cf. Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 225, for a more recent assessment of the services rendered as likely involving ‘more than cooking and cleaning’ and moving towards an understanding of the women’s role as patronage.

<sup>148</sup> One might wonder how an elite woman like Joanna, who might have had servants, fared with those tasks and how her lack of experience might have affected her status within the group of women.

<sup>149</sup> Ricci, *Mary*, 177f.; cf. Sim, ‘Women,’ 60.

<sup>150</sup> Ricci, *Mary*, 177; cf. Seim, *Message*, 62. This means we should be careful not to limit it to its most basic sense of serving but also not to read it in light of its later use ‘as a metaphor for leadership’ in Luke 22:26-25 (Green, *Luke*, 319).

look more closely at the meaning of ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς and its implications in the following. For now, suffice it to say that the present plural participle of ὑπάρχω can refer to ‘goods owned’ like ‘possessions’ and ‘financial resources’<sup>151</sup> and is used commonly in Luke for ‘someone’s property, possessions, [or] means.’<sup>152</sup> Thus, the women’s service is marked as first and foremost economic in nature.<sup>153</sup>

#### 2.3.2.2. *Giver or Receiver?*

The question is whether Joanna is one of the women providing this economic support or whether she is part of the group receiving it. The syntax allows for either of these options as there are two possible antecedents for the relative pronoun αἴτινες, the subject of the last clause. The first one, ἔτεροι πολλαί (v. 3), directly precedes the relative pronoun. In this reading, the many other women provided for Jesus, the Twelve, and the named woman. This would imply that Mary, Joanna, and Susanna would have a different role than the others, primarily the one of being with Jesus.<sup>154</sup> However, this reading is unlikely because it excludes Joanna, the only woman with ‘an explicit economic marker’<sup>155</sup> indicating she had the position and financial means<sup>156</sup> necessary for the kind of support imagined. Bauckham convincingly argues that the main reason for adding Chuza’s name and position in Luke 8:2 is to indicate that Joanna is one of the main contributors to the group’s expenses.<sup>157</sup>

Therefore, αἴτινες almost certainly refers to γυναῖκες τινες (v. 2), meaning *all* women (both the named ones and the many others) ‘supplied financial

---

<sup>151</sup> MGS, s.v. ‘ὑπάρχω,’ 1 C).

<sup>152</sup> BDAG, s.v. ‘ὑπάρχω,’ 1.; cf. Garland, *Luke*, 341.

<sup>153</sup> Spencer, *Luke*, 204.

<sup>154</sup> This is the reading of De Boer, ‘Mary,’ 144f.

<sup>155</sup> Sheena Orr, ‘Women and Livelihoods in 1<sup>st</sup> Century Palestine: Exploring Possibilities,’ *ExpTim* 121.11 (2010): 539-547; citing 546.

<sup>156</sup> Reid, *Part*, 126.

<sup>157</sup> Cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 119f., for his evaluation of the different reasons proposed for the mention of Joanna’s connection to Antipas.

support for the *entire* group.<sup>158</sup> Yet, this does not mean that every woman contributed to the same extent. Some might have been wealthy; others might have only had little resources.<sup>159</sup> Moreover, some might have been in no 'position to contribute financially at all.'<sup>160</sup> Sim suggests Joanna, as a married woman, was one of the latter.<sup>161</sup> So we need to reassess her economic status.

### 2.3.2.3. *Wealthy or Penniless?*

Sim does not challenge the reading of Luke 8:2f., which naturally places Joanna among the financial contributors, but he questions its historical accuracy.<sup>162</sup> Referring to the already mentioned *privilege of usufruct*,<sup>163</sup> he argues that Joanna would not have been able to dispose of her goods without Chuza's permission.<sup>164</sup> Bauckham challenges this position in an excellent overview of 'the possibilities Jewish women had to own possessions of which they had free dispositions.'<sup>165</sup> One of these possibilities, the bestowal of a deed of gift by her father or another family member, has already been deemed a possible source of Joanna's independent wealth.<sup>166</sup> Two further possibilities are connected to a change in her marital status.

If she was a widow,<sup>167</sup> Joanna could have supported Jesus with the means provided through the maintenance from Chuza's estate to which she was entitled or alternatively her dowry that she should have received back in full at his death if she decided to leave the estate.<sup>168</sup> Due to the possible age gap between Chuza and Joanna mentioned above,<sup>169</sup> there is a likelihood that she

---

<sup>158</sup> Garland, *Luke*, 341 (emphasis mine); cf. Bock, *Luke 1-9*, 714 and Marshall, *Luke*, 317.

<sup>159</sup> Cf. Spencer, *Wives*, 121; Orr, 'Women,' 546; and Reid and Matthews, *Luke*, 248.

<sup>160</sup> Sim, 'Women,' 52.

<sup>161</sup> Sim, 'Women,' 54.

<sup>162</sup> Sim, 'Women,' 52.

<sup>163</sup> Cf. n. 63-66.

<sup>164</sup> Sim, 'Women,' 54.

<sup>165</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 121; cf. 121-135 for the different possibilities.

<sup>166</sup> Cf. n. 67-68.

<sup>167</sup> Cf. Garland, *Luke*; 342 and Ricci, *Mary*, 154, who hints at the possibility in an aside.

<sup>168</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 129; cf. Horsley, *Galilee*, 200 and Sim, 'Women,' 54.

<sup>169</sup> Cf. n. 61.

might have been widowed. However, she is not referred to as a widow but a wife in Luke.<sup>170</sup> Moreover, most women remarried quickly as their change in status, though theoretically giving them economic freedom, often entailed the loss of economic security.<sup>171</sup> Still, Joanna might have been among the very few who 'found it advantageous to remain single' as she had sufficient funds to enjoy her unmarried life and the freedom it brought.<sup>172</sup>

If she was a divorcée, Joanna technically also had the right to be given her dowry in full.<sup>173</sup> Yet, Sim cautions that 'there were many safeguards built into the system to keep men in control of the economic resources,' among others exceptions that prevented a woman from receiving her dowry back.<sup>174</sup> It is easy to imagine that Chuza sought a divorce<sup>175</sup> after Joanna left him.<sup>176</sup> He could have accused her of unfaithfulness, which would have allowed him to keep her dowry as recompense, but adultery 'was almost impossible to prove.'<sup>177</sup> Or he might have evoked 'cruelty and humiliation ... as grounds of divorce' due to Joanna's improper behaviour travelling with a group of unrelated men and women.<sup>178</sup> A more likely scenario is that Chuza would have wanted to divorce as quietly and quickly as possible from the wife who endangered his career, reputation, and honour among his peers. So he might have settled matters outside the court, which would have meant Joanna received her dowry.<sup>179</sup>

Although we can only speculate about her marital status, in every possibility Joanna could have had funds to support her new community. We

---

<sup>170</sup> Bieberstein, *Jüngerinnen*, 50.

<sup>171</sup> Ilan, *Women*, 147.

<sup>172</sup> Instone-Brewer, *Divorce*, 117.

<sup>173</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 129; cf. Horsley, *Galilee*, 200 and Sim, 'Women,' 54.

<sup>174</sup> Sim, 'Women,' 54f.

<sup>175</sup> 'Divorce was always the right and responsibility of the husband to initiate' (Ilan, *Women*, 143).

<sup>176</sup> Moltmann-Wendel, *Mensch*, 140; cf. Bieberstein, *Jüngerinnen*, 50 and Davies, 'Women,' 187.

<sup>177</sup> Instone-Brewer, *Divorce*, 94.

<sup>178</sup> Instone-Brewer, *Divorce*, 107. 'Behaving improperly in public' as a wife would be considered a humiliation for the husband (Instone-Brewer, *Divorce*, 109). Yet, we do not know whether this would have been serious enough to affect the payment of the dowry.

<sup>179</sup> 'A divorce did not require a court unless there was a dispute about the ketubah inheritance or the grounds for the divorce.' (Instone-Brewer, *Divorce*, 117).

also cannot be sure whether Joanna put all her money into the movement. Though it seems likely that there was 'a general pooling of resources' into a 'common fund,'<sup>180</sup> nothing in the text indicates that the women gave everything they had. If Joanna provided 'the lion's share of the economic support for Jesus and his itinerant disciples,' as Bauckham suggests,<sup>181</sup> the others might not have needed to offer financial support. Yet, they did. So what motivated these women to give some or even all of their resources?

#### 2.3.2.4. *Benefactor or Beneficiary?*

Though there is no causal link between the two relative clauses describing the women as having been healed and as providing financially, it is not hard to see a connection between the two. The women's response to Jesus' healing was their service to him.<sup>182</sup> Thus, the women are first described as 'beneficiaries of Jesus' healing and [then] as benefactors of his mission.'<sup>183</sup> Their healing undoubtedly is the reason for their giving, but their response can still be interpreted in different ways. Pilch notes that 'in the ancient Mediterranean world, a person involved in a healing transaction ... would definitely owe the healer something.'<sup>184</sup> Therefore, the women might feel obliged to repay the debt to Jesus. Green argues against such an understanding in light of Jesus' conversation with Simon in the preceding pericope, which for Green highlights that 'in Jesus' ministry debts are canceled.'<sup>185</sup> Similar to the sinful woman in Luke 7, the women in Luke 8 respond to Jesus with 'loving gratitude,' which flows into service<sup>186</sup> rendered not just to Jesus<sup>187</sup> but to the whole group.

---

<sup>180</sup> Sim, 'Women,' 53. John indicates that there was a common purse, Judas was responsible for it, and it was also used to support the poor (John 12:6 and 13:29).

<sup>181</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 161.

<sup>182</sup> Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 225.

<sup>183</sup> Edwards, *Luke*, 234; cf. Spencer, *Luke*, 204; Seim, *Message*, 251; and Carroll, *Luke*, 182.

<sup>184</sup> Pilch, *Healing*, 95.

<sup>185</sup> Green, *Luke*, 319; cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 165.

<sup>186</sup> Garland, *Luke*, 336.

<sup>187</sup> The variant reading 'provided for him (αὐτῷ),' which would focus the response of the women solely on Jesus, likely is 'a Christocentric correction of a later period' (Witherington, 'Road,' 137, n. 17). For an argument in favour of the variant, cf. Ricci, *Mary*, 156-158.

Though this is a likely interpretation of Luke 8 within the narrative context, the concept of patronage must be addressed. Miller claims that the women ‘very clearly act as patrons by ... providing for Jesus “out of their own resources.”’<sup>188</sup> At least they are presented in a way that evokes the image of ‘wealthy patrons of the mission.’<sup>189</sup> Moreover, there are examples of elite Palestinian women financially supporting religious movements.<sup>190</sup> Would Joanna, as a member of a Hellenised Herodian elite, have understood herself as a patron of Jesus’ ministry?<sup>191</sup> The first sign that she did not is her decision to follow Jesus on the road and throughout the Galilean villages rather than stay in Tiberias and give provision when needed.<sup>192</sup> Moreover, there is the question of what Joanna tried to gain from her patronage. Patronage was an exchange of resources between a patron, who provided ‘social, economical and political resources,’ and a client, who offered ‘loyalty and honor’ in return.<sup>193</sup> It is likely that the group of Galilean villagers Joanna encountered around Jesus might not have welcomed her presence or her financial support, let alone honoured her for it. Relations between the elite and the rural population in Galilee ‘were frequently not cordial.’<sup>194</sup> Therefore, many followers of Jesus might have resented Joanna at first for ‘the luxury of her former lifestyle, the burden of taxation that financed it, and the pagan domination of their land that the Herodian court she belonged to represented for them.’<sup>195</sup> So rather than wielding influence over the group as a patron,<sup>196</sup> Joanna might have needed to

---

<sup>188</sup> Miller, ‘Cloth,’ 208.

<sup>189</sup> Reid, *Part*, 129; cf. Kathleen E. Corley, *Private Women, Public Meals: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993), 118f.; and Levine, ‘Itinerants,’ 54.

<sup>190</sup> Cf. Ilan, ‘Attraction,’ 11-22 and Bauckham, *Women*, 161f.

<sup>191</sup> Sawicki certainly portrays her as such when she imagines that Joanna ‘promoted the teaching and healing career of her protégé Jesus both among Herod’s clients and in villages and towns of Galilee and beyond’ (Sawicki, ‘Magdalenes,’ 198).

<sup>192</sup> Contra Levine, ‘Itinerants,’ 53.

<sup>193</sup> Halvor Moxnes, ‘Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts,’ in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 241-268, citing 248.

<sup>194</sup> Douglas E. Oakman, ‘The Countryside in Luke-Acts,’ in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 151-179, citing 165.

<sup>195</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 150.

<sup>196</sup> Contra Miller, ‘Cloth,’ 206.

prove herself worthy of honour first in the eyes of her travelling companions. Bauckham suggests that her financial contribution might have been a way of 'putting to rights some of the economic wrongs in which she had been involved as Chuza's wife.'<sup>197</sup> Yet, if this was an aspect of Joanna's provision, it unlikely reflects 'a conversion to the poor'<sup>198</sup> but came out of the overflow of Joanna's gratitude for her healing. Green, therefore, is probably right: Jesus 'graciousness toward these women is not repaid by their benefactions; rather, his graciousness is mirrored in theirs.'<sup>199</sup>

Though we can only speculate about the means and motivations of the women's contribution in general and Joanna's in particular, it has been shown that they would have been able to support the discipleship group. Yet, this is not their primary role. The first and foremost information Luke conveys about these women is that they were with Jesus as part of his closest following. Though they disappear from the narrative until the Passion account, the Lukan summary has prepared us to expect 'the persisting presence of the Galilean women disciples' throughout Jesus' ministry,<sup>200</sup> even though they are not explicitly mentioned.<sup>201</sup>

### **3. Witness of the Empty Tomb (Luke 24:1-11)**

The main focus of this section is to establish the presence of Joanna at the main events preceding and following her second mention in Luke 24:10 within the narrative of the empty tomb.<sup>202</sup> Whereas the mentions of the women of

---

<sup>197</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 150.

<sup>198</sup> Contra Bauckham, *Women*, 150.

<sup>199</sup> Green, *Luke*, 319; cf. Garland, *Luke*, 342.

<sup>200</sup> Spencer, *Luke*, 205; cf. Karris, 'Women,' 32.

<sup>201</sup> Bauckham, for example, suggests their presence among the seventy(-two) disciples sent out by Jesus in Luke 10 (Bauckham, *Women*, 112; cf. De Boer, 'Mary,' 149 and Green, *Luke*, 318).

<sup>202</sup> This means the engagement with the passages is more eclectic than in the case of Luke 8:1-3 and Romans 16:7.

Galilee in the scenes of the crucifixion (Luke 23:49) and the burial (Luke 23:55f.) are likely meant to remind the reader of the women in Luke 8, their presence among the disciples after their report of the empty tomb is more tentative. After a last possible mention as part of the group waiting for the promised Spirit in Jerusalem (Acts 1:14), the women who followed Jesus during his ministry disappear from the narrative and with them any trace of what happened to Joanna.

### 3.1. Joanna's Presence at the Crucifixion and the Burial

'As the Gospel reaches its climax,'<sup>203</sup> the Galilean women become visible again. Luke leaves no room for doubt that the women at the cross and the burial of Jesus are 'from Galilee' (23:49 and 55). Thus, both references function as 'flashbacks' to Luke 8, linking their presence in these final events of Jesus' life to their presence throughout his ministry.<sup>204</sup> The women who had been with him in Galilee are now with Jesus at the end of his journey.

#### 3.1.1. Joanna witnesses the Death of Jesus

Unlike the women in Mark (15:40f.) and Matthew (27:55f.), the women in Luke (23:49) are joined at the cross by 'all his acquaintances' (πάντες οἱ γνωστοί). These acquaintances remain unspecified,<sup>205</sup> though they might include followers of the wider discipleship group<sup>206</sup> and friends.<sup>207</sup> That Luke subsumes the Eleven under this vague term rather than mentioning their presence as witnesses to the death of Jesus directly is unlikely.<sup>208</sup> Setzer suggests

---

<sup>203</sup> Reid, *Part*, 199.

<sup>204</sup> Karris, 'Women,' 36.

<sup>205</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke (X-XXIV): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, vol. 2, AB 28A (Garden City: Doubleday, 1985), 1520.

<sup>206</sup> Darrell L. Bock, *Luke: Volume 9:51-24:53*, vol. 2, BECNT 3B (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996), 1865; cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 877.

<sup>207</sup> Cf. Luke 2:44 (the only other use of γνωστοί in Luke).

<sup>208</sup> Cf. Bieberstein, *Jüngerinnen*, 224 and Claudia Setzer, 'Excellent Women: Female Witness to the Resurrection,' *JBL* 116.2 (1997): 259-272, citing 265; contra Carroll, *Luke*, 472; Evans, *Luke*, 879; and Green, *Luke*, 828.

that the appearance of this group ‘blunts the distinctiveness of the women's witness’ as they become a part of a wider group.<sup>209</sup> However, this overlooks that the women are not included in but distinct from the group of acquaintances (οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῶ ... καὶ γυναῖκες).<sup>210</sup> Moreover, ‘the last role is played in the Greek text by the women alone.’<sup>211</sup> They are the ones ‘watching’ the events as expressed by the feminine plural participle ὁρῶσαι.<sup>212</sup> Though others are present, it is the women who are cast *as eyewitnesses* by Luke<sup>213</sup> in this scene and in the course of events that follow.

### 3.1.2. *Joanna knows where Jesus' Body was Laid*

The Galilean women are next mentioned at the burial of Jesus (23:55). Though the narrative has moved on several verses, introducing the role of Joseph of Arimathea as the provider of Jesus' tomb (23:50-54), the witness of the women is unbroken. Still *watching*, they *must have seen* Joseph take down the body from the cross (implied in 23:53) and then followed him to the tomb (as stated in 23:55) where they *saw* (εἶθεάσαντο) not just the tomb but how Jesus was laid in it. Again, the women are portrayed as eyewitnesses. Though others, like the acquaintances at the cross and Joseph at the tomb, play a part, it is the journey of the women that links the events following the crucifixion and guarantees the continuity of witness.<sup>214</sup> The burial scene is crucial in this as it prepares for the women's witness to the empty tomb. It is only because they have seen where Jesus was laid that they can later ‘vouch for the fact that the empty tomb really was the tomb [of Jesus].’<sup>215</sup> Thus, the women's presence at the entombment ensures ‘the continuity between the crucified Jesus and the

<sup>209</sup> Setzer, ‘Women,’ 265; cf. Reid, *Part*, 200.

<sup>210</sup> Syntactically this resembles the structure of Luke 8:1-3: The first group (the Twelve/the acquaintances) is separated by a prepositional phrase (with him/from afar) from the second group (the women), which then is further modified by a relative clause.

<sup>211</sup> Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1521.

<sup>212</sup> Culy, Parsons, and Stigall, *Luke*, 729; cf. Bieberstein, *Jüngerinnen*, 224.

<sup>213</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 48 (emphasis mine); cf. Bieberstein, *Jüngerinnen*, 224.

<sup>214</sup> Bieberstein, *Jüngerinnen*, 249; cf. Seim, *Message*, 149.

<sup>215</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 257.

risen Lord.<sup>216</sup> There can be no mistake that Jesus was dead, was buried, and was no longer in the tomb two days later.

The burial narrative also explains why the women visit the tomb again. As they have provided for Jesus throughout his journey, they set out to provide 'for his proper burial' now.<sup>217</sup> Yet, their preparations are interrupted. For a short narrative moment, there is a break in the women's journey, a sabbath break. 'The women, faithful Jews, put the spices down, and rest.'<sup>218</sup>

### 3.2. Joanna's Presence at the Empty Tomb – Turning Point 2

As the women rest, it is time to revisit the question of historicity before continuing with Luke's portrayal of the events and Joanna's role in them. In the first half of this chapter, we have established that women were likely part of Jesus' following in Galilee. It is plausible that they would have accompanied him on his last journey to Jerusalem as well (as Luke's references to the women in 23:49 and 23:55 indicate). Their presence at the cross and especially the tomb is also feasible, considering women had a significant role 'in the preparation [of the burial] and the grieving process.'<sup>219</sup> The fact that all gospels report that women discovered the empty tomb, though in varying ways,<sup>220</sup> is a sign that the presence of the women was a fixed part of the tradition. As there seems to be a preference for male over female witness in the ancient world, Ricci correctly asserts that 'there was absolutely no benefit gained from bringing women in except when the sources made the most definite reference to them.'<sup>221</sup>

---

<sup>216</sup> Seim, *Message*, 149; cf. Carroll, *Luke*, 473.

<sup>217</sup> Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1525; cf. Reid and Matthews, *Luke*, 621 and Seim, *Message*, 149.

<sup>218</sup> Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 641; cf. Bock, *Luke 9-24*, 1887; Garland, *Luke*, 940; Marshall, *Luke*, 883; and John Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, vol. 3, WBC 35C (Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 1166.

<sup>219</sup> Pizzuto-Pomaco, *Shame*, 91; cf. Carolyn Osiek, 'The Women at the Tomb: What are They Doing there?' *HvTSt* 53.1-2 (1997): 103-118, citing 111.

<sup>220</sup> Nolland, *Luke 18-24*, 1181; cf. 1177-1188 for his full discussion regarding the traditions of the empty tomb and resurrection appearances.

<sup>221</sup> Ricci, *Mary*, 186; cf. Reid and Matthews, *Luke*, 628 and Osiek, 'Women,' 116, who emphasise that the women's role was enshrined in tradition in a way that prevented the authors (especially Luke) from removing it despite a tendency to suppress female witness.

Thus, there are valid reasons to accept that some women found the tomb empty on Easter morning.<sup>222</sup> Moreover, ‘it can hardly be doubted’ that in the aftermath of their discovery, ‘some powerful and life-transforming experience overtook the early disciples,’<sup>223</sup> which I believe to be rooted in the encounter with the risen Jesus.<sup>224</sup> However, the resurrection is a matter of faith, and its historicity is not under discussion here. In this thesis we need to establish whether Joanna was among the early disciples in this life-transforming moment, as Luke recounts. Considering that, in all likelihood, ‘*Luke* believed the historical truth of the Resurrection Narrative,’<sup>225</sup> his consistent emphasis on the women’s role as primarily *seeing* the events makes it likely that he considered them to be *eyewitnesses*. Though they remain nameless throughout the crucifixion and burial (meaning Joanna’s presence can only be implied from Luke 8), in the empty tomb story the witnesses are recorded by name (Luke 24:10), and Joanna is among them. Therefore, at the very least, for Luke, Joanna was at the empty tomb, and she was among those who first realised that Jesus was not dead but alive and returned to the discipleship group with this news. The following will focus on these elements of the Lukan account.<sup>226</sup>

### 3.2.1. *Joanna Remembers and Proclaims*

We left the women resting ‘according to the law’ (23:56) but find them two days later in the early morning on their way to finish what they have started (Luke 24:1). What the chapter heading hides is that there is no break within the narrative; the two verses are closely linked by the construction μέν ... δέ thereby forming a single sentence.<sup>227</sup> On the one hand, this construction speeds up the

---

<sup>222</sup> Marshall even suggests that ‘there are no compelling arguments against [this] view’ (Marshall, *Luke*, 883).

<sup>223</sup> Nolland, *Luke 18-24*, 1182.

<sup>224</sup> Cf. I.7.2.

<sup>225</sup> Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 648.

<sup>226</sup> For an overview of the possible sources of the Lukan empty tomb story and differences to other accounts, cf. Nolland, *Luke 18-24*, 1184f. and Marshall, 882f.

<sup>227</sup> Culy, Parsons, and Stigall, *Luke*, 734; cf. Evans, *Luke*, 893.

narration time, jumping straight into the significant events of Easter morning by covering two days of narrated time in one sentence. On the other hand, it ensures the continuity of the witness of the women as it leaves no doubt that it is the same women who are present at every stage of the journey.

The women come to the tomb but do not find the body; instead, they encounter two men who tell them that Jesus is no longer dead but alive and then call them to remember the passion (and resurrection) predictions Jesus made 'while he was still in Galilee' (24:2-7). Verse 8 simply records: 'Then they remembered his words.' This sentence is significant because it implies that in Luke's mind, the women were present among the disciples to whom Jesus 'revealed his suffering and resurrection' in Galilee.<sup>228</sup> The women's remembrance, therefore, can be seen as further corroboration that the women travelled with Jesus and were part of the group called 'disciples' in Luke.<sup>229</sup>

Unlike in Matthew (Matthew 28:9f.), the women have no encounter with the risen Christ and, therefore, no direct experience of the resurrection on which to base their belief. Yet, 'the empty tomb, the remembered predictions, and the proclamation of the angels [seem to be enough to assure] the women of the reality of the resurrection of Jesus' within Luke's account.<sup>230</sup> This is indicated by their immediate return to 'the Eleven and to all the rest' (24:9). Their remembrance leads first 'to understanding and [then to] proclamation.'<sup>231</sup> In contrast to Matthew's account (Matthew 28:7), the women in the third gospel

---

<sup>228</sup> Maria-Luisa Rigato, "'Remember' ... Then They Remembered,' in *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff, FCNTECW (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 269-280, citing 272; cf. Garland, *Luke*, 942; Reid, 'Luke,' 20; Seim, *Message*, 151; and Ben Witherington III, *Women in the Earliest Churches* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 130. For an analysis of the literary correspondences between Luke 24:6-8 and the various passion predictions in Luke, cf. Rigato, 'Remember,' 276f. Though there are overlaps with predictions made solely to the Twelve, it is unlikely that Luke considered the women part of this group (contra Rigato, 'Remember,' 278).

<sup>229</sup> Contra Levine, 'Itinerants,' 57. Admittedly, this is not a case of 'direct evidence,' but it still strongly suggests that Luke envisions the women as part of the itinerant following of Jesus.

<sup>230</sup> Nolland, *Luke 18-24*, 1193; contra Evans, *Luke*, 898, who doubts 'whether the women themselves accepted these implications of their own story.'

<sup>231</sup> Osiek, 'Women,' 107; cf. Edwards, *Luke*, 711.

are not commissioned to tell the news of the resurrection to the disciples.<sup>232</sup>

Their report to the others is ‘undertaken of their own initiative.’<sup>233</sup> Reid argues that in this way they are shown as ‘faithful, persistent disciples’ who ‘both hear and act on the word.’<sup>234</sup>

Just after they have faithfully given their ‘full report’ of ‘all these things’ (ταῦτα πάντα) (24:9),<sup>235</sup> the narrative is interrupted by the ‘delayed mentioning of the women’s names.’ (24:10).<sup>236</sup> The list of names is not attached as an afterthought,<sup>237</sup> it is deliberately placed at the close of their report, similar to the list of witnesses at the end of a protocol of testimony.<sup>238</sup> Moreover, it is intrinsically linked with what comes before and after through a chiasmic structure of vv. 9f. (possibly also including vv. 8 and 11):<sup>239</sup>

---

<sup>232</sup> Some see this omission of Luke as diminishing the women’s role: De Boer finds it striking that the women ‘only receive the charge *to remember* and are not summoned to *do* anything’ (De Boer, ‘Mary,’ 155). Matthews thinks it relegates their witness to a ‘second hand account’ (Reid and Matthews, *Luke*, 632).

<sup>233</sup> Carroll, *Luke*, 478; cf. De Boer, ‘Mary,’ 155; Green, *Luke*, 838; and Seim, *Message*, 155.

<sup>234</sup> Reid and Matthews, *Luke*, 634; cf. Witherington, *Women*, 131, who argues that the women, rather than being ‘treated as emissaries to the disciples,’ are ‘summoned to be true disciples.’

<sup>235</sup> Green, *Luke*, 839.

<sup>236</sup> Joseph Plevnik, ‘The Eyewitnesses of the Risen Christ in Luke 24,’ *CBQ* 49.1 (1987): 90-103, citing 92; cf. Carroll, *Luke*, 476 and Nolland, *Luke 18-24*, 1191.

<sup>237</sup> Contra Marshall, *Luke*, 881.

<sup>238</sup> Seim, *Message*, 156.

<sup>239</sup> The following is a modification of the structure first proposed by Louis Dussaut, ‘Le Triptyque des Apparitions en Luc 24 (Analyse Structurelle),’ *RB* 94.2 (1987): 161-213, citing 168, and also argued for by Bauckham, *Women*, 187 and Garland, *Luke*, 943.

8 Then they **remembered his words** and, **returning** from the tomb,

9 they told all **these things to the Eleven**

and to all **the rest**.

10 And they were **the Magdalene**<sup>240</sup>

**Mary**

and

**Joanna**

and

**Mary**

**the mother of James**

and **the rest of the women** with them.

They told **these things to the apostles**.

11 and **these words seemed** unto them like nonsense, and **they did not believe** them.<sup>241</sup>

Interestingly, Joanna is placed at the centre of the inverted parallelism, which usually signifies importance. This is picked up by Bauckham, who suggests that even though 'it is impossible to be sure that Luke created this structure in order to suggest a central significance for Joanna, ... we can be sure that Joanna has some kind of special importance for Luke.'<sup>242</sup> He suggests that Joanna was Luke's source for the empty tomb tradition.<sup>243</sup> This fits in with his wider argument that the gospel writers 'were careful to name precisely the women who were well known to them as witnesses to these crucial events.'<sup>244</sup> Though the overall approach to consider the named women as eyewitnesses of the events is convincingly argued,<sup>245</sup> the specific significance of Joanna for Luke is

---

<sup>240</sup> This is the only time in the New Testament that Mary's nickname is mentioned before her personal name (cf. Dussaut, 'Triptyque,' 169).

<sup>241</sup> Translation mine.

<sup>242</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 187.

<sup>243</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 193; cf. Edwards, *Luke*, 712. Joanna might also be one of the sources behind the unique material about Herod (Bauckham, *Women*, 189; cf. Hoehner, *Antipas*, 120 and 303-5).

<sup>244</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 51. This would explain why Susanna (Luke 8:3) is replaced with Mary, the mother of James, in Luke 24:10. Susanna might not have been present at the events. For an overview of the other named female witnesses in the gospels, cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 298, table 8.

<sup>245</sup> Cf. Witherington, *Women*, 131; Edwards, *Luke*, 701; and Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 652.

harder to establish based on the structure above.<sup>246</sup> Focussing not just on the centre but the whole, what we have in vv. 9f. is a memorable summary of the main tradents (the women) and recipients (the men) of the first news of the resurrection. Widening the structure to include vv. 8 and 11<sup>247</sup> allows us to see the contrast between the reaction of these two groups to Jesus' words about his resurrection, of which both groups are reminded (the women by the men at the tomb and the men by the report of the women).<sup>248</sup> Whereas the women remember and repeat the words, the men consider them nonsense and remain unbelieving.

### 3.2.2. *Joanna Encounters Disbelief*

Everything in Luke's account so far has indicated that the women are 'trustworthy and understanding witnesses.'<sup>249</sup> This makes it even more surprising that they fail to convince their fellow disciples of the truthfulness of their report,<sup>250</sup> which included words the disciples had heard from Jesus himself. There are two lines of thought regarding the question of why the Eleven are 'not at their apostolic best'<sup>251</sup> when assessing the women's report.

The first one argues the reason for their unbelief is the event of the resurrection itself. 'The idea of a dead person rising was incredible, unbelievable, to them.'<sup>252</sup> The second and much more common approach focuses on the stated reason for the disciples' disbelief; the women's report

---

<sup>246</sup> Cf. Dussaut, 'Triptyque,' 208, who is also more cautious about making a statement about Joanna's significance within the structure.

<sup>247</sup> The proposed connection between the two verses is the repetition of ῥήματα ('his words' and 'these words').

<sup>248</sup> Cf. Reid and Matthews, *Luke*, 630; Seim, *Message*, 157; and Edwards, *Luke*, 707.

<sup>249</sup> De Boer, 'Mary,' 156; cf. Robert L. Brawley, *Luke: A Social Identity Commentary* (London: T&T Clark, 2020), 204; Bieberstein, *Jüngerinnen*, 261; and Seim, *Message*, 156.

<sup>250</sup> Seim, *Message*, 254; cf. De Boer, 'Mary,' 156 and Osiek, 'Women,' 113.

<sup>251</sup> Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 653.

<sup>252</sup> Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 648; cf. Edwards, *Luke*, 713 and Bock, *Luke 9-24*, 1898.

'seemed to them an idle tale.'<sup>253</sup> The word *λῆρος* used in the sense of 'idle talk'<sup>254</sup> and useless 'chatter'<sup>255</sup> seems to reflect the same 'tendency to discount the word of a woman'<sup>256</sup> as found in Josephus, who rules out the witness of women 'because of the levity and temerity of their sex' (Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 4.219 [Thackeray and Marcus]).

Whether or not it reflects the disciples' actual prejudice against the women's reliability,<sup>257</sup> it might help explain why Luke's narrative moves away from the women's witness at this point. Plevnik argues that their unbelief becomes 'the background of the disciples' own independent road to the knowledge and proclamation of the Easter reality.'<sup>258</sup> So far they have merely heard a report of the events rather than 'having actually been there,' meaning they do not qualify as eyewitnesses yet.<sup>259</sup> This changes with Peter's visit to the tomb, where he sees for himself (Luke 24:12). Though his experience is no replacement for the women's witness,<sup>260</sup> their report seems to receive 'a more reliable confirmation through a man.'<sup>261</sup> This fits in with what we know of women's witness in Judaism. Though women were generally able to testify in court,<sup>262</sup> their 'testimony was not sought out and was in fact avoided whenever possible' unless there was no other way to obtain it.<sup>263</sup>

It is, therefore, not surprising that the remainder of the Lukan account establishes the male witness of the resurrection, and the women, including

---

<sup>253</sup> Brawley, *Luke*, 204. Setzer sees the inclusion of this detail as a sign that 'Luke outwardly denigrates the significance and effect of the women's witness while his narrative affirms it' (Setzer, 'Women,' 265). However, there are clear narrative markers that the disciples' assessment is deficient ('it *seemed* to them'), not the women's witness.

<sup>254</sup> BDAG, s.v. 'λῆρος.' According to BDAG, it describes something 'which is totally devoid of anything worthwhile.'

<sup>255</sup> MGS, s.v. 'λῆρος.'

<sup>256</sup> Nolland, *Luke 18-24*, 1191; cf. Witherington, *Women*, 132 and Green, *Luke*, 840.

<sup>257</sup> One would hope that after travelling with Jesus for quite some time, the disciples would have had more trust in the women's words.

<sup>258</sup> Plevnik, 'Eyewitnesses,' 93.

<sup>259</sup> Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 48.

<sup>260</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 279; contra De Boer, 'Mary,' 155.

<sup>261</sup> François Bovon, *Luke 3: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 19:28-24:53*, trans. James Crouch, vol. 3, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2012), 353.

<sup>262</sup> Cf. Osiek, 'Women,' 112f. and Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 648.

<sup>263</sup> Ilan, *Women*, 165.

Joanna, disappear. Yet, just because they are no longer explicitly mentioned, this does not necessarily mean they are no longer there.

### 3.3. Joanna's Presence at the Events After the Empty Tomb

Luke's account establishes Joanna as a witness of the empty tomb, but the group of women *disappears* from the narrative before Jesus *appears* as the risen One. The question is whether they are no longer present at the subsequent events or they are present but remain unmentioned due to Luke's narrative strategy.

#### 3.3.1. Joanna Among the Ones with the Eleven (Luke 24:33)

In Luke 24:9 the women come back to the Eleven and *the rest of the disciples* (τοις λοιποις). Though there is no indication of who belonged to this group,<sup>264</sup> it is logical to assume that they are disciples from Galilee<sup>265</sup> who, like the Twelve and the women, have come to Jerusalem with Jesus.<sup>266</sup> *Two of this group* (δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν) set out to travel to Emmaus (Luke 24:13) and give an account of the discovery of the empty tomb to a fellow traveller (Luke 24:22f.), referring to the women as '*some women of our group*' (γυναῖκές τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν). After the realisation that they have encountered Jesus on the way, the two disciples return to Jerusalem where they find *the Eleven and those with them* (τοὺς ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς) (Luke 24:33). Given that the women have just been mentioned as part of the discipleship group, the most natural reading of Luke 24:33 is to understand τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς as a generic reference to all disciples who had stayed behind in Jerusalem including the women.<sup>267</sup>

---

<sup>264</sup> Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1546.

<sup>265</sup> Evans, *Luke*, 897.

<sup>266</sup> Luke 19:37 mentions a whole crowd of them.

<sup>267</sup> Cf. Brawley, *Luke*, 206; Green, *Luke*, 850; Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 664; Bieberstein, *Jüngerinnen*, 267; and Bauckham, *Women*, 281. Along the same lines, the women as witnesses to the resurrection might also be included in Paul's reference to the five-hundred brothers and/or the apostles in 1 Cor 15:6f. (cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 310).

From a narrative point of view, this means the women are also included in the group to whom Jesus appears in Luke 24:36,<sup>268</sup> as there is a ‘tight interconnectedness of the units’<sup>269</sup> (expressed by a genitive absolute).<sup>270</sup> Jesus appears *while* the Emmaus disciples are still speaking about their encounter on the road. Thus, even though there is ‘no [explicit] appearance of the resurrected Christ to the Galilean women’ in Luke,<sup>271</sup> they are envisioned as part of the gathered community of Jesus followers to whom Christ appears and whom he commissions to be witnesses (Luke 24:48).<sup>272</sup> At the very least Joanna, therefore, had a narrative encounter with the risen Christ. And though he only named her as a witness of the empty tomb, there is no reason to doubt that Luke also understood her as a witness of the resurrection. However, he slowly narrows the focus to the Twelve as the main witnesses, which becomes even more evident in Acts.<sup>273</sup>

### 3.3.2. *Joanna Among the Women in Jerusalem (Acts 1:14)*

The last trace of Joanna is probably found in Acts. Luke, in a significantly reduced way, informs his readers that with the Eleven there were women in the upper room praying (Acts 1:14). Unlike in Luke 23, they are not further identified in any way. Keener suggests ‘the identity of “the women” would have been clear enough’ for the audience of Luke-Acts identifying them as Joanna, the two Marys, and the other Galilean women present at the end of Luke.<sup>274</sup> However, their mention, chucked between the Eleven and the new group of Jesus’ family members, feels like an aside rather than a pause to

---

<sup>268</sup> Bovon, *Luke 19-24*, 397, who mentions the women explicitly as present in this scene.

<sup>269</sup> Nolland, *Luke 18-24*, 1210.

<sup>270</sup> Bock, *Luke 9-24*, 1931; cf. Carroll, *Luke*, 490 and Marshall, *Luke*, 901.

<sup>271</sup> Reid, *Part*, 201.

<sup>272</sup> Cf. Carroll, *Luke*, 491 (‘the whole band of disciples’); Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1572 (‘the nucleus Christian community’); Green, *Luke*, 852 (‘the whole company of his followers’); and Levine and Witherington, *Luke*, 665 (‘the assembly’), for the various generic expressions used by commentators to refer to the men and women witnesses in Luke 24.

<sup>273</sup> Nolland, *Luke 18-24*, 1220.

<sup>274</sup> Keener, *Acts 1-2*, 748; cf. Bruce, *Acts*, 41 and Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 212.

highlight their presence.<sup>275</sup> It is also questionable whether their presence is of any importance for the following events. Though they are likely included among the crowd of 120 (Acts 1:15),<sup>276</sup> they might have ‘no part in the proceedings’ regarding the replacement of Judas.<sup>277</sup> Peter’s address to the group (Acts 1:16) uses the gender-specific word for men (ἄνδρες) in combination with a term that could be understood generic (ἀδελφοί - brothers).<sup>278</sup> What we know is that despite being obvious candidates, fulfilling the criteria of Acts 1:21f. especially regarding the resurrection witness, the women are not considered for the replacement of Judas due to their sex.<sup>279</sup>

Thus, the last possible mention of Joanna tells us which role she could not fill but nothing about which part she might have played in the early church. It is relatively likely that Joanna might have stayed in Jerusalem with the others and so would have been among the group receiving the Holy Spirit at Pentecost (Acts 2:1).<sup>280</sup> Yet, from this point onwards, we can do nothing but speculate because the author of Luke-Acts does not tell us about her fate.

### 3.3.3. *Joanna’s Disappearance after Pentecost*

It is true that the women of Acts 1:14 ‘play no role in Luke’s story about the beginnings of the church.’<sup>281</sup> Yet, they are not the only disciples who have featured in significant roles in Luke and now are set aside, first due to the focus on the witness function of the Twelve,<sup>282</sup> and later due to its focus on ‘the leading players’ Peter and Paul.<sup>283</sup> Still, D’Angelo suggests that this focus cannot explain the almost complete silence in Acts regarding women’s role in

---

<sup>275</sup> Contra Keener, *Acts 1-2*, 746.

<sup>276</sup> Keener, *Acts 1-2*, 755; cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 222 and Witherington, *Acts*, 120.

<sup>277</sup> Haenchen, *Acts*, 159, n. 4; contra Forbes and Harrower, *Obscurity*, 151.

<sup>278</sup> Keener proposes that the address ‘may function more inclusively (Keener, *Acts 1-2*, 755 n. 202; cf. Witherington, *Acts*, 120, n. 21).

<sup>279</sup> Reid, *Part*, 133; cf. Bieberstein, *Jüngerinnen*, 275f.

<sup>280</sup> Keener, *Acts 1-2*, 795; cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 238 and Seim, *Message*, 183.

<sup>281</sup> De Boer, ‘Mary,’ 157.

<sup>282</sup> Bieberstein, *Jüngerinnen*, 278.

<sup>283</sup> Forbes and Harrower, *Obscurity*, 147; cf. De Boer, ‘Mary,’ 159 and Reid, ‘Luke,’ 18, who argues that Peter and Paul have ‘almost all the speaking roles’ in Acts.

ministry.<sup>284</sup> Though there are traces of women's involvement,<sup>285</sup> Luke 'treats their appearances with acute, not to say terminal, discretion.'<sup>286</sup>

We have already seen that in Luke 24 there is a tendency to replace, or at least confirm, the women's witness by male testimony. The focus on the witness of men (i.e. the Twelve) is even stronger in Acts. D'Angelo proposes that manhood as a criterion for the Twelve (Acts 1:21) is necessary to guarantee 'that the witness to the resurrection [is] acceptable in the public forum.'<sup>287</sup> Focussing on the male proclaimers of the resurrection might cater to the sensibilities of Luke's audience in whose cultural background 'male testimony was nearly always accepted most highly.'<sup>288</sup> Thus, the women's disappearance (or relegation to side notes) in Acts could have apologetic reasons. The author might want to avoid portraying the role of women in a way contrary to the Greco-Roman norms as it could become an obstacle to convincing a wider Greco-Roman audience of the truth of the gospel.<sup>289</sup>

This could mean that women played a part in the witness to and proclamation of the resurrection in the early church. Though 'Luke does not record their contribution,' his depiction of the women as eyewitnesses of the core events, including the commission to be witnesses to them, suggests their essential role in the beginnings of the church.<sup>290</sup> Bauckham proposes the women 'continued to be active traditioners whose recognized eyewitness authority could act as a touchstone to guarantee the traditions as others relayed them and to protect the tradition from inauthentic developments.'<sup>291</sup> Whether through public proclamation or private sharing with other women, Joanna could relay

---

<sup>284</sup> Mary Rose D'Angelo, 'Women in Luke-Acts: A Redactional View,' *JBL* 109.3 (1990): 441-461, citing 456.

<sup>285</sup> Acts 9:2 indicates that women were involved in a way that warranted their arrest. In Acts 18:26 Priscilla teaches Apollos, albeit in the presence of her husband. Other women, like Lydia (Acts 16:14f.), represent women who seem to act as patrons of the movement.

<sup>286</sup> D'Angelo, 'Luke-Acts,' 461.

<sup>287</sup> D'Angelo, 'Luke-Acts,' 449f.

<sup>288</sup> Keener, *Acts 1-2*, 786.

<sup>289</sup> Corley, *Women*, 117; cf. D'Angelo, 'Women,' 443.

<sup>290</sup> De Boer, 'Mary,' 160.

<sup>291</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 295.

the events based on her own experience and be a guarantor that the message preached was in line with the apostolic teaching, a role also proposed for Junia in this thesis.

Having come to the end of Joanna's story, we may now be able to connect some dots between her and Junia and answer some outstanding questions in the following.

## **4. Joanna the Disciple and Junia the Apostle**

### **4.1. Connecting Some Dots**

Though the link between Joanna and Junia based on the name similarity is tentative, there are overlaps between their stories. If not the same person, both women were connected to Romanised circles in Galilee, most likely the Herodian elite in Tiberias. In Joanna's case, this is based on her husband's position within the royal administration. In Junia's case, it is based on her Latin name, strongly suggesting a relation to Romanised circles in Palestine.

The second and most crucial overlap is that they are both portrayed as apostolic witnesses. Paul refers to Junia as an apostle in a way that indicates she must have been among the limited group of people who had seen the risen Lord and were commissioned by him. Joanna, at first glance, did not have a resurrection appearance but was 'only' a witness to the empty tomb. However, the analysis of subsequent events has shown that within Luke's narrative she very likely was part of the group to whom Jesus appeared. There are also indications that she was part of the beginnings in Jerusalem, even though she disappears from the narrative. The presence in Jerusalem has also been proposed for Junia. Therefore, both women might have been present and involved on the day of Pentecost.

Beyond that, we can only speculate about other similarities and try to answer some remaining questions, like that of Chuza's and Andronicus' identification and the role of Luke and Paul in their lives.

#### **4.1.1. *Joanna and Junia's Judaism***

The proposed biographical sketch of Junia places her among the Torah-observant members of the Roman Christian community. At the very least, Paul highlights her Jewishness. Though speculative, there is value in assuming that Joanna's understanding of Judaism was more conservative than that of her social circles and piqued her interest in Jesus' movement.<sup>292</sup> Even if it was not a conversion 'from a deficient Judaism,'<sup>293</sup> Joanna's journey towards Jesus might have been one of seeking a more authentic Judaism than the one she encountered in Herodian circles. There is no doubt that Luke depicts her as an observant Jew in the burial scene (Luke 23:56). Joanna and Junia, therefore, might have shared their outlook on matters of the law.

#### **4.1.2. *Leaving Securities***

As proposed in this thesis, Joanna likely had to cut her relations with her husband and the Herodian court, as neither would have accepted her continued support of Jesus. If Chuza divorced her, she could have used her means independently of him. Nevertheless, she would likely have '[suffered] economic loss from [her] change in status.'<sup>294</sup> Her decision to follow Jesus likely did also 'entail social censorship and derision.'<sup>295</sup> Moreover, her life as an itinerant follower of Jesus would have had significantly less comfort than life among the elite.

---

<sup>292</sup> Cf. Bauckham, *Women*, 195.

<sup>293</sup> Spencer, *Wives*, 138.

<sup>294</sup> Ilan, *Women*, 148.

<sup>295</sup> Ilan, 'Footsteps,' 127; cf. Sim, 'Women,' 55.

Joanna might not have given up all her means into the common fund during Jesus' lifetime, but Luke's portrayal of the community in Acts 4:32-37 suggests that the giving up of possessions became part of the community ethics of the early church in Jerusalem. Joanna's means might have derived mainly from property owned due to a deed of gift. Selling this property (Acts 4:34) would have meant giving up her economic freedom and relying entirely on the provision through the community. 'The means to support herself,' in a presumed Roman mission as Junia, would have been gone in this scenario.<sup>296</sup>

We know much less about Junia's economic status, but we have proposed she left her native country for Rome and then might have been exiled for a while from her second home. Moreover, she seems to have consistently faced the danger of imprisonment, which in antiquity involved not just the loss of freedom but also of status and honour, especially for a woman. Junia likely also faced opposition not just from the wider society but from within her own community.

Thus, both women were willing to face massive life changes, the loss of security, and ridicule in their following of Jesus.

#### **4.1.3. Herodian Connections**

Joanna is not the only person with a Herodian background in Luke-Acts. One of the prophets and teachers of the Antioch church, Manaen, is likely another member of the Herodian court within the Jesus movement (Acts 13:1).<sup>297</sup> Yet, we do not know of any link between Joanna and Manaen and Junia had no connection to the Antioch church according to the sketch outlined in this thesis.<sup>298</sup>

---

<sup>296</sup> Contra Bauckham, *Women*, 186.

<sup>297</sup> He could be another source for Luke's material on Antipas (cf. Hoehner, *Antipas*, 121 and 305-6).

<sup>298</sup> Contra Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Missionaries,' 430, who suggests Andronicus and Junia might have been co-workers of Paul in Antioch.

The Herodian links in Romans are stronger. The whole household of Aristobulus (Romans 16:10) and Herodion (Romans 16:11) are likely connected to the Herodian family.<sup>299</sup> If Junia was Joanna, she might have had contacts among these people and possibly had been involved in the conversion of some.<sup>300</sup>

#### 4.1.4. *Chuza and Andronicus*

The most apparent difference between Joanna and Junia is that they were married to different men. Bauckham's suggestion that Chuza adopted the name Andronicus like Joanna adopted Junia<sup>301</sup> is improbable because it assumes a favourable view of Chuza towards Jesus, which is not indicated anywhere in Luke-Acts.<sup>302</sup> Moreover, it defies Bauckham's purpose to prove that name similarity was the main reason for adopting a particular Greco-Roman name (the two names share no similarity whatsoever).

A more likely scenario is that Joanna remarried after the divorce from Chuza.<sup>303</sup> Re-marriage was common, and 'there was no stigma involved in marrying a divorcée.'<sup>304</sup> Andronicus could have been a member of the wider discipleship group,<sup>305</sup> and as a divorced woman, Joanna would have had the right to choose her husband herself.<sup>306</sup> Nevertheless, in light of Jesus' teaching on divorce and re-marriage (Mark 10:12), Joanna might have chosen to remain single until after Chuza's death.<sup>307</sup> He was probably significantly older than her,

---

<sup>299</sup> Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 896; cf. Moo, *Romans*, 940f. and Schnabel, *Römer 6-16*, 892f.

<sup>300</sup> Lampe suggests that members of Aristobulus' household might have been one channel through which Christianity reached Rome from the east (Lampe, 'Christians,' 222).

<sup>301</sup> Bauckham, *Women*, 184.

<sup>302</sup> If Chuza became part of Jesus' following, it would be strange that Luke omits him from his account while including Joanna and Manaen.

<sup>303</sup> Cf. Witherington, 'Joanna,' 14 and 46.

<sup>304</sup> Instone-Brewer, *Divorce*, 123.

<sup>305</sup> Tradition links him with the seventy(-two) disciples mentioned in Luke 10 (cf. II.2.1.).

<sup>306</sup> Instone-Brewer, *Divorce*, 118; cf. Kraemer, 'Women,' 58.

<sup>307</sup> Cf. Instone-Brewer, *Divorce*, 182f., regarding Jesus' stance on the "any matter" divorce and its consequences for his followers.

so he might have died during her time following Jesus, which would have freed her to remarry.<sup>308</sup>

Andronicus and Junia (whether or not she was also Joanna) were likely married and formed a missionary pair. They probably went (or were sent) as a couple from Jerusalem to Rome. We do not know how exactly their ministry there might have looked, but they were both involved in ways that led to their imprisonment.

#### 4.1.5. *Luke and Paul*

This brings us to the most complicated question: Who knew who? The biographical sketch of Junia proposed in this thesis suggests that Paul did not know Junia personally but had heard of her and knew details of her Christian journey (like the time of her conversion). So he would have known if she was also Joanna. Yet, he might have refrained from using her Hebrew name as it was less familiar to his majority gentile audience.

Considering that Luke portrays Joanna as a central eyewitness to the events surrounding Jesus' death and resurrection, he could have received her testimony first-hand.<sup>309</sup> So he would have known if she was also Junia. This becomes even more likely if he was Luke, Paul's travel companion. The author of the third gospel is not given in the text, but the gospel is traditionally ascribed to Luke, 'the beloved physician' (Col 4.14), a companion of Paul.<sup>310</sup> Whether or not Luke is the most likely candidate,<sup>311</sup> it is certainly possible that he was the author of the third gospel.<sup>312</sup> If there is a connection between Paul and Luke, it becomes even harder to explain why he should have omitted the

---

<sup>308</sup> Though likely due to literary reasons, the absence of Chuza's name in Joanna's second mention in Luke (Luke 24:10) might reflect the historical reality that Chuza was no longer part of the picture.

<sup>309</sup> Bauckham suggests that 'there is no reason why Luke could not have known Joanna' (Bauckham, *Women*, 194).

<sup>310</sup> Garland, *Luke*, 21; cf. Edwards, *Luke*, 4f. and Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 35-37.

<sup>311</sup> Cf. for example Green, *Luke*, 21.

<sup>312</sup> For internal and external evidence in favour of Lukan authorship, cf. Bock, *Luke 1-9*, 4-7.

important information that Joanna was also Junia, a person known to Paul. Though there are reasons not to include the double name formula in Luke from a narrative perspective,<sup>313</sup> a side note in Acts could have easily been added to highlight the famous apostle Junia among the women in Jerusalem without making her a main character or mentioning her connection to Rome. If Joanna's inclusion in Luke 24:10 was 'an attempt to present a well-to-do witness' relatable to Luke's audience, as Witherington suggests,<sup>314</sup> naming her as Junia might have destroyed the purpose. Based on what we know about Junia's incarceration, she was not just famous; she might have been infamous, especially in the eyes of the Roman authorities. As such, she certainly was not a woman to include in a writing that seems to tone down women's roles to socially acceptable ones.

Thus, even if Paul and Luke knew Joanna as Junia, they had valid reasons not to make that explicit in their writings. However, in the absence of any other source that mentions a connection between the women, this leaves us with no direct evidence regarding the identification of Junia with Joanna. Everything discussed above amounts to circumstantial evidence at best. And one might wonder whether this was worth the effort. As will become evident from the following, the answer is it was!

#### **4.2. Two Sides of the Same Coin**

Focussing on the core overlaps of Junia's and Joanna's journey, we can identify three significant events in their faith journeys: the moment they started to follow Jesus, the moment they encountered the risen Christ and were commissioned as witnesses by him, and the Pentecost event and its consequences.

---

<sup>313</sup> Cf. III.4.2.3.

<sup>314</sup> Witherington, *Women*, 131.

Based on Luke 8:3, we have some insights into Joanna's life before Jesus and what caused her to follow him. We lack this information for Junia. Based on Romans 16:7, we established a likely biographical sketch of Junia that filled some gaps between Pentecost and the arrival of the letter to the Romans. We have no information about Joanna after Pentecost whatsoever. Based on Luke's and Paul's portrayal of the women, both were witnesses of the resurrection. Therefore, if Junia was not Joanna, she at least *would have known* Joanna. As one of the unnamed disciples to whom Jesus appeared, she might have also been part of the women disciples at the empty tomb, the burial, the crucifixion, and in Galilee.

Junia's biographical sketch lacks the backstory of her life in the early years of the Jesus movement. Joanna, however, fades away in the missionary phase of the early church. Together, they represent two sides of the same coin. By overlapping their biographical sketches, we would gain a complete story: The journey of an exceptional disciple becoming an apostle in the early church.

## **5. Conclusion**

The two identifiers added to Joanna's name in Luke 8:3 allow us a glimpse into her life before she encountered Jesus. As the wife of 'Chuza, Herod's steward,' Joanna would have belonged to the elite circles of Galilee, most likely the Herodian elite in Tiberias. Her husband presumably had a position in the royal administration, which would have secured him and his family status and wealth.

Aside from Joanna's elite background, we know that she was healed by Jesus (Luke 8:2). As the story of her healing is not part of Luke's account, there is no indication of her illness, and we can only speculate how it might have impacted her life. We do know from the Lukan summary that after she was healed, she became part of Jesus' following and provided financially for the

group. This most likely meant that she, along with other women, travelled with Jesus throughout Galilee. Though the group of women is depicted in a way that resembles Greco-Roman patrons, these women were unlikely stay-at-home supporters. They were first and foremost with Jesus. Their presence in Jesus' entourage presumably would not have been considered as scandalous as the women formed their own social network travelling with but likely segregated from the men.

Joanna's specific case, however, involved an element of scandal, as it is plausible that she left her husband. Supporting Jesus and living at the Herodian court would have been incompatible. In this scenario, Chuza likely divorced her, which would have given her the right to dispose of her dowry as she saw fit. Even if she remained married, she could have owned property received by a deed of gift. Whatever means she used to provide for Jesus and the group, it is unlikely that she considered her contribution as patronage or the repayment of a debt owed for her healing; rather it came out of the overflow of her gratitude towards Jesus for making her whole.

Joanna and the Galilean women are next mentioned as eyewitnesses to the crucifixion, burial, and empty tomb (Luke 23 and 24). Their presence provides a continuous witness to the events, which ends when their credible testimony is met by the disciples' unbelief. From a narrative perspective, the women disappear into the background as their witness is replaced by male testimony. Though not explicitly mentioned in the following, the presence of the women is assumed in the rest of the narrative. According to Luke, Joanna would have seen the resurrected Jesus and was commissioned to witness. In the further development of Luke-Acts, however, she plays no part, though she is likely among the women mentioned in Acts 1:14 and probably also present at Pentecost. After that, we can only speculate that Joanna would have passed on what she had witnessed in some way.

Regarding Joanna's connection with Junia, no hard evidence for identifying the women can be added from Joanna's biographical sketch. However, there is an overlap in their biographical sketches that suggests, at the very least, that Joanna and Junia knew each other: They are both portrayed as witnesses of the resurrection. Junia's biographical sketch has led us back to the resurrection due to Paul's reference to her as an apostle, but we know nothing about her life as a follower of Jesus before Easter. We could follow Joanna until the resurrection in Luke, but the continuation of her role in the early church is not narrated in Acts. Overlapping their sketches – using the resurrection as a hinge – would allow us to see a complete story of a female disciple becoming an apostle in the early church.

## V. Conclusion

Having arrived at the end of our journey from Junia to Joanna, it is time to review the steps taken. We set out to explore what we can say about the life and ministry of Junia, analysing first her mention in Romans 16:7. Based on the descriptors in the verse, we concluded that Junia likely was a witness of the resurrection and, therefore, not a native of Rome but a Palestinian Jew, probably from Galilee.

This led to our study of Junia's name, considering the naming conventions of Jews in antiquity. A particular focus was given to Bauckham's hypothesis that the female disciple Joanna (Luke 8:3) used Junia as part of a double name (similar to Saul/Paul). The argument for the Joanna/Junia link was found lacking as it could neither establish that double names, let alone homophonous ones, were a common phenomenon nor that Junia as a name was widely known in Palestine.

However, the link between Palestine and Junia was closed by establishing that there was a prominent Junia (Junia Torquata) whose story could plausibly have been known at the Herodian court. Though by a tentative link, the connection between Joanna and Junia remained possible. Moreover, the likelihood that Junia as a name was probably known only within the circles to which Joanna, the wife of Herod's steward, belonged warranted further exploration of Joanna's life and ministry.

Though no direct evidence of a connection between Junia and Joanna was found, the significant overlap of their biographical sketches, i.e. the shared witness of the resurrection, strongly suggests that the women knew each other and had shared experiences in the following of Jesus. Both their stories have sections missing, and these are curiously complementary – with Jesus' resurrection as the hinge. We only know of Joanna up to and including the

resurrection, but her later life is missing. Junia must have had a pre-Rome history that connects her to the resurrection, but it is precisely that part of *her* life that is missing. It has been proposed in this thesis to *overlap* or superimpose these portraits, even if it is not possible to argue that they should be *combined* as a single historical person. It is historically plausible that Joanna's story might have continued along the same line as Junia's and that Junia's early story might have looked like Joanna's. Therefore, an overlap of their stories would give us a historically valid portrait of a female disciple who became an apostle in the early church.

Overlapping their stories is not meant to diminish their individual ones. There is no doubt that 'even without identifying Joanna with Junia, each of the two characters can still be exemplary with their life stories of faithful discipleship at great cost and their invaluable contribution to the kingdom of God.'<sup>1</sup> In fact, by exploring the possibility of their connection, the picture of both women and our understanding of their (and other women's) contribution to the kingdom of God has gained more contour.

Thus, the results of our discussion of the life and ministry of both Junia and Joanna will be outlined in the following, along with the results of the onomastic study regarding the name Junia that led to the tentative onomastic link between Joanna and Junia connecting the studies of the two women. Finally, this thesis will conclude with Junia's story, overlapping elements of Junia's and Joanna's portraits.

## **1. Junia – The Story**

The analysis of Romans 16:7 has shown that Junia is a woman and most likely an apostle, at least in the eyes of Paul. Yet, there is so much more that we

---

<sup>1</sup> Ng, 'Joanna,' 534.

can add to the portrait of Junia by looking closely at the descriptors in the verse and drawing on the literary and historical context of the greeting:

Andronicus and Junia, who are greeted together, presumably were a married couple and worked together as a missionary pair in Rome. Paul refers to them as his 'fellow Jews' and 'fellow prisoners,' both aspects that might have caused others in the Roman Christian community to look down on them. However, using the prefix *σὺν* in each case highlights his solidarity with them. Moreover, he commends them as 'outstanding among the apostles' and acknowledges their seniority in faith as they have been 'in Christ' before him.

The explicit reference to Junia's ethnicity might indicate that she was part of the Torah-observant group labelled 'the weak' in Romans 14 and 15. Her Jewishness in connection with Paul's statement that she was in Christ before him makes it probable that Rome was not her place of origin but a place she moved to from the East, most likely Palestine. Though there is a slight possibility that Junia (together with her husband) was among the Roman visitors who were converted on the day of Pentecost and brought their new faith back to Rome (Acts 2:10), there are two more plausible scenarios:

- 1) Junia was a Diaspora Jew with a Roman background residing in Jerusalem who became a Christian on or following the day of Pentecost. When tensions with the Jerusalem leadership led to persecution, she and Andronicus left the city and travelled to Rome, where they likely had connections. Once they arrived in the capital, they started to share their faith spontaneously with the Jewish community of which they became a part.
- 2) Junia was a Hellenised Palestinian Jew, probably from Galilee, who had followed Jesus during his ministry and on his last journey to Jerusalem. She might have been among the disciples who encountered the risen Jesus and later belonged to the circle of disciples present at Pentecost. Rather than returning to Galilee to escape the tensions with the Jerusalem leadership, Junia and Andronicus decided to accompany some of the Hellenists (back)

to Rome. In this scenario, it is possible that the Jerusalem church commissioned the couple to safeguard that the message preached (spontaneously and/or purposefully) would align with the apostolic teaching.

According to each of those biographical sketches, Andronicus and Junia would have arrived in Rome early after the events following the crucifixion. So they might have been evangelising among the Jews of Rome since the mid-30s. As they likely continued to live according to Jewish customs, their differing view on messianic matters might have been tolerated by the Jewish community. This seems to have changed in the lead-up to the year 49 CE, the year of the Claudian edict, which, according to Suetonius, led to the banishment of the Jews from Rome. The most likely scenario is that some followers of Jesus (maybe Pauline Christians emigrating from the East) started to question the necessity of following the law and abandoned the customs that formed the backbone of Jewish identity. Heated debates within the synagogues regarding this matter might have turned violent and so drew the attention of the Roman authorities.

Due to their standing as foundational members of the Christian community in Rome, Andronicus and Junia likely were at the centre of these altercations. As public figures in the disputes, they probably were recognised as some of the ringleaders behind the tumults by the authorities. Consequently, they had to leave Rome. Unlike Prisca and Aquila, who went to Corinth and met Paul (Acts 18:2), Andronicus and Junia, not willing to abandon their longstanding ministry in the capital, might have chosen to stay in the vicinity and returned to Rome as soon as the situation had calmed down.

No matter how long they were absent, the trauma suffered due to the severe intervention of the Roman state in their affairs undoubtedly caused a rift between the Jewish community and the followers of Jesus. Synagogue doors would have been closed to anyone proclaiming Christ independent of their

stance on Jewish customs. Andronicus and Junia's mission among the Jews of Rome under these circumstances must have become almost impossible, if not outright dangerous. Afraid of another interference in their matters, the Jewish community would have been eager to shift the blame for any unrest on the couple. The fact that Paul greets them as 'fellow prisoners' suggests Andronicus and Junia were willing to accept the risk of further run-ins with Roman authorities. Their disturbances of the peace could have been dealt with on a smaller scale, leading to Andronicus and Junia's (repeated?) incarceration instead of banishment. Thus, rather than being in prison at the same time and place as Paul, they might have been in prison for the same reason: their proclamation of the gospel.

This ministry must have disturbed the public order in a way that warranted not just the arrest of Andronicus but also that of Junia, even though the imprisonment of women was not common. This points to Junia's active and likely public participation in the mission activities of the couple. Their arrest and detention were likely meant to stop their proclamation and prevent them from further missionary activities. In prison they would have faced physical hardship (lack of fresh air, light, space, hygiene, and food), and Junia, being held in the same space as men, would have been vulnerable to sexual assault. Moreover, the shame associated with incarceration might have prevented many from supporting them during their imprisonment. As the aspect of shame would have remained after their release, Andronicus and Junia might have felt the social consequences of their detention for a long time. In all likelihood, at least some believers would have put into question the validity of their ministry in light of their repeated incarceration. As their missionary success among the Jews of Rome also would have been limited due to the changed circumstances after the edict, it is not hard to imagine that their reputation and their influence as apostles would have suffered not only among the growing gentile element but also among the Jewish-leaning section of the community. There might have

been many who looked down upon the couple despite their link to the earthly Jesus and their part in the Roman Christian community from the very beginning.

This was presumably Andronicus and Junia's situation when Paul's letter reached Rome, entailing the request to greet the couple. Paul, rather than adding insult to injury, commends them as his 'fellow prisoners of war,' sharing with them the sting of shame associated with the term while at the same time turning it into a commendation. Their imprisonment for him is not a sign of failure but proof that they are servants of the Lord willing to fight the good fight for the spread of the gospel of Jesus Christ. With this in mind, the most natural way to read ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις is in connection with the preceding descriptor as Paul's highest praise for the couple. They are 'outstanding among the apostles' because they are willing to forsake their own honour and safety due to their dedication to their Lord Jesus Christ. Paul seems to present them as models of what it means to be an apostle of Christ. As such they should not be looked down upon but be honoured and imitated by the Roman Christians.

Therefore, the greeting to Andronicus and Junia could be a call to honour the couple as the outstanding apostles they are despite their persistence in keeping Jewish customs and their trouble with the authorities. It could be understood as a practical outworking of the exhortation to 'welcome one another' (Romans 15:7) aimed at the gentile Greco-Roman audience. At the same time, it might have also been Paul's way of ensuring a positive reception from the couple themselves and the community of Torah-observant Christians they represented. His acknowledgement of people who had been fundamental in the life of their community might be Paul's way of signalling that he was not a threat, no matter what rumours they might have heard about him. His emphasis on the similarities between him and Andronicus and Junia and his adamance to commend their role and ministry despite its apparent obstacles

and presumably limited success at the time of writing also hint at another more personal purpose. His praise of their apostleship might be a way to defend his own apostleship, also marked by hardships, failures, and conflicts with fellow believers.

As a central criterion for this apostleship in Paul's eyes was the encounter with and commission by the risen Lord, it is unlikely that Paul would have included Andronicus and Junia in the circle of apostles unless he believed they had seen Christ after his resurrection. This tips the scales in favour of the second biographical sketch outlined above: Andronicus and Junia were most likely disciples of Jesus already in Galilee and witnesses of the events following the crucifixion.

## **2. Joanna/Junia - The Tentative Link**

The simple answer to the question of the origin of Junia's name is that it is a Latin name derived from the goddess Juno. Within the context of Romans 16:7, this answer is insufficient because Junia appears as the name of a Jewish woman who was likely not from Rome but had her roots in Palestine. Considering these factors in different ways, there are three approaches to the origin of Junia's name:

- 1) Following *Roman naming conventions*, the Latin name Junia was given to female members of the *gens Iunia* or freedwomen connected to this Roman tribe. So Junia most likely would have been a Jewish freedwoman (or descendant of a freedman) named after a former master (Lampe).
- 2) Considering the *naming conventions of Diaspora Judaism*, the foreign name Junia could be given to a Jewish woman because it was a common name in Rome at the time, and Jews often followed the naming trends of their pagan surroundings (Rutgers).

- 3) *Within the Jewish Palestinian onomasticon*, it could be explained as a transliteration of a Hebrew name (Wolters). If it is understood as a Latin name, it is most likely found in Romanised circles and might have been used as a substitute for a Hebrew personal name (Bauckham).

The first two approaches work well within the first biographical sketch outlined above, assuming that Junia was born in the Diaspora and moved to Jerusalem later in life. They are also the more natural interpretations as they explain the *Greco-Roman name Junia* within a *Greco-Roman context*. However, if Junia was a Palestinian Jew, as proposed by the more likely second biographical sketch, the explanation of the origin of the name becomes more difficult. The *Latin name Junia* does not fit easily into the *Jewish context* of first-century Palestine. Wolters and Bauckham attempt to solve this tension by presuming the name found in Romans 16:7 is based on or at least linked to a *Hebrew name* found in the *Jewish Palestinian context*. Wolters' transliteration approach arguing for a male Hebrew name behind IOΥΝΙΑΝ faces the same problem as the male Junias reading. The most natural reading, the common female name Junia, is replaced by a name for which the evidence is non-existent or extremely rare. Bauckham's double-name hypothesis takes the existence of the female personal name Junia seriously and manages to resolve the tension between the Latin name and the Palestinian origin of Junia. Joanna was the name used in Jewish contexts, and Junia was her alternative name in Greco-Roman contexts.

Even though it seems to bridge the gap between Joanna and Junia, Bauckham's argument is lacking. It assumes that homophonous double names were prevalent among Jews in antiquity, which the evidence cannot support. The popularity of Greco-Roman names like Jason (for the Hebrew Joshua) indicates that sound equivalency played a role for Jews in choosing foreign names. Yet, there are many examples of Greco-Roman names with no connection to Hebrew names, meaning similarity in sound was only one factor among others. Moreover, there is not enough evidence to presume that the

custom of double names was widespread among first-century Jews, although the epigraphic and literary evidence (e.g. Josephus, New Testament) supports its existence in specific circumstances.

The circumstances of the Lukan Joanna and the Roman Junia were specific. Joanna was likely part of the most Romanised circle of first-century Palestine, the Herodian court, before becoming a follower of Jesus. If she can be identified with Junia, she was also one of the early Jewish-Christian missionaries preaching the gospel outside of Palestine. None of these contexts *demand*s the use of an alternative Greco-Roman name. Single ethnic names are found both at the Herodian court and among Jewish-Christian missionaries. However, both contexts provide specific circumstances in which double names might occur, even though they might not always be recorded as such. The particular function of double names, providing alternative names for different cultural settings, might obscure their existence as only the name fitting the cultural background of the source is recorded. Thus, the New Testament is exceptional in recording both names. That it does not do so in the case of Joanna/Junia could be explained by the different writings in which she appears; there are reasons for Luke and Paul to prefer one name over the other.

What cannot easily be explained is why Joanna would choose Junia as a substitute name if there was no need to take on a Greco-Roman name in the first place. The name is not attested in Palestine, nor are there any known members of the Junian family in the area at the time. The lack of any Palestinian attestation of the name, especially in light of its regular occurrence elsewhere, weakens Bauckham's sound-equivalency argument significantly because it begs the question of how Joanna could have chosen a Latin substitute name that was likely not familiar to her.

It has been proposed in this thesis that the missing link might be the vestal virgin Junia Torquata, a contemporary namesake of Junia. This Junia was likely known at the Herodian court because of her role in her brother's trial before the

emperor Tiberius, a close friend of Antipas. The sound similarity of their names in combination with a shared character trait or Joanna's role in a situation similar to Junia's intercession for her brother might have triggered an association. The name Junia could thus have been given to Junia as a homophonous and, therefore, apt, even humorous or derogatory nickname, rather than taken on by her as part of a double name.

The proposed association between Joanna and Junia Torquata is tentative, perhaps speculative, but it is based on known events and associations of the court and political affiliations of Antipas. The introduction of the gossipy tidbit about Junia Torquata into the equation Joanna = Junia ensures that the identification remains *possible* as it demonstrates the name Junia *was* likely known in Palestine, at least in Herodian circles. This also means that even if Junia cannot be identified with Joanna, she probably was also part of the Herodian circles due to her Latin name. This is where the concluding sketch will place her, among the Herodian elite, without making the connection to Joanna explicit.

### **3. Joanna – The Backstory**

The mention of Joanna, *the wife of Chuza, the steward of Herod*, in Luke 8:3 is exceptional as her name is followed by two identifiers, allowing us to look into her life before she encountered Jesus. Unlike most of Jesus' followers, Joanna belonged to the elite circles of Galilee. Her husband Chuza was an ἐπίτροπος ('steward') of the tetrarch Herod Antipas. As such, he would have worked in the royal administration in Tiberias or as an overseer of a royal estate. With this position came social status and economic security. Both would have been shared by his wife Joanna. This might have been one of the reasons why her family agreed to a marriage with a foreigner (Chuza is a Nabatean name).

Joanna would have likely had no say in the choice of her husband but would have accepted her lot.

Another piece of information that can be gleaned from Luke 8 is that Joanna received healing. Her illness is not indicated, but it likely affected her social relations. She would have been isolated from her social circles, provided she was integrated into the world of Chuza. Her turn to Jesus in her need demonstrates her desire for a change in her situation, which might have included more than physical healing. Joanna's healing story is not recorded in Luke. Still, we know of its effects: the women of Luke 8, including Joanna, become part of the following of Jesus and provide the finances for the discipleship group.

Though Luke's portrayal of the women's role within the group can be read in light of Greco-Roman patrons financing a religious movement (and Luke's audience might have understood it in this way), there are indications in the text that they are *not* stay-at-home supporters. Like the Twelve, they are first and foremost *with* Jesus. Especially in Joanna's case, a return to her husband seems unlikely, as Chuza would not have supported her decision to finance a teacher critical of his employer. The women's presence among the growing group of disciples might not have been as scandalous as often proposed. The group of women is depicted as a distinctive group from the Twelve. Thus, even though they followed Jesus together, the groups might be segregated in a way. The women likely formed their own social network of support and accountability.

The women's serving is clearly marked as coming out of their possessions (ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων). What is in view here is economic support; the text tells us nothing about the women's daily lives or chores within the discipleship group. As a married woman, Joanna might not have been able to contribute much because her husband would have had control over all her assets, except property bestowed by deed of gift. This might be where Joanna's income came from. Due to her decision to follow an itinerant teacher and miracle worker in

his travels, Chuza might have initiated a divorce, and Joanna would have received her dowry, which she also could have used as she saw fit. She might have given of her money in return for her healing. Yet, it is more likely that her support for the whole group was an overflow of her gratitude for the healing received and for the integration into the community of Jesus' followers.

Though disappearing from the narrative until the pivotal events of the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, Joanna's presence, along with that of the other women, is assumed for the remainder of the story. Therefore, mentioning the women who followed from Galilee in the crucifixion and burial scene automatically links them back to the group of Luke 8 even though they are not named until the empty tomb account. Luke's narrative portrays a continuous witness of these women, leading from the crucifixion to the burial and the discovery of the empty tomb. The emphasis that the women *see* these events establishes them as eyewitnesses, and the statement of their names at the end of their report serves as a witness protocol. It leaves no doubt that Joanna has been part of the group from the cross until the moment of the report. However, the credible testimony of the women is contrasted with the disciples' disbelief, preparing the way for the first-hand experience of Peter and the other (male) disciples.

Within the narrative, the women's testimony is confirmed by and replaced with male witness. The women, including Joanna, disappear again from the storyline. Yet, as before, their presence among the discipleship group, though not expressed, is assumed. This means the author envisions Joanna as part of the group to whom Jesus appears in Luke 24:36, and consequently, she also receives the commission to witness to the events she has seen.

Though Luke has portrayed the women as being with Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem and as the only witnesses to all significant events surrounding Jesus' death and resurrection, they play no role in the further development of Luke-Acts and do not qualify for the apostolic office of the Twelve. Traces of Joanna's

presence might still be found in Acts 1:14 as part of a group of unspecified women who were likely also present at Pentecost. Due to Luke's silence about the women's involvement in the early church, we do not know what happened to Joanna. Yet, it is likely that as an eyewitness, she played her part in passing on the tradition.

#### **4. The Disciple/Apostle Junia – A Full Story<sup>2</sup>**

In this overlapped sketch, Junia's picture will be painted in broader strokes, highlighting significant moments in the journey rather than the details involved which we already encountered in the individual sketches. The sketch is *a* story, not *the* story of Junia, meaning it is *one of the historically possible constructions* rather than *the reconstruction* of her life and ministry. It is based on findings deemed likely in this thesis, but it also includes more imaginative elements. As this sketch is given in narrative form, the degrees of probability are not made explicit, so they should be judged in light of the discussions above.

Junia was a member of the Herodian elite in Galilee. After being healed by Jesus, she left her husband and broke with her former life. She became one of Jesus' travelling companions and provided financial support to the group. As part of Jesus' permanent following, she heard his teaching about the kingdom and saw the miraculous outworking of this message in his ministry. Junia was not the only female disciple; she was surrounded by a group of women with whom she shared her journey. Together they travelled with Jesus throughout Galilee and accompanied him on his last fateful journey to Jerusalem.

Unable to stay away, the women witnessed Jesus' death on the cross and followed his body to the tomb. They saw where he was laid. Two days later

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Appendix 1 and 2 for the individual stories of Joanna and Junia.

Junia and the other women returned to the grave but did not find his body. Instead, they received the message that Jesus had risen. Overwhelmed by the realisation that he was not dead but alive, they returned to the other disciples and told them about their experience. Some did not believe them, others had to see for themselves, and a few trusted the word of their female travel companions. When Jesus appeared to the whole group, Junia finally saw what she had already believed: The tomb was empty because Jesus was indeed alive. Junia was among those he commissioned to be witnesses to his resurrection.

In the following, Junia and the others stayed in Jerusalem, waiting for the promised Spirit to come. She experienced the filling of the Spirit and spoke to the crowds on the day of Pentecost. As a witness of all important events of Jesus' life and ministry, she shared what she had seen and heard with the new believers. Junia continued supporting the growing community out of her means and eventually sold her property. In Andronicus, another disciple, she found a new husband. When tensions in Jerusalem reached boiling point, they decided to accompany a group of believers setting out to Rome, where they began to proclaim to the Jewish community that Jesus was the Christ. A small group of believers formed around them in their beginning years. Yet, after a period of being tolerated by the Jewish community, tensions rose, and Andronicus and Junia had to leave another city behind. However, they returned this time, unwilling to give up their longstanding ministry. Their persistent proclamation of the gospel led to several imprisonments and the loss of reputation in the eyes of some of their fellow believers. Yet, no hardship they faced could prevent them from the witness to which they had been called by the risen Lord, and that is why Paul called them, Andronicus and Junia, 'outstanding among the apostles.'

As our exploration of the historical possibilities regarding the life and ministry of Junia comes to a close, we need to remind ourselves that Junia and

Joanna are only two of the named women in the New Testament. So there is room for further explorations of the life and ministry of individual women (and men) using all the tools the field of New Testament studies has to offer to close the gaps in their stories with informed historical imagination.

## Bibliography

- Abelard, Peter. *Expositio in Epistolam ad Romanos*. In vol. 178 of *Patrologia Latina*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844-1864.
- Abelard, Peter. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by Steven R. Cartwright. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2011.
- Agosto Efrain. 'Paul and Commendation.' In *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*. Vol. 1. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Revised edition. London: Bloomsbury, 2016, 143-168.
- Ameling, Walter. *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis: Band II. Kleinasien*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Arber, Catherine. 'Frontismus und Nationalsozialismus in der Stadt Bern: Viel Lärm, aber wenig Erfolg.' *BEZG* 65 (2003): 3-62.
- Arlandson, James M. 'Lifestyles of the Rich and Christian: Women, Wealth, and Social Freedom.' In *A Feminist Companion to the Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff. FCNTECW. London: T&T Clark, 2004, 155-170.
- Arzt, Peter. 'Iunia oder Iunias? Zum textkritischen Hintergrund von Röm 16,7.' In *Liebe zum Wort: Festschrift für P. Ludger Bernhard Osb*. Edited by Friedrich v. Reiterer and Petrus Eder Osb. Salzburg-Wien: Otto Müller Verlag, 1993, 83-102.
- Aune, David E. *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- Balz, Horst and Gerhard Schneider, eds., *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990-1993.
- Bang, Martin, ed. *Inscriptiones urbis Romae Latinae: Pars VI: Fasc. I: Index Nominum*. Part 6/1 of *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum VI*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1926.

- Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Barclay, John M. G. "'Do we undermine the Law?'" A Study of Romans 14:1-15:6.' In *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016, 37-59.
- Barentsen, Jack. 'Pre-Pauline Leadership and Pauline Constitution in the Roman Church: An Alternative Interpretation of Romans 12 and 16.' In *The Letter to the Romans*. Edited by Udo Schnelle. Leuven: Peeters, 2009): 595-616.
- Barnett, P. W. 'Apostle.' *DPL* 45-51.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels*. London: T&T Clark, 2002.
- Bauckham, Richard. 'Paul and other Jews with Latin Names in the New Testament.' In *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J. M. Wedderburn*. Edited by Alf Christophersen, Carsten Claussen, Jörg Frey and Bruce Longenecker. *JSNTSup* 217. London: T&T Clark, 2003, 202-220.
- Bauckham, Richard. 'The Caiaphas Family.' *JSHJ* 10.1 (2012): 3-31.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.
- Bauer, Walter, F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Belleville, Linda. 'Ιουνίαν ... επίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις: A Re-examination of Romans 16.7 in Light of Primary Source Materials.' *NTS* 51.2 (2005): 231-249.
- Bertram, Georg. 'συνεργός, συνεργέω.' *TDNT* 7:871-876.
- Bieberstein, Sabine. *Verschwiegene Jüngerinnen – Vergessene Zeuginnen: Gebrochene Konzepte im Lukasevangelium*. *NTOA* 38. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.

- Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and Robert Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1961.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke*. BECNT 3. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994-1996.
- Bösen, Willibald. *Galiläa: Lebensraum und Wirkungsfeld Jesu*. 2nd ed. Freiburg: Herder, 1998.
- Bovon, François. *Luke: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*. Translated by Christine M. Thomas; Donald S. Deer, and James Crouch. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002-2013.
- Brawley, Robert L. *Luke: A Social Identity Commentary*. London: T&T Clark, 2020.
- Briones, David E. 'Fellow Workers with God and One Another: Toward a Pauline Theology of Mission,' *CBQ* 81.2 (2019): 277-301.
- Brooten, Bernadette, "'Junia . . . Outstanding among the Apostles'" (Romans 16:7).' In *Women Priests: A Catholic Commentary on the Vatican Declaration*. Edited by Leonard and Arlene Swidler. New York: Paulist, 1977, 141-144.
- Brown, Raymond E. and John P. Meier. *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983.
- Brown, Raymond E. 'Further Reflections on the Origins of the Church of Rome.' In *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul & John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by Robert T. Fortana and Beverly R. Gaventa. Nashville: Abingdon, 1990, 98-115.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Book of the Acts*. NICNT. Revised edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Burer, Michael H. and Daniel B. Wallace. 'Was Junia Really an Apostle? A Re-examination of Rom 16.7.' *NTS* 47.1 (2001): 76-91.

- Burer, Michael. 'ΕΠΙΣΗΜΟΙ ἘΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΙΣ in Rom 16:7 as "Well Known to the Apostles": Further Defense and New Evidence.' *JETS* 58.4 (2015): 731–755.
- Byrne, Brendan. *Romans*. SP 6. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*. Translated and edited by John Owen. In vol. 19 of *Calvin's Commentaries*. 500 years edition. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009.
- Campbell, Douglas A. *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Biography*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Campbell, William S. *Romans: A Social Identity Commentary*. London: T&T Clark, 2023.
- Cappelletti, Silvia. *The Jewish Community of Rome: From the Second Century B.C. to the Third Century C.E.* Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Carroll, John T. *Luke: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012.
- Cervin, Richard S. 'A Note regarding the Name 'Junia(s)' in Romans 16.7.' *NTS* 40.3 (1994): 464-470.
- Chrysostom, John. *In Epistulam ad Romanos*. In vol. 60 of *Patrologia Graeca*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 161 vols. Paris, 1857-1866.
- Chrysostom, John. *Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by J. B. Morris and W. H. Simcox. In vol. 11 of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Series 1. Edited by Philipp Schaff. 1886-1889. 14 vols. Repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Cicero. *Letters to Friends: Volume I: Letters 1-113*. Translated and edited by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. LCL 205. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Clarke, Andrew D. 'Jew and Greek, Slave and Free, Male and Female: Paul's Theology of Ethnic, Social and Gender Inclusiveness in Romans 16.' In *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*. Edited by Peter Oakes. Carlisle: Paternoster Press; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002, 103-125.

- Co, M. A. 'The Major Summaries in Acts: Acts 2,42-47; 4,32-35; 5,12-16: Linguistic and Literary Relationship.' *ETL* 68.1 (1992): 49-85.
- Cohen, Naomi G. 'Jewish Names as Cultural Indicators in Antiquity.' *JSJ* 7.2 (1976): 97-128.
- Cohen, Naomi G. 'The Names of the Translators in the Letter of Aristeas: A Study in the Dynamics of Cultural Transition.' *JSJ* 15 (1984): 32-64.
- Cohick, Lynn H. *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians: Illuminating Ancient Ways of Life*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.
- Collingwood, R.G. *The Idea of History*. Edited by Jan van der Dussen. Rev. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Cook, John Granger. '1 Cor 9,5: The Women of the Apostles.' *Bib* 89.3 (2008): 352-368.
- Corley, Kathleen E. *Private Women, Public Meals: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Cotter, Wendy. 'Women's Authority Roles in Paul's Churches: Countercultural or Conventional?' *NovT* 36.4 (1994): 350-372.
- Cotton, Hannah M. and Jonathan J. Price. 'A Bilingual Tombstone from Zo'ar (Arabia) (Hecht Museum, Haifa, Inv. No. H-3029, Naveh's List No. 18).' *ZPE* 134 (2001): 277-283.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975-79.
- Croft, Steven. 'Text Messages: The Ministry of Women and Romans 16.' *Anvil* 21.2 (2004): 87-94.
- Culy, Martin M., Mikeal C. Parsons, and Joshua J. Stigall. *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. BHGNT. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010.
- D'Angelo, Mary Rose. 'Women Partners in the New Testament.' *JFSR* 6.1 (1990): 65-86.

- D'Angelo, Mary Rose. 'Women in Luke-Acts: A Redactional View.' *JBL* 109.3 (1990): 441-461.
- Das, A. Andrew, *Solving the Romans Debate*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Davies, Stevan. 'Women in the Third Gospel and the New Testament.' In *"Women like This" New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine. SBLJL 1. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991, 185-197.
- De Boer, Esther A. 'The Lukan Mary Magdalene and the Other Women Following Jesus.' In *A Feminist Companion to Luke*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff. FCNTECW. London: Sheffield Academic, 2002, 140-160.
- De Bruyn, Theodore S. *Ambrosiaster's Commentary on the Pauline Epistles: Romans*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Del Verme, Marcello. 'Christian Women of the Pauline Communities in Their Historical, Socio-Cultural, and Religious Contexts: the "Case of Junia" (Rm 16:7).' *RivB* 58.4 (2010): 439-468.
- Dio Cassius. *Roman History: Volume VII: Books 56-60*. Translated by Earnest Cary and Herbert B. Foster. LCL 175. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Romans*. 2 vols. WBC 38. Dallas: Word Books, 1988.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Christianity in the Making Volume 2: Beginning from Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Dussaut, Louis. 'Le Triptyque des Apparitions en Luc 24 (Analyse Structurelle).' *RB* 94.2 (1987): 161-213.
- Du Toit, Andrie. "'God's beloved in Rome" (Rom 1:7): The Genesis and Socio-Economic Situation of the First Generation Christian Community in Rome.' In *Focusing on Paul: Persuasion and Theological Design in Romans and Galatians*. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbach and David S. du Toit. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012, 179-202.

- Edwards, James R. *Romans*. NIBCNT 6. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992.
- Edwards, James R. *The Gospel according to Luke*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Nottingham: Apollos, 2015.
- Elvers, Karl-Ludwig, Jörg Fündling, Peter C. Nadig, Wolfgang Will, Christian Müller, Werner Eck, Tomasz Giaro, Peter L. Schmidt, and Kai Brodersen. 'Iunius.' In *Brill's New Pauly*. English Edition. Antiquity volumes edited by Christine F. Salazar. Classical Tradition volumes edited by Francis G. Gentry. Consulted online on 28 August 2019. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347\\_bnp\\_e602780](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e602780).
- Epp, Eldon Jay. *Junia: The First Woman Apostle*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2005.
- Euripides. *Children of Heracles. Hippolytus. Andromache. Hecuba*. Edited and translated by David Kovacs. LCL 484. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Evans, Craig A. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Evans, C. F. *Saint Luke*. TPINTC. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 2008.
- Fàbrega, Valentin. 'War Junia(s), der hervorragende Apostel (Rom 16,7), eine Frau?' *JAC* 27 -28 (1984-1985): 47-64.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Fisk, Bruce N. 'Synagogue Influence and Scriptural Knowledge Among the Christians of Rome. In *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. *SymS* 50. Atlanta: SBL, 2008, 157-85.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel according to Luke*. 2 vols. AB 28. Garden City: Doubleday, 1981-1985.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *First Corinthians: A new Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AYB 32. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Forbes, Christopher. 'Paul and Rhetorical Comparison.' In *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*. Vol. I. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Revised edition. London: Bloomsbury, 2016, 143-168.
- Forbes, Greg W. and Scott D. Harrower. *Raised from Obscurity: A Narrativ and Theological Study of the Characterization of Women in Luke-Acts*. Eugene: Pickwick, 2015.
- Förster, Hans. 'Der Aufenthalt von Priska und Aquila in Ephesus und die juristischen Rahmenbedingungen ihrer Rückkehr nach Rom.' *ZNW* 105.2: 189–227.
- Fowler, Jeaneane D. *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew: A Comparative Study*. JSOTSup 49. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988.
- Fox, Arminta. 'Decentering Paul, Contextualizing Crimes: Reading in Light of the Imprisoned.' *JFSR* 33.2 (2017): 37-54.
- Foxhall, Lin. *Studying Gender in Classical Antiquity*. KTAH. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Freyne, Séan. 'Jesus, the Wine-Drinker: A Friend of Women.' In *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and Women Re-viewed*. Edited by Ingrid Rosa Kitzberger. *BibInt* 43. Leiden: Brill, 2000, 162-180.
- Fuhrmann, Sebastian. 'Junia.' *EBR* 14:1068-1071.
- Gamble, Harry. *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism*. SD 42. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Garland, David E. *Luke*. ZECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.
- Godet, Frédéric. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. Translated by Alex Cusin. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1881-1882.

- Gordon, Richard. 'Vesta, Vestals.' *OCD* 1544-1545.
- Green, Bernard. *Christianity in Ancient Rome: The first three Centuries*. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Gruen, Erich S. *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Guignard, Christophe. 'Greek Lists of the Apostles: New Findings and Open Questions.' *ZAC* 20.3 (2016): 469-495.
- Gupta, Nijay K. 'Reconstructing Junia's Imprisonment: Examining a Neglected Pauline Comment in Romans 16: 7.' *PRst* 47.4 (2020): 385-397.
- Haacker, Klaus. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. THKNT 6. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1999.
- Hachlili, Rachel. 'Hebrew Names, Personal Names, Family Names and Nicknames of Jews in the Second Temple Period.' In *Families and Family Relations as Represented in Early Judaism and Early Christianities: Texts and Fictions*. Edited by Jan Willem van Henten and Athalyah Brenner. Leiden: Deo, 2000, 83-115.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.
- Hafemann, Scott J. 'The Role of Suffering in the Mission of Paul.' In *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles*. Edited by Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000, 165-184.
- Hanson, K. C. 'The Herodians and Mediterranean Kinship Part 2: Marriage and Divorce.' *BTB* 19.4 (1989): 142-151.
- Hanson, K. C. 'The Herodians and Mediterranean Kinship Part III: Economics.' *BTB* 20.1 (1990): 10-21.
- Harnack, Adolf von. 'Κόπος (Κοπιᾶν, Οἱ Κοπιῶντες) im frühchristlichen Sprachgebrauch. *ZNW* 27.1 (1928): 1-10.
- Harrer, G. A. 'Saul Who Also Is Called Paul.' *HTR* 33.1 (1940): 19-33.

- Harris, Murray J. *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament. An Essential Reference Resource for Exegesis*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2012.
- Hartmann, Andrea. 'A Woman Lost in Translation: The Name IOΥΝΙΑΝ in Romans 16:7 and its History of Interpretation.' *OpTh* 6 (2020): 646-660. <https://doi.org/10.1515/opth-2020-0138>.
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath. *Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998. Repr., Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Hatto of Vercelli. *In Epistulam ad Romanos*. In vol. 134 of *Patrologia Latina*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844-1864.
- Hemelrijk, Emily A. *Hidden Lives, Public Personae: Women and Civic Life in the Roman West*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Hemer, Colin J. 'The Name of Paul.' *TynBul* 36 (1985): 179-183.
- Hengel, Martin. 'Maria Magdalena und die Frauen als Zeugen.' In *Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel: Festschrift für Otto Michel zum 60. Geburtstag*. Edited by Otto Betz, Martin Hengel, and Peter Schmidt. Leiden: Brill, 1963, 243-256.
- Herron, Robert W. 'The Origin of the New Testament Apostolate.' *WTJ* 45 (1983): 101-31.
- Hill, Craig C. *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Hill, Craig C. 'Hellenists, Hellenistic and Hellenistic-Jewish Christianity.' *DLNT* 462-469.
- Hodge, Charles. *Romans*. CCC. Wheaton: Crossway, 1994.
- Hoehner, Harold W. *Herod Antipas*. SNTSMS 17. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972. Repr., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980.

- Horbury, William and David Noy. *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Hornblower, Simon and Antony Spawforth, eds., *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Horsley, G. H. R. *New Documents illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1976*. Sydney: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1981.
- Horsley, G. H. R. 'Name Change as an Indication of Religious Conversion in Antiquity.' *Numen* 34.1 (1987): 1-17.
- Horsley, G. H. R. 'Names, Double.' *ABD* 4:1011-1017.
- Horsley, Richard A. *Galilee: History, Politics, People*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Huttar, David. 'Did Paul call Andronicus an Apostle in Romans 16:7?' *JETS* 52.4 (2009): 747-778.
- Huyen, Susan E. *Women in the New Testament World*. EBS. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Ilan, Tal. 'The Greek names of the Hasmoneans.' *JQR* 78.1-2 (1987): 1-20.
- Ilan, Tal. 'Queen Salamzion Alexandra and Judas Aristobulus I's Widow: Did Jannaeus Alexander Contract a Levirate Marriage?' *JSJ* 24.2 (1993): 181-190.
- Ilan, Tal. 'The Attraction of Aristocratic Women to Pharisaism during the Second Temple Period.' *HTR* 88.1 (1995): 1-33.
- Ilan, Tal. *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine: An Inquiry into Image and Status*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995; repr. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Ilan, Tal. 'Names and Naming.' *EDSS* 2:596-600.

- Ilan, Tal. 'In the Footsteps of Jesus: Jewish Women in a Jewish Movement.' In *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and Women Re-viewed*, ed. Ingrid Rosa Kitzberger, BibInt 43. Leiden: Brill, 2000, 115-136.
- Ilan, Tal. 'Yohana bar Makoutha and Other Pagans Bearing Jewish Names.' In *These are the Names: Studies in Jewish Onomastics*. Volume 3. Edited by A. Demsky. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2002, 109-19.
- Ilan, Tal. *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity*. 4 vols. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002-2012.
- Instone-Brewer, David. *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and Literary Context*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Jeremias, J. 'Paarweise Sendung im Neuen Testament.' In *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959, 136-143.
- Jerome. *Commentariorum in Epistulam ad Philemon liber*. In vol. 26 of *Patrologia Latina*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844-1864.
- Jervis, L. Ann. *The Purpose of Romans: A Comparative Letter Structure Investigation*. JSNTSup 55. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.
- Jewett, Robert. *Dating Paul's Life*. London: SCM, 1979.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Acts of the Apostles*. SP 5. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Josephus. *The Life. Against Apion*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. LCL 186. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.
- Josephus. *The Jewish War: Volume I: Books 1-2*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. LCL 203. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Josephus. *The Jewish War: Volume III: Books 5-7*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. LCL 210. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928.

- Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities: Volume II: Books 4-6*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus. LCL 490. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.
- Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities: Volume III: Books 7-8*. Translated by Ralph Marcus. LCL 281. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.
- Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities: Volume V: Books 12-13*. Translated by Ralph Marcus. LCL 365. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943.
- Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities: Volume VII: Books 16-17*. Translated by Ralph Marcus and Allen Wikgren. LCL 410. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities: Volume VIII: Books 18-19*. Translated by Louis H. Feldman. LCL 433. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities: Volume IX: Book 20*. Translated by Louis H. Feldman. LCL 456. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Karris, Robert J. 'Romans 14:1-15:13 and the Occasion of Romans.' In *The Romans Debate: Revised and Expanded Edition*. Edited by Karl P. Donfried. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991, 65-84.
- Karris, Robert J. 'Women and Discipleship in Luke.' In *A Feminist Companion to Luke*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff. FCNTECW. London: Sheffield Academic, 2002, 23-43.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *An die Römer*. HNT 8a. 4th ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1980.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Volume 1: Introduction and 1: 1-2:47*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary: Volume 2: 3: 1-14:28*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.
- Kittel, Gerhard. 'αἰχμάλωτος, αἰχμαλωτίζω, αἰχμαλωτεύω, αἰχμαλωσία, συναιχμάλωτος.' *TDNT* 1:195-197.

- Klein, Günter. 'Paul's Purpose in Writing the Epistle to the Romans.' In *The Romans Debate: Revised and Expanded Edition*. Edited by Karl P. Donfried. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991, 29-43.
- Klein, S. 'Bar-Yohannis of Sepphoris at Rome.' *BJPES* (1940): 47-51.
- Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E.J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1944-1999.
- Kokkinos, Nikos. 'The Royal Court of the Herods.' In *The World of the Herods: Volume 1 of the International Conference The World of the Herods and the Nabataeans held at the British Museum, 17-19 April 2001*. Edited by Nikos Kokkinos. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2007, 279-303.
- Kokkinos, Nikos. *The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse*. Repr. and enl. ed. London: Spink, 2010.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. 'Women in the Pauline Mission.' In *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul's Mission*. Edited by Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson. Leicester: Apollos, 2000, 221-247.
- Kraemer, Ross S. 'Jewish Women and Christian Origins: Some Caveats,' in *Women & Christian Origins*. Edited by Ross Shepard Kraemer and Mary Rose D'Angelo. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, 35-49.
- Kraemer, Ross S. 'Jewish Women and Women's Judaism(s) at the Beginning of Christianity.' In *Women & Christian Origins*. Edited by Ross Shepard Kraemer and Mary Rose D'Angelo. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, 50-79.
- Kreitzer, L.J. 'Travel in the Roman World.' *DPL* 945-946.
- Kruse, Colin G. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Nottingham: Apollos, 2012.
- Lampe, Peter. 'Iunia/Iunias: Sklavenherkunft im Kreise der vorpaulinischen Apostel (Röm 16 7).' *ZNW* 76.1 (1985): 132-134.
- Lampe, Peter. 'The Roman Christians of Romans 16.' In *The Romans Debate*. Rev. and exp. ed. Edited by Karl P. Donfried. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991, 216-230.

- Lampe, Peter. *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*. Translated by Michael Steinhauser. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- Leon, Harry Joshua. *The Jews of Ancient Rome*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960. Repr., Whitefish: LLC, 2012.
- Levi, Giovanni. 'On Microhistory.' In *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*. Edited by Peter Burke. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity, 2001, 97-119.
- Levine, Amy-Jill and Ben Witherington III. *The Gospel of Luke*. NCBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. 'Women Itinerants, Jesus of Nazareth, and Historical-Critical Approaches: Reevaluating the Consensus.' in *Gender and Second-Temple Judaism*. Edited by Kathy Ehrensperger and Shayna Sheinfeld. Lanham: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2020, 45-64.
- Leviticus XX-XXVII*. Translated by Judah H. Slotki. In *The Midrash Rabbah*. Edited by H. Freedman and Maurice Simon. Vol. 2. London: Socino, 1977.
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott and Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1940.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations*. 5th ed. London: Macmillan and CO., 1876.
- Lin, Yii-Jan. 'Junia: An Apostle before Paul.' *JBL* 139.1 (2020): 191-209.
- Livy. *History of Rome: Volume XI: Books 38–40*. Edited and translated by J. C. Yardley. LCL 313. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2018.
- Lohse, Eduard. *Der Brief an die Römer*. KEK 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.

- Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida, eds., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains: Volume 1: Introduction & Domains*. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Luther, Martin. *Das Neue Testament Deutsch*. Wittenberg: Melchior Lotther, 1522. urn:nbn:de:bsz:24-digibib-bsz3517275746.
- Luther, Martin: 'Against the Roman Papacy an Institution of the Devil.' Translated by Eric W. Gritsch. In *Church and Ministry III*. Edited by Eric W. Gritsch, vol. 41 of *Luther's Works*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966, 263-376.
- Magnússon, Sigurður Gylfi and István M. Szijártó. *What is Microhistory? Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Malina Bruce J. and Jerome H. Neyrey. 'First-Century Personality: Dyadic, not Individual.' In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991, 67-96.
- Malina, Bruce J. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. 3rd rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Exeter: Pater Noster, 1978.
- Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Mathew, Susan. *Women in the Greetings of Romans 16.1-16: A Study of Mutuality and Women's Ministry in the Letter to the Romans*. LNTS 471. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Meier, John P. 'The Historical Jesus and the Historical Herodians.' *JBL* 119.4 (2000): 740-746.
- Michaelis, Wilhelm. 'συγγενής, συγγένεια.' *TDNT* 7:736-742.
- Michel, Otto. *Der Brief an die Römer*. KEK 4. 5th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.

- Miller, Amanda C. 'Cut from the Same Cloth: A Study of Female Patrons in Luke-Acts and the Roman Empire,' *RevExp* 114.2 (2017): 203-210.
- Moltmann-Wendel, Elisabeth. *Ein eigener Mensch werden: Frauen um Jesus*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn, 1987.
- Montanari, Franco. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Edited by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Morris, Leon. *Ministers of God*. London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1964.
- Morris, Leon. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988.
- Moxnes, Halvor. 'Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts.' In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991, 241-268.
- Mullins, Terence Y. 'Greeting as a New Testament Form.' *JBL* 87.4 (1968): 418-426.
- Murray, John. *The Epistle to the Romans*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1967.
- Mussies, Gerard. 'Jewish Personal Names in some Non-literary Sources.' In *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy*. Edited by Jan Willem van Henten and Pieter Willem van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1994, 242-276.
- Naveh, Joseph. 'Nameless People.' *IEJ* 40.2-3 (1990): 108-123.
- Neusner, J. *Song of Songs Rabbah: An Analytical Translation*. Vol. 2. BJS 196. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Ng, Esther Yue L. 'Did Joanna become Junia?' *JETS* 65.3 (2022): 523-534.
- Nolland, John. *Luke 1-9:20*. 3 vols. WBC 35. Dallas: Word Books, 1989-1993.

- Noy, David. *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe: Italy (excluding the City of Rome), Spain and Gaul*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993-1995.
- Noy, David. *Foreigners at Rome: Citizens and Strangers*. London: Duckworth, 2000.
- Oakman, Douglas E. 'The Countryside in Luke-Acts.' In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991, 151-179.
- Ogg, George. *The Chronology of the Life of Paul*. London: Epworth, 1968.
- Ollrog, Wolf-Henning. *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter: Untersuchungen zu Theorie und Praxis der paulinischen Mission*. WMANT 50. Neukirchen-Vlynn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1979.
- Origen. *In epistulam ad Romanos*. In vol. 14 of *Patrologia Latina*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844-1864.
- Origen. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: Book 6-10*. Translated by Thomas Scheck. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2002.
- Orr, Sheena 'Women and Livelihoods in 1<sup>st</sup> Century Palestine: Exploring Possibilities.' *ExpTim* 121.11 (2010): 539-547.
- Osiek, Carolyn. 'The Women at the Tomb: What are They Doing there?' *HvTSt* 53.1-2 (1997): 103-118.
- Osiek, Carolyn and Margaret Y. MacDonald. *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- Peeler, Amy. 'Junia/Joanna: Herald of the Good News.' In *Vindicating the Vixens: Revisiting Sexualized, Vilified, and Marginalized Women of the Bible*. Edited by Sandra Glahn. Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2017, 273-285.
- Pernot, Laurent. *Epideictic Rhetoric: Questioning the Stakes of Ancient Praise*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015.

- Pesch, Rudolf. *Die Apostelgeschichte: 1. Teilband: Apg 1-12*. EKKNT 5. Zürich: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 1986.
- Philo. *On the Decalogue. On the Special Laws: Books 1-3*. Translated by F. H. Colson. LCL 320. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937.
- Philo. *On the Embassy to Gaius. General Indexes*. Translated by F. H. Colson. LCL 379. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Pilch, John J. *Healing in the New Testament: Insights from Medical and Mediterranean Anthropology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Piper, John and Wayne Grudem. 'An Overview of Central Concerns: Questions and Answers.' In *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*. Edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem. 2nd ed. Wheaton: Crossway, 2006, 60-92.
- Pizzuto-Pomaco, Julia. *From Shame to Honor: Mediterranean Women in Romans 16*. Lexington: Emeth Press, 2017.
- Plevnik, Joseph. 'The Eyewitnesses of the Risen Christ in Luke 24.' *CBQ* 49.1 (1987): 90-103.
- Pliny the Elder. *Natural History: Volume II: Books 3-7*. Translated by H. Rackham. LCL 352. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- Plisch, U.-K. 'Die Apostelin Junia: Das exegetische Problem in Röm 16.7 im Licht von Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup> und der sahidischen Überlieferung.' *NTS* 42.3 (1996): 477-478.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke*. 5th ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922.
- Plutarch. *Lives: Volume VI: Dion and Brutus. Timoleon and Aemilius Paulus*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. LCL 98. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918.

- Porter Stanley E. and Bryan R. Dyer. 'Paul and Ancient Rhetoric: An Introduction to a Continuing Discussion,' in *Paul and Ancient Rhetoric: Theory and Practice in the Hellenistic Context*, Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Bryan R. Dyer. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Price, Robert M. *The Widow Traditions in Luke-Acts: A Feminist Critical Scrutiny*. SBLDS 155. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Pseudo-Epiphanius. *Index Discipulorum. Prophetarum Vitae Fabulosae*. Edited by T. Schermann. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907, 118-127.
- Quesnell, Quentin. 'The Women at Luke's Supper.' In *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983, 59-79.
- Rabanus Maurus. *In Epistulam ad Romanos*. In vol. 111 of *Patrologia Latina*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844-1864.
- Rahmani, Levi Y. *A Catalogue of Jewish Ossuaries in the Collections of the State of Israel*. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 1994.
- Rajak, Tessa. 'Justus of Tiberias.' *CIQ* 23.2 (1973): 345-368.
- Rapske, Brian. *The Book of Acts and Paul in Roman Custody*. Vol. 4 of *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Pater Noster, 1994.
- Reid, Barbara E. *Choosing the Better Part? Women in the Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Reid, Barbara E. 'The Gospel of Luke: Friend or Foe of Women Proclaimers of the Word?' *CBQ* 78.1 (2016): 1-23.
- Reid, Barbara E. and Shelley Matthews. *Luke*. 2 vols. WiC 43. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2021.
- Reid, D. G. 'Prison, Prisoner.' *DPL* 752-754.
- Rengstorf, Karl H. 'ἀπόστολος.' *TDNT* 1:407-447.
- Ricci, Carla. *Mary Magdalene and Many Others: Women who Followed Jesus*. Translated by Paul Burns. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

- Riesner, Rainer. *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus*. WUNT 71. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994.
- Riesner, Rainer. 'Archaeology and Geography.' *DJG* 45-59.
- Rigato, Maria-Luisa. "'Remember" ...Then They Remembered.' In *A Feminist Companion to Luke*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff, FCNTECW (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 269-280.
- Rives, James. 'The Iuno feminae in Roman society.' *EMC* 36 n.s. 11 (1992): 33-49.
- Rix, Helmut. 'Cognomen.' BNP. Consulted online on 26 November 2019.  
doi:10.1163/1574-9347\_bnp\_e302870.
- Rix, Helmut. 'Gentile.' BNP. Consulted online on 25 November 2019.  
doi:10.1163/1574-9347\_bnp\_e421690.
- Rix, Helmut. 'Supernomen.' BNP. Consulted online on 10 September 2019.  
doi:10.1163/15749347\_bnp\_e1126060.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914.
- Roetzel, Calvin J. *The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context*. 6th ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2015.
- Rutgers, Leonard Victor. *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Rutgers, Leonard Victor. 'Roman Policy towards the Jews: Expulsions from the City of Rome during the First Century CE.' In *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*. Edited by Karl P. Donfried and Peter Richardson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998, 93-116.
- Salamito, Jean-Marie. 'Συναιχμαλωτοι: Les "Compagnons de Captivité" de l'Apôtre Paul.' In *Carcer I: Prison et Privation de Liberté dans l'Antiquité Classique. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg (5 et 6 Décembre 1997)*. Edited by Cecile Bertrand-Dagenbach, Alain Chauvot, Michel Matter and Jean-Marie Salamito. Paris: De Boccard, 1999, 191-209.

- Salway, Benet. 'A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700.' *JRS* 84 (1994): 124-145.
- Sanday, William and Arthur C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. ICC. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902.
- Sawicki, Marianne. 'Magdalenes and Tiberiennes: City Women in the Entourage of Jesus.' In *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and Women Re-viewed*. Edited by Ingrid Rosa Kitzberger. *BibInt* 43. Leiden: Brill, 2000, 181-202.
- Schalit, Abraham. *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus*. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- Schellenberg, Ryan S. 'The Rest of Paul's Imprisonments.' *JTS* 69.2 (2018): 533-572.
- Schermann, Theodorus ed., *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae: Indices apostolorum discipulorumque domini Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto aliisque vindicate*. BSGRT. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. 'Apostle.' *DJG* 34-45.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. 2 vols. HTA. Witten: SCM R. Brockhaus; Gießen: Brunnen, 2015-2016.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. 'Apostles.' In *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday*. Edited by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin. Translated by Manfred Kwiran and W. Ward Gasque. Exeter: Paternoster, 1970, 287-303.
- Schneider, Gerhard. *Die Apostelgeschichte: Erster Teil: Einleitung, Kommentar zu 1,1-8,40*. HthKNT 5. Ungekürzte Sonderausgabe. Freiburg: Herder, 2002.
- Schottroff, Luise. 'Women as Followers of Jesus in New Testament Times: An Exercise in Sociohistorical Exegesis of the Bible.' In *The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics*. Edited by Norman K. Gottwald and Richard A. Horsley. Maryknoll: Orbis Books; London: SPCK, 1993, 453-461.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. BECNT. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018.

- Schulz, Ray R. 'Romans 16:7: Junia or Junias?' *ExpTim* 98.4 (1987): 108-110.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. 'Missionaries, Apostles, Coworkers: Romans 16 and the Reconstruction of Women's Early Christian History.' *WW* 6.4 (1986): 420-433.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1995.
- Seim, Turid Karlsen. *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Setzer, Claudia. 'Excellent Women: Female Witness to the Resurrection.' *JBL* 116.2 (1997): 259-272.
- Sim, David C. 'The Women Followers of Jesus: The Implications of Luke 8:1-3.' *HeyJ* 30.1 (1989): 51-62.
- Skinner, Matthew L. 'Remember My Chains: New Testament Perspectives on Incarceration.' *Int* 72.3 (2018): 269-281.
- Smallwood, E. Mary. *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations*. 2nd ed. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.
- Solin, Heikki. 'Names, personal, Roman.' *OCD* 1024-1026.
- Spencer, F. Scott. *Salty Wives, Spirited Mothers, and Savvy Widows: Capable Women of Purpose and Persistence in Luke's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Spencer, F. Scott. *Luke*. THNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019.
- Staley, David J. *Historical Imagination*. London: Routledge, 2021.
- Stanley, Christopher D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Stenschke, Christoph. 'Married Women and the Spread of Early Christianity.' *Neot* 43.1 (2009): 145-194.

- Strothmann, Meret. 'Iunia.' BNP. Consulted online on 05 November 2019.  
doi:10.1163/1574-9347\_bnp\_e602670.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Der Brief an die Römer*. NTD 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars: Volume I: Julius. Augustus. Tiberius. Gaius. Caligula*. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. LCL 31. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914.
- Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars: Volume II: Claudius. Nero. Galba, Otho, and Vitellius. Vespasian. Titus, Domitian. Lives of Illustrious Men: Grammarians and Rhetoricians. Poets (Terence. Virgil. Horace. Tibullus. Persius. Lucan). Lives of Pliny the Elder and Passienus Crispus*. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. LCL 38. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914.
- Tacitus. *Histories: Books 4-5. Annals: Books 1-3*. Translated by Clifford H. Moore and John Jackson. LCL 249. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931.
- Tacitus. *Annals: Books 13-16*. Translated by John Jackson. LCL 322. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937.
- Taylor, Joan E. "'Two by Two': The Ark-ETypal Language of Mark's Apostolic Pairings.' In *The Body in Biblical, Christian and Jewish Texts*. Edited by Joan E. Taylor. London: T&T Clark Bloomsbury, 2014, 58-82.
- Tcherikover, Victor A. and Alexander Fuks, eds., *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Tertullian. *Adversus Marcionem*. Edited and translated by Ernest Evans. 2 vols. OECT. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.  
[https://www.tertullian.org/articles/evans\\_marc/evans\\_marc\\_00index.htm](https://www.tertullian.org/articles/evans_marc/evans_marc_00index.htm)
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek: According to the Septuagint*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- Thayer, Joseph Henry. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1892.

- Theissen, Gerd. *The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christianity*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM, 1978.
- Theobald, Michael. *Römerbrief*. 2 vols. SKKNT 6. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1992-1993.
- Theophylact. *In Epistulam ad Romanos*. In vol. 124 of *Patrologia Graeca*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 161 vols. Paris, 1857-1866.
- Thielman, Frank S. *Romans*. ZECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018.
- Thorley, John. 'Junia, a Woman Apostle.' *NovT* 38.1 (1996): 18-29.
- Via, E. Jane. 'Women, the Discipleship of Service, and the Early Christian Ritual Meal in the Gospel of Luke.' *SLJT* 29.1 (1985): 37-60.
- Vos, Johan S. 'Antijudaismus/ Antisemitismus im theologischen Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.' *NedTT* 38 (1984): 89-110.
- Walters, James C. *Ethnic Issues in Paul's Letter to the Romans: Changing Self-Definitions in Earliest Roman Christianity*. Valley Forge: Trinity, 1993.
- Walters, James C. 'Romans, Jews, and Christians: The Impact of the Romans on Jewish/Christian Relations in First-Century Rome.' In *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*, ed. Karl P. Donfried and Peter Richardson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998, 175-195.
- Walters, James C. "'Phoebe" and "Junia(s)" – Rom. 16:1-2, 7.' In *Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity*. Vol. 1. Edited by Carroll D. Osburn. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2007, 167-190.
- Wansink, Craig S. *Chained in Christ: The Experience and Rhetoric of Paul's Imprisonments*. JSNTSup 130. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Watson, Francis. 'The two Roman Congregations: Romans 14:1-15:13.' In *The Romans Debate: Revised and Expanded Edition*. Edited by Karl P. Donfried. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991, 203-215.
- Weidemann, Ursula. 'C. SILANUS, APPIA PARENTE GENITUS. A Note on Tac. Ann. 3, 68, 3.' *AcCl* 6 (1963): 138-145.

- Weima, Jeffrey A. D. *Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings*. JSNTSup 101. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- Weima, Jeffrey A. D. *Paul the Ancient Letter Writer: An Introduction to Epistolary Analysis*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016.
- Wiefel, Wolfgang. 'The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity.' In *The Romans Debate*. Rev. and exp. ed. Edited by Karl P. Donfried. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991, 85-101.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Der Brief and die Römer*. EKKNT 6. Studienausgabe. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlagsgesellschaft; Mannheim: Patmos, 2010.
- Williams, Margaret H., 'The Organisation of Jewish Burials in Ancient Rome in the Light of Evidence from Palestine and the Diaspora,' *ZPE* 101 (1994): 165–182.
- Williams, Margret H. 'Palestinian Jewish Personal Names in Acts.' In *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Vol. 4 of *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Pater Noster, 1995, 79-113.
- Williams, Margret H. 'Jewish Use of Moses as a Personal Name in Graeco-Roman Antiquity - a Note.' *ZPE* 118 (1997): 274.
- Williams, Margaret H. 'The Structure of the Jewish Community in Rome.' In *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*. Edited by Martin Goodman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998, 215-228.
- Williams, Margaret H., 'The Use of Alternative Names by Diaspora Jews in Graeco-Roman Antiquity.' *JSJ* 38.3 (2007): 307-327.
- Winter, Bruce W. *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline communities*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Witherington III, Ben. *Women in the Earliest Churches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

- Witherington III, Ben. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998.
- Witherington III, Ben. 'On the Road with Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, and Other Disciples – Luke 8.1-3.' In *A Feminist Companion to Luke*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff. FCNTECW. London: Sheffield Academic, 2002, 133-139.
- Witherington III, Ben with Darlene Hyatt. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Witherington III, Ben. 'Joanna: Apostle of the Lord – or Jailbait?' *BRev* 21.2 (2005): 12-14 + 46-47.
- Wolter, Michael. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 2 vols. EKKNT 6. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlagsgesellschaft; Ostfildern: Patmos; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014-2019.
- Wolters, Al 'IOYNIAN (Romans 16:7) and the Hebrew Name Yēḥunnī.' *JBL* 127.2 (2008): 397-408.
- Wright, N. T. *Paul: A Biography*. London: SCPK, 2018.
- Ziesler, John. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. TPINTC. London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity International, 1989.
- Zoccali, Christopher. 'Romans.' In *T&T Clark Social Identity Commentary on the New Testament*. Edited by J. Brian Tucker and Aaron Kuecker. London: T&T Clark, 2020.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1 – Junia: A Story<sup>1</sup>

Junia was a Hellenised Jew from Palestine, most likely from Galilee. She was married to Andronicus, and they shared their life and mission.<sup>2</sup> Both followed Jesus during parts of his ministry in Galilee and went with him on his last journey to Jerusalem. Present among the group of disciples after the events of Jesus' death, they encountered the risen Christ and received a commission to be his witnesses.

As part of the nucleus of the early church in Jerusalem, Andronicus and Junia experienced the coming of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Like the others, they began to speak in different languages, connecting especially with Jews in the crowd who had links to Rome. While the community grew, adding many of the Hellenised Jews present at Pentecost to their numbers, tensions with the Jewish leadership in Jerusalem rose. When the pressure became unbearable, many believers left Jerusalem, and some of the Hellenist Jews returned to their home cities.

Andronicus and Junia, rather than returning to their home region Galilee, decided to accompany those Hellenists who wanted to go to Rome. The Jerusalem church charged the couple with safeguarding that the message preached about Christ in Rome would align with the apostolic teaching. Arriving in Rome not long after the events following the crucifixion of Jesus, the couple started to share the good news about Jesus among the Jewish community of Rome. As they continued to live according to Jewish customs, the community tolerated their proclamation of a Jewish messiah. A small group of

---

<sup>1</sup> Junia's story as it is found here is not a biography. It is *a* story, not *the* story, meaning it is *one of the historically possible constructions* rather than *the reconstruction* of her life and ministry. It is based on the findings deemed likely in this thesis, but it also includes more imaginative elements. As this sketch is given in narrative form the degrees of probability are not made explicit, so they should be judged in light of the discussions in this thesis.

<sup>2</sup> This is as much Andronicus' story as it is Junia's, so he features throughout this sketch alongside Junia.

believers, consisting of Jews and Godfearers, formed around the couple over the years. It was too small to be considered a threat by the Jewish leadership of the various synagogues in Rome of which they still were a part.

Things changed when the first gentile Christians emigrated to Rome from the East and started questioning the necessity of living according to Jewish customs, influenced by Paul's version of the gospel. Tensions with the Jewish community began to rise as the Christian message was no longer just a matter of theological debate. The claim that there was a way to believe in the God of Israel without adhering to the law threatened the core of Jewish identity. Andronicus and Junia were at the forefront of this conflict, arguing against abandoning the Jewish way of life with their Christian brothers and sisters and defending the Christian message to their Jewish brothers and sisters. They failed. Altercations got so heated that they drew the attention of the Roman authorities, who restored order by banishing the leading figures behind the uprisings from Rome. Due to their involvement in the debates that led to the unrest, Andronicus and Junia were recognised as some of the troublemakers responsible and had to leave.

Not willing to abandon their ministry in Rome, to which they felt called by Christ, Andronicus and Junia stayed in Italy waiting for a possibility to return to the capital. This opportunity came soon enough. Once the unrest had been dealt with and public order was restored, the Roman authorities lost interest in the Jewish matter. Andronicus and Junia returned to a changed world. The fear of another Roman intervention had caused an unrepairable rift between the Jewish community and the followers of Jesus. During their exile, Christian gatherings with a less Jewish outlook had developed, and the Christians holding to the Jewish customs slowly became a minority. Andronicus and Junia were welcomed back by their fellow Jewish believers. Yet, their relationship with the gentile believers was strained. Though they acknowledged the couple's authority as eyewitnesses to the earthly life of Jesus, they did not

appreciate the couple's continued emphasis on adherence to certain Jewish customs.

Outside of the Christian community, Andronicus and Junia's mission among the Jews of Rome also ran into trouble. With the synagogue doors closed to them, their ministry became more complicated and more public. Rather than sharing their faith with fellow Jews in a gathering, they spoke with Jews in the streets and marketplaces. This made their missionary activity open to the public eye and, thereby, more dangerous. Yet, this did not prevent them from continuing their proclamation of the gospel.

At various moments their preaching caused such a stir that the authorities had to intervene again. As the incidents were more localised than before, Andronicus and Junia were not banished but incarcerated. Junia was interred in the same facility as all other (mainly male) prisoners. It stank, it was dark, it was crowded, and only Andronicus' presence could protect Junia from sexual assault. For the provision of food, the couple was reliant on the help of friends. However, the shame associated with imprisonment prevented many from helping them. Those who continued to support them were mainly Jewish believers who remembered Andronicus and Junia's foundational role in their community. Some of the gentile Christians, however, started to question their authority and the validity of their gospel due to their imprisonment. Thus, their reputation suffered despite their longstanding ministry and their connection to the earthly Jesus.

During one of their imprisonments, a letter from the apostle Paul arrived in Rome. In it, Paul asked his Roman audience to greet his fellow Jews and prisoners of war, Andronicus and Junia. Aware of their situation, Paul commended them to his audience. Highlighting that he shared their Jewishness and that he also had been a prisoner in the past, he showed his solidarity with them. Moreover, he turned their shame into praise by emphasising that their willingness to forsake their own honour and safety made them 'outstanding

among the apostles.’ With his last commendation that they were ‘in Christ before [him],’ he acknowledged their seniority in faith and emphasised their long Christian history. On the one hand, this commendation was a call to honour Andronicus and Junia, reminding those who questioned their ministry of their faithful service to the Lord, which should be emulated. On the other hand, by acknowledging their role and authority, Paul made plain that he had no intentions of usurping their authority. On the contrary, he hoped to win the support of the couple and, with them, the support of those in the Roman community who considered him a dangerous antinomian.

This is the place to end Junia’s story. We do not know how the Roman audience or Andronicus and Junia received this greeting. Yet, I like to *imagine* that Paul received the welcome he had hoped for, and the three apostles found a way to work together or support each other’s ministries for the sake of the gospel and their Lord Jesus Christ.

## **Appendix 2 – Joanna: A Story<sup>3</sup>**

Joanna belonged to the elite circles of Galilee. She was married to Chuza, an official in the royal administration in Tiberias. Chuza was not a Jew but came from Nabatea, one of the neighbouring kingdoms. He came to the Herodian court as a young man in the entourage of Phasaelis, Antipas’ Nabatean wife.

He sought a marriage arrangement with a respectable Galilean family to further his career and found a suitable candidate in the young Joanna. By the time of their marriage, Chuza was already a wealthy and influential man, one of the reasons why Joanna’s Jewish family overlooked that he was a foreigner

---

<sup>3</sup> Joanna’s story as it is found here is not a biography. It is *a* story, not *the* story, meaning it is *one of the historically possible constructions* rather than *the reconstruction* of her life and ministry. It is based on the findings of this thesis deemed likely, but it also includes more imaginative elements. As this sketch is given in narrative form the degrees of probability are not made explicit, so they should be judged in light of the discussions in this thesis.

much older than their daughter. It was a beneficial match for both sides. Though Joanna had no say in the choice of her husband, she accepted the wishes of her family. With Chuza's position came social status and economic security that Joanna shared as his wife. In addition to her dowry, Joanna's father had given her a part of his estate as a gift, providing her with an income not under the control of Chuza.

Joanna fell ill a few years into her marriage, and doctors could not help. Her illness meant she became increasingly isolated from the people around her. Desperate to change her situation, she sought the help of an itinerant preacher and miracle worker who was talked about in Tiberias, Jesus of Nazareth. The encounter with Jesus changed her life. Restored to wholeness and full of gratitude, Joanna did not return to Tiberias but remained with Jesus as part of his following. This led to a break with Chuza, who could not support her following a preacher critical of Antipas. He divorced Joanna soon after she first met Jesus to avoid a prolonged scandal. Using the money from her dowry that she received back at the moment of divorce and the income from her property, Joanna began financially supporting Jesus and the group of disciples.

She was not the only woman to do so; a whole group of women travelled together with Jesus and the Twelve. Each of them gave what she could. Some of the women were related to some of the Twelve, but most were women like Joanna, who had left their former life. They formed their own social network within Jesus' following, supporting each other and holding each other accountable in their relations with the men of the group.

Joanna's beginnings within the discipleship group were not easy. As she had been the wife of a Herodian official, she stood for (and had benefitted from) a hated system that placed heavy taxes on the population and cooperated with Rome. So there was some resentment at first. And life on the road and in the housings of the ordinary people of Galilee was less comfortable than her elite

life in Tiberias. Things that had been done by her servants, cooking, baking, mending clothes, became part of her daily life.

Yet, being with Jesus, listening to his teaching about the kingdom of God, witnessing his healing ministry, and sharing life with him and the other disciples also became part of her daily life. So Joanna went with Jesus on his last fateful journey to Jerusalem. With the other women from Galilee, she saw him die on the cross. Unable to leave him, they followed Joseph of Arimathea to the grave and saw the tomb where he was laid. Then they returned home, keeping themselves busy with the preparation for the proper care of his body, their last service to him, until the beginning of the Sabbath forced them to stop and face their grief.

Early in the morning on the first day of the week, Joanna and the other women made their way to the tomb, but they did not find his body. Instead, they were called to remember what Jesus had said to them about his death and resurrection in Galilee. And they remembered. Overwhelmed by the realisation that he was not dead but alive, as he had said, Joanna and the other women returned to the Eleven and the other disciples and reported everything they had seen and heard. So they became the first to witness that the tomb was empty. Their testimony was received in different ways. Some considered it the idle talk of women overwhelmed by grief, others had to see for themselves and went to the tomb, and a few trusted the word of the women with whom they had travelled for such a long time.

All doubt ended when the risen Jesus appeared to the whole group of disciples, and they experienced first-hand that he was indeed alive. Joanna was among those whom he commissioned to be witnesses to his resurrection. After the resurrection Joanna stayed with the Eleven and other believers in Jerusalem, waiting for the promised Spirit until Pentecost.

This is as far as Joanna's story can be traced in Luke. We do not know how her life continued after Pentecost. Yet, I like to *imagine* that she continued to use her financial resources to serve the community of believers in Jerusalem and that she began to share what she had witnessed first-hand: Jesus' life and ministry, his death, burial, and resurrection, and the change that all of this brought to her life.

And maybe she found a new husband, and with him she left Jerusalem for the ends of the earth, i.e. Rome, where she became a foundational figure of the Christian community and continued her witness to the things she had seen.