

June 2022

## Junia as a Female Apostle in Romans 16:7 : A Literature Review of Relevant Sources from 2010 to Present

Matt H. Hamilton  
*Liberty University*, [mhhamilton@liberty.edu](mailto:mhhamilton@liberty.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/eleu>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Hamilton, Matt H.. 2022. "Junia as a Female Apostle in Romans 16:7 : A Literature Review of Relevant Sources from 2010 to Present." *Eleutheria* 6, (1). <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/eleu/vol6/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Rawlings School of Divinity at Scholars Crossing. It has been accepted for inclusion in Eleutheria by an authorized editor of Scholars Crossing. For more information, please contact [scholarlycommunications@liberty.edu](mailto:scholarlycommunications@liberty.edu).

---

## Junia as a Female Apostle in Romans 16:7 : A Literature Review of Relevant Sources from 2010 to Present

### Abstract

Ever since Bernadette Brooten's seminal article in 1977, there has been a heated (and sometimes violent) debate over the identity and function of Junia(s) in Rom. 16:7. While recent years have seen tentative consensus in certain areas, such an outlook belies the deep and nuanced arguments which still exist. This essay will attempt to address a hole in the literature, namely a comprehensive review of the Junia debate since 2010. It will do this by cataloguing the discourse into four categories: the Name-Gender Debate, the Syntax-Grammar Debate, the Rhetoric-Context Debate, and the Apostleship Debate. After this analysis, comments will be given on the state of the discussion, as well as questions for further research. A new theme or direction for the Junia debate can be identified, which is that of reconciliation.

### Keywords

Junia, Junias, Junia(s), Female Apostle, Women, Women in Ministry, Gender, Rom. 16:7, Romans 16:7, Apostle, Apostleship, inclusive, exclusive

### Cover Page Footnote

Currently pursuing a Masters of Arts in Christian Apologetics

## Introduction

Most debates involving the issue of “women in ministry” center around two key texts: 1 Cor. 14:33-35 and 1 Tim. 2:11-15. Within the last few decades, however, there has been a push to challenge the unipolarity of these passages, arguing instead for a “multipolar” view that surveys a broader range of biblical data. For instance, proponents like N.T. Wright claim that the starting point for the discussion should be Mary Magdalene’s witness of the resurrection and Phoebe/Junia’s prominence in Romans 16.<sup>1</sup> Others concur with such a position, thinking that Rom. 16:7 should be foundational for any discourse concerning the restriction or liberation of women in ministry.<sup>2</sup> This sentiment also exists on opposing sides of the confessional aisle. Roman Catholic scholar Bernadette Brooten writes, “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>3</sup> Eastern Orthodox liturgy still celebrates Junia, arguably as an important church figure.<sup>4</sup>

Seeing the importance that other biblical passages beyond 1 Timothy and 1 Corinthians are playing in the ecclesial debate, it is important to produce careful and rhetorically balanced literature on the subject. This article seeks to contribute to the scrum, choosing to focus on the issue of Junia in Rom. 16:7. Currently, scholarly consensus concludes that Junia was indeed “prominent among the apostles.”<sup>5</sup> While this is a fair claim to make, such a blanket statement would belie the careful nuance which exists in the substratum of the field (especially in recently published works). The purpose of this article therefore will be to provide a rigorous literature review of the publications which concern the identity and function of Junia in Rom. 16:7. We will limit the scope of our examination to

---

<sup>1</sup>N.T. Wright, “It’s About the Bible, Not Fake Ideas of Progress,” *The Times* (United Kingdom), Nov. 23, 2012.

<sup>2</sup>These would include, but are not limited to, Stephen Croft, “Text Messages: The Ministry of Women and Romans 16,” *Anvil* 21, (2004): 91-92, Roger Nicole, “Biblical Egalitarianism and the Inerrancy of Scripture,” *Priscilla Papers* 20.2, (2006): 7, etc.

<sup>3</sup>Bernadette Brooten, “Junia ... outstanding among the apostles’ (Romans 16:7)” *Women Priests*, edited by Bernadette Brooten, L.J. Swindler, and Arlene Swindler. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1977.

<sup>4</sup>Elizabeth Muir, *A Women’s History of the Christian Church* (New York, NY: University of Toronto Press, 2019), 4.

<sup>5</sup>Esther Ng, “WAS JUNIA(S) IN ROM 16:7 A FEMALE APOSTLE? AND SO WHAT?” *Journal of the Evangelical Society* 63, no. 3 (2022): 517.

works published after 2010. This is done for several reasons: (1) There are no comprehensive surveys which cover this timeframe (2) It represents a shift in argumentation from earlier debates (3) Spatial restrictions. The proposed time span should not be thought as absolute. Several important or helpful pieces were written before this year (Wolters 2008, Huttar 2009, Cohick 2009, Stephenson 2009), and therefore will be referenced as needed.<sup>6</sup>

Numerous sources have been authored during this time span. Hence, a need arose to parse through the data. General and Key Word title searches were made through Google Scholar, Atla Religion Database with AtlaSerials Plus, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global, and Liberty University's Jerry Falwell Library to discover scholarly contributions. Terms searched included "Rom. 16:7," "Junia," "Female Apostle," "Junia Rom. 16:7," etc., to create broad results. Only sources that specifically dealt with Junia in Rom. 16:7 were included. Sources outside this parameter were discarded unless they (1) were cited by important works, (2) added important or nuanced points to the discussion, and (3) were found in the search results of this methodology. The scope of this literature review is also limited in another fashion - some articles could not be accessed due to language barriers or availability issues. They will be included in the extended bibliography.

This dispute regarding Junia can be separated into four different categories: The Name-Gender Debate, The Syntax-Grammar Debate, The Rhetoric-Context Debate, and the Apostleship Debate. Any author attempting a thorough discussion of the subject should address all four levels. The Name-Gender Debate concerns the identity of Junia(s) in Rom. 16:7, asking whether the individual addressed is male or female. Meanwhile, the Syntax-Grammar Debate examines the pericope<sup>7</sup> "ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις" arguing whether it is better translated as "prominent among the apostles" or "well known to the apostles." Some argue that the socio-rhetorical factors surrounding Rom. 16:7 indicate the apostleship or non-apostleship of Junia(s), which makes up the content of the Rhetoric-Context Debate. Finally, the Apostleship Debate considers what

---

<sup>6</sup>Al Wolters, "IOYNIAN (Romans 16:7) and the Hebrew Name Yēhunnī," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127, no. 2 (2008): 397-408; David Huttar, "Did Paul call Andronicus an apostle in Romans 16:7?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 52, no. 4 (2009): 747-778; Lynn Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2009); Hope Stephenson, "Junia: woman and apostle," *Women in the Biblical World: A Survey of Old and New Testament Perspectives*, ed. Elizabeth McCabe, 122-136 (Lanham, MD: University Press of American, 2009).

<sup>7</sup>Full verse: ἀσπάσασθε Ἀνδρόνικον καὶ Ἰουλίαν τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου καὶ συναιχμαλώτους μου, οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, οἳ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ,"

functions are indicated by ἀπόστολος in Rom. 16:7, and whether these should be normative in an ecclesial context. This article will use the above paradigm to organize the works, and then review them on an author-by-author basis, beginning with The Name-Gender Debate.

### The Name-Gender Debate

Entering the Twentieth century, many held that Junia did not even exist. Instead, the person referenced in Rom. 16:7 was Junias (Ἰουνιάς), a male apostle celebrated by Paul. Such a view was challenged by Bernadette Brooten in 1977 (“Junia ... outstanding among the apostles’ (Romans 16:7)”), who initiated a heated conversation on the identity of Junia(s), culminating in Eldon Epp’s 2005 seminal book, *Junia: The First Woman Apostle*.<sup>8</sup> The debate between these two temporal poles consisted of several issues.

Greek manuscripts of the NT initially did not have any accentuation or punctuation. This leaves flexibility in how the form IOYNIAN should be translated when these aspects were eventually added. If one was to add the circumflex over the ultima (Ἰουνιάς), then the accusative shortened form (Junias - Ἰουνιάς) of the male name Ἰουνιάνος would obtain. This became known as the contracted-form or hypocoristic theory, which gained popularity in the nineteenth century (especially since hypocoristic shortening was popular with some Greek names). If the acute was added to the penultima (Ἰουνία), the result would be either the feminine accusative form of Ἰουνία or the masculine accusative form of Ἰουνίας (Junias).<sup>9</sup> As of 2010, the consensus in scholarship has been for a female derivative Ἰουνίαν by a large majority. While space does not permit a full analysis, reasons for this agreement include: (1) The contracted form of Ἰουνιάνος cannot be found in Greek literature<sup>10</sup> (2) Junia was common name, especially in Rome, where there are at least 250 epigraphical attestations<sup>11</sup> (3) Majority opinion

<sup>8</sup>Andrea Hartmann, “Junia – A Woman Lost in Translation: The Name IOYNIAN in Romans 16:7 and its History of Interpretation,” *Open Theology* 6, no. 1 (2020): 646.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., 646-660.

<sup>10</sup>See Peter Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 176; Richard Cervin, “A Note Regarding the Name ‘Junia(s)’ in Romans 16.7” *New Testament Studies* 40, no. 3 (1994): 466.

<sup>11</sup>See Richard Bauckham, *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 169; Peter Lampe, “The Roman Christians of Romans 16,” *The Romans Debate*, ed. K.P. Donfried, 216-230 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker

until the thirteenth century was that the person referenced to in Rom. 16:7 was certainly a woman<sup>12</sup> [Giles of Rome is the first to popularize the male reading]<sup>13</sup> (4) There is no evidence for Ἰουνίας in the most important manuscript evidence.<sup>14</sup> For further review and investigation, please see these works.<sup>15</sup>

Since 2010, there has not been a proliferation of movement in the Name-Gender Debate. Most of scholarship has seemed to be content with the identification of Junia as a woman, including hardened advocates like Wayne Grudem to a degree.<sup>16</sup> Any challenge to this consensus came in the form of Al Wolters's 2008 essay concerning the philology of IOYNIAN, and scattered articles have dealt with his points (Cohick 2009, Peeler 2019, Hartmann 2020, Lin 2020, Ng 2020, etc.).<sup>17</sup> Wolters's argument can be summed in three simple steps: (1) A Hebrew name יהונה is inscribed on ossuaries during NT times (2) This

---

Academic, 1991), 223; Cervin, "A Note Regarding the Name 'Junia(s)' in Romans 16.7," 466.

<sup>12</sup>Thomas Schreiner, *Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2018), 748.

<sup>13</sup>Eldon Epp, *Junia: The First Woman Apostle* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2005), 35.

<sup>14</sup>Peter Arzt-Grabner, "Junia oder Iunias? Zum textkritischen Hintergrund von Röm 16,7," *Liebe zum Wort*, ed. Friedrich Reiterer, Petrus Eder, Ludger Bernhard, 83-102 (Wien: Otto Müller Verlag, 1993), 87-94.

<sup>15</sup>Reviews used: Hartmann, "Junia – A Woman Lost in Translation: The Name IOYNIAN in Romans 16:7 and its History of Interpretation," 646-660; Schreiner, *Romans*, 748; Susan Mathew, *Women in the Greetings of Romans 16.1-16* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013), 97-100. For further investigation: Brooten, "Junia ... outstanding among the apostles' (Romans 16:7)," 1977; Ray Schulz, "Romans 16:7: Junia or Junias?" *Expository Times* 98, no. 4 (1987): 108-110; Joseph Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1993); John Thorley, "Junia, A Woman Apostle," *Novum Testamentum* 38, no. 1 (1996): 18-29; 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," *New Testament Studies* 42, no. 3 (1996): 477-478; Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Short Commentary* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006); Linda Belleville, "Ἰουνίαν ... ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις: A Re-examination of Romans 16.7 in Light of Primary Source Materials," *New Testament Studies* 51, no. 2 (2005): 231-49.

<sup>16</sup>See his switch in scholarly opinion: Wayne Grudem and John Piper, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991); Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More than One Hundred Disputed Questions* (Sisters, OR: Multnomah, 2004), 226.

<sup>17</sup>Curiously, scholars on all sides of the Junia debate have largely ignored Wolter's contribution without much explanation.

name would most likely be vocalized as *yēhunnī* (3) When Hellenized into Koine Greek, this name would appear as the first declension masculine noun Ἰουνίας (with its accusative form being Ἰουνίαν).<sup>18</sup> It should be noted that Wolters recognizes limitations to his work, “In my own opinion, a plausible (but not a decisive) case can be made for either position.”<sup>19</sup>

Both Cohick 2009 and Peeler 2019 give minimal attention to Wolters, tending to treat him as an isolated voice contradicting the norm of agreement on Junia. Cohick 2009 argues that the postulated Greek form given by Wolters (Ἰουνίας) has not been represented in any epigraphical or literary source. While the philological form is theoretically possible, it ultimately is an argument from silence, given its actual absence.<sup>20</sup> Peeler 2019 adds that Wolters admits to the limitations of his theory (that either the masculine or feminine forms are plausible), and considering the almost universal agreement for Junia, one should prefer the feminine reading.<sup>21</sup>

Yii-Jan Lin offers perhaps the most thorough counterargument to Wolters to date. She begins her assessment by summarizing his essay and noting that most of the analysis is teleologically driven, rather than conclusions one would arrive at naturally. Lin also details the lack of analysis that has been given to Junia’s counterpart, Andronicus. The Greek name ANΔPONIKON is well attested in Rome (29 uses) and is most likely a relative of Paul. Does ANΔPONIKON derive from a Hebrew name? Perhaps a feminine Hebrew name? This rhetorical questioning serves to underscore Lin’s primary point: if Andronicus as a Jewish man was clearly given a well-attested masculine Greek name, why could IOYNIAN not be a Jewish woman with well-attested feminine Latin name? Such an evaluation is bolstered by the commonality of “Junia” as a name in Rome (250 Greek and Latin inscriptions). *Yhwny*, on the other hand, has only two undisputed instances (and possibly but not necessarily is pronounced as *Yēhunnī*).<sup>22</sup> Lin also contends that a Jewish man would most likely not go by a Hellenized name in

---

<sup>18</sup>Wolters, “IOYNIAN (Romans 16:7) and the Hebrew Name *Yēhunnī*,” 397-408.

<sup>19</sup>Wolters, “IOYNIAN (Romans 16:7) and the Hebrew Name *Yēhunnī*,” n. 70.

<sup>20</sup>Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians*, 177.

<sup>21</sup>Amy Peeler, “Junia/Joanna: Herald of the Good News,” *Vindicating the Vixens*, ed. Sandra Glahn 273-285 (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2017), 276.

<sup>22</sup>Yii- Jan Lin, “Junia: An Apostle before Paul.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 139, no. 1 (2020): 192-194.

Rome that is nearly identical to indistinguishable from a (popular) female Roman name.<sup>23</sup>

Another response is given by Hartmann 2020. She argues that the female name Junia (250 uses) is more popular and better supported than Wolters's Yēhunnī (2 undisputed occurrences). There is no reason to prefer a rarely attested male name over a widely attested female name, especially if the masculine term is highly similar to or even indistinguishable from the feminine Roman name. Hartmann claims that Paul, who was a Roman citizen and familiar with their naming conventions, would not have used a transliterated male Hebrew name which could be easily confused with a Latin female name by his audience.<sup>24</sup> Hartmann provides an excellent historical survey overviewing the nuances of the Name-Gender debate pre-2010.

If Lin 2020 has written the most against Wolter by quantity of text, then Esther Ng has the most thorough assessment in favor of Wolters work. She splits her analysis into four sections: etymology, frequency, meaning of "apostle," and references in church history. Ng begins by noting the consensus in recent scholarship (which, according to her, is based on the universality of acute accenting [Ἰουνία] in Greek manuscripts after the 9<sup>th</sup> century and on the feminine ending *Juniam* in the Vulgate) and recounting Wolter's theory. She claims that if Ἰουνία is the Hellenized form of the male Yēhunnī, it does not show that the generation who added the accentuations to IOYNIAN or that Paul considered the individual to be a woman. Further, there are examples of Hebrew-derived, three-syllable Greek masculine names given *-am* endings in the Vulgate.<sup>25</sup>

Ng also desires to answer previous objections to Wolter's argument. In responding to Lin, Ng charges that she has made three assumptions: (1) The person in Rom. 16:7 is a woman (2) She adopted a Latin name while in Rome (3) a Jewish man would not have adopted a name identical to a Latin feminine name. The first is begging the question, while the other two are unproven assumptions.<sup>26</sup>

Further, one cannot assume "Junia" is correct because of its comparative frequency. Cohick 2009 argues that Ἰουνία is not present in any literary or epigraphical source, therefore making Wolter's argument one from silence. Ng responds by citing the high amount of Hellenized biblical names (especially of the

---

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., n. 13.

<sup>24</sup>Hartmann, "Junia – A Woman Lost in Translation," n. 132.

<sup>25</sup>Esther Ng, "WAS JUNIA(S) IN ROM 16:7 A FEMALE APOSTLE? AND SO WHAT?" 519-521.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., n. 15.



same declension as Ἰουνίας) who are attested to nowhere apart from their biblical occurrence. It is premature to write off Ἰουνίας as non-existent. Despite the regularity to which Ἰουνία appeared in the Roman world, no Jewish women (apart from the purported Rom. 16:7 reference) in the timespan surrounding the NT was named Junia in Latin or Greek. This makes it doubtful that the Jewish individual referenced in Rom. 16:7 is indeed female, especially if the name does not penetrate the Palestinian area.<sup>27</sup>

The third section offered by Ng supposes Paul would have not thought of Junia(s) as male. 1 Cor. 9:5 claims that apostles can take their wives with them. This presumes that the “apostles” are men. In her fourth section, Ng argues against the universality of church father attestation for the female form. In this she isolates Epiphanius and Origen as supporting a male reading of *Junias*, and answers objections towards the unreliability of their witness. Ng attempts to win that Origen would not have considered the individual in 16:7 a woman because of his interpretations and broader thought. This would be in step with several apostles lists, which are exclusively male. She finishes by “conjecturing” (Ng’s words) why church fathers took either a male or female position.<sup>28</sup> After Ng, no scholar (that could be found) commented on Wolter 2008.<sup>29</sup>

Many others have written on the Name-Gender subject since 2010, but they are mostly reiterations of previous arguments. Significant voices who offer no new information include but are not limited to: McKnight 2011, Mathew 2013, Peeler 2019, Gupta 2020, Belleville 2021.<sup>30</sup> Despite this uniformity, several authors have stood out in their suggestions.

Arzt-Grabner 2010 gives a brief history of the Name-Gender debate, focusing especially on the contributions of Marie-Joseph Lagrange. His contribution concentrates on textual criticism. After examining relevant papyri, majuscule, miniscule, Latin, Coptic, Syriac, and Bohairic manuscripts, Arzt-

---

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., 521-22.

<sup>28</sup> Esther Ng, “WAS JUNIA(S) IN ROM 16:7 A FEMALE APOSTLE? AND SO WHAT?” 523-525.

<sup>29</sup>No articles to date have dealt specifically with the philological elements of Wolters’s argument, which is an interesting observation.

<sup>30</sup>Scot McKnight, *Junia Is Not Alone* (Englewood, CO: Patheos Press, 2011); Nijay Gupta, “Reconstructing Junia’s Imprisonment: Examining a Neglected Pauline Comment in Romans 16:7,” *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 47, no. 4 (2020): 385-397; Linda Belleville, “Women Leaders in the Bible,” *Discovering Biblical Equality: Biblical, Theological, Cultural, and Practical Perspectives*, ed. Ronald Pierce, Cynthia Westfall, and Christa McKirland, 70-89 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2021).

Grabner determines there is no real evidence that the person referenced in Rom. 16:7 was male. Feminine readings are virtually uncontested.<sup>31</sup>

Zell 2014 argues that the data concerning Junia(s) is uncertain, as both Ἰουνιάων and Ἰουνίας are valid options. According to Zell, Ἰουνιάων is present in most of the Byzantine minuscules and is the preferred option of later commentators. Despite being in a scholarly journal, this is not an academically rigorous paper. Many details are left out, and there is no engagement with claims from either side of the debate. Since Zell does not use any sources for his section on the Name-Gender Debate, it is difficult to ascertain the origin of his information (especially when he deviates from consensus).<sup>32</sup> Grudem and Piper 2020 and Grudem 2012 concur with a similar conclusion to Zell.<sup>33</sup>

Harding 2016 is the rare commentator to argue that the short-form hypothesis is still plausible. This theory argues that Ἰουνιάων is the accusative of Ἰουνιάς, which is a Greek hypocoristic form of the masculine Latin name *Junianus*. This Latin name is well attested, and there are many examples of these abbreviated Greek “nicknames” (both in biblical and Greek literature). He also notes that Linda Belleville has made arguments against the short-form hypothesis by claiming that Greek nicknames were usually shortened while Latin nicknames were lengthened. This would be incorrect, according to Harding, because Paul is writing in Greek rather than Latin. Foreign names brought into Greek have also experienced the process of nickname “shortening.” Harding argues that multiple other authors find the short-form hypothesis plausible. Ultimately, despite his positivity for hypocoristic forms, Harding concludes that the data is inconclusive on Junia(s)’s gender, but the female version should be given slight preference.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>Peter Arzt-Grabner, “Junia, die rehabilitierte Apostelin: aus der Werkstatt der Exegeten; ein textkritischer Beitrag.” *Bibel und Kirche* 65, no. 4 (2010): 243-245.

<sup>32</sup>Paul Zell, “Exegetical Brief: Romans 16: 1,7 Phoebe, a Deacon? Junia, an Apostle?” *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 111, no.2 (2014): 102-107.

<sup>33</sup>Wayne Grudem and John Piper, “An Overview of Central Concerns,” *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (Revised Edition)*, ed. Wayne Grudem and John Piper, 57-90 (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2020), 76-78. It does not appear that Grudem and Piper have altered much of their essay since 1991. Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More Than 100 Disputed Questions* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012), np.

<sup>34</sup>Michael Harding, “Female Apostleship in Romans 16:7,” *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 21, (2016): 64-70.

There are some areas where he makes mistakes, however.<sup>35</sup> Sanborn 2017 argues for Junias on the basis that this would be a unique instance of a female apostle and would suggest that there are other apostles beyond Paul and the Twelve. When the church elected a new apostle, it was always from men.<sup>36</sup>

While not providing exegetically novel material to the Name-Gender Debate, Malms 2017 discusses the impact of institutional bias in modern philology alongside the history of Scandinavian translations. After tracing the interrelated development of translating Junia(s) and philology, he concludes (referencing the switch from the feminine to the masculine), “During the nineteenth century, the progress of philology appears to have opened the door for changing the biblical text on grounds that were in essence ideological, rather than contextualizing, and reflected nineteenth-century society rather than that of the first century.”<sup>37</sup> Similarly, Preato 2019 offers little new material to the Name-Gender Debate. Apart from an excellent summary of the issues regarding Junia(s)’s gender and apostleship, he provides updated data on recent English Bible translations.<sup>38</sup>

Clark 2018 seeks to discover the identity of Junia(s) by connecting them to the biblical character Joanna. She does this by comparing names, events, and similarities between the two persons, determining that Junia could be a latinized form of Joanna. While Chuza (Joanna’s husband) does not Hellenize perfectly to “Andronicus,” it is still a philological possibility. Clarke also seeks to flesh out further details of Junia’s ministry, before and after Christ, showing the valuable role women play in the church (and reducing the anonymity surrounding women in biblical history).<sup>39</sup>

Virtually all commentaries sampled between the period of 2010 to March 2022 agree on the feminine rendering of Ἰουνίας in Rom. 16:7. Significant voices include but are not limited to: Keener 2009, Hultgren 2011, Kruse 2012,

---

<sup>35</sup>One of these is his misquotation of Fitzmeyer 1993 (page 738), where Harding switches the Ἰουνιάς and Ἰουνίας.

<sup>36</sup>Scott Sanborn, “A Review of Robert Jewett on Romans Part 3 Romans 13-16.” *Kerux* 32, no. 1 (May 2017): 23-52.

<sup>37</sup>Mats Malms, “Gendered Philology: The Apostle Junia/s in Scandinavian Bible Translation.” *History of Humanities* 2, no. 2 (2017): 460-466.

<sup>38</sup>Preato, Dennis. “Junia, a Female Apostle: An Examination of the Historical Record.” *Priscilla Papers* 33, no. 2 (Spring 2019): 8-15.

<sup>39</sup>Constantina Clark, “Exploring the True Identity of Junia: Prominent among the Apostles,” *Journal of Early Christian History* 8, no. 3 (2018): 96-106.

Longenecker 2016, Harvey 2017, Moo 2018, Schreiner 2018, and Garland 2021.<sup>40</sup> One commentator found the subject to be inconclusive.<sup>41</sup>

### The Syntax-Grammar Debate

While most debate encompassing Junia has centered on the Name-Gender issue, the last two decades have seen rise to a new type of argument. Popularized by Daniel Wallace and Michael Burer in 2001, this category of thought seeks to use the grammatical and syntactical structure of Rom. 16:7 (ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις) to argue that Junia was *well known to the apostles* rather than *prominent among the apostles*. The former statement would exclude Junia from apostleship, while the latter would see her included as an important/distinguished member. Helpful to this discussion was the innovation of the exclusive/inclusive distinction, which facilitates organization of thought on the subject.<sup>42</sup>

Pre-2010, those who contended for an exclusive rendering of Rom. 16:7 typically held to several points.<sup>43</sup> The first was that Paul always uses the term “apostle” in its most official sense. Second, the article τοῖς before ἀποστόλοις points out “the definite, well-known class of persons exclusively so called.”<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>Craig Keener, *Romans* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2009), 211; Arland Hultgren, *Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011), 574-575; Colin Kruse, *Paul's Letter the Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012), 563-565; R.N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016), 982. John Harvey, *Romans* (Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2017); Douglas Moo, *The Letter to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2018), 938. Schreiner, *Romans*, 748. David Garland, *Romans: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2021), 297o. It seems that Kruse made a mistake on pg. 561 n. 13, where he attributes a quote from Chrysostom to Origen. See also Gerald Bray, *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament VI Romans* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1998), 372.

<sup>41</sup>Andrew Spurgeon, *Romans* (Cave Creek, AZ: Langham Publishing, 2020); it should be noted that Spurgeon does not quote a source later than 1996 (or 2000, depending on the version) on the subject.

<sup>42</sup>Burer, Michael, and Daniel Wallace. “Was Junia really an apostle?: a re-examination of Rom 16.7.” *New Testament Studies* 47, no. 1 (Jan. 2001): 76-91.

<sup>43</sup>A succinct summary of which is provided by Mathew 2013.

<sup>44</sup>Charles Hodge, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (New York, NY: Hodder and Stoughton, 1983), 449. Burer and Wallace, “Was Junia Really an Apostle,” 81.

Third, the word “apostle” means “one who is commissioned and sent,” and is never used in association with those who minister from personal choice (Paul also never uses it in the wider sense). Fourth, ἐν states “where” Andronicus and Junia were considered notable, i.e., in the Twelve Apostles (“by” is an incorrect rendering). Finally, Scripture would record Andronicus and Junia elsewhere if they were truly great/prominent apostles.<sup>45</sup> Most of these positions are still affirmed by contemporary proponents.

Burer and Wallace, who are the primary advocates of the exclusive view, argue that “the collocation of ἐπίσημος with its adjuncts shows that, as a rule, ἐπίσημος with a genitive personal adjunct indicates an inclusive comparison (“outstanding among”), while ἐπίσημος with (ἐν plus) the personal dative indicates an elative notion without the implication of inclusion (“well-known to”).”<sup>46</sup> To support this claim, Burer and Wallace produced many examples from relevant texts (biblical Greek, inscriptions, papyri, etc.) which supposedly indicate an exclusive rendering.<sup>47</sup> Their view was challenged by a trio of seminal works produced by Bauckham 2002, Belleville 2005, and Epp 2005.

When responding to Burer and Wallace, the above triumvirate attacked from a litany of angles. Arguments included: having faulty methodology because of minimal evidence and overstatement, the primary usage of ἐν plus plural dative is inclusive both inside and outside the NT, failing to provide a clear “exclusive ἐπίσημος + plural dative conveying ‘well-known to’” example, and lexical searches that contradicted Burer and Wallace’s results.<sup>48</sup> In particular, Epp’s book is considered by many to be the definitive work on Junia, with some expressing difficulty imagining its reversal.<sup>49</sup>

Most post-2010 discussion on the Syntax-Grammar Debate is built off the previous arguments made by Bauckham, Belleville, and Epp. Commentators who follow but don’t make significant contributions include: Stephenson 2009,

---

<sup>45</sup>Mathew, *Women in the Greetings of Romans 16.1-16*, 102; Burer and Wallace, “Was Junia Really an Apostle,” 81; Huttar, “Did Paul Call Andronicus an Apostle in Romans 16:7,” 747-748.

<sup>46</sup>Burer and Wallace, “Was Junia Really an Apostle,” 76.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., 76-91.

<sup>48</sup>Mathew, *Women in the Greetings of Romans 16.1-16*, 102-103.

<sup>49</sup>Anthony Thiselton, “Junia: the First Woman Apostle,” *Ecclesiology* 5, no. 2 (2009): 267

Peppiatt 2019, Gupta 2020.<sup>50</sup> Commentators who still concur with Burer and Wallace include: Grudem 2012.

While not falling within our chosen timeframe, Huttar 2009 also deserves brief attention, if not only because few scholars interact with him. Huttar organizes his arguments into three sections, two of which are relevant for this discussion, “Lexical Grammatical Considerations,” and “Interpretative History.”<sup>51</sup> The former brings forth further consideration for the Syntax-Grammar Debate. It examines the meaning of ἐπίσημος, occurrences of person/thing + ἐπίσημος + ἐν phrases, occurrences of Person/Thing + various expressions + ἐν phrases, and conceptual parallels.<sup>52</sup> “Interpretive History” attempts to challenge scholarly consensus concerning patristic commentators. According to Huttar, there are multiple church fathers who understood Rom. 16:7 in a “non-inclusive” manner, eliminating the idea that natural readers universally took the verse as inclusive.<sup>53</sup>

In opposition to the exclusivist view, Hultgren 2011 argues that Junia and Andronicus should be included in the apostolic circle. Firstly, this “apostolic circle” shouldn’t be thought of as only the Twelve, as other persons were assigned the title “apostle” outside of this group (Paul, James, Barnabas, etc.). It therefore does not make sense to argue Andronicus and Junia could not have been apostles as such. Secondly, the fact that Paul describes them as being “in Christ” before him bears favorably on this position, as they fall in the timeframe for commissioning apostles (1 Cor. 15:7-8; 18). Thirdly, the phrase “ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις,” was understood as inclusivist by patristic commentators. Fourthly, if the above phrase makes a reference to a nameless third party (the apostles) in the exclusive sense, then Paul is also excluding himself from that group. This dynamic can only be avoided by seeing both Andronicus/Junia and Paul as insiders. Fifthly, Hultgren argues that the property of “prominence” would not be attached to Junia/Andronicus if they did not belong to the apostles. Finally, when interpreters incorrectly attributed the name “Junias” to the individual in Rom. 16:7, there was no hesitation to include them in the circle of the apostles.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup>Lucy Peppiatt, *Rediscovering Scripture's Vision for Women: Fresh Perspectives on Disputed Texts* (Downers Grove, IL: Downers Grove, 2019).

<sup>51</sup>Huttar, “Did Paul Call Andronicus an Apostle in Romans 16:7?” 747-748.

<sup>52</sup>Huttar, “Did Paul Call Andronicus an Apostle in Romans 16:7?” 748-756.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., 760-778. Interestingly, Huttar 2009 is largely ignored on both sides of the debate.

<sup>54</sup>Hultgren, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, 582-583.

According to Hultgren, “Viewpoints should not be changed when it is realized that the person in question is a woman.”<sup>55</sup>

The next author to make significant arguments in the Syntax-Grammar Debate is Mathew 2013. She argues firmly for the inclusivist position, mostly repeating the arguments made by Bauckham, Belleville, and Epp. More than her predecessors, however, Mathew contends that Paul was not using the “technical” sense of apostle in Rom. 16:7. Instead, a broader sense of the term was applied (more analysis below). Patristic commentators and modern translators also concur with Junia belonging to the apostles. The adjective ἐπίσημος carries a meaning of marked out, distinguished, prominent, and outstanding. It compares a person/thing to other entities of the same class and distinguishes them as outstanding/prominent. Mathew finishes her analysis by appealing to the broader context of Rom. 2:2-16. None of its constituent verses should be thought of as independent pericope, but instead harmonize with their immediate surroundings. Given that there are multiple female leadership roles in that context, Mathew argues that it is hard to maintain an exclusivist view.<sup>56</sup>

Zell 2014 and Harding 2016 are two authors in favor of an exclusivist reading. Zell is essentially a recapitulation of Burer and Wallace’s 2001 article.<sup>57</sup> Harding 2016 splits his analysis into two parts, covering both the inclusive and exclusive positions of the Syntax-Grammar Debate. While both these categories are primarily overviews of previous arguments, he includes some assessment at the end of each section. For instance, Harding examines multiple lexicons to determine the meaning of ἐπίσημος, suggesting it could carry the idea that Andronicus/Junia had a good reputation among the apostles. The definite article ἐν is highly versatile, which can render it ambiguous. There are senses, however, in which ἐν harmonizes well with an exclusive position. According to Harding, while a valid case can be made for either inclusive or exclusive interpretations, ultimately the near and wide contexts of Rom. 16:7 should determine its meaning. The article concludes by noting that broader Scriptural evidence points to the exclusive reading.<sup>58</sup>

In 2015, Michael Burer published a defense of his and Wallace’s earlier article, “Was Junia really an apostle?: a re-examination of Rom 16.7,” which advocated for the exclusivist position. In the updated essay, he offered sharp

---

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., 583.

<sup>56</sup>Mathew, *Women in the Greetings of Romans 16.1-16*, 103-104.

<sup>57</sup>Zell, “Exegetical Brief: Romans 16: 1,7 Phoebe, a Deacon? Junia, an Apostle?” 106-107.

<sup>58</sup>Harding, “Female Apostleship in Romans 16:7,” 71-79

rejoinders to the counterarguments offered by Bauckham, Belleville, and Epp.<sup>59</sup> Ultimately, Burer sought to establish three points: (1) his and Wallace's original essay withstood critique (2) Seventy-one new texts which support the use of ἐπίσημος plus the genitive for an inclusive rendering (3) Thirty-six new texts which support the use of ἐπίσημος plus the dative for an exclusive translation.<sup>60</sup> Strangely, despite the rigor of Burer's arguments, replies have not been given by Bauckham, Belleville, or Epp.<sup>61</sup>

After 2015, Burer's article set the tone for future discussion within the Syntax-Grammar Debate. However, opponents of the exclusivist view didn't fade from the conversation. Preato 2019 argues that Burer doesn't give enough credence to patristic evidence which contradicts his thesis. The conclusions of natural readers should be preferred over those reconstructing the language thousands of years later. Preato also offers a sturdy survey of the Syntax-Grammar Debate up until 2019, while simultaneously noting that most contemporary translations prefer the inclusivist view.<sup>62</sup>

Peeler 2019 likewise offers a rejoinder to Burer. According to her, there are multiple points where he makes an exclusive interpretation of a passage that is not clearly such a way. Notable examples include Lucian and an inscription from Asia Minor. Burer also recognizes one instance of the ἐπίσημος dative construction that is inclusive but dismisses the case because it involves an impersonal noun. Peeler objects to this decision. She notes a tendency in Burer's writing to overstate his case, amplifying hypotheses which lack sufficient evidence. Finally, Peeler finishes by arguing that the patristic commentators all took Rom. 16:7 to be inclusive and responds to an objection made by Burer to this point.<sup>63</sup>

Bartlett 2019 argues that native Greek speakers understood Rom. 16:7 as being inclusive, despite being firmly against the ministry of women. If there was a

---

<sup>59</sup>Michael Burer, "ΕΠΙΣΗΜΟΙ ἘΝ ΤΟΙΣ ἈΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΙΣ IN ROM 16:7 AS 'WELL KNOWN TO THE APOSTLES': FURTHER DEFENSE AND NEW EVIDENCE," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 58, no. 4 (Dec. 2015): 731-755.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid. The wording here closely follows Burer for accuracy.

<sup>61</sup>It is worth noting that the fair and gracious attitude present in Burer and Wallace's first article also found its way into Burer 2015.

<sup>62</sup>Preato, "Junia, a Female Apostle: An Examination of the Historical Record," 11-13.

<sup>63</sup>Peeler, "Junia/Joanna: Herald of the Good News," 283-284.



way to clearly read the text as “well-known to,” then the church fathers would have taken it this way. Rom. 16:7 also provides few details about Junia’s apostleship. This is contra to Chrysostom, who claimed she was notable because of her works. This either means he knew something about her apostleship outside the text, or Chrysostom was engaging in speculation. But given his reservations about women in leadership, the latter is not likely. The Greek Church also has traditions about the nature and location of Andronicus and Junia’s ministry. It would appear that a “memory” of Junia existed within the Greek Church (where Chrysostom served) of her serving in an apostolic missionary role.<sup>64</sup>

No scholar in the English-speaking world up to this point had attempted a thorough evaluation of Burer’s argument, preferring instead to make minor comments and to appeal to the church fathers. This trend was broken, however, by an article released by Yii-Jan Lin in 2020, who examined the one-hundred seven new examples procured by Burer in support of an exclusivist translation.<sup>65</sup> She first sets aside the seventy-one examples that could support an exclusive reading as inconclusive evidence, preferring to focus on more sure ground. In this case, that foundation would be the thirty-six exclusive texts brought forth by Burer which have a grammatical structure identical to Rom. 16:7. Despite Burer’s organization, according to Lin, only eleven of the thirty-six are exactly parallel to the “ἐπίσημος plus ἐν plus dative” construction located in that verse. The other texts merely follow an “ἐπίσημος plus dative” rendering, and therefore are not sufficient parallels.<sup>66</sup>

Of the eleven examples that Burer has listed as ἐν plus dative constructions, Lin only counts nine that are so.<sup>67</sup> None of these nine new examples are convincing. Several involve an inclusive use of ἐπίσημος presented with misleading translations (especially when wider context is considered). Others, although initially promising, still fail to provide an instance of exclusivity when context is again considered. Lin takes this as a key contention, that the “ἐπίσημος plus ἐν plus dative” construct is ambiguous. Inclusivity or exclusivity is assigned to it, or any other related example, based on subject and group. The context, not construction, determines whether one takes an inclusive/exclusive reading. According to Lin, the entire Syntax-Grammar Debate also presupposes a

---

<sup>64</sup>Adam Bartlett, *Men and Women in Christ* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Academic, 2020), 382-383.

<sup>65</sup>Lin, “Junia: An Apostle before Paul,” 194-197.

<sup>66</sup>*Ibid.*, 195.

<sup>67</sup>*Scholia in Euripides Hippolytum* and Theodoret, *Historia religiosa* are apparently mislabeled.

dichotomy of inclusion or exclusion (because of English convention) that isn't necessarily the case. Even one takes Burer's argument concerning "ἐπίσημος + ἐν + dative" as a contextual probability, it would still fail.<sup>68</sup>

Besides addressing Burer, Lin also answers Huttar. She does this in two manners. First, considering "Lexical-Grammatical Considerations," Lin points out that either Huttar doesn't engage with other works that contradict his arguments or he introduces too many variables for sufficient evidence.<sup>69</sup> Second, in respect to "Interpretative History," Lin argues that Huttar takes improbable interpretations based on highly flexible understandings of the patristic commentators. Specifically, Lin attempts to unravel Huttar's arguments concerning Origen on Rom. 16:7. She does this by examining several possible interpretations of the passage.<sup>70</sup>

Ng 2020, meanwhile, does not attempt to adjudicate between the inclusive/exclusive positions. Instead, her goal is to show that the inclusive reading is not "unassailable truth."<sup>71</sup> She does, however, respond to Lin on the topic of patristic commentators. According to Ng, the counterinterpretation provided by Lin has already been answered by Huttar. The difference between Origen's explanations of "οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ" supports Huttar's non-inclusive interpretations. Ng also argues that some later commentators (Luther, Beza, Vermingli) held to non-inclusive views.<sup>72</sup>

Schulz 2021 is dedicated to countering arguments that translation committees use to make textual decisions. In this case, he counters the idea that Euripides used "ἐν plus dative" in an exclusive sense. He states that the "ἐν plus dative" is used ten times referencing people in Romans 16, all inclusive. Therefore, one can disregard Euripides.<sup>73</sup>

Most commentators surveyed decided for an inclusive reading of Rom. 16:7 (such as Porter 2015, Bird 2016, Thiselton 2016, Thielman 2018,<sup>74</sup> Schreiner

<sup>68</sup>Lin, "Junia: An Apostle before Paul," 195-197.

<sup>69</sup>Lin, "Junia: An Apostle before Paul," n. 29.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., n. 30.

<sup>71</sup>Ng, "WAS JUNIA(S) IN ROM 16:7 A FEMALE APOSTLE? AND SO WHAT?" 527-528.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., n. 41, 528.

<sup>73</sup>Ray Schulz, "Which Text?" *Lutheran Theological Journal* 55, no. 3 (Dec. 2021): 159-163.

<sup>74</sup>Unfortunately, Thielman was not accessible for use during this project.

2018, Moo 2018).<sup>75</sup> Two commentators were in favor of an exclusive reading (Sherwood 2020, Yarbrough 2020) while two others were ambiguous on the matter (Hahn 2017, Spurgeon 2020).<sup>76</sup>

### The Rhetoric-Context Debate

It could be argued that Rhetoric-Context Debate and Syntax-Grammar Debate could be folded under a single category, the Inclusive/Exclusive Debate, as both are ultimately attempting to make conclusions about inclusivity and exclusivity. Such an action would, however, (1) ignore the paradigmatic shift from being philology focused to contextually focused, and (2) the diversity of thought in each category. Hence, it is best to make a distinction that recognizes the uniqueness of each approach in determining the apostolic status of Junia (and/or Andronicus, as regrettably he is omitted in most discourse).

Because the shift to rhetorical/contextual applications occurs predominantly after 2019, there is little to no historical debate on the subject. David Huttar, writing in 2009, can be credited with initiating the conversation. Huttar discusses the possible purposes of the greeting and description of Andronicus/Junia, the ranking of apostles, the order of the greetings, other possible evidence from Andronicus/Junia's descriptions, and possible parallel descriptions of other individuals in Rom. 16:7.<sup>77</sup> Of the above, Huttar finds all but the first two to be inconclusive. He identifies three groups impacted by the greetings in Romans 16 – Paul (who recommends himself and expresses warmth to his compatriots), the church (where praise should be aroused for these individuals), and Andronicus/Junia (who received the greetings as encouragement).<sup>78</sup> Huttar concludes, however, that “the designation of Andronicus as an apostle, that is, invoking the inclusive view, does not fit very

---

<sup>75</sup>Stanley Porter, *The Letter to the Romans* (United Kingdom, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2015); Michael Bird, *Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2016); Anthony Thiselton, *Discovering Romans: Content, Interpretation, Reception* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016); Frank Thielman, *Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2018)

<sup>76</sup>Aaron Sherwood, *Romans: A Structural, Thematic, and Exegetical Commentary* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2020). Robert Yarbrough, “Romans,” *ESV Expository Commentary*, ed. Ian Duguid, James Hamilton, Jay Sklar (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2020); Scott Hahn, *Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2017).

<sup>77</sup>Huttar, “Did Paul call Andronicus an apostle in Romans 16:7?” 756-760.

<sup>78</sup>Lin, “Junia: An Apostle before Paul,” 199-200.

well with any of the three potential purposes outlined above”<sup>79</sup> Paul also would have placed Andronicus and Junia’s apostleship first in his list of descriptors for them, because of its eminence. Finally, Paul would have not engaged in ranking apostles, which is inconsistent with the rest of his behavior.<sup>80</sup>

While Huttar began the discussion, Lin 2020 is the first major response given to his argument (albeit eleven years alter). She argues that Huttar has misunderstood the value/effectual power of rhetorical praise and how Paul viewed apostleship. It is this last point, however, that Lin seeks to turn around: the inclusivist view is strengthened by the way Paul sees apostles. She does this in two ways. Paul recognizes human institutions, but ultimately defends his apostolicity by divine authority, rather than the approval of others.<sup>81</sup> Therefore, it makes no sense “for him to describe Andronicus and Junia as “esteemed by the apostles,” which would introduce the authority of other apostles and legitimate their approval. It makes perfect sense... for Paul to acknowledge their apostolic status after establishing his relationship to them and their shared experience, which further justifies his own claims of apostleship and authority.”<sup>82</sup> Keener 2009 makes a similar argument.<sup>83</sup> Secondly, Lin argues that the phrase οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ is indicative of apostleship, based on its chronology and order of calling. Paul constantly emphasizes his place as the last and eschatological apostle, and the only other place Paul uses πρὸ ἐμοῦ is in reference to other apostles who were before him.<sup>84</sup> It is with these twin arguments that Lin furthers the Rhetoric-Context Debate.

Bartlett 2019 also employs contextual arguments. After identifying Andronicus and Junia as his relatives, Paul gives them a first commendation (fellow prisoners) and last commendation (in Christ before him). It would therefore be expected for the intermediate phrase to also be a point of praise. Yet, it is unlike Paul to consider association with the apostles as a point of praise. Being part of the apostles, on the other hand, would count as a commendation.

---

<sup>79</sup>Huttar, Did Paul call Andronicus an apostle in Romans 16:7?” 757

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., 758-760

<sup>81</sup>Lin, “Junia: An Apostle before Paul,” 199-204.

<sup>82</sup>Lin, “Junia: An Apostle before Paul,” 204.

<sup>83</sup>Keener, *Romans*, 186.

<sup>84</sup>Lin, “Junia: An Apostle before Paul,” 204-208.

While such thoughts are not conclusive, they trend toward the inclusive position, according to Bartlett.<sup>85</sup>

Ng 2020 disagrees with Lin's assessment. In response to the claim that Paul was reluctant to rely on human legitimation, Ng points out that Paul appealed to his acknowledgement by, and agreement with, the apostles at Jerusalem (Gal. 2:2). Moreover, in the less directly agonistic relationship that Paul has with the Roman audience, it is not out of the question for him to commend Junia based on "the esteem of the apostles." As for Lin's second argument, Ng replies that οἱ κῆρ is dealing with a new attribute of the individuals (namely, their earlier conversion), rather than their apostleship. Paul's other πρὸ ἐμοῦ usage (Gal. 1:17) is unpersuasive as well. Ng claims that the phrase is used adjectivally and clearly references apostles.<sup>86</sup>

Hartmann 2020 also disagrees with Lin. She responds to Lin's second argument by noting that the original audience most likely did not make the connection to the Corinthian and Galatians passages used by Lin. Instead, it is more probably that the original audience heard Andronicus and Junia's ministry as apostles and their seniority (though not necessarily superiority) to Paul.<sup>87</sup>

Stenschke 2020 argues that Paul's conflicting references to "women's functions" in Romans when taken together, and read in sequence, have a rhetorical function. They "show that, for Paul, the affirmation of traditional female roles and behaviour... and the new status, options and ministries of women in early Christian communities and missionary activities... are not mutually exclusive."<sup>88</sup> Such an idea better suits the purpose of Paul's letter.<sup>89</sup>

Lane 2021 is the latest to write on the Rhetoric-Context Debate. She takes a different angle than the previous interlocutors, instead focusing on the socio-rhetorical aspects of Rom. 16:1-16 and the ways this impacts women's leadership. To do so she analyzes the inner texture, intertexture, social and cultural texture,

---

<sup>85</sup>Bartlett, *Men and Women in Christ*, 382.

<sup>86</sup>Ng, "WAS JUNIA(S) IN ROM 16:7 A FEMALE APOSTLE? AND SO WHAT?" 527.

<sup>87</sup>Hartmann, "Junia – A Woman Lost in Translation," n. 22.

<sup>88</sup>Christoph Stenschke, "Paul's references to women in his letter to the Romans and their function in the argument of the letter: a modest proposal," *Neotestamentica* 54, no. 1 (2020): 39-40.

<sup>89</sup>*Ibid.*, 40.

ideological texture, and sacred texture of the passage.<sup>90</sup> The results of such an investigation concluded that “Women had formidable leadership roles in the Roman church structure... Women impact other women in leadership... Mutuality in discipleship and leadership for women and men.”<sup>91</sup>

### The Apostleship Debate

Ecclesiology and church governance are convoluted subjects, no matter which angle one approaches them from. This “messiness” extends to the debate over Junia as well, which can be easily overrun with numerous variables and complexities. Because the threat of information overload is imminent, we have decided to restrict our discussion to works that specifically contextualize “apostleship” to Rom. 16:7. Scholarly pieces deemed important or worthy outside of this range will be consulted when needed.<sup>92</sup>

The Apostleship Debate examines whether the word ἀπόστολος should be taken in its technical sense or in a broad sense. The former indicates membership in or authority on par with the Twelve, while the latter allows for flexibility in interpretation. David Shaw identifies a semantic range for the term (as used by Paul) involving six categories. (1) Paul himself, verified by his eyewitness, labors, and signs [Rom. 1:1, 1 Cor. 9:1-2, 2 Cor. 12:12] (2) Peter, James, and John as pillars of the church [Gal. 2:8-9] (3) Peter and the brothers of the Lord [1 Cor. 9:5] (4) Jesus appeared to Peter, the Twelve, five-hundred brothers, James, and “all the apostles” last of whom was Paul [1 Cor. 15:6-8] (5) Itinerant missionaries such as Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, and Apollos, who seem to be called apostles by inference (6) Messengers or emissaries for the church [2 Cor. 8:23, Phil. 2:25].<sup>93</sup> The first three categories denote the Twelve and Paul. Most debate occurs between categories four and five. There is nothing to keep an individual from

---

<sup>90</sup>Ca-Asia Lane, “Exploring the Dichotomy of Women in Ecclesial Leadership during the Pauline Mission: A Sociorhetorical Analysis of Romans 16:1–16 and 1 Corinthians 11:1–16 and 14:26–40,” PhD. diss., Regent University, 2021: 99-122.

<sup>91</sup>Lane, “Exploring the Dichotomy of Women in Ecclesial Leadership During the Pauline Mission,” 123.

<sup>92</sup>See general works on the title of apostle: Holger Mosbech, “Apostólos in the New Testament,” *ST* 2 (1948): 166-200; E. M. Kredel, “Der Apostelbegriff in der neueren Exegese,” *ZKT* 78 (1956); C. K. Barrett, *The Signs of an Apostle* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1972); J. A. Kirk, “Apostleship since Rengstorff,” *NTS* 21 (1975): 249-264.

<sup>93</sup>David Shaw, “Is Junia also among the apostles?: Romans 16:7 and recent debates.” *Churchman* 127, no. 2 (2013): 113-114.

being associated with multiple categories.<sup>94</sup> Sometimes authors use the categories interchangeably, which creates confusion.<sup>95</sup> Debate pre-2010 has mostly concerned the technical and broad connotations of “apostle,” and there have not been many dedicated works specific to Rom. 16:7 written on the subject (unlike with the Name-Gender and Syntax-Grammar Debates).

Post-2010 Apostleship Debate contains many of the same themes as the as the previous era, although it received much greater attention following the virtual consensus in the Name-Gender and Syntax-Grammar Debates. Unlike the previous sections, which have sought to follow a loose chronological order when presenting material, this section will group the debate into two different fields: “apostle” as indicating little to no authority and “apostle” as indicating some degree of authority. Grouping discourse in such a manner will help organize the diversity of arguments that exist in this category.

Schreiner 2018 points out that other members of the church had apostolic authority besides the Twelve, such as Paul, Barnabas, and James. The word *ἀπόστολος* is not necessarily a technical term, and most likely meant itinerant evangelist when applied to Junia. This is the sense it carries when used by the Apostolic Fathers. In this way Andronicus/Junia would not access the same degree of authority as James or Barnabas. Schreiner also notes the possibility that Junia could have directed her efforts primarily towards women. The reference to Junia as a coworker is scarcely grounds for women exercising authority over men, especially in context of 1 Tim. 2:12. Private teaching of men also does not necessitate Junia having apostolic office. While women regularly contributed to Christian missions, their focus could have been on other women, and their ministry in this manner would not have contradicted 1 Tim. 2.<sup>96</sup> Schreiner’s conclusions are supported by Matera 2010, Harding 2016, Harvey 2017, Fesko 2018, Spurgeon 2020, Reumann 2020, Sherwood 2020, and Yarbrough 2020.<sup>97</sup> Moo 2018 agrees, but adds that authoritative apostles were carefully circumscribed in the NT, of which Junia is not. It is unlikely that they are

---

<sup>94</sup>Ibid., 114-115.

<sup>95</sup>These categories for organizing Paul’s “views” on apostleship should not be thought of as sacrosanct, as many perhaps would disagree with Shaw’s arrangement. They prove useful, however, for sifting through the data, and should be thought of as heuristic for our purposes.

<sup>96</sup>Schreiner, *Romans*, 749.

<sup>97</sup>Frank Matera, *Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010); John Fesko, *Romans* (Dallas, GA: Tolle Lege Press, 2018); John Reuman, *Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2019).

messengers or emissaries, as Paul always specifies the source and purpose of an emissary's commission.<sup>98</sup> Shaw 2013 reaches similar conclusions but notes that (1) Junia's ministry should not be overlooked (2) That Junia didn't publicly teach men, per Chrysostom. She possibly specialized on women and private contexts (3) Paul doesn't provide a job description for apostle, therefore much of the work on the subject is conjecture. One should therefore prefer more explicit references to women's ministry in Scripture (1 Timothy, 1 Corinthians, etc.).<sup>99</sup>

Hahn 2017 and Osborne 2017 believe that Junia was an emissary or messenger based on Paul's words in 2 Cor. 8:23 and Phil. 2:25. Osborne further think that while Junia may have only been a representative/messenger, that this was still an office in the church, with Junia being outstanding in that regard.<sup>100</sup> On a different train of thought, Sanborn 2017 argues that even if Junia(s) was a female apostle, it does not prove that women should be ordained to teaching elder. Only men can take this role, apparently.<sup>101</sup>

Ng 2020 makes several arguments for why Junia could not be an apostle. (1) Arguments for female apostleship often commit two fallacies "(1) filling in gaps to magnify the contributions of the women in question; and (2) assuming the same ministry when two persons are given the same descriptors."<sup>102</sup> (2) Leadership titles in the Jewish Diaspora were sometimes honorary. (3) While Greco-Roman leadership culture was complex, it and early church ministries always had men at the helm. (4) Women's ministry in the early church and apocryphal writings always had constraints, they either taught women or taught in private, this is even true for Chrysostom. (5) Paul's purpose in Roman's was to recommend Phoebe, and he hoped that women would support her.<sup>103</sup>

Despite the thundering arguments made above, many authors disagree with the conclusions. Hultgren 2011 argues for understanding Junia as an apostle in the "strict sense." The fact that Paul took the term seriously when referencing himself indicates that he does not apply "apostle" lightly when he understands a

---

<sup>98</sup>Moo, *Romans*, 939-940.

<sup>99</sup>Shaw, "Is Junia also among the apostles?: Romans 16:7 and recent debates," 115-118.

<sup>100</sup>Grant Osborne, *Romans* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2017), .

<sup>101</sup>Sanborn, "A Review of Robert Jewett on Romans Part 3 Romans 13-16," np.

<sup>102</sup>Ng, "WAS JUNIA(S) IN ROM 16:7 A FEMALE APOSTLE? AND SO WHAT?" n. 43

<sup>103</sup>*Ibid.*, 528-531.



person(s) to have been commissioned by Christ. When the “broader” sense of apostle is used, it is always in reference to a specific place or purpose.<sup>104</sup> Hubnar 2013 points out the importance Paul places upon apostles, as they are the foundation the church is built on. It was a specially designated position of ministry described of Paul, James, Barnabas, etc. (as opposed to “messengers”). Paul was selective with this term, as he doesn’t even apply it to Timothy and Apollos. Despite common thought, there is nothing in the criteria of apostleship which restricts women.<sup>105</sup>

Hubnar, like Hultgren, is arguing for a “stronger sense” of apostle (as she rejects the term “technical” as an illegitimate category). Therefore, Andronicus and Junia should not be thought of as simply itinerant missionaries, who are not on the same level as the Twelve. Such ideas (1) don’t realize the temporary, limited purposes of the Twelve – not even Paul is on their level – “apostles” referred to a more expansive group of individuals (2) hierarchies within the apostolate is superficial conjecture (3) Being an itinerant missionary does necessitate that Junia did not have authority – as this is the same work Paul did (4) Paul elevates Junia and aligns himself with her. Because of these reasons, it is likely that Junia is an authoritative apostle.<sup>106</sup> Of the commentators, Kruse 2012 (not specified), Lancaster 2015, Porter 2015, Thiselton 2016 (not specified), Longenecker 2016 (not specified), and Belleville 2021 agree or are sympathetic to “Junia as leader,” although they are not always specific in their statements.<sup>107</sup>

There are some who argue for viewing Junia “broadly” as an itinerant evangelist, yet still affirm some form of a leadership trending role for her. Mathew 2013 disagrees with the “technical sense” of apostolicity (on par with the Twelve). Instead, Junia should be seen as part of the apostolic band in the broad sense. Paul vigorously defends his apostleship, noting criteria one would need to be considered the term: an encounter with Christ, divine commission, sufferings/strivings, and signs/works. Unless Paul found these criteria in Junia, he would not have applied the label “outstanding among the apostles” to her. Junia’s role is not specified, but her imprisonment indicates that she had a significant position in spreading the gospel. Mathew argues that an appropriate parallel for Junia and Andronicus would be Barnabas, Silas, and Apollos, who are also called

---

<sup>104</sup>Hultgren, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, 583-584.

<sup>105</sup>Jamin Hubnar, “A new case for female elders: an analytical reformed-evangelical approach,” ThD diss, University of South Africa, 2013, 397-400.

<sup>106</sup>*Ibid.*, 402-404.

<sup>107</sup>Sarah Lancaster, *Romans* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015).

apostles. Most likely, Junia and Andronicus might have been itinerant evangelists, representing a congregation.<sup>108</sup> Mathew also notes that Rom. 16:7 is nestled between greetings to other women leaders.<sup>109</sup>

Keener 2009, like Mathew, argues that Paul uses “apostles” in a broader sense. It does not mean merely “messengers” or “the Twelve.” Paul’s only other uses of “apostles” in Romans applies to himself. The term probably refers an agent commissioned by Christ, which implies special authorization and is normally accompanied by suffering/signs and wonders. Keener argues that given the culture, it is hard to ascertain the sphere of Junia’s ministry. It is possible that Andronicus and Junia each focused on ministry to their own genders.<sup>110</sup> Bartlett 2019 argues that the term apostle in the NT did not simply refer to the primary founding apostles. In both Acts and the Pauline corpus it extends to traveling evangelists and church planters. Relevant examples would be Barnabas, Apollos, and Silas. Paul was also considered an apostle in this “wider sense,” although his authority was similar to the Twelve and James. Andronicus and Junia were most likely included in the broader category of pioneer missionaries or missionary apostles. A natural reading of Rom. 16:7 indicates that Andronicus and Junia had a leading role as a missionary apostle, but this does not imply a settled position in church leadership structure.<sup>111</sup> As for the authority Junia carried, it was most likely comparable to that of Barnabas, Silas, or Apollos.<sup>112</sup> Stephenson 2009, McDonald 2019, and Garland 2021 concur that Junia was an itinerant evangelist, trending towards having some type of authority.<sup>113</sup>

Cohick 2009 argues that Andronicus and Junia might have been traveling missionaries. If this was the case, however, it is less likely that Paul would have used the definite article τοῖς in referring to the apostolic group which Junia/Andronicus belonged. This couple also met certain criteria laid out in the NT for apostleship.<sup>114</sup> “While the title carried a range of meanings, all but one

---

<sup>108</sup>Mathew, *Women in the Greetings of Romans 16.1-16*, 103-105.

<sup>109</sup>*Ibid.*, 103.

<sup>110</sup>Keener, *Romans*, 187.

<sup>111</sup>Bartlett, *Men and Women in Christ*, 377.

<sup>112</sup>Bartlett, *Men and Women in Christ*, 384.

<sup>113</sup>Margaret MacDonal, “Women in Pauline Churches,” *The Blackwell Companion to Paul*, ed. Stephen Westerholm, 268-285 (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2014).

<sup>114</sup>Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians*, 178.

New Testament reference (Phil. 2:25) suggest an authoritative figure in the community.”<sup>115</sup>

Peeler 2019 dances around the question, noting that Junia should be thought of as an apostle, but focuses on the uncontroversial aspects of her ministry.<sup>116</sup> Vymeister 2019 agrees with this method.<sup>117</sup> For other voices on the subject, see: Köstenberger 2000, Miller 2011, Adetunji and Olujide 2013, Williams 2014, Duff 2016, Schreiner and Köstenberger 2016, Westfall 2016, Muir 2019, Osiek 2019, Dzubinski and Stasson 2021, and Lee 2021.<sup>118</sup>

### Notes and Further Research

We will not attempt to adjudicate between the various positions on Junia. The purpose of this article was to uncover the development, breadth, and nuance associated with the debate since 2010, and we are satisfied with our result. Ultimately, the desire in constructing a literature review on “Junia in Rom. 16:7” was to encourage and assist further research in a winsome manner. With that background in mind, we will proceed to make notes and pose questions for further discussion. (1) The authors bias is toward the egalitarian position. (2) There are many quality essays concerning general topics [such as “Women in Ministry,”

---

<sup>115</sup>Ibid.

<sup>116</sup>Peeler, “Junia/Joanna: Herald of the Good News,” 284-285.

<sup>117</sup>Nancy Vyhmeister, “Junia the Apostle.” *Memory and Life*, (2013): 115.

<sup>118</sup>Andreas Köstenberger, “Women in the Pauline Mission,” *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul’s Mission*, eds. Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson, (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2000); J.D. Miller, “What can we say about Phoebe?” *Priscilla Papers* 25, no. 2 (2011), 16–21; VR Adetunji and E Olujide, “A Study of the Roles of Phoebe and Prisca in the Epistle to the Romans in the Context of the Methodist Church Nigeria.” *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* 3, no. 6 (2013): 132-138; Nancy Duff, “The ordination of women: biblical perspectives,” *Theology Today* 73, no. 2 (July 2016): 94-104; David Williams, *Junia: A Woman, An Apostle* (United Kingdom, Williams Press, 2014); Thomas Schreiner and Andreas Köstenberger, *Women in the Church (Third Edition): An Interpretation and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016. Cynthia Long Westfall, *Paul and Gender: Reclaiming the Apostle’s Vision for Men and Women in Christ* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016); Carolyn Osiek, “Leadership Roles and Early Christian Communities,” *The Oxford Handbook of New Testament, Gender, and Sexuality*, ed. Benjamin Dunning, 505-521 (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2019); Leanne Dzubinski, and Anneke Stasson, *Women in the Mission of the Church* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2021); Dorothy Lee, *The Ministry of Women in the New Testament: Reclaiming the Biblical Vision for Church Leadership* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2021).

etc.] that were not included because they did not meet the parameters. While not specific to the debate on Junia, and mostly tautological, they are no doubt an asset that one needs to consider if they desire to study the subject. (3) Concerning the Name-Gender Debate, current consensus is that Andronicus's counterpart in Rom. 16:7 is the feminine "Junia" (4) Concerning the Syntax-Grammar Debate, current consensus is for the inclusive view "prominent among the apostles." It should be noted that several parties dissent from this conclusion (5) Concerning the Rhetoric-Context Debate, it is still too young a field to declare a winner. Currently, despite Ng's best efforts, Lin 2020's arguments are the standard. They are even being included in contemporary commentaries.<sup>119</sup> (6) Concerning the Apostleship Debate, this is where one finds the most vigorous disagreement.

(7) Two positions can be vaguely discerned in the debate: limiting women in ministry and delimiting women in ministry. (8) The former is not always caught up with consensus, as certain authors (Zell 2014, Harding 2016, Sanborn 2017, Spurgeon 2020) still reference debates/conclusions from thirty years ago that are typically rejected by all sides. The latter is too comfortable with consensus, as important pieces like Wolters 2008, Huttar 2009, Burer 2015, and Ng 2020 have gone mostly unaddressed. (9) The quantity of writings in favor of women in ministry far outweigh those who advocate for limits. (10) Many portions of this debate were conjecture based (11) An underdeveloped aspect of this debate is the socio-rhetorical and contextual dynamics. Further research should be done to alleviate this disparity

(12) The authority and weight of patristic commentators seems to be assumed. Why is the opinion of church fathers decisive in determining an outcome? What is the relation between them and the interpretation of Scripture? Are they primary or supporting arguments? Are their views fleshed out or presumed? More study should be done on the specifics and presumptions that go into patristic application. (12) Most authors seem satisfied with conceptualizing authority on a "Y-axis" scale. "Authority" manifests itself on a monolithic standard, where one can be said to be functionally "above another." Must leadership be seen in this strict and rigid structure? Could it not have more fluid aspects to it (Z and X axis's, per se)? Is it anachronistic to think that Paul had such formal structures in mind when writing Romans? Men and women's leadership in Greco-Roman times had many complexities to it. Authors and audiences might have cared less about the gender of their leaders and more about how that person could contribute to the growth of Christ's body. Anachronism and our conceptualization of leadership structures should see more research.

(13) Despite their best efforts, it does not appear that Rom. 16:7 alone will turn the tide in favor of delimiting women in ministry. This is in part because of

---

<sup>119</sup>See Garland, *Romans*, 297o.

the complexity and role of conjecture in determining Junia's apostleship. It should be combined with other arguments in further discussions. (14) Most authors who discuss Junia's apostleship don't contextualize their conclusions to other leadership discourses (1 Timothy and 1 Corinthians, etc.). What does Junia's apostleship mean or not mean in these other debates?

(15) Esther Ng's article is the latest and most challenging to egalitarian points of view. While not insurmountable by any measure, Ng launches a comprehensive and intelligent defense of limiting Junia. She also enjoys the position of being the most recent, well-written article on the subject, helping her frame all previous discussion (which is something Ng does well). Further research on Junia should involve the inclusion of and response to the arguments made by Ng. (16) Those in favor of limiting women in ministry tend to argue that Andronicus and Junia were itinerant evangelists/missionaries, yet don't take the discussion any further. This has opened room for those in favor of delimiting women in ministry to contend that such a task necessitated or involved public leadership. (17) Egalitarians should find answers to "Junia may have been an apostle, but she primarily worked with women. This was how the patristic commentators viewed women's leadership." (18) Finally, Melanie Howard has a fitting quote concerning this entire project,

On its face, the Junia debate proports to be a scholarly conversation about philology or early Christian leadership practices. However, this superficial view belies the deeply ideological and theological substratum of the debate. That is, it is notable that many of the scholarly views opposing an identification of Junia as a female apostle are being published within the more theologically conservative space of the *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*. This suggests that the debate, then, is likely being motivated by theological and ideological presuppositions to a greater degree than what may appear at face value.<sup>120</sup>

One last word will be noted about reconciliation. Unfortunately, a byproduct of the vicissitudes between egalitarians and complementarians on the Junia debate has been an ignorance of women's contributions in ministry. Despite both sides claiming to celebrate feminine labors, the silence is resounding. Such action is merely a confirmation of the violent erasure women have received throughout church history, of which the Junia debate is a mere microcosm. No matter what generation, God has always called women to propagate the good

---

<sup>120</sup>Melanie Howard, "Recent Feminist Approaches to Interpreting the New Testament," *Currents in Biblical Research* 20, no. 1 (2021): 75.

things of the gospel and serve Him faithfully.<sup>121</sup> This certainly true of Junia, who was intimately praised by Paul for her efforts and suffering. The lack of recognition for the work of women, whether one thinks it comes under the context of male authority or not, is disgraceful. Reconciliation or conciliation, as forcefully stated by Lecrae Moore, requires “defrauded parties to be made whole. Not just apologizing for the offense.”<sup>122</sup> A wrong has been rendered unto Junia, which the community has the obligation to genuinely repair.<sup>123</sup> The academy and church has co-opted Junia for a broader theological debate, creating a semiotic specter divorced from embodied personhood and striving. Amy Peeler states it best:

If it is correct that Paul’s use of “apostle” indicates neither the twelve alone nor every Christian, and if his view is that the apostles had to have seen the risen Christ (1 Cor. 9:1; 15:8), been called by God (Rom. 1:1; 1 Cro. 1:1; Gal. 1:1), and set apart for a particular ministry (Rom. 11:13; 1 Cor. 12:28-29) of evangelism and discipleship (9:1) accompanied by miraculous deeds (2 Cor. 12:12), then it seems rather uncontroversial to imagine what Junia might have done in the early church... Readers of the text today do not know what she thought or practiced about such things like authoritative public teaching of men, but we know what she thought about Christ and his very good news... all Christian women and men, indebted to her work, bear the responsibility to carry out the same gospel mission still.

No matter the differences, both complementarians and egalitarians can give praise to God for the good things He has done through his servant Junia. Hopefully this paper serves as an example of a new direction in the Junia debate, one that seeks to explore the issue fully and fairly while recognizing the work of all God’s servants.

## Conclusion

---

<sup>121</sup>Dzubinski and Stasson, *Women in the Mission of the Church*, 2.

<sup>122</sup>“Facts,” track 2 of Lecrae Moore, *All Things Work Together*, Reach Records/Columbia Records N/A, 2017, digital media.

<sup>123</sup>Even if one thinks that Junia is a male, hopefully, they can still affirm the ethic of celebrating the wonderful ministry of both women and those who have been forgotten. Some might think that Junia is “well-known” to the apostles. She is still well-known for her outstanding ministry!

The Junia debate in Rom. 16:7 is an ongoing project. It presents flavor, depth, and nuance which transcends multiple academic disciplines. As an intersection between philology, hermeneutics, feminist theory, gender, church history, ministry, ecclesiology, philosophy, social sciences, literary studies, biblical studies, etc., the discussion on Junia has unique potential to further each field. Despite this potential, theological and ideological presuppositions control the direction of the debate, which can hurt its evolution. The present article attempted a literature review of Junia as a female apostle, beginning at the year 2010. It separated discourse into four categories: the Name-Gender Debate, the Syntax-Grammar Debate, the Rhetoric-Context Debate, and the Apostleship Debate. After examining the corresponding articles, notes and further research questions were given for deliberation. Finally, we suggest a new direction for the debate: the reconciliation of Junia in ministry.

### Bibliography

- Adetunji, VR, and E Olujide. "A Study of the Roles of Phoebe and Prisca in the Epistle to the Romans in the Context of the Methodist Church Nigeria." *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* 3, no. 6 (2013): 132-138.
- Arzt-Grabner, Peter. "Junia oder Iunias? Zum textkritischen Hintergrund von Röm 16,7." *Liebe zum Wort*, ed. Friedrich Reiterer, Petrus Eder, Ludger Bernhard, 83-102. Salzburg, Wien: Otto Müller Verlag, 1993.
- Barrett, C.K. *The Signs of an Apostle*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1972.
- Bartlett, Adam. *Men and Women in Christ*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Academic, 2020.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Gospel Women : Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Belleville, Linda. "Ἰουνίαν ... ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις: A Re-examination of Romans 16.7 in Light of Primary Source Materials," *New Testament Studies* 51, no. 2(2005): 231-49.
- Belleville, Linda. "Women Leaders in the Bible." *Discovering Biblical Equality: Biblical, Theological, Cultural, and Practical Perspectives*, ed. Ronald Pierce, Cynthia Westfall, and Christa McKirland. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2021.

- Bird, Michael. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2016.
- Bray, Gerald. *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament VI Romans*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1998.
- Brooten, Bernadette. "'Junia ... outstanding among the apostles' (Romans 16:7)" *Women Priests*, edited by Bernadette Brooten, L.J. Swindler, and Arlene Swindler. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1977.
- Burer, Michael. "'ΕΠΙΣΗΜΟΙ ἘΝ ΤΟΙΣ ἈΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΙΣ IN ROM 16:7 AS 'WELL KNOWN TO THE APOSTLES': FURTHER DEFENSE AND NEW EVIDENCE." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 58, no. 4 (Dec. 2015): 731-755.
- Burer, Michael, and Daniel Wallace. "Was Junia really an apostle?: a re-examination of Rom 16.7." *New Testament Studies* 47, no. 1 (Jan. 2001): 76-91.
- Cervin, Richard. "A Note Regarding the Name 'Junia(s)' in Romans 16.7." *New Testament Studies* 40, no. 3 (1994): 464-470.
- Cohick, Lynn. *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2009.
- Clark, Constantina. "Exploring the True Identity of Junia: Prominent among the Apostles." *Journal of Early Christian History* 8, no. 3 (2018): 96-106.
- Croft, Stephen. "Text Messages: The Ministry of Women and Romans 16," *Anvil* 21 (2004): 91-92.
- Duff, Nancy. "The ordination of women: biblical perspectives." *Theology Today* 73, no. 2 (July 2016): 94-104.
- Dzubinski, Leanne, and Anneke Stasson. *Women in the Mission of the Church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2021.
- Epp, Eldon. *Junia: The First Woman Apostle*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2005.
- Fesko, John. *Romans*. Dallas, GA: Tolle Lege Press, 2018.



- Fitzmyer, Joseph. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1993.
- Garland, David. *Romans: An Introduction and Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2021.
- Grudem, Wayne. *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More than One Hundred Disputed Questions*. Sisters, OR: Multnomah, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More than One Hundred Disputed Questions*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012.
- Grudem, Wayne, and John Piper. *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991.
- Grudem, Wayne, and John Piper. "An Overview of Central Concerns." *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (Revised Edition)*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem, 57-90. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2020.
- Gupta, Nijay. "Reconstructing Junia's Imprisonment: Examining a Neglected Pauline Comment in Romans 16:7." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 47, no. 4 (2020): 385-397.
- Hahn, Scott. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2017.
- Harding, Michael. "Female Apostleship in Romans 16:7." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 21, (2016): 59-86.
- Hartmann, Andrea. "Junia – A Woman Lost in Translation: The Name IOYNIAN in Romans 16:7 and its History of Interpretation." *Open Theology* 6, no. 1 (2020): 646-660.
- Harvey, John. *Romans*. Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2017.
- Hodge, Charles. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. New York, NY: Hodder and Stoughton, 1983.
- Howard, Melanie. "Recent Feminist Approaches to Interpreting the New Testament." *Currents in Biblical Research* 20, no. 1 (2021).

- Hubnar, Jamin. "A new case for female elders: an analytical reformed-evangelical approach." ThD diss, University of South Africa, 2013.
- Hultgren, Arland. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Hurley, James. *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1981.
- Huttar, David. "Did Paul call Andronicus an apostle in Romans 16:7?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 52, no. 4 (2009): 747-778.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Short Commentary*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Keener, Craig. *Romans*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2009.
- Kirk, J.A. "Apostleship since Rengstorff." *NTS* 21, (1975): 249-264.
- Köstenberger, Andreas. "Women in the Pauline Mission." *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul's Mission*, eds. Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson, (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2000.
- Kredel, E.M. "Der Apostelbegriff in der neueren Exegese." *ZKT* 78, (1956).
- Kruse, Colin. *Paul's Letter the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Lampe, Peter. *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Roman Christians of Romans 16." *The Romans Debate*, ed. K.P. Donfried, 216-230. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1991.
- Lancaster, Sarah. *Romans*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015.
- Lane, Ca-Asia. "Exploring the Dichotomy of Women in Ecclesial Leadership during the Pauline Mission: A Sociorhetorical Analysis of Romans 16:1–16 and 1 Corinthians 11:1–16 and 14:26–40." PhD. diss., Regent University, 2021.

- Lee, Dorothy. *The Ministry of Women in the New Testament: Reclaiming the Biblical Vision for Church Leadership*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2021.
- Lin, Yii-Jan. "Junia: An Apostle before Paul." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 139, no. 1 (2020): 191-209.
- Longnecker, R.N. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016.
- MacDonald, Margaret. "Women in Pauline Churches." *The Blackwell Companion to Paul*, ed. Stephen Westerholm, 268-285. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2014.
- Malms, Mats. "Gendered Philology: The Apostle Junia/s in Scandinavian Bible Translation." *History of Humanities* 2, no. 2 (2017): 459-471.
- Matera, Frank. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Mathew, Susan. *Women in the Greetings of Romans 16.1-16*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013.
- McKnight, Scot. *Junia Is Not Alone*. Englewood, CO: Patheos Press, 2011.
- Miller, J.D. "What can we say about Phoebe?" *Priscilla Papers* 25, no. 2 (2011), 16-21.
- Moo, Douglas. *The Letter to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2018.
- Moore, Lecrae. "Facts." Track 3 on *All Things Work Together*. Reach Records/Columbia Records N/A, 2017, digital media.
- Mosbech, Holger. "Apostólos in the New Testament." *ST* 2, (1948): 166-200.
- Moulton, James, and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Muir, Elizabeth. *A Women's History of the Christian Church*. New York, NY: University of Toronto Press, 2019.
- Ng, Esther. "WAS JUNIA(S) IN ROM 16:7 A FEMALE APOSTLE? AND SO WHAT?" *Journal of the Evangelical Society* 63, no. 3 (2022): 517-533.

- Nicole, Roger. "Biblical Egalitarianism and the Inerrancy of Scripture," *Priscilla Papers* 20.2 (2006): 7.
- Osiek, Carolyn. "Leadership Roles and Early Christian Communities." *The Oxford Handbook of New Testament, Gender, and Sexuality*, ed. Benjamin Dunning, 505-521. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Peeler, Amy. "Junia/Joanna: Herald of the Good News." *Vindicating the Vixens*, ed. Sandra Glahn. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2017.
- Peppiatt, Lucy. *Rediscovering Scripture's Vision for Women: Fresh Perspectives on Disputed Texts*. Downers Grove, IL: Downers Grove, 2019.
- 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." *New Testament Studies* 42, no. 3 (1996): 477-478.
- Porter, Stanley. *The Letter to the Romans*. United Kingdom, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2015.
- Preato, Dennis. "Junia, a Female Apostle: An Examination of the Historical Record." *Priscilla Papers* 33, no. 2 (Spring 2019): 8-15.
- Reuman, John. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2019.
- Sanborn, Scott. "A Review of Robert Jewett on Romans Part 3 Romans 13-16." *Kerux* 32, no. 1 (May 2017): 23-52.
- Schreiner, Thomas. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2018.
- Schreiner, Thomas, and Andreas Köstenberger, *Women in the Church (Third Edition): An Interpretation and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016.
- Schulz, Ray. "Romans 16:7: Junia or Junias?" *Expository Times* 98, no. 4 (1987): 108-110.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Which Text?" *Lutheran Theological Journal* 55, no. 3 (Dec. 2021): 159-163.

- Shaw, David. "Is Junia also among the apostles?: Romans 16:7 and recent debates." *Churchman* 127, no. 2 (2013): 105-118.
- Sherwood, Aaron. *Romans: A Structural, Thematic, and Exegetical Commentary*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2020.
- Spurgeon, Andrew. *Romans*. Cave Creek, AZ: Langham Publishing, 2020.
- Stephenson, Hope. "Junia: woman and apostle." *Women in the Biblical World: A Survey of Old and New Testament Perspectives*, ed. Elizabeth McCabe, 122-136. Lanham, MD: University Press of American, 2009.
- Stenschke, Christoph. "Paul's references to women in his letter to the Romans and their function in the argument of the letter: a modest proposal." *Neotestamentica* 54, no. 1 (2020): 1-45.
- Thielman, Frank. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2018.
- Thiselton, Anthony. *Discovering Romans: Content, Interpretation, Reception*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Junia: The First Woman Apostle." *Ecclesiology* 5, no. 2 (2009): 266-267.
- Thorley, John. "Junia, A Woman Apostle." *Novum Testamentum* 38, no. 1 (1996): 18-29.
- Vyhmeister, Nancy. "Junia the Apostle." *Memory and Life*, (2013): 115.
- Westfall, Cynthia Long. *Paul and Gender: Reclaiming the Apostle's Vision for Men and Women in Christ*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016.
- Williams, David. *Junia: A Woman, An Apostle*. United Kingdom, Williams Press, 2014.
- Wolters, Al. "IOYNIAN(Romans 16:7) and the Hebrew Name Yēhunnī." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127, no. 2 (2008): 397-408.
- Wright, N.T. "It's About the Bible, Not Fake Ideas of Progress." *The Times* (United Kingdom), Nov. 23, 2012.

Yarbrough, Robert. "Romans." *ESV Expository Commentary*, ed. Ian Duguid, James Hamilton, Jay Sklar. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2020.

Zell, Paul. "Exegetical Brief: Romans 16: 1, 7 Phoebe, a Deacon? Junia, an Apostle?" *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 111, no.2 (2014): 102-107.

### Extended Bibliography

Adetunji, VR, and E Olujide. "A Study of the Roles of Phoebe and Prisca in the Epistle to the Romans in the Context of the Methodist Church Nigeria." *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* 3, no. 6 (2013): 132-138.

Andria, Solomon. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011.

Arzt-Grabner, Peter. "Iunia oder Iunias? Zum textkritischen Hintergrund von Röm 16,7." *Liebe zum Wort*, ed. Friedrich Reiterer, Petrus Eder, Ludger Bernhard, 83-102. Salzburg, Wien: Otto Müller Verlag, 1993.

Barrett, C.K. *The Signs of an Apostle*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1972.

Bartlett, Adam. *Men and Women in Christ*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Academic, 2020.

Barton, John, and John Muddiman. *Romans*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Baukhham, Richard. *Gospel Women : Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.

Belleville, Linda. "Ἰουνίαν ... επίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις: A Re-examination of Romans 16.7 in Light of Primary Source Materials," *New Testament Studies* 51, no. 2(2005): 231-49.

Belleville, Linda. "Women Leaders in the Bible." *Discovering Biblical Equality: Biblical, Theological, Cultural, and Practical Perspectives*, ed. Ronald Pierce, Cynthia Westfall, and Christa McKirland. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2021.

Bieringer, R. "Women and leadership in Romans 16: the leading roles of Phoebe, Prisca, and Junia in early Christianity." *East Asian Pastoral Review* 44, no. 3 (2007): 221-237.

- Bird, Michael. *Bourgeois Babes, Bossy Wives, and Bobby Haircuts: A Case for Gender Equality in Ministry*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2016.
- Bo-young, Kang. "Exegetical considerations for understanding the scope of Paul's concept of 'Apostology'." *Mission Network* 5, no. 1 (2014):17-53.
- Bray, Gerald. *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament VI Romans*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1998.
- Brooten, Bernadette. "'Junia ... outstanding among the apostles' (Romans 16:7)" *Women Priests*, edited by Bernadette Brooten, L.J. Swindler, and Arlene Swindler. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1977.
- Burer, Michael. "'ΕΠΙΣΗΜΟΙ ἘΝ ΤΟΙΣ ἈΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΙΣ IN ROM 16:7 AS 'WELL KNOWN TO THE APOSTLES': FURTHER DEFENSE AND NEW EVIDENCE." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 58, no. 4 (Dec. 2015): 731-755.
- Burer, Michael, and Daniel Wallace. "Was Junia really an apostle?: a re-examination of Rom 16.7." *New Testament Studies* 47, no. 1 (Jan. 2001): 76-91.
- Caldwell, Kristen. "When Phoebe, Pricilla and Junia arrive at Ephesus: three women who defied three prohibitions." *Ashland Theological Journal* 44, (2012):39-55.
- Cervin, Richard. "A Note Regarding the Name 'Junia(s)' in Romans 16.7." *New Testament Studies* 40, no. 3 (1994): 464-470.
- Clark, Constantina. "Exploring the True Identity of Junia: Prominent among the Apostles." *Journal of Early Christian History* 8, no. 3 (2018): 96-106.
- Cobb, L.S. "Women's Leadership in the Early Church: Possibilities and Pushbacks." *Frontiers in Spiritual Leadership*, ed. Allison, S.T., Kocher, C.T., Goethals, G.R. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Cohick, Lynn. *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2009.

- Croft, Stephen. "Text Messages: The Ministry of Women and Romans 16," *Anvil* 21 (2004): 91-92.
- Curtis, Heath. "A female apostle?: a note re-examining the work of Burer and Wallace concerning επιστημος with εν and the dative." *Concordia Journal* 28, no. 4 (Oct. 2002): 437-440.
- Del Verme, Marcello. "Christian women of the Pauline communities in their historical, socio-cultural, and religious contexts: the "case of Junia" (Rm 16:7)." *Rivista Biblica* 58, no. 4 (2010): 439-468.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "La' donna-apostolo': il caso di Giunia (Rm 16,7) nel contesto/scenario delle donne all'interno dei gruppi protocristiani." *Bibbia e Oriente* 51, no. 2 (2009): 147-174.
- Doriani, Daniel. *Romans*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2021.
- Duff, Nancy. "The ordination of women: biblical perspectives." *Theology Today* 73, no. 2 (July 2016): 94-104.
- Dzubinski, Leanne, and Anneke Stasson. *Women in the Mission of the Church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2021.
- Epp, Eldon. *Junia: The First Woman Apostle*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minor Textual Variants in Romans 16:7." *Transmission and Reception*, ed. By Jeff Childers, David Parker, Carroll Osburn, 123-141. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Text-critical, exegetical, and socio-cultural factors affecting the Junia/Junias variation in Romans 16,7." *New Testament textual criticism and exegesis*, J. Leuven, 227-291. Peeters, 2002.
- Fesko, John. *Romans*. Dallas, GA: Tolle Lege Press, 2018.
- Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "The Apostleship of Women in Early Christianity." *Women Priests: A Catholic Commentary on the Vatican Declaration*, ed. Leonard Swidler and Arlene Swidler, 135-40. New York, NY: Paulist, 1977.



- Fitzmyer, Joseph. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1993.
- Foster, Paul. "Junia - female and an apostle." *The Expository Times* 117, no. 9 (2006): 371-372.
- Funkschmidt, Kai. "'Junia Heute' - Basisinitiative Für Frauenordination in Der Neupostolischen Kirche Gegründet." *Materialdienst* 83, no. 3 (2020): 219-222.
- Garland, David. *Romans: An Introduction and Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2021.
- Giles, Kevin. "Apostles before and after Paul." *Churchman* 99, no. 3 (1985): 241-256.
- Grenz, Stanley. *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1995.
- Grudem, Wayne. *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More than One Hundred Disputed Questions*. Sisters, OR: Multnomah, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More than One Hundred Disputed Questions*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012.
- Grudem, Wayne, and John Piper. *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991.
- Grudem, Wayne, and John Piper. "An Overview of Central Concerns." *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (Revised Edition)*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem, 57-90. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2020.
- Gupta, Nijay. "Reconstructing Junia's Imprisonment: Examining a Neglected Pauline Comment in Romans 16:7." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 47, no. 4 (2020): 385-397.
- Hahn, Scott. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2017.
- Harding, Michael. "Female Apostleship in Romans 16:7." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 21, (2016): 59-86.

- Hartmann, Andrea. "Junia – A Woman Lost in Translation: The Name IOYNIAN in Romans 16:7 and its History of Interpretation." *Open Theology* 6, no. 1 (2020): 646-660.
- Harvey, John. *Romans*. Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2017.
- Heim, Erin. "Women in the Pauline Tradition: Lessons from the Jesus Tradition." *Who Created Christianity? Fresh Approaches to the Relationship Between Paul and Jesus*, Craig Evans and Aaron White. Peabody, MA: Hendrikson, 2020.
- Hodge, Charles. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. New York, NY: Hodder and Stoughton, 1983.
- Hodges, Zane. *Romans*. Denton, TX: Grace Evangelical Society, 2013.
- Howard, Melanie. "Recent Feminist Approaches to Interpreting the New Testament." *Currents in Biblical Research* 20, no. 1 (2021).
- Hubnar, Jamin. "A new case for female elders: an analytical reformed-evangelical approach." ThD diss, University of South Africa, 2013.
- Hultgren, Arland. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Hurley, James. *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1981.
- Huttar, David. "Did Paul call Andronicus an apostle in Romans 16:7?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 52, no. 4 (2009): 747-778.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Short Commentary*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Keener, Craig. *Paul, Women, and Wives*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Romans*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2009.

- Kelter, Gert. "Junia(s) - Die "umstrittene Figur": Kritische Anmerkungen Zu Einer Angeblich Neuen Erkenntnis." *Lutherische Beiträge* 18, no. 1 (2013): 40-50.
- Kirk, J.A. "Apostleship since Rengstorff." *NTS* 21, (1975): 249-264.
- Köstenberger, Andreas. "Women in the Pauline Mission." *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul's Mission*, eds. Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson, (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2000).
- Kredel, E.M. "Der Apostelbegriff in der neueren Exegese." *ZKT* 78, (1956).
- Kruse, Colin. *Paul's Letter the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Lampe, Peter. *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Junia/Iunias: Sklavenherkunft im Kreise der vorpaulinischen Apostel (Röm 167)." *ZNW* 76, (1985): 132-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Roman Christians of Romans 16." *The Romans Debate*, ed. K.P. Donfried, 216-230. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1991.
- Lancaster, Sarah. *Romans*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2015.
- Lane, Ca-Asia. "Exploring the Dichotomy of Women in Ecclesial Leadership during the Pauline Mission: A Sociorhetorical Analysis of Romans 16:1–16 and 1 Corinthians 11:1–16 and 14:26–40." PhD. diss., Regent University, 2021.
- Lee, Dorothy. *The Ministry of Women in the New Testament: Reclaiming the Biblical Vision for Church Leadership*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2021.
- Lin, Yii-Jan. "Junia: An Apostle before Paul." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 139, no. 1 (2020): 191-209.
- Lohse, Eduard. "Der Brief an die Römer," *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament - Band 004*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.

- Longnecker, R.N. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016.
- MacDonald, Margaret. "Women in Pauline Churches." *The Blackwell Companion to Paul*, ed. Stephen Westerholm, 268-285. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2014.
- Malms, Mats. "Gendered Philology: The Apostle Junia/s in Scandinavian Bible Translation." *History of Humanities* 2, no. 2 (2017): 459-471.
- Matera, Frank. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Mathew, Susan. *Women in the Greetings of Romans 16.1-16*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013.
- McKnight, Scot. *Junia Is Not Alone*. Englewood, CO: Patheos Press, 2011.
- Middendorf, Michael. *Romans 9-16*. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 2016.
- Miller, J.D. "What can we say about Phoebe?" *Priscilla Papers* 25, no. 2 (2011), 16-21.
- Moore, Lecrae. "Facts." Track 3 on *All Things Work Together*. Reach Records/Columbia Records N/A, 2017, digital media.
- Moo, Douglas. *The Letter to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2018.
- Mosbech, Holger. "Apostólos in the New Testament," *ST* 2, (1948): 166-200.
- Moulton, James, and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Muir, Elizabeth. *A Women's History of the Christian Church*. New York, NY: University of Toronto Press, 2019.
- Ng, Esther. "WAS JUNIA(S) IN ROM 16:7 A FEMALE APOSTLE? AND SO WHAT?" *Journal of the Evangelical Society* 63, no. 3 (2022): 517-533.
- Nicole, Roger. "Biblical Egalitarianism and the Inerrancy of Scripture," *Priscilla Papers* 20.2 (2006): 7.

- Osiek, Carolyn. "Leadership Roles and Early Christian Communities." *The Oxford Handbook of New Testament, Gender, and Sexuality*, ed. Benjamin Dunning, 505-521. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Peeler, Amy. "Junia/Joanna: Herald of the Good News." *Vindicating the Vixens*, ed. Sandra Glahn. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2017.
- Pederson, Rena. *The Lost Apostle*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2006.
- Peppard, Michael. "Junia, Phoebe, and Prisca in Early Christian Rome." *Doctrine and Life* 69, no. 1 (2019): 2-11.
- Peppiatt, Lucy. *Rediscovering Scripture's Vision for Women: Fresh Perspectives on Disputed Texts*. Downers Grove, IL: Downers Grove, 2019.
- Peterson, David. *Romans*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2020.
- Peterson, David. *Romans*. Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2017.
- 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." *New Testament Studies* 42, no. 3 (1996): 477-478.
- Porter, Stanley. *The Letter to the Romans*. United Kingdom, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2015.
- Preato, Dennis. "Junia, a Female Apostle: An Examination of the Historical Record." *Priscilla Papers* 33, no. 2 (Spring 2019): 8-15.
- Pramanik, Sushana. "Re-visioning the ministry of women in Rom 16: a socio-cultural reflection." *Religion and Society* 59, no. 2 (2014): 54-74.
- Ramelli, Ilaria. "What was the role of women in the churches?" *T&T Clark Handbook of the Early Church*, edited Ilaria Ramelli, J.A. McGuckin, and Piotr Ashwin-Siejkowski. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2021.
- Reuman, John. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2019.
- Richardson, Peter. "From Apostles to Romans 16 and the of Women in the Early Church." *University of Toronto Press* 2, no. 2 (Sept. 1986): 232-261.

- Rivier, Gabrielle, Eldon Epp, and John Jackson. *Junia: Une Femme Apôtre Ressuscitée Par L'exégèse*. Genève: Labor et fides, 2014.
- Sanborn, Scott. "A Review of Robert Jewett on Romans Part 3 Romans 13-16." *Kerux* 32, no. 1 (May 2017): 23-52.
- Sasagu, Arai. "One the Apostle "Junia(s)" in Rom. 16:7." *Transactions of the Japan Academy* 59, no. 3 (2005): 185-198.
- Scaer, David. "Was Junias a female apostle?: maybe not." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 73, no. 1 (Jan. 2009): 76.
- Schnabel, Eckhard. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer, Kapitel 6-16: Historisch-Theologische Auslegung*. Witten: Brunnen, 2016.
- Schreiner, Thomas. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2018.
- Schreiner, Thomas, and Andreas Köstenberger, *Women in the Church (Third Edition): An Interpretation and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016.
- Schroder, Anke. "Junia. Römer 16." *Die besten Nebenrollen*, (2006): 272-276.
- Schulz, Ray. "Junia Reinstated: Her Sisters Still Waiting." *Lutheran Theological Journal* 38, no. 3 (2004): 129-143.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Romans 16:7: Junia or Junias?" *Expository Times* 98, no. 4 (1987): 108-110.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Twentieth-century Corruption of Scripture." *The Expository Times* 119, no. 6 (2008): 270-274.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Which Text?" *Lutheran Theological Journal* 55, no. 3 (Dec. 2021): 159-163.
- Shaw, David. "Is Junia also among the apostles?: Romans 16:7 and recent debates." *Churchman* 127, no. 2 (2013): 105-118.
- Sherwood, Aaron. *Romans: A Structural, Thematic, and Exegetical Commentary*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2020.

- Sotill, Wolfgang. "Maria, Junia Und Priska: In Der Urkirche Gab Es Viele Frauen, Nur Sind Sie Bis Heute Unbekannt." *Abrahams Kinder* 2016: 48-49.
- Spurgeon, Andrew. *Romans*. Cave Creek, AZ: Langham Publishing, 2020.
- Stephenson, Hope. "Junia: woman and apostle." *Women in the Biblical World: A Survey of Old and New Testament Perspectives*, ed. Elizabeth McCabe, 122-136. Lanham, MD: University Press of American, 2009.
- Stenschke, Christoph. "Paul's references to women in his letter to the Romans and their function in the argument of the letter: a modest proposal." *Neotestamentica* 54, no. 1 (2020): 1-45.
- Szabados, Adam. "AZ APOSTOLOK HAGYOMÁNYA: AZ APOSTOLI TEKINTÉLY ÉS AZ EGYHÁZ LEGKORÁBBI HAGYOMÁNYÁNAK KAPCSOLATA." Diss., Budapest, 2018.
- Theobald, M. "Phoebe und Junia. Zwei biblische Frauen-ohne Heimatrecht in der römisch-katholischen Kirche?" *Jesus, Kirche und das Heil der Anderen*, 2013.
- Thielman, Frank. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2018.
- Thiselton, Anthony. *Discovering Romans: Content, Interpretation, Reception*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Junia: The First Woman Apostle." *Ecclesiology* 5, no. 2 (2009): 266-267.
- Thorley, John. "Junia, A Woman Apostle. " *Novum Testamentum* 38, no. 1 (1996): 18-29.
- Uzukwu, Gesila. *The Oneness of the Believers: Studying Rom 16,1-16 in the Light of Gal 3,28*. Leuven, Peeters, 2009.
- Vyhmeister, Nancy. "Junia the Apostle." *Memory and Life*, (2013): 115.
- Walters, James. "Phoebe and Junia(s)-Rom. 16:1-2,7," *Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity*, ed. Carroll Osburn. Joplin, Missouri: College Press, 1995.

- Westfall, Cynthia Long. *Paul and Gender: Reclaiming the Apostle's Vision for Men and Women in Christ*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Der Brief and die Römer*. EKKNT 6. Studienausgabe. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlagsgesellschaft; Mannheim: Patmos, 2010.
- Williams, David. *Junia: A Woman, An Apostle*. United Kingdom, Williams Press, 2014.
- Winter, Brian. *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Witherington, Ben. "Joanna: apostle of the Lord--or jailbait?" *Biblical Worldview* 21, no. 2 (2005): 46-47.
- Wolters, Al. "IOYNIAN(Romans 16:7) and the Hebrew Name Yëhunnî." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127, no. 2 (2008): 397-408.
- Yarbrough, Robert. "Romans." *ESV Expository Commentary*, ed. Ian Duguid, James Hamilton, Jay Sklar. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2020.
- Zell, Paul. "Exegetical Brief: Romans 16: 1, 7 Phoebe, a Deacon? Junia, an Apostle?" *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 111, no.2 (2014): 102-107.