

ἘΠΙΣΗΜΟΙ ἘΝ ΤΟΙΣ ἈΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΙΣ IN ROM 16:7  
AS “WELL KNOWN TO THE APOSTLES”:  
FURTHER DEFENSE AND NEW EVIDENCE

MICHAEL BURER\*

I. INTRODUCTION

In 2001 Daniel B. Wallace and I published an article on the person of Junia in Rom 16:7.<sup>1</sup> There we argued that the more likely meaning of the adjective ἐπίσημος with the prepositional phrase ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις is “well known to the apostles” instead of the more commonly accepted “notable among the apostles.” In other words, we argued that Paul identifies Junia as an exceptional person in the opinion of the apostles, not that he recognizes her as an outstanding apostle.<sup>2</sup> Three substantive rejoinders to our work were soon published by Richard Bauckham, Eldon Jay Epp, and Linda L. Belleville.<sup>3</sup> In the present article I respond to the objections raised in these rejoinders and offer new evidence to prove that our original hypothesis still stands as a reasonable interpretation of Paul’s statement. In short, this article demonstrates three things. (1) The argument and evidence from our original article withstands critique. (2) Seventy-one new texts demonstrate that Paul could have readily used ἐπίσημος plus the genitive to show that Andronicus and Junia were “notable among the apostles.” (3) Thirty-six new texts, all but one of which parallel Rom 16:7 exactly in grammatical structure, provide further evidence that Paul intended ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις to mean that Andronicus and Junia were “well known to the apostles.”

---

\* Michael Burer is associate professor of NT at Dallas Theological Seminary, 3909 Swiss Ave., Dallas, TX 75204.

<sup>1</sup> Michael H. Burer and Daniel B. Wallace, “Was Junia Really an Apostle? A Re-examination of Rom 16.7,” *NTS* 47 (2001) 76–91. Thanks are due to Dr. Wallace and Dr. Wayne Grudem for reviewing a draft of this article and making numerous suggestions for improvement.

<sup>2</sup> Although there is general consensus that Ἰουνιαν should be accented as Ἰουνίαν and regarded as feminine, there is no unanimity on this issue. Al Wolters argues the name is likely a masculine first declension form of a Hebrew name (“IOYNIAN (Romans 16:7) and the Hebrew Name *Yehunnī*,” *JBL* 127 [2008] 397–408).

<sup>3</sup> Richard Bauckham, *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 172–80; Eldon Jay Epp, “Text-Critical, Exegetical, and Socio-Cultural Factors Affecting the Junia/Junias Variation in Romans 16,7,” in *NT Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel* (ed. A. Denaux; BETL 161; Leuven: Leuven University/Peeters, 2002) 227–91; Linda L. Belleville, “Ἰουνιαν ... ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις: A Re-examination of Romans 16.7 in Light of Primary Source Materials,” *NTS* 51 (2005) 231–49. Subsequently Epp published his arguments anew but essentially unchanged from his 2002 work (*Junia: The First Woman Apostle* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005] 72–78).

## II. RESTATEMENT OF CENTRAL THESIS

Our central argument viewed the adjective and the prepositional phrase as a semantic unit. “The thesis of this article is that the expression *ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις* is more naturally taken with an exclusive force rather than an inclusive one.”<sup>4</sup> By exclusive we meant that the person described by the adjective was not considered part of the group referred to by the prepositional phrase; this is the interpretation we advanced for Rom 16:7. By inclusive we meant that the person described by the adjective was part of the group referred to by the prepositional phrase; this is the more traditional interpretation of “notable among the apostles.” After noting that the lexical data for the meaning of *ἐπίσημος* could support either the inclusive or exclusive view,<sup>5</sup> we then stated our thesis:

As a working hypothesis, we would suggest the following. Since a noun in the genitive is typically used with comparative adjectives, we might expect such with an implied comparison too. Thus, if in Rom 16.7 Paul meant to say that Andronicus and Junia were outstanding *among* the apostles, we might have expected him to use the genitive (τῶν) ἀποστόλων. On the other hand, if an elative force is suggested—i.e. where no comparison is even hinted at—we might expect ἐν + dative.<sup>6</sup>

## III. RESPONSE TO CRITICISMS

The criticisms of our work among the rejoinders can be reduced to four basic arguments: (1) Our view cannot be sustained lexically or (2) grammatically. (3) The paucity of evidence cited does not support the sweeping nature of the conclusion we drew. (4) The particular texts cited do not support the meaning for which we argued. I will respond to each of these arguments in turn.

1. *Response to lexical arguments.* Belleville offered a lexical argument against our conclusion that was short and crisp. She first reviewed glosses for *ἐπίσημος* given by standard lexica. Then she simply stated that we were wrong: “Junia then is a ‘distinguished’ or ‘remarkable’ *member of* (and not simply *known to*) the apostles (*LSJ* s.v.)”<sup>7</sup> Her point is that *ἐπίσημος* must be understood to have inclusive force from a lexical standpoint. In response, the thesis we advanced cannot be disproven with a simple recitation of the lexical possibilities for this adjective, as it was not solely a lexical argument. Many of the definitions Belleville cites, which are simply glosses for *ἐπίσημος*, could be exclusive or inclusive. A closer examination of the lexical entries she cites in support shows that her contention does not hold; examples given in these lexica can be understood as exclusive even when they do not have a genitive or dative following.

<sup>4</sup> Burer and Wallace, “Junia” 84.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* The elative function of the adjective conveys an intensification of the positive notion, similar in English to the use of the word “very” with an adjective. See Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the NT* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996) 296.

<sup>7</sup> Belleville, “Re-examination” 243.

The LSJ entry for ἐπίσημος is a case in point against Belleville’s argument. This lexicon lists the relevant categories of meaning for the adjective as follows: I. 1. *erving to distinguish*; II. 1. *having a mark, inscription or device on it*, esp. of money, *stamped, coined*; 2. of epileptic patients, *bearing the marks of the disease*; of cattle, *spotted or striped*; 3. *notable, remarkable*; of garments, *fine*; and of persons, *notable*; in bad sense, *conspicuous, notorious*; 4. *significant*; 5. *conspicuous* (with reference to a place).<sup>8</sup> To refute Belleville’s contention, we can examine entry II. 3, which appears to be the one to which she refers when she uses the words “notable” and “remarkable” to defend her argument. The first citation in LSJ following this definition is Sophocles, *Ant.* 1258, which is part of a short response from the Chorus when Creon enters carrying the dead body of Haemon: καὶ μὴν ὄδ’ ἀναξ αὐτὸς ἐφήκει // μνήμ’ ἐπίσημον διὰ χειρὸς ἔχων, // εἰ θέμις εἰπεῖν, οὐκ ἀλλοτρίαν // ἄτην, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτῶν, “And look here, the master himself arrives // having in his hands a remarkable memorial, // if it is right to say, not of another’s // ruin, but of his own wrong.” The meaning of “remarkable” for ἐπίσημος is not in question. The question is, *to whom* or *how* is this remarkable? The context requires that ἐπίσημος be taken as exclusive. The presence of the body is something that is remarkable *to the chorus*, who are separate from the action. For Belleville to argue that ἐπίσημος means “remarkable” does not support an inclusive use any more than it supports an exclusive use. That question must be decided from the context.

More to the point, we argued that the appropriate meaning for ἐπίσημος in Rom 16:7 must consider its adjuncts as well, especially if it is an implicit comparative adjective. Definitions listed alone in a dictionary without context cannot be trump cards to play in this passage because lexical tools do not often address the meaning of words *in collocation with* other words. In addition, the judgments of lexicographers must occasionally be evaluated. In this instance, because we have raised a question about the traditional interpretation of ἐπίσημος in Rom 16:7, the lexica should not be marshaled as *primary* evidence for any one interpretation of ἐπίσημος; we need to evaluate that interpretation on other grounds. Belleville’s argument that the exclusive view of ἐπίσημος in Rom 16:7 cannot be supported from the standard lexica demonstrates a misunderstanding of our original thesis and an unwillingness to examine the evidence anew. As Belleville and others point out, for many years standard lexica identified Junia as a man. Belleville does not accept that as correct simply because the lexica said so. Why would she do that here regarding the meaning of ἐπίσημος?

2. *Response to grammatical arguments.* Belleville also offered grammatical arguments against our thesis; they were weightier than her arguments regarding the lexica, but she still did not deal with the main point of our work. Belleville’s basic point is that ἐν plus a plural dative almost always means an inclusive idea: “Primary usage of ἐν and the plural dative (personal or otherwise) inside and outside the NT (with rare exception) is *inclusive* ‘in/among’ and not *exclusive* ‘to’ (as claimed by Burer and

<sup>8</sup> LSJ 656. The entry also includes categories I.2 and III, but these do not deal with adjectival uses.

Wallace).<sup>9</sup> And again, “While dative personal nouns are typically used to show the recipients (‘to’/‘for’), this is not the case for the preposition *ἐν* plus the dative.”<sup>10</sup>

As I argued above regarding the lexical matter, Belleville has missed our point that the collocation of the adjective plus the prepositional phrase is in view. The major failing of her argument is that she regards *any* translation of *ἐν* plus plural dative as “among” to be inclusive, regardless of other words associated with the prepositional phrase. But our point was that the adjective and prepositional phrase must be viewed in tandem. My point here is that the inclusive/exclusive distinction is not in play every time *ἐν* plus dative is used, so it is inappropriate to state as she does that the “primary usage of *ἐν* and the plural dative (personal or otherwise) inside and outside the NT (with rare exception) is *inclusive* ‘in/among’ and not *exclusive* ‘to.’” Further, when it is in play, the exclusive sense is sometimes quite appropriate.

To help make my case, we can examine her use of Robertson’s grammar. Belleville references Robertson’s grammar as containing “a substantial list of NT examples of an adjective followed by *ἐν* plus the personal plural dative as ‘inclusive.’”<sup>11</sup> Here is the passage to which she refers:

5. ‘Among.’ With plural nouns *ἐν* may have the resultant idea of ‘among,’ though, of course, in itself it is still ‘in,’ ‘within.’ Thus we note *ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν* (Mt. 11:11), *ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν* (Ac. 2:29), *ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς* (4:34), *ἐν ὑμῖν* (1 Pet. 5:1), *ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰουδα* (Mt. 2:6). This is a common idiom in the ancient Greek. Not very different from this idea (cf. Latin *apud*) is the use *ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν* (Mt. 21:42), like Latin *coram*. One may note also *ἐν ὑμῖν* in 1 Cor. 6:2. Cf. *ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* (Gal. 1:16). See also 2 Cor. 4:3; 8:1.<sup>12</sup>

This passage illustrates a number of problems with Belleville’s argument about the uniform meaning of *ἐν* plus plural dative. First, Belleville says this paragraph deals with adjective plus *ἐν* plus plural dative. Not considering the idiom Robertson discusses in the latter part of the paragraph, this is only the case in one of the passages cited (Matt 2:6); the others are simply locative (Matt 11:11; Acts 2:29; 4:34; 1 Pet 5:1). Second, Belleville has apparently equated “among” with “inclusive,” but that is not a necessary connection, as Robertson’s discussion of the idiom in the latter part of the paragraph shows. Simply put, the inclusive/exclusive distinction is not in play every time *ἐν* plus dative is used, so therefore a blanket statement about the meaning of *ἐν* plus dative cannot hold when an adjective is part of the collocation. Third, the idiom *ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν*, “in our eyes,” from Matt 21:42 which Robertson mentions at the end of this paragraph, is certainly exclusive and provides ready evidence against Belleville’s assertion. In the phrase *καὶ ἔστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν*, “and it is marvellous in our eyes,” *ἐν* plus dative cannot be taken

<sup>9</sup> Belleville, “Re-examination” 243.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. 243 n. 52.

<sup>12</sup> A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek NT in the Light of Historical Research* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.; Nashville: Broadman, 1934) 587.

as inclusive; otherwise “our eyes” are equated with the chief stone. Instead this phrase highlights whose opinion is in view with a necessary distinction between the thing being considered and the entity engaged in the act of mental assessment. The preposition ἐν plus dative, which Belleville wants always to be inclusive, cannot mean that in Matt 21:42.

3. *Response to the charge of paucity.* Because the rejoinders objected to the number of texts we discussed and how we sifted them, I decided to redo the search within the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG) database so that a fuller accounting of the evidence could be offered.<sup>13</sup> To make sure that all possible parallels were found, I searched for all forms of the adjective ἐπίσημος.<sup>14</sup> This yielded 62 distinct forms found a total of 3,387 times.<sup>15</sup> To avoid anachronism I excluded any texts from the 5<sup>th</sup> century AD or later; this removed 1,719 texts from consideration.<sup>16</sup> I then examined the remaining 1,668 texts to find relevant parallels for discussion. I will discuss new evidence below, but this resumption of the search allows me to make some statements about the breadth of the evidence here.

As anyone who has done searches of this kind in TLG can attest, the pool of relevant texts can vary widely in size. Simple lexical searches tend to yield large numbers of hits, as is the case with ἐπίσημος. However, when additional words are added to the search or the search is refined to isolate a particular grammatical construction, often the pool of pertinent texts becomes quite small. The adjective ἐπίσημος occurs thousands of times, but rarely does it occur with adjuncts; most often it occurs as a nominal form or as an attributive adjective. When ἐπίσημος does appear with adjuncts, rarely is the entire construction exactly like what is found in Rom 16:7. So the pool of texts for comparison to Rom 16:7 is quite small.<sup>17</sup> We emphasized originally that within the pool of texts that are reasonably parallel, there are certain trends that can be identified. In addition, our review of the scholarly literature on this passage showed that rarely, if ever, does anyone wrestle with the exclusive meaning as an option. If we can bring to the table *any* examples that support the exclusive view, then those who assume that the inclusive view is the only possible option in this text must at least *acknowledge* that another meaning is possible. In our original piece we brought forth a number of examples to support our thesis and below I list 108 new passages for consideration. Seventy-one support our assertion that ἐπίσημος plus the genitive as inclusive is normative.

<sup>13</sup> TLG is available online at <http://www.tlg.uci.edu>. Many thanks are due to the University of California Irvine for this helpful tool.

<sup>14</sup> In our original research we considered only the positive form because we wanted to focus on implied comparative meanings, not explicit ones.

<sup>15</sup> These results include all forms of the adjective plus the related adverb and forms resulting from crasis.

<sup>16</sup> The exceptions to this rule were 238 texts whose date TLG listed as *varia* (but not the nine texts marked *incertum*). To ensure that I was examining all pertinent texts from the relevant time period, I included these unless it was clear from the title or other data in the TLG citation that they were 5<sup>th</sup> century AD or later.

<sup>17</sup> That is one of the reasons that in our original article we discussed several passages that we deemed as unlikely parallels.

Thirty-six support our assertion that ἐπίσημος plus the dative as exclusive is normative. Only one new text runs counter to our thesis, but it is not an exact parallel to Rom 16:7. The pool of texts is not overly large, but it is valuable and does validate our original conclusions. One final point on this score: No author who wrote contrary to our thesis offered any new evidence to bolster their own claims. They simply rehearsed and reassessed what Dr. Wallace and I offered originally. If the authors critiqued us because we did not offer enough evidence, one would think that part of their response would be to offer more evidence to the contrary, but that was not done.

4. *Review of original evidence.* In response to the fourth basic charge against our original thesis, in this section I will defend our interpretation of particular passages we discussed in the original article. Contrary to the tone of the rejoinders, there actually is a fair amount of agreement on the meaning of the passages we cited, even on several that we argued had an exclusive meaning. Implicitly, then, the rejoinders acknowledge that ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις in Rom 16:7 *could* mean “well known to the apostles.” Here I will review the passages we discussed and then highlight issues of agreement or disagreement with the rejoinders.

a. *Biblical and patristic Greek.* Our citation of passages from biblical and patristic Greek for the most part did not engender much discussion. On 3 Macc 6:1 we noted that the genitive is used with the inclusive sense.<sup>18</sup> Belleville does not discuss this passage. Bauckham and Epp agreed with our assessment.<sup>19</sup> On *Pss. Sol.* 17:30 we noted that the genitive is used with the inclusive sense.<sup>20</sup> Neither Belleville nor Epp discuss this passage. Bauckham agrees with our assessment.<sup>21</sup> On *Mart. Pol.* 14:1 we noted that ἐκ plus genitive is used with the inclusive nuance.<sup>22</sup> No one discussed this passage in response. On Add Esth 16:22 we noted that ἐν plus dative is inclusive, but the parallel is inexact because the nouns are impersonal.<sup>23</sup> Epp and Belleville both cite this passage as evidence against our thesis but do not acknowledge our qualification of the inexact parallel.<sup>24</sup> Bauckham agrees with our assessment.<sup>25</sup>

The discussion gets more intense concerning *Pss. Sol.* 2:6, which reads οἱ υἱοὶ καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ἐν αἰχμαλωσίᾳ πονηρᾷ, ἐν σφραγίδι ὁ τράχηλος αὐτῶν, ἐν ἐπισήμῳ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, “Your sons and daughters in evil captivity, their neck in a seal, in [a place] conspicuous to the nations.”<sup>26</sup> Here we argued that ἐν plus dative has an exclusive nuance. Belleville argues that we have not cited *Pss. Sol.* 2:6 correctly.<sup>27</sup> Epp agrees with our assessment.<sup>28</sup> Bauckham argues that this text should

<sup>18</sup> Burer and Wallace, “Junia” 86.

<sup>19</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 177; Epp, “Junia/Junias” 286.

<sup>20</sup> Burer and Wallace, “Junia” 86.

<sup>21</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 177.

<sup>22</sup> Burer and Wallace, “Junia” 86.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> Epp, “Junia/Junias” 286; Belleville, “Re-examination” 245.

<sup>25</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 177.

<sup>26</sup> This Greek text and the next are taken from A. Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta* (rev. Robert Hanhart; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

<sup>27</sup> Belleville, “Re-examination” 246–47.

be dropped from consideration.<sup>29</sup> At issue here is whether ἐπισήμῳ in this passage should be taken as an adjective or as a noun. In our initial analysis we took it to be an adjective, but both Bauckham and Belleville argue the word should be construed as a noun, which they think would invalidate the parallel.<sup>30</sup> But there are legitimate reasons to consider this word to be functioning adjectivally in this text. At first blush ἐπισήμῳ appears to be a substantive because it is preceded by the preposition ἐν. However, comparison of this construction with the only other occurrence of ἐπίσημος in this book leads to the conclusion that the noun form is not used here. The other occurrence is in *Pss. Sol.* 17:30: καὶ ἔξει λαοὺς ἐθνῶν δουλεύειν αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τὸν ζυγὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν κύριον δοξάσει ἐν ἐπισήμῳ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ καθαριεῖ Ἱερουσαλημ ἐν ἀγιασμῷ ὡς καὶ τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, “And he will have the peoples of the nations serve him under his yoke, and he will glorify the Lord in a prominent [place] of all the earth, and he will cleanse Jerusalem in holiness as even at the beginning.” If the logic of arguing for ἐπισήμῳ as a noun in 2:6 is valid because it is preceded by ἐν, then the same ought to be true in 17:30, but that leads to an unclear meaning: “he will glorify the Lord with a mark of all the earth.” A more natural way to take this construction is as a reference to a place with the noun τόπος elided: “he will glorify the Lord in a prominent [place] of the earth,” that is, Jerusalem, which is clarified by the following clause. This is the way one accepted scholarly translation has rendered *Pss. Sol.* 17:30.<sup>31</sup> This use finds a parallel in P. Oxy. 1408 where τοῖς ἐπισημοτάτοις is governed by ἐν, and the word τόποις is not in the text of the papyrus (although the editors do suggest that its omission was a mistake on the part of the original author of the papyrus).<sup>32</sup> Understanding the noun τόπος as elided makes a great deal of sense when applied to *Pss. Sol.* 2:6: “their neck with a seal in a [place] well known to the nations.” Thus ἐπισήμῳ would be an adjective, even though it is preceded by ἐν.

In light of this subsequent analysis, our initial assessment of *Pss. Sol.* 2:6 would require some modification, but not wholesale revision. Regarding this passage we stated initially:

In *Pss. Sol.* 2:6, where the Jewish captives are in view, the writer indicates that ‘they were a *spectacle among* the gentiles (ἐπισήμῳ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). This construction comes as close to Rom 16:7 as any we have yet seen. The parallels include (a) people as the referent of the adjective ἐπίσημος, (b) followed by ἐν plus the dative plural, (c) the dative plural referring to people as well. All the key elements are here. Semantically, what is significant is that (a) the first group is not a

<sup>28</sup> Epp, “Junia/Junias” 286.

<sup>29</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 175–76.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.; Belleville, “Re-examination” 246–47.

<sup>31</sup> R. B. Wright, *Psalms of Solomon: A New Translation and Introduction*, in *The OT Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1985) 2:667. NETS translates differently: “and he shall glorify the Lord in the mark of all the earth”; here a note on the word “mark” reads “Perhaps *sight*,” offering an alternate translation in keeping with what I argue above. See Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (New York: Oxford University, 2007) 775.

<sup>32</sup> Burer and Wallace, “Junia” 87. See Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part XII* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1916) 13.

part of the second—that is, the Jewish captives were not gentiles; and (b) what was ‘among’ the gentiles was the Jews’ notoriety. This is precisely how we are suggesting that Rom 16:7 should be taken.<sup>33</sup>

At this juncture, we would offer the following revisions to this statement.<sup>34</sup> We should have included more of the preceding Greek text so that readers could easily see the presence of the preposition ἐν with context and thus understand that there was another option for interpretation. We should have changed the statement “The parallels include (a) people as the referent of the adjective ἐπίσημος” to reflect that here more likely the referent of the adjective ἐπίσημος is a place, not people, based on a more thorough analysis of the parallel in 17:30. We should have given a more appropriate translation. The translation we gave, “a spectacle among the gentiles,” was that of Wright,<sup>35</sup> though not incorrect, it is not as accurate as “in (a place) visible” or “in (a place) notorious” to the Gentiles. We would not change, however, the basic conclusion that this passage confirms our hypothesis that ἐπίσημος plus (ἐν plus) a dative personal adjunct should be best understood as exclusive.<sup>36</sup>

b. *Papyri*. The four examples in the papyri we discussed all used ἐπίσημος plus genitive to convey an inclusive meaning.<sup>37</sup> Belleville does not discuss these passages. Epp mentions them, presumably in agreement with our assessment.<sup>38</sup> Bauckham discusses three of the four passages we cited.<sup>39</sup> He lists one of our four passages in his chart, agreeing with our assessment.<sup>40</sup> However, Bauckham argues that P. Oxy. 1408 and P. Oxy. 2108 should be dismissed from consideration. Both of these texts use the superlative form of ἐπίσημος with a geographical referent: P. Oxy 1408 speaks of “the most important [places] of the nomes” with the phrase τοῖς ἐπισημοτάτοις τῶν νομῶν, while P. Oxy. 2108 mentions “the most conspicuous places in the villages” with the phrase τοῖς ἐπισημοτάτοις τόποις τ[ῶ]ν κωμ[ῶ]ν]. Concerning these texts Bauckham states, “There can be no question that the superlative should be followed by the genitive but this is not evidence for the meaning of constructions with ἐπίσημος itself.”<sup>41</sup> Bauckham’s desire to dismiss these as evidence is only valid on the assumption that the inclusive meaning is in view, which would naturally then use the genitive. From the standpoint of proving the hypothesis, however, these should not be dismissed because the question of which meaning is in view should remain open. His statement assumes that the superlative form of

<sup>33</sup> Burer and Wallace, “Junia” 86–87.

<sup>34</sup> In reflecting on this error and the few others that I note, neither Dr. Wallace nor I could remember who was responsible for them. Given that I was the junior member of our team, most likely I was the culprit in each case!

<sup>35</sup> Wright, “Psalms of Solomon” 652.

<sup>36</sup> This becomes even clearer when 2:6, which uses ἐπίσημος plus ἐν plus dative, is compared with 17:30, which uses ἐπίσημος plus genitive as inclusive.

<sup>37</sup> Burer and Wallace, “Junia” 87.

<sup>38</sup> Epp, “Junia/Junias” 286. Epp mentions that we discuss three passages from the papyri. I assume that he did not count P. Oxy 3364, line 22, which contains the adjective plus genitive entirely in reconstructed text.

<sup>39</sup> I assume here, as I did with Epp, that Bauckham ignored the passage with reconstructed text.

<sup>40</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 177.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.* 176 n. 287.

the adjective would never use ἐν plus dative with an exclusive meaning, but my subsequent research found places where that is indeed the case. These are shown below in the listing of new evidence.

c. *Inscriptions*. In our original piece we discussed four inscriptions parallel to Rom 16:7. The parallels are strong because all use ἐπίσημος with ἐν plus dative with personal nouns. Bauckham did not discuss these passages in depth, but his presentation of the evidence in chart form indicates agreement with our assessment.<sup>42</sup> Belleville disagreed with our handling of all these passages, citing each as having an inclusive meaning.<sup>43</sup> Epp disagreed with our assessment of the four by arguing against our interpretation of the one example we handled in depth.<sup>44</sup>

I wish to argue more carefully here that these passages support our thesis and cannot be considered inclusive. Here is what we said originally about the inscriptions:

In TAM 2.905.1 west wall. coll. 2.5.18 we read the description of a man who is ‘not only foremost in his own country, but also well known to the outside population’ (οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ πατρίδι πρώτου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔθνει ἐπίσημου). Here the person who is ἐπίσημος is called such only in relation to outsiders (πρῶτος is used in relation to his own countrymen). It is not insignificant that ἐν plus the dative personal noun is used: the man is well known to a group of which he is not a member. Similar idioms are found in Asia Minor TAM 2.1–3.838; TAM 2.1–3. 905 west wall. coll. 3.12; and Fd Xanth 7.76.1.1.1.1.4. In each instance the group that the individual is well known to but is not a part of is mentioned with ἐν plus the dative.<sup>45</sup>

Here is Belleville’s citation of Asia Minor TAM II 838 defg.3–4:<sup>46</sup>

TAM II, 1–3 838 (Asia Minor): ὁ καὶ Κτασάδας β', ὁ πολεΐτης ἡμῶν, ἀνὴρ γένει καὶ ἀξία πρώτος τῆς πόλεος (sic) ἡμῶν, ἐπίσημος δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔθνει, ... (... foremost *in* our city but also *prominent in* the nation [i.e. prominent *among* the nationals] ...)<sup>47</sup>

Here is the relevant citation with a few more lines of context:

ἐπεὶ [Κτ] ησικλῆς καὶ Κτασάδας β', ὁ πολεΐτης ἡμῶν, ἀνὴρ γένει καὶ ἀξία πρώτος τῆς πόλεος (sic) ἡμῶν, ἐπίσημος δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔθνει, γένους λαμπροῦ καὶ ἐπίσημου καὶ πρώτου τῆς πόλεως ἡμῶν {ἐπίσημος δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔθνει,}

Important to note is the implicit contrast between the relationship of the individual mentioned to his city and to the larger entity of the nation. In the beginning of the

<sup>42</sup> Ibid. 177.

<sup>43</sup> Belleville, “Re-examination” 245.

<sup>44</sup> Epp, “Junia/Junias” 286–87.

<sup>45</sup> Burer and Wallace, “Junia” 88.

<sup>46</sup> Based upon the current implementation of the Packard Humanities Institute “Searchable Greek Inscriptions” website, available at <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions>, I have changed the citation forms slightly from our original article and from Belleville’s to make them easier for the reader to locate in that database.

<sup>47</sup> Belleville, “Re-examination” 245.

citation, this man is called *πολείτης*, which identifies him as a citizen of the particular *πόλις*. This phrase could be translated, “our citizen, a man by nature and worth first over our city.” Similar to what we noted originally in our footnote 53, there is a contrast made in the next phrase, the *δέ* invoking the slight contrast and the ascensive *καί* adding additional focus: “and also well known to the nation.” There is a sense of separation, as the city is the locale of which the man is most naturally construed as a part, but the nation is on a different, broader level. Note that the possessive pronoun is used with *πολείτης* and *πόλεος* but not with *ἔθνει*. More to the point of our thesis note the construction *πρῶτος* plus genitive to indicate “first over our city” of which the man is a part, and then note *ἐπίσημος* plus *ἐν* plus dative to indicate “well known to the nation,” which is not the primary relationship the author wishes to address. Of course the man is part of the nation, but his membership within that entity is not the focus of the language; his citizenship of the city is. Unless the genitive and dative expressions mean the same thing, the first has to be inclusive while the second has to be exclusive. To make the argument stronger, note the following words that continue the description: “of a race/clan that is bright and notable and first among our city.” Here we see *ἐπίσημος* plus genitive to indicate “notable among,” strengthened by the presence of two other superlative adjectives plus the possessive pronoun. In this one example, both parts of our thesis are seen and validated, so this passage does not support the inclusive view as Belleville asserts, nor is it the point of focus that Epp wishes to adopt in his discussion.<sup>48</sup> Note as well that Belleville’s clarification of the phrase under consideration as “among the nationals” is invalid, as the text has the *singular* noun *ἔθνει* following the dative.<sup>49</sup>

Here is Belleville’s citation of Asia Minor TAM II 905 W. wall.col. II.16–18:

TAM II west wall. coll. 2.5 (Asia Minor): — — — — —, πατρός Ἀπολλωνίου [δι]ς τοῦ Καλλιάρχου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ πατρίδι πρώτου, ἀλλὰ [καί] ἐν τῷ ἔθνει ἐπίσημου [ς] (-----, not only foremost *in* his native town but also *prominent in* the nation [i.e. *among* the nationals] ...) <sup>50</sup>

In my opinion our original assessment of this text stands, but there is an additional piece of data from the citation we should have discussed to strengthen our argument. Following *ἐπίσημου* in this citation is the phrase *καί διαπρεπούς*. This is synonymous to *ἐπίσημος*; *διαπρέπω* means “appear prominent or conspicuous, strike the eye,”<sup>51</sup> which might on its own support the exclusive view, but LSJ also offers the meaning “to be eminent,” which might support the inclusive view. The prepositional modifiers listed for this latter meaning in LSJ are key: *ἐν τινι* and *ἐπί τινι*. The likely difference in meaning between these two phrases would be “to be eminent” *to* someone, that is, in their opinion, when used with the preposition *ἐν*,

<sup>48</sup> Epp, “Junia/Junias” 286–87.

<sup>49</sup> Belleville offers this same translation for the next two inscriptions, but it is invalid in those texts for the same reason.

<sup>50</sup> Belleville, “Re-examination” 245.

<sup>51</sup> LSJ 409.

or *over* someone when used with the preposition ἐπί. These coincide well with the exclusive and inclusive uses. Here διαπρεποῦς is used in parallel with ἐπίσημος, both of which are connected to ἐν plus dative; their synonymous lexical meanings imply that their collocations are also synonymous, that is, διαπρεποῦς plus ἐν plus dative is similar in meaning to ἐπίσημος plus ἐν plus dative. In this passage the resultant meaning would be “well known, eminent to/in the opinion of” someone, which is the exclusive view.

The third passage is similar to the other inscriptions we cited. Here is Belleville’s citation of Asia Minor TAM II 905 W. wall.col. III.12.60–62:

TAM II west wall. coll. 3.12 (Asia Minor): προγόνων Λυκία[ρχῶν καὶ ἐ]ν μὲν ταῖς πατρίσιν πρωτεούντων. [ἐν δὲ τῷ ἔθ]ν[ει] ἐπίσημων καὶ λαμπρῶν καὶ καθ’ ἐ[κάστη] γάρχη[ν] (... president of the Lycians and not only foremost *in* our native towns but also esteemed and illustrious *in* the nation [i.e. *among* the nationals] ...).<sup>52</sup>

Here is the passage with some important prior context:

ὁ προεξιῶν ἀρχιφύλαξ Λυκίω[ν, ἀνὴρ κα]ῖ γένοι καὶ ἀξία καὶ φρονήματι καὶ μετρίότητι βί[ο]υ κοσμούμενος, προγόνων Λυκία[ρχῶν καὶ ἐ]ν μὲν ταῖς πατρίσιν πρωτεούντων, [ἐν δὲ τῷ ἔθ]ν[ει] ἐπίσημων καὶ λαμπρῶν καὶ καθ’ ἐ[κάστη] γάρχη[ν]

The preceding context refers to a single individual, one Opramoas of Apollonius. This passage includes the same idiom as above, namely, that the individual is extolled relative to his own group and then relative to those outside his group. This is the best way to understand the μὲν ... δέ construction and the juxtaposition of πατρίσιν and ἔθνη.

Belleville argues that we have misrepresented the meaning of the inscription Asia Minor FdXanth VII 76.6. She states, “the subject matter has to do with a prominent ally *among* Rome’s alliances: ἐν ταῖς ὑπὲρ Ῥωμαίων] συμμαχίαις ἐπίσημον?] γενόμενον.”<sup>53</sup> But this is not a correct interpretation of the passage. Prior context, specifically in section 75, illuminates the topic: a man named Καλλιῶν who is praised because of his excellent service to the Lycian League. His connection to Rome is strong because he served as priest to the goddess of Rome and as an ambassador to leaders. If allies are mentioned, the most natural way to understand this discussion is Callias vis-à-vis the allies, not as part of them. This is strengthened further by the fact that he is an individual, and the entity in the dative case connected to ἐπίσημος is an ally to Rome; this also explains the difference in gender between ἐπίσημον and συμμαχίαις. The most natural way then to take this passage is exclusive. Callias is either “distinguished in the estimation of” or “well known to” the allies of Rome, of which he is not a part.

d. *Classical literary texts.* In our original article we discussed three classical literary texts relative to our thesis. We argued that Lycurgus, *Ag. Leo.* 129 uses ἐπίσημος

<sup>52</sup> Belleville, “Re-examination” 245.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.* 246.

plus dative in an exclusive sense. Belleville does not discuss this passage. Epp and Bauckham agree with our assessment.<sup>54</sup> We argued that Euripides, *Baob.* 967 uses ἐπίσημος plus dative in an exclusive sense. Belleville does not discuss this passage. Bauckham agrees with our assessment.<sup>55</sup> Epp states, “I would question whether [this passage] is so clearly exclusive—when it refers to Pentheus as ἐπίσημον ὄντα πᾶσιν,” but he gives no reason against our assessment.<sup>56</sup> We argued that Euripides, *Hipp.* 103 uses ἐπίσημος plus ἐν plus dative with an exclusive sense. Bauckham and Epp agree with our assessment.<sup>57</sup> Belleville agrees with our assessment, although she dismisses its weight: “Of all the examples listed by Burer and Wallace as *exclusive*, only Euripides *Hippolytus* 103 is truly so. But it is also five centuries earlier than the other examples and at a time when ἐπίσημος had not yet acquired a comparative sense.”<sup>58</sup> Based upon the research I have done, I see no evidence that the meaning of ἐπίσημος changed with the centuries as to whether it could carry a comparative sense. It would have helped Belleville’s case if she had listed some evidence for her claim, but none was given. Note that the rejoinders were practically unanimous in their agreement with our assessment of these texts as exclusive.

e. *Hellenistic literary texts.* We discussed a number of Hellenistic literary texts in our original article. The first group of passages we discussed as mixed evidence for our thesis, but this was mitigated by the fact that they were impersonal. We first mentioned Lucian, *Dial. meretr.* 1.2 as a passage that uses ἐν plus dative with an inclusive sense against our thesis. Belleville does not discuss this passage. Epp and Bauckham agree with our assessment.<sup>59</sup> We argued that Philo, *Fug.* 10 uses ἐν plus dative with an inclusive sense against our thesis. Bauckham, Epp, and Belleville all agree with our assessment.<sup>60</sup> We argued that Galen, *De Meth. Med.* 14.10.242 uses the genitive with an inclusive sense, which actually fits our thesis. Belleville does not discuss this passage. Epp agrees with our assessment.<sup>61</sup> Bauckham agrees with our assessment but incorrectly places the passage under the heading of ἐπίσημος plus ἐν plus dative, not ἐπίσημος plus genitive.<sup>62</sup>

Next we discussed examples from Hellenistic texts that were personal. We argued that Lucian, *Harm.* 1.17 uses ἐν plus dative in an exclusive sense. This passage generated some discussion. Bauckham agreed with our assessment.<sup>63</sup> Epp agreed, but he inexplicably argues that ἐν is not present in this text.<sup>64</sup> Belleville argued that this should be considered inclusive. The phrase in question is καὶ τὸ ἐπίσημον εἶναι

<sup>54</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 177; Epp, “Junia/Junias” 287.

<sup>55</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 177.

<sup>56</sup> Epp, “Junia/Junias” 287.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*; Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 177.

<sup>58</sup> Belleville, “Re-examination” 247.

<sup>59</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 177; Epp, “Junia/Junias” 287.

<sup>60</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 177; Epp, “Junia/Junias” 287; Belleville, “Re-examination” 245.

<sup>61</sup> Epp, “Junia/Junias” 287.

<sup>62</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 177.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>64</sup> Epp, “Junia/Junias” 287.

ἐν πλήθει. Belleville translates this as “and to be *the conspicuous one in a crowd*,”<sup>65</sup> but this translation is not defensible. In this piece Harmonides the flute player discusses with his teacher Timotheus how to gain fame and notoriety for his artistic ability. He is not seeking to distinguish himself among other flautists or musicians; rather he seeks fame among the population at large. Here is the passage with some additional context:

τὰ μέγιστα δὲ καὶ ὧν ἕνεκα ἐπεθύμησα τῆς αὐλητικῆς, οὐχ ὁρῶ πῶς ἂν ἀπ’ αὐτῆς μοι προσγένοιτο, ἢ δόξα ἢ παρὰ τῶν πολλῶν καὶ τὸ ἐπίσημον εἶναι ἐν πλήθει καὶ δεικνύσθαι τῷ δακτύλῳ, καὶ ἦν που φανῶ, εὐθύς ἐπιστρέφεσθαι πάντας εἰς ἐμέ καὶ λέγειν τοῦνομα, οὗτος Ἀρμονίδης ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ ἄριστος αὐλητής.

But the most important thing, even for which I set my heart upon flute playing, I do not see how it will come to me from playing—glory from many, to be the one noticed by the crowd and to be pointed at by the finger, and wherever I appear immediately all to turn around towards me and say my name, “This is Harmonides; he is the best flautist.”

The whole tenor of this passage points to an exclusive meaning for ἐπίσημος: Harmonides seeks to be an exceptional flautist and thus be recognized and pointed out by all. Even if he is in the midst of a crowd, he will be separated from them by the recognition that he is the best flute player, thus implicitly different from and not a part of them.

The next passage we discussed was Lucian, *Dial. mort.* 6.1, but we mistakenly cited it as *Peregr.* 6.1. We identified this passage as using the genitive with an inclusive idea. Belleville does not discuss this passage. Epp agrees with our assessment.<sup>66</sup> Bauckham agrees with our assessment by its placement on his chart, but also notes our citation error, for which we are thankful.<sup>67</sup>

The next passage we discussed was Lucian, *Merc. cond.* 28,<sup>68</sup> which generated a bit of discussion. In our original piece we stated that this was one text that offered a true grammatical parallel to Rom 16:7 with an inclusive idea and thus offered evidence against our thesis. All three rejoinders agreed with our assessment.<sup>69</sup> In response to this assertion of an inclusive view in this passage, Heath R. Curtis has subsequently argued that in fact we were wrong and that this passage does in fact have an exclusive nuance.<sup>70</sup> He asserts that we were misled by the Loeb Classical Library translation to treat this as inclusive; a proper understanding of this passage sees the slave as seeking to be so different from the others that he in fact becomes the director of their (metaphorical) chorus. Curtis states, “Lucian is warning his

<sup>65</sup> Belleville, “Re-examination” 246.

<sup>66</sup> Epp, “Junia/Junias” 287.

<sup>67</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 177 n. 291. Bauckham notes that he was not able to find the citation. On the hunch that it was within Lucian, I was able to use the TLG advanced lemma search to find it.

<sup>68</sup> We originally cited this reference as 2.8, which was an error.

<sup>69</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 177; Epp, “Junia/Junias” 287; Belleville, “Re-examination” 245.

<sup>70</sup> Heath R. Curtis, “A Female Apostle? A Note Re-examining the Work of Burer and Wallace Concerning ἐπίσημος with ἐν and the Dative,” *ConJ* 28 (2002) 437–40.

reader of the importance of what *the other slaves* will think because it is they who might report one's behavior to higher authority. Therefore, one must 'take pains to be conspicuous *to* the folks [slaves] who are praising and to be the *chorus director* [not a member of the claque]."<sup>71</sup> This idea of separation and difference between the larger group who praises and the one who becomes their leader supports the exclusive view in this passage. Curtis is correct; thus we were incorrect in our original assessment: We should have argued that this passage from Lucian was *exclusive* and fit our pattern. Curtis's work has strengthened our thesis.

Here we also discussed Josephus, *J.W.* 2.418 as having an inclusive force for *ἐπίσημος* with *ἐν* plus the dative. Belleville agrees with our assessment, as do Epp and Bauckham.<sup>72</sup> At present, however, I do not think that we properly assessed this passage in our original article. The text reads οὓς δὲ πρὸς Ἀγρίππαν ἐν οἷς ἦσαν ἐπίσημοι Σαυλὸς τε καὶ Ἀντίπας καὶ Κοστόβαρος προσήκοντες τῷ βασιλεῖ κατὰ γένος, "[The leaders sent] some to Agrippa, among whom were nobility: Saul and Antipas and Constobarus, who were related to the King." We stated a hunch regarding a specialized use for *ἐπίσημοι* in our original analysis: "But even this text is not a clean parallel: the relative clause is expected to consist of *ἐν* plus the dative, and the adjective is almost functioning as a technical term, without any notion of comparative force."<sup>73</sup> Further research has led me to the conclusion that when used as a substantive *ἐπίσημος* often has the meaning of "nobility, elite, upper class." Take, for example, this passage:

Joannes Chrysostomus Scr. Eccl. (AD 4–5), *In Acta apostolorum (homiliae 1–55)*.  
Vol. 60 pg. 167 line 2.<sup>74</sup>

Ὅρα τὸ ἄτυφον τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τὸ ἐπεικὲς, πῶς οὐ παρὰ ταύτη μένει, οὐδὲ παρὰ ἄλλω τινὶ τῶν ἐπισήμων, ἀλλὰ παρὰ βυρσεῖ.

This passage illustrates this meaning well, as *τινὶ τῶν ἐπισήμων* ("someone from the nobility") is contrasted with a common laborer, *παρὰ βυρσεῖ* ("with a tanner"). The reason this is important for the present discussion is that as a substantive with this meaning, the word loses comparative force and serves only to identify, not to compare. This meaning makes sense in Josephus, *J.W.* 2.418. Strong evidence that *ἐπίσημοι* means "nobility" here is that Josephus describes the individuals mentioned as related to the king. Thus the sense of the phrase in question would lose comparative force and simply identify the individuals as among the nobility. The same issue would be in play in Lucian, *Dial. mort.* 438, which we originally identified as similar to this passage from Josephus.<sup>75</sup> This passage reads *Καὶ ἄλλοι μὲν πολλοὶ*

<sup>71</sup> Ibid. 439.

<sup>72</sup> Bauckham, *Gospel Women* 177; Epp, "Junia/Junias" 288; Belleville, "Re-examination" 245.

<sup>73</sup> Burer and Wallace, "Junia" 89–90.

<sup>74</sup> This citation form is based on that given in the TLG database. Because I relied so heavily upon it for this research, I have decided to retain their naming conventions for authors and works, as well as their reference citation form, but I have removed the TLG canon numbers, used abbreviations to conserve space and changed the order slightly.

<sup>75</sup> Burer and Wallace, "Junia" 90 n. 65. Subsequent authors have pointed out that our original citation of *Peregr.* 22.2 was an error, for which we are thankful.

συγκατέβαινον ἡμῖν, ἐν αὐτοῖς δὲ ἐπίσημοι Ἰσμηνόδωρος τε ὁ πλούσιος ὁ ἡμέτερος καὶ Ἀρσάκης ὁ Μηδίας ὕπαρχος καὶ Ὀροίτης ὁ Ἀρμένιος, “Now on the one hand many others were going down with us, but among them the nobility were Ismenodorus, a rich man from our town, Arsaces, the ruler of Media, and Oroites the Armenian.” Here the context reinforces the meaning of “nobility” for ἐπίσημοι, as one of the individuals is specifically identified as rich and another is identified as a ruler. No comparative force would be meant here, so the issue of inclusive or exclusive would be off the table.<sup>76</sup> So these two texts which we originally regarded as counter to our thesis actually should be removed from consideration as not parallel to Rom 16:7.

5. *A word about Chrysostom.* One critique of our work concerns the evidence from Chrysostom. In his commentary on Romans he states essentially that Junia was a woman and had the title of apostle.<sup>77</sup> Based upon this passage, many argue that the issue is essentially settled: If Chrysostom, who spoke Greek, thought that Junia was a woman and an apostle, who are we to argue differently?<sup>78</sup> This argument is appropriate to a point, but it is not weighty enough to end all debate. I would agree that we should give credence to ancient commentators who were closer linguistically to Paul than we are. This does not mean, however, that we are to accept their assessments and arguments without critical examination. As an example, in our original article we discussed Epiphanius, *Index discipulorum* 125, who takes Junia to be a man, but he does the same with Prisca!<sup>79</sup> We must value Chrysostom’s place as a native speaker of Greek, but we cannot allow that estimation to prematurely end discussion of grammatical nuances that he himself theoretically could have misunderstood.<sup>80</sup> If enough evidence can be given to counterbalance his interpretation, then one could reasonably conclude that Chrysostom misunderstood the Greek text he was reading. I would argue that we have given enough evidence to call Chrysostom’s interpretation here into question. Perhaps some will not be swayed, but we must still have the discussion.

---

<sup>76</sup> This would be the case as well in a passage we did not discuss before: Cyrillus Alexandrinus Theol. (AD 4–5), *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam*. Vol. 70 pg. 744 line 37. This passage reads “Ὅτι δὲ οὐχὶ ἐν μόνῃ τῇ Ἰδουμαίᾳ δαπανηθήσεται πληθὺς, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ τῶν ἐπισήμων ἐν αὐτοῖς, πλείστη τε ὄση καὶ ἐλεεινὴ γενήσεται πᾶσις, “And because not in only Idumea will the throng be consumed, for indeed even from the nobility among them; both the greatest and the pitied will experience calamity.” The best sense of the passage is that τῶν ἐπισήμων is substantival with ἐν αὐτοῖς identifying the larger group, “the nobility among them.”

<sup>77</sup> *Hom. Rom.* 31.

<sup>78</sup> See, e.g., Epp, “Junia/Junias” 289–90.

<sup>79</sup> Burer and Wallace, “Junia” 77.

<sup>80</sup> Moisés Silva presents a balanced discussion of how Chrysostom can be appropriately evaluated on this score (*Interpreting Galatians: Explorations in Exegetical Method* [2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001] 29–31).

## IV. REVIEW OF NEW EVIDENCE

In my new search of the TLG database, I examined each of the 1,668 relevant texts for five data points:<sup>81</sup> (1) the form of the adjective ἐπίσημος, whether it was positive, comparative, or superlative; (2) its grammatical use in context; (3) the presence of any adjuncts; (4) whether the adjuncts were personal or impersonal; and (5) whether the sense was inclusive or exclusive. Then I assessed whether the text was evidence for or against either part of our thesis. Of these 1,668 texts, 108 are appropriate for consideration, and all but one of these support our thesis, namely, that ἐπίσημος plus genitive carries an inclusive meaning while ἐπίσημος plus (ἐν plus) dative carries an exclusive meaning. The one text that does not support our thesis is not an exact parallel to Rom 16:7 because it involves impersonal nouns. I found no new texts to support the arguments of the rejoinders, namely, that ἐπίσημος plus a personal dative has an inclusive meaning.

1. Evidence that supports ἐπίσημος plus genitive as inclusive, e.g. “notable among.” Because there is not much debate concerning our assertions regarding ἐπίσημος plus genitive as inclusive, as this nuance is in keeping with expected grammatical usage, for space considerations I simply list citations grouped by author which support this part of our thesis. Each of these passages uses ἐπίσημος plus genitive with an inclusive idea. These seventy-one texts show that Paul had this grammatical structure as a legitimate option for an inclusive meaning in Rom 16:7 had that been his intention regarding Junia and her relationship to the apostles, but instead he used ἐπίσημος plus ἐν plus dative.

- Aelius Aristides Rhet. (AD 2), *Ἰσθμικός εἰς Ποσειδῶνα*. Jebb pg. 25 line 2.
- Aelius Herodianus et Pseudo-Herodianus Gramm. et Rhet. (AD 2), *De prosodia catholica*. Part+volume 3,1 pg. 326 line 18.
- Aesopus et Aesopica Scr. Fab. (6 BC), *Fabulae*. Fable 174 version 1 line 4.
- Agathemerus Geogr. (post 1 BC), *Geographiae informatio*. Sec. 23 line 3.
- Astrologica (date varia), *Περὶ νοσούντων* (e cod. Laur. plut. 28, 34, fol. 18). Vol. 1 pg. 127 line 8.
- Basilius Caesariensis Theol. (AD 4), *Epistulae*. Epistle 252 sec. 1 line 7.
- Claudius Ptolemaeus Math. (AD 2), *Geographia* (lib. 4–8). Bk. 4 chp. 5 sec. 38 line 2; Bk. 5 chp. 1 sec. 10 line 1.
- Clemens Romanus et Clementina Theol. (AD 1), *Homiliae* [Sp.]. Homily 12 chp. 2 sec. 3 line 1.
- Ctesias Hist. et Med. (5–4 BC), *Fragmenta*. Volume-Jacoby-F 3c,688,F frg. 1b line 39;<sup>82</sup> frg. 1b line 708;<sup>83</sup> frg. 45 line 535.
- Cyrillus Alexandrinus Theol. (AD 4–5), *Commentarii in Joannem*. Vol. 1 pg. 238 line 27; *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam*. Vol. 70 pg. 228 line 57; *Commentarius in xii prophetas minores*. Vol. 1 pg. 186 line 17; Vol. 2 pg. 357 line

<sup>81</sup> As a reminder to the reader, these texts contain the word ἐπίσημος and occur before the 5<sup>th</sup> century AD.

<sup>82</sup> Similarly Diodorus Siculus Hist. (1 BC), *Bibliotheca historica* (lib. 1–20). Bk. 2 chp. 2 sec. 2 line 4.

<sup>83</sup> Similarly Diodorus Siculus Hist. (1 BC), *Bibliotheca historica* (lib. 1–20). Bk. 2 chp. 24 sec. 2 line 2.

- 18; *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate*. Vol. 68 pg. 281 line 24; *Epistulae paschales sive Homiliae paschales (epist. 1–6)*. Homily 5 sec. 1 line 39; *Epistulae paschales sive Homiliae paschales (epist. 1–30)*. Vol. 77 pg. 500 line 51; Vol. 77 pg. 472 line 42;<sup>84</sup> *Expositio in Psalmos*. Vol. 69 pg. 1060 line 36; Vol. 69 pg. 1068 line 2; *Glaphyra in Pentateuchum*. Vol. 69 pg. 244 line 36; Vol. 69 pg. 380 line 56.
- Demetrius Gramm. (3–2 BC), *Fragmenta*. Frg. 23b line 6.
  - Diodorus Siculus Hist. (1 BC), *Bibliotheca historica (lib. 1–20)*. Bk. 2 chp. 11 sec. 1 line 6; Bk. 11 chp. 84 sec. 7 line 7; Bk. 13 chp. 27 sec. 5 line 3; Bk. 14 chp. 41 sec. 4 line 4; Bk. 14 chp. 77 sec. 5 line 2; Bk. 16 chp. 27 sec. 3 line 5; Bk. 19 chp. 19 sec. 4 line 4; Bk. 27 chp. 17 sec. 1 line 1.
  - Diogenes Phil. Babylonius (2 BC), *Testimonia et fragmenta*. Frg. 104 line 2.
  - Eusebius Theol. et Scr. Eccl. (AD 4), *Historia ecclesiastica*. Bk. 2 chp. 10 sec. 1 line 5; Bk. 4 chp. 18 sec. 6 line 2; Bk. 5 chp. 1 sec. 1 line 2; Bk. 6 chp. 30 sec. 1 line 4; Bk. 8 chp. 13 sec. 3 line 2; Bk. 8 chp. 14 sec. 15 line 2; *Onomasticon*. Pg. 22 line 15.
  - Eutropius Hist. (AD 4), *Breviarium ab urbe condita (Paeanii translatio)*. Bk. 3 chp. 14 line 17; Bk. 6 chp. 8 line 16; Bk. 7 chp. 16 line 2.
  - Flavius Josephus Hist. (AD 1), *Antiquitates Judaicae*. Bk. 4 chp. 174 line 3; Bk. 13 chp. 129 line 1; Bk. 16 chp. 16 line 2; *De bello Judaico libri vii*. Bk. 6 sec. 381 line 1.
  - Heliodorus Scr. Erot. (AD 3), *Aethiopia*. Bk. 10 chp. 3 sec. 2 line 4.
  - Hephaestion Gramm. (AD 2), *Enchiridion de metris*. Pg. 36 line 6; Pg. 38 line 6.
  - Herodianus Hist. (AD 2–3), *Ab excessu divi Marci*. Bk. 1 chp. 7 sec. 4 line 5.
  - Joannes Chrysostomus Scr. Eccl. (AD 4–5), *Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae (lib. 1–3)*. Vol. 47 pg. 340 line 7; *In epistulam i ad Corinthios (homiliae 1–44)*. Vol. 61 pg. 169 line 17; *In illud: Vidi dominum (homiliae 1–6)*. Homily 6 sec. 2 line 27.
  - Lucianus Soph. (AD 2), *Nigrinus*. Sec. 24 line 8.
  - Marcianus Geogr. (AD 3–5), *Periplus maris exteri*. Bk. 2 sec. A line 26.
  - Menander Rhet. (AD 3–4), *Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν*. Spengel pg. 393 line 6.
  - Palladius Scr. Eccl. (AD 4–5), *Dialogus de vita Joannis Chrysostomi*. Pg. 108 line 20.
  - Philostorgius Scr. Eccl. (AD 4–5), *Historia ecclesiastica (fragmenta e passione Artemii)*. Bk. 7 frg. 3a line 4; *Historia ecclesiastica (fragmenta ap. Photium)*. Bk. 10 frg. 8 line 7.
  - Porphyrius Phil. (AD 3), *Introductio in tetrabibulum Ptolemaei*. Vol. 54 pg. 195 line 6.
  - <Pythagoras> Phil. (6–5 BC), *Testimonia*. Frg. 18 line 2.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>84</sup> Similarly Cyrillus Alexandrinus Theol. (AD 4–5), *Epistulae paschales sive Homiliae paschales (epist. 1–6)*. Homily 4 sec. 1 line 11.

<sup>85</sup> Similarly Hermippus Hist. et Gramm. (3 BC), *Fragmenta*. Frg. 22 line 3; and Flavius Josephus Hist. (AD 1), *Contra Apionem (= De Judaeorum vetustate)*. Bk. 1 sec. 163 line 2.

- *Scholia in Aristophanem, Scholia in plutum (scholia vetera et fort. recentiora sub auctore Moschopulo)* (date varia). Argumentum-scholion sch plut verse 179 line 39.
- *Scholia in Aristophanem, Commentarium in plutum (recensio 1) (scholia recentiora Tzetzae)* (date varia). Argumentum-dramatis personae-scholion sch plut verse 179 line 22.
- *Scholia in Homerum, Scholia in Iliadem (scholia vetera) (= D scholia)* (date varia). Book of Iliad 20 verse 3 line of scholion 8.
- *Scholia in Homerum, Scholia in Iliadem (scholia vetera)* (date varia). Book of Iliad 11 verse 110–1 line of scholion 2.
- Strabo Geogr. (1 BC–AD 1), *Geographica*. Bk. 10 chp. 1 sec. 7 line 6.
- Theodoretus Theol. et Scr. Eccl. (AD 4–5), *Interpretatio in Daniele*. Vol. 81 pg. 1356 line 49.
- Theodorus Mopsuestenus Theol. (AD 4–5), *Expositio in psalmos (in catenis)*. Psalm 44 verse 14a line 9.
- Theon Math. (AD 4), *Υπόμνημα εἰς τοὺς προχείρους Πτολεμαίου κανόνας (commentarium magnum) (lib. 1–3)*. ST number 315 pg. 95 line 14.

2. *Evidence that supports ἐπίσημος plus (ἐν plus) dative as exclusive, e.g. “well known to.”* Because this aspect of our thesis is the most debated, I will present this evidence more explicitly. First I list with translation and comment ten illustrative texts. Then I list twenty-six other passages, including Greek text, translation, and their five data points. All of these passages use ἐπίσημος plus (ἐν plus) dative with an exclusive sense; thirty-five are personal, and one is impersonal. They confirm an exclusive meaning as much more likely than inclusive for Rom 16:7, which involves ἐπίσημος plus ἐν plus dative with personal nouns.

a. *Texts with translation and comment.* Cyrillus Alexandrinus Theol. (AD 4–5), *Expositio in Psalmos*. Vol. 69 pg. 1057 line 30. “Ὅτι δὲ γεγόνασιν ἐπίσημοι καὶ ἀπόβλεπτοι τοῖς ἀπανταχοῦ.” “And because they had become notable to and admired by those everywhere.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive. Two factors reinforce the exclusive sense here: First, ἐπίσημοι is parallel to ἀπόβλεπτοι, the latter of which means “to be gazed upon, admired.” This has to be taken in an exclusive sense, which means ἐπίσημοι more likely carries that sense as well. Second, the adverb ἀπανταχοῦ, here a substantive, points to others around them who hold them in high regard.

Diodorus Siculus Hist. (1 BC), *Bibliotheca historica (lib. 21–40)*. Bk. 37 chp. 2 sec. 4 line 3. Ἐπολέμουν δὲ Ῥωμαίοις Σαυνῖται, Ἀσκολανοί, Λευκανοί, Πικεντῖνοι, Νωλανοί, καὶ ἕτεροι πόλεις καὶ ἔθνη· ἐν οἷς ἐπισημοτάτη καὶ μεγίστη καὶ κοινή πόλις ἄρτι συντετελεσμένη τοῖς Ἰταλιώταις τὸ Κορφίνιον ἦν.<sup>86</sup> “Now at war with the Romans were the Samnites, the Askolonites, the Leukanites, the Pikentinites, the Nolanites, and other cities and nations, among whom the most esteemed and greatest and common city at present counted by the Italians was Korphinius.” (1) superlative, (2) superlative, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive. The relevant clause

<sup>86</sup> This wording is repeated in *Posidonius Phil., Fragmenta (Theiler)* (2–1 BC). Frg. 223 line 2.

begins with ἐν οἷς, which itself is inclusive, as it refers to Korinthios among the entities at war with Rome. The pertinent phrase in question, however, is not ἐν οἷς but τοῖς Ἰταλιώταις. This should be considered exclusive, as the phrase συντετελεσμένη τοῖς Ἰταλιώταις indicates the assessment of Korinthios, a city, by the Italians, a group of people. To call this inclusive would create an odd relationship between the two entities.

Ephraem Syrus Theol. (AD 4), *Ad imitationem proverbiorum*. Pg. 187 line 6. Πιστεύειν δὲ δεῖ ὅτι, ἐὰν ὑπομείνωμεν αὐτόν, ἔστι καρπὸς τῆς ἐργασίας ἡμῶν. Θέλω πρακτικὸς εἶναι καὶ ἐπίσημος ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἢ αραβαίνειν ἐντολὰς καὶ εἶναι αὐτοῖς βδελυκτός. “And it is necessary to believe that, if we wait for him, there is fruit in our work. I want to be practical and well known to the brothers or to transgress commandments and to be abominable to them.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) ἔν plus dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive. The parallel phrase εἶναι αὐτοῖς βδελυκτός logically is exclusive in force, which reinforces the exclusive sense for ἐπίσημος ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.

Gregorius Nyssenus Theol. (AD 4), *In inscriptiones Psalmorum*. Vol. 5 pg. 142 line 15. κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ὁ διὰ τοσοῦτων <ἀγώνων> ταῖς κατὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν νίκαις ἐγγυμασθεῖς ἐπισημοτέρας τὰς νίκας ἑαυτῷ ποιεῖ. “In the same way through such struggles, being practiced relative to victories over the enemies, even he makes the victories better known to himself.” (1) comparative, (2) comparative, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive. The fact that the dative adjunct is the reflexive pronoun ἑαυτῷ implies a strong distinction between the person who receives the information and the thing esteemed as ἐπίσημος.

*Historia Alexandri Magni, Recensio a sive Recensio vetusta* (date varia). Bk. 2 chp. 21 sec. 26 line 2. ὦμοσα γὰρ περιφανεῖς καὶ ἐπίσημους ὑμᾶς ποιῆσαι πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις. “For I swear to make you evident and notable to all men.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive. The collocation with περιφανεῖς, which means “seen all around, conspicuous, evident,” has to be taken as exclusive and thus reinforces the exclusive nuance for the parallel use of ἐπίσημος.

Lucianus Soph. (AD 2), *Apologia*. Sec. 4 line 21. ὅσω γοῦν πᾶσιν ἐπισημότερος εἶναι δοκεῖς, τοσοῦτω καταγελαστότερος ἂν δόξειας εἶναι ἀντιφωνοῦντος τοῦ νῦν βίου τῷ βιβλίῳ. “At any rate how greatly you seem to be more eminent to all, you might seem to be so much the more ridiculous when you answer from the present life in the book.” (1) comparative, (2) comparative, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive. The use of the verb δοκέω in the context supports the idea that the dative shows those who have the mental perception about the entity identified as ἐπίσημος.

Lucianus Soph. (AD 2), *Hermotimus*. Sec. 44 line 11. τῷ δὲ ἐνάτῳ λέων ἔστω τοῦπίσημον [crasis of τὸ ἐπίσημον]. “Let a lion be the mark to the ninth [competitor].” (1) positive, (2) substantival, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive. The context of this passage is how one might choose arrangements for an athletic match among an uneven number of competitors. Beads with drawings are placed in a jar, and the competitors draw the beads. Competitors are paired based upon matching beads. The bead with no match indicates the bye for the round; in this case that bead is marked with a lion. The mark on the bead is to be the distinguishing sign to

the competitor that he has the bye for that round. This reinforces the possibility that the dative can be used to indicate the receiver of information, much like in Rom 16:7.

*Prolegomena de Comoedia, De comoedia* (date varia). Line 22. ὁ μέντοι γε Ἀριστοφάνης μεθοδεύσας τεχνικώτερον τῶν μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν κωμωδίαν ἐνέλαμψεν ἐν ἅπασιν ἐπίσημος ὄφθεις οὕτως καὶ οὕτως πᾶσαν κωμωδίαν ἐμελέτησε. "Indeed at any rate Aristophanes after having dealt with the more skilled of those with him gained glory with the comedy thusly appearing prominent to all and thusly pursuing every comedy." (1) positive, (2) elative, (3) ἐν plus dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive. The presence of the verb ὄφθεις reinforces the exclusive sense here for ἐπίσημος because it focuses upon the mental perception of those who regard Aristophanes. Aristophanes is different than all the others because he gained more glory than them with comedy.

Theodoretus Theol. et Scr. Eccl. (AD 4–5), *Commentaria in Isaiam*. Sec. 9 line 121. εἰ δέ που ἐν ὄρους κορυφῇ μία πίτυς ἢ κυπάριττος καταλειφθείη, (λίαν ἐστὶ) τ(οῖς) παριούσιν ἐπίσημος. "And if one pine anywhere on the mountain might be butted or a cypress left behind, it is exceedingly notable to those who are present." (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive. Since trees are ἐπίσημος and people the ones who notice it, this use is most likely exclusive. An inclusive sense here would be nonsensical.

*Scholía in Pindarum, Scholia in Pindarum (scholia vetera)* (date varia). Ode O 1 scholion 184a line 4. εἶη σὲ μὲν τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον ὃν ζῶμεν ἐν ὑψει καὶ εὐδαιμονία διαζῆν, ἐμὲ δὲ τοσαῦτα τοῖς νικηφόροις προσδιαλέγεσθαι τοῖς ἐγκωμίοις, προφανῆ καὶ ἐπίσημον ὄντα διὰ τὴν σοφίαν ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν. "Indeed it might be with reference to you [that] I was living in this time which we live in grandeur and prosperity, but with reference to me such things to the things which bring victory holding conversation to the laudatory odes, being manifest and notable because of wisdom to all the Greeks." (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) ἐν plus dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive. The use of προφανῆ, which means "conspicuous, plain, clear," has to be taken in an exclusive sense. This reinforces the exclusive sense for ἐπίσημον.

b. *Texts with Greek, translation, and data points only. Apophthegmata, Apophthegmata (collectio anonyma) (e cod. Coislín. 126)* (date varia). Apophthegm 175 line 78. καὶ οὕτως πάλιν τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα ἐνώκησεν ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐγένετο πᾶσιν ἐπίσημος, ταπεινοφρονῶν, καὶ τῇ ἐξομολογήσει καὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ πρὸς κύριον εὐφραντικός.<sup>87</sup> "And thus again the divinity inhabited the spirit within him, and he became remarkable to all, humble, and cheery to the confession and thankfulness to the Lord." (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Cyrillus Alexandrinus Theol. (AD 4–5), *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam*. Vol. 70 pg. 16 line 27. Ὡσπερ τοίνυν ἐπισημοτάτη γέγονεν ἡ πρόσληψις τοῖς ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ, οὕτω βούλεται καὶ τὸν τῆς ἀποβολῆς μὴ ἀγνοεῖσθαι τρόπον. "Therefore just as this assumption has become most well known to those from Israel, thus he [God] de-

<sup>87</sup> Similarly *Apophthegmata, Apophthegmata patrum (collectio systematica) (cap. 1–9)* (date varia). Chp. 5 paragraph 46 line 97.

sires even not to be ignorant of the life of the lost.” (1) superlative, (2) elative, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Cyrillus Alexandrinus Theol. (AD 4–5), *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam*. Vol. 70 pg. 236 line 29. Ἔσονται τοίνυν φανεροί, φησὶ, τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ἐπίσημοι καὶ Θεῶν γνωριμώτατοι, καὶ διαπρεπεῖς ἐν κόσμῳ. “Accordingly they will be visible, he says, that is, notable and well-known to God, and distinguished in the world.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Cyrillus Alexandrinus Theol. (AD 4–5), *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam*. Vol. 70 pg. 377 line 33. Ἦν μὲν γὰρ τό γε ἦκον εἰς δόξαν, ἐπίσημος ἐν ἀγγέλοις, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄνω δυνάμεσιν περιφανής, καθάπερ ἀμέλει καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄστροις Ἐωσφόρος. “For indeed he was present in glory, prominent to angels, and manifest to all powers above, just as the morning star also is careless among the stars.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) ἐν plus dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Cyrillus Alexandrinus Theol. (AD 4–5), *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam*. Vol. 70 pg. 521 line 52. Ἐφρόνουν τε μεγάλως ἔχοντες μητέρα τὴν Τύρον, ἐπισημοτάτην τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀλκιμωτάτην ἐν νήσοις, ταῖς κατὰ γε φημὶ τὴν ἑῴαν. “They [i.e. the Carthaginians] thought greatly [of themselves] because they had Tyre as their mother, which was at the same time the most excellent and most valiant to the islands which were, as I said, in the east.” (1) superlative, (2) superlative, (3) ἐν plus dative, (4) impersonal, (5) exclusive.

Cyrillus Alexandrinus Theol. (AD 4–5), *Commentarius in xii prophetas minores*. Vol. 1 pg. 61 line 2. καταμαρτυρήσει γὰρ ὡςπερ τῆς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ μοχθηρίας ἀφηρημένα ταυτὶ, καὶ τὴν δίκην αὐτοῖς ἐπισημοτέραν ἐργάσεται, καὶ καταφανῆ ποιήσει τὴν ὀργήν. “For just as he will bear witness against the depravity of Israel, which has been taken from them, he also will make judgment more known to them, and he will make wrath manifest.” (1) comparative, (2) comparative, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Cyrillus Alexandrinus Theol. (AD 4–5), *Commentarius in xii prophetas minores*. Vol. 2 pg. 278 line 13. πλὴν σείσω καὶ ἔτι, τουτέστιν, ἐπίσημόν τι καὶ διαβόητον τοῖς ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐργάσομαι πάλιν, μονονουχὶ κατασειῶν τὰ πάντα. “Nevertheless I will shake even still, that is, I will again make the entire earth something prominent and famous to those all around by throwing down all things in a single night.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Eunapius Hist. et Soph. (AD 4–5), *Fragmenta historica*. Vol. 1 pg. 236 line 18. Σιμωνίδης· οὗτος ἦν ἐπὶ Ἰοβιανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως διὰ φιλοσοφίαν πᾶσιν ἐπισημώτατος. “Simonides: He was during the time of Jovian the king through philosophy most remarkable to all.” (1) superlative, (2) elative, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Euripides Trag. (5 BC), *Bacchae*. Line 967. Δι. ἐπίσημον ὄντα πᾶσιν. “Dionysus: Becoming remarkable to all.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Eusebius Theol. et Scr. Eccl. (AD 4), *Commentarius in Isaiam*. Bk. 1 sec. 80 line 48. οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄλος ἐνιαυτὸς παρελεύσεται, μεθ' ὃν ἡ πάλαι ἐπηρεμένη καὶ τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐπίσημος καὶ διαφανής τῶν υἱῶν Κηδᾶρ πόλις ἀφανισθήσεται. “For a year will not pass after which the city of the sons of Kedar raised long ago, prominent and visi-

ble to all, will be hidden.” (1) positive, (2) elative, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Eusebius Theol. et Scr. Eccl. (AD 4), *Praeparatio evangelica*. Bk. 10 chp. 14 sec. 11 line 1. ἐγένετο δ' ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐπισημότατος ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησι. “Now this man [Thales of Miletus] became most well known among the Greeks.” (1) superlative, (2) elative, (3) ἐν plus dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Flavius Josephus Hist. (AD 1), *Antiquitates Judaicae*. Bk. 10 chp. 240 line 4. τοῦτο γὰρ ποιήσαντι πορφύραν δώσειν ἐνδεδύσθαι καὶ χρύσειον περὶ αὐχένα στρεπτὸν καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ μέρος τιμῆν καὶ γέρας τῆς σοφίας, ὡς ἂν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπισημότατος γένοιτο τοῖς ὄρωσι. “For by doing this, to give him [i.e. Daniel] purple to wear and a chain of gold about his neck and a third of his rule as a portion as honor and gift for his wisdom, so from them he might become most distinguished to those who saw.” (1) superlative, (2) elative, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

*Historia Alexandri Magni, Recensio Byzantina poetica (cod. Marcianus 408)* (date varia). Line 2460. Ὠρα καλῆ πρὸς τὴν Θεάν, Ἀλέξανδρε, προσήλθες. Ἐπίσημον γενέσθαι σε δεῖ κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ πᾶσι δήμοις ὡς ἀστὴρ καλὸς ὑπερεκλάμψεις. “At this good hour you came to the goddess, Alexander. It is necessary for you to become famous among every city and to all districts; as a beautiful star you will be bright.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

*Historia Alexandri Magni, Recensio Byzantina poetica (cod. Marcianus 408)* (date varia). Line 3997. ὁμνυμι γὰρ τὴν Πρόνοιαν καὐτὴν τὴν σωτηρίαν μητρὸς Ὀλυμπιάδος μου, περιφανεῖς ποιήσω ὡς ἐπίσημους τοὺς αὐτοὺς πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις τάχει.<sup>88</sup> “For I swear even by Forethought [i.e. Athena] herself, the savior of my mother Olympia, I will quickly make them evident as well known to all men.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

*Historia Alexandri Magni, Recensio β* (date varia). Bk. 2 sec. 21 line 57. ὦμοσα γὰρ περιφανεῖς καὶ ἐπίσημους ὑμᾶς ποιῆσαι πᾶσιν, τουτέστιν ἀνασταυρωθῆναι, ἵνα πάντες ὑμᾶς θεωρῶσιν. “For I swore to make you evident and well known to all, that is, to be crucified anew, so that all might see you.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Joannes Chrysostomus Scr. Eccl. (AD 4–5), *In diem natalem*. Vol. 49 pg. 352 line 12. καὶ πολὺς περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης πανταχοῦ γίνεται λόγος, τῶν μὲν αἰτιωμένων, ὅτι νέα τίς ἐστὶ καὶ πρόσφατος, καὶ νῦν εἰσηνήκεται, τῶν δὲ ἀπολογουμένων, ὅτι παλαιὰ καὶ ἀρχαία ἐστὶ, τῶν προφητῶν ἤδη προειπόντων περὶ τῆς γεννήσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄνωθεν τοῖς ἀπὸ Θράκης μέχρι Γαδείρων οἰκοῦσι κατάδηλος καὶ ἐπίσημος γέγονε. “And a great word concerning this day goes everywhere, on the one hand by those who accuse, because a certain thing is young and fresh, and now has been introduced, and on the other hand by those who speak in defense, because it is old and ancient, already spoken beforehand by the prophets concerning his birth, and from the beginning it had become visible and

<sup>88</sup> Similarly *Historia Alexandri Magni, Recensio β* (date varia). Bk. 2 sec. 21 line 42; *Historia Alexandri Magni, Recensio γ (lib. 2)* (date varia). Sec. 21 line 55.

well known to those who live from Thrace as far as Cadiz.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Joannes Chrysostomus Scr. Eccl. (AD 4–5), *In epistulam i ad Corinthios (homiliae 1–44)*. Vol. 61 pg. 169 line 16. ἀλλὰ μερίζεται τι πρὸς σὲ καὶ κενοδοξία πολλάκις, καὶ τὸ παθεῖν εὖ καὶ ἐπίσημότερον πολλοῖς δι’ ἐκεῖνον γίνεσθαι. “But something is divided to you and this is often vanity, and to be well off becomes even more evident to many through this.” (1) comparative, (2) comparative, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Joannes Chrysostomus Scr. Eccl. (AD 4–5), *In Genesim (homiliae 1–67)*. Vol. 53 pg. 361 line 64. ὅπως ὁ φιλόανθρωπος Θεὸς βουλόμενος ἅπασιν ἐπίσημον ποιῆσαι τὸν πατριάρχην, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτων ἐτῶν ἀριθμὸν τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπιδείκνυται μακροθυμίαν. “Thus the benevolent God, desiring to make the patriarch prominent to all, for a number of years showed himself patient to his house.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Lucianus Soph. (AD 2), *De domo*. Sec. 7 line 6. Ἐτι δὲ θαυμάσειεν ἂν τις καὶ τῆς ὀροφῆς ἐν τῷ εὐμόρφῳ τὸ ἀπέριττον κὰν τῷ εὐκόσμῳ τὸ ἀνεπίληπτον καὶ τὸ τοῦ χρυσοῦ ἐς τὸ εὐπρεπὲς σύμμετρον, ἀλλὰ μὴ παρὰ τὰς χρείας ἐπίφθονον, ἀλλ’ ὁπόσον ἂν καὶ γυναικὶ σῶφρονι καὶ καλῇ ἀρκέσει ἐπίσημότερον ἐργάσασθαι τὸ κάλλος. “And someone might still even wonder at the simplicity of the ceiling in its beauty, and the perfection in its order, and the proportion of gold in its beauty, not odious beyond need, but the beauty made so much more evident even to a wise woman or a pretty girl.” (1) comparative, (2) comparative, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Lucianus Soph. (AD 2), *De saltatione*. Sec. 8 line 16. ὁ γοῦν Ὀμηρος τὸν Μηριόνην, οὐκ αἰσχῦναι βουλόμενος ἀλλὰ κοσμηῆσαι, ὀρχηστὴν προσεῖπεν, καὶ οὕτως ἄρα ἐπίσημος ἦν καὶ γνώριμος ἅπασιν ἐπὶ τῇ ὀρχηστικῇ ὥστε οὐχ οἱ Ἕλληνες μόνον ταῦτα ἠπίσταντο περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ Τρῶες αὐτοί, καίτοι πολέμιοι ὄντες. “So Homer calls Meriones a dancer, not wanting to shame but rather to honor, and thus he was famous and well known to all because of his dancing, with the result that not only the Greeks knew these things about him but also the Trojans themselves, who were his enemies.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Macarius Scr. Eccl. (AD 4–5), *Apocriticus seu Monogenēs*. Bk. 3 Blondel pg. 80 line 20. Ὡσπερ γὰρ στρατιώτης εὖ καὶ καλῶς τῇ παντευχίᾳ χρώμενος ἔνδοξος δι’ αὐτῆς καὶ λαμπρὸς καὶ ἐπιφανής, {καὶ} δι’ αὐτῆς εἰς βασιλεία σεμνῶς εἰσπορεύεται, δι’ αὐτῆς εἶσω τῶν ἀνακτόρων λάμπει, δι’ αὐτῆς ἐπίσημος ἀρχοντικαῖς δυνάμεσι, δι’ αὐτῆς τὸ ἄμαχον ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ἔχει. “For similarly a soldier is well and good in armor when attacked, esteemed because of it and shining and manifest. By it he reverently goes to the king, by it he shines inside the king’s dwellings, by it he is prominent to the ruling powers, by it he has no battle in the cities.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

*Prolegomena de Comoedia, De comoedia (Anonymus Crameri i)* (date varia). Line 66. ὁ μέντοι γε Ἀριστοφάνης μεθοδεύσας τεχνικώτερον τὴν κωμῶδιαν ἐν ταύτῃ ἀνέλαμψεν ἐν ἅπασιν ἐπίσημος φανείς. “Indeed Aristophanes, after treating come-

dy more skillfully, shined out in this, appearing prominent to all.” (1) positive, (2) elative, (3) ἐν plus dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

*Scholia in Euripidem, Scholia in Euripidem (scholia vetera)* (date varia). Vita-argumentum-scholion sch Hec sec. 379 line 16. ἡ δὲ σύνταξις οὕτως· δεινὸς χαρακτήρ καὶ ἐπίσημος ἐν βροτοῖς τὸ ἀπὸ ἐσθλῶν γενέσθαι.<sup>89</sup> “And thusly the arrangement: a character becoming terrible and notorious to mortals from good.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) ἐν plus dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

*Scholia in Euripidem, Scholia in Euripidem (scholia vetera)* (date varia). Vita-argumentum-scholion sch Hipp sec. 5 line 2. τοὺς μὲν σέβοντας· τὸ ἐξῆς τῆς διανοίας· προαποδειχθέντος τοῦ μεγάλην μέ τινα εἶναι καὶ ἐπίσημον παρὰ πᾶσι. “Indeed the worshipers: the sequence of the thought: after proving me to be someone great and notable before all.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) ἐν plus dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

*Scholia in Euripidem, Scholia in Euripidis Hecubam (scholia vetera et scholia recentiora Thomae Magistri, Triclinii, Moschopuli et anonyma)* (date varia). Sec. Sch hyp-scholion 379 line 30. καὶ ἐπίσημος, ἦγουν διάδηλος, ἐν βροτοῖς, τὸ γενέσθαι τινα δηλονότι ἀπὸ ἐσθλῶν καὶ εὐγενῶν. “And well known, that is to say distinguishable, to mortals, being clearly from those good and well-born.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) ἐν plus dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

Theodoretus Theol. et Scr. Eccl. (AD 4–5), *Historia religiosa* (= *Philotheus*). Vita 2 sec. 6 line 7. Ἐπίσημος δὲ καὶ περιβλεπτός ἦν οὐ τοῖς αὐτόθι μόνοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ Συρίᾳ τῆς φιλοσοφίας φροντιστηρίοις, ἐν οἷς καὶ ἐτελευτα βιώσας, ὡς λέγεται, τέτταρα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἔτη. “And he was notable and distinguished not only to those there, but also to the schools of philosophy in Syria, in which even he passed his life when, as it is said, he lived to 104 years.” (1) positive, (2) positive, (3) ἐν plus dative, (4) personal, (5) exclusive.

3. *Evidence counter to our thesis.* In our previous article, we discussed evidence which went against our thesis, and in my subsequent research I have found only one new passage in that vein: Oribasius Med. (AD 4), *Eclogae medicamentorum*. Chr. 149 sec. 2 line 3. ταῦτα μὲν, κἂν μηδεμία συναίσθησις περὶ τὴν ὑστέραν ὑπάρχη <ῆ> ψύξις λανθάνουσα, πολλάκις εἴθε περιωδυνεῖν· ἐπισημότερον δ' ἐν ταῖς φλεγμοναῖς, ὁπότε καὶ περὶ αὐτὴν ἀλγήματα συνίσταται νυγματώδη σφυγμὸν ποιοῦντα ἐκ διαστημάτων. “Indeed with reference to these things, even if no sensation concerning the womb might exist or cooling escaping notice, often pain is the norm. And more evident among inflammations, whenever even concerning it pain arises punctuated, making at intervals.” (1) comparative, (2) comparative, (3) ἐν plus dative, (4) impersonal, (5) inclusive. This cannot be personal, of course, but it is slightly awkward to think of the pain and inflammation as being in the same group. But the point is clear: Pain is more evident among inflammation, so this citation goes contrary to our thesis. Important to note is this passage has impersonal nouns, thus it is not a complete parallel to Rom 16:7.

<sup>89</sup> See identical wording in *Scholia in Euripidem, Scholia in Euripidis Hecubam (scholia vetera et scholia recentiora Thomae Magistri, Triclinii, Moschopuli et anonyma)* (date varia). Sec. Sch hyp-scholion 379 line 16.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this article I have aimed at three things: (1) defend the original presentation of our thesis; (2) present new evidence to support ἐπίσημος plus genitive as inclusive (e.g. “notable among”); and (3) present new evidence to support ἐπίσημος plus (ἐν plus) dative as exclusive (e.g. “well known to”). A review of our original arguments and evidence shows considerable agreement between us and our interlocutors on the force of many passages; where our interpretation of certain passages was challenged, a ready response can be given. A thorough re-examination of the occurrences of ἐπίσημος in ancient Greek literature has brought 107 more passages to light that support our thesis, thirty-six of which are parallel to Rom 16:7. In short, I believe that our original thesis is still sound, and even more so in light of this new evidence. Thus the exegesis of Rom 16:7 which identifies Andronicus and Junia as “well known to the apostles” is stronger than before.

Part of our intent with the original article was to open the door to consideration of an interpretation that had simply been brushed aside by contemporary scholarship. Most of the technical discussion about this matter dismisses the exclusive interpretation out of hand. We hoped with our original article to crack the door open a bit to the exclusive view, and now with this article the door stands wide open. Acknowledgment of *any* pertinent parallels to an exclusive view for ἐπίσημος plus (ἐν plus) dative lends credence to our original thesis and requires that it be considered as a possible exegesis of Rom 16:7. As I indicated above, all rejoinders admit that some passages with ἐπίσημος plus (ἐν plus) dative must be taken with an exclusive sense. With a defense of our original evidence and the addition of new passages to the debate, our thesis that ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις should be understood to mean “well known to the apostles” is strengthened considerably. Any responsible exegetical discussion of Rom 16:7 and the role of Junia vis-à-vis the apostles must wrestle with—not dismiss without argument—the view that she was not an apostle as such, but regarded as notable by that group. My unchanged opinion is that the latter is the proper exegesis of this passage.