Durham E-Theses

Women in the Greetings of Rom 16:1-16: A Study of Mutuality and Women's Ministry in the Letter to the Romans

MATHEW, SUSAN

Women in the Greetings of Rom 16:1-16: A Study of Mutuality and Women's Ministry in the Letter to the Romans

By Susan Mathew

Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Durham University

Department of Theology and Religion

2010

Acknowledgements

Declaration

No part of this thesis has been submitted for a degree in this or any other University. The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published in any format, including electronic and the Internet, without the author's prior written consent. All information derived from this thesis must be acknowledged appropriately.

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to investigate the leadership roles of women within the model of mutuality in Pauline churches as specified in Romans 16:1-16. The three major issues focussed in this study are the leadership roles of women in the Pauline churches (Romans 16:1-16), the nature of mutuality reflected in the greetings to men and women, and the way in which the greetings to men and women in Rom 16 relate to the ethos of mutualism in Rom 12-15.

Starting from the premise that Romans 16 is an integral part of the letter, the study begins with an overview of previous research in the areas of major focus (Chapter 1). It is followed by the analysis of the form of greetings in the Pauline letters against the backdrop of the Hellenistic use of greetings to understand the significance of the specific form of the greetings in Rom 16:1-16 and its purpose of encouraging mutual relationship (Chapter 2). The analysis of the leadership of women in the Greco-Roman world shows that women's leadership roles in the Pauline churches were not countercultural; rather they were part of the culture of the Greco-Roman world, where some women of wealth or higher social status exerted some independence (Chapter 3). The women named (Rom 16:1-16) and greeted with descriptive phrases perhaps draw our attention to Paul's acknowledgment of some women, who worked as his associates, and point to relationships of mutuality in the greetings (Chapter 4). The study of Romans 12-13 helps to clarify the model of mutuality in the body metaphor and the repeated term 'ἀλλήλους', signifying that Christian experience is not only an individual experience but also has social and ethical aspects (Chapter 5). The contextual application of mutuality in the community as mutual welcoming and mutual *up-building* (Rom 14-15) is the focus of Chapter 6. The final attempt is to draw together the peculiarities of the Pauline ethos of mutuality which encourages the leadership roles of women in the greetings (Chapter 7).

Mutuality of relationships in Romans transcends gender discrimination as Paul accepts and appreciates men and women for their toil with regard to the church and to himself. The women named and greeted with specific roles (Rom 16) are Phoebe, Prisca, Junia, Persis, Mary, Tryphaena and Tryphosa, Rufus' mother, Nereus' sister and Julia. The leadership of women in the church is placed within the structures of mutuality in Romans. Mutuality is the model of relationship Paul wants to urge on Roman Christians and the ethical obligations are guided by the dynamic relationships of 'love mutualism', which are evident in Romans 12-15. Love mutualism works as mutual service to the other that works within the hierarchies and is dynamic.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of ancient literature follow The *SBL Handbook of Style* (2004) wherever possible. In addition, the following abbreviations are used:

AB	*Anchor Bible*
ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary*
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*
AGJU	*Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums*
BDAG	*Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 3rd ed. Chicago, 2000.*
BCE	Before the Common Era
BJS	*Brown Judaic Studies*
BRev	*Bible Review*
BT	*The Bible Translator*
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CD	*Damascus Document*
CE	Common Era
CFTL	Clark's Foreign Theological Library
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
DPL	*Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*
EDNT	*Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by H. Balz, G. Schneider. ET. Grand Rapids, 1990-1993.*
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
EBib	*Études Bibliques*
ETR	*Études théologiques et religieuses*
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
GR	*Greece and Rome*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HTS	*Harvard Theological Studies*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IJT	*Indian Journal of Theology*
JAAR	*Journal of the American Academy of Religion*
JAC	*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*
JB	*Jerome Bible*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JETS	*Journal of Evangelical Theological Society*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JSJ	*Journal of the Study of the Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSNT	*Journal of the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	*Journal of the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series*

JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KEK	*Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*
KJV	*King James Version*
LSJ	*Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, A Greek-English Lexicon 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996.*
LTJ	*Lutheran Theological Journal*
LXX	Septuagint
MM	*Moulton, J. H., and G. Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. London, 1930. Reprint, Peabody, Mass., 1997.*
MSS	Manuscripts
NCBC	New Critical Bible Commentary
New Docs	*New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri. Edited by G.H. R. Horsley and S. Llewelyn . North Ryde, NS.W., 1981-*
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	*Novum Testamentum Supplements*
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
PCPSSV	Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Supplement Volume
QD	Quaestiones disputatae
RBen	*Revue bénédictine*
REB	Revised English Bible
ResQ	*Restoration Quarterly*
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SE	*Studia Evangelica*
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTS	Society for New Testament Studies
SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and Its World
SVF	*Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by G. Kittel and G.Friedrich.Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964-1976.*
TGI	*Theologie und Glaube*
THKNT	*Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament*
TJ	*Trinity Journal*
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
VC	*Vigiliae Christianae*
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WW	*Word and World*
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentlische Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

Papyri

P.Amh.	*The Amherst Papyri, Being an Account of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of the Right Hon. Lord Amherst of Hackney, F.S.A. at Didlington Hall, Norfolk,* ed. B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt. London.
BGU	*Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen* (later *Staatlichen*) *Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden.* Berlin.
P. Cair. Zen	*Zenon Papyri, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire,* ed. C.C. Edgar, Cairo.
P.Fay.	*Fayum Towns and their Papyri,* ed. B.P. Grenfell, A.S. Hunt and D.G. Hogarth. London 1900.
P.Giss.	*Griechische Papyri im Museum des oberhessische Geschichtsvereins zu Giessen,* ed. O. Eger, E. Kornemann, and P.M. Meyer. Leipzig-Berlin 1910—1912.
P. Giess.	Griechischte Papyri im Museum des oberhessischen Geschichtsveriens zu Giessen. O. Eger, et.al., eds.3 vols. Leipzig/Berlin, 1910-1922.
PGM	Papyri graecae magicae, ed. K. Preisendanz. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1928-31.
P.Hamb.	*Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek.*
P.Iand.	*Papyri Iandanae,* ed. C. Kalbfleisch et al. Leipzig.
P.Mert.	*A Descriptive Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of Wilfred Merton.*
P.Oxy.	*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri.* Published by the Egypt Exploration Society in Graeco-Roman Memoirs. London.
P.Oslo	*Papyri Osloenses.* Oslo.
P.Princ.	*Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*
PSI	*Papiri greci e latini*
P.Ryl.	*Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library,* Manchester.
P.Tebt.	*The Tebtunis Papyri.* London.

Inscriptions

CII, CIJ	*Corpus Inscriptionum Iudicarum ,* ed. J.-B. Frey. 2 vols. Pontificio Istituto Di Archeologia Cristiana,1936 -52.
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
CPJ	*Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum,* 3 vols.
EG	*Epigrafia greca,* ed. M. Guarducci. 4 vols. Rome, 1967-78.
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae,* Berlin.
IGR, IGRR	*Incriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes,* ed. R. Cagnat et.al. 3 vols. Paris, 1906-27. Reprint, Chicago, 1975.
IKilikiaBM 1	Journeys in Rough Cilicia, 1962-63, ed. G. E. Bean and T. B. Mitford. DenkscheWien 85. Vienna, 1965.
MAMA	*Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua.* 10 vols. Manchester, then London 1928-93.
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 1-11. Ed. J. J. E Hondius et..al. 1923- . 12-25. Ed. A. G. Woodhead et al. Leiden, -1971.
I Eph.	*Die Inschriften von Ephesos 8 Vols. (Bonn 1979-84)*

Josephus
Ant.   *Antiquitates Judaicae (Jewish Antiquities)*
Ag.Ap.   *The Life Against Apion*
J.W.   Jewish War

Philo
Leg.Alleg.   *Legum Allegoriae*
In Flacc   *In Flaccum*
De Somn   *De Somniis*
Leg. Ad. Gaius   *Legatio ad Gaium*

Mishnah
m. Git   Gittin
m.Sota   Sota
m.Yebam   Yebamot
m. Yoma   Yoma

Babylonian Talmud
b.Pesah   Talmud Pesahim
b. Qidd   Qiddushin

Tosefta
t. Meg   Megillah
t. Zeb   Zebahim

Jerusalem Talmud
y. Ber   Berakhot
1 Clem   *1 Clement*
Herm.Man   Shepherd of Hermas, *Mandate*

T Sim   *Testament of Simon*
T. Zeb   *Testament of Zebulun*
Pittacus *Epig.*   *Epigramma*
Periander *Ep.*   *Epistulae*
Theognis *Eleg.*   *Elegiae*
Cleobulus *Epig.*   *Epigrammata*
Thales *Epig.ded.*   *Epigramma dedicatrium*

Unless otherwise noted, the translations of the ancient texts in this thesis follow,
where available, the renderings of LCL. The translations of New Testaments texts
are my own unless otherwise stated.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Purpose of Study

Despite the apparent restrictions on women in the worship and ministry of the church elsewhere (1 Cor 14:34-35; cf. 1 Tim 2:11-12), the Pauline greetings in Rom 16:1-16 affirm the mutuality of men and women in Christian ministry.[1] Rom 16:1-16 contains a list of persons who were engaged in the ministry of the church very actively. Paul greets them and acknowledges their ministry. No less than ten women are mentioned, and Paul describes their ministry in the same way as he acknowledges men.

What is the significance of these greetings to men and women for our understanding of women's roles and leadership in Christian ministry? How do we account for Paul's positive approach to the role of women's ministry in the church? What can we say about the women here mentioned and their leadership roles? What models of mutuality are implied in this passage and how do they relate to the notion of mutual interdependence explained elsewhere in Romans and in Paul's other letters?

1.2. The Issues Raised

The form of greetings in Romans 16 is different from other letters, and the second person plural aorist imperative ἀσπάσασθε is used sixteen times. Paul instructs the letter recipients to greet individuals and groups, which is rarely found elsewhere other than Romans. The greetings in the second person are significant due to the fact that they strengthen relationships and form closer bonds between people.

---

[1] I start with a simple definition of 'mutuality' as 'relationships of reciprocal care'. By the end of this thesis we will have deduced a richer and deeper definition on the basis of Paul's exposition of mutual relations in Rom 12-16.

The greetings are directed to the members of the church, and all members of the Roman church are participating in greeting one another. Romans 16:16 can be seen as the summation of greeting: 'greet one another with a holy kiss' (ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ), which includes the whole church as if nobody should be missed out.

It is also significant that the greetings are attached to women in ministry acknowledging their toil and hard work, with descriptive phrases in relation to Christ, Paul and the church. Most of the women appear in a prominent position in the list, which shows their active participation in ministry and the preference Paul has given for them as his associates. The descriptive phrases in the greeting list in Romans are unique, since a large number of descriptive phrases are used when compared to other Pauline letters. The descriptive phrases in fact give strong commendation. Moreover, by way of acknowledging Paul's relations with some persons in the Roman community, he is building up strong relations within the community itself, i.e., between one another.

The greetings in Romans 16 are significant taking into account their connection to the whole focus of the letter. It seems that the aim of the letter is to create unity and love among the Roman Christians and not just a political move to assure the place of Paul in the Roman church nor to make himself acceptable.[2] The verbal echoes and thematic links in Romans show how Paul is tactically conveying the need of togetherness in the community.

The three major issues of focus in this research are the leadership roles of women in the Pauline churches as specified in Romans 16, the disposition of the mutuality reflected in the greetings to men and women, and the way in which the

---

[2] For more discussion of Paul's reasons for writing Romans, see A. J. M. Wedderburn, *The Reasons for Romans*, J. Riches (ed.) (SNTW; T& T Clark: Edinburgh, 1988), 97f.

greetings to men and women in Rom 16 relate to the ethos of mutualism in Rom 12-15. We may break these major issues down into the following questions:

1. What are the special characteristics of the greetings in Rom 16?

2. What can we know about these named women and their leadership roles?

3. By what criteria are their ministries acknowledged by Paul?

4. What are the peculiarities of the form of greetings and the descriptive phrases in Romans 16:1-16?

5. How does the relational language modify the greetings?

6. What models of mutuality are implied in this passage with its exhortations to mutual greeting?

7. How do these greetings relate to the notion of mutuality and love in Rom 12-13 and mutual recognition in Romans 14-15?

These questions will be answered by a detailed analysis of the function of the greetings in Rom 16:1-16 and by analysis of the greetings as a continuation of the exhortations of Paul to have positive mutual relations (chapters 12-15). However, before we explore further the content of Romans 16, we need to examine an important preliminary question: Is this chapter integral to the whole of the letter to the Romans?

1.3. Romans 16: A Part of the Letter of Romans?

Although there is a consensus among scholars about the Pauline authorship of the whole letter of Romans, scholars are divided in their opinion about the integrity and destination of Romans 16. It has been widely discussed whether Romans 16 is a separate letter or a letter written by Paul to the Ephesians rather than to the Romans.[3]

---

[3] Scholars like J. B. Lightfoot, F. J. A. Hort, Eduard Riggenbach, Donatien de Bruyne and Peter Corssen of the late 19th and early 20th centuries studied the fundamental issues of the textual tradition of Romans. Their studies are important to understand the textual traditions although their conclusions

The variations in the manuscript evidence, the silence of many of the fathers about chapters 15 and 16, the different positions of the doxology, the people addressed in the long greeting list etc. have long been the focus of discussion in the study of Romans. Therefore a careful analysis of the textual evidence is essential to the study of Romans 16.

I propose that Romans 16 is an integral part of the Pauline letter to Romans and that its destination is Rome rather than Ephesus. In order to demonstrate this, first the different letter forms of Romans will be analysed on the basis of textual evidence. Secondly, the arguments for an Ephesian destination will be explored and finally the evidence for Rom 16 as an original part of the Romans letter will be argued.

1.3.1. Various Forms of the Letter

The textual history of Romans shows that there are three basic forms of Romans. They are: a fourteen chapter form, a fifteen chapter form and a sixteen chapter form.

1.3.1.1. The Fourteen Chapter Form

a) *The Fourteen Chapter Form:* It is possible to suggest from different types of evidence that the letter of Romans existed in a form of only fourteen chapters. The fourteen chapter form is attested by two different *capitula* systems. Codex Amiatinus (vg[A]) of the eighth century is the oldest MS preserving the first system, in which we find the text of Romans divided into fifty-one parts, with a brief summary.[4]

---

are open to debate. See J. B. Lightfoot (ed.), *Biblical Essays* (New York: Macmillan, 1904), 285-374; F. J. A. Hort, 'On the End of the Epistles to the Romans' *Journal of Philology* 3 (1871) 51-80; E. Riggenbach, 'Die Textgeschichte der Doxologie Röm. 16, 25-27 im Zusammenhang mit den übrigen, den Schluss des Römerbriefs betreffenden, textkritischen Fragen' *Neue Jahrbüchen für deutsche Theologie* 1 (1892), 526-605; D. de Bruyne, 'Les deux derniers chapitres de la lettre aux Romains' *RBen* 25 (1908) 423-430; P. Corssen, 'Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes' *ZNW* 10 (1909), 1-45. See also H. Gamble, *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism* (Studies and Documents 42; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 15.

[4] 'Part of the oldest documentary evidence for the fourteen-chapter text is given by the *capitula or breves* found in many Vulgate MSS'. Gamble, *Textual History*, 16. Most of the details for the 'various

Capitulum L cites specially Rom 14:15, 17: 'Concerning the danger of grieving a brother by one's food, and the kingdom of God is not food and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit' and *capitulum* LI refers to the doxology, 16:25-27: 'Concerning the mystery of the Lord kept in silence before passion, his truth having been revealed after the passion'. *Capitulum* L refers to the themes of Romans 14:23 and no *capitula* can be seen for the last two chapters 15 and 16. Thus, the form of the text is 1:1-14:23 + 16:25-27.

Codex Amiatinus is not a separate witness, but it can be found in other Vulgate MSS. Gamble writes, 'A portion of the Amiatine system is found appended to another *capitula* system in Codex Fuldensis (vg^F), also of the sixth century, the only witness to the second system'.[5]

Another witness to the fourteen chapters of Romans is *Concordia epistularum Pauli*. This is a 'concordance to the Pauline letters found in partial form in a number of Vulgate MSS'[6] and applies to the Roman text extending only to 14:23, with the doxology following.

The text with fourteen chapters can also be seen in Marcionite prologues to the Pauline letters, particularly that of the Romans. Moreover, the patristic testimony is significant for the textual history of Romans 16. Three church fathers, Irenaeus, Cyprian and Tertullian have not cited from Romans 15-16. However, the Muratorian canon gives evidence for chapter 15 of Romans to Paul's journey to Spain.[7]

---

letter forms' are taken from Gamble, *Textual History,* 15-35, since Gamble discusses the textual problems extensively.

[5] Gamble, *Textual History*, 17. The *capitula* I-XXIII refers to Rom 1-14 and to these are added *capitula* XXIV-L1 of the Amiatine system. The last *capitulum* of the Fuldensian series relates to Rom 14:1-23 and this is followed by the Amiatine *capitulum*, which refers to Rom 9, with the result of a double description of Romans 9-14. The lack of Amiatine *capitula* I-XXIII could be explained by the fact that the scribe compensated for this by adding from another MS without noticing the duplication. Therefore the text would be 1:1-14:23, but without the doxology.

[6] Gamble, *Textual History*, 18.

[7] It is reported in the canon that Luke dealt only with the events for which he had been an eyewitness in Acts and also reports about Paul's journey to Spain from Rome. The author of the Muratorian

Origen's testimony on the textual history of Romans can be considered as the most explicit one. In his *Commentaria in epistolam ad Romanos* Origen clearly states that Marcion completely removed the doxology: 'Marcion, by whom the evangelical and apostolic writings were falsified, completely removed this section (i.e., 16:25-27) from this letter; and not only this, but also from that place where it is written "all that is not of faith is sin" he cut it away up to the end'.[8] It is reported by Origen that in addition to removing the doxology, Marcion 'cut away' everything following 14:23 and Marcion himself was the creator of the form of the letter. Origen also refers to all the catholic MSS as containing the doxology, though not at the same places but in Rom 14:23 and in other places at the end of Romans 16.

A fourteen chapter form of Romans can also be seen from the MS tradition with a difference in the position of the doxology. Gamble lists five attested possibilities for the place of the doxology with the evidence.[9]

The doxology is the concluding element and therefore should be placed at the end of the letter; therefore the presence of the doxology after 14:23 constitutes indirect testimony to the fourteen chapter form of the text. That the position of the doxology after 14:23 marks the conclusion of the letter is confirmed by several Latin

---

canon employs the term for Spain as *Spania,* which is also found in Rom 15:24 and 28 in showing Paul's plan of a journey to Spain. So it can be inferred that the author of the Muratorian Canon was acquainted with Rom 15.

[8] See also Gamble, *Textual History*, 22.

[9] The possibilities are: a) doxology after 16:23 (24) and only there: ‎א B C D E 81 436 630 1739 1962 2127 syr^p cop vg def ar gig Origen Ambrosiaster Pelagius;

   b) doxology after 14:23 and only there: L Ψ 181 326 330 451 460 614 1241 1877 1881 1984 1985 2492 2495 *et plur.*[40] syr^h goth[41] Origen Chrystosum Cyril Theodoret John of Damascus pseudo-Oecumenius;

   c) doxology after both 14:23 and 16:23 (24): A P 5 17 33 104 109 arm;

   d) doxology after15:33 and only there: P^46 ;

   e) doxology completely absent: G F 629 g E 26 inf. (BVL: Γ^B) Marcion (Origen) Jerome (Origen?) Priscillian.

From the above lists, it is significant to note that the doxology is placed at different positions and the Greek tradition attests the position at the end of chapter 14, though it can be found there occasionally also in the Latin. Gamble, *Textual History*, 23; B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/UBS, [2] 1994), 470-472, 475-477.

MSS but just before the doxology they add a brief benediction.[10] It is also worth noting that some of the MS evidence omits the doxology. Origen testifies to a fourteen chapter text lacking the doxology by Marcion. Both Priscillian and Jerome also give evidence for a text without the doxology but with the final two chapters. In Priscillian's letters, the final part in Romans is described only in terms of 16:21-23, and Gamble suggests, 'if Priscillian had known the doxology it would probably have been allotted a new and separate section since as a rule the sections cover small amounts of text and take account of shifts in subject matters'.[11]

The Old Latin text witnesses the complete omission of the doxology. This is clearly shown by the great family of Pauline bilingual MSS, codices Claromontanus (D; BVL: 75), Boernerianus (G; BVL: 77) and Augiensis (F; BVL: 78). Thus, there are three variants of the fourteen chapter form:

    a)   1:1-14:23

    b)   1:1-14:23 + 16:25-27

    c)   1:1-14:23 + benediction + 16:25-27

b) The Fourteen Chapter Form and the Variants in 1:7 and 1:15

In some of the MS and Patristic witnesses, chapters 15-16 are omitted and also the addressees of the letter in 1:7 and 1:15 are lacking. The only direct MS witness for the complete omission of the Roman address in the first chapter is Codex Boernerianus (G). Most texts read: τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ but G reads: τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ. Likewise in 1:15 the words τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ in the

---

[10] Gamble, *Textual History*, 24. This was first observed by de Bruyne in MS i-2/9 (BVL: 86; Monza, Biblioteca Capitolare) of the tenth century. After the doxology, the words *gratia cum omnibus sanctis* followed. De Bruyne discovered two other MSS, Clm 17040 and 17043, with the same reading.

[11] Gamble, *Textual History*, 25. The doxology can be seen missing in some other evidence too. In Jerome's *Commentariorum in epistolam ad Ephesios*, the doxology is absent in the complete form. It is not present in Codex Bobbiensis of the ninth or early tenth century and also in the Freising fragment of the fifth or sixth century, which 'contains near the end of Romans only 14:10-15:13 and the doxology is absent after 14:23'.

phrase καί ἐν ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίσασθαι are omitted in G. Augiensis (F), the sister codex is altered from Rom 1:1-3:18, but the Greek text is almost similar to that of G. Rome is also not mentioned by some old commentators namely Origen and Ambrosiaster.

1.3.1.2. The Fifteen Chapter Form

A fifteen chapter form is also suggested in regard to the argument that Chapter 16 was originally addressed to the Ephesians rather than to the Roman church. It may be argued that Romans circulated in the form of 1:1-15:33. The Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline letters (P[46]) provides the doxology between 15:33 and 16:1, representing a tradition in which Romans apparently ended with chapter 15. Thus the form is 1:1-15:33 +16:25-27.[12]

1.3.1.3. The Sixteen Chapter Form

The sixteen chapter form with doxology is attested in the Greek New Testament in modern editions and many existing manuscripts as well, although the text is not uniform due to the difference in the presence and positions of the benedictions found at the end of chapter 16. The benediction ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν is found after 16:20a (as 16:20b) in modern editions. Another benediction ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. ἀμήν is found in many witnesses after the doxology as 16:23 and in a few witnesses after 16:28.[13] The variations in the use of this benediction and position of the doxology seem to be related.

As the various forms of the letter are discussed, the next attempt is to analyse the destination of Romans 16.

---

[12] See Gamble, *Textual History*, 33, 34.
[13] For more discussion see Gamble, *Textual History*, 35.

1.3.2. The Ephesian Hypothesis

a) Variant Hypothesis

There are two issues regarding the Ephesian hypothesis: a) whether the Ephesian letter constitutes a complete letter as in Rom 16, or only a part of a larger Ephesian letter; and b) whether this Ephesian material was related to Romans as a result of Paul's composition and circulation, or by a later redactional work.[14]

One hypothesis holds that Rom 16 (16:1-23) was addressed to Ephesus and its attachment to Romans was Paul's own work. The main proponent of this view is T. W. Manson.[15] He proposed that Romans 1-15 is the original letter to the Romans, 'but at the same time a copy was prepared to be sent to the Ephesian community'.[16] This copy to the Ephesian church contains the whole of Romans 1-15 to which Paul added chapter 16 as a letter of recommendation for Phoebe, the bearer of the letter to Ephesus and Paul used his chance to greet his many friends in Asia and to include the warning against false teaching. Thus the letter was composed of two 'editions' one addressed to Rome and the other to Ephesus, in which chapter 16 formed a unity

---

[14] Gamble, *Textual History*, 41.

[15] T. W. Manson, 'St. Paul's letter to the Romans - and Others', in K. P. Donfried, (ed.), *The Romans Debate*, revised and expanded edition (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 3-15. He attributed the fourteen chapter form to Marcion, who tried to eliminate all the references to Rome in 1:7, 15 along with Rom 15 for dogmatic reasons. Manson suggests that in Romans, Paul's reflective summation of his definitive views on the relationship between Christianity and Judaism is dealt with more than anywhere else. He disagrees that Romans is a letter of self-introduction for Paul himself, expecting a friendly reception from his Roman friends, but argues that it is 'summing up' or 'manifesto' of Paul's deepest convictions. But Bornkamm disagrees with Manson's rejection of Romans as a letter of self-introduction and according to him Romans 'summarizes and develops the most important themes and thoughts of the Pauline message and theology' and 'the letter to the Romans is the last will and testament of the Apostle Paul'. See G. Bornkamm, 'The Letter to the Romans as Paul's Last Will and Testament', in K. P. Donfried (ed.) The *Romans Debate,* 16-28.

[16] Manson, 'St. Paul's Letter', 13. Cf. H. Koester, 'Ephesos in Early Christian Literature', in H. Koester (ed.), *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia*, (Pennsylvania: Trinity Press, 1995), 119-140, at 122,123. Koester assumes that Romans 16 was a letter to Ephesus. The greetings to Paul's fellow workers and personal acquaintances show that they must have been located in Ephesus rather than in Rome.

with the rest of the letter. Thus Manson argues for 'two textually attested forms of Romans'.[17]

A second version of the Ephesian hypothesis regards the Ephesian matter of Romans 16 as a piece of Paul's Ephesian correspondence. It is assumed that it was joined to the Roman letter by a later redactor and has no connection with Romans. This hypothesis argues, 'Romans was originally a circular letter, that chapter 16 was appended to the copy addressed to Ephesus, and only later and wrongly became an apparently integral part of the whole letter'.[18] In fact there is division in the opinions of scholars about what parts of Romans 16 are to be reckoned to the Ephesian fragment: 16:3-20 as the Ephesian material with 16:1-2 as an integral part of the Roman letter; or 16:1-2 as belonging to the Ephesian letter, as a letter of recommendation for Phoebe etc.

b) Arguments

The arguments against the Roman address of Romans 16 suggest that, on the one hand, its features are not suitable to a Roman address and, on the other hand, that it is suitable to an Ephesian address. The form of chapter 16 and certain aspects of the textual tradition demonstrate that chapter 16 is separate from the remainder of the letter. Some 18th century scholars namely J. S. Semler, J. G. Eichhorn and David Schulz observed that the content of Romans 16 seems not to be in agreement with a Roman destination and that Romans 16:1-20 was in fact a letter of Paul to the Ephesian church.

---

[17] Gamble, *Textual History*, 42; See T. W. Manson, 'St. Paul's Letter to the Romans – and Others', in M. Black (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1962), 225-241, at 239.

[18] J. Ziesler, *Paul's Letter to the Romans* (TPI; London: SCM, 1989), 20.

External Evidence

a. The oldest manuscript for Paul's letters is P[46], dated as early as the beginning of the third century. In this manuscript, as we have noted, the closing doxology (16:25-27) is placed at the end of chapter 15. P[46] (third century CE) is the only manuscript that has the closing doxology at the end of Romans 15, but its evidence cannot be neglected completely and it seems to suggest an edition of Romans with 15 chapters.[19]

b. The independence of Romans 16 is further explained by its epistolary form. Chapter 16 has 'its close formal correspondence with the ancient letter of recommendation (ἐπιστολὴ συστατική) as known from the documentary remains of the Hellenistic period'.[20] The three basic elements of the commendation letter in Romans 16:1, 2 such as introducing the person, description of the person and the request on their behalf for some favour are similar to the ancient letters of recommendation. Thus possibly the long list of greetings is necessary, since a woman traveller such as Phoebe would have need of a document assuring her welcome by the individuals and family groups named.[21]

Internal Evidence

a. Extent of greetings

It is assumed that the unusual number of greetings to individuals and groups in Romans 16 leads to a question about Paul's acquaintance with them, as he had never visited the Roman churches before, and also suggests the possibility of an Ephesian destination. At the time of writing Romans Paul had not visited the city or the

---

[19] Ziesler, *Romans*, 20; Gamble, *Textual History*, 40.
[20] Gamble, *Textual History*, 40.
[21] E. J. Goodspeed, 'Phoebe's Letter of Introduction', *HTR* 44 (1951), 56-57; J. I. H. McDonald, 'Was Romans 16 a Separate Letter?' *NTS* 16 (1970), 369-71, at 370-71. McDonald argues that Romans 16:1-23 appears as an independent letter on the basis of the resemblance of Romans 16 to a short letter of Greco-Roman times.

Christian community of Rome, but has shown clearly his desire to visit the church at Rome (1:10, 11; cf. 1:13, 15): 'now at last I may find a way in the will of God to come to you, for I long to see you … I am ready to preach the gospel to you who are in Rome also'. Again towards the end of the letter, he reminds them of his wish to come to Rome and, on his way of mission to Spain, to visit the Roman community (15:19b-23; 15:24, 28-29). From these verses it is implied that Paul is expecting to visit the Christian community in Rome for the first time. The greetings to twenty-six persons, who are mentioned by name, and five groups, might appear unlikely since Paul had never visited Rome.[22]

b. Warning against False Teachers

Another argument which seems favourable to an Ephesian destination is the presence of the warning against the false teachers in 16:17-20, which is not relevant to Romans. Paul usually stresses his apostolic authority against the issues of false teaching in the churches he founded; as there is no reference to false teaching in Romans 1-15, such a warning at the close of the letter is strange and thus this does not agree with that of the Roman community. The tone and content of 16:17-20 can be regarded as appropriate to Ephesus due to the existence of false teaching, which is

---

[22] Moreover, the descriptions of the persons to be greeted are noteworthy. Most of the names in Rom 16 cannot be found anywhere in the New Testament. One of the arguments for the Ephesian destination of Romans is that the people mentioned in Romans 16 are more readily associated with Ephesus than with Rome. Among them the names of Prisca and Aquila are notable since it is assumed that they were in Asia (1 Cor 16:19: probably in Ephesus, cf. Acts 18:24-26), and in Acts 18:2 it is mentioned that they were expelled from Rome. Paul's admonition to greet 'the church in their house' is also a possible argument. In 2 Tim 4:19, greetings are sent to Prisca and Aquila, who are in Ephesus. Thus all the evidence apart from Romans places them in Ephesus. 'If they were in Ephesus as late as the writing of 1 Corinthians, they are hardly expected to be in Rome, with a house church there also (Rom 16:5a), so soon afterward'. Gamble, *Textual History*, 38.

We are not provided with any information of other individuals with their non-Roman location. However, it can be inferred from the descriptions of those greeted. Epaenetus is greeted with the description as 'the first convert in Asia for Christ' (Rom 16:5), which suggests his stay in Ephesus. Some descriptions of persons being greeted suggest Paul's personal association and since Paul had never visited Rome before, it may be argued that the greetings are not directed to Rome but to another community which Paul knows well. For instance Epaenetus and Stachys are called 'my beloved' (16:5b, 9), Mary is described as one 'who has laboured much for us' (16:6), Andronicus and Junia are 'my fellow prisoners' (16:7) and Rufus' mother is referred to us Paul's own mother (16:13). The first person possessive pronoun indicates the closeness of the relationship with Paul and suggests a non-Roman address of Romans 16.

attested in 1 and 2 Timothy.[23] Therefore by comparing Rom 16 with other Pauline letters, the heretics can be situated in a community Paul knew well and in which he previously worked.

These are the major arguments for the non-Roman and the Ephesian destination of Rom 16.

1.3.3. Arguments for Romans 16 as an integral part of the Romans letter

It will be argued here that Romans consists of 16 chapters and is addressed to Rome. First we will list the evidence to show that the fourteen chapter form is not a complete form of the letter addressed to the Romans.

The internal evidence of the letter does not support the view that the fourteen-chapter text was the letter sent to Rome:

1. The exhortation to the strong and weak in faith begins from 14:1 and continues till 15:13, and so it is improbable for the letter to end in 14:23.

2. If we assume that the letter ends with 14:23, then the specific address and the concluding formulae would be missing.

3. Chapter 15 and chapter 14 are clearly related, just as there is a close link between 15:14-32 and 1:8-13, and therefore chapter 15 could not be separated from the rest of the letter.

The problem of the letter to Romans is between a fifteen and a sixteen chapter form. The fundamental problem is whether chapter 16 belongs to Paul's letter to Rome. Against the thesis that 'chapter 16 (or some part of it) was originally a separate piece addressed to some other community, usually thought to be Ephesus',[24] we will canvass here the external and internal evidence.

---

[23] Manson, 'Paul's Letter to the Romans', 13. See also Gamble, *Textual History*, 39, 40.
[24] Gamble, *Textual History*, 36.

1. Although the oldest manuscript P[46] places the doxology after chapter 15 ('the first textual attestation for a fifteen-chapter form of Romans'[25]), this evidence of one MS cannot be accepted without question, and it is difficult to conclude that Romans had originally 15 chapters. However, it is possible to think that P[46] represents a Roman letter then adapted by the addition of chapter 16 and sent to another church. But for this, there should be references to Rome in 1:7, 15, and that is lacking as the early chapters of the letter are missing from P[46]. It is plausible to assume that the presence of the doxology after 15:33 does seem to point to the existence at one time of a 15 chapter form of Romans. However, it is important to consider the fact that the Latin MSS of the Vulgate which omit chapter 16 also omit chapter 15, or they have them both in one block (15:1-33 and 16:1-23). 'Therefore', Lampe argues, '15:1-16:23 have to be treated as one unit by the textual critic - one block which is addressed to Rome'.[26] It is also assumed that the doxology (16:25-27) is non-Pauline and Marcionite in origin, thus solving the text critical problems of that segment.[27] Though the position of the doxology varies and it is absent in some of the manuscripts, the non-Pauline character of the doxology cannot be attested from the evidence of the manuscripts alone.

---

[25] Gamble, *Textual History*, 40.

[26] P. Lampe, 'The Roman Christians of Romans 16', in K. P. Donfried (ed.), *The Romans Debate*, 217. Lampe suggests two exceptions to this rule. a) 'The miniscule 1506 from the year 1320 has chapter 15, but omits 16:1-23 ... The genealogical trees (stemmas), which have been proposed for the manuscripts of the letter to the Romans agree that the text of miniscule 1506 is a descendant of Marcion's Roman text (Rom 1-14) and of texts that offer chapters 15 and 16:1-23 as one block together ... The ancestors of miniscule 1506 assure that Romans 15 and 16:1-23 belong together once we come to the older strata of textual history. b) P[46] from the year ca. 200 reads chapters 1-14; 15; 16:25-27; 16:1-23. It presents both chapters 15 and 16:1-23, but they do not appear in one block'. Lampe denies the possibility of P[46] supporting the hypothesis that Paul's original letter included only chapters 1-15.

[27] W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon,1975), 310-14; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (London: A & C Black, 1957), 11-13; Manson, 'Paul's Letter to the Romans', 8; Donfried, 'Short Note on the Romans', in Donfried (ed.), *Romans Debate*, 50. It is assumed that the Pauline letter to the Romans ends with 16:23 and the doxology is composed by Marcion.

Another factor which needs consideration is that although 15:33 has the appearance of the ending of the letter, it contains no reference to 'grace',[28] which is an essential ingredient in the other Pauline conclusions (Rom 16:20; 1 Cor 16:23; 2 Cor 13:14; Gal 6:18; Eph 6:24; Phil 4:23; Col 4:18; 1 Thess 5:28; 2 Thess 3:18; Philemon 25) and even the Pastoral Epistles agree with this pattern. There is no reference to grace after v.15 in Romans 15. Therefore most likely Paul would not have ended the letter with Romans 15:33. Lampe suggests 'that formulations like "God of peace [with you]" never end the letter but precede requests to greet – greetings like the ones in Romans 16 and also the *de* in Romans 16:1 on the other hand presupposes a previous text'; thus there is continuity between chapters 15 and 16.[29]

2. Although Paul had never visited the Roman community at the time of writing, this does not rule out the possibility of his friendship with the members of the Roman church. The possibility for Paul having friends in Rome cannot be discarded due to 'the general mobility of individuals and groups about the *Imperium Romanum* and the forceful westward thrust of the early Christian missionary enterprise'.[30]

3. The extent of the greetings shows that this is addressed to Rome rather than to Ephesus.

a. The greetings in Romans 16 are an exception when compared to the other Pauline letters. The other letters of Paul are also addressed to churches founded by Paul himself and he is familiar with those churches; in such contexts he did not

---

[28] Ziesler notes the absence of the element of grace in 15:33. Ziesler, *Romans*, 21.

[29] Lampe, 'Roman Christians', 217. The peace wish followed by requests for greetings can be seen in the other Pauline letters like Phil 4:9; 2 Cor 13:11; 1 Thess 5:23; 2 Thess 3:16. ἀμήν does not conclude letters: Rom 1:25; 9:5; 11:36; Gal 1:5; 1 Thess 3:13, etc.

[30] Gamble, *Textual History*, 47; Cf. the lengthy essay of G. La Piana, 'Foreign Groups at Rome', *HTR* 20 (1927) 183-403.

particularise the greetings as in Romans, rather what is found is in the form of a collective greeting.[31] In this light, could we assume that the Roman community is well-known to Paul? One of the purposes of the greetings in Romans can be seen as 'to prepare the way for his coming and to enlist the support of the Roman Community for his western missionary work, one means of achieving this was to single out those who he knew or was known by, thus claiming them as his personal references'.[32]

b. It is also striking that in Romans 16 the greetings to 26 persons and five groups indicate Paul's personal connections in a community that he had never visited.[33] The greetings of Romans present two peculiarities compared to other Pauline letters: they are directed to individuals, and the list of greetings is unusually long. It seems that the list of greetings is recommendation for Paul himself rather than for Phoebe (16:1-2). Lampe suggests that Paul sends greetings to individuals whom he knows in person although he does not know the Roman church; 'common friends build a bridge of confidence between people who do not know each other'.[34] It is also worth noting that the greetings are not direct greetings from Paul to his personal friends, but he instructs the Romans to greet them. The greetings are sent to the Roman church as a whole and the whole church is involved in the action of greeting. So they are not merely communication between Paul and the individuals greeted. Therefore it can be seen as a Pauline strategy to bring about unity in the Roman church.

---

[31] Gamble, *Textual History*, 48.

[32] Gamble, *Textual History*, 48, 49. Cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London: Collins, 1932), 20.

[33] Lampe, 'Roman Christians', 218.

[34] Lampe, 'Roman Christians', 218. The same pattern of greeting can be seen in Colossians (4:7f, 15, 17). Although he doesn't know the church, he greets some individuals stating his relations with them.

c. Paul does not claim that he knows every one of the persons greeted but only that he knows very clearly some of them. The familiar descriptive characterisation of some individuals, namely Prisca and Aquila, Epaenetus, Andronicus, Junia, Ampliatus, Stachys, Rufus and the mother of Rufus suggest Paul's familiarity with them. As Ziesler suggests, 'the Roman church after its partial return from exile was in danger of fragmentation' and it existed in different house churches; in chapter 16, Paul is trying to mention all such groups.[35] The other letters of Paul (the undisputed: 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians and even Philemon) when compared to Romans 16 have very few personal greetings and this can be argued as a reason for a Roman destination rather than an Ephesian destination. As we explore Paul's endearment to or praise of these persons, it will appear that these persons are important for the Church and might have been able to travel in ways that brought them into encounter with Paul, or make them known to him, before ending up in the Roman churches.

d. The descriptive phrases used for the individuals which were used to argue for an Ephesian destination can have an effect in the opposite direction. If these individuals are still in Ephesus at the writing of Paul, then the words of introduction have no effect as the church in Ephesus is already familiar with them, as Prisca and Aquila are his fellow workers, Epaenetus is the first convert of Asia and Andronicus and Junia are notable among the apostles. But in a context where Christians are relatively little known to each other, such as the Roman churches, such description of praise make better sense. They may know Timothy as Paul's fellow worker and other fellow workers are mentioned in 16:21-23. Even the 'ecumenical greeting' of 16:16 fits well to Rome and 16:4 is stated with thanks for Prisca and Aquila from all the

---

[35] Ziesler, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, 21.

churches of Gentiles. Though it is unusual in Paul, as Lampe suggests, 'this global perspective can be easily explained by the unique situation of Romans 1-15. Paul stands on the door step between east and west'.[36] As Paul is planning to work in Spain, he wants the support of the Romans (15:19-23). Lampe suggests that the greetings from 'all churches' are the 'best recommendation for Paul himself' although Paul never visited the Roman Church.[37] But the greetings serve as a significant aspect in creating a bond of relationship and bringing about unity between the members of the community, and the communities as well, rather than merely supporting Paul's own purpose.

e. The proponents who hold the view that Romans 16 was a part of Roman address have supported their opinion by referring to the evidence from other sources and also inscriptional evidence. The argument put forward by J. B. Lightfoot is on the basis of Romans 16:10-11 of οἱ ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου and ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου. He argues that the 'designations referred to persons among the households of Aristobulus ... and of Narcissus, ... members of the imperial household by inheritance from their former heads', and thus a Roman location is possible.[38] Gamble suggests that the argument has some force as Paul did not usually indicate a house church by using 'οἱ ἐκ τῶν'.[39]

f. The question whether the admonition in Rom 16:16-20 is suitable for a Roman address needs to be explored on the basis of its tone and content. Lampe suggests that if there appears to be a change in tone, then possibly that is not directed to the Romans, who are even praised (16:19) like in the rest of the letter (1:8; 15:14);

---

[36] Lampe, 'Roman Christians', 218.
[37] Lampe, 'Roman Christians', 218.
[38] J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, (London: Macmillan, 1894), 72, 73. Lightfoot bases his argument on Phil 4:22 where those 'of Caesar's household' are greeted (ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας).
[39] Gamble, *Textual History*, 51.

rather this 'is directed against the possible heretics not belonging to the Roman church but planning to infiltrate it'.[40] The content of 16:16-20 is explained not in terms of the content of Rom 1-15, since there is no suggestion of the existence of false teaching present in the community. But Paul may have in mind a possible danger that could attack the community, so this cannot hinder Romans 16 from being addressed to Rome.

Therefore the Ephesian destination for Romans 16 seems to be improbable, and it is difficult to detach it from what precedes it. To sum up, on the basis of the preceding study, it appears that Romans 16 is an integral part of the Pauline letter to Romans. The textual evidence proves the possibility of Romans 16 being addressed to Rome. The content of Romans 16 also shows that it agrees well with the Pauline purpose in his letter to the Romans. The greetings function to create bonds between his personal friends and the Romans, between the Romans and himself, and among the Romans themselves despite their social and ethnic diversity.[41] The greetings are sent to the Roman church as a whole and thus all the members of the church are joined in the mutual greetings, which indeed create love and unity among them. The style and structure of the Pauline epistolary conclusions show that without the sixteenth chapter, 'the 15 chapter text lacks an epistolary conclusion and the unusual aspects of some elements in ch. 16 find cogent explanation only on the assumption of its Roman address'.[42]

---

[40] Lampe, 'Roman Christians', 221. Scholars are divided in their opinion regarding the authenticity of these verses: one group suggests a Pauline postscript (Moo [D. J. Moo, The *Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 929], Fitzmyer [J. A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993], 745), while the other explains the distinct features as due to non-Pauline interpolation (Jewett [R. Jewett, *Christian Tolerance: Paul's Message to the Modern Church* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982), 17-23], Ollrog [W–H. Ollrog, *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter*. (WMANT 50; Neurkirchen: Neukirchener, 1979), 226-34]. For more discussion see R. Jewett, *Romans* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 986-996.
[41] See for more discussion on the greetings, chapter 2.
[42] Gamble, *Textual History*, 127.

1.4. The Women Named in Rom 16

Romans 16 opens with the letter of recommendation for Phoebe (Rom 16:1, 2), which is followed by the greetings (16:3-15), the general exhortation of greetings with a holy kiss (16:16), hortatory remarks (16:17-20), the grace benediction (16:21b), the greetings from Paul's associates (16:21-23) and a second grace benediction (16:24). This study focuses on 16:1-16, which includes the letter of introduction for Phoebe and the greetings to twenty six persons out of whom twenty four persons are named and nine are women. The women named in Rom 16 are Phoebe (ἀδελφή, διάκονος, and προστάτις), Prisca (co-worker), Junia (fellow-prisoner, outstanding among the apostles), Mary, Tryphoena and Tryphosa, Persis (hard working members), Julia, Nereus' sister and Rufus' mother (mother of Paul). I will argue that the women mentioned in the list with special descriptions were the leaders of communities and had influential participation in the church, since they are designated with titles similar to those of the male associates of Paul or of Paul himself.

In recent years, the two main areas of discussion have been: the specific connotation of the titles used for the women and their social roles in relation to the Pauline mission and the Roman church in particular. In order to situate my research, a brief survey of previous research is in order regarding the roles of women (Rom 16:1-16), their relationship with Paul and their toil for the church.

1.4.1. Phoebe

The major debates on Phoebe concern her expected role in relation to the Roman church, her position as διάκονος of the church of Cenchreae, and her status implied by the title προστάτις. The interpretation of διάκονος ranges from

practical help to the recognized leadership of the church of Cenchreae, and προστάτις ranges from helper to benefactor.[43]

Regarding her expected mission to the Romans, Jewett proposes that Phoebe's task in relation to the Roman church is to be the patroness of the Spanish mission, which he considers as the purpose of the letter of Romans. He considers Phoebe as an upper class benefactor and that her responsibility is to create a 'logistical base' for the Spanish mission. The responsibilities of Phoebe in relation to the Spanish mission are three-fold: 'to present the letter to the various congregations in Rome and discuss its contents and implications with church leaders'; to persuade the independent house churches that Paul was a reliable person for the Spanish Mission project; and to seek 'the advice and counsel of the Roman house churches to find suitable resources for the mission in Spain'.[44] He also argues that the greetings (Rom 16:3-16) following the recommendation for Phoebe work as if those persons 'are being recruited as advisers and supporters of Paul and Phoebe'.[45]

I suggest that this interpretation of the role of Phoebe as the ambassador for the Spanish mission project and the people mentioned in the greetings as recruited to support her are highly reductionist, since Romans is a letter permeated with Pauline theological contributions to the community's mutual behaviour and the greetings are commendation of the aforementioned individuals' partnership in Christian mission as well as partnership with him and his mission. Moreover, I doubt whether Phoebe is a wealthy and upper class benefactor as Jewett proposes, since wealth may not be an

---

[43] Cranfield and Käsemann suggest the role of informal service and helper. See C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,* 2 Vols. (Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 1979), 781; E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 410.

[44] Jewett, *Romans*, 90. See also R. Jewett, 'Paul, Phoebe, and Spanish Mission', in J. Neusner, *et al.* (eds.), *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism*: *Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 144-64; Jewett, *Romans*, 89-91, 941-948.

[45] Jewett, *Romans*, 948.

essential requisite for being the patron in the earliest churches.[46] The purpose of the requests on behalf of Phoebe seems open ended and is misapprehended by Jewett when he interprets it solely in terms of the Spanish mission.

Paul's recommendation of Phoebe opens another avenue of research on her relation to Paul as superior or inferior. Whelan suggests that the relation between Paul and Phoebe implies some sort of mutual obligation. He suggests, in Rom 16 'Paul is exploiting this network of "clients" on behalf of Phoebe introducing her to his network of connections and thereby reciprocating her benefactions to him and his church'.[47] Whelan's suggestion of the mutual obligation between Paul and Phoebe is significant to my thought; however, I would go further and suggest that the mutual obligation is not confined to Phoebe but extended to the individuals and groups greeted, since Rom 16:3-16, apart from commendation of the individual's hard work, reveals Paul's rhetorical strategy to apply his theological and ethical admonitions of mutual relations in the previous chapters (12-15). Paul probably wants to bring to light not only the mutual obligations between Phoebe and himself but also between 'many' and Phoebe, calling on the mutual relations within a wider community of people.

Cotter's view that Phoebe's role as benefactress is conventional carries important implications for my research as I take into account the socio-historical context of the passage and analyse women's leadership roles as well as participatory roles in the religious, political and cultural spheres of the Greco-Roman world.

---

[46] Meggitt suggests that it is not plausible to infer that the individuals mentioned by Paul in his letters are mentioned due to the fact that they are 'elite or prosperous in the society'. J. Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival* (SNTW, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 134.

[47] C. F. Whelan, 'Amica Pauli: The Role of Phoebe in the Early Church', *JSNT* 49 (1993), 67-85, at 84. There is a sense of mutual indebtedness between Paul and Phoebe; Phoebe is the patron of Paul and Paul is reciprocating her actions. Whelan suggests Phoebe is sent to the Ephesian church, while I suggest that Phoebe is sent to the church in Rome and that Romans 16 is an integral part of the letter to the Romans. See also J. C. Campbell, *Phoebe: Patron and Emissary* (Paul's Social Network: Brothers and Sisters in Faith; Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2009).

According to Cotter, 'Phoebe's role as benefactress and guardian is evidence of the financial independence possible for many women in the Imperial period. She also may have been able to act as guardian due to influential people among her family members and friends. Such exercise of power is completely conventional'.[48]

The social and theological role of Phoebe has been a topic of interest in recent years.[49] Many commentators have also highlighted the role of Phoebe in relation to the Pauline mission.[50] Although the role of Phoebe and relations to Paul have been the object of focus in previous studies, the aspect of mutuality embedded in her social and ecclesial leadership roles is given lesser attention. The structure of the passage, the titles used, the requests on behalf of Phoebe highlight her social and theological role as well as mutuality in her relationship to Paul and the wider community and all these will be the focus of my interest.[51]

1.4.2. Prisca

Prisca is greeted with her husband Aquila and her name is put in the first place as they are greeted as wife and husband. The major debates are about the social status of Prisca and her house church leadership.

The social status of Prisca and Aquila has been widely debated. On the one hand, scholars suggest that they are of 'relatively high status because of their

---

[48] W. Cotter, 'Women's Authority Roles in Paul's Churches: Countercultural or Conventional' *NovT* 36 (1994), 350-372, at 369.

[49] A. D. Clarke, 'Jew and Greek, Slave and Free, Male and Female: Paul's Theology of Ethnic, Social and Gender Inclusiveness in Romans 16', in *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*, Peter Oakes (ed.) (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 103-125, at 117. E. E. Ellis, 'Paul and His Co-workers', *DPL*, 183-189, at 185. E. E. Ellis, 'Paul and His Co-Workers', *NTS* 17 (1977), 437-452, at 442; E. S. Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London: SCM, 1995); E. S. Fiorenza, 'Missionaries, Apostles, Co-workers: Romans 16 and the Reconstruction of Women's Early Christian History', *WW* 6 (1986), 420-433, at 426; See S. Croft, 'Text Messages: The Ministry of Women and Romans 16', *Anvil* 21 (2004), 87-94, at 89. D. C. Arichea, 'Who was Phoebe? Translating *Diakonos* in Romans 16:1', *BT* 39 (1988), 401-409, at 409; J. M. Bassler, 'Phoebe', in Carol Meyers (ed.) *Women in Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 134-135 at 135.

[50] Cranfield, *Romans,* 2:781; Käsemann, *Romans*, 410; J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9-16* (WBC; Texas: Word Books, 1988), 886, 887; Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 729-730; Jewett, *Romans,* 945.

[51] See below chapter 4; 4.2.

patronage of Paul, frequent travels, and the capacity to own property in Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome, large enough for house churches'.[52] On the other, on the basis of Aquila's trade and the travel costs, it is imagined that they are not of high status.[53] Although Meggitt is right that the criteria suggesting high status (hospitality for the meetings of the saints and references to travel) 'are not sustainable grounds for regarding an individual as wealthy',[54] presumably they were relatively wealthy. It is unusual for a female's name of a married couple to be given precedence; Winter argues that placing a wife's name ahead of the husband's 'would indicate that the wife was either of a higher rank or higher social status than he'.[55] This might indicate her role in relation to the church, her personal contribution and her relationship to Paul and his mission, which is evident in the title 'my co-workers'. As Jewett suggests, this usage is unique to Paul and reveals a 'distinctive Pauline approach to missional collegiality, referring both to himself and to others with this egalitarian term'.[56] I consider that a mutuality model is possibly the best model to follow in the ministerial partnership. The greeting formula ἀσπάσασθε is combined with a thanksgiving formula εὐχαριστῶ in order to express indebtedness not only from Paul but also from all the churches of the Gentiles (πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν), implying mutuality between Paul and Prisca as well as Paul, Prisca and all the churches of the Gentiles.

---

[52] Jewett, *Romans*, 956; G. Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982), 90; W. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 59.

[53] P. Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 195. He suggests that a lower status is possible because of the trade of Aquila and that the cost of travel is also affordable to lower class people.

[54] Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 134, 135. He argues that hospitality is not indicative of elite status since the desire of one to give to others is a matter of goodwill rather than wealth.

[55] B. W. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*: *The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 180. See also R. MacMullen, 'Women in Public in the Roman Empire*', Historia* 29 (1980), 208-18, at 209.

[56] Jewett, *Romans,* 957.

Fiorenza argues for Prisca's house church leadership since the house church 'provided space for the preaching of the word, for worship, as well as for social and eucharistic table sharing'.[57] Fiorenza suggests that the house churches presuppose that some wealthy citizens have joined the Christian movement, who could provide space and economic resources for the community. Paul's rhetorical strategy in greeting Prisca describes an aspect of mutuality embedded in her leadership roles as he appreciates and acknowledges her contribution to the Pauline mission.

1.4.3. Junia

The current debates on Junia, who is greeted with Andronicus, are: the name gender debate (Junias [male name] or Junia [female name]); whether she is an insider of the apostolic circle or an outsider; and whether she was Joanna of the Jerusalem church. The argument on the name was founded on the question whether a woman could be an apostle in the church. Those who agree that Junia was a woman move further to argue whether she exercised her leadership among the apostles.

Most recently, Epp argues that Junia is a woman apostle and she is outstanding among the apostles.[58] Epp argues that unless Paul had found the qualities of apostleship in Andronicus and Junia, he would not have called them apostles and even as 'outstanding among the apostles', (there is no evidence that they witnessed the resurrected Jesus), but points to the fact that 'they were 'in Christ' before he was and they were in prison with Paul and therefore had suffered as he had for his apostleship'.[59] Thus it is significant that Paul is acknowledging them as 'outstanding among the apostles'.

---

[57] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 175.
[58] E. J. Epp, *Junia: The First Woman Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 69, 70.
[59] Epp, *Junia*, 69, 70. There is no evidence whether they saw Jesus after the resurrection.

However, B. H. Burer and D. B. Wallace argue that Junia was well known to the apostles rather than outstanding among them.[60] In a recent article titled 'Did Paul call Andronicus an Apostle in Romans 16:7?' David Hutter argues, 'The lexical-grammatical evidence makes it possible, the evidence from the context is inconclusive, and the historical evidence makes the non-inclusive interpretation more probable'.[61] Similar to Epp, L. Belleville suggests that Junia is a feminine name and she is notable among the apostles by examining the computer databases of Hellenistic Greek literary works, papyri, inscriptions, and artifacts.[62] R. S. Cervin discussed the Latin names and the method of transcription into Greek and demonstrated that from the nature of the name and the nature of transcribing Latin names into Greek, Iunia is a feminine name.[63] J. Thorley discusses the arguments for 'Junia' on linguistic grounds.[64] Winter deals with women in the civic context, exploring the possibility of comparing Junia Theodora with Phoebe and with Junia.[65]

Bauckham opts for a sound-equivalence theory for the names Joanna and Junia.[66] Bauckham builds up his arguments upon the presuppositions that Junia and Andronicus were among the founders of the Jerusalem Christian community and Paul's description as 'prominent among the apostles' would be meaningful with reference to her prominence among the women followers of Jesus.[67]

Although her roles are discussed in the previous research, Paul's purpose of including Junia in the list of greetings and describing her special characteristics with

---

[60] M. H. Burer and D. B. Wallace, 'Was Junia Really an Apostle? A Re-examination of Rom 16:7', *NTS* 47 (2001), 76-91.
[61] D. Hutter, 'Did Paul call Andronicus an Apostle in Romans 16:7?' *JETS* (2009), 747-778, at 778.
[62] L. Belleville, Ἰουνιαν…ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις: A Re-examination of Romans 16:7 in Light of Primary Source Materials', *NTS* 51 (2005), 231-249.
[63] R. S. Cervin, 'A Note regarding the name "Junias" in Romans 16:7', *NTS* 40 (1994), 464-470.
[64] J. Thorley, 'Junia, A Woman Apostle', *NovT* 38 (1996), 18-26.
[65] Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows,* 193-204. See pp. 84, 85.
[66] R. Bauckham, *The Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 181-194.
[67] Bauckham, *Gospel Women,* 184.

special implications for the Roman church have not been brought to the stage significantly. I would like to build upon Paul's descriptions that imply the different possibilities in which she is remarkable to the Roman church and thus bring to light the aspect of mutuality in the description of Junia's leadership role as well as her partnership in Christian mission.

1.4.4. Other Women Members of the Greeting list

The same descriptive phrase (to labour κοπιάω, Rom 16:6, 12) is used to describe four of the women in the greeting list - Mary, Tryphoena, Tryphosa and Persis: πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ὑμᾶς to denote Mary (v.6); πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν Κυρίῳ to denote Persis (v.12); κοπιώσας ἐν Κυρίῳ to denote Tryphoena and Tryphosa (v.12). Dunn argues that the term does not denote a leadership function as in 1 Thess 5:17, because Paul merely recognises devoted work on behalf of the church (1 Cor 16:16; 1 Thess 5:12).[68] But again their roles within larger relationships of mutuality need to be considered.

Paul states that Rufus' mother was also a 'mother of mine' (16:13). Though it is unclear what Paul really meant by this, it could be inferred that she might have helped him in a specific situation or ministered to him regularly at some point in his labours.[69] Nereus' sister and Julia are mentioned in a cluster of names in v.15 without any designation. The inclusion in the greeting list implies some sort of recognition of their participation in ministry and his mutual obligation although it is not specified in what ways.

The unusually long list of greetings in Rom 16 with a number of women greeted and appreciated for their toil and hard work in relation to Paul and the members of the Roman church, poses certain questions regarding the aim of Paul in

---

[68] Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 894.
[69] T. R. Schreiner, *Romans* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998), 793.

greeting them along with other male members of the Roman church. *Prima facie,* these women presumably assumed leadership roles along with Paul or his male associates, probably those mentioned in the greeting list in Rom 16 or others who are mentioned with the same descriptive phrases in the other epistles. The concept of mutuality is easily lost inside those sections, and I would like to revive it by looking through the lens of Paul's exhortations in the previous chapters. Paul S. Minear gives a passing reference to this in his discussion of Phoebe: 'Would she be able to present more fully and directly the reasons for mutual acceptance which Paul had set forth in earlier sections of the letter?'[70] It is crucial to find out how these women's leadership roles are embedded in the question of relationships of mutuality. I will look at the mutual relations between Paul and the women mentioned and also between the people mentioned in the passage, between both men and women and the whole range of people included in the greetings in Rom 16:16. The leadership role of these specially named women in the whole context of Pauline church leadership, as motivated by the model of mutuality in the sphere of relationships, is a new avenue of research.

1.5. Women's leadership in Pauline Churches

Women in Pauline church leadership have been a focus of attention due to the incompatible Pauline statements about the roles of women in the church, especially the prohibition and restriction on their participation in church activities, veiling and silence in the church (1 Cor 11; 14). Other epistles witness Paul appreciating women for their hard work and toil in relation to him as well as the church. So there seems to be a question of inconsistency in Pauline views on women. I would like to list some of the positive and negative affirmations of women's role by recent studies which

---

[70] P. S. Minear, *The Obedience of Faith; The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans* (SBT 2/19; London: SCM, 1971), 24.

relate to hierarchical, feminist and egalitarian models in the relational and leadership arena of women's position. Although an extensive analysis of different views is impossible due to limitations of space, they are important as backdrop for the research. What is fascinating to me is whether a model of mutuality is pertinent and practical in the proper functioning of gender roles.

Fiorenza suggests that the history of the early Christian movement includes the leadership of women and is 'egalitarian'.[71] She comments, 'women and men in the Christian community are not defined by their sexual procreative capacities or by their religious, cultural or social gender roles, but by their discipleship and empowering with the Spirit'.[72] She regards Gal 3:28 as a 'communal Christian self-definition' rather than 'a statement about the baptized individual' and the differences of religion, class, race, nationality and gender are irrelevant because all are baptized and are one in Christ.[73] She propounds a 'feminist Christian spirituality' and 'discipleship of equals'[74] and comments on two major objections: 'the church of women does not share in the fullness of the church' and 'the charge of "reverse sexism" and the appeal to "mutuality with men" whenever we gather together as the *ekklesia* of women in her name'.[75] She suggests for the second objection that 'women in turn have to reclaim their spiritual powers and to exorcise their possession by male idolatry before mutuality is possible'.[76] I try to define the relationship between men

---

[71] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 140. In 1993, she published a work titled *Discipleship of Equals: A Critical Feminist Ekklesia-logy of liberation*, in which she shares her vision about the world of justice and well being against the powers of patriarchal oppression and dehumanisation. E. S. Fiorenza, *Discipleship of Equals: A Critical Feminist Ekklesia-logy of liberation* (New York: Cross Road, 1993). Luise Schotroff visions a liberated womanhood in relation to God rather than affirming equality with men. Luise Schotroff, *Lydia's Impatient Sisters: A Feminist Social History of Early Christianity,* trans. by Barbara and Martin Rumscheidt (Louisville: John Knox, 1995).
[72] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 212, 213.
[73] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 213.
[74] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 344.
[75] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her,* 347.
[76] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her,* 347. C. Heyward and Mary Grey argue for the concept of relationality in their feminist approaches, which is significant as it has redemptive and healing power. C. Heyward, *The Redemption of God: The Theology of Mutual Relation* (Washington, D.D. University

and women in a model of mutuality which is not divorced from the egalitarian model as such but entails it. The egalitarian model seems to be a static phenomenon, while mutuality is dynamic.

The negative statements regarding women's participation in worship as well as the church pose a problem since Paul appreciates women in the church and acknowledges their leadership roles in Rom 16:1-16. Wire argues that 'the women prophets in Corinth's church have a place in the group Paul is addressing, some role in the rhetorical situation'.[77] According to Wire, 1 Corinthians mostly concerns women directly or indirectly. It is directed to one party in Corinth 'the Corinthian Prophets'.[78] She tries to reconstruct the authority of the women prophets in the Corinthian community, by whom Paul feels threatened. Interestingly, these issues do not arise in Romans.

Although women's exercise of power in the Imperial period is completely conventional, Cotter argues that 'the women in Paul's letters who show themselves to be leaders in these communities appeared to fit into cultural norms acceptable in Roman culture. But the reality of their involvement due to the character of the assembly as God's *ekklesia* endowed the leadership with a countercultural equality with the men members of the community'.[79] In the context of the Christian church, Cotter's finding is very significant since Romans calls forth an aspect of mutuality in the role of women in the *basileia* of God.

This aspect of mutuality is different from the inclusive aspect in some respects. Clarke suggests a 'theology of inclusiveness' in the greetings of Romans 16

Press of America, 1982), 152; Mary Grey, *Redeeming the Dream: Feminism Redemption and Christian Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1989); see also K. Ehrensperger, *That We may be Mutually Encouraged: Feminism and the New Perspective in Pauline Studies* (London: T& T Clark, 2004), 117-120.

[77] A. Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*: *A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 9.

[78] Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets* , 9

[79] Cotter, 'Women's Authority Roles in Paul's churches', 372.

as expressed in the other letters of Paul (Gal 3:28; 1 Cor 12:13; Col 3:11; cf. also Eph 2:13-16). The greetings as presented in Rom 16 'transcend all ethnic, social and gender barriers'.[80] 'Inclusiveness' appears to entail an egalitarian perspective - unity and equality; however, I will argue that the model of mutuality entails inclusivism but appreciates diversity and dynamism.

An extreme hierarchical model of the relationship between men and women is described by Martin. In a chapter entitled 'Prophylactic Veils', Martin deals with the issue of the veiling of women in public worship and the subordination of women. The text seems to be condoning the subordination of women which is an apparent contradiction to Paul's acknowledging the equality of men and women in the Lord. Paul's citation of the baptismal formula that 'in Christ there is neither male nor female' (Gal 3:27-28), is acknowledged as a retention of the ancient notion that the eschatological human being will be androgynous, having overcome the polarity of the male/female dichotomy.[81] Martin states that Paul is not questioning the ideology of hierarchy in the subordination of women while he tries to change the status of the strong in relation to the weak in the rest of his letter to the Corinthians. He presents evidence in connection with physiology that the bodies of women are weaker, more vulnerable than men to desire, danger and pollution, and all the more dangerous to the church's body.[82] He suggests that veiling situates women in their proper position in the ordered hierarchy of society, which also means that they are not intended to be passive but must participate in their covering. The veil was the sign of woman's own authority as well as the sign of weakness and relative powerlessness. He argues that Paul is more concerned about the body of Christ, the Christian community since he is

---

[80] Clarke, 'Jew and Greek', 103-125.
[81] D. B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 229; for detailed discussion see 229-249.
[82] Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 233.

addressing communal problems, which affect each member of the community rather than individualistic issues. Women's bodies are different from men's and are inferior. After the resurrection, femininity will be swallowed up by masculinity. He suggests that Paul cannot consider the female equal to male due to the hierarchy of physiology.[83] I wonder whether Martin has done proper justice to the text and the issues it apparently deals with, because he wishes to 'speculate about what Paul *thought* he was doing'. In order to carry out that speculation, he depends heavily on materials drawn from ancient philosophical writings, medical discourse and Greco-Roman culture, especially to reconstruct the ideological matrix of the body, in the light of which he attempts to interpret the text. Martin's attempt to present the different ideological expressions of body in ancient times is interesting. But the question remains as to what extent Paul was really influenced by the body ideology of contemporary times. I think that too many details from the background could eclipse the actual focus of the text; consequently there seems to be the danger of reading into the text.

The hierarchy of spaces that controls the relationship between men and women is the area of interest of Jorunn Økland, *Women in their Place: Paul and the Corinthian Discourse and Sanctuary Place*.[84] She analyses not only 1 Corinthians but also a wider set of texts and argues for an ancient discourse of gender and sanctuary space. 'Paul's exhortations concerning women's ritual roles and ritual clothing in 1 Corinthians 11-14 structure and gender the Christian gathering as a particular kind of space constructed through ritual, a "sanctuary space"'.[85] The concern is 'gender order of the ritual space in the community' and not the veiling or

---

[83] Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 248, 249.
[84] J. Økland, *Women in their Place: Paul and the Corinthian Discourse of Gender and Sanctuary Space* (JSNTSup, 269; London: T& T Clark International, 2004).
[85] Økland, *Women in their Place*, 1.

covering. The sphere is divided into the private sphere and the public sphere and maintains that sanctuary space should not be treated as a subcategory of public space, but as a special category.[86] The author holds the view that the gendered power relations are maintained by hierarchical measures. Paul's task is about hierarchy, creation and head coverings, hair style and nature in 11:2-16 and is that there should be a clear difference between male and female, which in many of the passages is organized hierarchically.[87] Women cannot teach and thus serve as mediators of logos between God and men (14:36). Women can only be receivers of knowledge, which makes sense within a hierarchical way of thinking in which women designate the place at the bottom of the cosmological hierarchy and man is located higher up, closer to the surface of the logos.

However, Watson argues that the appropriate criterion for judging the texts is only through the reality of agape. He argues that agape is the inner Trinitarian love opened up to human participation in Jesus and his Spirit. If agape is the beginning and the end of Christian faith and living, then it is agape that must provide the final criterion for Christian reflection on sexuality and gender.[88] Christian women and men are not free from eros, but they practise a qualitatively different love, whose origin and pattern is the divine love to which they are constantly redirected in worship, preaching and sacrament, and in mutual fellowship with one another.[89]

Paul envisions a community of togetherness, in which men and women together participate in the grace of God, and in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. Watson refers to the 'belonging together' of agape in Paul's picturing in 1 Cor 13. He refers to 'patriarchy' as the project of male self-definition 'apart from woman'

---

[86] Økland, *Women in their Place*, 58.
[87] See Økland, *Women in their Place*, 137-143.
[88] F. Watson, *Agape, Eros, Gender: Towards a Pauline Sexual Ethic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), ix.
[89] Watson, *Agape, Eros, Gender*, ix.

and feminism as the other extreme of female self-definition 'apart from man' and that 'belonging together' does not represent a *via media* between two equal and opposite extremes, 'patriarchy and feminism'.[90] Watson's view of belonging togetherness and the fundamental character as love is suggestive for my project. But I would develop this theme of belonging togetherness motivated by love, as it implies Pauline love mutualism evident in the greetings and promotes community relationships. As he bases his arguments on 1 Cor 13, I would rather base my argument in Romans since the language of mutuality - 'one another' - is repeated more times in Romans, and Paul seems to make special efforts to commend this type of relationship to the community of Romans.

I would like to explore in this research the possibilities of reconstruction of Paul's gender vision within his communitarian ethic. What I would propose is a balanced mutual ethic engendered by the *basileia* of God. In relation to this, I wish to explore the possibilities of the impact of the greetings in Rom 16:1-16 on Paul's diverse notions about the participation of women in ministry and how far the body metaphor in Rom 12 and the up-building metaphor in Rom 14, 15 can influence gender roles and relationships in ministry and leadership of the church.

1.6. Greetings as a Letter Form

Greeting is a distinct literary form found in the closing of a letter. The two types of greetings Paul used in his letter closings are: a) *informational* (information regarding greetings) and b) *instructional* (instruction to greet others). Among Pauline greetings in letter closings, the greetings in Romans have special significance as they have more instructional greetings. There are three types of greetings corresponding to the three persons of the verb: the first person form, the second person form, and the

---

[90] Watson, *Agape, Eros, Gender*, 5.

third person form. The first and third person greeting types can be put together under the banner of informational greeting, which is information of greeting by the sender to the addressee (ἀσπάζομαι; ἀσπάζονται), whereas the second person type of greeting can be called instructional greeting (ἀσπάσασθε), that is, instruction to the recipient to greet others. How does greeting individuals and groups operate to influence the wider relational communitarian ethics? This question promotes the starting point of this research. The impact of the greetings on Pauline exhortations (12-15) and vice versa is a further new possibility of research.

Gamble in his work *The Textual History of Romans*, deals with Romans 16 and the Pauline conclusions.[91] He highlights the commendatory character of the descriptive phrases and that the imperative form of the greeting verb represents a direct personal greeting of the writer and has the effect of Paul's own greetings to those addressed in the letter.[92] He argues that the kiss greeting is 'a sign of fellowship within the community, of the community with the Apostle, and indeed of one community with others'.[93]

Weima in his work, *Neglected Endings* deals with the closing conventions in Pauline letters: their forms and variations and as well their hermeneutical significance.[94] The greetings have an important role in keeping and establishing relationships. He suggests that 'the second person type of greeting involves the congregation in passing on his greeting to others' and expressed 'a stronger sense of public commendation for those individuals being specifically greeted by the apostle'.[95] He suggests that the greeting in Romans is unique because it contains

---

[91] Gamble, *Textual History,* 84-95.
[92] Gamble, *Textual History*, 93.
[93] Gamble, *Textual History,* 76.
[94] J. A. D. Weima, *Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings* (JSNTSup, 101; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).
[95] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 108.

more greetings, because it has two greeting lists (16:3-16; 21-23), because of the commendatory element found in the first list, and because 'the kiss greetings were not an expression of farewell but a challenge by the apostle to the readers to let peace and harmony characterize their relations with each other'.[96]

Mullins in the article entitled 'Greetings as a New Testament Form' deals with the elements of greeting, the types of greeting and the elaborating phrases. According to Mullins, the second person type of greeting is an 'indirect salutation'. 'The writer of the letter indicates that the addressee is to greet someone for him. In this way the writer of the letter becomes the principal and the addressee becomes his agent in establishing a communication with a third party who is not intended to be among the immediate readership of the letter'.[97] It implies at least 'a fair cordiality between the writer and the person greeted' and the second person type of greeting implies close relationships and 'friendly bonds.'[98]

Considering the previous arguments as the bases of my research, I would like to develop their views on the second person greeting. What is the social dynamic in the greeting with the verb ἀσπάσασθε? Is ἀσπάσασθε the same as that of Paul greeting the third party or the second group greeting the third party? It is significant that greetings in the second person imperative induce a web of relationships. For example, when one person is being greeted, the whole group of the Roman community joins in the greeting, and vice versa, thus creating a web of mutual greetings. Therefore the Pauline purpose of greetings in the second person imperative in Romans reaches its climax in Romans 16:16 where ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους is used. In this thesis, I will explore the social dynamics extended and enacted in these

---

[96] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 117.
[97] T. Y. Mullins, 'Greeting as a New Testament Form' *JBL* 87 (1968), 418-426, at 420.
[98] Mullins, 'Greeting as a New Testament Form', 420.

greetings and the implication of the inclusion of women in the relationships of honour and mutuality they create.

1.7. Mutualism in Paul's Communal Ethos

The theme of mutuality is not an isolated theme in the greetings (Rom 16) but it is the continuation of Paul's exhortations throughout Romans, especially in Rom 12-15. The verbal and thematic links indicate Paul's desire to create love and mutuality among the Roman believers. The terms 'love' (eight times) and 'one another' (11 times) used in Romans (12-16) imply Pauline emphasis on mutuality.[99] The body metaphor and the term 'one another' (Rom 12, 13) and Paul's exhortation to welcome one another as Christ has welcomed (Rom 14, 15) clearly impact the greetings (Rom 16).

It is likely that Paul assumes the paradigm of mutuality in Rom 12-15 as the model to be employed when he urges Roman believers to greet certain men and women and greet one another (Rom 16:1-16). The women described with their significant roles indicate their leadership and Paul's rhetoric of greetings implies their leadership within the structures of mutualism. Therefore it is important to look at the Pauline ethos of mutuality in general as well as particular in Romans 12-15.

1.7.1. General Research

The initial basic research on the community aspect of Pauline theology was done by R. Banks,[100] *Paul's Idea of Community,* where he deals with the community

---

[99] Love (Rom 12:9; 13:10a, 10b; 14:15; 15:30; 13: 8a, b, 9) and 'one another' (Rom 12:5, 10a, b, 16; 13:8; 14:13, 19; 15:5, 6, 14; 16:16).

[100] R. Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in their Historic Setting* and *the Church as the Body of Christ in the Pauline Corpus* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1980). Other works on the body are G. L. O. R. Yorke, *The Church as the Body of Christ: A Re-examination* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1991); E. Best, *One Body in Christ: A Study of the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London: SPCK, 1955); Y. S. Kim, *Christ's Body in Corinth: The Politics of a Metaphor* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008).

as a family and community as a body, unity in diversity among the members, and also the contribution of women in church, in various chapters.

Horrell suggests that the ἀδελφός language indicates mutual regard or 'other regarding' morality (Rom 14 and 1 Cor 8) in relation to a weaker sibling. He treats 'solidarity, difference and other-regard': 'corporate solidarity does not then imply uniformity, not even in the matters of ethical conviction, but implies precisely a community within which differences can remain, because of the generous other-regard which offers a welcome to the other…'.[101] Horrell suggests solidarity and 'other-regard' are the two 'metanorms' of Pauline ethics in the model of Christ. Mutual love φιλαδελφία is 'the love of siblings', which could be expressed not only in material sharing but also in hospitality and support to travellers at the local level as well as throughout the Christian congregations. Like Horrell, I wish to think through Paul's communal ethos, by studying a range of texts, but I will focus on a feature he has not fully explored, that is, relationships of mutuality in the Christian community.

1.7.2. Particular Research on Rom 12-15 in Relation to Community Building

A lot of research has been done on the question of division in the Roman churches. The different views regarding Rom 12-15 are dealt with in this section, as they are important to understand the model of mutuality in Paul's exhortations to the Roman community.

Watson in his work *Paul, Judaism and Gentiles: A New Perspective*, and in the article 'The Two Roman Congregations: Romans 14:1-15:13', assumes that there were two groups, 'Jewish Christians' and 'Gentile Christians', who were divided: 'Paul's argument does not presuppose a single congregation in which members disagree about law; it presupposes two congregations, separated by mutual hostility

---

[101] D. G. Horrell, *Solidarity and Difference: A Contemporary Reading of Paul's Ethics* (London: T& T Clark International, 2005), 199.

and suspicion over questions of the law, which he wishes to bring together into one congregation'.[102] He suggests that 'because Christ came to save both Jews and Gentiles, Jews are exhorted to join with the Gentiles in common worship'.[103] According to him, 'Rom 16 confirms the hypothesis about the purpose of Romans derived from 14:1-15:13. The purpose of Romans is to encourage Jewish and Gentile Christians in Rome, divided over the question of the law, to set aside their differences and to worship together'.[104] Although Watson assumes the two congregations come together in worship, the Pauline idea of mutual acceptance between the groups retaining their convictions needs to be developed further.

Barclay's view is significant to my research as I reconstruct the theology of the mutuality that entails otherness, interdependence, personhood, recovery of the community's collegiality and partnership. In his article 'Do we undermine the law?', he suggests that the Gentiles and Jews are divided on the issue of Jewish law and Paul exhorts them to welcome and tolerate fellow believers even if they do not observe such rules. 'The mutual tolerance demanded by Paul in the Roman churches requires that neither side allow their strongly-held convictions to determine the contours of Christian commitment'.[105] The mutual tolerance between the groups enhances mutual welcoming.

Reasoner analyses the context of Rom 14-15 in the historical perspective that the strong and the weak were divided in the matter of vegetarianism and that it fits with first century Roman society. He analyses Paul's solution to the division in the perspective of the whole letter of Romans and explains how the righteousness of God given to believers brought through Christ is related to the believer's obligations. He

---

[102] F. Watson, 'The Two Roman Congregations', K. P. Donfried, (ed.), *Romans Debate*, 206.
[103] Watson, 'The Two Roman Congregations', 206.
[104] Watson, 'The Two Roman Congregations', 211.
[105] J. M. G. Barclay, 'Do we undermine the Law?: A Study of Romans 14:1-15:6', in J. D. G. Dunn (ed.), *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1996), 287-308, at 302.

suggests, 'Obligation as a social force was pervasive throughout Roman society, and Paul defines the obligation of the strong in a way they would not expect – they are to align their eating habits with the "weak" and support the "weak" (14:21; 15:1-2) – rather than force the weak to defer to their social status, as would be the norm in Roman society'.[106] What needs to be explored further is how such obligations relate to the model of Christ and are taken up within an ethos of mutuality.

The idea that Romans 14:1-15:13 is a general paraenesis based on 1 Cor 8-10 dealing with a problem that could arise in any community, as Karris suggests,[107] is an issue we will need to discuss. I will argue that Paul is addressing the actual situation and that the exhortations are relevant to the Roman community.

In the social-scientific treatment of Romans by Esler in his work, *Conflict and Identity in Romans,* he argues that Rom 12-15 outlines 'identity descriptors'.[108] He suggests thematic links between the chapters of Romans that 'relate to the attitudes and behaviour appropriate to the members of the Christ movement'; that these may be called '"norms" in a social identity sense or, more particularly, "identity descriptors"'.[109] I wish to explore, however, the ways in which Paul urges the Romans to let their identity be defined and developed in relationships of mutuality.

The aspect of brotherly love is fundamental to mutual relations which Aasgaard in his work '*My Beloved Brothers and Sisters'* deals with in regard to

---

[106] M. Reasoner, *The Strong and the Weak: Romans 14:1-15:13 in Context* (SNTSMS 103; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 232.

[107] R. J. Karris, 'Romans 14:1-15:13 and the occasion of Romans' in Donfried, (ed.) *Romans Debate*, 65-84. Karris analyses Rom 14:1-15:13 from a history of religions perspective, an exegetical perspective and a paraenetic perspective and suggests, 'there is very little history of religions or exegetical evidence that there were communities of the "weak" and the "strong" in Rome'. Karris, 'Romans 14:1-15:13', 84.

[108] P. F. Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 308. See also B. Winter, 'Roman Law and Society in Romans 12-15', in P. Oakes (ed.), *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002), 67-102.

[109] Esler, *Conflict and Identity,* 339. He suggests links between 14:1-15:13 and 15:14-16:27 and 12-13, with a theme of love.

Christian siblingship in Paul. In his discussion of Romans 12-15, he argues that in Rom 12:10, Paul emphasizes mutual relations: 'Paul here aims at φιλαδελφία as a general and mutual obligation among Christians; the exhortation is directed towards all indiscriminately'.[110] He argues that Paul's strategies in Rom 14:1-15:13 link the sibling metaphor very closely to the motif of non-judgment. 'A sibling should not be passed judgment on, nor be despised (14:10)'... 'the appropriate way of judging a sibling is to refrain from judging, and thus avoid destructive consequences, such as the injury or the ultimate ruin of a co-Christian (14:15, 21)'.[111]

The peculiarities of the Pauline exhortations (12-15) to the Roman community have been studied from various angles in recent years. The 'other regarding character', the mutual love and the differentiated motives of the groups (the strong and the weak) have been the objects of research. However, the thread of mutuality that underlies the chapters 12-15 and its impact on the greetings have yet to receive the degree of attention that they deserve.

1.8. The Contribution and the Plan of Thesis

As we have seen a variety of research has been done on the greetings, the roles of women (Rom 16) and the Pauline exhortations (Rom 12-15). However, the major focus of this research is on women's leadership roles in the Pauline churches and the leadership roles in the relationships of mutuality.

Assuming that Rom 16 is an integral part of the letter, the focus of this research is the greetings in Rom 16:1-16 that indicate the leadership of women in the Pauline churches. The instructional greetings indicate the persons who were to be greeted by the recipients of the letter and the rhetoric of the passage, i.e. the way of presentation

---

[110] R. Aasgaard, *'My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!': Christian Siblingship in Paul* (JSNTSup 265; London: T& T Clark, 2004), 172.
[111] Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers and Sisters*, 210.

of the persons to be greeted, implies their leadership roles. Their relationship to Paul denotes their association with Paul and their partnership in Christian ministry. These types of greetings have the function of increasing mutual relations not only between Paul and the persons greeted but also between the persons who do the greeting and those who are being greeted. Moreover, the mutuality in the greetings seems to be in continuation with the Pauline theme of love and mutuality (in chapters 12 and 13) and his dealing with a special issue of division in the Roman community (chapters 14 and 15) in order to welcome and receive one another. The analysis of the mutual relations in Romans 12-15 could help us deduce a model of the Pauline ethos of mutuality or 'Pauline love mutualism', because Paul describes genuine love as the motivation for mutual relations (Rom 12:9). The extensive use of ἀλλήλους language in Romans 12-16 (fourteen times in Romans; out of which eleven are in Romans 12-16) indicates Paul's emphasis on mutual relations among fellow believers and his strategy in bringing it about, which holds the community together in the midst of differences and diversities.

The method of study will be analytical, exegetical and rhetorical. The socio-cultural context of the select passage will be analysed in order to deduce the significance of women's ministry in the greetings of Paul. I will also engage in theological analysis of Paul's notion of mutuality. A total view of Paul's communitarian ethic will also be helpful in defining and reconstructing the mutuality model. Based on this model, the thesis will follow the following progression.

The second chapter deals with the rhetorical analysis of greetings. In this chapter the structure of conclusion in Hellenistic letters and Semitic letters in general and the Pauline letters in particular are studied and the different types of greetings

are also addressed with a special focus on the peculiarities of the greetings in Romans 16.

The third chapter deals with women in leadership in the Greco-Roman world. This chapter focuses on women in the public sphere: law, politics, patronage and heads of the household. Women in leadership in the religious sphere are also studied with a special focus on Synagogues.

The fourth chapter is the hub of the thesis as it deals with the importance of women in the Pauline mission. The women of Rom 16:1-16 are analysed in comparison with women in the Roman Empire. The women specially mentioned with their roles in the Pauline churches are discussed in order to place them in the wider sphere of Pauline associates. The roles of women are studied with their roles as stated by the descriptive phrases.

The fifth chapter focuses on the theological and ethical analysis of Rom 12-13 by discussing Paul's strategies to bring about mutuality. The body metaphor and the practical implications in bringing about love and mutuality are the centre of attention.

The sixth chapter discusses his strategies in dealing with the contextual issue of the weak and the strong in the Roman church (Rom 14-15). The solution to the problems in the community is through mutual welcome and acceptance through the self renunciation of one's own interests.

The seventh chapter is the concluding chapter, where a theology of love mutualism is reconstructed. The model of mutuality in the greetings is deduced from the exegetical analysis of Rom 12-15. The leadership of women within the structures of mutualism implied in the greetings is a challenge to communitarian ethics as far as Paul's social vision for Christian community is concerned.

Chapter 2

The Form of Greetings in the Romans Letter Closing

2.1. Introduction

The epistolary style of the Pauline letters is marked by the presence of four major features/sections: '1) the Opening (sender, recipient, salutation); 2) the Thanksgiving; 3) the Body ([including] transitional formulae, autobiographical statements, concluding paraenesis, apostolic parousia); and 4) the Closing (peace benediction, hortatory section, greeting, autograph, grace benediction)'.[1] Although the first three sections are widely discussed by scholars, the final section has not been given much attention. However, Weima properly situates its significance: 'A Pauline letter closing … is a carefully constructed unit, shaped and adapted in such a way as to relate it directly to the major concerns of the letter as a whole, and so it provides important clues to understanding the key issues addressed in the body of the letter'.[2] Thus the closing section of Pauline letters is as important as the other epistolary sections.

Greeting was a 'distinct literary form' found in the closing of a letter.[3] Among the Pauline greetings in the letter closings, the greetings in Romans have special significance. The two types of greetings Paul used in his letter closings are: *Informational* (information regarding greetings) and *Instructional* (instruction to greet others).

---

[1] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 11. The relationship between rhetorical analysis and epistolary analysis is much discussed by scholars. S. J. Stowers observes the need 'to compare Christian letters to the whole range of letters and to approach them with a knowledge of ancient epistolary and rhetorical theory' [S. J. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Library of Early Christianity 265; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986), 23], whereas J. L. White notes, 'The use of rhetorical techniques, especially in the theological body of St. Paul's letters, indicates that a knowledge of these traditions is quite relevant to the study of early Christian letters'. J. L. White, *Light from Ancient Letters* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 3.

[2] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 22.

[3] Mullins, 'Greeting as a New Testament form', 418. He suggests, 'It forms a communication bridge even where there is no specific merchandise to be exchanged' and creates friendship.

The aim of this chapter is to analyse the form of greetings in the closing section of Romans (16:1-16), since it is distinctive in comparison with the greetings elsewhere in Pauline letter closings. The discussion proceeds against the backdrop of the Hellenistic and the Semitic epistolary styles, which Paul might have been acquainted with. This helps us to understand how far the greetings enhance mutual relationship, which is one of the key aspects of the exhortations of Paul to the Roman believers (Rom 12-15).

2.2. Letter Closing in the Hellenistic Letters

In order to understand the Pauline epistolary style, it is important to have a glance at the epistolary theory and practice of the ancient world, to which he is indebted. The evidence for this is supplied by the Greek Papyrus letters and literary letters of antiquity.[4] A letter consists of mainly three parts: salutation, body, and conclusion. Here, the epistolary conventions of the letter closing in the Hellenistic letters are discussed with special focus on the greeting formulae and the descriptive phrases.

In the Hellenistic letters, the final wish or the farewell wish appears as an essential element.[5] Gamble notes, 'functionally, the final wish marks the definitive

---

[4] Gamble, *The Textual History,* 57: The papyrus letters are 'described as "non-literary" because they were not intended for "publication"… [by contrast to] "literary" letters of antiquity, by which we may refer either to letters transmitted through literary tradition or to letters composed in rather sophisticated and artful style'.

[5] See for more discussion F. Ziemann, *De Epistularum Graecarum Formulis Sollemnibus Quaestiones Selectae* (Berlin: Haas, 1912), 334-356; F. X. J. Exler, *The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter of the Epistolary Papyri (3rd c. B. C.- 3rd c. A. D.): A Study in Greek Epistolography* (Washington: Ares Publishers, 1923), 73-77, 103-107; H. Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des Griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (Helsinki: Akateeminen Kirjakauppa, 1956), 151-154; Gamble, *Textual History*, 58-59; J. L. White, 'Epistolary Formulas and Clichés in Greek Papyrus Letters', in *SBL Seminar Papers* 2 (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1978), 289-319, 289-29; 'The Greek Documentary Letter Tradition: Third Century BCE to Third Century CE, *Semeia* 22 (1981), 92-95; 'New Testament Epistolary Literature in the framework of Ancient Epistolography', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II, 25.2 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), 1730-56, 1733-34; *Light from Ancient Letters*, 198-202. There were letters in which a farewell wish did not occur: business letters (agreements of sale, loans, receipts, contracts, tenders written in letter form) and other types of letters. F. Francis refers to these types of letters (private, public, secondary, early as well as late) that do not have closing formulas but just stop; e.g. P. Tebt. 34; P. Tebt. 29; P. Tebt. 34; P. Oxy. 1071. See F. O.

conclusion of a letter, much in the manner of the concluding asseveration ("sincerely," etc.) and signature in modern usage'.[6]

The two basic forms of the farewell wish are ἔρρωσο ('Be Strong!', 'farewell', 'good-bye')[7], or εὐτύχει ('May you prosper')[8]; ἔρρωσο occurs more than the other.[9] In the older Papyrus letters, the farewell wish is expressed in the verb itself: ἔρρωσο and εὐτύχει. But towards the end of the second century CE the more expansive form ἐρρῶσθαί σε εὔχομαι ('I pray that you may be well') was used instead of the simple form and it became the standard closing formula in the second and third centuries, which is a combination of the farewell wish and a closing health wish.[10] The farewell wish has the function of bringing a letter to a definitive close and it has the final position in a letter and can have elaborations.[11]

Another epistolary convention, the 'health wish', expresses concern about the welfare of the letter recipient by stating the letter writer's own well-being.[12] The

---

Francis, 'The form and function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and 1 John', *ZNW* 61 (1970), 110-26, at 125.

[6] Gamble, *Textual History*, 58.

[7] The present passive imperative of ῥώννυμι, which means to be strong, vigorous. Terms like farewell and good bye are used at the conclusion of the letters, e.g. P. Princ. 72; P. Princ. 163; P. Oxy. 2786.

[8] The present active imperative of εὐτυχέω; e.g. P. Tebt. 41, P. Tebt. 53. This form was expanded to διευτυχέω; e.g. P. Oxy. 2342, P. Oxy. 2713.

[9] Roller identifies the distinction in the two forms of the final wish that ἔρρωσο is used in letters to peers or inferiors while εὐτύχει occurs in letters to superiors, which seems to be less likely as Gamble suggests that the distinction is not so obvious. Gamble agrees with Ziemann in this view. See O. Roller, *Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe; Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom Antiken Briefe*, BWANT 4/6 (58) (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933), 481-82; F. Ziemann, *De Epistularum Graecarum,* 350-56; Gamble, *Textual History*, 58.

[10] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 31.

[11] The farewell wish is brief and has a fixed form but it has three types of elaboration which begin to appear in the second century BCE: i) the recipient is referred to in a term of relationship or endearment such as ἀδελφέ (brother), πάτερ (father), κύριε (lord) etc., and also denotes a relationship beyond family boundary, in the vocative case, e.g. P. Ryl. 233, P. Oxy. 1296; ii) the prepositional phrase such as μετὰ τῶν σῶν πάντων ('with all of yours'), σὺν τοῖς σοῖς πᾶσι ('with you all'), or ἐν πανοικησίᾳ ('in [your] all household'); e.g. P. Giss. 24, P. Hamb. 54, P. Amh. 135; iii) an adverbial phrase such as διὰ ὅλου βίου ('throughout [your] whole life'), εἰς τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον ('for all time'), εἰς μακροὺς αἰῶνας ('for many years'), πολλοῖς χρόνοις ('for many years'). Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 32.

[12] See for detailed description, Ziemann, *De Epistularum Graecarum*, 302-325; Exler, *Ancient Greek Letter*, 107-111; Koskenneimi, *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechichen Briefes,* 130-39; cf. Roller, *Das Formular*, 62-65; Gamble, *Textual History*, 60-61; White, 'Epistolary Formulas and Clichés', 295-99; Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 34-39.

basic form of the health wish varies with historical periods, as is evident in the Greek papyrus letters, unlike the ancient Latin letters, where the *formula valetudinis* has a fixed form but stands in different locations: the opening section, the closing section, or both.[13] However, the Greek health wish has a fixed basic form depending on its position, whether it is used in the opening section or the closing section. Exler notes the form of the health wish in a letter opening has the basic structure: εἰ ἔρρωσθαι, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· ἐρρώμεθα (ὑγιαίνομεν) καὶ ἡμεῖς (αὐτοί) ['If you are well, it would be good. We too are well'].[14] The health wish in the closing section of the letter comes before the farewell wish and has the basic form: ἐπιμέλου σεαυτοῦ ἵν᾽ ὑγιαίνῃς ('Take care of yourself in order that you may be healthy'), which has no reference to the writer's own well-being.[15]

The other parts of the letter closings are greetings (which will be dealt with as a separate section as it is the focus of this chapter), the concluding autograph, date, illiteracy formula[16] and postscript. A concluding autograph was the closing remarks of the letter sender in his or her own hand, when a secretary was employed to assist in the writing of letters. The autograph has the effect of the writer writing the letter in

---

[13] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 35. Exler suggests that the health wish comes in the body of the Hellenistic letter, which is less likely because the health wish has a role of maintaining relationships between the persons involved and the frequent occurrence of the health wish in the letter closings indicate the improbability of its position in the body of the letter. See Exler, *Ancient Greek Letter*, 101-113; *contra* Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 34-35.

[14] The basic form varies: the common changes are καλῶς–εὖ, ἐρρώμεθα – ὑγιαίνομεν, αὐτοί–ἡμεῖς and the additions are πρὸ μὲν πάντων or πρὸ τῶν ὅλων, τὰ λοιπά or τἆλλα, βούλομαι or θέλω, κατὰ λόγον, κατὰ νοῦν or κατὰ γνώμην. The opening health wish was a separate formula and comes after the opening greeting from the third century BCE to the middle of the second century BCE, e.g. PSI 331; PSI 364; UPZ 64; from the mid second century BCE to the early second century CE, the health wish began to be combined with the opening greeting, e.g. P. Tebt. 12; P. Oxy. 2979; BGU 1204; in the latter part of the second century CE and the third century CE the health wish appears as a separate formula. See Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 35, 36; Exler, *Ancient Greek Letter,* 103-105.

[15] There are variations although not in an extensive manner as in the opening health wish, e.g. P. Mert. 62; P. Petr. 2; P. Oslo. 47. The health wish in the closing of the letter disappears by the first century CE and the beginning of the second, probably due to the combined form of the health wish and the farewell wish: ἐρρῶσθαί σε εὔχομαι ('I pray that you may be well'). See Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 38.

[16] The illiteracy formula is a brief note at the end of the letter showing that a secretary had written the document since the person who is actually sending the letter is illiterate. See Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 50; Exler, *Form of the Ancient Greek Letter,* 124-127.

his or her own hand ('I have written in my own hand'). The dating formula occurs in most official or business letters, and (if it occurs) it occupies the final position in the closing section of the letter, after the farewell wish. A postscript includes final information, added to the end, that was not included earlier.

It is rare that the letters have all the elements together in the closing section, since it depends on the particular situation and style of the letter.

2.2.1. Greetings

Greeting is the third epistolary convention commonly found in the ancient Hellenistic letters. Although concluding greetings are not frequently present in the letters before the first Christian century CE, greetings attained a fixed position at the close of a letter from the first century onwards. The greeting of the writer to the addressee was located at the beginning of the letter (χαίρειν) and the closing greeting can be considered as a 'secondary' greeting. The purpose of both opening and closing greetings was to maintain relationships. As Weima suggests, the greetings was one of 'the key means of expressing "philophronesis" – that is, the friendly relationship that existed between the sender of the letter and its recipient'.[17] The concluding greetings are directed to the friends or family members of the addressee.

The basic form of the concluding greetings consists of the verb of greeting and the object and both of them can be subjected to various modifications. The verb commonly used for expressing greetings in letter closings is ἀσπάζεσθαι[18] ('to greet, welcome, salute'). Προσαγορεύειν[19] (to address, call, by name) and

---

[17] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 39.

[18] ἀσπάζεσθαι means 'to effect ἀσπασμός, mostly to proffer the greeting which is customary on entering a house or meeting someone on the street or parting'. An 'ἀσπασμός in a letter is a greeting from a distance, which is a substitute for a greeting and embrace in personal encounter. It expresses sincere attachment in separation and thus serves to strengthen personal fellowship'. K. H. Windisch, 'ἀσπάζομαι' *TDNT* 1, 496-502, at 496.

[19] E.g. P. Geiss. 12; P. Mert. 63; P. Tebt. 58, 768; P. Oslo. 153; P. Oxy. 293, 294, 743.

ἐπισκοπεῖσθαι (to look after, watch over)[20] are also used infrequently. The writer wants the addressee to convey the greetings to others when the verb is presented imperatively (ἀσπάζου, ἀσπάσαι).[21]

2.2.1.1. Types of Greetings

There are three types of greetings corresponding to the three persons of the verb: the first person form, the second person form, and the third person form.[22] The first and third person greeting types can be put together under the banner of informational greeting, which is an information of greeting by the sender to the addressee, whereas the second person type of greeting can be called instructional greeting, that is, instruction to the recipient to greet others.

1. The first person form ἀσπάζομαι is very rarely used in the final greetings in the first century CE and began to be used in the final greetings in the second century CE.[23] In the first person form of greeting, the writer of the letter greets directly, and it is the most direct and personal form of the greeting formulae; e.g. P. Wash 30: ἀσπάζομαί σε ἄδελφε Νεικῆτα (I greet you, brother Neicetes').[24] The first person type of greeting usually occurs in the opening (χαίρειν) and it emphasizes the friendly relationship between the person who does the greeting and the persons greeted. If the first person greeting is directed to someone other than the person in the opening, it shows that the writer wants to communicate with more persons than in the

---

[20] The plain meaning of the verb is not related to greeting. However, it is used as a technical term for greeting which means 'send regards to'; e.g. P. Mert. 63; P. Oslo. 153. John White argues that the indicative form of the verb has this meaning while the imperative does not have the same meaning; Weima disagrees by suggesting that the indicative as well as the imperative of the verb have the same meaning. White, 'Epistolary Formulas and Clichés', 298-99; White, *Light from Ancient Letters*, 202, fn. 63. Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 40.

[21] Gamble, *Textual History*, 59.

[22] Mullins, 'Greeting as a New Testament Form', 418; Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 40; Koskenniemi, *Des griechischen Briefes*, 148-51. Koskenniemi describes the types in a different way: a) the writer greets the addressee; 2) the writer greets others through the addressee; and 3) the writer conveys greetings from another party to the recipient.

[23] Gamble, *Textual History*, 59.

[24] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 40.

previous list.[25] As Mullins suggests, one of the important aspects of the first person type of greeting is 'its potential for spelling out the intended readership of the letter'.[26]

2. In the second person form of greeting, the writer requires the addressee to convey the greetings to someone on his behalf: e.g. P. Tebt. 412: ἀσπάζου τὴν μετέρα σου καὶ τὸν πατέρα σου ('Greet your mother and your father'). Thus the addressee becomes the agent of communication between the sender and the third party and the form of the greeting can be either the present imperative ἀσπάζου, or the aorist imperative ἀσπάσαι. The second person greetings occur in the final section of the letter unlike the first person greeting, which is usually located in the letter opening. It is less personal than the first person greeting.[27]

On the one hand, this type of greeting implies a closer relationship between the writer of the letter and the addressee than between the writer and the person greeted, and on the other, it also suggests a closer relationship between the addressee and the person greeted than between the writer and the person greeted. Thus the appearance of a second person type of greeting indicates a series of close and friendly bonds. Mullins suggests that the degrees of relationships can be determined not only by the greeting formula but also by the epistolary situation; the second person type of greetings is significant since it informs the relationships which exist beyond the scope of the letter rather than the relationships indicated in the letter.[28]

3. In the third person form of greeting, the letter writer becomes an agent through whom a third party greets the addressee or even some fourth party: e.g.

---

[25] See e.g. BGU 276; P. Fay. 116; P. Mert. 81, 82, 85; P. Oxy. 123, 1067, 1494; P. Princ. 70; P. Tebt. 415.
[26] Mullins, 'Greeting as a Letter Form', 420.
[27] See e.g., BGU 632; P. Fay. 112, 123; P. Mert. 22, 81, 82; P. Oslo. 47, 48, 49, 150, 161; P. Oxy. 114, 295, 300, 1061, 1489; P. Princ. 68, 70; P. Ryl. 230, 231; P. Tebt. 412.
[28] Mullins, 'Greeting as a New Testament Form ', 420, 421.

P. Mich. 464: ἀσπάζονταί σέ σου τὰ παιδία ('Your children greet you').[29] The position of third person greetings is in the letter closing rather than in the opening, similar to that of the second person greetings,[30] which is the least personal in form compared to the other types and gives information about the relationship existing beyond that of the letter writer and the addressee.

2.2.1.2. Elements of Greetings

The three basic elements in the secondary (closing) greetings are: 1) the greeting verb; 2) the sender of greeting; 3) the recipient of greeting. There is another optional element in secondary greetings which is an elaborating phrase. The first three elements are essential and can vary in different types of greeting. In the first person and second person types of greetings, the verb alone functions as the first and second elements. An example of each type is as follows:[31]

P. Herm. 14: ἀσπαζόμεθα Διόσκορον καὶ Εὐσδαίμονα καὶ τοὺς παρὰ σοὶ παῖδας

P. Oxy. 1016: ἀσπάζου τοὺς σοὺς πάντας

The person who is greeting needs to be expressed in the third-person type, for example,

P. Iand. 9: ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς πάντας κατ᾽ ὄνομα Λοπεινᾶς

2.2.1.3. Elaborating/Descriptive Phrases

In the Hellenistic letters, the elaborating phrases used in the closing greetings indicate some of the specific aspects of the writer-reader relationships. They give emphasis to some aspect of greeting, which usually serves to modify or to call particular attention to one of the basic elements of greeting such as the greeting verb,

---

[29] Weima, *Neglected Endings,* 42. The third person indicative singular or plural is used.
[30] For example, P. Mert. 22, 81, 82, 83; P. Oxy. 2981, 2982, 3312; P. Princ. 70.
[31] The examples are given by Mullins, 'Greeting as a New Testament Form', 419.

the person who is to do the greeting, or the person who is being greeted.[32] The phrases used are different according to their functions.

a) One type of phrase is used to strengthen the relationships indicated by the basic elements and they are called *modifiers*. The verb of greeting is sometimes elaborated by the modifier πολλά and this can be used with any of the three types of greeting, such as the first person type, the second person type and the third person type of greeting (ἀσπάζεσθαι πολλά, to greet warmly). 'Here the writer seeks to convey to the reader the thought that his greeting is something special, and that it is not just a conventional gesture'.[33] The use of πολλά, is the most general method of modifying the effect of the verb and it is intended to intensify the warmth of the greeting. At other times, the entire clause is introduced with πρὸ πάντων or πρὸ τῶν ὅλων ('above all', 'by all means').

b) Another elaborating phrase is an *interjection,* which is a 'fairly irrelevant comment thrown in as part of the greeting'; 'a simple pious wish for good luck of one sort or another for the person greeted' or a curse against a mutual enemy.[34] It can also take the form of telling something about the greeter, which is a 'personality signature', as Mullins suggests.[35]

c) The third kind of elaborating phrase is the *personal description*, which is a phrase used to describe the person being greeted. The phrases show the special relationship between the writer and person greeted or it includes a word of endearment. The objects of greetings are variously designated by proper names, but sometimes with a personal description which states the form of relationship, e.g. P.

---

[32] Mullins, 'Greeting as a New Testament Form', 419.
[33] Mullins, 'Greeting as a New Testament Form', 422.
[34] Mullins, 'Greeting as a New Testament Form', 422.
[35] Mullins, 'Greeting as a New Testament Form', 422.

Oxy. 533, ἀσπάσασθε Στατίαν τὴν θυγατέρα μου καὶ Ἡραχλείδην καὶ Ἀπίονα τοὺς υἱούς μου.

In some cases, the objects of greetings are not named but appear in a general collective designation: e.g. πάντας τοὺς ἐν οἴκῳ (ἐνοίκους), 'all among your household,' 'your whole family'. But considering the fact that this was too impersonal a way of greeting friends some writers added a *personalizing phrase*, κατ᾽ ὄνομα which means 'by name' e.g. P. Mich. 206, ἀσπάζου τοὺς σοὺς πάντας κατ᾽ὄνομα. ἀσπαζονταί σε καὶ τοὺς σοὺς πάντας οἱ ἐμοὶ πάντες κατ᾽ ὄνομα.

d) The fourth type is the identifying *phrase.* The role of the identifying phrase is to characterize the person who does the greeting, which can occur in a first person or in a third person type of greeting. An example of this rare type of elaborating phrase is P. Oxy. 1067, κἀγω Ἀλεξανδρος ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς πολλά.

It is to be noted that though Paul adapted the Hellenistic epistolary models for Christian purposes, he expressed a sense of freedom in literary matters. He was not tied to any fixed models and he often combined non-Jewish Hellenistic customs with Hellenistic Jewish ones.[36] 'That Paul envisioned a worship setting as he composed his letters is evident in the manner in which he altered customary conventions and/or by the way in which he used Christian formularies as a substitute for set epistolary phrases'.[37]

---

[36] P. T. O'Brien, 'Letters, Letter Forms', *DPL*, 550-553, at 551; see also R. W. Funk, *Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God*: *The Problem of Language in the New Testament and Contemporary Theology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 270. For more discussion see Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 57-76.

[37] J. L. White, 'Saint Paul and the Apostolic Letter Tradition', *CBQ* 45 (1983), 433-444, at 437.

2.3. Letter closing in the Semitic Letters

It is also important to have a look at the closing conventions of ancient Semitic letters as Paul himself claims a Jewish and Pharisaic background (Rom 11:1; 2 Cor 11:22; Phil 3:5-6; Gal 1:13-14; 1 Cor 15:9). The Semitic letters fall under two categories, primary and secondary. The primary letters have two basic epistolary conventions: farewell wish *shalom* ('peace', 'health', and 'well-being') which has the double function of saying farewell and health wish, and secondly, signature (only rare occurrence of a postscript). Weima suggests that the Semitic letters differ from the Hellenistic letters which less commonly have a signature.[38] He also notes that Paul might have been influenced by Semitic signature practice as he has used in his writing 'I, Paul, write this in my own hand' (Phlm 19; 1 Cor 16:21; Gal 6:11; 2 Thess 3:17; Col 4:18). The secondary (literary) letters have epistolary conventions such as a farewell wish (Ep. *Arist*. 33; 2 Apoc. Bar. 86.1; Josephus, *Life* 365), a date (2 Macc 11.33), a health wish (opening health wish: e.g. Ep. *Arist*. 35; 2 Macc. 1.10; 2 Macc 11.28; closing health wish; e.g. Josephus *Ant*. 17. 135).[39]

Compared to the Hellenistic letter closing, the Semitic letter closings are shorter and less elaborate, and few letters are found with links between the body and closing sections points to some general comments. Weima notes, 'As we found with respect to ancient Hellenistic letters, there does not appear among the Semitic letters to be any deliberate and careful adaptation of closings so that they summarize and echo key issues previously taken up in their respective bodies'. However, he also notes that a few examples with links between Semitic letter closings and the body of the letter indicate the writer's intention of writing appropriate endings.[40]

---

[38] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 67. For more discussion see pages 57-76.
[39] Weima, Neglected Endings, 74-75.
[40] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 76. Doty suggests that there are no 'direct lines of borrowing by Paul from Jewish epistolary materials in terms of form and structure'. W. G. Doty, *Letters in Primitive*

2.4. Letter Closing in the Pauline Letters

We have discussed the epistolary forms of the ancient Hellenistic letters and the Semitic letters to comprehend how far Paul's epistolary writings have been influenced by these forms. Although echoes of Hellenistic influence can be seen to a greater extent and Semitic influence to a lesser extent, Weima suggests from Paul's 'creation of the forms unparalleled in ancient letters'[41] that Pauline letter closings relate to the specific epistolary situations. As we deal with the closing conventions of the Pauline letters, we will look into the different forms used by Paul in his letters especially in the letter to the Romans. The conclusion of Paul's letters consists of a grace benediction, the wish of peace, the greetings, the greeting with a holy kiss, the autographic conclusion and some other elements.

The grace benediction functions as a final wish and is seen in the ultimate position, the exception of which can be found in 1 Corinthians 16:23, where Paul conveys his love to be with them by a wish. The grace benediction has three components such as the wish, the divine source and the recipient. The wish includes grace (χάρις) in the disputed as well as the undisputed letters; 2 Cor 13:13 has additional words such as love and fellowship. The divine source τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ 'of [our]Lord Jesus [Christ]' is present in all undisputed letters of Paul but absent in disputed letters. The genitive phrase 'of Christ Jesus' depicts that Christ Jesus is the source of grace. The variation can be found in 2 Cor 13:13 where θεός and πνεῦμα are used. The recipient is introduced with μετὰ (with) and followed by ὑμῶν (e.g. Rom 16:20b; 1 Cor 16:23; 2 Cor 13:13; Gal 6:18; Phil 4:23; 1 Thess 5:28;

Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973), 22. Fitzmyer finds some parallels between New Testament epistolography and Aramaic letters. See J. A. Fitzmyer, 'Some Notes on Aramaic Epistolography', *JBL* 93 (1974), 201-225, at 220.

[41] Weima, *Neglected Endings,* 77.

2 Thess 3:18; Phlm 25); the divine source is absent in disputed letters e.g. Eph 6:24; Col 4:18b; 1 Tim 6:21b; 2 Tim 4:22b; Tit 3:15b.[42] The variations are τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν and πάντων ὑμῶν (which has an emphatic function). The grace benediction's link to the early Christian liturgy can be seen in 1 Cor 16:20-23, where Paul deviates from the simple farewell wish to the grace benediction. As Weima suggests the reasons for the variations in Paul are: a) he may be concerned about the spiritual welfare of the readers; b) his desire to give a Christological focus; c) to build 'inclusio' with the opening salutation, which has a grace factor and d) also due to his theological, liturgical and pastoral interests.[43]

The wish of peace appears in the epistolary conclusions and holds an earlier position, which occurs in all undisputed letters except 1 Corinthians and Philemon. The elements of the peace benediction are the introductory element (δέ, καί) and the divine source (Θεός). In the grace benediction, grace is given by Christ and here, peace by God. The peace wish has variations in 1 Cor 13:11, where peace and love are used; 2 Thess 3:16 'may the God of peace himself give you peace at all times and all ways'; 1 Thess 5:23-24 'may the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly … till the coming of Christ'; while peace is the basic form of the wish, and the recipient (μετὰ + ὑμῶν).[44] The letter of Romans has two peace benedictions (15:33; 16:20a) with some special features. The origin of the peace benediction can be mapped out from the Aaronic blessing (Num 6:24-26). In the Semitic letters the farewell wish 'shalom' connotes the wish for peace since it has the meaning of total well-being. In the Pauline letters the peace benediction comes at the beginning of the letter closing and it has the function of expressing concern for the spiritual welfare of the readers.

---

[42] See Weima, *Neglected Endings,* 78-87.
[43] Weima, *Neglected Endings,* 87.
[44] There are other benedictions in Pauline letters: Rom 15:5-6; 15:13; 1 Thess 3:12-13; 2 Thess 2:16-17; 2 Thess 3:5.

The greetings are always placed between the peace-wish and the grace benediction if both are present in the letter. Greetings with a kiss come along with other greetings, which will be discussed in the next section.

The other element, the autograph statement τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ (Παύλου) in/with my own hand [of Paul] appears in five (three undisputed and two disputed) letters of Paul (1 Cor 16:21; Gal 6:11; 2 Thess 3:17; Phlm 19; cf. Col 4:18a).[45] The autograph formula indicates that Paul used a secretary to write the letter and his personal writing is given as a signature to the letters.

Doxology is another important element in the letter closing. Doxology differs from benediction: 'whereas the benediction is an invocation to God to bestow a blessing on some person(s), the doxology is an expression of praise to God'.[46] The elements of doxology are: the object of praise (God in the undisputed letters); the element of praise (glory); the signal of time and the affirmative response. The origin of the doxology is drawn from Jewish worship, which has the same four elements as the New Testament doxologies. Doxology functions as a conclusion of the arguments and exhortations in a letter. Paul might have been influenced by the Semitic letters.

Concluding hortatory remarks point to the main issues of the respective letters and can be found in the closings of the undisputed Pauline letters. They are absent in 2 Thessalonians. The other elements found are the joy expression, the letter of recommendation and the postscript.

The pattern of the major components of the conclusion can be represented as hortatory remarks, wish of peace, greetings, greetings with kiss, and grace benediction. According to Gamble, whether these elements are present or absent, or

---

[45] Only Galatians and Philemon's autographic statement use the verb ἔγραψα, while others lack a main verb. The autograph statement is found with the greeting formula (three occurrences: 1 Cor 16:21; 2 Thess 3:17; Col 4:18a).

[46] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 135,136.

with addition of other items, the sequence is never violated.[47] In the components and structure, the epistolary conclusions suggest regularity in their pattern. But no two conclusions are the same in all their features.

2.4.1. Form of Greetings in the Pauline Letters

The Pauline epistolary conclusion is marked by the greetings to the addressees. These can be found in all Pauline undisputed letters except Galatians.[48] Although there are similarities between the Pauline greeting formula and the Hellenistic greeting formula, there is a considerable diversity of form and scope within the Pauline greetings. In the Pauline letters as well as the Hellenistic letters, ἀσπάζεσθαι with the object is the basic formula of greeting; the three types of greetings as first, second and third person types are used, while the second person instructional type is more common.

2.4.1.1. Informational Greetings

The first person type and the third person type come under this group as they contain information about the greetings.

1. First Person type of Greeting: The first person type of greeting ἀσπάζομαι (I greet) is found only in Romans 16:22. Tertius, the apostle's secretary, greets the readers of the letter: ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ Τέρτιος ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν κυρίῳ. In the Hellenistic letters also, the use of the first person greeting formula is restricted. The personal greeting usually appears in the opening salutation (χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη) and because of this reason it may not appear in the closing greeting.

---

[47] Gamble, *Textual History*, 83.

[48] The absence of any greetings in the epistle to the Galatians was interpreted as due to the rebuking features found in the Galatians letter or that Galatians was meant to be a circular letter. Weima suggests that the omission may be due to 'the strained relations that existed between Paul and his Galatian converts'. Among the disputed letters of Paul, the greeting is missing only in Ephesians and 1 Timothy. In the other New Testament letters, the greeting occurs in Heb 13:24 (2 times), 1 Pet 5:13-14; 2 Jn 13 and 3 Jn 15 (2 times). Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 115.

There is a distinctive formula ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου ('The greeting [is written] with my own hand':1 Cor 16:21; 2 Thess 3:17; Col 4:18) that belongs to this greeting type. This type of greeting seems to have no parallels in the other letters of Paul's day.[49] Although ἀσπασμός can be taken as the grace benediction, the grace benediction is a wish of grace and not a word of greeting. So Weima suggests that ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου is a 'genuine greeting' of Paul and is a 'Pauline type of first person greeting'.[50]

2. Third Person Type of Greeting: In the third person type of greeting, Paul conveys the greetings of others to the people, who are the recipients of the letter. The writer, Paul, serves as an agent in sending greetings on behalf of people who are with him. The present indicative singular ἀσπάζεται or plural ἀσπάζονται is used in the third person type of greetings. The greetings are sent 'on behalf of specific individuals (Rom 16:21, 23:1 Cor 16:19b; Phlm 23), of well-defined groups (1 Cor 16:19a; Phil 4:22), or of very general groups (1 Cor 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12b; Phil 4:21)'.[51] Paul also sends greetings on behalf of 'the church in Asia' (1Cor 16:19a) or for 'all the saints' (2 Cor 13:12b) or for 'all the churches of Christ' (Rom 16:16b), which suggests that Paul is more concerned about the unity and fellowship of the church, and his own apostolic status, while he communicates greetings on behalf of the churches.

2.4.1.2. Instructional greetings

Second Person Type of Greetings: In the second person type of greetings, Paul instructs the readers or the recipients of the letter to greet others. Thus the recipients of the letter are greeting others as instructed by the writer of the letter. Although there is an implicit idea that they are acting as an agent of the sender of the

---

[49] Weima, *Neglected Endings,* 105.
[50] Weima, *Neglected Endings,* 108.
[51] Weima, *Neglected Endings,* 109.

letter, the explicit action is that they are greeting others as if they are greeting themselves and not as per the instruction of Paul.

It can be inferred from this type of greeting that the persons who are greeted likewise are not a part of the congregation to whom the letter was addressed. So it may be assumed that one of the house churches at Rome was the actual recipient of Paul's letter and 'Paul authorizes them to pass on his personal greetings to specific persons who belonged to other house churches in the capital city'.[52] However, Gamble suggests that even though the recipients of the letter can be seen as the agents of greetings, the recipients of the greetings are among the circle of readers.[53]

The sender's greetings conveyed by the addressees to the third party is equal to the sender himself greeting them. 'The second person imperative form of the greeting verb functions as a surrogate for the first person indicative form, and so represents a direct personal greeting of the writer himself to the addressees'.[54] It seems that 'the involvement of the congregation in passing on his greetings to others expressed a stronger sense of public commendation for those individuals being specifically greeted by the apostle'.[55]

However, the second person greeting indicates Pauline instruction as 'you greet', which is important to this research on mutuality in Romans: Paul (A) instructs readers (B) 'you' to greet others (C). It is not merely passing on of his own greetings but group B greets group C as if they themselves are greeting the third party; ἀσπάσασθε - you (plural) greet.

---

[52] Weima, *Neglected Endings,* 108. Weima refers to C.-H. Kim, *The Form and Structure of the Familiar Greek Letter of Recommendation* (SBLDS 4; Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1972), 139-140.

[53] Gamble, *Textual History*, 92, 93.

[54] Gamble, *Textual History*, 93; Mullins, 'Greeting', 418. Mullins suggests that the second person imperative form shows that the recipients of the greetings stand outside the immediate readership of the letter. But Gamble argues that this may be true for Hellenistic private letters but does not seem good for Pauline letters or for Romans 16 and therefore the recipients of the second person greetings in Romans 16 are members of the community. See previous note.

[55] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 108.

The plural aorist imperative ἀσπάσασθε[56] occurs twenty times in the undisputed letters, and is the most frequent of the greeting types, while the third person greeting form occurs only ten times. It is also interesting to note that apart from Romans, the second person greeting type occurs only four times and of these three (1 Cor 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12; and 1 Thess 5:26) belong to the exhortation of the holy kiss. Thus the only second person type of greeting found outside Romans is in Phil 4:21.

2.4.1.3. Elements of Greeting

The closing greetings of the Pauline letters contain the same three elements as that of the Greco-Roman letters. They are 1) the greeting verb ἀσπάσασθε; 2) the giver of the greeting; and 3) the recipient of the greeting. Paul's use of the elements is the same in all the greetings. The elaborating phrases are the optional element of the greetings.

2.4.1.4. Elaborating/Descriptive Phrases

The elaborating phrases which are most abundant in the Pauline letters are those with the personal description phrases although they are least abundant in the papyri.[57] Paul uses a number of additions or elaborating phrases to his greetings in order to modify or stress the three elements in the closing section such as the greeting verb, the person who greets and the person being greeted, as in the Hellenistic letters.

a) The first element of the greeting formula is given more weight by the addition of the adverb πολλά in 1 Cor 16:19b, which is added in the Hellenistic letters to give a more personal tone.[58] Another type of elaboration to the first element

---

[56] The verb ἀσπάσασθε is used in the disputed Pauline letters such as Col 4:15; 2 Tim 4:19; Tit 3:15b. In the other letters of the New Testament, the second person type occurs in 1 Pet 5:14 and 3 Jn 15b, Heb 13:24a.

[57] Mullins, 'Greeting as a New Testament Form', 424. The interjection, which can be seen in the Hellenistic letters, does not appear at all in Pauline Letters.

[58] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 110.

of the greeting formula is in the phrases such as ἐν κυρίῳ (in the Lord) and ἐν

Χριστῷ (in Christ); e.g. (1 Cor 16:19b) ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ and (Phil 4:21)

ἀσπάσασθε … ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, which serve to modify the verb, with 'the verb

being "christianized" by the additions'.[59]

b) The second element of the greeting formula, the giver of the greeting is also

elaborated, by using identification phrases. Identification phrases used can be found

in Rom 16:21, 22; 23a, 23b; Phlm 23-24; Phil 4:22, Col 4:10-12 (cf. 1 Pet 5:13).

Only one of the identification phrases is used with a first-person type of greeting, 'I,

Tertius, who wrote the letter, greet you' (Rom 16:22). All the rest are in the third-

person type of greetings. Rom 16:23a is a typical example of this type, 'Gaius, who

is the host to me and to the whole church, greets you'. In these cases, the descriptive

phrases are used with the pattern of a nominative in apposition to the person's name

followed by the first person personal pronoun in the genitive, as ὁ συνεργός μου

('my fellow worker'); οἱ συγγενεῖς μου ('my kinsmen'), which points to the nature

of the relationship that exists between the sender of the greeting and Paul.

c) The descriptive phrases are also used with the third element of greeting, the

recipient. The phrases are used to identify by name and/or personal description those

who are being greeted, for example, Rom 16:5b, 11b, 12a, 12b. Apart from Romans,

this occurs only once, in Col 4:15 (Ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ ἀδελφοὺς καὶ

Νύμφαν ...). Nympha, particularly mentioned in the greeting, is the object of

greeting. It is also notable that the person being greeted is signified by means of

appositive noun or adjective followed by first person personal pronoun in the

genitive.[60] The phrases used to describe the recipient have different purposes.

---

[59] Gamble, *Textual History*, 74.
[60] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 111.

First, the descriptive phrases of the recipient express a strong commendation, e.g. τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου ('my beloved': Rom 16:5b, 8, 9, 12b); τὸν δόκιμον ἐν Χριστῷ ('esteemed in Christ': Rom 16:10a); τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν κυρίῳ ('chosen in the Lord': Rom 16:13).

Second, the addition of the phrases such as ἐν κυρίῳ or ἐν Χριστῷ (᾽Ιησοῦ) refers to the recipient[61] (Greet so and so in the Lord), although it modifies the verb (Greet in the Lord /Christ), e.g. 1 Cor 16:19b and Phil 4:21. This type of descriptive phrase gives a strong element of commendation to the recipient as Paul is acknowledging that person in relation to the Lord.[62]

Third, relative clauses are also used with these phrases such as οἵτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν ('who risked their necks for my life': Rom 16:4a); οἷς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστῶ ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν ('to whom not only I but also all churches of the Gentiles give thanks' Rom 16:4b); ὅς ἐστιν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς ᾽Ασίας εἰς Χριστόν ('who is the first convert of Asia for Christ': Rom 16:5b). The role of these phrases may be recognition of their achievement or a commendation rather than to introduce the person being greeted to the addressees since those persons would have been famous in the Christian community.

2.5. The Romans Letter Closing

The Romans letter closing (Rom 15:33-16:27) has special features compared to the other letter closings. It is the longest letter closing and it includes two peace benedictions (15:33; 16:20a), a letter of recommendation (16:1-2), the two greeting lists (16:3-16, 21-23), an hortatory section (16:17-20) and a doxology (16:25-27).

---

[61] The prepositional phrase occurs 11 times in relation to the recipient of the greeting: Rom 16:3, 5b, 7, 8, 9, 10a, 11b, 12a, 12b, 13; Phil 4:21a.
[62] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 111.

The first greeting list is unique due to its length and the number of people being greeted with descriptive phrases concluding with the greeting with a holy kiss (v.16a) and the greetings to the Romans from all the churches of Christ (v.16b). It is followed by an hortatory section that includes the paraenesis (v.17-18; 19b), the joy expression (v.19a) and the peace benediction (v.20a). The hortatory section is followed by the grace benediction (16:20b), which is the final section of Paul's other letters. But here it is followed by the second list of greetings, where Paul passes on his greetings from his co-workers including his amanuensis (Rom 16:21-23). The Romans letter closing ends with a long doxology (16:25-27). The following is the outline:

15:33   Peace Benediction

16:1-2   Letter of Recommendation

16:3-16   First Greeting List

         vv. 3-15   Second Person Greetings

         v. 16a   Greeting with a holy kiss

         v. 16b   Third Person Greeting

16: 17-20a   Hortatory Section (Autograph)

         vv. 17-18   παρακαλέω unit

         v. 19a   Joy expression

         v. 19b   General paraenetic command

         v. 20a   Peace Benediction

16:20b   Grace Benediction

16:21-23   Second Greeting List

16:25-27   Doxology

The closing conventions in the Romans letter closing are briefly discussed in the following section.

It is a distinctive feature in Romans that it has two peace benedictions, compared to the other letters of Paul. The peace benediction in 15:33 has the adjective πάντων (all) expressing the range of the wish, and it reflects the practice of papyrus letters of the day. Here in Romans, it seems that Paul is intending to bring about peace for 'all' in the collective sense because of his dealing with the problems and divisions in the previous chapters, thereby bringing in peace between the strong and the weak in the Roman church. Weima notes, 'The addition of πάντων would thus be a subtle attempt by Paul to tailor the peace benediction so that it reinforces his previous calls for peace and unity among *all* the members of the church'.[63] The peace benediction in 16:20a is the second peace benediction within the same letter closing; it is placed before the grace benediction;[64] here it calls for God to act for someone ('The God of peace will crush Satan under your feet speedily'); it is a part of the hortatory section where Paul himself addresses the readers and strongly urges them to work for unity.

The second epistolary form in the Romans letter closing is the letter of recommendation for Phoebe. It has a similar structure and content to that of ἐπιστολὴ συστατική or *littera commendaticia* in the Greco-Roman letters.[65] The

---

[63] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 96.

[64] Some manuscripts place the grace benediction in 16:24 and some in 16:27; however, the widely held view supports 16:20b as its original location.

[65] The ancient letters of recommendation are studied by C. W. Keyes and Chan-Hie Kim. C. W. Keyes, 'The Greek Letter of Introduction' *AJP* 56 (1935), 28-44; Kim, *Familiar Letter of Recommendation*. Phoebe's letter of introduction has the following contents: 1) Συνίστημι δὲ ὑμῖν (I commend to you); 2) Φοίβην (Phoebe); 3) τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν, οὖσαν [καί] διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς, (our sister, a deacon of the church at Cenchreae); 4) ἵνα αὐτὴν προσδέξησθε ἐν κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων καὶ παραστῆτε αὐτῇ ἐν ᾧ ἄν ὑμων χρῄζῃ πράγματι· (so that you may welcome her in the Lord as is fitting for the saints, and help her in whatever she may require from you); 5) καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴ προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ (for she has been a benefactor of many and of myself as well I commend). The letter of recommendation although not in the standard form can be found in 1 Cor 16:15-18 cf. Eph 6:21-22

Hellenistic letters have a fixed form to some extent, consisting of the elements: verb of recommendation, name of the person recommended, describing phrase, request clause, circumstantial clause and purpose clause. Phoebe's letter of recommendation has all the above mentioned forms except the circumstantial clause which implies that Paul is following the example of contemporary letters of introduction.[66] Nevertheless, this does not reduce Paul's purpose of recommending Phoebe to the Romans as she is the bearer of the letter.

The commonly held view is that the hortatory section in Romans 16:17-20 was written by Paul's own hand (not explicitly mentioned) and that it serves as an autograph. It echoes the concerns of the apostle in that it strongly warns those who cause dissensions and divisions in the community. Karl Donfried observes that Rom 16:17-20 is the conclusion of the matters discussed in the previous chapters and that it appears as a 'final warning', whereas Paul Achtemeier suggests that Rom 16:17-20 not only summarizes Paul's exhortations in chaps. 12-16 but also reflects the 'whole of his theology, namely the unity of Jews and Gentiles'.[67]

The doxology in Romans (16:25-27) is one of two doxologies in the undisputed letters of Paul that appear in the letter closing (cf. Phil 4:20).[68] Many scholars have

---

and Col 4:7-8. Those who argue 1 Cor 16:15-18 is a formal letter of introduction are Gamble, *Textual History*, 97; L. L. Belleville, 'Continuity or Discontinuity: A Fresh look at 1 Corinthians in the Light of First Century Epistolary Forms and Conventions' *EvQ* 59 (1987), 15-37, 34; G. D. Fee, The *First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 832.

[66] The notion that the ancient letters of recommendation are independent letters that are not found in the letter closings made some scholars argue that Phoebe's letter was originally an independent letter of recommendation. However, Gamble cites several examples of letters that have the letter of introduction in the closing of the letters; this probably places Phoebe's letter as one of Romans' letter closing conventions as she is the bearer of the letter. See Gamble, *Textual History*, 84-87. Those who hold the view that Rom 16:1, 2 is a separate letter are A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East,* (trans.) L. R. M. Strachen (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910), 171, 235; J. Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (New York*:* Charles Scribner's Sons, [3]1918), 135; E. J. Goodspeed, 'The Ancient Letter of Introduction', 55-57; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 292; McDonald, 'Was Romans XVI a separate letter?', 369-72.

[67] K. Donfried (ed.), *Romans debate*, 44-52; P. J. Achtemeier, *Romans* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1985), 238.

[68] The authenticity of the doxology in Romans has been questioned on textual and literary grounds, since the manuscripts place the doxology in various places in 14:23; 15:33; 16:23. See above p.6, fn.

noticed the verbal and thematic links between the doxology in Romans and the earlier parts of the letter, (e.g.16:25a- 1:11, 16; 9:17; 15:13, 19; 16:25b-26a-3:21).[69]

Paul reflects the practice of contemporary letter closings in that the closing conventions have the function of summarizing and reinforcing the main arguments of the letter. The greetings in the Romans letter closing is the focus of the next section.

2.6. Greetings in the Romans Letter Closing

The form of greetings in the Romans letter closing is significantly different when compared to other Pauline letters in some respects. It contains 21 greetings, more than all the other undisputed Pauline letters. It has two greeting lists: 16:3-16 and 16:21-23, the first list being different from the second one. There are seventeen greetings in the first list compared to four in the second.[70] The first list has more greetings of the second person type, which is the instructional type, a type very rarely used in the other letters.

2.6.1. The First Greeting List (16:3-16)

The first greeting list has group greetings as well as individual greetings. Altogether twenty four persons are named and two persons are mentioned in relational terms. Out of the twenty six people, nine are women.[71] The individuals greeted are: Mary, Persis, Epaenetus, Amplias, Urbanus, Herodion, Apelles, Rufus, Rufus' mother; and the groups greeted are: Prisca and Aquila; Andronicus and Junia;

---

9. But there are still scholars who support its authenticity. See L. W. Hurtado, 'The Doxology at the End of Romans', in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (eds. E. P. Epp and G. D. Fee, Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 185-99. Weima, *Neglected Endings,* 142.

[69] See Gamble, *Textual History*, 123; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 913; Dunn observes that the 'doxology has summarized well some of the basic concerns of the letter' (917).

[70] The second list of greetings (Rom 16:21-23) consists of individual and group greetings. Paul communicates the greetings of the below mentioned persons to the Romans by using the third person greeting formula and fewer descriptive phrases. The persons mentioned are: a) Timothy, ὁ συνεργός μου; b) Lucius, Jason, Sosipater οἱ συγγενεῖς μου; c) Tertius, the writer of the letter; d) Gaius, whose hospitality Paul and the whole church enjoyed; e) Erastus, city οἰκονόμος; f) Quartus, our brother.

[71] It is possible to add Phoebe also in the list of the women greeted, since Phoebe was to be welcomed (in the letter of recommendation) and welcome has a connotation of greeting.

Household of Aristobulus; Household of Narcissus; Tryphaena and Tryphosa; Asyncritus, Philegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes and the brethren; Philologus and Julia, Nereus and his sister, Olympas and all the saints. The other two general greetings in Romans 16 are: 'greet one another with a holy kiss'[72] and 'all the churches of Christ greet you'.

A brief description of the descriptive phrases used for men is given in the following.[73] Epaenetus is described as 'the first fruits in Asia into Christ' (ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς Χριστόν; 16:5) like Stephanas, who is 'the first convert in Achaia' (1 Cor 16:15; cf. 2 Thess 2:13). Possibly, the first converts are devoted to ministry and emerged to be the leading figures in the church.[74]

Paul often indicates his affection for particular Christians, by referring to them as 'my beloved [name]' (Rom 16:5, 8-9b; Epaenetus, Amplias, Stachys) cf. 'the beloved Persis' (Rom 16:12). ἀγαπητός denotes a warm personal relationship (16:5, 8, 9, 12). Amplias is described as Paul's 'beloved in the Lord (ἀγαπητόν μου ἐν κυρίῳ), which shows Paul's relationship with him as well as his standing in relation to the Lord and the Roman church (v.8). The description of some individuals as ἀγαπητός is important since Paul emphasises the theme of ἀγάπη in Rom 12-15.

δόκιμος may refer to Apelles' maturity (16:10), that he is respected and esteemed (cf. Rom 14:18), but it is more probable that Paul could mean he is tested and proved as a Christian.[75] Paul is recognizing in a way their positive efforts for the expansion of the church as well as one another in the Lord. The term involves the

---

[72] The holy kiss is discussed as a separate section. See below 2.6.2.
[73] For the phrases used of women, see below chapter 4.
[74] See Moo, *Romans*, 920; L. Morris, The *Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 533.
[75] Godet [F. L. Godet, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Vol. 2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1880), 492]; Murray [J. Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Vol. 2; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965)]; Moo, *Romans*, 924; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 896 accept it as a character that is tested and proved.

testing of one's character or proof of one's character (2 Cor 2:9; 8:2; 9:13; 13:3; Phil 2:22).

ἐκλεκτός is used of individuals chosen for a particular task, and so Rufus was known as one specially chosen for some role or to bear some significance (16:13). It is less plausible to identify Rufus as the son of Simon of Cyrene, since Paul evidently knows of no other Christian Rufus in Rome and Mark 15:21 gives evidence of a Christian Rufus well known to the Christian community.[76]

The final greeting in the first list: 'all the churches of Christ greet you' is significant as Paul speaks in wider terms to express the greetings to Romans. As Weima puts it, 'so here it seems, Paul presents himself to the Romans as one who has the official backing of all the churches in Achaia, Macedonia, Asia, Galatia, Syria and elsewhere in the eastern part of the empire'.[77] This is the only third person greeting in the list out of the seventeen greetings. This greeting has a universal implication for the exhortations in the letter, that he was not alone in his missionary endeavour; rather a large number of churches joined him in the body of Christ to pass on their greetings. It is also significant to note the important bearing that the greeting has on the instructions given in earlier chapters. It highlights the mutual interdependence by being one body in Christ, i.e. relationships in Christ that build up one another.

The first list of greetings in Romans has many peculiarities. The recipients of the letter are not merely readers of the letter but they are asked by Paul to participate in the action of the greeting, i.e. they are not silently accepting the exhortations in the letter but have an active role in contextualising the exhortations. The whole group is

---

[76] See Cranfield, *Romans,* 2: 794; Moo, *Romans,* 926; Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 897; *contra* Käsemann, *Romans,* 414; Schlier (H. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief* (HThKNT 6. Freiburg: Herder, 1977), 445.
[77] Weima, *Neglected Endings,* 227.

asked to greet the people mentioned since the greeting formula ἀσπάσασθε (you-pl) indicates that the audience is a group rather than an individual.

What are the social dynamics in the greeting with the verb ἀσπάσασθε*? Is* ἀσπάσασθε the same as that of Paul greeting the third party or the second group greeting the third party? Gamble suggests that the imperative form of the greeting verb 'represents a direct personal greeting of the writer' and has the effect of 'Paul's own greetings' to those addressed in the letter.[78] However, the instruction 'you greet' possibly deepens and strengthens relationships between B (recipients of the letter) and C (the recipients of the greeting), thus establishing a mutual bond between A (Paul) and B and between B and C and between A and C. It also modifies the relationships between B and C by strengthening friendship and increasing respect for the persons greeted. If the greeting would be considered as having the same effect as that of a Pauline greeting, then the outcome of it is diminished and the persons in between act as agents only. As the persons in group B should be regarded as the intended readership of the letter or the members of the congregation of Rome, the position of group C, whether they are the people outside the congregation or members of the same should be taken into consideration. It is meaningful that greetings in the second person imperative induce a web of relationships no matter whether they are of the same congregation or not. When one person is being greeted, the whole group of the Roman community joins in the greeting and vice versa creating mutual greetings, implying a call to strengthen ἀγάπη among the Roman Christians. It is significant that the greetings function in representing or re-positioning one another or in fact relating one another.

---

[78] Gamble, *Textual History*, 93. The closing greetings function as a 'more direct and personal way of expressing and developing an intimate bond between Paul and his readers, as well as promoting unity and fellowship among the various churches'. Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 115.

The commendatory element in the first list is also unique in Romans because no other Pauline letters have such elaborative phrases that praise the persons being greeted. According to Gamble the use of the descriptive phrases denotes the significant relationship between the persons greeted and Paul himself (16:3-4, 5, 7-9, 13). 'He ties them to himself and himself to them'.[79] These descriptive phrases may not be used by Paul to 'help the Roman Christians identify the persons being greeted', since such persons must be known to the Roman community, but in order to give the greetings a strong commendation.[80] Weima points out that the greetings contain 'laudatory phrases' that emphasize positive relations between the person greeted and Paul, thereby supporting the apostle's credibility among the believers in Rome who do not know him personally.[81] However, the relationship between Paul and the persons greeted is only one of the dimensions of the social relations which Paul wants to express through greetings.

Paul acknowledges women's toil and hard work in the same way as he describes his ministry. The women greeted in the list with the descriptive phrases indicate their active part in the Christian church. The names of ten women appear in Romans 16:1-16: Phoebe, Prisca, Mary, Junia, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, Persis, Rufus' mother, Julia, Nereus' sister. Phoebe, Prisca (with Aquila) and Junia (with Andronicus) are introduced with more descriptive phrases. All of them except Julia and Nereus' sister are given descriptive phrases with regard to their active roles in the church. For example, Phoebe as διάκονος, Prisca as συνέργος, Junia as 'prominent among the apostles', Mary, Persis, Tryphoena, Tryphosa, as hard working members, Rufus' mother as the mother of Paul, and Julia and Nereus' sister in connection with the group greeting (these are analysed in the fourth chapter).

---

[79] Gamble, *Textual History*, 92.
[80] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 226.
[81] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 226.

Romans 16 has an extensive number of descriptive phrases among the Pauline letters; apart from Romans (and except one instance in Col 4:15), 'there is no individualization of the recipients of greetings through naming names or adding descriptive phrases'.[82] The greetings of Romans 16 are addressed to specific individuals and groups while in other letters Paul uses a general and collective greeting. As Gamble suggests, 'The particularisation of the greetings is accomplished not only by the naming of names, but in many cases by supplying the names with rich descriptive characterizations'.[83]

The relational character of the greetings in Romans can be seen as the persons are greeted in relation to Paul, Christ and the church. The descriptive phrases in the greeting list emphasize the strong relations that existed between the persons greeted/praised by Paul.[84] By acknowledging Paul's relations with some persons in the Roman community, Paul is building up strong relations with such persons by becoming part of the commendations that those persons receive. As Gamble suggests, 'Paul's commendatory greetings to specific individuals serve to place those individuals in a position of respect vis-à-vis the community, but also, by linking the Apostle so closely with them, place Paul in the same position'.[85] The ways of greetings 'in the Lord' show their relationship with the Lord as well as love, solidarity and affection between those who belong to the Lord.[86] Moreover, the

---

[82] Gamble, *Textual History*, 75. Although Nympha's name is mentioned in Col 4:15, no descriptive phrase is used. Therefore the descriptive phrases used in the second person type of greetings in Romans 16 are significant and a number of phrases are used qualifying the persons mentioned.

[83] Gamble, *Textual History*, 91.

[84] Käsemann, *Romans*, 412; Gamble, *Textual History*, 92; Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 226.

[85] Gamble, *Textual History*, 92.

[86] Schreiner, *Romans*, 790. They are not merely secular 'hellos' but are rooted in the new life of Christ. Thus the phrases with κύριος which occur in greetings show the impact of one's relationship with Christ in the practical and ethical context of the church as a whole. It denotes the 'present sovereign dominion in the life of a Christian' and on the other, it implies the solidarity, affection and mutuality between the people of the community, since it indicates the influence of Christ on the life of a Christian incorporated into him. See J. A. Fitzmyer, *Paul and His Theology* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1989), 90.

phrase 'in the Lord' serves as a unifying factor. It shows the new identity of the believers in the community in relation to Christ. Thus it holds all the members of the community together irrespective of gender, status, and ethnicity, around one axis. Phoebe, Prisca and Aquila are mentioned in relation to the church: Phoebe as the διάκονος of the church; Paul identifies the church in the house of Prisca and Aquila and also acknowledges that 'all the churches of the Gentiles' are grateful to them, which seems to be an approval of their roles as well as their support for many groups of Gentile Christians.

What is more important to this research is the dynamic of relationships that Paul wants to urge in the life of Roman Christians through the greetings. In this dynamic, Paul does not exclude women's participation, which is very clear from his praise of certain women in the greeting list. I suggest that these women named and greeted were involved in greeting others and that they are not only in the receiving end of the greeting but also pass on the welcome and greeting to others. All the members of the community have an active participation in one way or other. Greeting is a way of acknowledging and welcoming others. Moreover, the Christological significance in the relationship of the church is emphasized as Paul describes those people 'in the Lord' and 'in Christ', which gives impetus for the church to maintain the dynamics in relationship to one another. The church has no existence without Christ and the relationships should be maintained in the manner of Christ.

Apart from the two group greetings in Rom 16:14, 15 and the household of Aristobulus, all of them are mentioned in relation to the Lord. They are greeted 'in Christ Jesus' (ἐν Χριστῷ ᾽Ιησου v.3), or in Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ v. 9), beloved 'in the Lord' (v.8), tested in Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ v.10), those in the Lord (v.11), those who labour 'in the Lord' (v.12), or who are elect in the Lord (v.13). Epaenetus is the first-fruits of Asia 'in Christ' (v.5) and Andronicus and Junia are notable because they were 'in Christ' (v.7) before Paul.

2.6.2. Greeting with a Holy Kiss

The imperative used in the context of the greetings in Romans 16:16a for the exchange of the holy kiss is significant as it appears as a summation of the whole greeting list.[87] What does this signify? Could the exchange of the holy kiss be among the members of a closed community of friends or relatives? Where does it originate? What was the meaning of the 'holy' kiss?

The practice of the 'holy kiss' is regarded as originating in the community of believers,[88] since the role of the kiss has its specific importance among the believers rather than being found in the Greco-Roman world[89] or ancient Judaism.[90] Others

---

[87] The Greek noun for kiss is φιλήμα, which comes from the verb φιλέω, whose primary meaning is 'to love', and the expression of love can be in the outward act of a kiss. For more discussion see Stählin, 'φιλέω κτλ.' TDNT 9, 113-171 at 128-146.

[88] In the New Testament, the noun φιλήμα (kiss) is used seven times. They are: a) Jesus' expectation of a welcoming kiss from Simon (Lk 7:45); b) Jesus asking Judas about kissing the Son of Man (Lk 22:48); c) Paul's instructions to greet with a holy kiss (Rom 16:16; 1 Cor 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12; 1 Thess 5:26); and d) the kiss of agape (1 Pet 5:14).
  The verb καταφιλέω appears six times. In Matt 26:49 and Mark 14:45, it is used in connection with Judas, whereas in Luke three references can be found: woman kissing Jesus' feet (7:38, 45) and the father kissing the lost son on his return (15:20). Another reference is in Acts 20:37, which refers to the occasion when the Ephesian elders bid farewell to Paul. Among the above instances, there is only one reference to a woman kissing a man while in other cases it is not specified but possibly men kissing each other. The erotic sense of kiss is not found in the New Testament and the kiss command by Paul and Peter cannot be regarded with such a connotation.

[89] In Greco-Roman society, the nature of the kiss differs with the levels of society and region. A public kiss (both heterosexual and homosexual) is not encouraged in Greco-Roman society. 'Clement of Alexandria rules that one is never to kiss his wife in the presence of domestics, and never even to greet her in the presence of slaves'. W. Klassen, 'Kiss' 4 ABD, 89-92, at 91. References to a public kiss can be found in: Plutarch Cato 17E, where the elder Cato dismissed Manilius out of the Senate due to his public kiss to his wife in the presence of his daughters; Aristophanes Frogs 754, where the slaves kissed each other signifying a new-found community. There is also evidence for the practice of the kiss that denotes the reunion of loved ones, the role of reconciliation and showing love towards one another (Lucian, Alexander the False Prophet 39).
  The Pauline admonition to kiss cannot be regarded as having its source from the practice of Greco-Roman world. 'There is no basis in ancient texts, Jewish and Greco-Roman, outside the New Testament for the transformation of the kiss into a sign of religious community'. W. Klassen, 'The Sacred Kiss in the New Testament: An Example of Social Boundary Lines', NTS 39 (1993), 122-135, at 128; see also K. Thraede, 'Ursprünge und Formen des "heiligen Kusses" im frühen Christentum' JAC 11/12 (1967-68), 124-180 at 145.

[90] It is difficult to trace the origin of this custom in Judaism or Christianity. The different interpretations of the significance of the practice can be seen as: a) exchanging power from one person to another, b) a ceremonial greeting related to the Old Testament practices, or c) related to prayer. Klassen, 'Kiss', 90. Some similarities can be seen in the practices of Judaism. Josephus referred to a kiss four times. He used the noun φιλήμα in the death scene of Masada, 'when the fathers bid farewell to their loved ones before they massacre them' (J.W. 7:321). The other examples are the kiss of Amasa which led to murder (Ant. 7:284); the kiss of reconciliation between Achab and Adabos

find the custom has its start in 'the life and ministry of Jesus' primarily in the post-resurrection experiences of John 20:21-23 or when Judas kissed Jesus in the garden, which conveyed different messages; to the outsiders (a sign) and the insiders (usual greeting), which is commonly called as a kiss of betrayal.[91]

Paul's exhortation to greet with the 'holy kiss' (φιλήμα ἅγιον) is found four times in his letters in the epistolary conclusion (1 Thess 5:26; 1 Cor 16:20b; 2 Cor 13:12; Rom 16:16) out of the seven undisputed letters; cf. 1 Pet 5:14, it is 'kiss of love' (φιλήμα ἀγάπης). ἀσπάσασθε is the verb and the object of the action is expressed with ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ (Greet one another with a holy kiss).

The variations involve the reversed order of ἁγίῳ φιλήματι in 2 Cor 13:12a and τοὺς ἀδέλφους πάντας in 1 Thess 5:26 (Greet all the believers with a holy

---

(*Ant.* 8:387); and the pagan king, Darius kisses the guardsman, Zerubabelos (*Ant.* 11.59), where the kiss signifies the seal of the covenant between the pagan king and a devout Jew.

In the Old Testament, it is recorded that Jacob kissed Rachel at their first meeting (Gen 29:11) See Klassen, 'Kiss', 90. (Some Jewish commentators explained that Jacob wept after the kiss because those who had seen him kiss Rachel would propose that he would introduce some new form of licentiousness. Josephus records that not Jacob but Rachel wept and there is no kiss, although Jacob is 'overcome with love for the maid' and amazed in her beauty (*Ant.*1.288-91)). Laban complained of not being allowed to kiss his daughters and grandchildren, when Jacob and his family went out without notice (Gen 31:28). Other examples of kiss in the Old Testament are Gen 29:11, 13; 31:28; 32:1; 33:4; Exod 4:27; 18:7. The other two references where the heterosexual kiss occurred are in Esther's meeting with King Artaxerxes (Add Esth 15:8-12); and Raguel's kiss with his daughter (Tob 10: 12). However, there is little evidence for non-relatives kissing each other.

In Judaism, the kiss has three different functions as a 'kiss of reverence, kiss of reunion or reconciliation (Gen 45:15), and kiss of farewell' and there is no general advice given to kiss each other in Jewish sources. Klassen, 'Sacred Kiss', 124. The story of Joseph and Aseneth, which is pre-Christian, has references to a number of kisses. C. Burchard, 'Joseph and Aseneth', in J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2 (London: Darton, Longman and Todd,1985), 177-248, at 206f. Asenath greets her parents with a kiss (4.1) and her father in turn kisses her (4.7) and when Joseph arrives, her father urges her to greet Joseph. There are a lot of references and kiss has multiple connotations in Joseph and Asenath as a reverential greeting, a part of reunion, part of reconciliation and an erotic sense as well. See also Klassen, 'Sacred Kiss', 124,125.

The kiss was not seen as a formal act by Jews in the first century. Jews had set limitations, 'as Egyptian men and women would not kiss Greek lips defiled by animal sacrifice (Herodotus 2.41) and later Christians would not kiss pagans'. Klassen, 'Sacred Kiss', 125. There is less evidence for the practice of the public kiss among Jews in the Second Temple Period.

In one of the rabbinic commentaries on Genesis (*Gen. Rab.* 70[45b]) it is written: 'in general, kissing leads to immorality: there are however three exceptions, namely kissing someone to honour that person (Samuel kissing Saul, 1 Sam 10:5), or kissing upon seeing someone after a long absence (Aaron kissed Moses, Exod 4:27), and the farewell kiss (as when Orpah kissed Naomi (Ruth 1:14)'. Klassen, 'Sacred Kiss', 126.

[91] See Klassen, 'Sacred Kiss', 128; S. Benko, *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969), 82. Benko finds the beginnings in the post resurrection appearances (John 20:21-23).

kiss),[92] preceded by Paul's request to his readers to pray for him. Klassen suggests that in 1 Thess 5:26 it is a command to kiss without urging a mutual exchange of kisses and that in the other three cases 'since the admonition is in the midst of the discussion of greetings, to and from others, it seems evident that the imperative is meant to assume that mutual greeting should not be neglected'.[93]

It is likely that the practice of the 'holy' kiss emerged in the context of the first Christians. As Klassen argues, 'Paul was the first popular ethical teacher known to instruct members of social groups to continue to greet each other with a kiss whenever or wherever they meet'.[94] In fact the imperative has not drawn boundaries regarding gender and it is not an erotic act, but an act meant to express ἀγάπη (1 Pet 5:14).

It is worth noting that the admonition to practise the holy kiss situated in the context of greetings in the conclusion of the letter has its impact on the whole focus of the letter. In Romans 16, the instruction to kiss comes at the end of the instruction to greet a number of named individuals and groups including men and women and they are to be 'kissed as equals', although they 'represented separate branches of the believing community in Rome'.[95] The consensus is that the holy kiss should be practised only when the church is gathered or in the context of worship.[96] But it is a sign of love and affection wherever Christians meet rather than restricted to one context.

---

[92] NRSV translates τοὺς ἀδέλφους as 'the brothers and sisters'.

[93] Klassen, 'Sacred Kiss', 130.

[94] Klassen, 'Sacred Kiss', 130. The practice was not restricted to the worship context, but as something the Christians should practise wherever they meet.

[95] Jewett, *Romans*, 974. He suggests that the holy kiss is not limited to the familial boundary, but it is practised among all members of the body of Christ irrespective of their custom or culture.

[96] Benko suggests that the holy kiss has its significance in relation to the role of the Holy Spirit, that the Holy Spirit was transmitted and received through the kiss and the kiss thus becomes 'the life giving breath of God'; see Benko, *Pagan Rome*, 81, 82, 92.

The 'holy' kiss can be an expression of the oneness of people who represent different social classes, and it expresses the warmth of love transcending gender, religious, national, and ethnic divisions. It signifies that they saw themselves as 'in Christ' and 'the new reality is affirmed in the freedom of quite innocently greeting each other with a holy kiss'.[97] Thus this practice strengthens the relationship between one another.

It is possible that Paul's request to greet with a 'holy' kiss puts weight on the word 'holy' and that the greetings should be with proper and holy motives because the early church found problems with the kiss greeting, the exchange of the kiss suggesting an erotic experience.[98] Therefore in such a background, Paul's admonition may be a warning against such unholy practices. However, the reference to a 'holy' (ἅγιον) kiss indicates the way by which the apostle wants to characterize the greeting kiss of believers (ἅγιοι) in distinction from others who practised it. Among Christians, the kiss symbolized unity and togetherness for Christians, but for others it could be simply an expression of friendship and good will.[99]

Therefore the practice of the holy kiss has its impact in holding a community together without divisions and disparities. On the other hand, the possibility of kiss becoming merely a ritual cannot be overlooked. It is 'a sign of fellowship within the community, of the community with the Apostle, and indeed of one community with others'.[100] As Klassen rightly suggests, 'The admonitions to kiss one another serve to

---

[97] Klassen, 'Sacred Kiss', 133.
[98] Weima, *Neglected Endings*, 113. The erotic element found in Song of Songs is taken as an allegory. But the Old Testament warns of the dangers of the 'woman kiss' (Prov 7:13). Also the woman kissing Jesus' feet can be viewed as an act of reverence or gratitude or an expression of agape, see Klassen, 'Kiss', 129.
[99] Benko, *Pagan Rome,* 98.
[100] Gamble, *Textual History*, 76.

stress the liberty to express without inhibition to all people of whatever background, rank or gender, the ardour of agape in any context'.[101]

Paul's admonition to greet one another with a holy kiss in the context of greetings in Romans is significant as it includes all members of the Roman Church, including those he has not mentioned in the list of greetings. It has a function of creating love, affection and mutual care among the believers and signifies Paul's strategy to bring about mutuality in the community, which is the focus of Rom 12-15. Pauline purpose of greeting in the second person imperative in Romans reaches its peak in Romans 16:16a, as ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους is used. It shows how this people are important to his ministry as well as to the church and to one another (ἀλλήλους).

2.7. Conclusion

The greetings in Paul's letters clearly reflect the epistolary practice of his day. The elaborations and additions found in the greetings are used by Paul in a way that relates to the particular situation of his letters to specific communities. The form of greetings in the Romans letter closing is significant since among the Pauline letter closings, Romans contains more instructional greetings. In the instructional form, the writer instructs the addressee to greet a third party. The extensive use of instructional greetings in Romans, which are very specific as well as loaded with descriptive phrases, implies that Paul wishes to preserve a close rapport with the congregations as he instructs them to act for him.

Although Paul instructs the readers to greet a third party, it has the effect of group B's direct greeting to group C. These greetings can express the intimate bond between Paul and his readers, his readers and the persons greeted, and Paul and the

---

[101] Klassen, 'Sacred Kiss', 135.

persons greeted as well. The instruction to greet one another is the climax of the greetings which in fact throws light on the mutuality of relationships. Paul's instruction to greet others points to his desire to bring unity among the churches as well as among the believers in the Christian community.

The mutuality of relationships in Romans transcends gender discrimination in the Christian community as Paul accepts men and women as his associates, which is very significant in this study. The women being greeted with descriptive phrases implies that they played leadership roles in the church. What are the leadership roles implied by the descriptive phrases? We analyse in the following chapters women's leadership roles implied in the greetings against the backdrop of contemporary Greco-Roman society. The leadership of women in Greco-Roman society is the focus of the next chapter.

Chapter 3
Women in the Roman Empire

3.1. Introduction

In *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*, B. W. Winter has successfully shown that women were evidently engaged in *politeia* (πολιτεία), contrary to the common perception that wives in the first century were a 'monochrome group', who were 'confined to domestic dwellings in order to fulfil the role of dutiful wife engaged primarily in childbearing and managing the household', which is also assumed of women in the early Christian communities.[1] In his reconstruction of the social settings of women's lives in the first century, Winter is aiming at a deconstruction of the common perception that women were kept away from the public and played the roles of wives and household management. He musters evidence that women were involved in the public sphere, and 'it is very unlikely that one could epitomize all first-century marriages by a single stereotype of restriction to the home and reproductive activity in the vast Roman Empire, any more than it would be possible to do so today in our multicultural world'.[2]

This chapter focuses on the roles of women in areas of public non-religious life and religious life in the Roman Empire, which helps us understand their possible influence on women in Pauline communities. While basically agreeing with Winter that his presentation of 'new women' in the Roman empire does offer more help to understand women in Pauline communities, I will carry it further to point out that the epigraphic evidence can provide a solid backdrop against which the leadership roles of women (Romans 16:1-16) can be properly situated. In doing so, I will draw

---

[1] Winter, *Roman Wives*, 6. Winter defines *politeia* in terms of 'all activities outside the home' and not in terms of women's involvement in the political sphere. Winter, *Roman Wives*, 173.

[2] Winter, *Roman Wives*, 6.

from other scholars of first century social and religious life as I discuss women in courts, politics, magistracy, patronage, priesthood and Jewish synagogues.[3]

3.2. Women in Courts

It is interesting to note that woman's ability was used in an effective manner in the political sphere in the early centuries in the Greco-Roman world. As Bauman writes, 'there were from about the turn of the third century (BCE), women lawyers, some of whom not only had a theoretical knowledge of the law, but also gave opinions to consultants... And women did put their knowledge to good use in the political sphere, though unlike men they could not use it to attract votes in the chase for public office'.[4] There were women who argued for themselves or on behalf of others in the courts. Valerius Maximus refers to women's defence in courts as they were compelled against their will to testify in the courts before a large gathering of men in the time of Cicero (106-43 BCE).[5] Fannia is recorded as the first woman who conducted her own defence against her husband regarding the return of her dowry (100 BCE). Her husband married her with the purpose to divorce her on the grounds of unchastity, which was known to him before marriage, since he wanted to acquire her property.[6]

Another example is that of women who became legal advisors after their training in law in the first century BCE or CE, and were active in prosecuting the cases of their fellow people.[7] Maesia of Sentinum in the early first century was

---

[3] Half of this chapter focuses on Jewish synagogues because Paul might be more influenced by Jewish culture and practice. He often went to the synagogues after his conversion experience (Acts 13:42; 17:1, 2, 10, 17; 18:4, 7, 8, 17, 19, 26; 19:8; 22:19; 26:11).

[4] R. A. Bauman, *Women and Politics in Ancient Rome* (London: Routledge, 1992), 45-46. Bauman comments that the opinions of women lawyers 'did not have the same capacity to make law as the *responsa* of male practitioners'. His comparison of the skills of the women lawyers with that of male counterparts is not appealing.

[5] Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings,* VIII. 3.

[6] Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings,* VIII. 3

[7] Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, VIII. 3. 2. See also Bauman, *Women and Politics*, 50.

highly proficient in the law and demonstrated her skill in male dominated courts, such that she was called an 'Androgyne' (man-woman).[8]

Carfania, a senator's wife (died c 48 BCE), was 'ever ready for lawsuit and always spoke on her behalf before the Praetor, not because she could not find advocates but because she had impudence to spare'.[9] Carfania's act resulted in the change of the law that prohibited women from making claims for others before magistrates.

The Justinian code supports women in litigation concerning 'civic status, obligations of freed condition, marriage, divorce, support, dowry, minority status and child custody-essentially private matters, though also among those most often of concern to men, too'.[10] Juvenal (c. CE 60-100) gives evidence of women conducting cases, learning civil laws and performing judgement. It is interesting to note the questions raised by women as he quotes, 'Do we as women ever conduct cases? Are we learned in civic law? Do we disturb your courts with our shouting?', questions all answered by 'yes'.[11]

The above evidence shows that some women were learned in law and were active in prosecution as well as defence. The prohibitions concerning their involvement lead us to wonder whether those were caused by a few women trespassing male dominated spheres. However, the participation of women in these areas could not be entirely forbidden.

---

[8] Bauman, *Women and Politics*, 50.

[9] Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, 8.3.2; see also Winter, *Roman Wives*, 177; Bauman, *Women and Politics*, 50. The Valleian decree of the Senate was put into practice in the time of Claudius or Nero and this resulted in discouraging women from bringing requests for another person. The reason for the edict was Carfania who brought requests without shame and dishonour before magistrates. See J. E. Grubbs, *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook on Marriage, Divorce and Widowhood* (London: Routledge, 2002), 60-61.

[10] See R. MacMullen, 'Women in Public in the Roman Empire', *Historia* 29 (1980) 208-18, at 210.

[11] Juvenal, *Satires*, 2. 51-52, see also Winter, *Roman Wives*, 179.

3.3. Women in Politics

Women's names are seen in the election posters in Pompeii asking electors to vote for their candidate, where the majority of supporters were women. Husbands and wives together also supported candidates and asked the people to vote.[12] MacMullen notices that the wife's name coming ahead of that of her husband shows 'an inversion of the status explained by neither of the parties having any sense of status between them at all, or by the woman being free or freed, the man freed or slave'.[13] This signifies the importance of the wife's higher rank or higher social status than her husband. The candidates for civic office were also supported by women alongside their husbands. At least one married woman was allowed to speak in the Forum before the Triumvirs. Valerius Maximus refers to Hortensia, who argued against the heavy tax imposed on women and won the case by lessening the heavy tax yoke.[14]

Thus there are reasons to doubt Cotter's generalisation: she states, 'in the matter of public presence, Roman culture did not allow women to call attention to themselves. In legislative and juridical assemblies women were excluded from any leadership role and any role that would bring attention to themselves'.[15]

3.4. Women Magistrates and Patronage

Apart from the evidence of literary as well as legal sources that limits women's role to the private sphere, some inscriptions throw light on the significant roles of women in the ancient world. As Rives comments, 'the importance of women in civic life is another aspect of the ancient world that is known almost

---

[12] MacMullen, 'Women in Public in the Roman Empire', 209; see also Winter, *Roman Wives*, 180.
[13] MacMullen, 'Women in Public in the Roman Empire', 209; see also Winter, *Roman Wives*, 180.
[14] Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, VIII. 3. 3. He writes, 'Hortensia, daughter of Q. Hortensius, pleaded the cause of women before the Triumvirs resolutely and successfully when the order of matrons had been burdened by then with a heavy tax and none of the other sex ventured to lend them his advocacy'.
[15] Cotter, 'Women's Authority Roles', 367

entirely from inscriptions, since legal and literary sources usually depict women as largely relegated to private life'.[16] Some examples are the following:

Phile, the daughter of Apollonius and wife of Thessalus, was honoured as 'the first woman in Priene to hold the office of magistrate' (first century BCE).[17] Her position in the public sphere and her benefactions indeed highlight the fact that wealth had an important role in public life and could alter the position of women in society.[18]

Another woman is Plancia Magna from Perge, who was the magistrate of her city, as well as occupying the priesthood of Artemis and the priesthood of the imperial cult. She was honoured with two statues and is recorded as 'the daughter of the city' and 'the benefactor' in these statutes.[19] Claudia Metrodora from Chios is also an influential figure, who was a powerful woman in the public sphere and a contemporary of Junia Theodora.[20] She financed festivals and buildings associated with her native city and she acted as a civic patron.[21]

Another example of a woman combining public office with her role in the household is Aurelia Leite of Paros, who was honoured by the erection of 'a marble

---

[16] J. Rives, 'Civic and Religious Life', in J. Bodel, (ed.), *Epigraphic Evidence: Ancient History from Inscriptions* (London: Routledge, 2001), 118-136 at 135, 136.

[17] *Die Inschriften von Priene*, no. 208. Winter, *Roman Wives*, 181. Women holding the position of magistrates in the ancient world are in contradiction to Grubbs' view that women did not serve as magistrates or senators at all in Roman history. See Grubbs, *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire*, 71.

[18] Rives, 'Civic and Religious Life', 136.

[19] *L'Année épigraphique* (1958), 78; (1965), 209. See Winter, *Roman Wives*, 182; Rives, 'Civic and Religious Life', 136; M. T. Boatwright, 'Plancia Magna of Perge: Women's Roles and Status in Roman Asia Minor', in S. B. Pomeroy (ed.), *Women's History and Ancient History* (London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 249-272.

[20] The inscriptions of Claudia Metrodora are found in L. Robert, 'Inscriptions de Chios du Ier siècle de notre ère', *Études épigraphiques et philologiques* (Paris: Champion, 1938), 133-34; J. and L. Robert, 'Bulletin épigraphique', *Revue der études grecques* 69 (1956) 152-53, no. 213; J. Keil, 'Inschriften'in *Forschungen in Ephesos* III (Vienna, 1923), 94-95, no. 3; *Die Inschriften von Ephesus*, VII.1 no. 3003. See pp. 26, 85.

[21] R. A. Kearsley, 'Women in the Public East: Iunia Theodora, Claudia Metrodora and Phoebe, Benefactress of Paul', *TynBul* 50 (1999), 189-211, at 199. Claudia Metrodora was the magistrate of the city in two occasions and four times gymnasiarch. See also J. M. Arlandson, *Women, Class, and Society in Early Christianity: Models from Luke-Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997), 36.

statue of the wisdom-loving, husband-loving, children-loving woman'.[22] There were also women holding a magistracy of the city after the first century as there were seventeen women in proportion to 214 men found in coins in the East from CE 180-275.[23]

A contemporary inscription from Corinth (c. CE 43) testifies that the Roman colony honours a benefactress, named Junia Theodora, described by the cognate noun προστασία of the noun προστάτις.[24] She lived in Corinth during the period of Paul's mission in Corinth. Her activity is related to commercial patronage. 'The public honouring of Junia occurs in five separate decrees or official letters that were recorded on a composite inscription erected in Corinth'.[25] The inscriptions testify that 'Junia was a Roman citizen with considerable wealth which she used to offer hospitality to ambassadors and to care for Lycian exiles in Corinth'. She is described in a decree of the people of Patara in Lycia as 'a woman held in highest honour … who copiously supplied from her own means many of our citizens with generosity, and received them in her home and in particular never ceased acting on behalf of citizens in regard to any favour asked – the majority of citizens have gathered in assembly to offer testimony on her behalf'.[26]

---

[22] *IG* xii. 5.292 (c. CE 300).

[23] MacMullen, 'Women in Public', 213.

[24] D. I. Pallas, S. Charitonidis, and J. Venencie, 'Inscriptions lyciennes trouvées à Solômos près de Corinthe' *Bulletin de Correspondance héllenique* 83 (1959), 496-508; Kearsley, 'Women in the Public East', 194-195. 'The value of this epigraphic material to our understanding of Phoebe's activity lies in its contemporaneity, its location, and its detailing. Theodora is recognized by the federal assembly of the Lycians for her hospitality to Lycians travelling to Corinth, and her meeting of their needs, possibly commercial. The text alludes to the elevated civic circles in which she had influence, and among which she was able to act on behalf of the Lycians'. See Clarke, 'Jew and Greek', 116. See also Winter, *Roman Wives*, 186. She acted as a patron of thirty six cities of the Lycian Federation. See pp. 26, 84.

[25] Winter, *Roman Wives,* 183. The official letters include: a decree of the Federal Assembly of the Lycian cities; a letter from the Lycian city of Myra to the Magistrates of Corinth; a decree of the Lycian city of Patara; a letter and decree of the Federal Assembly of Lycia; a decree of the Lycian city of Telmessos.

[26] M. R. Lefkowitz and M. B. Kant, *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Source Book in Translation* (London: Duckworth, 1992), 160.

As noted in the examples given above, public patronage, by which a 'wealthy benefactor endowed a city' and received approval by means of 'statues, inscriptions and public office', and the patronage of clubs, associations, trade guilds, etc., were common in the Greco-Roman world.[27] The patrons of clubs presided at meetings; the titles of leadership were also given to them, and they had the right to perform special ceremonial duties. Female benefactors described by the term προστάτις are present in epigraphic sources.[28] As MacMullen also observes, 'perhaps a tenth of the protectors and donors that the *collegia* sought out were women'.[29]

As Kloppenborg suggests, inscriptions from the fourth century BCE to the later Roman Empire demonstrate that 'voluntary associations represented a cultural institution integral to Hellenistic and Roman society where they played a significant role in mediating various kinds of social exchange'.[30] The members exerted their freedom to speak their opinions, and the binding factors were fellowship and friendliness. Moreover, they were granted the opportunity to become an officer or magistrate and 'to participate in a *cursus honorum* to which he or she could never aspire outside of the association'.[31] Due to their greater independence in possessing

---

[27] C. Osiek and D. L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House churches* (Louisville: John Knox, 1997), 50; C. Osiek & M. Y. MacDonald, *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 199-209. For 'Benefactors and the institution of Patronage', see L. Y. Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians: Illuminating Ancient Ways of Life* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2009), 285-301.

[28] See G. H. R. Horsley, *NewDocs*, 4:239-244. Examples include *PGM* 36, 338; *1 Eph* 1V.1063. The term προστάτις (*patronus* in Latin) (or *epistates*) denoted an official of the *collegium*. J. S. Kloppenborg, 'Collegia and Thiasoi: Issues in function, taxonomy and membership', in J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (eds.), *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* (London: Routledge, 1996), 16-30, at 26.

[29] MacMullen, 'Women in Public', 211. See also G. Clemente, 'II Patrnato Nei Collegis Dell'Impero Romano' *Studi classici e orientali* 21 (1972), 142-229, at 160-213.

[30] Kloppenborg, 'Collegia', 17.

[31] Kloppenborg, 'Collegia', 18. Franz Poland assumes that 'every association is in some sense a cult association', while Kloppenborg argues that the more helpful categorization could be based on membership, rather than purposes and that the three categories are shared occupation, household connections and common cult. F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1909), 5; Kloppenborg, 'Collegia', 23, 24; see also P. A. Harland, *Associations, Synagogues and Congregations: Claiming a place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 29.

money and power in the imperial period,[32] women often take the role of benefactor

for clubs and associations.[33] It is also striking to see the occurrence of *mater collegii*

in inscriptions in connection with the professional guilds.[34] Harland identifies

mothers and daughters of civic and official organizations.[35]

Thus, women were probably not only members but also leading members in

professional guilds. Some of the titles used in associations carry important

overtones for our study of Romans 16, which would help us figure out the roles of

women in Pauline communities. However, instead of arguing for complete

equivalence of the model of associations to that of the Pauline community, I will

---

[32] Women enjoyed more freedom and privileges under the Roman law. The examples are 1) free marriage (*sine manu)* escaped the fetters of *manus mariti*. There is a notion that men married in their early thirties, and it is likely that the wife survived her husband so she would be *sui iuris*, as would her grown daughters. In *sine manu*, 'women were on equal par with their husbands in terms of ownership and disposal of property by the system of separation of goods'; 2) The *ius trium liberorum*, the law of three children or four children allowed women to act without a guardian and transact business without a tutor; 3) The *tutor optivus* gave women the right to choose their own guardian; 4) The *tutor fidiuciarius* gave women the right to make a will. Whelan, 'Amica Pauli', 73, 74; Cotter, 'Women's Authoritative Roles in Paul's Churches', 363-66; M. S. Collins, 'Money, Sex and Power: An examination of the Role of Women as Patrons of the Ancient Synagogues', in *Recovering the Role of Women: Power and Authority in Rabbinic Jewish Society*, (ed.) P. J. Hass (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 7-22 at 15.

[33] Evidence can be seen from the inscriptions of clubs and associations praising women who built their meeting houses and financed dinners and received public honour in the cities where their generosity was carried out. Clemente, 'Il Patroneiato Nei Collegis Dell'Impero Romano', 142-229. Clemente suggests that of 147 inscriptions, from professional *collegia* in Italy, 12 have names of women as patrons as *patrona* (9) and *mater* (3) and the woman identified as a wife (4) and daughter (1) of a certain man. In most cases the woman was identified independently and not on behalf of her husband. Only one inscription identifies a woman (*mater*) as the wife of the certain man. See also *prostates* in Franz Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen*, 363-366; Cotter, 'Women's Authority', 364.

[34] Examples are *CIL* IX 2687 (*mater collegii centonariorum*); III 7505; XIV 69 (*c. dendrophorum*); XIV 256 (*corporis fabrum navalium*). While some think the titles are purely honorific, the collegium of Aesculapius and Hygia mentions the *pater* and *mater* as members of the collegium in some official positions (*CIL* VI 10234.10-12). The similar view that *mater synagogoi* was purely honorific was challenged by Brooten's study followed by van der Horst (1991) and Cohen (1980). Till then the title was interpreted with no official positions but treated as honorary. See B. J. Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues* (Brown Judaic Series, 36; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982), 55-65; P. W. van der Horst, 'The Jews of Ancient Crete', *Journal of Jewish Studies* 39 (1988), 183-200; S. J. D. Cohen, 'Women in the Synagogues of Antiquity' *Conservative Judaism* 34 (1980), 23-29.

[35] Daughter: *SEG* 37 (1987) 1099bis (Amorion; II-III CE); *IGR* III 90 (Ankrya; II CE), 191 (Ankrya; mid- II CE); *MAMA* VIII 455, 514-517 a-b (Aphrodiasias; II-III CE), 191; *I Ephesos* 234, 235, 239, 424, 424a, 1601e (late I-early II CE); Mother: *IGR*III 191 (Ankyra; mid –II CE); *MAMA* VIII 492b (Aphrodisias; ICE); *IG* V. 1 499, 587, 589, 597, 608 (Sparta; early III CE); *IKilikia*BM 1 27 (early III CE); P. A. Harland, 'Familial Dimensions of Group Identity (II): Mothers and Fathers in Associations and Synagogues of the Greek world' *JSJ* 38 (2007), 57-79. I read this article from the website www. philipharland.com, 1-16, at 4, 5 on June 2008.

discuss in the succeeding chapter the relevance of this material for Pauline communities.[36]

3.5. Priesthood (Greco-Roman)

In the classical Greek tradition, the existence of priestesses in service to Greek Goddesses is well attested in some inscriptions and ancient writings.[37] There was an assumption that the gender of the deity was associated with that of the priest, but evidence shows that gender difference was not a hindrance to the service of the male and female deities.[38] Their function included service for a particular deity in a particular sanctuary, which comprises 'care and upkeep of the sanctuary and the statue of the deity, the performance of rites of purification, and safeguarding the sanctuary treasures and gifts' and these services were rewarded by a small amount of fees and a portion of the sacrifices.[39] Kraemer writes, 'although the majority of priests for official Roman cults were male and organized into colleges, particularly during the republican period, one of the most famous of all official Roman priesthoods was held by women, that of the Vestal Virgins'.[40] According to Mary

---

[36] See C. Osiek, '*Diakonos* and *Prostatis*: Women's Patronage in Early Christianity' *HTS* 61 (2005), 347-370. R. S. Ascough raises problems for using the model of associations to understand Christian community, especially Pauline community. R. S. Ascough, 'Voluntary Associations and the Formation of Pauline Christian Communities: Overcoming the Objections' in *Vereine, Synagogen und Gemeinden im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien*, (eds.) Andreas Gutsfeld und Dietrich-Alex Koch (Studies and Texts in Antiquity and Christianity 25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 149-183, at 182.

[37] R. S. Kraemer, *Her Share of the Blessings: Women's Religions among Pagans, Jews, and Christians in the Greco-Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 81. Priestesses are found in service of Demeter, Hera, Athena, Artemis, Eileithyia, Isis, Bona Dea, Cybele. For discussion on 'Greek standards for women in public' see J. G. Sigountos and M. Shank, 'Public Roles for Women in the Pauline Church: A Reappraisal of the Evidence' *JETS* 26 (1983), 283-295, at 288-292.

[38] Athena Polias was attended by a priest, and Dionysos, Helios, and Apollo were served by a priestess. See R. Garland, 'Priests and Power in Classical Athens', in M. Beard and J. North (ed.), *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World* (London: Duckworth, 1990),73-91, at 77.

[39] Kreamer, *Her Share of the Blessings*, 81. The status of these religious positions cannot be generalized. The priesthood is determined by family membership in Athens, but from the 5th century BCE, the criterion of selection was in connection with the gender of the particular deity (the election was by lot and was a prestigious one since they considered priests and priestesses as being elected by gods themselves). See also Garland, 'Priests', 77.

[40] Kreamer, *Her Share of the Blessings*, 81. Plutarch has shown that the phase of the service of Vestals was for about thirty years and after that they were permitted to marry. Plutarch, *Life of Numa Pompilius*, 10. 'The 'privileges accruing to Vestal virgins were considerable, including freedom from

Beard, the vestals functioned like virgins, matrons and aristocratic males and they played 'an important part in their symbolic position'.[41]

From the Hellenistic period women's cultic offices began to flourish in Greek and Roman worship as well as in new mysteries and Roman emperor worship. Examples include the Priestess of Athena who is recorded in an inscription (Chrysis, *IG* II, 1136) from Delphi in the second century CE, who received honours for taking part in a procession to Apollo. Tata of Aphrodisias in western Asia Minor was a priestess of Hera and of the imperial cult, who also held the office of *stephanophorus* 'crownbearer'.[42] Her responsibilities included providing funds for religious festivals and public entertainments, supplying oil free of charge for the athletes who competed in public games, offering sacrifices throughout the year for the health of the imperial family, and sponsoring banquets open to the public.[43]

Women had numerous official positions in the worship of Isis. Aba of Histiria in Thrace was high priestess of Cybele in the second century CE, and there are other priestesses attested in the inscriptions.[44] Aba of Histiria not only looked after the great festival of Cybele but also funded a public banquet, excelling all previous generosity. In Hellenistic Greek cities and towns, women and men who

---

any male guardianship and the right to make a will and bequeath property during the lifetime of their fathers … Vestals who broke their vows of chastity during their term of office were walled up in a small chamber furnished with a couch, a lamp, minimal food, and left to die'. See Kraemer, *Her Share of the Blessings*, 81, 82.

[41] M. Beard, 'The Sexual Status of Vestal Virgins', *JRS* 70 (1980), 12-27, at 21.

[42] Family position also played an important part in attaining priesthoods. Tata of Aphrodisias in the second century CE (Tation, *CIJ*, 738) was a member of an illustrious family of the first rank. Her inscription makes known her patrilineage and she holds the title of the mother of the city. Her husband's status stands as a secondary thing when compared to that of her father. Similarly, Aba of Histiria and Menodora came from prominent families. Their position and privilege depended on their familial connections. Marital status is secondary to that of the actual position held, and the example of Tata, whose husband held the office of *stephanophorus,* does not indicate that she received her position by virtue of his. See the following page.

[43] Kraemer, *Her Share of the Blessings*, 84.

[44] Kraemer, *Her Share of the Blessings*, 84, 223. The inscriptions are *CIL* 6.502; *CIL* 6.508; *CIL* 6.2257, *CIL* 6.2260; *CIL* 6.2259; *CIL* 14.371; *CIL* 14.408; *CIL* 10.6075; *CIL* 6.30972; *CIL* 10.6074.

held cultic offices paid the money for public religious festivals and entertainments, and the costs of these functions were also massive.

Menodora is attested in inscriptions from Sillyon in Pamphylia for her benefactions in the early third century CE (*IGRR* III, 800-2). She had a variety of careers not only in religious affairs but also in civic offices such as: 'high priestess of at least two emperors (probably Septimius Severus and Caracalla), priestess of Demeter, and of "all the gods," hierophant for life of the city's gods, *dekaprotos, demiourgos and gymnasiarch*'.[45] She also 'distributed money and corn to the entire populace, 300,000 denarii to orphans and children, financed the building of a temple, and provided numerous other benefactions'.[46]

Women were able to take public roles in special cases, and they were notably wealthy. If they have their name placed before their husband's, their status will probably be higher than their husbands. Thus, the discussion on the position and status of women in Greco-Roman paganism helps to understand their roles in religious leadership influencing both private and public spheres.

3.6. Jewish Synagogues

As far as the position and function of women in Jewish religious life are concerned, we get totally diverse and conflicting portrayals, depending whether they come from rabbinic sources or inscriptional and archaeological sources. Rabbinic writings caricature Jewish women as those who 'led restricted, secluded lives and were excluded from much of the ritual life of Jewish men especially from the study of Torah'.[47] Evidence from the Greco-Roman Diaspora suggests,

---

[45] Kraemer, *Her Share of the Blessings*, 85.
[46] Kraemer, *Her Share of the Blessings*, 85.
[47] Kraemer, *Her Share of the Blessings,* 93.

however, that at least some Jewish women played active religious, social, economic and even political roles in the public lives of Jewish communities.[48]

Brooten in the work, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue*, focussed on women who played significant leadership roles in synagogues in the ancient world, that include 'heads of the synagogue', 'leaders', 'elder', 'priestess', and 'mothers of the synagogues', as evidenced in the inscriptions dating from the second century BCE to the sixth century CE. They come from different locations and different communities. Women were also involved as donors to the synagogue buildings.[49] Trebilco records that four out of fifty three inscriptions regarding donations are by women alone and another fifteen are by women with their husbands.[50] Here, I will deliberately limit my exploration to the leadership roles of women in the synagogues, which seems to be at odds with the commonplace portrayal of Jewish society as ostentatiously male centred.

3.6.1. ἀρχισυνάγωγος (Head of the Synagogues)

ἀρχισυνάγωγος was the title of a leading official in the synagogue and has the primary position in the list of the officials. This official seems to be 'the spiritual and intellectual leader of the synagogue and responsible for its spiritual direction and regulation, including at times teaching the community and on other occasions inviting someone else to preach'.[51]

---

[48] Kraemer, *Her Share of the Blessings,* 93.

[49] It is evident in the inscriptions that women were donors to the synagogues. For example, Tation from Phoecaea, donated the whole synagogue building. This inscription is unique since Tation holds the position of προεδρία and a golden crown, which was a prominent position in the synagogue. She was possibly a wealthy and independent woman, who was able to build a synagogue (*CIJ* 738; *IGR* 4.1327). See P. R. Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 110.

[50] Trebilco, *Jewish Communities*, 112.

[51] Trebilco, *Jewish Communities,* 104, 105. *CII* 1404 mentions that the role of the heads of the synagogue includes reading of the law and teaching of the commandments. The exhortation and spiritual direction of the congregation is attested in Lk 13:10-17; cf. Acts 18:12-1; Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho,* 137, Epiphanius, *Panarion,* 30.18.2. They invited members of the congregation to preach (Acts 13:15). The synagogue heads together with the elders collected money to

3.6.1.1. Inscriptional Evidence

Three Greek inscriptions have been found with women bearing the title of 'head of the synagogue'. Though there is a strand of interpretation which takes the title as purely honorific, the different aspects of the title's use for men as well as women are dealt with in Brooten's work on *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue* showing that there were presumably women leaders in the synagogue. The three inscriptions cite the names of the women such as Rufina from Smyrna, Ionia (*CII* 741; IGR IV 1452), Sophia from Crete (*CII* 731c) and Theopempte from Caria (*CII* 756).

The inscription (*CII* 741; *IGR* IV 1452) with Rufina titled ἀρχισυνάγωγος is dated probably around the second or third century CE.

> Ῥουφεῖνα Ἰουδαία ἀρχισυνάγωγος κατεσκεύασεν τὸ ἐνσόριον τοῖς ἀπελευθέροις καὶ θρέμασιν μηδενὸς ἄλου ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντος θάψαι τινά. εἰ δέ τις τολμήσει, δώσει τῷ ἱερωτάτῳ ταμείῳ (δηνάρια) ͵αφ καὶ τῷ ἔθνει τῶν Ἰουδαίων (δηνάρια) ͵α. Ταύτης τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς τὸ ἀντίγραφον ἀπόκειται εἰς τὸ ἀρχεῖον.

> Rufina, a Jewess, a head of the synagogue, built this tomb for her freed slaves and the slaves raised in her house. No one else has the right to bury anyone (here). If someone should dare to do, he or she will pay 1,500 denars to the sacred treasury and 1,000 denars to the Jewish people. A copy of this inscription has been placed in the (public) archives.

From the inscription, it is clear that Rufina was a woman of affluence, who had the means to build tomb for her freed slaves and the slaves who were raised in her house. 'This tomb may be that of her slaves, to whom Rufina would have been a patron'.[52] It is not clear from the inscription whether she was married or not, since there is no evidence of her marital status. This type of inscription is quite usual in

---

be sent to the patriarch (*Cod. Theod.* 16.8.14, 17) and were likely the leaders of the congregation. See Brooten, *Women Leaders,* 28-29.

[52] Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 10. Brooten suggests, 'this grave, the persons to be buried in it, the marble plaque with its official legalistic language, and the high fine to be imposed all point to the wealth and influence of this woman'.

the Jewish as well as the non-Jewish communities of the Asia Minor. There are two other Jewish inscriptions from Smyrna which refer to office holders.[53] Rufina was a wealthy and independent Jewess, able to handle business matters of her time. She was possibly a member of a leading family of Smyrna. She was an active head of the synagogue in the whole sense of the title for which Trebilco suggests reasons such as her 'administrative and managerial skill', her educational qualification and her economic background.[54]

The second inscription (*CII* 731c 4th or 5th Century CE) mentions Sophia of Gortyn as elder and head of the synagogue of Kisamos.

Σοφία Ἰορτυνία,

πρεσβυτέρα κὲ ἀρχισυναγώγισσα Κισάμου ἔνθα.

Μνήμη δικέας ἰς ἑώνα.᾽Αμήν

'Sophia of Gortyn, elder and head of the synagogue of Kisamos (lies) here, the memory of the righteous one for ever'. Amen.

It is interesting to note two roles 'elder and the head of the synagogue' mentioned in the inscription with the feminine forms (πρεσβυτέρα, ἀρχισυναγώγισσα) of the title. As we shall see below, the different opinions regarding the title include that the titles were received as honorary through her husband, who would be πρεσβύτερος and ἀρχισυνάγωγος. Another view compares with that of the other Jewish women titles such as ἀρχηγισσα, ἱέρισα, ἀρχισυνάγωγος, and πρεσβυτέρα. The marital status of Sophia is not mentioned in the inscription and therefore it is unlikely that she received the title from her

---

[53] The inscriptions are *CII* 739, an inscription in which Irenopoios is described as 'an elder and father of the tribe and the son of the elder'; *CII* 740 another inscription from the same synagogue. Another inscription included the name of the scribe of a Jewish community in Smyrna. The titles such as elder, scribe, father of the tribe were used in the inscriptions. The first two are common titles whereas the father of the tribe is possibly equivalent to the father of the synagogue. See Brooten, *Women Leaders,* 11.

[54] Trebilco, *Jewish Communities*, 106.

husband. It is obvious in the inscription that she was an important figure in the Jewish community of Kisamos. She was an elder and the head of the synagogue as well.

The third inscription (*CII* 756 4th or 5th century CE) reads: '[From Th]eopempte, head of the synagogue, and her son Eusebios'. It is unsure whether the inscription is funerary or donative, since it is carved into the top of a white marble quadrangular post. The inscription shows that Theopempte, the head of the synagogue, and her son are donors of the post. One can understand that she would be wealthy enough to make the donation with her son, who could be an adult or infant. Her husband's name is not mentioned but the son's name being mentioned points to the fact that she was married. Her son did not possess a title. If his father had a title, it would have been carried on to the son. The picture that emerges from this inscription is that she was the donor of the synagogue and the head of the synagogue as well.

3.6.1.2. Role Identification

There are different lines of interpretation regarding the role of women synagogue heads, i.e., whether the title is purely honorific[55] or whether women played an equal role to that of the male officials.[56]

---

[55] See E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, Mathew Black and Pamela Vermes (rev. and ed.) (2 Vols. Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 1973-1979), 2:435.

[56] There is also literary evidence from Jewish, pagan and Christian sources. The New Testament gives evidence of the head of synagogues (Mark 5:22, 35, 36, 38; cf. Luke 8:49). Cf. Luke 8:41, ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς, whereas in Matt 9:18, 23 ἄρχων is used. There would be a question whether these titles denote the same functions. Another question that comes to our mind through the Jairos passage is whether there was more than one head of the synagogue since Jairos is mentioned as one of the heads of the synagogue (Mark 5:22). Luke 13:10-17 gives an idea of the role of the head of the synagogue as preventing the people from moving away from Torah. Acts of the Apostles also gives reference to the head of the synagogue inviting apostles to give sermons in the synagogue, which possibly shows a leadership role (Acts 13:15). In Paul's missionary activity in Corinth (Acts 18:1-17), we meet two synagogue officials, Crispus (v.8) who had become a believer in Christ, and Sosthenes, who had not (v.17).

The common perception is that it was an entirely honorific title and had no responsibility involved in it. It is assumed that the title had come through the husband, who was an ἀρχισυνάγωγος. However, there are weaknesses in this presupposition for women bearing honorary titles, because out of the three inscriptions, two did not give any evidence that they were married; the Rufina and Theopempte inscriptions give an impression that they are fairly independent in controlling funds, household and business affairs; in the inscriptions, 'where wives of synagogue heads are named (*CII* 265, 553, 744), they do not in fact bear the title of their husbands'.[57] Therefore the thesis that the title is purely honorary in the case of women and functional in the case of men is unlikely.

Brooten's suggestion is highly likely. On the basis of the evidence, the role of the female synagogue head is the same as in the case of their 'male counterparts' i.e., that they 'were active in administration and exhortation'.[58] Their responsibility possibly includes women but not exclusively so. They possibly had administrative capacity as in the case of Rufina, administering her whole household.

How did these women acquire official status? It is understood from the Rufina inscription that she was possibly wealthy and a member of a wealthy, leading Roman family. Theopempte also had funds. Sophia fulfilled two roles as elder and ἀρχισυνάγωγος possibly indicating her involvement in the matters of the

---

The early rabbinic sources such as m. *Yoma* 7.1 refer to the head of the synagogue, where the context is reading from the Torah on *Yom Kippur*. Other evidence includes *t. Meg*. 4. 21 (Zuck. 227); *b. Pesah* 49b; *y. Ber*. 6a.28-29.

Several fourth-century laws indicate that the head of the synagogue was one of the important official positions in the synagogue. Examples, *Cod. Theod*. 16. 8. 4; *Cod. Theod*. 16. 8. 13; *Cod. Theod*. 16. 8. 14. Further evidence can be obtained from Patristic fathers such as Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho,* 137, Epiphanius of Salamis (c. 315-403) and Palladius, *Dialogue on the Life of John Chrysostom*. Pagan sources also used this title. In Flavius Vopiscus' *Life of Saturninus* 8, *Scripores Historiae Augustae* 3.398-399, the emperor Alexander Severus was called the Syrian ἀρχισυνάγωγος by his opponents. This evidence makes it clear that the title was well known in the ancient world.

[57] Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 30.
[58] Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 30.

synagogue. Therefore their active involvement in the synagogue (or par with that of the male officials) and wealthy family connections may be the factors that helped them to assume leadership roles.

3.6.2. ἀρχήγισσα (**Leader**)

3.6.2.1. Inscriptional Evidence

The Peristeria inscription gives evidence for a woman leader. It was first published in 1937 from Thebes in Phthiotis in Thessaly (*CII* 696b): Μνῆμα Περιστερίας ἀρχηγίσις (Tomb of Peristeria, leader).

Another inscription *CII* 731g reads῾ Υπὲρ εὐχῆς ᾽Ιακωβ ἀρχιγοῦ πιννωνᾶ᾽ (In accordance with a vow of Jacob, president, the setter of pearls). These inscriptions date c. $4^{th}/5^{th}$ CE. The title ἀρχηγός occurs only once in Jewish inscriptions and *principalis* is its Latin parallel. Example, *CII* 681- *Ioses arcisna et principalis filius Maximini Pannoni sibi et Qyriae Coniugi sui vivo suo memoria dedicavit.* (Ioses, head of the synagogue and leader, son of Maximinus Pannonus, dedicated this monument, while still alive, for his wife and himself.). Due to the lack of context, in order to understand the meaning of ἀρχήγισσα, a study of its use in different literature is required.

3.6.2.2. Literary Evidence

ἀρχηγός in ancient literature functions as an adjective and as a noun. As an adjective, it means 'beginning', 'originating', 'primary' 'leading', 'chief', and as a noun, means 'founder', 'ancestral hero', 'prince', 'chief', 'first cause', 'originator', and 'originating power'.[59] The word has meanings as 'human ancestor of a tribe or family' or a 'leader'.[60]

---

[59] G. Delling, 'ἀρχηγός' *TDNT* 1, 487-88; see also *MM*, 81.
[60] The ancestor of a tribe or family is the sense in Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics* 8.12.4, whereas leader is the sense in Eusebius, *De ecclesiastica theologia* 2.9; Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 37.

LXX uses the term to translate a number of Hebrew words, such as *rosh* in the sense of military, political or clan leader (e.g. Exod 6:14; Num 13:3; 14:4; 25:4; Deut 33:21); *qasin* in the sense of chief, ruler (Judg 11:6, 11; Isa 3:6,7) and *sar* in the sense of prince, official, governor (Judg 5:15; 1 Chron 26:26; Neh 2:9; Isa 30:4).

Josephus uses ἀρχηγός five times, three times in the sense of originator, author, and twice in the sense of ancestor, founder of the race.[61] Philo uses it with the meaning of leader, chief.[62] The New Testament speaks of Christ as the ἀρχηγός, originator of life (Acts 3:15), of salvation (Heb 2:10) and of faith (Heb 12:2) and leader and saviour (Acts 5:31).

Therefore the three basic meanings are ancestral hero or heroine, founder/originator, and leader/chief.

In Jewish inscriptions (*CII* 696b, 731g) the meaning is probably leader or chief rather than originator. Therefore, the plausible meaning is leader, albeit Jewish titles differed with respect to locality and it is quite difficult to decide definitely as to the original meaning. There is a question whether ἀρχηγός and ἀρχισυνάγωγος refers to the same position, e.g. *CII* 681. It is not explicitly mentioned in the inscriptions whether ἀρχηγός denotes the leadership role in the Jewish community.[63]

---

[61] Josephus used ἀρχηγός in the sense of the originator and author as of crimes (*Ant.* 7. 207); of trouble (*Ant.* 20.136); of legal violations (*Ag. Ap.* 1.270) and in the sense of the ancestor or founder (*Ag. Ap.* 1.71, 130).

[62] Philo uses ἀρχηγός in *Leg. Alleg.* 3.175; *De somn.* 1. 89.

[63] Brooten notes whether founder might be the best translation as parallel to fatherly figures in early Christian texts. But she thinks this is speculative and supports 'leader' as the more likely translation. See Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 38, 39.

3.6.3. Πρεσβυτέρα (Elder)

3.6.3.1. Inscriptional Evidence

The title elder used for women in some Greek inscriptions has been found (Πρεσβυτέρα/ Πρεσβυτέρησα). There is also another inscription in which a woman is called Πρεσβύτις.

The examples are:

a) *CII* 731c (4th/5th CE), Sophia of Gortyn was both the head of the synagogue as well as elder (see above).

b) *CII* 692 (4th/ 5th CE) 'Tomb of Rebeka, the elder who has fallen asleep'.

c) Three Greek Inscriptions found in Apulia mention women elders, which date from the third to the sixth centuries CE. *CII* 581; *CIL* IX 6226 'Tomb of Beronikene, elder and daughter of Ioses'. Here Beronikene's father bears no title. She is described as the daughter of her father rather than the wife of a man. Other inscriptions include *CII* 590; *CIL* IX 6230 and *CII* 597; *CIL* 6209.

3.6.3.2. Literary Evidence

The term Πρεσβυτέρα can bear several different meanings. It denotes a political function as the 'elders of Israel' (Num 11:16-30; 2 Sam 3:17; 5:3; 17:4, etc.) and/or judicial functions as the 'elders of the city' (Deut 19:12; 21:2-9, 19-20; 2:15-21; 25:7-9). Philo and Josephus mention the *gerousia* of Alexandria and the members of the *gerousia* are called Πρεσβυτέροι.[64] The New Testament cites members of Sanhedrin as 'elders' (Matt 16:21; Mark 8:31; 11:27; Luke 9:22).

The meaning of an elder is varied, and it is hard to define. The Talmud refers to an elder as a scholar (*b.Qidd*. 32b). The *Theodosian code* (16.8.13) and *Justinian Code* (*Cod. Iust*.1.9.15) refer to elders as synagogue officials. Another meaning is in

---

[64] Philo (*In Flacc*. 74, 76, 80; *Leg. ad Gaium* 229) and Josephus (*J.W*. 7. 412).

equivalence to *seniores* and *maiores.* It occurs in the plural in inscriptions (*CII* 663, 731f, 803, 1404), and its parallel with the New Testament references is striking. In Luke 7:3-5, the centurion considers the elders as the official representatives of the Jewish community. The 'elders' in the New Testament refer to the decision making body of the church, e.g. Acts 11:30; 15:2, 4, 6, 22-23; 16:4; 21:18; Jas 5:14.

3.6.3.3. Role Identification

The evidence in the inscriptions and the literature points to women as elders. The function of an elder may be different in different periods as well as regions. The elder title is sometimes used in the plural where it refers to a council of elders, and it appears most often in a religious context, as religious functionaries.[65] But the perception that the title for woman is honorary, the title could be received from her husband, who was an elder, and the arguments against maintaining the honorary title exclusively for women are discussed in the section on ἀρχισυνάγωγος. That the husband's name is not mentioned with elder women in the inscriptions reduces the possibility of considering it as honorary. Six, possibly seven, inscriptions with women bearing the title 'elder' show the possibility of women fulfilling leadership roles.[66] Therefore it is most likely that women were the members of the council of elders; they were involved in financial matters and were also possibly seated in the front facing the congregation like the male elders.[67]

---

[65] There are four inscriptions, which refer to 'elders' in the plural (e.g. *CII* 663, 731F, 803, 1404) and also the New Testament references to Jewish and Jewish Christian elders (Luke 7:3-5; Acts 11:30; 15:2, 4, 6, 22-23; 16:4; 21:18; Jas 5:14). The functions in the religious context can be seen in *Cod. Theod.* 16.8.13: related to the worship service in *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, Nov. 146.1; collecting money in the synagogue in *Cod. Theod.* 16.8.14; the special seating arrangements during the worship service denote their religious function (*t. Meg.* 4.21).

[66] Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 55.

[67] The question can be raised as to whether women could be the full members of the judicial council; whether women could have been scholars or could read the Bible in the synagogue. See Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 55.

3.6.4. μήτηρ συναγωγῆς (Mother of the Synagogue)

3.6.4.1. Inscriptional Evidence

The evidence includes two Greek inscriptions with μήτηρ συναγωγῆς *CII* 496, *CII* 166 (1st BCE - 3rd CE); two Latin inscriptions with the equivalent of μήτηρ συναγωγῆς *CII* 523, *CII* 639; *CIL*V 4411; one Latin inscription with *pateressa CII* 606 (*CIL* IX 623); one inscription with μήτηρ *CII* 619d (3rd – 6th CE).[68] It is interesting to note that Verturia Paulla from Rome in the inscription *CII* 523 was the mother of the two synagogues of Campus and Volumnius, which was found parallel with *CII* 508 from Rome, where a father of synagogues is mentioned. Mother (father) of the synagogue is a key term of leadership, and it is most likely to denote their active involvement in the synagogues. Also, it is difficult to conclude that Verturia obtained this title from her husband since no husband's name is mentioned in the inscription, unlike the Menorah inscription *CII* 166 which gives the name of the husband. It seems that she was an office holder just like a πατήρ συναγωγῆς. The title *pateressa* is the feminine of *pater*. There is a question whether *pateressa* and μήτηρ συναγωγῆς referred to one and the same function, or whether *pateressa* refers to a less official position or implies a synagogue function at all.

The title πάτηρ/μήτηρ is also used without the synagogue description. What would be the implied role when it is so? Did it refer to a civic function? It is the common title among the Jewish Venosan inscriptions. Brooten records that 'πατήρ occurs nine times outside of our inscription while μὴτηρ and *pateressa* occur one

---

[68] They are all from Italy, Rome (*CII* 523, *CII* 496, *CII* 166); Venosa (*CII* 606: *CIL* IX 6231, *CII* 619d, *CII* 619c); Venetia (*CII* 639; *CIL* V 4411). Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 57.

time each'.[69] The number of occurrences of the title in the inscriptions makes clear that the title was a significant one in the Venosan Jewish community.

3.6.4.2. Literary Evidence

There is one literary reference to Jewish mothers of the synagogue in a Christian anti-Jewish polemic, '*De Altercatione Ecclesiae et Synagogae*', which is a dialogue between two matrons, *synagoga* and *Ecclesia*.[70] The mothers of the synagogue mentioned as the outstanding women of the Jewish community attest to the fact that the title was well-known even outside the Jewish community and shows their leadership position. *Theodosian code* 16.8.4 refers to the three synagogue officials such as 'priests', 'heads of the synagogues' and 'fathers of the synagogues' along with 'all others who serve the synagogue'. This fourth century law gives evidence on the functions of the synagogue officials, although it is hard to define their actual function and their distinguished status in the community.[71] The literary evidence is too limited to define clearly the functions of mother/father when used independently.

3.6.4.3. Role Identification

One of the interpretations about the role of mother of synagogue is gender-biased, which holds up the theory of honorary title for women.[72] Another suggestion was πάτηρ συναγωγῆς and μήτηρ συναγωγῆς were responsible to care for the sick and dying; the former also make arrangements for the funerals, while the latter

---

[69] Seven out of the ten inscriptions with πάτηρ are named Faustinus and μήτηρ in *CII* 6119d is named Faustina, which probably suggests both are from the same family. See Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 63. Some of the examples are *CII* 590, *CII* 599, *CII* 611, 612 etc.

[70] The work, dated fifth century CE, is discussing a controversial point on the bestowal of the eternal life only for the circumcised, which excludes women in general and even the mothers of the synagogue, who are outstanding women of the Jewish community. Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 63.

[71] Jesus refers to the title 'fathers' in Matt 23:9. 'And call no one your father on earth, for you have one father, the heavenly one', which seems to be an honorific title. There is also the prohibition to call any one '*rabbi*' (vs.7-8). The title '*abba*' occurs as an honorific title in the rabbinic sources.

[72] See S. Krauss, *Synagogale Altertümer* (Berlin: Benjamin Harz, 1922), 166.

had responsibility for providing money for poor brides.[73] Some find the title must be an 'active role in administration', while some find parallel roles with that of patronage.[74] They may have some honorary roles in directing charitable works and assistance in the community.

However, the evidence shows clearly that women bore the title of mother of the synagogue or mother. Although the function is not clearly defined, it seems that they held some administrative position in the synagogue.

3.6.5. ἱερεία/ἱέρισα (Priestess)

3.6.5.1. Inscriptional Evidence

Three ancient Jewish inscriptions have the title of ἱερεία/ἱέρισα for women ranging from first century BCE to fourth century CE, and those were found in Tell el-Yahudiyyeh in Lower Egypt, in Beth She'arim in Galilee, and in Rome.[75]

They are a) *CII* 1514 (SEG 1 (1923) no. 574)

Μαριν ἱέρισα χρηστὴ πασίφιλε καὶ ἄλυπε καὶ φιλογίτων …

O Marin, priest, good and friend to all, causing pain to no one and friendly to your neighbours, farewell! (She died at the age of) approximately fifty years, in the third year of Caesar (Augustus), on the thirteenth day of Payni (June 7, 28 BCE). Brooten writes 'C. C. Edgar, who first published the inscription in 1922, thought that ἱέρισα was "the name of Marion's father; whether it is an indeclinable noun or whether this is a genitive in –α I do not know"'.[76] But Hans Lietzmann assumed it to be ἱέρισα, 'Priestess'.[77] Women bearing the title ἱέρισα are interpreted as not in a

---

[73] Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 64, 65.
[74] Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 65.
[75] Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 73.
[76] Brooten, *Women Leaders,* 73. Brooten cites from C. C. Edgar, *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l' Egypte* 22 (1922) 13, no. 25.
[77] Hans Lietzmann, *Kleine Schriften*, ed. Kurt Aland; 3 Vols.; *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur* 67, 68, 74; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958-1962), 1.442; Brooten, *Women Leaders*,73. The name Marion occurs in Greek Inscriptions such as *SEG* 17 (1960) 818 (Cyrenaica), *SEG* 17 (1960) 819.

real sense performing the actual function of priestess in the Jewish community but rather belonging to the family of priests, that of Aaron's family.[78]

b) *CII* 315 (c. 3rd - 4th CE) from the Monteverde catacomb in the Via Portuensis. Ἐνθάδε χιτε Γαυδεντια ἱέρισα…'

'Here lies Gaudentia, Priest, (aged) 24 years. In Peace be her sleep!' The name Guadentia appears in another inscription CII 314 from the same place; she is a daughter of a man named Oklatios. Galudentis (male form of the name) occurs in *CII* 316. Inscriptions with men (possibly five) bearing the title ἱερεύς are also found from the Monteverde catacomb.

c) *CII* 1007 Σαρα θυγάτηρ Ναιμιας μήτηρ ἱερείας κύρα Μαρ[ει]ης [ἔν]θα κ[εῖται?]

'Sara, daughter of Naimia, mother of the priest, Lady Maria, lies here'.

This inscription is dated to the fourth century CE. Miriam has been interpreted as a *kohenet*, wife of a *kohen*.

3.6.5.2. Role Identification

Scholars interpret ἱέρισα as probably designating the wife or daughter of a ἱερεύς and as a member of the priestly family since presumably there is no priestess in the Jewish system.[79] The three possible interpretations regarding this are: firstly, ἱερεία/ἱέρισα is simply the Greek equivalent of *kohenet* (wife of a priest); secondly, ἱερεία/ἱέρισα in the inscriptions means the priest in the cultic sense; thirdly, it denotes a Synagogue function. *Kohenet* is not a biblical but is a rabbinic term.[80] The

---

[78] Brooten, *Women Leaders,* 74. In Tell el-Yahuddiyyeh, there was a Jewish Temple founded by Onias IV during the time of Ptolemy VI Philometor and Cleopatra (181-146 BCE), who because of the Maccabean revolt was unable to continue the Jerusalem High priesthood.

[79] See E. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* (13 vols. Bollingen Series 37; Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1953-1968), 1: 253-257; see also Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 78, 79.

[80] A man becomes a *kohen* by birth but woman becomes a *kohen* by birth and by marriage. The Old Testament refers to the priest's daughter having rights to eat priestly offerings (Lev 22:12-13). The Holiness Code speaks of the priest's daughters and wives (Lev 21:7, 9). It is said in Lev 22:13 that the

passages referring to *kohenet* show the rights and privileges of a *kohenet* and how she loses it and how weak it is when compared to the priestly privileges of a man. *Kohenet* passages do not speak about leadership in a congregation or cultic functions, but rather the rights of becoming a member of a priestly class.

The possibility of women performing religious functions in ancient Israel[81] poses a question regarding the masculine nature of the Israelite priesthood. Brooten suggests that 'there are scraps of scattered evidence which could indicate a more varied historical reality than we are accustomed to imagine'.[82] She also suggests that the cultic or priestly functions may include 'singing psalms, providing musical accompaniment, performing priestly blessings, examining the priestly offerings and animals and performing sacrifices'.[83]

The function of a priest as bestowing priestly blessings and reading the Torah in the synagogue can be seen in M. Git 5:8 (cf. Philo of Alexandria, *Hypothetica* 7.13; Philo suggests that the priest has preference to the elder). The *Theodosian code* (16.8.4) gives preference to the priests as the synagogue functionaries. Is it possible for the women to perform the same functions as that of the male counterparts? It is unlikely that the women in the inscriptions with the title were forbidden the

---

daughter of a priest could lose her privileges in a priestly family by marrying a non-priest. The Mishnah lists a number of occasions and reasons when a *bat kohen* loses her right to eat of the priestly heave-offering (m. *Yebam* 7:4-6; m. *Sota* 3.7 (priestliness of a *kohenet* implies less than the priestliness of a *kohen)*; m. *Sota* 3:7 (the priestliness of a woman was much more fragile and open to profanation than that of a man). See Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 78.

[81] The two texts that allude to priestesses in the ancient Israel are Exod 38:8 (*hassobot* -ministering women) and 1 Sam 2:22 (ministering women). There are differing opinions about 'the women who ministered at the tent of meeting' as house keepers in Exod 38:8 and 1 Sam 2:22 or doing menial duties, which is quite unlikely and Brooten regards this as over interpretation. See Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 85. The other possible suggestions for priestesses in the Bible are Zipporah, who performed the ritual of circumcision on her son (Exod 2:16, 21; 4:24-26); Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite (Judg 5:24); and Miriam, who is called a prophet, who led the Israelite women in dancing and worship (Exod 15:20-21; Mic 6:4).

[82] Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 88.

[83] Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 88.

functions of the priests; it seems that they received the title by virtue of their rights of the priestly descent and perhaps due to their donations to the synagogue.

There are also inscriptions and Papyri referring to ἱερεύς dating from the first century BCE to the third century CE (*CII* 346; *CII* 347; *CII* 355; *CII* 375). Women were possibly involved in cultic functions. They might have performed priestly duties and performed leadership roles in the congregation in the Jewish synagogues.

3.7. Conclusion

It is clear that some women enjoyed considerable freedom and independence in the socio-political, religious and cultural context of the Greco-Roman world. Although wealth and status were assumed as the rationale for assuming leadership, the evidence shows women had skills and potential to become lawyers, politicians, magistrates, patrons of associations, priestess of the cult and leaders of the synagogues. Women bore titles the same as that of men in the synagogues as heads of the synagogues, elders, priestesses, leaders, and mothers of the synagogue. Most of the references are not from the first century but from later centuries. As we have found evidence from the later centuries, with caution, we could say that Jewish culture is not opposed to women's leadership.

On the one hand, it is argued that those titles are honorary for women; on the other hand, there are convincing claims that they are not honorary titles. The examples of women, who were not mentioned in relation to their husbands in the inscriptions, argue against the dependent character (to their husbands) of women holding those titles. Although their function is not clearly defined in the inscriptions, these titles possibly denote leadership roles, administrative capacity and organizational character. Some of the titles used for the women in the Pauline churches are similar to that of the Greco-Roman world. Although the exact nature of

these leadership roles remains obscure, it possibly implies a functional similarity, although in a different context. This provides a clear vantage point in our analysis of the roles of the women in Romans 16 and their contribution to the Pauline communities, which will be the task of the next chapter.

Chapter 4

Women in Romans 16:1-16

4.1. Introduction

Among Pauline letter closings, Romans 16 contains more greetings as well as more personal names than any other, including both men and women. Moreover, they are greeted due to their activities in regard to the church and to Paul. The greeting formula and the rhetoric of the passage support mutual relations.

The passage (16:1-16) seems to be Paul's acknowledgement of some people's hard work and their roles in relation to the Roman believers and to himself. Women appreciated for their roles apparently denote his attitude to women in church and ministry. The tone of his speech to restrict their involvement in the church elsewhere in his letters (1 Cor 11:1-16; cf. 1 Cor 14:34, 35) strikes a notable dissonance with what we find in Romans 16, where he appreciates their work. This chapter consists of the detailed analysis of those women named and portrayed with descriptive phrases that help us understand the roles they played in the Pauline mission as well as in the Roman church.

The major focus of this chapter is to deduce the leadership roles of women and the implication of Paul's mutuality model through his rhetoric. Thus, the roles of women are discussed: firstly, the role of Phoebe; secondly, Prisca; thirdly, Junia; fourthly, hardworking members: Mary, Persis, Tryphoena and Tryphosa; finally other members: Rufus' mother, Nereus' sister and Julia.

4.1 The Role of Phoebe

Rom 16:1, 2

v. 1. Συνίστημι δὲ ὑμῖν Φοίβην τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν, οὖσαν [καί] διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς,

v. 2. ἵνα αὐτὴν προσδέξησθε ἐν κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων καὶ παραστῆτε αὐτῇ ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῄζῃ πράγματι· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴ προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ.

I commend to you our sister Phoebe, a deacon of the church at Cenchreae, so that you may welcome her in the Lord as is fitting for the saints, and help her in whatever she may require from you, for she has been a benefactor of many and of myself as well (NRSV).

It has been widely accepted that Romans 16:1, 2 is a letter of introduction for Phoebe to the Romans. Although the role of Phoebe in relation to the Romans is not very explicit, the social and theological role of Phoebe in Cenchreae can be clearly deduced from the passage. It is probable that Phoebe was a Gentile Christian, since her name shows connections to pagan mythology.[1] Her home town is Cenchreae and she is the διάκονος of the church of Cenchreae,[2] and προστάτις of many as well as Paul. *Prima facie*, Rom 16:1, 2 appears as a letter of recommendation for Phoebe, but one may be able to pick up some hidden motives like recommendation for Paul himself, or an intention for the Spanish mission or to prepare ground for the visit of Paul. What is the importance of the relationship between Phoebe and Paul? What is the significance of the descriptive phrases used for her? Why is she recommended to the Romans? What is her expected mission, as portrayed in the epistle to the Romans?

---

[1] The mythical Phoebe was the daughter of Heaven and Earth, the wife of Coeus, mother of Leto and the grandmother of Apollo and Artemis. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 729.

[2] Cenchreae was the eastern port of Corinth. Six possible towns are known with the names of Cenchreae. Fitzmyer lists the towns: 1) a place in Argeia in the eastern Peloponnesus; 2) a town in Troas in Asia Minor; 3) a town near Lindos on the island of Rhodes; 4) a place near the town of Mitylene on the island of Lesbos; 5) a place near Lampsakos in the Troas; and 6) one of the two ports of Corinth. Cenchreae is the port of Corinth (situated seven kilometres southeast of Corinth, on the Saronic Gulf, serving trade with Asia), and is associated with Paul's mission. See Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 730.

The aim of this section is to analyse the roles of Phoebe and her significance in the Pauline mission. I will deal with the titles διάκονος and προστάτις used for Phoebe, her contribution to the Spanish mission (as proposed by R. Jewett), and the relation of reciprocity as evident in the structure and content of the passage, in order to deduce the role of Phoebe in the letter to the Romans.

4.2.1. Διάκονος

The role of Phoebe as διάκονος has long been a subject of debate. Διάκονος generally expresses the concept of serving.[3] 'Διακονέω has the special quality of indicating very personally the service rendered to another'.[4] Although it denotes generally the concept of serving, Paul in his letters uses the term with special meaning in relation to the Church (ἐκκλησία).[5] Of all the uses, only Rom 16:1 designates a woman as διάκονος of a church, which is unique as well as noteworthy. It is unique because Phoebe is the only woman named with this title by Paul. Different renderings will help us to figure out the original meaning of the title used by Paul in relation to Phoebe. The use of διάκονος in relation to the church could denote the function of a minister. Here, I will attempt to analyse the noun διάκονος in order to find out in what sense Paul used it in Rom 16:1, to signify the role of Phoebe in regard to the church of Cenchreae. Therefore, I will analyse the terminology and the different notions in the Pauline Epistles, its wider use (New

---

[3] Other Greek words which have the notion of serving are δουλεύω, θεραπεύω, λατρεύω, ὑπηρετέω. δουλεύω means 'to serve as a slave with a stress on subjection', θεραπεύω 'expresses the willingness for service', λατρεύω means 'to serve for wages', which also connotes performing religious and cultic duties. H. W. Beyer, 'διακονέω, διακονία, διάκονος', *TDNT* 2, 81. ὑπηρετέω denotes 'to act under instruction', in a sense of an assistant, servant, or an inferior officer. *LSJ*, 179, 315, 407, 736.

[4] Beyer, 'διακονέω', 81.

[5] Paul (and the New Testament writers) preferred to use the διακονία word group to speak of service or ministry rather than the terms office or rule (ἀρχή), honour (τιμή) or power (τέλος), which denote positions of ecclesiastical office.

Testament, Greek literature and Judaism), and finally the function of Phoebe as διάκονος of the church of Cenchreae.

4.2.1.1. Διάκονος in Pauline Epistles

Paul uses the concrete noun διάκονος, the abstract noun διακονία and the verb διακονέω to address different contexts and designate individuals as well. In this section, the discussion is limited to the undisputed letters of Paul, Colossians and Ephesians.[6]

The verb διακονέω is used in relation to Paul himself (Rom 15:25; 2 Cor 3:3; 8:19-20) and Onesimus (Phlm 13). In Rom 15:25, Paul expresses that he is going to minister to the saints (διακονῶν τοῖς ἁγίοις), which is important to our discussion because Phoebe's ministry is also in relation to the saints in Cenchreae.

He uses the abstract noun διακονία in a range of contexts and in relation to a variety of individuals. It includes himself (Rom 11:13; 15:31; 2 Cor 4:1; 5:18; 6:3; 2 Cor 11:8); Stephanas and his household (1 Cor 16:15); Archippus (Col 4:17); Roman Christians (Rom 12:7); Corinthian Christians (1 Cor 12:5); Christians in general (Eph 4:12); the ministry of death and condemnation (2 Cor 3:7, 9); the ministry of the Spirit (2 Cor 3:8); and the relief aid in the form of the collection (2 Cor 8:4; 9:1, 12-13).

It is interesting that 1 Cor 16:15 talks about the service of the household of Stephanas 'to the saints'.[7] Service to the saints implies service to a group of people (gathered together as a church) and is probably related to a leadership role. Early Christianity regarded all important activity with regard to the up-building of the

---

[6] Although the authenticity of Colossians and Ephesians is widely disputed, I assume those to be Pauline or very closely connected to Paul, since they have similar themes and structure to the undisputed letters.

[7] Other instances where διακονία is related to the saints are Rom 15:31 (my *service* in Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints); 2 Cor 8:4 (the fellowship of *ministering* to the saints); 1 Cor 9:1 (concerning the *ministering* to the saints); Eph 4:12 (for equipping of the saints for the work of the ministry).

community as διακονία (Eph 4:11f).[8] Paul describes διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν and διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων (1 Cor 12:4, 5).[9] The different services in the early church are being performed by different members of the community and are rendered to the same Lord. Διακονία is placed between προφητεία and διδασκαλία (Rom 12:7). It also denotes obligations and responsibilities in the community.

Moreover, the concrete noun διάκονος occurs frequently in the Pauline letters to denote different functions in the context of ἐκκλησία. It is used to denote Paul himself (1 Cor 3:5, 6; Eph 3:7; Col 1:23, 25); Apollos (1 Cor 3:5); Tychicus (Eph 6:21; Col 4:7); Epaphras (Col 1:7); Phoebe (Rom 16:1); the Philippian deacons (Phil 1:1); the false apostles (2 Cor 11:15, 23); the Roman authorities (Rom 13:4); and Christ (Rom 15:8; Gal 2:17). They are described in relation to God (2 Cor 6:4); Christ (2 Cor 11:23; Col 1:7); the church (Col 1:25); the new covenant (2 Cor 3:6); righteousness (2 Cor 11:5); and the Gospel (Eph 3:7; Col 1:23).

The opinion that the word group denotes 'humble service of other people' is criticised by Collins. He argues that that the term denotes a task of carrying messages, emphasizing the notion of an agent or messenger in non-Christian sources and the same idea can be seen in the New Testament use of the term too. He argues that the words διάκονος, διακονία, διακονέω 'do not speak directly of "attitude" like "lowliness" but express concepts about undertakings for another, be that God or (hu)man, master or friend',[10] that διακονία in the New Testament is a task entrusted by divine authority.

---

[8] Beyer, 'διακονία', 87.

[9] Different charismas are for the common good and for the up-building of the body of Christ. Paul's account of ministries shows no evidence for only one group exercising or controlling all ministries in the early church; rather the responsibility for ministry or service was shared by different groups within the community.

[10] J. N. Collins, *Diakonia: Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources* (Oxford: University Press, 1990), 194. See also Robert Hannaford, 'The Representative and Relational Nature of Ministry and The Renewal of the Diaconate', in *The Ministry of Deacon: Ecclesiological Explorations* (Uppsala: NEC, 2000), 245. Georgi also shares the same opinion that διακονία refers to the service performed by those

Who are the beneficiaries of διακονέω? The beneficiaries of διακονέω are the members of the community. It affects the life of a community in its entirety. Paul specially mentions the beneficiaries as the saints in general or a church in particular. The verb denotes that the benefactor specified in each context plays an important role in the particular community or congregation.

I would like to discuss selected Pauline passages such as 1 Cor 16:15; Phil 1:1; Col 4:17 and 4:7, and Rom 16:1 which I consider as vital to my discussion on Phoebe.[11] I have selected these passages for several reasons: a) the individuals or the group mentioned are the associates of Paul in ministry; b) their contribution is to the community of saints; 3) they are mentioned as διάκονος or otherwise identified by their service.

Stephanas and his household have devoted themselves to the service (διακονία) of the saints (1 Cor 16:15). According to Banks, Stephanas appears as a 'co-worker … in the founding of the church'.[12] Devoted for work should be understood in the sense of set themselves aside for work.

Archippus' service (διακονία, Col 4:17) denotes the special act of 'service' of a διάκονος, though it could not be equated to the later technical sense of deaconate.[13] διάκονος denoting a title for a special function in the developing constitution of the church is found first in Phil 1:1 (σὺν ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις), where Paul sends greetings to all the saints in Philippi. It is notable that

---

whom God has chosen to be messengers; see D. Georgi, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians* (SNTW; Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 1987), 27-32; A. D. Clarke, *Serve the Community of the Church: Christians as Leaders and Ministers* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 239.

[11] See for more discussion on the ministry in the New Testament, see A. Hentschel, *Diakonia im Neuen Testament: Studien zur Semantik unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Rolle von Frauen* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 90-137. Rom 16:1 is discussed as a separate section, see 4.2.1.7.

[12] Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community*, 164; I. H. Marshall and D. A. Hagner, *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1339. See also S. Schreiber, 'Arbeit mit der Gemeinde (Rom16:6, 12). Zur versunkenen Möglichkeit der Gemeindeleitung durch Frauen', *NTS* 46 (2000), 204-226, at 214-217.

[13] J. D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 288.

deacons are greeted with the overseers (ἐπισκόποι)[14] and named after them. The question is how these offices are integrated or co-ordinated. Although it is difficult to determine the specific duties of deacons and overseers, it is implausible that both denote different duties of the same person. Some scholars suggest these titles are 'functional' rather than 'titular', thus describing 'someone who serves others' rather than a title denoting leadership.[15] Elsewhere Paul refers to church workers without referring to an office (Rom 12:8; Gal 6:6; 1 Thess 5:12). However, as O'Brien suggests, with Beyer and others, 'he has in view particular members of the congregation who are specifically described and known by these two titles; otherwise the addition seems to be meaningless' and they 'have special, self-evident authority'.[16] Best rightly argues that the two groups mentioned particularly (with the saints) suggest a distinction between ordinary believers and ministers as they are particularly mentioned.[17]

Ephaphras (Col 1:7) and Tychicus (Col 4:7; Eph 6:21) are specially called διάκονος. Epaphras is σύνδουλος of the apostle and διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Col 1:7). Tychicus is διάκονος ἐν Κυρίῳ (Eph 6:21; Col 4:7). Dunn suggests that the term may describe 'an individual's sustained commitment like Paul's co-worker and not the title of a defined office'.[18] But as Paul's fellow worker, the person probably shared the responsibilities of Paul and had an effective participation in ministry.

---

[14] Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Philippians*, 82.

[15] G. D. Fee, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 69.

[16] P. T. O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 48; Beyer, 'διακονία', 616; M. Silva, *Philippians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 40, 41.

[17] E. Best, 'Bishops and Deacons: Phil 1:1' *SE* 4 (1968), 371-376 at 372-374; O' Brien, *Philippians*, 49.

[18] Dunn, *Colossians and Philemon*, 65, 272.

4.2.1.2. Διάκονος in the New Testament (other than Pauline Literature[19])

Service in the NT has a special significance as far as Jesus' life and ministry are concerned. He bases his teaching on the commandment of loving one's neighbour and that the attitude of serving is essential to being a disciple. He taught and practised service which is sacrificial and self-denying, which are the virtues of the kingdom of God.

Διακονέω is used with the meaning 'to wait at table' (Lk 17:8; Jn 12:2; Lk 12:37; Lk 22:26).[20] It is used in a sense 'to supervise a meal' (Acts 6:2). It also means in a broader sense 'to be serviceable', which includes many different activities such as provision for bodily sustenance. The purpose of the coming of the Son of Man is not to be ministered but to minister (Mk 10:45). Moreover, διακονεῖν denotes the service to the community (cf. Heb 6:10). The charismata are divided into ministry of the word and ministry of deed (1 Pet 4:10, 11; cf. 1 Pet 1:10-11). Διάκονος specifies 'the waiter at a meal' (Jn 2:5, 9) and the servant of a master (Mt 22:13).

4.2.1.3. Διάκονος in the Pastoral Letters

The deaconate related to the episcopate is also found in 1 Tim 3:1f; a list of requirements for an overseer (vv.1-7), followed by those for a deacon (vv.8-13). A specific group is later assigned to be deacons and possibly used in a technical sense, which means the 'function' integrated with the 'office'.[21] The lack of reference to teaching or authority in the list of qualifications of deacons does not imply that their

---

[19] The Pastoral letters are discussed below, since they have a special reference to the role and function of the deaconate, although it is debated whether they represent a later development and are deutero-Pauline.

[20] Διακονεῖν is also used to describe Martha's care (Lk 10:40); Peter's mother-in law's service (Mt 1:31) and angels ministering to Jesus (Mk 1:13; Mt 4:11). See G. Lohfink, 'Weibliche Diakone im Neuen Testament', in J. Blank et al. (eds.) *Die Frau Im Urchristentum* (QD 95; Freiburg: Herder, 1983), 320-338; Philsy, 'Diakonia of Women in the New Testament' *IJT* 32 (1983), 110-118.

[21] I. H. Marshall and P. H. Towner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Pastoral Epistles* (Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 1999), 489.

responsibilities are limited to tasks of practical needs; rather to become the effective leaders in their household points strongly to their responsibility in the church (v.9).[22]

4.2.1.4. Διάκονος in Extra Biblical Greek literature

Διακονέω is first found in contemporary Greek in Herodotus with a meaning 'to wait at table' (cf. Aristophanes *Acharnenses* 1015ff; Diodorus Siculus V. 28, 4; Athenaeus of Naucratis IX, 21). In particular, it means to taste or to direct a marriage feast and more generally 'to provide or care for', which is often used as the work of a woman (Athenaeus of Naucratis IX 20, Dion of Chrysostomus *Orationes* 7, 65; Sophocles *Philoctetes* 285f, Plato *Leges* VII 805e).[23] Based on the above meanings, the comprehensive meaning is 'to serve' (Herodotus IV, 154, *P. Oxy* II, 275, 10). Greeks consider serving as of undignified, lowly and inferior status.

4.2.1.5 . Διάκονος in Judaism

In the Jewish tradition, the master-servant relationship is used to describe the God- human relationship. Διακονεῖν is used by Philo with a meaning 'to serve' or 'to wait at a table' (Vit. Cont. 70; cf. Vit. Cont. 75). Josephus uses it with three meanings such as to wait at table (*Ant.* 11.163); to serve with a notion to obey (*Ant.* 17.140); and 'to render priestly services' (*Ant.* 7. 365).[24]

4.2.1.6 Διάκονος in Inscriptional Evidence

There are extant inscriptions citing female διακόνοι of cultic organisations in the non-literary sources from Ephesus.[25] It is also interesting to note that an inscription from the fourth century recognizes a lady called Sophia, who is

[22] I disagree with Beyer's suggestion that the primary functions of deacons are those pertaining to practical needs and inferior to that of overseers. Beyer, 'διακονέω', 90. Acts (6) gives a notion whether deacons' are selected to do the practical service rather than the ministry of the word. However the origin of the deaconate is not to be found in Acts 6, but in relation to the episcopate.
[23] Beyer, 'διακονέω', 82.
[24] See for more discussion Beyer, 'διακονέω', 82.
[25] *IG* 111, 2. x. 3527; *SEG* 425; Guarducci, *EG* 1V. 345-47; Guarducci *EG* 1V. 368-70.

described in four ways; a 'second Phoibe', δούλη, νύμφη of Christ and διάκονος as well (Guarducci *EG* 1V. 445).[26] The title 'second Phoibe' seems to be an allusion to Phoebe in Rom 16:1. There are other women mentioned by the title διακόνος,[27] which is an evidence of women with this title.

4.2.1.7. Phoebe as Διάκονος (Rom 16:1)

In Rom 16:1, Phoebe is designated the διάκονος of the church of Cenchreae. The discussion is mainly centred on whether Paul is referring to her leadership in the church or a general sense of service. It is probable that her title denotes a significant role since she is singled out as the διάκονος of the church of Cenchreae; as Thomas suggests that 'the term deacon was used to designate a believer who had been set apart for work in the church with the added authority which came with an act of setting apart'.[28] The term is referring to a special office but the nature of this special office is not clearly depicted in the New Testament writings.[29]

The title is translated as 'servant' (NIV), 'deaconess' (RSV, NAB, NJB, JB, Philips), 'who serves' (GNB), 'who holds office in the congregation' (NEB), 'active in the service of the congregation' (William Barclay), 'a deacon in the church of Cenchreae' (NRSV). Some of the translations may be based on the general sense of the term denoting 'one who serves at the table'. Whelan suggests that to translate διάκονος in Romans 16:1 as the synonym for the later office of deaconess (3rd or 4th century CE) would limit the function and responsibility when compared to the male

---

[26] See G. H.R. Horsley, *New Docs,* 4:239-241.
[27] See Horsley, *New Docs,* 4:239-240. Examples are *IG* III, 2.x.3527, *SEG* 425, Guarducci *EG* IV 345-47, Guarducci *EG* IV 368-70.
[28] W. D. Thomas, 'Phoebe: A Helper of Many', *ExpTim* 95 (1984), 336-337, at 337.
[29] C. S. Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1992), 238. Although the office of the deacon is interpreted in the light of Acts 6, who is called to serve, the particular title is not used in Acts 6. That is, there is no reason to suggest that Acts 6 is the origin of the office.

deaconate.[30] Since there is no separate Greek word for deaconess in the first three centuries CE, the English translation of διάκονος as deaconess is incorrect and misleading. It may be during the fourth century that the Greek word διακόνισσα is developed and the role and responsibility is vastly different from that of the first century διάκονος.[31] Διάκονος can serve to designate both a man and a woman.

Some commentators interpreted διάκονος in terms of informal service or limited ministry to women or to the sick, in the role of a helper. For example, Cranfield suggests that Phoebe's activities are to 'the practical service of the needy'; Käsemann considers her ministry was the 'charitable care of the poor, sick, widows and orphans…'.[32]

On the other hand, some consider Phoebe as the leader of the particular congregation. Dunn indicates that 'διάκονος together with οὖσαν points more to a recognized ministry or position of responsibility within the congregation'.[33] Fitzmyer regarded Phoebe as the minister and leader of the congregation.[34] Although a developed form of the deaconate is hard to distinguish at the time of Romans, the role and function should be determined by the context of each letter as well as each particular congregation.[35]

The term διάκονος can be used in a general sense for exercising some role of service. But in certain respects it seems to designate this role as crystallised into

---

[30] Whelan, 'Amica Pauli', 67.

[31] See Whelan, 'Amica Pauli', 68. *Contra* Romaniuk suggests, 'Paul knowingly magnifies the role of Phoebe when he likens her role in the community to that of an officed deacon', and is a 'pleasant exaggeration', which can be accepted only if there is any evidence of Paul speaking that is not totally true and for his own personal benefits. K. Romaniuk, 'Was Phoebe in Romans 16, 1 a Deaconess?' *ZNW* 81(1990), 132-34, at 133, 134. See also D. C. Arichea, 'Who was Phoebe?', 407. I disagree with the term 'pleasant exaggeration' and his view that Phoebe was 'an ordinary lay-woman'; if Paul exaggerates women's roles, it should be true for Paul's statements for others elsewhere.

[32] Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:781; Käsemann, *Romans*, 410; Clarke, 'Jew and Greek', 117.

[33] Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 886, 887.

[34] Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 729-730. See also B. Holmberg, *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 99-102; Ellis, 'Paul and His Co-workers', 185.

[35] Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 886, 887.

a designated office; e.g. when related to 'the saints' or 'the church'. This is clear when it is placed with other titles (Phil 1:1 and Pastorals) and is probably the case in Romans 16:1 with Phoebe.

Function of Phoebe as διάκονος: It is noteworthy that Romans 16 is the only occasion in which Paul describes Phoebe. Paul's description of Phoebe includes her title not only as the διάκονος, but also her roles as ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν and προστάτις. Although it seems difficult to locate the specific role of Phoebe in the church of Cenchreae, it is possible to make some deductions from the form of recommendation and the titles used by Paul. The way he recommends Phoebe to the Romans and the requests to the Romans to receive her and 'assist her in whatever she needs of you' indeed give some evidence of her role in the church of Cenchreae. Ellis equated διάκονος with that of 'a special class of co-workers, those who are active in preaching and teaching'.[36] As noted above, when Paul uses διακονέω or διάκονος in relation to a congregation, it implies an idea of some role in leading the congregation.

The early Christian missionary movement was spread by travelling missionaries, but Phoebe could not be understood as an itinerant missionary[37] because her responsibilities as διάκονος are centred on the local church of Cenchreae, as the leader of the local community. As H. J. Klauck rightly asserts, her 'ministry' or 'office' could not be regarded as equal to the later deaconesses, whose ministry is limited to women; rather she was the διάκονος of the whole church in Cenchreae.[38]

---

[36] Ellis, 'Paul and His Co-workers', 442.
[37] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her,* 171; Jewett suggests Phoebe's role as a local leader rather than as a travelling missionary; Jewett, *Romans,* 945.
[38] H. J. Klauck, *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981), 31; Fiorenza, 'Missionaries, Apostles, Co-workers, 425.

It is also striking that Fiorenza tries to equate Phoebe's title to that of the charismatic preachers in Corinth as co-workers; the major difference is that Phoebe is not the opponent of Paul but has friendly relations with Paul.[39] I presume that the hermeneutic tool to interpret Phoebe's role as διάκονος of the church of Cenchreae should be Paul's use of διάκονος in relation to the community or the church. The responsibilities of a διάκονος involve some leadership role, which probably includes teaching as well as preaching.[40]

I suggest that Phoebe's mission in relation to the community at Cenchreae may be the same as that of the house of Stephanas who committed themselves 'to the διακονία of saints' (1 Cor 16:15) and Timothy, co-worker of Paul[41] (1 Thess 3:2).[42] In 1 Cor 3:5, 9 Paul uses the expression to designate himself and Apollos, that they were called by God and entrusted with a common ministry.[43] As Paul describes the members of the community as co-workers, deacons and patrons, such terms carry no gender distinctions. It can well be translated as 'minister', which is a significant title to denote a specific role in the church, a person with special functions, who is engaged in the leading activity of the church.[44] This title in Romans 16 'clearly points to a leadership role over the whole church, not just a part

---

[39] Fiorenza, 'Missionaries, Apostles, and Co-workers', 426. See also Georgi, *Opponents of Paul in Corinth*, 29-32. The word group διάκονος, διακονία, διακονέω is used in 2 Corinthians 11:13 to characterize the false apostles, who were the charismatic preachers, visionary prophets, and spirit-filled apostles.

[40] See Croft, 'Text Messages', 89. See also A. Hentschel, *Diakonia im Neuen Testament*, 167-172.

[41] 1 Thes 3:2 poses a textual question whether συνεργόν or διάκονον should be read. Metzger suggests the best reading is συνεργὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. See Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 563.

[42] See Cotter, 'Women's Authority Roles in Paul's Churches', 354. Tychicus is also called as 'our beloved brother' and faithful διάκονος (Col 4:7; cf. 2 Cor 3:6).

[43] 1 Cor 3:5 shows that the Pauline concept of leadership is task oriented rather than person oriented. See A. D. Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical & Exegetical Study of 1 Cor 1-6* (New York: Brill, 1993), 119.

[44] Arichea, 'Who was Phoebe?' 409.

of it; and the way the title is introduced suggests a recognized office, though doubtless not as well defined as it later became in the church (1 Tim 3:8-13)'.[45]

Phoebe's title διάκονος shows her leadership role exercised in the church of Cenchreae, although it cannot be placed in the set hierarchy of the developed constitution of the church. Paul's use of the term in Rom 16:1 is the same as his use for his fellow workers as well as himself. The correct rendering would be a minister of the church of Cenchreae. Although there is no question of the fully fledged office of diaconate at the early stage, Phoebe could be identified as διάκονος, a women of recognized status and significance. Having looked at the διάκονος role of Phoebe, I will focus on the next significant title προστάτις.

4.2.2. Προστάτις

Of all the women associates of Paul, Phoebe has a unique place, since she is the only woman entitled διάκονος of a specific church. Alongside this, Paul uses a special title προστάτις (Rom 16:2) to describe her function and role in relation to his ministry, which is also a unique word in the entire New Testament. Even though the details of her activities are not clearly depicted in the epistle, it is possible to deduce her role and function in the community of Cenchreae from the titles used. Epigraphic evidence suggests that there were female 'patrons', who took an active part in voluntary associations and guilds, and patronage was a well established institution in the first century.[46]

This section attempts to make a study of the term προστάτις in order to find out the meaning with regard to Phoebe in Rom 16:2. After analysing different translations and interpretations, I will suggest what role Phoebe had probably played as the προστάτις of many and of Paul himself.

---

[45] Bassler, 'Phoebe', 135.
[46] See for more discussion chapter 3.

4.2.2.1. Translations and Interpretations

Προστάτις is the feminine form of προστάτης and is used for a sponsor of a private association. Προστάτης could mean one who stands before as the leader, president or ruler, or one who stands to protect as a guardian, champion or patron.[47] The title occurs in six Jewish inscriptions in which it is difficult to differentiate between the meanings whether leader or patron is the suitable translation.[48] Trebilco comments that the inscriptions testify that 'there was often more than one προστάτης in the community and that it was a significant position in some synagogues'.[49] In the LXX, the term has the meaning of 'leader' or 'ruler' and not 'patron'. Josephus and Philo used both meanings such as 'leader' or 'patron' and 'champion' as well. Philo usually employs προστάτης and προστασία in the sense of the title or office of the 'president' of the community.[50] It is also important to note that the term is commonly used in the ancient world to denote 'the patron of a pagan religious society', who looked after 'the group's interests'.[51] The role of μήτηρ συναγωγῆς is assumed to have parallel roles with that of προστάτης.[52]

Προστάτις has been translated in different forms as 'she has been a great assistance to many' (BGD); 'a helper of many' (RSV); 'a good friend to many' (NEB); 'a great help to many people' (NIV); 'has come to the help of many' (NJB); 'a benefactor of many' (NRSV). Whelan suggests that the problem concerning the

---

[47] *LSJ,* προστάτης, 1526-27.
[48] Horsley, *NewDocs,* 4:242. The inscriptions are *CPJ* 3, 1441 (Xenephyris); *CPJ* 2, 149 (Alexandria, the prostates of a loan society); *CPJ* 1, 101f. (Oxyrhynchos); *CIJ* 100 and 365 (Rome); *SEG* 29.969 (Naples).
[49] Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor,* 109.
[50] Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor,* 109. See also J. M. Reynolds and R. Tannenbaum, *Jews and God Fearers at Aphrodisias: Greek Inscriptions with Commentary.* PCPSSV vol.12 (Cambridge Philological Society, 1987), 41. In the LXX it translates the word ruler (1 Chr 27:31; 29:6; 2 Chr 8:10), overseer (2 Chr 24: 11) and commissioner (2 Chr 24:11). See also 1 Esdras 2:12 (cf. 6:18; Sir 45:24; 2 Macc 3:4. In Josephus προστάτης means patron nine times (e.g. *Ant* 14: 157, 444), leader nine times (e.g. *BJ* 1:633), and champion once (*BJ* 2:135); Philo uses the term three times with meanings leader, patron and champion (*Virt.* 155; *Abr.* 221).
[51] Trebilco, *Jewish Communities,* 109.
[52] Brooten, *Women Leaders,* 65. See 3.6.4

translation of the term is in connection with the 'hidden assumptions of Bible translators regarding the position of women in primitive Christianity and more importantly a lack of understanding of the position of women in the imperial period'.[53] Let me analyse the different renderings.

i. Helper

A number of English versions translate προστάτις as helper. They are such as 'succourer' (KJV), 'helper' (RSV, NAS, and NKJV), 'a great help' (NIV), and 'has come to the help of' (NJB). Some commentators also interpret with the same meaning. For example, Käsemann suggests that 'προστάτις … cannot in the context have the juridical sense of the masculine form, i.e. the leader or representative of a fellowship. There is no reference, then to a "patroness" who could not take on legal functions…. The idea is that of personal care which Paul and others have received at the hand of the deaconess'.[54]

The possibility of interpreting in this line may be: 1) the cognate verb προΐστημι has the meaning 'to have an interest in, show concern for, care for, and give aid';[55] 2) the term προστάτις and the request of Paul to assist (παραστῆτε) Phoebe in whatever she needs has resulted in some of the manuscripts (F, G) replacing προστάτις by παραστάτις. On the basis of the request of Paul 'to receive her worthily of the saints' and 'to stand by her in whatever she requires of you', the term is rendered as 'she has been the assistant (παραστάτις) of many and Paul as well' and corresponding to the activity of διάκονος translated as 'helper'. However, as we have discussed in the previous section, the rendering as helper is

---

[53] See Whelan, 'Amica Pauli', 69.
[54] Käsemann, *Romans*, 411; see also Barrett, *Romans*, 282-283. Although Cranfield assumes a general sense of a 'helper' role for Phoebe, he agrees that Phoebe is possessed of 'some social position, wealth and independence'; Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:782.
[55] *BDAG*, 870.

unlikely in the context of Rom 16:2.[56] The lexical evidence indicates it should be translated as 'protectress' or 'patroness', and it is misleading to translate προστάτις as helper, since those who were in the position of προστάτις enjoyed a high position, and were far more than 'assistants' to others.

ii. *Leader or president of the congregation*

Another suggestion is that it could be translated as leader or president of the congregation. The arguments[57] are based on:

a) The related term προΐστημι in 1 Thess 5:12: 1 Tim 3:4-5, and 5:17, which speaks about someone with authority and who presides over or governs a community of believers.

b) The masculine form of the noun προστάτης is used for stewards of the king's property or for the chief officers over the people (1 Chr 27:31; 2 Chr 8:10; 24:11; Esd 2:12; Sir 45:24; 2 Macc 3:4).

c) Justin Martyr used the word προστάτης for a person presiding over the communion (*First Apology* 65).

d) The passive form ἐγενήθη in the clause describes an appointment to an office; the clause καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴ προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ should be rendered 'for she has been appointed, actually by my own action, an officer presiding over many'.

These arguments have their own shortcomings, since προστάτις is used here not in relation to the church but to individuals. Also it is worth considering how she could be the president of Paul and many others as well. It is also dubious to take the

---

[56] Fiorenza, 'Missionaries', 425.
[57] This argument is put forward by R. R. Schulz, 'A Case for 'President' Phoebe in Romans 16:2', *LTJ* 24 (1990), 124-27; see also E. Y. Ng, 'Phoebe as *Prostatis*', *TJ* 25 (2004), 3-13, at 4.

phrase καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ as indicating the agent of the action. The idea of presidency is unlikely in this case.[58]

iii. Patroness, Protectress, Benefactress

The appropriate translation could be patroness, protectress or benefactor. The rendering 'benefactor' is adopted by NRSV and TNIV and recent commentators also interpret along this line.[59]

This line of interpretation is built upon assumptions such as that προστάτις is equivalent to the more common προστάτης, the masculine counterpart, and that the Greek words are equivalent to the Latin words *patronus* and *patrona*. The Latin equivalent, *patronus* is used to refer to patronage of collegia or clubs.[60] It is possible to argue that Phoebe is similar to the patrons/patronesses of individuals, of voluntary associations, clubs, and professional guilds. Hence she may be offering monetary support, procuring political advantages, serving as legal representative for individuals, opening her house to receive visitors or provide meeting grounds, etc. Reynolds and Tannenbaum suggest that the position of the patronage, if it refers to the community, would be similar to that of *pater* or *mater* of synagogues and would be similar to that of the Hellenistic cult societies.[61] Judge evaluates that the better attested meaning 'protectress' suffered from appearing to assign Phoebe a much higher social status than might have been anticipated,[62] an issue which will be discussed in the following section.

---

[58] Murray, *Romans*, 2:227; Schreiner, *Romans*, 788.
[59] Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 887; Jewett, *Romans,* 946, 947. See also B. Reike, 'προΐστημι' *TDNT* 6, 700-703, at 703; *MM*, 551.
[60] Trebilco, *Jewish Communities*, 116; R. MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations*: 50 BC to AD 284 (London: Yale University Press, 1974), 74-76.
[61] Reynolds and Tannenbaum, *Jews and God Fearers*, 41.
[62] E. A. Judge, 'Cultural Conformity and Innovation in Paul: Some Clues from Contemporary Documents', *TynBul* 35 (1984), 3-24, at 21.

4.2.2.2. The Social status of Phoebe

There are differing views about the social status of Phoebe. On the one hand, many scholars suggest that she is a woman of high social standing, since προστάτις denotes an 'upper class benefactor'[63] and base their argument on the fact that she is a wealthy patron, and that the references to the offices, households, and help rendered to the congregation and the fact that she has funds to travel give us evidence of the social status of a person and that the role of wealthier women in the early church is well attested in providing hospitality and the place of meeting and leading roles in the congregations.[64]

On the other hand, some scholars suggest that wealth is not a guiding factor to decide independence and influence. For example, Meggitt suggests that it is not plausible to infer that the individuals mentioned by Paul in his letters are mentioned due to the fact that they were 'elite or prosperous in society'.[65] He argues in relation to Phoebe as follows; a) independence could not be regarded as a deciding factor to determine whether she is elite or non-elite;[66] b) the term προστάτις cannot be regarded in a manner pointing to her wealth; c) Phoebe's ability to travel cannot be

---

[63] Theissen, *Social Setting of Pauline Christianity,* 252-57. The other scholars who share a similar view about the leading role of male and female upper class benefactors in early Christian communities are Holmberg, Funk, Murphy-O'Connor, Meeks, Kearsley, Trebilco, Garrison. Jewett portrays Phoebe as the patron for the Spanish mission; see Jewett, *Romans,* 947; Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 57; Kearsley, 'Women in the Public East', 189-211; Trebilco, *Jewish Communities*, 109.

[64] S. R. Llewelyn, 'Changing the Legal Jurisdiction', *NewDocs* 9, 45-53, at 50.

[65] Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty, and Survival*, 134. Meggitt proposes that the reference to the household with slaves, hospitality and material help rendered to the members of the community and travel are not secure evidence of a high social-economic status in the Pauline community. See Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 128-135.

[66] Meggitt agrees that Phoebe is definitely an independent woman since she is not mentioned with any male name and also she is capable of conducting business tours, but non-elite as well as the elite woman enjoyed independence. See Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 145; cf. A. Cameron, 'Neither Male nor Female', *GR* 27 (1980), 60-68, at 62, 63. Cameron in her article remarks that the women of lower and middle-classes 'lived relatively active lives' in the late republican and early imperial Rome and Phoebe, although not belonging to the upper-class, is certainly of substantial means.

'an indicator' of her elite status.[67] Rather he agrees that Phoebe had some significant contribution in Pauline communities but not on the basis of her wealth as a source of travel. Although Phoebe did not play the traditional role of a patron, he agrees that Paul's words indicate her significant position in the church at Cenchreae.[68]

Moreover, Meggitt doubts whether Paul is using προστάτις for Phoebe in a sense of 'social superiority'.[69] His argument is based on three issues: firstly, she is not equal to the patrons of Greco-Roman world; secondly, he infers that χρῄζῃ πράγματι is a request for material help for Phoebe, which is unusual in a patron-client relationship, where patrons required political or social support in return; thirdly, sending a recommendation on behalf of a patron is quite unusual in Paul's day since the recommendee was socially inferior to the patron and not superior.

Having described the above two viewpoints, my suggestions are; firstly, Phoebe is not necessarily elite nor of high status, but rather, relatively wealthy when compared to the members of the church of Cenchreae; secondly, patron in the full technical sense of the Greco-Roman world is unwarranted; however, she has some informal benefactress role. Thirdly, I disagree with Meggitt that Paul requested material help for Phoebe, since the expression does not point to any specific help, but is an open-ended request.

What made Paul recommend Phoebe to the church at Rome? What is the significance of their relationship? The ancient letters of recommendation testify to recommendees in two different ways: one as inferior to the letter writer, as a client

---

[67] Meggitt suggests that there were lower class patrons and travel could be by various means and not much to do with wealth and status. Lydia and Phoebe are misrepresented as 'wealthy, entrepreneurial, independent women', since most women were denied access to the economic resources and their jobs were basic, not skilled jobs. See Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival,* 69, 78, 144.
[68] Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival,* 149.
[69] Meggitt*, Paul, Poverty and Survival,* 146-148.

to the writer, and the other as more or less social equals.[70] In the light of Romans 16, an inferior role of Phoebe can hardly be found. Rather on the basis of her social role as προστάτις and ecclesiastical role as διάκονος, it is far more plausible to find mutuality in the relationship between Paul and Phoebe. Whelan suggests that Phoebe being described as 'the patron of many and of myself' implies that Paul accepts her as his social superior to some extent.[71] That Phoebe was merely a financial benefactor is less clear but both share their honour and prestige acting in reciprocity: Phoebe as the patron of Paul and Paul as recommending or sponsoring her. Whelan rightly suggests that patronage here implies 'mutual obligation' or reciprocity.[72]

Therefore, I suggest that there is a concept of mutual obligation in the relationship between Paul and Phoebe rather than social superiority. It is not one-way patronage, but the model of patronage is taken up into a relationship of mutuality and reciprocity. Thus Phoebe seems to be an influential figure with relative wealth (to entertain guests at her home) and some social position, being a benefactor of many as well as of Paul.

4.2.2.3. Function of Phoebe as Προστάτις

On the basis of the preceding discussion, it appears that Phoebe played the role of a benefactor or patron, and our next task is to discover in what sense she is the προστάτις to Paul as well as many.

---

[70] Whelan, 'Amica Pauli', 80, 81. The first type shows an unequal relationship and the writer may be superior to the recommendee, while in the second type, the writer assumes the role of a mediator introducing the person to a new group of friends. The recommendee being the superior of the writer is rarely found.

[71] Whelan, 'Amica Pauli', 83. That Phoebe is the social superior of Paul to some extent is accepted by Jewett as well as Judge. See Jewett, 'Spanish Mission', 149-50; Judge, 'Cultural Conformity and Innovation in Paul', 21. Bieringer suggests Phoebe is 'superior of Paul' which is not likely; R. Bieringer, 'Women and Leadership in Romans 16: The Leading Roles of Phoebe, Prisca, and Junia in Early Christianity: Part I', *East Asian Pastoral Review* 44 (2007), 221-237, at 235.

[72] Whelan, 'Amica Pauli', 84. There is a sense of mutual indebtedness between Paul and Phoebe. Whelan suggests Phoebe is sent to the Ephesian church, while I consider that Phoebe is sent to the church in Rome and that Romans 16 is an integral part of the letter to the Romans. See above 1.3.

The different possible roles may be such as[73]

1.   Patron of the congregation of Cenchreae

2.   Legal representative of individuals

3.   Patron-client relationship

4.   Benefaction in terms of hospitality and practical help

There is no way to think that Phoebe worked as merely an assistant or helper since she is acknowledged by the same title as the patrons in associations and guilds. Phoebe is neither described as a προστάτις of the church of Cenchreae nor explicitly in a juridical or technical sense. Moreover, it is also doubtful whether a patron-client relationship in the Greco-Roman world was involved in the relationship between Phoebe and Paul. However, what is more explicitly suggested is the notion of reciprocity involved in the request on behalf of Phoebe. The benefaction system involves reciprocal relations within networks, and the characteristic of these relations involves exchange of benefits or gifts of numerous kinds in return for appropriate honours. 'Relations were reciprocal in the sense that both the benefactor and the beneficiary had something to gain from the exchange, whether tangible or otherwise'.[74]

Most scholars who agree on the benefactor role of Phoebe assume her role of hospitality.[75] Her benefaction could be compared to that of Junia Theodora, who welcomed Lycian travellers and citizens in her own house and looked after their interests.[76] Unlike Junia in a civic or federal capacity with a particular ethnic group, Phoebe acted as a patron to many individuals, presumably saints, for she 'has been a patron of many and myself also' (προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ;

---

[73] Ng, 'Phoebe as *Prostatis*', 6-9.
[74] Harland, *Associations, Synagogues and Congregations*, 97.
[75] Schreiner, *Romans*, 788; Ng, '*Phoebe as Prostatis'*, 12.
[76] See above, 3.4. See also Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians*, 301-307.

Rom 16:2). She may have been 'a host to many and her sphere of influence was the church in Cenchreae in whose service she operated, possibly as her home'.[77]

The recipients of her patronage were 'many' (πολλῶν). They could have been those who were financially supported or used her contacts and influence on their behalf, possibly those residing in Cenchreae. If Phoebe's patronage is limited to the church of Cenchreae, Paul would have mentioned it more clearly as the προστάτις of the church. 'Many' implies that those who benefited from her patronage were uncountable. Paul himself was also the recipient of patronage which was expressed by a double pronoun καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ, emphasizing, perhaps, her patronage to his missionary work. As described above, the mutual obligation between Phoebe and Paul is significant.

The specific situation in which Phoebe extended patronage to many as well as Paul is unknown, but it can be assumed that hospitality is the main issue in consideration. Although Phoebe might be noted for hospitality like other women-associates in Pauline communities, I doubt whether Paul used the term προστάτις to refer only to her hospitable character. It could be assumed that Phoebe as the benefactor played a substantial role in the community and her contribution is significant as well as noteworthy and is to be reciprocated. Phoebe could have supplied 'aid to others, especially foreigners, providing housing and financial aid and representing their interests before local authorities'.[78] Thus we find a mixture of all the possible roles assigned for a patroness, including formal, legal and social expectations. As Fiorenza rightly affirms:

---

[77] Winter, *Roman Wives*, 195. Byrne suggests that through her ministry of hospitality, she earned recognition among her own community and among many believers passing through. See B. Byrne, *Romans* (Sacra Pagina Series 6; Collegeville: Liturgical, 1996), 448.

[78] Moo, *Romans*, 916. Benefaction included not only financial help, but also allowing clients to get access to social and economic resources as well. See Whelan, 'Amica Pauli', 84. Contra Ng, 'Phoebe as Prostatis', 9 (who suggests that Paul did not depend on Phoebe only for monetary benefits).

The well-to-do converts to Christianity must have expected to exercise the influence of a patron in the early Christian community. Christians such as Phoebe acted as benefactors for individual Christians and the whole church. In dealings with the government or the courts they represented the whole community. With their network of connections, friendships with well placed persons, and public influence, such benefactions eased the social life of other Christians in Greco-Roman society.[79]

The preceding study shows that Phoebe's title προστάτις is unique, since she is the only woman in the New Testament bearing this title, and significant with respect to her role as the benefactor. The correct rendering of the term προστάτις is 'benefactor', rather than helper or president. The notion of reciprocity is explicit in the request on behalf of her. Phoebe is probably an influential woman and a relatively wealthy person. Since she is presented as προστάτις 'of many and of myself (Paul) as well' (v.2) and not specifically as προστάτις of the church, the emphasis falls on her role as patron or benefactor, though the title reinforces her role as διάκονος. What was the intention of Paul in recommending Phoebe to the Romans? Were there any hidden motives like patronage for the Spanish mission? This will be the focus of discussion in the following section.

4.2.3. Expected Role: Patronage in the Spanish Mission?

4.2.3.1. Jewett's Thesis

Robert Jewett proposes that Phoebe's mission is solely the preparation for the Spanish mission as the main practical outcome of Romans.[80] He outlines the purpose of the letter to the Romans as follows: 'Paul wishes to gain support for a mission to the barbarians in Spain, which requires that the gospel of impartial, divine righteousness revealed in Christ be clarified to rid it of prejudicial elements

---

[79] Fiorenza, 'Missionaries, Apostles', 426.
[80] Jewett, *Romans,* 74-91, 941-948. See also Jewett, 'Paul, Phoebe, and the Spanish Mission', 142-161.

that are currently dividing the congregations in Rome'.[81] Jewett considers that the request in 16:2b (παραστῆτε αὐτῇ ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῄζῃ πράγματι) is important in determining the role of Phoebe. 'The "matter" is her missionary patronage, which she has provided for many others and now is providing for Paul, and this help is what Paul requests from the Roman congregations'.[82] Phoebe's presentation as the προστάτις (16:2c) describes her leadership role in the letter to the Romans and indicates her high social status. He suggests, as bearer of the letter, that Phoebe has some significant tasks such as 'to present the letter to the various congregations in Rome and discuss its contents and implications with church leaders',[83] and to bring about unity among the house churches in order to get the full support for the Spanish mission; to find 'suitable resources for the mission in Spain'.[84] He suggests that the greetings are 'the first stage of the recruitment process', and can be understood in relation to Phoebe's task to prepare the ground for Paul's visit to Rome.[85]

4.2.3.2. Evaluation of Jewett's View

Although Phoebe's role in Rome cannot be explicitly made out from the recommendation, Jewett correlates the role of Phoebe to her patronage for the Spanish mission on account of the background of Spain and Paul's desire to visit Spain as well. The inference could be given some weight if the purpose of Romans is only the Spanish mission. Although it is true that Paul is longing to expand his

---

[81] Jewett, *Romans*, 1. Jewett argues that Romans is an 'ambassadorial letter'; the 'theological argumentation' and the 'ethical admonitions' in the epistle to the Romans have as their purpose that of seeking the support of the believers in Rome, and also the success of 'the co-operative mission to evangelize Spain'. Jewett links Paul's use of the term 'barbarians' in Romans 1:14 to the picture of Spain, due to the evidence of uncivilized areas. Jewett, *Romans,* 44*,* 77. See also Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 305-307. Kümmel argues that Romans has a purpose of creating a 'base of operations' in Rome and to spread mission further to Spain, to preach Christ where he has not already been named (Rom 15:20); P. Stuhlmacher, 'The Theme of Romans', in K. P. Donfried, (ed.), *The Romans Debate* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 333-345; Jewett, *Romans*, 87. See for more discussion Jewett, *Romans*, 89-91.
[82] Jewett, *Romans*, 90.
[83] Jewett, *Romans*, 90. See also Jewett, 'Spanish Mission', 151.
[84] Jewett, *Romans*, 90
[85] Jewett, *Romans,* 946.

missionary enterprise to Spain (Spain is mentioned twice in his missionary plans in Romans; 15:24, 28), I doubt whether the unfavourable conditions in Spain as explained by Jewett were a barrier to his plan of mission. Moreover, it is unlikely that barbarians (Rom 1:14) were the uncultured people of Spain.[86] That the cultural, linguistic and political situation of Spain caused a barrier to begin the mission in Spain is unpersuasive when compared to the missionary strategy of Paul and the notion that he could not embark on his plan for the Spanish mission without the support and resources of the believers in Rome also lacks evidence in the epistle to the Romans. As Barclay rightly suggests, 'As a travelling artisan, he had learned to make his way in many different cities, and, as an 'apostle to the Gentiles' it is hard to imagine that he had *always* depended on local synagogue contacts (however Acts may portray matters)'.[87]

4.2.3.3. Πρᾶγμα

Jewett argues that πρᾶγμα in Rom 16:2 is a significant term to determine the role of Phoebe in the letter to the Romans, which merits discussion and evaluation. I do not agree that πρᾶγμα denotes Phoebe's missionary patronage.

My points of dissent are based on:

i.   Translation: the matter (τὸ) πρᾶγμα

ii. Analysis: relating the ἵνα and γάρ clauses to find the meaning of πρᾶγμα

iii. Interprétation: πρᾶγμα as Phoebe's patronage

i. Translation: Jewett's translation of the expression ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῄζῃ πράγματι ("she might need in the matter") is incorrect, because πρᾶγμα in the expression cannot be translated as 'the matter'. ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῄζῃ πράγματι

---

[86] Jewett links Paul's use of the term 'barbarian' in Romans 1:14 to the picture of Spain. Jewett, *Romans,* 77. The population live in 'villages and are wild and uncivilized'.

[87] J. M. G. Barclay, 'Is it Good News that God is Impartial?: A Response to Robert Jewett, Romans: A Commentary' *JSNT* 31 (2008), 89-111, at 94, 95. (Italics as given in the article)

is an indefinite clause used with the subjunctive and there is no definite article used in order to specify a particular thing.

The different translations of verse 2b do not give the meaning of πρᾶγμα in a precise manner, rather with an indefinite meaning. Examples include: 'and help her with anything she needs' (JB); 'and stand by her in any business in which she may need your help' (NEB); 'and help her in whatever she may require from you' (NRSV); 'and help her in whatever she may require from you' (RSV); 'and support her in any business in which she may need your help' (REB); 'and assist her in whatever business she has need of you' (NKJV). Therefore, I prefer the translation of v.2b: 'and help her in whatever matter she may need from you'.

ii. Analysis

Jewett's analysis of v.2 by relating the two ἵνα and γάρ clauses to find the purpose of recommendation seems to be unwarranted. That is, his way of relating πρᾶγμα to προστάτις is inaccurate on the basis of the analysis of the passage. The ἵνα (v.2a, 2b) clause introduces the two-fold purpose of Paul's letter of recommendation for Phoebe, whereas καὶ γάρ in v.2c signifies Phoebe as a person worthy of help, i.e. not as an elucidation of the πρᾶγμα itself.

The letter of recommendation for Phoebe has a similar style to that of the recommendation letters among the papyri and literary collections.[88]

The three similar features are:

a) the person introduced with name;

b) a brief statement of the qualifications or credentials of the person by referring to the relationship to the person recommending and other background information;

---

[88] Kim, *Greek Letter of Recommendation*, 7. See also Gamble, *Textual History*, 84.

c) request on behalf of the person recommended.[89]

The brief pericope (16:1, 2) has features similar to Paul's recommendations in other letters (Phil 4:2, 3; 1 Cor 16:15-18; 1 Thess 5:12-13a; Phlm 10-17). These commendations include features like introduction, qualifications of the person recommended and the desired role from the recipient. It is also significant to note that the Greek benefaction inscriptions have three vital components: the benefactor's efforts for official recognition; the award of honours by the Council and the people; and the reason for the endearment and approval of the person's status or position,[90] which are the same three features as in Phoebe's recommendation in Rom 16:1, 2.

Therefore, Jewett's technique of relating the two clauses to find the role of Phoebe is doubtful because the two clauses have different purposes in view. Rom 16:2 (a, b) is a ἵνα clause introducing the purpose of recommendation 'that you may receive her in the Lord in a manner worthy of the saints, and help her in whatever matter she may need from you', whereas v.2c begins with καὶ γάρ: 'for she has been a patron of many as well as of myself', re-emphasising her credentials.

iii. Interpretation

I disagree with Jewett's interpretation of πρᾶγμα as referring to a specific matter (the matter) in the letter of recommendation for Phoebe. His argument is based on his presupposition that the letter to the Romans has one main purpose of the Spanish Mission and so the role of Phoebe is so specific that 'the matter that Phoebe will bring to Rome has an integral relation to the purpose of the letter, and

---

[89] The request clause consists of ἵνα or ὅπως - purpose clause and a γάρ causal clause. See Kim, *Greek Letter of Recommendation*, 64.

[90] Winter, *Roman Wives*, 186.

Paul requests that the congregation provide whatever she needs to accomplish it'.[91]

Though Jewett's aim is to prove that the Spanish mission is the purpose of the letter to the Romans, I consider that the letter has several different purposes in view.[92]

I will argue that Jewett's interpretation of πρᾶγμα to find the role of Phoebe as well as the purpose of the whole letter is totally unjustifiable. I would like to build up my arguments by comparing Phoebe's letter with the ancient letters of recommendation and the exegetical analysis of the verse.

Jewett's basic thesis that the purpose of Phoebe's visit is mentioned in the letter of recommendation can be brought under scrutiny because the role of the recommendee is not usually mentioned in the letter of recommendation. The letters were carried with the individuals on their travel but the purpose of the journey is not stated.[93] Although 'in some cases the recipient of the letter is asked to do a definite favour for the person introduced, in about half of the letters where any favour is mentioned, it is of a quite general character'.[94]

The favour requested in the letters is usually general, without mentioning exactly the purpose of the visit, which is similar in Rom 16:2: αὐτὴν προσδέξησθε ἐν κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶς ἁγίων καὶ παραστῆτε αὐτῇ ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῄζῃ πράγματι. This request formula has a resemblance in terminology with that of the letters of recommendation.[95] The reasons why the recipient should do the favours requested is also not given in the letters, apart from the close relations to the writer

---

[91] Jewett, *Romans*, 946. He suggests that Phoebe needs no help in business, lawsuit and housing; however, the help she needed from the recipients of the letter is specific, i.e. help for the Spanish Mission.

[92] J. D. G Dunn, 'Romans', in *DPL* (Illinois: IVP, 1993), 838-846, at 839, 840; Käsemann also considers the Spanish mission as one of the purposes of the letter, Käsemann, *Romans*, 398. See also Wedderburn, *Reasons for Romans*, 97-102.

[93] S. R. Llewelyn, 'The Christian Letters of Recommendation', *NewDocs*, 8:170.

[94] Keyes, 'Greek Letter of Introduction', 40. 'To assist in whatever matter' is a general way of asking a favour (P. Cairo. Zen. 59101, 59192, 59284, PSI. 8, 969. P. Oxy 787, P. Giss 71, P. Giss 88). See also; Kim, *Recommendation,* 72.

[95] Keyes, 'Greek Letter of Introduction', 41. The different forms of the verbs δεχέσθαι and χρῇζειν are used in the common letters too.

or the virtues of the bearer of the letter (e.g. P. Oxy 1064, P. Flor 2, P. Giss 71).[96] Although most of the letters share common characteristics, there are peculiar forms for each letter.

4.2.3.4. Exegetical Analysis

The request of favour on Phoebe's behalf (16:2: παραστῆτε αὐτῇ ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῄζῃ πράγματι) could be interpreted in different ways in relation to some personal matter in business or lawsuit, which may be the aim of Phoebe's visit to Rome, on the basis of the use of πρᾶγμα. It could also have a sense of 'an open ended request for aid' in view of the expression ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῄζῃ.[97]

The word πρᾶγμα is used eleven times in the New Testament, of which four are in Pauline letters.[98] Paul's references to πρᾶγμα are: Rom 16:2 whatever matter (ἐν ᾧ ἂν χρῄζῃ πράγματι); 1 Cor 6:1; lawsuit (τις ὑμῶν πρᾶγμα ἔχων); 2 Cor 7:11 this very thing (τῷ πράγματι); 1 Thess 4:6 this matter (τῷ πράγματι). There is no definite article used in Rom 16:2 to specify a special matter; rather an indefinite clause is used with the subjunctive (ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῄζῃ πράγματι) 'in whatever matter she may need from you'.[99] Πρᾶγμα as used in 1 Corinthians refers to a lawsuit or dispute with a fellow brother as is clear from the context, whereas the other two (1 Thess 4:6; 2 Cor 7:11) are used with a definite article, with specific reference. Πρᾶγμα used without referring to a specific matter occurs only once in the Pauline letters, i.e. in Romans 16:2.

---

[96] In some of the literary letters, the reasons are given as 'because he has done favors to me' Chion. 2; 'because you wish to know good men' Plato 14; 'you will help both cities', Socrates 3; and 'because he praised you' Socratici 30.

[97] Kim, *Greek Letter of Recommendation*, 133.

[98] W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, *A Concordance to the New Testament*, I. H. Marshall (ed.) (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2002), 926. The other NT uses are Mt 18:19 anything (περὶ παντὸς πράγματος); Lk 1:1 those things (ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων); Acts 5:4 this thing (τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο); Heb 6:18 two things (δύο πραγμάτων); Heb 10:1 the good things (τῶν πραγμάτων); Heb 11:1 things (πραγμάτων); James 3:16 every evil thing (πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα).

[99] See also Barclay, 'Is it Good News that God is Impartial?', 95, 96.

Πρᾶγμα is generally used in the sense of matter, thing or affair.[100] It has different shades of meanings; that which is done, deed, thing, event, occurrence; that which is to be done, undertaking, occupation, task; in general, thing, matter, affair. Examples in the papyri include *P. Oxy* VI (ordinary meaning - an action or deed); P. Ryl II, P. Oxy IX (vaguer meaning - a matter or affair); P. Ryl II, P. Strass I (lawsuit cf. 1 Cor 6:1); P. Oxy IV (weaker sense of trouble); *Chrest. I.* (business, trade). Although Jewett suggests that πρᾶγμα has a vague meaning, it seems that he wants to fix it with a specific meaning, which is unjustified from a hermeneutical point of view.[101]

In the context of Romans 16:2, it could be presumably a task which is to be done. It is improbable to interpret this as a lawsuit or dispute, since the task is not to settle a dispute.[102] That Phoebe needs any help in her business is also less plausible, since she is a woman, who helped a number of Christian missionaries and she is a 'patron of many'. But the indefinite use of πρᾶγμα could mean that in different matters Phoebe could stand in need of the help of the Romans and in all such matters they need to assist her.[103] The indeterminate expression implies an open-ended request to provide whatever help the person requires.[104] Therefore Jewett's reading of the verse to find the meaning of πρᾶγμα denoting her patronage is unlikely because the purpose of Phoebe's visit is not specifically pointed out in v.2.

Thus it is clear that Jewett's translation, analysis and interpretation of Rom 16:2 (or πρᾶγμα) in order to determine the expected role of Phoebe in Rome is highly questionable. I infer that the expected role of Phoebe in Rome is not explicit in the letter of recommendation, as Jewett considers. I prefer verse 2b to be

---

[100] *BDAG*, 858, 859; *MM*, 532; G. Friedrich, (ed.) 'πρᾶγμα' *TDNT* 6, 638-40**.**
[101] Jewett, *Romans*, 946.
[102] Dunn suggests that 'there is sufficient testimony of women acting as independent litigants'. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 888. See also Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 731.
[103] Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:782; Moo, *Romans*, 915; Käsemann, *Romans*, 411.
[104] Example: Athanaeus, *Deipn.* 10.74.10; Jewett, *Romans*, 945, 946.

translated as 'and help her in whatever matter she may need from you'. The analysis of the passage shows that the matter is not specific. The request of favour on behalf of Phoebe implies that the believers in Rome have to assist her in various matters (whatever matter). ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῄζῃ πράγματι is not denoting 'the matter', but is a general way of asking favours from the recipients in a letter of recommendation. The clause beginning with γάρ is re-emphasizing the credentials of Phoebe that she is a woman worthy of help and that she is the προστάτις of many as well as Paul. Therefore, the request on Phoebe's behalf could imply certain significant characteristics: she has an indefinite number of significant tasks; she is worthy of undertaking those tasks and she is worthy of assistance.

4.2.4. Relation of Reciprocity

The underlying fact in the entire passage is the relation of reciprocity. The relation of reciprocity is precipitated to a notable degree between Paul and Phoebe, and he wants to extend this to the relationship between Phoebe and the Romans. The way of presenting Phoebe to the Romans is significant in many respects since reciprocity is very much implicit in the letter of recommendation. As I have described some of the key ideas in the preceding sections, my next venture is to make apparent the most significant aspect of the relationship, which Paul wants to communicate to the Romans, which is not equality, inferiority, or superiority, but mutuality. The relations of reciprocity can be seen in the structure of the passage, in the sibling relationship, and in the request for welcome and assistance.

4.2.4.1. Structure of the Passage

Mutuality is evident from the structure of Rom 16:1-2.

a. what Phoebe has done for others:

v.1 οὖσαν διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς

b. what Romans have to do for her:

v.2a προσδέξησθε ἐν κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων καὶ παραστῆτε αὐτῇ ἐν ᾧ ἄν ὑμῶν χρῄζῃ πράγματι

a´. what Phoebe has done for others:

v.2b προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ

Structure a + a´ shows the relationship between Paul and Phoebe, and also Phoebe and many others, while (a + a´) + b also calls for a pattern of mutuality between Phoebe and the believers in Rome. What Paul and others have received from Phoebe is worth giving her back. There may be a question regarding by what means the Romans received her help in order to reciprocate. It could be inferred that Paul's portrayal of Phoebe as 'our sister' has implications for the believers in Rome as well. It is possible to think that the believers of Rome could have received Phoebe's help as a προστάτις (of many). Precisely by putting this in such general terms, Paul includes a wide possible circle of beneficiaries.

4.2.4.2. Sibling Relationship (ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν)

Paul introduces Phoebe first to the Romans as 'our sister' ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν (v.1). The use of the feminine ἀδελφή in contrast to masculine ἀδελφός in Phoebe's recommendation is worth noting. This shows that the designation of woman fellow-Christian as 'sister' seems to have been particularly characteristic of Christianity (1 Cor 7:15; 9:5; Phlm 2; James 2:15).[105] The reference to Phoebe as 'our sister' shows her membership in the Christian community. 'It carries the nuance of her solidarity with Paul as well as with all other Christians in Rome and

---

[105] Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 886. There are also examples in *Ign. Pol.* 5.1; *2 Clem.* 12.5; 19.1; 20. 2; *Herm.* 2.2.3; 2.3. The Papyri letters of recommendation (PSI III 208, PSI IX 1041, P. Alex 29, P. Oxy XXXVI 2785, *SB* X 10255, SB III 7269, P. Oxy VIII 1162, SB XVI 12304 and *P. Oxy* LV1 3857) also use familial languages like 'sister', 'brother', daughter, catechumen etc. in introducing the person who is travelling. The familial titles imply the Christian context of the letters with ecclesiastical connotations. See Llewelyn, *NewDocs,* 6:171.

elsewhere'.[106] Dunn indicates that ἡμῶν denotes a universal meaning: the concept of international brotherhood and sisterhood or the role of Phoebe in relation to the churches as a whole.[107] However, Aasgaard points out that the sibling metaphor used in Phoebe's case is associated with particular status and authority; the responsibility includes both internal and external affairs: a role in the church and involvement in the proclamation of Christ to outsiders.[108]

4.2.4.3. Reciprocity in Hospitality and Assistance

The purpose of the recommendation is stated with a ἵνα clause to welcome her with full hospitality and to provide her with whatever she needs (v.2). How is reciprocity attached to these requests? How is Paul emphasizing Phoebe's action for others, in order to prove that she is worth receiving it back?

The first purpose of recommendation is stated in the expression: αὐτὴν προσδέξησθε ἐν κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων. There are differing views among the scholars regarding προσδέξησθε. On the one hand, it indicates a general way of showing hospitality and on the other, welcome has some relation to her ecclesiastical position as the leader of the church because of the use of the phrases 'ἐν κυρίῳ' and 'ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων'. Käsemann thinks welcome may be meant in the sense of offering her lodging and help in a 'secular way'.[109] Cranfield suggests that the expression has some significance in relation to her role in the church since the phrase 'in the Lord' is added to it.[110] In the secular letters of recommendation

---

[106] Jewett, 'Paul, Phoebe and the Spanish Mission', 148.

[107] Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 886.

[108] Aasgaard, '*My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!',* 297-298. The person's sibling status appears to be related to their roles as missionary co-workers. Cf. 1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; Phlm 1; 1 Thess 3:2; 2 Cor 2:12f; Phil 2:25: Sosthenes, Timothy, Titus, Epaphroditus are Paul's messengers and co-workers in missionary endeavour.

[109] Käsemann, *Romans*, 411.

[110] Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:781-782. Cranfield suggests the expression 'worthy of the saints' is superfluous. But ἄξιος was an important term used in the Roman government to demonstrate honour, rank, office, esteem, worthiness. Jewett thinks the meaning is the same as in Phil 2:29, concerning welcoming back Epaphroditus; Jewett, *Romans*, 945; Jewett, 'Spanish Mission', 150. It probably has

προσδέξεσθαι is used with respect to the hospitality given to the bearer of the letter.[111] The phrase 'worthy of the saints' throws light on the fact that she should be welcomed as a fellow believer (cf. Rom 12:13).

Earlier Paul had exhorted the Romans to welcome (προσλαμβάνεσθε) one another 'just as Christ welcomed (προσελάβετο) you, to the glory of God' (Rom 15:7). The special motive is that the welcome should be in a Christian manner, as that of someone who belongs to Christ.[112] Welcoming or receiving has nuances such as showing hospitality and having fellowship. Hospitality has a significant place in the Christian community. Προσδέχομαι often appears in the letters of recommendation but Paul adds two phrases ἐν κυρίῳ and ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων in his requests to welcome Phoebe.

The second request on Phoebe's behalf is to 'help her in whatever matter she may need from you'. As noted in the section under πρᾶγμα, it has a sense of 'an open-ended request for aid' in view of the expression ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῄζῃ.[113] I suggest Paul's requests for favours are based on her role as προστάτις for many and for Paul as well. In the recommendation for Phoebe, her action for others is given as substantial evidence to show that Phoebe is fit for receiving favours from Romans. Therefore the contribution from Romans is not a futile move, but rather is repaying or reciprocating her contributions to a wider community including Paul.

To conclude, Phoebe as the διάκονος plays an important leadership role in the church of Cenchreae. Also, her role is stated in the title προστάτις of many as well

---

the connotation that Phoebe is to be welcomed with honour. Goodspeed suggests since Phoebe is a person of high social status, and welcome has some connotation of giving her good housing: Goodspeed, 'Phoebe's Letter of Introduction', 56.

[111] The prepositional phrase used with προσδέχομαι has the function of reminding the letter recipients to offer 'proper hospitality to the recommended person'; example, P. Oxy LXI 3857; See, S. R. Llewelyn, *NewDocs*, 8:171.

[112] Moo, *Romans*, 915; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 731.

[113] See above 4.2.3.3.

as Paul. Her expected role to the Romans should not be limited to the Spanish mission, since πρᾶγμα is not a definite matter in the request for help. The chiasm of the passage is woven in such a way as to show the significant aspect of reciprocity. Her action for others needs to be reciprocated and she is a woman qualified for hospitality as well as help in whatever matter she needs. This gives an insight about Phoebe's contribution to the Pauline mission on the one hand and on the other, Paul's way of presenting her and his desire of reciprocating her actions on behalf of many as well as himself.

4.3. The Role of Prisca (Rom 16:3, 4, 5)

Ἀσπάσασθε Πρίσκαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν τοὺς συνεργούς μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, οἵτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν, οἷς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστῶ ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶς ἐθνῶν, καὶ τὴν κατ᾽ οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν.

'Greet Prisca and Aquila, who work with me in Christ Jesus, and who risked their necks for my life, to whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles. Greet also the church in their house'. (NRSV)

Prisca and Aquila[114] were a couple who made significant contributions to the early Christian mission, as Jerome Murphy-O'Connor puts it, 'the most prominent couple involved in the first-century expansion of Christianity'.[115] Paul's greeting in Romans 16:3 and the fact that their names come first in the long list of greetings illustrate their acquaintance with him and their significant contribution to his

---

[114] Prisca and Aquila are mentioned as a pair in the New Testament. The diminutive form Priscilla is used in Acts (Acts 18:2, 3; and 18:18, 26) whereas the proper form Prisca is used in the Pauline epistles. Although Aquila was described in Acts as a certain Jew, a man of Pontus by race, we are told nothing about Prisca's origins. Both names are Latin and there is no clue about their ethnic origin. See Cranfield, *Romans*, 374; J. M. Bassler, 'Prisca/ Priscilla', in C. Meyers, (ed.), *Women in Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 136, 137, at 136.

[115] Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, 'Prisca and Aquila: Travelling Tentmakers and Church Builders' *BRev* 8 (1992), 40-51, at 40. See also F. Gillman, who suggests Prisca as 'one of the cosmopolitan and well-traveled women mentioned in the New Testament tradition'; F. M. Gillman, *Women Who Knew Paul* (Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), 49.

missionary enterprise (Rom 16:3-6). The special characteristics of the greetings to Prisca[116] and Aquila are: 1) Prisca's name is mentioned first; 2) It is combined with a cluster of appreciations (descriptive phrases) and thanks not only from Paul but also a large group from all the churches of the Gentiles; 3) It is the longest in the list showing their prominence among the people in the group of greetings; 4) The greetings are directed to them as well as to the church in their house. These features signify the zealous nature of their involvement in mission. The special rhetorical work, which Paul employs to describe this couple, is also significant to explore.

The account in Acts 18 gives a picture of their background and relationship to Paul. It is possible to assume that they had been leaders in Rome and actively involved in mission prior to Paul's coming to Corinth. Due to the edict of Claudius in 49 CE by which Jews had been expelled from Rome, they moved to Corinth and based their business and ministry in Corinth (Acts 18:2). Paul, while on his second missionary journey, met them at Corinth and stayed with them by virtue of the same vocation, tent-making (Acts 18:3). After eighteen months of their stay at Corinth, they moved to Ephesus with Paul (Acts 18:18-19). It was from Ephesus that Paul sends greetings from Prisca and Aquila's church to the church in Corinth (1 Cor 16:8, 19). By the time of Romans 16:3 they may have returned to Rome after the lapse of the edict in 54 CE. Later, they were again in Ephesus (2 Tim 4:19).

This section attempts to deduce the role of Prisca and her contribution to the Pauline mission and analyze the rhetorical method Paul uses while speaking about her and Aquila. Was her role related to her higher social status? What sort of leadership did she play, as she is mentioned as συνεργός as well as one who risked her life for Paul? What is the reason for the Gentile churches' indebtedness to her?

---

[116] Her name indicates that she was probably freeborn as it was not a slave name. See P. Lampe, 'Prisca', *ABD* 5, 467-468, at 467.

Why was it important for Paul to greet the church in her house? How was she engaged in ministry along with her husband Aquila? I will discuss these issues in four sections: firstly, the social status of Prisca; secondly, her contribution to the Pauline mission; and, thirdly, the relational aspect embedded in the passage; and finally, the rhetorical analysis of the passage.

4.3.1. Social Status

In our journey to discover the social status of Prisca (and Aquila), we deal with two important issues: whether she belonged to an affluent group and the reason for putting Prisca's name first when mentioned with her husband.

The social status of Prisca and Aquila has been widely debated. On the one hand, scholars have suggested that they are of 'relatively high status because of their patronage of Paul, frequent travels, and the capacity to own property in Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome, large enough for house churches'.[117] On the other, on the basis of Aquila's trade and the travel costs, it is imagined that they need not be of high status.[118] The criteria suggesting high status and social significance (hospitality to the meetings of the saints and references to travel), according to Meggitt 'are not sustainable grounds for regarding an individual as wealthy'; he concludes that they did not differ in their economic status from the rest of the church members or

---

[117] Jewett, *Romans*, 956; Theissen, *Social Setting of Pauline Christianity,* 90; Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 59.

[118] Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 195. Lampe suggests a lower status is possible because of the trade of Aquila and that the cost of travel is also affordable to lower class people. See Lampe, *Paul to Valentinus*, 192-195. However, Hock suggests that for Paul, tent-making did not mean great wealth, reputation nor prestige (1 Cor 4:11-13; cf. 2 Cor 11:7; cf. 1 Cor 9:18f) but μόχθος (1 Thess 2:9). See R. F. Hock, 'Paul's Tent-making and the Problem of His Social Class', *JBL* 97 (1978), 555-74 at 555-64. *Contra* Hock, Jewett suggests that this argument is not convincing and does not explain all the evidence, since he suggests: 'Prisca's house in the elegant Aventine quarter of Rome and that the names of Prisca and possibly also Aquila were associated with the noble Acilius family indicates a higher social niveau'. Jewett, *Romans*, 956, 957. *Contra* Jewett, Lampe suggests lots of scepticism regarding this opinion, Lampe, 'Prisca', 468.

society.[119] As Meggitt observes, the economic status of a person is not necessarily related to a person's desire to be hospitable to others and neither to the ability to travel. Paul's description about the couple also gives no clue about their social status except their acquaintance with him and their involvement in ministry (there is evidence of their trade as tent making in Acts 18:3). However, it is neither plausible to assume a high social status and that they belonged to an affluent group, nor to assign them to a much lower status. It seems that they were relatively wealthy and influential in the Christian community because of their support for Paul and their active roles in house churches, wherever they had travelled.[120]

Out of the six references to the couple in the New Testament, Prisca is named first in four of them (Acts 18:18, 26; 2 Tim 4:19; and Rom 16:3), whereas Aquila is mentioned first in Acts 18:2 and 1 Cor 16:19 by giving preference to the male name.[121] It is rare for a female's name in a married couple to come first and this is the only case in the Pauline epistles. It is possible that Prisca is of higher social status, and more prominent and knowledgeable than Aquila (Rom 16:3; 2 Tim 4:19; Acts 18:18, 26).[122]

---

[119] Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 134, 135. He argues that hospitality is not indicative of elite status since the desire of one to give others is a matter of fact rather than wealth. The hospitality practised in antiquity does not signify the economic status of an individual. For example, the poor market gardener (*hortulanus*) in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* extended hospitality to a traveller in spite of his poor condition to afford the visitor. See Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8. 631 (Philemon and Baucus). In addition, people travelled for different reasons: business, work, health, religion, sport, tourism etc. The means of travel also vary from expensive to inexpensive and travel *per se* cannot indicate status in the first century world. See Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 132-134.

[120] L. Gaston, 'Faith in Romans 12 in the Light of the Common Life of the Roman Church', in J. V. Hills (ed.), *Common Life in the Early Church: Essays Honoring Graydon F. Snyder* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 258- 264, at 260. See also P. Oakes, *Reading Romans in Pompeii: Paul's Letter at Ground Level* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 76-77.

[121] Kurek-Chomycz lists the textual variants and he suggests, 'It cannot be excluded that some of the textual variants in the passages mentioning Prisca and Aquila in Pauline epistles, ... may be understood as intended to diminish the importance of Prisca'. D. A. K-Chomycz, 'Is there an "Anti-Priscan" Tendency in the Manuscripts? Some Textual Problems with Prisca and Aquila', *JBL* 125 (2006), 107-128, at 128.

[122] Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*, 59; Dunn*, Romans 9-16,* 892: Prisca was the more dominant of the two or of higher social status and she may have provided the financial resources for the business. Other opinions are that Prisca may be the more gifted than Aquila, the one who brought most money into the marriage, or the one who was mostly contributing to their 'home-based'

It seems that she, rather than Aquila may be Paul's sponsor, which denotes her active partnership in the house church leadership. Winter argues that placing a wife's name ahead of the husband's would indicate that the wife was of a higher rank or social status than he.[123] However, although it is difficult to prove the higher status of Prisca, I assume that her prominence was due to her leadership role in the early Christian missionary movement,[124] since the greeting verb is directed to the couple with preference for Prisca's name and to the house church as well; 'Greet Prisca and Aquila … and the church in their house' (v. 3, 4).

4.3.2. Contribution to the Pauline Mission

The greetings are due to the couple by virtue of their devotion to the ministry as well as to Paul himself. They are portrayed as his fellow workers and as having risked their lives for Paul. Both these descriptions require further elaboration.

4.3.2.1. συνεργός

Paul begins the greetings in Rom 16 by designating Prisca and Aquila as συνεργοί μου (my co-workers, v.3). The personal pronoun 'μου' emphasizes their relationship to Paul and is thus more significant than ἡμῶν, in a collective sense. The phrase 'my co-workers in Christ Jesus', seems to imply their Christian work as colleagues. The places where they were with him as co-workers were Corinth and Ephesus, where they had resided when they were expelled from Rome due to Claudius' edict. They may have gone back to Rome by the time of Paul's writing of

---

ministry. Fiorenza finds the reason for her prominence may be her higher status, or her prominence in mission or both. Fiorenza, 'Missionaries, Apostles, Co-workers', 428.

[123] 'In the Roman colony of Pompeii women alongside their husbands were actively supporting candidates for civic office'. Winter, *Roman Wives*, 180. MacMullen comments that 'it is also common to have a woman's name written ahead of man's … an inversion of status explained by neither of the parties having any sense of status between them at all, or by the woman being free or freed, the man freed or slave'. See MacMullen, 'Women in Public in the Roman Empire', 209. See above chapter 3, section 3.3

[124] *Contra* Jewett, who asserts that it is less plausible to suggest she was more active in house church leadership. Jewett, *Romans*, 955. Murphy-O'Connor suggests Prisca's prominence in the church; see Murphy-O'Connor, 'Prisca and Aquila', 42.

the epistle to the Romans and he lists them as the first of his acquaintances because they were supporters of his ministry.

He elsewhere used this title for his associates in Christian ministry: Urbanus (Rom 16:9), Timothy (Rom 16:21), Titus (2 Cor 8:23) Epaphroditus (Phil 2:25), Euodia and Syntyche (Phil 4:3), Philemon (Phlm 1) and others such as Tychycus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Mark and Justus (Col 4:11), Mark, Aristarchus, Demas and Luke (Phlm 24) and Paul himself (1 Cor 3:9; 2 Cor 1:24). According to Ollrog, συνεργός is a distinctive Pauline expression to denote 'one who labours together with Paul as commissioned by God at the shared work of mission preaching'.[125] He analyses the word in the light of its frequent use in the Pauline letters. It includes: 1) partaking in the divine commission (1 Cor 3:5-9; 2 Cor 1:24; 6:1-4; 1 Thess 3:2); 2) working together with Paul in the activities of the congregation (1 Cor 3:5-9; 15:48; 16:10; 2 Cor 1:26; 6:1; 8:17, 23; Phil 2:30; 1 Thess 3:2); and 3) proclamation of the word (in close association with διάκονος and κοπιᾶν; 1 Cor 3:8-9; 16:15-18; 1 Thess 3:2). Jewett also suggests that this usage is unique to Paul as it is nowhere used in early or later church writings, and reveals a 'distinctive Pauline approach to missional collegiality, referring both to himself and to others with this egalitarian term'.[126] Ellis argues that συνεργός is not used of believers in general, and that the qualifiers 'with God', 'in Christ', 'of Paul', and 'for the Christian community' indicates 'whose work it is, the sphere and company in which it is done, and those who receive its benefits'.[127]

---

[125] Ollrog, *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter*, 67; see also Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 892.
[126] Jewett, *Romans,* 957.
[127] Ellis, 'Paul and His Co-workers', 440. They are co-workers 'with God' (1 Cor 3:9; 1 Thess 3:2); in Christ (Rom 16:3, 9; cf. 1 Thess 3:2); of Paul (Rom 16:21; Phil 2:25; Phlm 24); and for the Christian community (2 Cor 8:23; cf. 1 Cor 3:9; 2 Cor 1:24). In 1 Cor 3:9; 2 Cor 1:24; 8:23, the co-workers are implicitly distinguished from the congregation.

As a co-worker with Paul, probably Prisca functioned as a colleague in his mission. Prisca is not denied the title συνεργός because she is a woman. Possibly the function of Prisca is as Paul's associate, by fulfilling tasks like those of his male co-workers and of Paul himself. Although she worked in friendly association with Paul, the most part of her work was independent of him.[128] It is evident from the Acts account that they shared the same occupation, tent-making, but here it is obvious that συνεργός meant their effort and contribution to the Pauline mission. The phrase ἐν Χριστῷ ᾽Ιησοῦ highlights their endeavour in the Christian mission.

4.3.2.2. τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν

The figurative language 'risked their lives for my sake' in fact denotes sacrifice on their part to save Paul's life in some endangered situation. The particular episode in which they risked their lives (necks) (Rom 16:4) is unknown. There is a widely accepted view that they have intervened to rescue Paul during the Ephesian crisis referred to in 1 Cor 15:32 (cf. Acts 19:23-31). Jewett suggests that their ability to save Paul's life in a dangerous situation shows their 'patronal capacity' has its impact from their high social status, in order to act effectively with authorities for Paul's release.[129] The expression used is a colloquialism for 'risking execution'. This particular verbal expression alludes explicitly to death by 'decapitation'.[130] Although the phrase is a symbolic usage, it is possible that Prisca and Aquila might have risked their lives for Paul (cf. Acts 18:12-17; 19:23-41; 1 Cor 15:32; 2 Cor 1:8-10; 6:5; 8:2; 11:23).[131] Therefore it indicates that they acted as patrons or benefactors of Paul at some point (perhaps in Ephesus, cf. 1 Cor 15:32) at some personal risk to protect the apostle when his life was in danger.

---

[128] Ellis, 'Paul and His Co-workers', 439.

[129] Jewett, *Romans*, 957. See discussion on the social status of Prisca, above 4.3.1.

[130] Jewett, *Romans,* 957, 958. The form of quick execution was normally the privilege of Roman citizens, avoiding crucifixion, strangulation, burning at the stake etc.

[131] Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 892.

4.3.2.3. House Church

It is interesting to note that the second object of the main verb 'greet' is 'the church in their house'. The subordinate clauses such as 'who risked their own necks for my life, to whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles' are sandwiched between the two objects of the main verb. The word ἐκκλησία means 'assembly' and denotes 'political as well as religious groups'.[132] In this context, it denotes religious groups.

Prisca and Aquila established and supported a church in their house in all the places of their residence. There is no clear evidence for the existence of special buildings used for churches until the third century CE.[133] Rather the references are to the gatherings in private houses, those ordinary houses given over to church purposes.[134]

The house church 'provided space for the preaching of the word, for worship, as well as for social and eucharistic table sharing'.[135] Women played an important role in the founding and supporting of the house churches.[136] Paul greeted Aphia 'our

---

[132] Jewett, *Romans*, 958. Paul used 'church of God' (1 Cor 1:2;10:32; 11:22; 15:9; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:13) and 'churches of God' (1 Cor 11:16, 22; 1 Thess 2:14), which he did not use in Romans; however ἐκκλησία was used in order to denote the Christian congregations in Cenchreae (16:1), in Corinth (16:23), and in all other locations (16:4, 16).

[133] J. M. Peterson, 'House-Churches in Rome', *VC* 23 (1969), 264-72; Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her,* 179.

[134] W. Sanday & A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary to the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902), 420; Ziesler, *Romans*, 351.

[135] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her,* 175. Fiorenza argues that the house churches presuppose that some wealthy citizens have joined the Christian movement, who could provide space and economic resources for the community. On the contrary, Meggitt suggests that wealth is not at all a deciding factor in antiquity for hospitality. See Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, 134, 135. See above 4.2.2.2. I suggest that probably those women who supported the Christian community with their resources were relatively wealthy.

[136] Acts gives evidence that the church of Philippi began with the conversion of the business woman Lydia from Thyatira (Acts 16:15). It is possible to assume that women were also involved in the household conversions and house churches, along with men (cf. Acts 10:1ff; 16:32f; 18: 8f; 1 Cor 1:14, 16; 16:15f; Rom 16:23). See A. Weiser, 'Der Rolle der Frau in der urchristlichen Mission', in G. Dautzenberg (ed.), *Die Frau im Urchristentum* (QD, 95; Freiburg: Herder, 1983), 158-81, at 166, 167; Klauck, *Hausgemeinde*; V. Branick, *The House Church in the Writings of Paul* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989), 58-97; D. C. Verner, *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles* (SBLDS, 71; Chicago: Scholars Press, 1983), 127-180; Banks, *Paul's Idea,* 118-

sister,' who, together with Philemon and Archippus, was a leader of a house church in Colossae (Phlm 2). Prisca and Aquila were mentioned twice with 'the church in their house' (Rom 16:4; 1 Cor 16:19). Similarly, the epistle to the Colossians also highlights Nympha of Laodicea and 'the church in her house' (Col 4:15). Women's involvement in the Roman church is seen by the number of women greeted, constituting one third of the whole greeting (Rom 16:1-16).[137]

Prisca worked for the establishment as well as support of the house churches with her husband Aquila. Their tent-making trade helped them to support their ministry financially, independent of any local church.[138] Although they were the co-workers of Paul, they worked independently.[139] Their house churches in Corinth, Ephesus and possibly Rome were centres for mission activity. Prisca seems to have been proficient in teaching as evident from Acts 18:28, 29 (Prisca instructed Apollos in the ways of the Lord).[140]

The strategy of the mission of the couple is different from that of Paul in such a way that they travelled as a pair and gathered converts together in house churches,

---

127; G. Dautzenberg, 'Zur Stellung der Frauen in der paulinischen Gemeinden', in *Die Frau im Urchristentum* (QD, 95; Freiburg: Herder, 1983), 193-221.

[137] The women mentioned by name in Rom 16 are eight and two more women, the mother of Rufus and the 'sister' of Nereus are mentioned in relational terms. Women may be included among the house of Aristobulus and Narcissus, and also among the 'brethren' or 'saints' in Rom 16:15.

[138] Klauck, *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche*, 21-26; Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 178.

[139] Fiorenza suggests that Prisca did not stand under Paul's authority. Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 178. 'Standing under his authority' is an unclear phrase to picture Prisca's relationship to Paul, since we cannot see (even in one instance) any conflicts between their missionary strategies. Their relationship was governed by mutuality and also there was conformity in the mission agendas. The similar features between Paul and the missionary couple were that they were of the same trade, supported their missionary activity by themselves, were Jewish Christians, travelled for the cause of mission, and suffered for the cause of the gospel.

[140] There is a notion that Prisca's role of teaching is not an official one, but one that was private. See R. Schumacher, 'Aquila und Priscilla', *TGI* 12 (1920), 89-99; Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 202. I suggest that her active leadership in the house church and her role as co-worker would clearly show that probably she played the same roles as those of Paul's male co-workers. Osiek identifies that some women taught mixed groups. Osiek, *Woman's Place*, 162. See also R. W. Gehring, *House Church and Mission: The Importance of Household Structures in Early Christianity* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 216; A. Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries,* J. Moffat (trans.) (New York: Harper, 1962 [1908]), 222.

so that 'they did not divide the apostolic διακονία of the eucharistic table sharing that establishes community and the word that aims at conversion of individuals'.[141]

Moreover, the house churches of Prisca and Aquila throw light upon the members constituting house churches. They did not constitute only the members of the 'family' of the *paterfamilias* or *materfamilias*. They were most likely made up of converts of other families, thus meaning 'the church that met at their house' rather than 'the church made up of members of their household'.[142] The church in their house seems to be 'the community of Christians regularly meeting in their house, including, in addition to the Christian members of the household or *familia*, other Christians for whom it was convenient to meet for worship in their house'.[143]

House churches played a vital role in the development of the early Christian movement.[144] Whilst being co-workers of Paul, Prisca and Aquila seems to have an independent footing in mission. The role of Prisca in the house church could be that of leadership, which denotes her fervour and significance in the Christian mission.

4.3.3. Mutuality

Paul greeted Prisca and Aquila and the church in their house. The greeting formula ἀσπάσασθε is combined with a thanksgiving formula εὐχαριστῶ in order to express indebtedness not only from Paul but also from all the churches of Gentiles (πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν). Here I will elaborate on the greeting formula as well as the thanksgiving formula to deduce their involvement in the Christian mission and to assess Paul's rhetorical tactics.

---

[141] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 179.
[142] Moo, *Romans*, 920.
[143] Cranfield, *Romans*. 2:786.
[144] See for more discussion, F. V. Wilson, 'The Significance of the Early House Churches' *JBL* 58 (1939), 105-112.

4.3.3.1. Greeting: ἀσπάσασθε

Prisca and Aquila need to be honoured and welcomed because they are fellow workers, who have risked their lives on behalf of Paul, as discussed in the previous section. Here the greeting is to honour and welcome Prisca and Aquila and the church in their house.

The second person plural imperative form ἀσπάσασθε is used as the greeting formula. It has certain unique characteristics. This is not merely sending greetings but Paul asking his recipients to greet those people, 'you (plural) greet'.[145] Ἀσπάσασθε cannot be translated as 'I send greetings to …', as suggested by Gamble.[146] That 'the greeting verb functions here as a surrogate for the first person indicative form' is an unconvincing argument that diminishes the significance of the verb in the second person imperative form. Therefore, it is not merely passing on the greetings from the writer to the individuals mentioned, but rather it asks the recipients to greet them. This type of greetings is not a one-to-one greeting but establishes and strengthens a chain of close relationships. It is important to note that the greeting is also a type of recognition of the ones being greeted. The recognition underlying the greetings in Rom 16 is a mutual recognition that Paul wants the recipients to carry to one another that includes both men and women, who toiled for the gospel or for himself. Therefore the greeting has several important functions: 1) it acknowledges the roles of those who are the key figures in the church; 2) it has a commendatory function, thereby calling for mutual honour and recognition; 3) it establishes close relationships between not only the greeter and the recipients of the greeting but also between Paul (who is pursuing the action of the greeting) and the recipients of the greeting.

---

[145] ἀσπάσασθε is repeated 16 times in the pericope (Rom 16:3-16a). This form shifts to ἀσπάζονται (they greet) in v. 16b.

[146] Gamble, *Textual History*, 93; Weima shares a similar view, Weima, *Neglected Endings,* 105, 108.

Paul (group A) asked the believers in Rome (group B) to greet Prisca and Aquila and the church in their house (group C), which works as a direct greeting group B to group C. This type of greeting is significant since it strengthens not only the relationship between B and C but also that between A and C, and A and B, thus creating a mutual bond.

4.3.3.2. Thanksgiving: εὐχαριστῶ

The εὐχαριστῶ formula[147] used to communicate gratitude (Rom 16:4) to Prisca and Aquila is important as well as noteworthy. This formula is found in an imperial inscription at Ephesus.[148] *1. Eph.* III. 961: 'εὐχαριστῶ σοι, κυρία ῎Αρτεμι' (I give thanks to you, Lady Artemis). The Pauline theme of thanksgiving reiterates the theme of thanksgiving in the patron-client system. The idea of thanksgiving reminds us of the reciprocal relations, since 'reciprocity governed the entire gamut of relationships - human and divine in antiquity'.[149]

Paul has given particular attention to express his thanks to the couple. The reason for his indebtedness may be at least two specially mentioned factors: for being his fellow workers and for saving his life at some point even at the risk of their own. Moreover, all the churches of the Gentiles are indebted to Prisca and Aquila.

---

[147] Εὐχαριστῶ and εὐχαριστία are Hellenistic words, derived from χάρις, χαρίζομαι, εὐχάριστος, which were not in existence before 300 BCE. See P. Schubert, *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings* (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1939), 121. *BDAG*, 4I5, 416. Εὐχαριστῶ has meanings such as feel obligated to thank, render or return thanks. The references in the Pauline literature which express thankfulness to God are Rom 1:8, 21, 7:25; 14: 6; 1Cor 1:4, 14; 10:30; 11:24; 14:17, 18; 2 Cor 1:11; Eph 1:16; 5:20; Phil 1:3; Col 1:3, 12; 3:17; 1 Thess 1: 2; 2: 13; 5:18; 2 Thess 1: 3; 2 Thess 2:13; Phlm 4. See Moulton and Geden, *Concordance to the Greek New Testament*, 440.

[148] G. H. R. Horsley, 'Giving Thanks to Artemis', *NewDocs*, 4 (1987), 127-129, at 128.

[149] J. H. Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in its Greco-Roman Context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 320. In the Greco-Roman world, the rendering of honour and gratitude was a significant aspect governing human-human as well as divine-human relationships. P. Schubert has identified that one of Paul's purposes of thanksgiving is to honour the churches to which it is addressed and also Paul gives thanks to God for grace on the house churches (1 Cor 1:4). He also suggests that the thanksgiving in Rom 16:4 is 'at a colloquial, conversational level'. Schubert, *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings*, 83. Moreover, Paul's mode of thanksgiving reflects the Greco-Roman thanksgiving conventions. That is, there is a tone of public praise for his converts and co-workers, for example, Phil 1:3, 5; 2 Cor 8:16; 1 Thess 2:13-15; Rom 16:4. See Harrison, *Paul's Language*, 269.

The reason for the indebtedness of the churches of Gentiles is not specified in the passage. Cranfield suggests that the Gentiles are thankful for saving the life of Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles,[150] but Jewett suggests that this view may direct the attention to Paul himself, which may not be Paul's intention since his aim is to honour Prisca and Aquila,[151] that they receive the universal recognition from Gentiles. It is likely that the indebtedness is because of the significant as well as sacrificial step the couple had made for the cause of mission in Corinth as well as in Ephesus in their own right as well as by patronising Paul in his mission process. Patronising the mission includes devotion, commitment and not least, the financial requirements. These may be the reasons for which the Gentile churches were to be grateful.[152]

Paul's intention in conveying the Gentiles' thanksgiving has a very significant effect as far as the whole epistle is concerned. It echoes his theme of the unity between Jews and Gentiles in Rom 14:1-15:13 and a sense of mutuality between the two groups expressed in the Jerusalem offering in Rom 15:27.[153] Paul highlights to the church this sense of unity and mutuality, and also draws attention to what Prisca and Aquila have done for him. Here we can see some hidden motives of Paul, primarily to honour and acknowledge the couple's actions on behalf of him, but secondarily to reciprocate their deeds of benefaction. There may be an implied invitation to receive the universal recognition and thanks of others by contributing to the Pauline mission by risky aid.[154]

---

[150] Cranfield, *Romans,* 2:786.

[151] Jewett, *Romans,* 958.

[152] Ollrog, *Mitarbeiter*, 27; Jewett, *Romans*, 958.

[153] Oster argues that τὰ ἔθνη in Romans 16:4 denotes 'congregational religious culture more than congregational racial character'. R. E. Oster, 'Congregations of the Gentiles (Rom 16:4): A Culture-Based Ecclesiology in the Letters of Paul', *RestorQuart* 40 (1998), 39-52, at 40.

[154] Jewett, *Romans*, 958.

Moreover, it is striking that the praise and thanksgiving come from 'all the churches of the Gentiles'. It kindles an image of churches from different corners, honouring the missionary couple with one voice. This implies not only the couple's contribution to the Christian mission, especially to Gentiles, but also their influence and ability to win the applause of all.

The believers of Rome are also joining with the activity of thanksgiving. Therefore, the image is of a wider group giving thanks to Prisca and Aquila, made up of Paul, all the churches of the Gentiles and the believers in Rome. This enhances and strengthens bonds between those who have joined hand-to-hand in expressing their obligation to Prisca and Aquila. This sort of commendation has an implied agenda of refreshment and the establishment of new relationships, bonds and friendships. Therefore the theme of mutuality is very much implied in the formula of thanksgiving.

4.3.4. Rhetorical Analysis

The way Paul presents Prisca and Aquila is significant and rhetorically crucial. It is significant in different respects. First of all, they are mentioned as associates of Paul by describing their remarkable contribution with regard to his life by risking their own lives. Then Paul moves on to broaden the sphere of their influence to all the churches of the Gentiles, which possibly included the Romans. It also seems to have an echo of Rom 15:27, where the Gentiles are mentioned as partakers of spiritual things. The way of presentation is interesting as follows:

1. Prisca and Aquila were to be greeted by the Romans;

2. They were associates of Paul in Christ Jesus and risked their lives for Paul;

3. They were thanked by Paul as well as by all the churches of the Gentiles;

4. The church in their house was also to be greeted by the Romans.

As Paul describes them as his associates (συνεργοί μου) and as having risked their lives for his sake, those phrases obviously state the relationship with Paul. But their action on behalf of Paul was bringing to them thanksgiving (εὐχαριστῶ), not only from Paul but also from all the churches of the Gentiles. His use of the language πᾶσαι (all) is significant as it gives a wider picture of a community in gratitude to Prisca and Aquila. Why did Paul use this type of implied inclusive language? I assume he was using this language to show that possibly the action of Prisca and Aquila benefited the Romans. He was not presenting explicitly that the Romans were at the receiving end. But it seems that there is an implied inclusion of the Romans in the phrase 'all the churches of the Gentiles'. Moreover, since the Roman church is predominantly a Gentile church, the Romans might be included in the wider group. At the same time, the role of Prisca and Aquila was not limited to the Romans only. Just like what was said of Phoebe, as the patron of many, here Paul is introducing them with a universal recognition.

It seems that Paul and all the churches of Gentiles were on one side, and Prisca and Aquila and the church in their house were on the other. The first group was indebted to the second because of their actions, and as a result they were to be greeted and thanked. Paul was giving reasons why the Romans should greet Prisca and Aquila. It is an instruction, and he motivates the Romans to greet them. Thus Paul rhetorically creates mutuality by giving instruction to greet and by describing their actions and their association with himself and with the churches as well. His rhetorical method forges mutuality.

Thus it is clear from the greetings to Prisca (and Aquila) that Prisca played a significant part in the Christian mission. Paul is acknowledging her commitment and accomplishments in the Christian mission. She was a co-worker of Paul and was

willing to support his ministry at all costs. Moreover, she may have been the leader of the church in her house, as well as involved in teaching and preaching of the word. Her contribution was profound as she was beneficial to all the churches of the Gentiles, not solely to women but to both men and women. She was gifted to equip leaders for ministry (Apollos). Her and Aquila's 'missional collegiality' with Paul, being his associates, was remarkable, even though they had different strategies and methods of missionary enterprise. 'She was obviously a very important, well-travelled missionary and church leader whose work on occasion intersected with that of Paul'.[155]

Paul's method of presentation is significant as it creates mutuality. He communicated to the Roman believers that Prisca had a key role in the Christian mission. It is also an attestation that Prisca and Aquila are a precious couple to the Christian churches in general and to the church at Rome in particular. The greeting formula and the thanksgiving formula highlight the theme of mutuality, which is one of the aims that Paul wanted to accomplish in the Roman church.

4.4. The Role of Junia (Rom 16:7)

Ἀσπάσασθε Ἀνδρόνικον καὶ Ἰουνιᾶν τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου καὶ συναιχμαλώτους μου, οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, οἳ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ.

'Greet Andronicus and Junia, my relatives who were in prison with me; they are prominent among the apostles, and they were in Christ before I was'. (NRSV)

Junia is a controversial figure among the recipients of the greetings of Paul in Romans 16:2-16. The controversy is due to the fact that she is the only woman who is called 'apostle' in the New Testament. The four descriptive phrases used by Paul are significant to understand Junia's role: she and Andronicus are συγγενεῖς μου,

---

[155] Bassler, 'Prisca', 136.

συναιχμάλωτοι, ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις and πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ (16:7). Especially the last two phrases used for Junia (and Andronicus) are significant, since such phrases are seldom used to describe Paul's co-workers. However, the question of the role of Junia has revolved around two complex issues. One is the name-gender debate and the other concerns her participatory role in the apostolic circles (if the name refers to a woman).

The aim of this section is to show that the Junia greeted with Andronicus is a woman and that she is 'prominent among the apostles'. Therefore this section attempts to discuss the debated issues regarding Junia to deduce her role in the early Christian missionary movement in general and the Pauline mission in particular. The issues such as the name-gender debate, Bauckham's arguments on Joanna-Junia and her relationship to the apostolic band will be discussed in the first section, while the other descriptions, which state her relationship to Paul, will be discussed in the second section, and finally, the significance of Junia's contribution to the believers in Rome will be explored.

4.4.1. Junia or Junias? The Name-Gender Debate

Differently accented Greek forms allow the possibility for the name of Andronicus' partner in Rom 16:7 to be feminine Ἰουνίαν (from Ἰουνία −ας, ἡ, 'Junia') or masculine Ἰουνιᾶν (from Ἰουνιᾶς, -ᾶ ὁ, 'Junias') or Ἰουνίαν (from Ἰουνίας, -α, ὁ 'Junias').[156] The evidence shows that by far the most likely reading for Ἰουνιαν is Junia.

---

[156] Epp, *Junia,* 23. The masculine forms have been understood as the contracted forms of the Greek name Ἰουνιανός (Junianos) or the Latin name *Iunianus*.

4.4.1.1. History of Debate

Until the twelfth century, there was consensus (with a few exceptions) regarding the name as feminine.[157] From the thirteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century, scholars were more inclined to the masculine identification.[158] As Thorley writes:

> The universal view of the church fathers was that the name was Junia and she was a woman and the English *Authorized Version* of 1611 followed this in reading "Junia", clearly a woman's name; and in fact "Junias" became a man in English translations only in 1881 when the *Revised Version* was published. Luther, however, in his German translation of 1552 had already opted for "den Juniam", and continental translations have since then mostly followed this masculine interpretation.[159]

Thus, it is also striking that very many recent views are in favour of the feminine name.[160] The Greek texts, with different accentuations of the name attest the name-gender paradox.[161] Similarly the translations[162] and the commentators[163]

---

[157] Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 737,738. Fitzmyer lists the patristic Fathers, who agreed that Junia is a female character and identified the reasons for being qualified among the apostles. Those include Ambroisaster, Chrysostom, Rufinus, Jerome, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Ps-Prismasius, Oecumenius, John Damascene, Haymo, Rabanus Maurus, Hatto, Lanfranc of Bec, Bruno the Carthusian, Theophylact, Peter Abelard, and Peter Lombard. The possible exception is Origen who once reads a masculine name 'Junias' in Rufinus' translation of his commentary in Migne, *PG* 14, 1281B and 1289A in *In epistolam ad Romanos* 10. 39. This is probably an error, because all the other witnesses to the same commentary offer 'Junia' and in *In epistolam ad Romanos* 10. 21, he uses the feminine name. See Lampe, 'The Roman Christians of Romans 16', 223; Moo, *Romans*, 922. Epiphanius (c. 315-403 CE) cites the name as masculine although it is overlooked. However his opinion is unreliable since he calls Prisca also a man.

[158] Giles (Aegidius) of Rome (thirteenth century CE**)** seems to be the first commentator to take both Andronicus and Julian (the variant reading) to be men, based on the assumption that only a man could be an apostle. Thus Junias, the masculine name was preferred to the feminine name till the 1970s. See Bauckham, *The Gospel Women,* 167.

[159] Thorley, 'Junia, A Woman Apostle', 18. Thorley argues that Junia is a woman and explored the reasons for the most probable feminine name on linguistic grounds. Junia is a woman until Luther opted for a masculine name, and its impact on the recent translations could be tainted with a 'chauvinistic' flavour. Thorley suggests that although Schulz arrives at the same conclusion, there are 'linguistically several imprecise arguments' in his article, which is clarified in his own article. See Thorley, 'Junia', 19; R. R. Schulz, 'Junia or Junias?' *ExpTim* 98 (1987), 108-10. Some continental translations restore the name Junia; see e.g. *Die Gute Nachricht Bibel*, *ad loc*. The *Authorized Version* of 1611 followed Tyndale's translation reading Junia.

[160] Burer and Wallace, 'Was Junia Really an Apostle?', 78. Thorley comments that recent commentators 'have asserted that there is no justification for a masculine interpretation of the name'; see Thorley, 'Junia', 19.

[161] The Greek texts with masculine accentuation are the United Bible Societies 3rd (1975) and 4th (1993) editions and the Nestle- Aland 25th (1975), 26th (1979) and 27th (1993). Those with feminine accentuation are *Textus Receptus* (Trinitarian Bible Society); Loch's (Ratisbonae, 1862);

show disagreement regarding the same. The conflict regarding the name originated from the presupposition that no woman could be called an apostle and so the accusative form of the name must refer to a male name Junias or Junianus.[164]

4.4.1.2. Cases against the Masculine Form

According to the name-contraction theory, the shortened form Junias (masculine) is a 'Greek hypocoristic form' of the Latin name *Iunianus*.[165] The name *Iunianus* is derived from the form of name (*cognomina*) ending in –*anus* and from *gentilicia,* whereas the male names in Greek end in –ας (the examples in New Testament are Epaphras from Epaphroditus, Antipas from Antipatros). The possibilities can be assessed by three factors: the occurrence of similar Greek names, the evidence for the contracted form, and the context of the whole passage containing Rom 16:7.

Tischendorf's 8th edition (Lipsiae, 1869-72); Westcott-Hort's (Macmillan, 1881); von Soden's (Göttingen, 1913); Souter's 2nd edition (Oxford University, 1947); and *The Majority Text* (edited by Z. Hodges and A. Farstad, Thomas Nelson, 1982). The Modern Greek translation of Vellas (United Bible Societies, 1967) has added the feminine article to the name, which explicitly specifies that the gender is feminine. For these details I am indebted to Cervin 'A Note Regarding the Name Junia(s) in Romans 16:7', 464, 465. Some of the manuscripts read Julia in Rom 16:7, which is a feminine name and it occurs in 16:15. Julia is found in P[46] 6 it [ar, b] vg[mss] cop[bo] eth Jerome, which Metzger suggests is a clerical error. See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 475, 476. See also U.-K. Plisch, 'Die Apostlein Junia: Das Exegetische Problem in Röm 16:7 im Licht von Nestle – Aland und der Sahidischen Überlieferung', *NTS* 42 (1996), 477-478.

[162] The Revised Standard Version, New American Standard Bible, New American Bible, New International Version, German Version (*Die Heilige Schrift*, Philadelphia: National Bible Press, 1967), Norwegian version (*Biblen,* Minneapolis: Norske Bibekselskabs, 1898) assume the name to be masculine, while KJV, NKJV, NRSV, ESV, NET, TNIV, Latin Vulgate, (*Nouyi Zavet'* United Bible Societies, 1959), Russian version (*Biblia*, United Bible Societies, 1989) assume that the name is feminine.

[163] Modern commentators are divided on the gender of the name. Those who agree on the feminine gender include Jewett, Dunn, Sanday and Headlam, Cranfield, Schreiner, H. Koester, whereas those who agree on the masculine gender include Barrett, Murray. There are also some assuming the gender to be 'problematic', who suggest that the issue cannot be resolved.

[164] Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:788. He suggests that the possibility of the accentuation of the masculine name rests on 'conventional prejudice' and that the feminine name is ruled out by others because of contextual reasons. Another notion is that the personal descriptions such as τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου, συναιγμαλώτος and ἐπίσημοι and the relative pronoun οἵτινες are all masculine. Cervin argues that the masculine gender is used here because in the plural it is the generic gender. In order to refer to a group of mixed gender, the masculine form must be used. For example, τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου means my relatives (masculine/feminine). See Cervin, 'Name Junia(s)', 470.

[165] Bauckham, *Gospel Women,* 168.

The arguments against this masculine form of the name include the lack of evidence for the abbreviated form Junias among Greek names from antiquity; and that Junius and Junianus are even rare among Greek people. Cervin comments 'this name does not occur in any extant Greek or Latin document of the NT milieu'.[166] So also Bauckham suggests that the name Junias is not attested, while Junia is 'well attested'.[167] Also, the claim that the name *Iunianus* could be shortened to *Iunias* (or has been shortened at all) lacks evidence and thus the claim is to be considered unwarranted.[168] Moreover, the general context of the passage does not exclude women's active participation in mission.

Therefore it is unlikely that Andronicus' partner in Romans 16:7 bears a masculine name Ἰουνιᾶς or Ἰουνίας.

4.4.1.3. Cases for the Feminine Form

Junia was a very common Latin name.[169] The typical Latin name has three parts, the *praenomen* (personal name), the *nomen* (name of the clan or gens) and the *cognomen* (family name). Probably other names are added as titles, honours and by adoption. Latin *nomina* (clan names) often have the suffixes –*ius* (masc) and -*ia* (fem). Women usually did not have a *praenomen* but were named with their gens. Cervin, in his analysis of the names has discovered a large number of Iunii in the Greco-Roman world.[170] Peter Lampe counts more than 250 instances of Junia in

---

[166] Cervin, 'Name Junia(s)', 466. See also Bauckham, *Gospel Women*, 168.

[167] Bauckham, *Gospel Women*, 169.

[168] Cervin, 'Name Junia(s)', 467. The theory of the contracted name Junias has serious difficulties. See Epp, *Junia,* 24.

[169] Lampe, 'Roman Christians', 223; see Cervin, 'Name Junia(s)', 467. Lampe suggests slave origins in pre-Pauline apostles; P. Lampe, 'Iunia/Iunias: Sklavenherkunft im Kreise der vorpaulinischen Apostel (Röm 16 7)', *ZNW* 76 (1985), 132-134.

[170] Cervin showed that the claim of J. Piper and W. Grudem that 'the name Iunia was not a common woman's name in the Greco-Roman world' is erroneous by referring to a large number of women named as Iunia. J. Piper and W. Grudem, (eds.), *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (Wheaton, Ill: Crossway, 1991), 80. Julius Caesar's murderer's sister is named as Iunia; the *Iunia familia* is found in Tacitus' (i-ii AD) *Annals* (3.24, 69; 15.35); in Livy's (i BC –i AD) *History of Rome* (2.5.7; 9.17.11); and in Cornelius Nepos' (i BC) Lives (*Atticus* 18.3). Iunia Calvina (Vespasian 29.4) and Iunia Claudilla (Caligula 12.1-2) are mentioned in

Rome alone.[171] The number of occurrences of the name Junia is one of the pieces of evidence for the feminine name.

The occurrence of the name-pairs in Romans 16:7 (Andronicus and Junia), and 16:3 (Prisca and Aquila, [certainly a couple]) shows the possibility for a feminine name, even though the name of the sisters or relatives Tryphaena and Tryphosa in 16:12 appears paired in the same way. It is likely that Andronicus and Junia were husband and wife.[172]

The gender-biased interpretation based on the question whether women could be included in the category of apostles is also unjustified because the majority of the consensus opts for the feminine name. The 'church tradition from the Old Latin, Coptic, Syriac and Vulgate versions and the early Greek and Latin fathers onwards affirms a female apostle'.[173] Moreover, Romans 16 is significant in indicating the inclusive characteristics of women's ministry at different levels. Therefore the feminine name Junia is the most likely reading for Ἰουνιαν.

4.4.2. Joanna – Junia: Bauckham's Arguments

Bauckham opts for a sound-equivalence theory for the names Joanna and Junia.[174] This theory is based on the postulate that 'the similarity in sound of Junia to the Hebrew name Joanna (Yehohannah or Yohannah) is quite close' and therefore he suggests that 'the Junia of Romans 16:7 is the same person as Luke's Joanna (Luke 8:3)'.[175] It was customary to adopt a Greek name along with a Semitic name, which

---

Suetonius' (i-ii AD) *Twelve Caesars* and also in Tacitus' *Annals*. Men are also mentioned in *Twelve Caesars*: Iunius Novatus (*Augustus* 51.1); Iunius Rusticus (*Domitian* 10.3) and L. Iunius Silvanus (*Claudius* 24.5). There are quite a few women mentioned in the Latin Anthology and Latin Inscriptions. Moreover a number of Greek authors are also mentioned by this name. For detailed analysis, see Cervin, 'Name Junias', 468.

[171] Lampe, 'Roman Christians', 226.

[172] Cranfield, *Romans*, 2; 788; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 422; Ziesler, *Romans*, 351.

[173] Belleville,Ἰουνιαν…ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, 231, 232. Epp has come up with reasons for accepting the feminine name 'Junia', see for details Epp, *Junia*, 23, 24.

[174] Bauckham, *Gospel Women,* 181-194.

[175] Bauckham, *Gospel Women,* 184.

is in 'alignment with Roman political rule'. Bauckham built his arguments upon the presuppositions that both were among the founders of the Jerusalem Christian community, that Paul's description of her as 'prominent among the apostles' would be meaningful with reference to the early Christian literature, and that the reference to her in Luke's gospel attests her prominence among the women followers of Jesus.[176]

He argues the case with two possible considerations. First of all, other early Christian missionaries also had a 'Greek or Latin sound-equivalent to their Semitic name and evidently preferred to use the former when working in the diaspora, since it was more culturally appropriate and user-friendly for non-Semitic speakers'.[177] Among these are Silas/Silvanus, John Mark, and Joseph/Justus Barsabbas and he finds a similar case with that of Joanna/Junia. Secondly, Joanna, with her husband Chuza belonged to the Herodian aristocracy of Tiberias and hence Junia would be her equivalent name used already in her Palestinian context, and would have the appropriateness 'not only of being a sound-equivalent of her Hebrew name but also of being a distinguished, aristocratic Roman name'.[178] Although Bauckham stated that he could not decide between the two possibilities, he took the second as more plausible, since Joanna, as a wife of Herod's Steward would have spoken Latin already and thus would easily become a Christian missionary in Rome. He also suggested the possibility that either the Greek name Andronicus could be the name adopted by Chuza, or Andronicus would be her second husband, since Joanna was already widowed at the time of Jesus' ministry.[179]

---

[176] Bauckham, *Gospel Women,* 184.
[177] Bauckham, *Gospel Women,* 184.
[178] Bauckham, *Gospel Women,* 186.
[179] Bauckham, *Gospel Women,* 186.

Winter has discussed Bauckham's argument for the possibility of Joanna to be the same person as Junia. He does not clearly show his opinion whether Bauckham's argument is correct or not, but rather suggests possible inferences from those arguments. That is, 'even if Joanna and Junia were not one and same person, some conclusions can be drawn from Rom 16:7', that

> Junia is a married woman, who along with her husband has been a long-standing Jewish Christian. Together they have been imprisoned with Paul, presumably for their identification with his cause.... They clearly have a considerable sphere of influence among Christians, and while Junia is unlike Phoebe in that she has a husband, both she and Andronicus are connected to the leading authorities in this movement.[180]

The evidence for Joanna as Junia is very speculative. Although there is a little evidence for the name change hypothesis, it is not explicit from the textual evidence and Bauckham can cite no exact parallels to this Joanna-Junia equivalence. However, she possibly belonged to the earliest Christian community, since Paul describes her as being in Christ before him.

It is also interesting to note B. W. Winter's discussion on the possibility for Junia of Rom 16:7 to be the same person as Junia Theodora.[181] The similarities between Junia Theodora and Phoebe in Romans 16 have already been discussed in the previous section on Phoebe.[182] However, the following arguments are put forward against the identification of Junia Theodora and Junia. The reasons are: firstly, Paul's description of her as in Christ before him and his kinsfolk are irrelevant in the case of Junia Theodora; secondly, there is no evidence in the inscriptions that Junia Theodora is married, whereas 'the names Andronicus and Junia were linked by the connective 'and', just as Prisca and Aquila were (Rom

---

[180] Winter, *Roman Wives*, 203.
[181] Winter, *Roman Wives*, 201.
[182] See above 4.2.2.3.

16:3), who according to Acts 18:2 are married',[183] hence probably referring to husband and wife.

4.4.3. Relationship to the Apostolic Band

Paul's description of Andronicus and Junia is very significant: ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις. The phrase is translated and interpreted in two ways as 'prominent among the apostles' or 'well-known to the apostles'. One shows the inclusive nature of apostleship that she is one among them, while the other denotes the exclusive nature that she is outside the sphere of apostles. The phrase 'noteworthy among the apostles' implies that Andronicus and Junia were apostles, while 'esteemed by the apostles' or 'well-known to the apostles' implies that they were not apostles.

4.4.3.1. Exclusive Approach

The exclusive view considers that Andronicus and Junia were 'well-known to the apostles' or 'esteemed by the apostles' but not apostles in any real sense. The assumptions of the exclusivists are: a) Paul uses ἀπόστολος only 'in its strict, official sense'; b) the article τοῖς 'seems to point out the definite, well-known class of persons almost exclusively so called'[184]; c) the term 'apostle' keeps the meaning 'one commissioned and sent' and is never used concerning men (or women), who go out of their own choice, and Paul never uses it in the wider sense; d) 'ἐν states *where* these two were considered illustrious: "in the circle of" the Twelve at Jerusalem ("by" is incorrect)';[185] e) and the scripture would not be silent about Andronicus and Junia, if they were prominent apostles.

---

[183] Winter, *Roman Wives*, 201, 202.

[184] C. Hodge, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1983), 449; see also Burer and Wallace, 'Was Junia Really an Apostle?', 81.

[185] R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961), 906-7; Burer and Wallace, 'Was Junia Really an Apostle?,' 81; See also Murray, *Romans*, 2:229-30; Romaniuk suggests the term ἀπόστολοι as an 'analogical' interpretation for Junia and

M. H. Burer and D. B. Wallace have argued 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')' concluding that Junia was 'well-known to the apostles' rather than 'outstanding among them'.[186] Junia as a member of the apostolic band is agreed but her apostolic status is questioned in their thesis, which is based on the following observations: ἐπίσημος implies not only a comparative sense as 'prominent or outstanding among' but also an elative sense as 'famous, well-known to/by'; the meaning of a term is linked with the context and 'the collocation of the word with its adjuncts'; in the comparative sense the 'substantival adjunct' should be personal.

This view is challenged by three critics, namely, Epp, Bauckham and Belleville.[187] Bauckham argues that their method of interpretation is ambiguous because of the minimal evidence to justify the arguments, whereas Belleville argues that in Greek, the primary usage of ἐν and the plural dative inside and outside (with exceptions) the NT is inclusive "in"/ "among" and not exclusive "to" and that they fail to offer one clear biblical or extra-biblical Hellenistic example of an 'exclusive sense of ἐπίσημος and a plural noun to mean 'well-known to'.[188] Epp suggests that their statement 'the genitive personal modifier was consistently used for an inclusive idea, while the (ἐν plus) dative personal adjunct was almost

---

Andronicus because they were not among the twelve disciples, which is vague in terms of Paul's other descriptions. Romaniuk, 'Was Phoebe in Romans 16, 1 a Deaconess?', 133.

[186] Burer and Wallace, 'Was Junia Really an Apostle?', 76. In this article, they analysed the inclusive and the exclusive views and opted for the exclusive notion by picking up examples from biblical Greek, Patristic Greek, papyri, inscriptions, classical and Hellenistic texts. See also Hutter, 'Did Paul Call Andronicus an Apostle in Romans 16:7?', 778.

[187] Epp, *Junia*, 76-78; Bauckham, *Gospel Women*, 175-176; Belleville, 'Re-examination of Romans 16:7', 243-248.

[188] Belleville, 'Re-examination of Romans 16:7', 244-45.

never so used', cannot be taken without 'very significant difficulty' depending on the evidence they suggested.[189] Based on Greek grammar, the agent of the passive is expressed by ὑπό + genitive and not by ἐν + the dative case, which is used to denote impersonal instrument and means.[190]

The claim of the exclusivists that the term 'apostle' is used only in the 'technical sense' is incorrect on the basis of its usage elsewhere in the Pauline epistles.[191] The content and context of the passage show that the exclusive view is unlikely. Verse 7 cannot be taken as an independent pericope but as a part of 16:2-16. Women who are in leadership roles are greeted elsewhere in the greeting section. The Bible versions with an idea of exclusivism: (CEV) 'highly respected by the apostles'; (Amplified) 'they are men held in high esteem by the apostles'; (NET) 'well known to the apostles' certainly misread the text.

4.4.3.2. Inclusive Approach

The scholars who agree with the inclusive view argue that Junia was 'outstanding among the apostles', and there is a consensus that she was an apostle although not in the technical sense of the word. The inclusive approach takes the term 'apostle' in a broad sense.[192] Patristic commentators[193] and modern translations[194] consider Junia a part of the apostolic band.

---

[189] Epp found thirteen personal examples: eight ἐπίσημος + dative instances that are exclusive; no ἐπίσημος + genitive that are exclusive; three ἐπίσημος + genitive that are exclusive; and two personal cases that have ἐπίσημος + ἐν + dative but also are inclusive. See Epp, *Junia*, 77.

[190] Cervin, 'Name Junias,' 470.

[191] Paul uses the term 'apostle' not only in the technical sense with a meaning of being 'sent and commissioned by God' (1 Thess 2:6), but also as delegates of the churches (2 Cor 8:23; cf. Phil 2:25); preacher of the gospel and other roles related with the establishment and the administration of the churches (1 Cor 9:5; 12:28; Eph 2:20; 3:5; 4:11). See P. W. Barnett, 'Apostle', *DPL* , 45-51, at 47; H. D. Betz, 'Apostle'*, ABD*, 1, 309-311, at 309, 310.

[192] Barrrett, *Romans*, 283, 84; Dodd, *Romans*, 240; Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:789; Käsemann, *Romans*, 414; Schreiner, *Romans*, 796; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 739-40; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 423; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 895; Moo, *Romans*, 923; Jewett, *Romans*, 963. Dunn argues that Andronicus and Junia belonged to the apostolic band in a short period following Jesus' resurrection.

[193] See above 4.4.1.1

[194]The renderings are as follows: New International Version and New American Standard Bible as 'outstanding among the apostles'; New Revised Version and New American Bible as 'prominent

The adjective ἐπίσημος means marked out, distinguished, outstanding, and prominent, which compares the person or thing with other representatives of the same class and distinguishes it/them as prominent.[195] The notion of the apostle was much broader in the early church than merely the 'Twelve'. It is also used to designate 'messenger', 'missionary preacher', or 'itinerant missionary'. In the epistles, Paul is strongly defending his apostleship: he claims to have had an encounter with the risen Christ (1 Cor 9:1; Gal 1:1, 15-17) and also a divine commission to proclaim the gospel (Rom 1:1-5; 1 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:1, 15-17) and the 'acceptance and endurance of the labours and sufferings' connected with ministry and the results following as 'signs, wonders, and mighty works'.[196] Therefore Epp rightly argues that unless Paul had found these criteria in Andronicus and Junia, he would not have called them apostles or even as 'outstanding among the apostles'. Though Paul is not referring to their resurrection experience, but points to the fact that 'they were 'in Christ' before he was and they were in prison with Paul and therefore had suffered as he had for his apostleship'.[197] Presumably, Paul is acknowledging them as 'outstanding among the apostles' for these reasons.

Paul meets all these criteria: he had seen the risen Christ; had a divine commission; had sufferings and did signs and wonders. Probably he expects any 'apostle' to meet all four criteria. In the case of Andronicus and Junia, 'in Christ before Paul' they could have met all four criteria, even if Paul does not spell this out. This is definitely not the same as an 'apostle of churches' (2 Cor 8:23), who did practical works or were missionaries (Acts 13).

---

among the apostles'; New Century Version as 'very important apostles'; KJV, ASV, RSV, NKJV as 'who are noted among the apostles'.

[195] K. H. Rengstorf, 'ἐπίσημος' *TDNT* 7, 267.

[196] Epp, *Junia*, 69-71. 'The apostles of Christ include Barnabas (2 Cor 9:6), the brothers of the Lord (Gal 1:19; 1 Cor 9:5), probably Silvanus/Silas (1 Thess 2:7) and perhaps Apollos (1 Cor 4:9), as well as Paul himself'; Bauckham, *Gospel Women*, 180.

[197] Epp, *Junia*, 69, 70.

Paul is not specifically pointing out the reasons why they were honoured among the apostles, but the other descriptions imply their toil in Christian mission and thus strongly place them in a position of privilege.

Another question concerns the location of their apostolic ministry, that is, whether they are related to any of the local congregations. Paul neither gives any particular area as their focus of ministry as in the case of Phoebe in 16:1, nor specifies whether they were witnesses of the resurrection. Jewett suggests that they had functioned somewhere in the eastern mission during the time of shared imprisonment with Paul, and that they are now in Rome.[198]

Junia's actual role is not specified but the description of Paul 'shows that she had a role and it was not a case of Andronicus simply travelling with a wife who was an appendage (1 Cor 9:5). She has shared imprisonment with him because she was identified as a significant player herself in the Christian cause… Junia had her sphere of influence in the circle in which she operated'.[199] Their apostolic status could be counted in the same way as that of Barnabas, Silas, and Apollos (1 Cor 4:6, 9; 9:5-6; Gal 1:19; 1 Thess 2:1; 2:7). Since they were in Christ before Paul, it is likely they were members of the Jerusalem crowd who received a vision of the resurrected Jesus (1 Cor 15:7).

Barrett does not support a 'second-grade apostleship' in Pauline letters, but argues for two well defined categories such as 'apostles of Christ' (Paul himself and Peter) and envoys of churches.[200] Although the categorization of Junia's role is not

[198] Jewett, *Romans*, 964. Bauckham argues that they were missionaries in the 'Greco-Roman circles', which is one of the possibilities but not certain. Bauckham, *Gospel Women*, 181-203.

[199] Winter, *Roman Wives*, 203. Fiorenza suggests that the traditional role as 'wife' is not the matter of consideration, 'but rather their commitment to the partnership in the work of the gospel'. Fiorenza, *'In Memory of Her*, 173.

[200] C. K. Barrett, *The Signs of an Apostle* (London: Epworth, 1970), 47. Barrett argues for the translation of ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις as 'men of note among the apostles', which is against my argument. Barrett identifies different categories of apostles (ἀπόστολος or *shaliah*). They are 1) the twelve; 2) the Supreme Apostles: Peter and John who belonged to the twelve and James who did

explicitly stated, she may be a representative of a church, as in the case of Paul and Barnabas sent for evangelistic mission by the Antioch church and not as 'apostles of the churches' (agents or messengers) with specific purposes such as practical duties for collecting money for the poor in the Jerusalem church (2 Cor 8:23). But 'apostle of the churches' in a sense of missionary agent is possible. Andronicus and Junia possibly did the same ministry as that of Paul and Barnabas, 'they are itinerant missionaries engaged in the work of the gospel' and seem to have engaged in the Gentile mission.[201]

4.4.4. Other Descriptions

4.4.4.1. συγγενεῖς

In Rom 16 Paul identifies three persons as his kinspeople or relatives (συγγενεῖς μου) in Rome, to whom he sends greetings and also three persons who send their greetings to Rome from Corinth. The first group consists of Andronicus, Junia and Herodion (Rom 16:7, 11) and the second group consists of Lucius, Jason and Sosipater (Rom 16:21). Συγγενής is not mentioned in any of the other Pauline epistles except Romans.

The term συγγενής could be used with different connotations. One of these is to denote family connections to refer to a common ancestry or descent or literally 'relatives' of Paul.[202] It is unlikely to be the same as that of the ἀγαπητός, φίλος, which is a second reading.[203] Apart from the familial relations and friendly

---

not; 3) Apostleship of circumcision (Gal 2:8); 4) possibly John's work; 5) the agents of Jerusalem leaders (Gal 2:4; 1 Cor 15:7); 6) Paul's own apostleship; 7) subordinate apostles to the Jerusalem church (possibly including Andronicus and Junia); 8) apostles of the churches who were delegates or messengers (2 Cor 8:23; Phil 2:25). See Barrett, *Signs of an Apostle*, 71-73.

[201] Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 172. Betz also suggests that they could serve as a missionary apostle; see Betz, 'Apostle', *ABD,* 310.

[202] E. E. Ellis, 'Co-workers, Paul and His' *DPL*, 186.

[203] W. Michelis, 'συγγενής, συγγένεια', *TDNT* 7, 742. Fàbrenga suggests that συγγενεῖς denotes 'friend' and not 'fellow countrymen', suggestions according to Lampe are based on 'shaky presuppositions'. See V. Fàbrega, 'War Junia[s], der hervorragende Apostel [Röm. 16, 7], eine Frau?' *JAC* 27/28 [1984/85]: 47-64. Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 74.

connections, it denotes those of the same tribe or race. It seems more likely that συγγενής in Rom 16 denotes Jewish race. That is, Paul is here referring to Christians who are fellow Jews with him.[204]

Why is Paul interested in emphasizing Jewish relations in Romans specially? Does it mean that the special recognition of a few as his kinspeople denotes the rest of the people in the list as Gentile Christians?[205] Jewett suggests the possible reason, 'as Paul's effort to affirm the legitimacy of some of the Jewish Christians currently being discriminated against by the Gentile Christian majority in the Roman house and Tenement churches'.[206] Other than Romans 16, the term is used in Romans 9:3, where he appeals that 'I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my brothers and sisters, my relatives according to the flesh' (τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα).[207] Paul's use of συγγενής is significant because it indeed highlights the inclusion of Jews and Gentiles in God's plan of salvation (Rom 9-11).

4.4.4.2. συναιχμάλωτοι

Another significant description of (Andronicus and) Junia in Rom 16 is συναιχμαλώτους (fellow prisoners of Paul) as used in Colossians 4:10 (Aristarchus) and Philemon 23 (Epaphras). The word 'prisoner' (αἰχμάλωτος) refers to a captive taken in a war.[208] It is interesting to note that Paul applies it so selectively, only to four persons. The personal pronoun 'μου' along with 'σύν' (with) indicates a 'shared experience'[209] or a joint venture.

---

[204] Clarke, 'Jew and Greek', 112. See also Jewett, *Romans*, 962; Dunn, *Romans*, 894; Bauckham, *Gospel Women,* 170; Moo, *Romans*, 921; Belleville, 'Re-examination of Romans 16:7', 233; Schreiner, *Romans*, 795.

[205] Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 74.

[206] Jewett, *Romans*, 962. See also F. Watson, 'The Two Roman Congregations', 210. Watson suggests that Andronicus and Junia are linked with the earliest Jewish Christianity.

[207] Cf. συγγενεῖς is used in Josephus, Ant. 1.276; 2.269, 278; 9.249; 11.341; 12.257, 338.

[208] *LSJ*, 45; *MM*, 16.

[209] Jewett, *Romans*, 962.

It is clear from Colossians 4:3; Philemon 1, 10, and 13 that Paul was in prison and the persons designated as fellow prisoners shared imprisonment with him.[210] Although the occasion of imprisonment of Andronicus and Junia is not specific, that does not reduce the impact of their effort. Therefore the term possibly shows that they were imprisoned at one of the occasions of Paul's imprisonments. 'They are his "fellow prisoners" in the sense that they too had suffered imprisonment for their allegiance to the gospel'.[211] Gerhard Kittel argues that 'fellow prisoner' is used in a metaphorical sense,[212] which seems unlikely since Paul was imprisoned on many occasions (2 Cor 6:5; 11:23).

4.4.4.3. πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ

Paul's description of Andronicus and Junia as being in Christ before him suggests that they were very early Jewish Christians, which is an accepted notion. It denotes that their conversion experience was before that of Paul (prior to 34 CE), which probably attests their apostolic status on the basis of witness to the resurrection, since Paul refers to himself as the last of the series of witnesses to the resurrection (1 Cor 15:8).[213] It also indicates that they could have been present among 'the visitors from Rome' on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:10), and as the members of the Jerusalem church, they could also have been involved in the incidents mentioned in Acts (6:1; 11:19).[214] It seems that Paul wants the Romans to acknowledge their task of mission for a longer period.

---

[210] Luke refers to an overnight incarceration in Philippi (Acts 16:24-34), while Paul refers to many imprisonments (2 Cor 11:23).

[211] Bauckham, *Gospel Women,* 172. The same opinion is shared by the majority of the scholars like Dunn, Jewett, Schreiner, Moo. Sanday and Headlam suggests a different place and time of imprisonment and not the same as that of Paul, which is unlikely because the term implies the possibility of the same occasion as that of Paul. See Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 423; Cranfield, *Romans*, 788-789.

[212] G. Kittel, 'συναιχμάλωτος', *TDNT* 1, 196-197.

[213] Jewett, *Romans*, 964.

[214] Jewett, *Romans*, 964.

It is interesting to note Bauckham's suggestion that 'they were almost certainly Palestinian Jews (unless they were diaspora Jews converted while visiting Jerusalem) and probably members of the early Jerusalem church', that 'Andronicus and Junia may well have been involved in the founding or early growth of the Christian community in Rome' and 'they must certainly have been leaders of considerable significance among the Roman Christians' as 'outstanding among the apostles'.[215] Although the expression is not explicit enough to draw a firm conclusion, it is plausible that 'this couple had functioned as Christian apostles for more than two decades before Paul wrote this letter to Rome requesting they be greeted by other believers in Rome, who evidently were not inclined to acknowledge their accomplishments and status'.[216]

4.4.5. Significance of Junia to the Roman church: Pauline Motivation

Why is Paul asking the Romans to greet Junia? What is her significance to the Roman church? Firstly, the purpose of greetings in the second person plural is to create relationships and bonds. Secondly, Paul acknowledges her toil in ministry, which is also an encouragement for others to suffer for the cause of the gospel.

Paul describes Junia and Andronicus as συγγενεῖς μου and συναιχμαλώτους, which throw light on their relationship to Paul. This seems to imply an equal standing in mission with that of Paul and his co-workers. But the other two descriptions ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστολόις and πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ explicitly state their relationship to the early Christian community and their significant contribution to the Christian mission as well.

---

[215] Bauckham, *Gospel Women*, 181.

[216] Jewett, *Romans*, 964. There is another notion that Andronicus and Junia were members of the Antioch church and Jewett considers that view as less plausible because of their very early origin as Christian missionaries. See also Käsemann, *Romans*, 414.

In fact, Paul's descriptions possibly imply in what respects they are remarkable to the Roman church. Firstly, Junia is portrayed as an associate of Paul. She is not only an apostle (in a sense of co-worker) but also prominent among them. The reasons for their distinctiveness is not specific, but one can make out that the reasons may include their toil (fellow prisoner) and missionary zeal (in Christ before Paul). Secondly, Paul's description of her as 'prominent among the apostles' seems to imply the returning of benefits to Paul (honouring Paul through honouring her and Andronicus) through the reputation of those who associate with himself (cf. Rom 16:3, 4). Thirdly, it reveals the mutual obligation which comes about by being in Christ (cf. Rom 12:5). The phrase 'in Christ' places all the human relationships in a deeper context, i.e. we all belong together because we are in Christ/the Lord. Reciprocity in the actions of Andronicus and Junia is not very explicit in the text as it is in the case of Phoebe (προστάτις of many as well as Paul) and Prisca (ἀσπάσασθε not only from Paul but also a large group from all the churches of the Gentiles). But rather all are mutually obliged in the 'body of Christ'.

Paul wants to make a chain of relationships. It seems that Paul wants to establish and maintain relationship to the Roman believers on the basis of Junia's fame. Paul asks the Romans to greet Junia, who is a well-reputed figure among the apostles, which in turn helps Paul's relationships to the Romans. By greeting Andronicus and Junia, the Romans join themselves to the circle of those who recognize them and therefore to Paul and to the apostles, who know and honour them.[217]

In conclusion, it is plausible that Junia is a feminine name and she is 'outstanding among the apostles' as well. Although the role is not explicitly made

---

[217] Some textual variants (C* F G) read ᾽Ιουνιαν for ᾽Ιουλίαν (Rom 16:15).

out as in the case of Phoebe as διάκονος of the church of Cenchreae, and προστάτις of many as well as Paul, and that of Prisca, as her leading role in the church in her house, we get a picture regarding Junia's contribution to the early Christian mission and the Pauline mission from the descriptive phrases. She is a Jewish Christian and the wife of Andronicus and one among the leading members of the Christian community known as 'apostles'.

The greeting attached with the descriptive phrases denotes Paul's intention to create and strengthen mutual relationships and bonds. Those phrases indeed throw light on the significance of Junia and her valuable contribution to the Christian Church. Her prominence among the apostles probably signifies her active leadership in ministry.

4.5. Hardworking Members: Mary, Persis, Tryphoena, Tryphosa

The same descriptive phrase is used to describe four of the women in the greeting list -- Mary, Tryphoena, Tryphosa and Persis (to labour κοπιάω, Rom 16:6, 12); πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ὑμᾶς to denote Mary (v.6); πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν Κυρίῳ to denote Persis (v.12); κοπιώσας ἐν Κυρίῳ to denote Tryphoena and Tryphosa (v.12). This term is used only for these four women in the long list of greeting consisting of a large number of individuals and groups, implying that these women's works need to be appreciated and commented upon. These four women were not working as a team, except Tryphoena and Tryphosa, which indicates Mary's and Persis's independent endeavour.

The verb is used elsewhere by Paul of himself (1 Cor 15:10; 2 Cor 6:5; 11:23, 27: Gal 4:11; Phil 2:16; Col 1:29; 1 Thess 2:9; 3:5; 2 Thess 3:8); of himself and Apollos (1 Cor 3:8); of apostles in general (1 Cor 4:12); of the household of Stephanas, including Fortunatus and Achaicus, and of other individuals (1 Cor

16:16; 1 Thess 5:12); indeed as a characteristic that would be reflected in all believers (1 Cor 15:58; cf. Eph 4:28).

4.5.1. Mary (Rom 16:6)

'Maria'/ Mary in Rom 16 represents the pagan name of a Roman gens.[218] On the one hand, the name was very common among Jews,[219] and on the other hand, the name is used among Gentiles,[220] which poses a difficulty in deciding her ethnicity. Lampe suggests that the greater possibility is for her pagan status, since Paul is not identifying her especially as a kinswoman.[221] Jewett opts for her strong Jewish background in Rome.[222]

However, her toil for the Romans is specially mentioned by Paul as ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ὑμᾶς 'she has laboured for you'. It seems that Mary functioned as a missionary in Rome and her work was on behalf of a congregation, since Paul specifies her work 'for you'. The verb 'labour' occurs 23 times and the noun 'labour' occurs 18 times in the early Christian sources, and as analysed by Harnack, supports the technical meaning of 'missionary and congregational work'.[223] Dunn argues that the term does not denote a leadership function, because Paul recognizes devoted work on behalf of the church (1 Cor 16:16; 1 Thess 5:12),[224] that is, the willingness to meet the needs of a new congregation such as voluntarily submitting to undertake tasks. But this seems improbable, since one of the Pauline purposes of the greetings in Rom 16:2-16 seems to be to commend those who are in leadership roles, including women. The

---

[218] 'The Latin-pagan 'Maria' occurs 108 times in the Roman inscriptions of *CIL* VI. The semitic 'Maria' cannot be counted even 20 times in Rome'. Lampe, 'Roman Christians', 225.

[219] Dunn, *Romans,* 893.

[220] See Jewett, *Romans,* 960. She is likely a slave or former slave in the Marius family. Horsley suggests that whether Mary was 'a Jew or a Roman cannot be determined with certainty' by examining the other examples of this name. G. H. R. Horsley, 'Maria the διάκονος', *NewDocs* 2, 193-95.

[221] See Lampe, *Paul to Valentinus*, 176.

[222] Jewett, *Romans*, 961.

[223] Adolf von Harnack, 'κοπιᾶν (Οἱ Κοπιῶντες) im frühchristlichen Sprachgebrauch' *ZNW* 27 (1928) 1-10; Jewett, *Romans,* 961. See also Ollrog, *Mitarbeiter*, 71.

[224] Dunn, *Romans*, 893.

verb implies honourable toil for the sake of the gospel or the community, and is clearly a commendation.[225] The term as used elsewhere for Paul and his co-workers in denoting apostolic labours in fact throws light upon her roles in relation to the church.

The adjective πολλά (much) denotes her hard work for missionary purpose, probably denoting much longer time than others as 'one of the earliest members of the church at Rome and its organization could have been largely due to her influence'.[226] Therefore Paul is appreciating her hard work for the missionary cause on behalf of a congregation for an extended time and her leadership might have helped the congregation to flourish in Rome.

4.5.2 Persis (Rom 16:12)

Persis may be Gentile or Jewish. It is a typical name for a feminine slave, a name found six times in the Roman epigraphic and literary sources.[227] It is also interesting to note that Paul adds one more descriptive phrase τὴν ἀγαπητήν (the beloved) for Persis along with one denoting her missionary task and toil as πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν Κυρίῳ. 'In the Lord' could be seen as a further sealing of her hard work as a missionary for an extended period, as seen in the case of Mary.[228]

Paul often indicates his affection for his fellow Christians, by referring to them as 'my beloved [name]' (Rom 16:5, 8, 9b, Epaenetus, Amplias, Stachys). 'The beloved Persis' denotes a close relationship which implies her relationship to the Roman believers too. Ἀγαπητός in vv. 5, 8, 9, 12, denotes a 'warm personal

---

[225] Schreiber suggests community leadership of women with the use of the term κοπιάω (Rom 16:6, 12); Schreiber, 'Arbeit mit der Gemeinde (Rom 16:6, 12)', 217. See also, A. L. Chapple, 'Local Leadership in the Pauline Churches: Theological and Social Factors in its Development. A Study based on 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians and Philippians', PhD diss., University of Durham, 1984, 398-349.

[226] Murray, *Romans*, 2:229.

[227] P. Lampe, 'Persis,' *ABD* 5 (1992) 244.

[228] See the section on Mary, 4.5.1.

relationship'.[229] The Pauline description of some individuals as ἀγαπητός is important since he emphasizes the theme of ἀγάπη in Rom 12:9-21; 13:8-10. Persis played a significant role in the congregation and probably her roles needed to be appreciated; she is beloved by the Roman believers and Paul as well.

4.5.3. Tryphoena, Tryphosa (Rom 16:12)

On the basis of the names found in the inscriptions, Lampe suggests that Tryphoena and Tryphosa were possibly Gentile Christians from a slave background.[230] Lampe does not think that they were sisters, while others argue that the similarity in names and the conjunction 'and' denote a sibling relationship.[231] They are described as labourers in the Lord κοπιώσας ἐν Κυρίῳ (v.12) indicating their missionary work or work as local church leaders. Therefore they need to be honoured for their toil in mission.

4.6. Rufus' Mother (Rom 16:13)

Paul states that Rufus' mother was also a 'mother of mine' (v.13). Though it is unclear what Paul really meant by this, it could be inferred that she might have helped him in a specific situation or ministered to him regularly at some point in his labours.[232] A mother's role is implied here.

Meeks suggests that the language of familial affection (e.g. mother, father, brother and sister) is a characteristic in Pauline Christian groups and rare in associations.[233] Members are unrelated in a literal sense but address one another or name themselves in familial terms 'to express identity and feeling of belonging and

---

[229] Dunn, *Romans*, 893. In v. 8, Amplias is described as Paul's 'beloved in the Lord', which shows Paul's relationship with him as well as his position in the church.
[230] Lampe, *Paul to Valentinus*, 169, 183.
[231] P. Lampe, 'Tryphaena and Tryphosa' *ABD* 6, 669. Those who think that they were sisters include Käsemann, *Romans*, 414-415; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 879; Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 741; R. L. Omanson, 'Who's who in Romans 16? Identifying Men and Women among the People Paul sent greetings to' *Bib Trans* 49, (1998), 430-436, at 433.
[232] Schreiner, *Romans*, 793.
[233] Meeks, *Urban Christians*, 31.

community'.[234] As Horrell rightly suggests: 'Paul's labelling of Christians as ἀδελφός implies "role ethics", a set of expectations as to how behaviour and relationships should be structured which follow from a certain role-designation'.[235] It signifies the Pauline vision of Christian community that upholds mutuality and harmony in the relationships between one another.

4.7. Nereus' Sister (Rom 16:15)

Nereus' sister is also mentioned in a cluster of five names (v.15) and she is not given any designation, and here the term ἀδελφή denotes her relationship to Nereus as a sister in a literal sense.

Jewett suggests that the sister of Nereus is not personally known to Paul, but Paul might have heard about her because of her leading role in the church.[236] That may be the reason why Paul does not mention her name but refers to her as the sister of Nereus. It is suggested that she and Nereus are the children of Philologos and Julia,[237] but this is unlikely as there is no evidence given in the text. It is interesting to note that she and Julia are among the leading members of the congregation (two-fifths), which is possibly a 'tenement church', since it is led by a group of leaders rather than by a 'single patron'.[238] It is possible to assume a collective leadership in 'tenement churches' and that is also different in structure compared to the house church, led by Prisca and Aquila.

---

[234] Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations*, 33. Harland suggests that language of familial affection occurs in a number of associations, where the members are not literally related to the same family.

[235] Horrell, *Solidarity and Difference*, 113. The term ἀδελφός when metaphorically used indicates that a sibling-like bond is expected from the two parties involved.

[236] Jewett, *Romans,* 972.

[237] Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:795; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 742; Moo, *Romans*, 926, Dunn, *Romans*, 2:898 suggest this view only as a possibility.

[238] Jewett, *Romans*, 972.

4.8. Julia (Rom 16:15)

Julia is likely a slave or a freed woman. She is a part of a group of five members (v.15). Julia is connected with Philologus which probably indicates that they were a married couple[239] or possibly brother and sister.[240] That Julia is connected to Philologos with καί (and) suggests that she was married to Philologos. Like Nereus' sister, Julia is possibly in the leadership of the tenement church as she is one among the five leaders mentioned by Paul to be greeted in v.15. Therefore the greeting acknowledges her work for the church.

4.9. Conclusion

Thus far we have attempted to study the roles of women in Romans 16:1-16. Some women clearly exercised leadership roles since they were described with descriptive phrases and those phrases indicated their different roles in the church. Phoebe is the διάκονος of the church of Cenchreae and προστάτις of many as well as Paul. Prisca was a co-worker of Paul and was willing to support his ministry at all costs. Moreover, she may have been the leader of the church in her house. Her contribution was profound as she was beneficial to all the churches of the Gentiles, not solely to women but to both men and women. Junia is a feminine name. She is a Jewish Christian and the wife of Andronicus and both are described as 'prominent among the apostles', which is indicative of their leading position as well as special function in the community. Mary, Persis, Tryphoena and Tryphosa were hardworking women and part of the appreciated and acknowledged team, who had supported Paul and his mission by various means. Rufus' mother was a 'mother' to

---

[239] Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 427; Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:795; Dunn, *Romans*, 2: 898; P. Lampe, 'Julia,' *ABD* 3 (1992), 1125.

[240] Jewett, *Romans*, 972. See also above, fn. 217: some textual variants (C* F G) read ᾿Ιουνιαν for ᾿Ιουλίαν (Rom 16:15).

Paul. Nereus' sister and Julia were possibly part of the leadership team of a tenement church.

Primarily, what we have deduced from these passages is the roles of these women pertaining to leadership as well as roles related to Paul and active participation in the church and his mission. Secondly, women were greeted and appreciated for their hard work, which gives us an insight into Paul's attitude to women in leadership. Paul refers here to women in various kinds of leadership without feeling the need to offer any kind of explanation or defence; their leadership is mentioned and honoured alongside that of men (or over men) without any special remark, as if this was unusual or controversial. And the reciprocity he describes and creates is thus quite gender-blind: he binds these women into webs of exchange with himself, his churches and the Romans with mutual obligations going in all directions irrespective of gender. There are no special provisions, or special expectations, or special limitations because they are women: they are just like everyone else, and can appear at any point in this web of mutual exchange. Their hard work is honoured and reciprocated quite without reference to their gender.

The third, but not the least important matter in this passage is the aspect of mutuality. Paul appreciates mutual relations as he asks the Roman believers to greet those people. The rhetoric of the passage envisages mutuality and encourages mutual relations between one another irrespective of gender identity.

This aspect of mutuality is not an exclusive theme in Romans 16, but may be found more profoundly in the exhortation in Romans 12-15, where Paul repeatedly emphasises one-another relationships through thematic as well as linguistic links, which is the subject of the next two chapters.

Chapter 5

The Body Metaphor and ἀλλήλους: A Paradigm of Mutuality in Romans 12, 13

5.1. Introduction

Women's ministry within the structures of mutualism, one of the important aspects of the greetings (Rom 16:1-16), was the focus of the preceding chapter. Although Paul pinpoints mutual relationships between Jews and Gentiles in Romans 1-11, it is apparent in chapters 12-15 that he desires to hold the believers together to strengthen social relationships as 'one body in Christ' (Rom 12:5).[1] The body metaphor is also used by Paul's contemporaries such as rhetoricians, philosophers, moralists and historians. Although Paul uses a similar rhetoric, he depicts it in a Christian communitarian perspective.

It is striking that Paul speaks about the mercies of God in the beginning of chapter 12, which is the whole story of the Gospel - the love of God (Rom 12:1 cf. 5:5, 8; 8:39), which is not accidental, since ἀγάπη is a subject matter that runs through Romans 12 and 13. The theme of love (ἀγάπη) and the term 'one another' (ἀλλήλους) underscore mutual relationships that embrace the community together. Paul urges on the Romans that social existence and social responsibilities should be in tandem with their personal devotion to God (Rom 12:1, 2).

How does Paul describe mutual relations through the body politic and the language of 'one another'? The aim of this chapter is to discuss the body metaphor and the exhortations of Paul to enhance love and mutuality, in order to deduce the Pauline mutuality model implied in Romans 12 and 13.

---

[1] Apart from 1 Corinthians 12 and Romans 12, the body metaphor is used in the deutero-Pauline epistles (Eph 1:23; 2:16; 3:6; 4:1-16; Col 1:8-24; 2:17-19; 3:15). Kim recently suggests that the different approaches to the conception of community as the body of Christ are: '*boundary-protected* community' (ecclesiological organism); '*boundary-overcoming* community' (the New Perspective on Paul as the matter of relationship) and the 'apocalyptic community' (participating in the divine will). Kim, *Christ's Body in Corinth*, 11.

5.2. The Body Metaphor in the Pauline Epistles

Paul uses the body metaphor in the context of the charismatic community (Rom 12; 1 Cor 12; cf. Eph 4:12; Col 1:18). As Dunn suggests, 'The body imagery is actually an expression of the consciousness of community and oneness experienced by the first Christians as they met "in Christ"'.[2] In the ensuing sections, the discussion is focussed on the body metaphor as a political metaphor in antiquity and Paul's use of the body metaphor in 1 Corinthians and Romans.

5.2.1. The Body as a Political Metaphor in Antiquity

In the Greco-Roman world, the metaphor of the body is used as an expression of political and cosmic solidarity. Ancient literature witnesses the use of the metaphor for a social and political group. It is also used in *homonoia* (concord) speeches. The most important themes in the use of the body metaphor in different realms are unity, hierarchy and interdependence.

5.2.1.1. Unity

Unity is a common topos in the use of the body metaphor in antiquity. For example, Plutarch describes the unity of the Greek city states with the same phrase as Paul uses, ἕν σῶμα (one body).[3] In the speech of Menenius Agrippa, the fables of Aesop are used to exhort the plebs to stop their agitation and submit to the patricians, and were widely known in the Greco-Roman world; they compare the state to the human body and the revolt of some members of the body against the stomach until they were starved and revived their organic unity.

> In the days when man's members did not all agree amongst themselves, as is now the case, but each had its own ideas and a voice of its own, the other parts thought it unfair that they should have the worry and the trouble and the labour of providing for the belly, … they therefore conspired together that the hands should carry no food to the mouth, nor

---

[2] Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 724.
[3] Plutarch, *Philopoemen*, 8, cited by E. Schweizer, "σῶμα κτλ.", *TDNT* 7 (1971), 1041.

the mouth accept anything that was given it, nor the teeth grind up what was received. While they sought this in an angry spirit to starve the belly into submission, the members themselves and the whole body were reduced to utmost weakness. Hence it had become clear that even the belly had no idle task to perform, and was no more nourished than it nourished the rest … Drawing a parallel from this to show how like was the internal dissension of the bodily members to the anger of the plebs against the Fathers, he prevailed upon the minds of his hearers.[4]

Aelius Aristides compares political turbulence to a disease like consumption, to a tearing apart of the body, and to the folly of cutting off one's own feet.[5] The body image is widely used by the philosophical moralists, who were Paul's contemporaries. For example, Seneca wrote,

What if the hands should desire to harm the feet, or the eyes the hands? As all the members of the body are in harmony one with another because it is to the advantage of the whole of the individual members to be unharmed, so mankind should spare the individual man, because all are born for a life of fellowship, and society can be kept unharmed only by the mutual protection and love of its parts.[6]

Dio Chrysostom used the metaphor in his speeches.[7] The speeches of Dio Chrysostom in Tarsus around the beginning of the second century point to the polis, the city state, as a body, and strife, discord, or any civil disturbance as a disease that must be eradicated from it.[8] Discord affects the whole body politic. For he says,

---

[4] Livy, *History of Rome* 2.32; see also Aesop *Fables* 132; Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses* 33.16; Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 2.10.4-5; see J. Horst, "μέλος" *TDNT* 4 (1967) 556, 562f; Menenius in the speech urges the Roman people to work together for harmony, abandoning rebellion.
[5] Aelius Aristides, *Orations* 17.9; 23.31; 24.18, 38-39; 26.43. See also R. F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999), 459.
[6] Seneca, *Anger* 2.31. See Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 458.
[7] Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses* 9.2; 33.44; 39.5; 40.21; 41.9; 50.3. He also used the body metaphor to refer to friends. Dio thinks that friends are more useful than the members of one's own body because they can freely move around. See *Discourses* 3.104-107; cf. 1.31-32. See also Collins, *1 Corinthians,* 458.
[8] Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses* 34.17, 20, 22; 38.12; 48.12; Aelius Aristides, *Orations* 24.16, 18. Dio compares the citizens of the state to different aspects of the body such as eyes, with which to see the city's interest, others as the ears to hear and some as the tongues to advise and some as the minds (*Discourses* 39.5). It is said by the rhetoricians that strife in the political body is the same as the illness caused by the improper working of the internal parts of the body. The body would be sick due to the

> At any rate, if one were to run through the entire list of citizens, I believe he would not discover even two men in Tarsus who think alike, but on the contrary, just as with certain incurable and distressing diseases which are accustomed to pervade the whole body, exempting no member of it from their inroads, so this state of discord, this almost complete estrangement of one from another, has invaded your entire body politic.[9]

These *homonoia* speeches use the body metaphor to argue for unity or concord.

5.2.1.2. Hierarchy

It is also significant to note the hierarchy of society affirmed by *homonoia* speeches. It is assumed that the 'body is hierarchically constituted and that illness or social disruption occurs when that hierarchy is disrupted'.[10] In relation to class conflict, the speeches reflect the social situation of ancient political thought as opposition between the two groups in the ancient city: rich and poor, or upper class (the 'haves') and lower class (the 'have-nots'). Some of the examples are the following: Aelius Aristides admires Solon, the quasi-legendary Greek forefather and lawgiver: 'He was most of all proud of the fact that he brought the people together with the rich, so that they might dwell in harmony in their city, neither side being stronger than was expedient for all in common'.[11] Dio speaks in Tarsus to the *demos*, the main body of citizens as opposed to the small ruling class; sometimes he refers to the conflicts between the Council, the small upper class and the Assembly, the large

---

disturbance of the natural and harmonious function of the different groups and classes. See Isocrates, *On the Peace* 109. See also Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 38.

[9] Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses* 34.20. The speeches urging for unity are called *homonoia* speeches (*concordia* in Latin). In the times of crisis, these speeches are delivered calling for unity or concord. 'Within "deliberative rhetoric" - that is, rhetoric urging a political body toward some course of action – a popular topic was concord or unity'. Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 38. Cf. 1 Cor 1:10 'I encourage you brothers… that you all agree and that you allow no schisms to exist among yourselves…'; 12:25 'that there be no schisms in the body': Paul's major concern is the unity of the church, Christ's body. M. M. Mitchell categorizes 1 Corinthians as a letter with the topoi of *homonoia* speeches, since Paul's main intention is the unity of the church. M. M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*: *An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1991), 65-66.

[10] Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 40. Class conflict can also cause social disruption.

[11] Aelius Aristides, *Orations* 24.14.

lower class of citizens. In the same speech, he speaks to the *demos* on its conflict with the city's linen workers, who are quarrelling for civic rights and privileges.[12] The strong and the weak classes of the society were in conflict with each other.

To some extent, the main aim of *homonoia* speeches is alleviation of conflict by affirming the hierarchy of society. The political hierarchy of the city is related to the hierarchical model of the cosmos, as each entity knows its position in the whole galaxy. As Aelius Aristides says,

> The sun proceeds in its course ever preserving its proper place, and the phases of the moon and the motion of the stars go on, and the revolutions and the positions of each in respect to one another and their proper distances, and again their harmonies are preserved, since agreement prevails among them, and there are no differences present nor do they arise, but all things have yielded to the law of nature and they use one will concerning all their duties, so that if imitation of the gods is an act of men of good sense, it would be the part of men of good sense to believe that they are all as a unity, as far as is possible.[13]

Dio refers to the heavenly bodies and the elements of the cosmos that represent concord.[14] However, it is interesting to note that the topos of the cosmos related to the city could work in the reverse direction. Pseudo-Aristotle refers to the elements of the cosmos by appeal to commonplaces regarding concord, noting that the opposite classes could work together for unity maintaining hierarchy: 'It is as if men should wonder how a city survives, composed as it is of the most opposite classes... that out of plurality and diversity it achieves a homogeneous unity capable of admitting every variation and degree'.[15] Since it is assumed that 'the opposites are necessary for each

---

[12] Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses* 34.16, 21, 23.
[13] Aelius Aristides, *Oration* 23.77.
[14] Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses* 38.11; Air, earth, water, fire and ether are hierarchically arranged; see Philo, *On Joseph* 145; *1 Clement* 20; Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations* 5:30; Aelius Aristides, *Oration* 24.42; 27.35.
[15] Pseudo-Aristotle, *On the Cosmos* 5.396b.

other's existence, it would appear that the weak and poor are necessary to balance the strong and rich - in the city as well as the cosmos'.[16]

In another topos of *homonoia* speeches the idea of the state as a household is followed. While the cosmos works well, since every cosmic entity knows its own position as well as its function, the household lives peacefully because the different members do their own duty with mutual respect but with submission to those superior to them in their families.[17] However, the interdependence between the family members does not imply equality.

On the one hand, *homonoia* speeches have a familiar theme that one should work for the common good by denying personal interests while yielding to others. The upper class should honour the interests of the lower in order to maintain concord and the common good. Aelius Aristides calls forth the opposite classes to follow the pattern of the household, fathers to their sons and masters to slaves, i.e., on the one side, the ruling class by renouncing some of their authority and, on the other side, the inferior are led by accepting the decisions of the superiors.[18]

On the other hand, the conservative ideology in the Greco-Roman world may be called benevolent patriarchalism which 'maintained the social hierarchy by urging the lower class to submit to those in authority and the higher class to rule benevolently and gently, accommodating its own demands in order to protect the

---

[16] *Contra* Mitchell, who considers that the purpose of the whole political body is to make all members strong. Martin observes, 'Homonoia is not aimed at equality or strength for all the members but the preservation of the "natural" relation of strength to weakness'. Mitchell, *Paul and Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 127; Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 41.

[17] Dio Chrysostom, *Discourse* 24.24; 38.15; Aelius Aristides, *Oration* 24.7; Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 41.

[18] Aelius Aristides, *Oration* 24. 32-33. See also Dio Chrysostom, *Discourse* 40.34; Demosthenes, *Epistle* 3.45; Mitchell, *Paul and Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 130-32.

interests of those lower down the social scale'.[19] That is, the upper class continues to rule without any reversal of positions.

Dio, while dealing with the conflict between Tarsus, the powerful city and the smaller neighbouring towns in *Discourse* 34.47-50, advises Tarsus to yield to the smaller towns without the reversal of their status. He thinks that discord arises because of the oppression of the weak by the strong and he urges, 'the stronger should yield to the weaker as long as the condescension does not yield to an actual reversal of positions'.[20] In a second speech, he addresses Nicomedia in *Discourse* 38 insisting that they achieve the title of 'the first city' by being the benefactor of the smaller cities in their area and surpassing Nicea in benefaction, with whom they have conflict and dispute. He accepts the natural hierarchy, since he thinks that it is not wrong for a man to seek recognition or the attaining of first rank.

5.2.1.3. Diversity and Interdependence

Apart from the aspects of unity and hierarchy, the differing gifts of the members of the community as well as their exercise for the total benefit of the community are the other significant features of the body metaphor in the Greco-Roman literature. In the Sophist doctrine of society, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (c. 20 BCE) compares the state to a body with interdependent members: ἔοικέ πως ἀνθρωπείῳ σώματι πόλις. σύνθετον γὰρ ἐκ πολλῶν μερῶν ἐστιν ἑκάτερον ('How like a human body is a city. For it is also put together from many different

---

[19] Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 42. Martin renamed Paul's 'love patriarchalism' (proposed by Theissen) as 'benevolent patriarchalism'. See Theissen, *Social Setting of Pauline Christianity,* 107-110; D. B. Martin*, Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (London: Yale University Press, 1990), 26-30*,* 88-91, 126-129. Martin states that benevolent patriarchalism is used by Greco-Roman writers; see Philo's *patēreunous*, *On Joseph* 67-69. Benevolent patriarchalism has its position between democracy (excessive freedom of the masses and the enslavement of the upper class to the lower class) and tyranny (harsh dictatorship that does not give ear to the desires of the masses).

[20] Dio, *Discourse* 34.6-7; Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 46.

parts').[21] Epictetus (c. 55 CE - c.135 CE) wrote, 'What, then, is the profession of a citizen? To treat nothing as a matter of private profit, not to plan about anything as though he were a detached unit, but to act like the foot or the hand, which, if they had the faculty of reason to understand the constitution of the nature, would never exercise choice or desire in any other way but by reference to the whole'.[22]

There is evidence in Plato's *Republic* and in Cicero's *On Duties* regarding the different functions of the members of the body.[23] Plutarch also comments about the law of nature that the different members are 'for mutual preservation and assistance, not for variance and strife'.[24] Another tradition by Orphics and Stoics considers the universe as the body of God.[25]

It is important to note the reference of Seneca to the pantheistic tradition, where humans are a part of the world body: *… omne hoc, quod vides, quo divina atque humana conclusa sunt, unum est; membra sumus corporis magni. Natura nos cognatos edidit, cum ex isdem et in eadem gigneret. Haec nobis amorem indidit mutuum et sociabiles fecit.* '… all that you behold, that which comprises both god and man, is one – we are the parts of one great body. Nature produced us related to one another, since she created us from the same source and to the same end. She engendered in us mutual affection, and made us prone to friendships'.[26] Seneca also expresses the difference between 'a composite body' and 'a separate body' in the social sphere: 'there are certain bodies which are integers, a man, for example; and others which are composite, as a ship or a house or anything, in short, whose different parts are united by assemblage; and certain others again which are

---

[21] Dionysius Halicarnassus, *Antiq. Rom.* 6.86.1; see Jewett, *Romans*, 743.
[22] Epictetus, *Discourses* 2.10.4-5.
[23] Plato, *The Republic* 370A-B; Cicero, *On Duties* 3.5.22-23; 3.6.26-27.
[24] Plutarch, 'On Brotherly Love', *Moralia*, 478D.
[25] E. Schweizer, 'σῶμα κτλ.', 1037-38.
[26] Seneca, *Epistulae Morales,* 95.52; see J. N. Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca* (NovTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 170-71. See Jewett, *Romans*, 743.

distributed, their parts remaining separate, for example an army, a nation, a council, for the components of these bodies are united by right or duty, but by nature are individual and detached'.[27] Here σῶμα is used to refer to the legislatures as social bodies.

The first century Jewish authors, Josephus and Philo referred to the body metaphor. Josephus wrote, 'As in the body when inflammation attacks the principal member all the members catch infection, so the sedition and disorder in the capital gave the scoundrels in the country free licence to plunder'.[28] Also Philo wrote about the High Priest who offers prayers and asks for blessings in order 'that every age and every part of the nation regarded as a single body (ἑνὸς σώματός) may be united in one and the same fellowship (κοινωνία), making peace and good order the aim'.[29]

The study of the body politic in the Greco-Roman world is significant as we move on to the Pauline rhetoric of the body politic. Paul's rhetoric shares some of the common topoi found in antiquity and both aim at creating unity. The question is whether this goal is attained also in Paul by maintaining the social hierarchy and the status structures that prevail in society. What is the special dynamism in the Pauline rhetoric of the body politic?

5.2.2. 1 Corinthians 12: Exegetical Analysis

Paul uses the body metaphor to deal with the Corinthians' erroneous view of spiritual gifts that affects their social harmony (1 Cor 12:12-31). Paul's use of the body metaphor in 1 Corinthians is important to this analysis because: a) it is an

---

[27] Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*, 102.6; see E. Schweizer, 'σῶμα κτλ.', 1034f; See Jewett, *Romans*, 743.
[28] Josephus, *Bell* 4.406-407; cf. 1.507; 2.264; 5.277-279.
[29] Philo, *Special Laws* 3.131; cf. *Dreams* 1.27-28. See Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 459.

elaborate exposition of the body metaphor; b) Paul's portrayal is more descriptive than in Romans; and 3) it helps to identify the different emphases in Romans.

5.2.2.1. One Body, Many Members (12:12, 13)

The 'one body' is characterized by many members. In spite of its variety of members, it is nevertheless one body. Paul uses two comparative particles 'for just … so also' (καθάπερ γὰρ… οὕτως) and he applies the metaphor to Christ and not to the church (v.12).[30] Garland suggests that 'the clause "so also is Christ" is awkward only because Christ is shorthand for the church as the body of Christ (12:27)'.[31] This notion is challenged as it would imply 'the ontological identification between Christ and the church'.[32] Barrett argues that such identification is unthinkable for Paul since Jesus is the Lord of all the church (12:3). He observes, 'Christ however remains always as the prototype of the relationship'.[33]

Paul aims to urge unity or oneness among the Corinthian believers. He proposes that although the body is one, it has many members and although there are many members, it is one. In 1 Cor 10:17, the idea that many are one body is drawn from the concept of the Lord's Table, many of them eating of the one loaf. Best suggests that this is what Paul will argue *from* and not argue *for*.[34] Paul further emphasizes that the body can function only through its diversified members.

---

[30] In Col 1:18, the church is called Christ's body. The same comparative particles are repeated in Rom 12:4, 5. Although Paul repeats the same subject to the Roman believers, the passage is shorter than in 1 Corinthians.

[31] D. E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 590. Fee supports the view that 'Christ means the church as a shortened form for the body of Christ'. G. D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 602.

[32] A. C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2000), 996. The following verses 12:12-30 do not support this view (Best and Whitley). Käsemann observes: 'Ecclesiological metaphysics are read even into the Pauline statements in a highly dangerous way … to put the matter somewhat too epigrammatically, the apostle is not interested in the church *per se*… He is only interested in it so far as it is the means whereby Christ reveals himself on the earth and becomes incarnate in the world through his spirit'. E. Käsemann, 'The Theological Problem Presented by the Motif of the Body of Christ', in *Perspectives on Paul* (London: SCM, 1971), 102-21, at 110, 117.

[33] C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: Adam &Clark, 1968), 286.

[34] Best, *Body*, 96. Best's reading of 1 Cor 12 in the whole context of 1 Cor 12-14 is unsatisfactory. See Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 602.

Therefore there can be diversity in unity and unity in diversity. For just as the body has many limbs and organs and yet they make up one body, so also the body of Christ despite its various organs and differing functions, makes one body. Although uniformity cannot be expected in differing organs and limbs that constitute a body, there can be unity in plurality. Soards observes, 'Paul's point is unity dominates diversity and makes diversity genuinely meaningful and constructive' rather than simply unity in diversity and diversity in unity.[35]

5.2.2.2. Diversity of Members (12:14-20)

Paul affirms that diversity is part and parcel of the body. In vv.15-16, he compares one sense organ with another and uses the classical rhetorical technique of personification. As Thiselton suggests,

> It is precisely *not* a late twentieth-century or early twenty-first-century 'postmodern' assurance that within certain boundaries everyone 'does one's own thing'. The respective functions of hands, feet, (v.15), ears, and eyes (v.16) *coordinate* the organism as one. If each did not play his or her *assigned role*, the one body would collapse into a chaotic non-entity. Hence, v.15 not only reassures those who feel inferior that they do indeed belong to the body, but also asserts the *necessity* for the *coherent unity* of the body both of those who feel inferior and to those who devalue others.[36]

Since the 'many' are expected to perform their assigned and different roles, the body is a differentiated entity, i.e. plurality and diversity of the body is emphasized (v.14). Paul uses double negatives in vv.15, 16 so that the result becomes positive; 'if the foot should say, "because I am not a hand, I do not belong to the body"'; if the ear should say, "because I am not an eye, I do not belong to the body"'. The foot and the hand despite their difference belong to the body, the same with the eye and the ear.

---

[35] M. L. Soards, *1 Corinthians* (NIBC, Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999), 263.

[36] Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 1002. The protasis of the conditional sentence uses an aorist subjunctive: ἐὰν εἴπῃ ὁ πούς and means 'if the foot should say' or 'if the foot were to say' (NJB) or 'suppose the foot were to say' (REB), and the apodosis: οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ του σώματος (NIV) I am not of the body or I do not belong to the body (NRSV, REB, NIV, NJB).

Difference does not indicate that the organs are independent. Similarly, there are different spiritual gifts and those are to be used as being parts of one body.

Another type of rhetorical question is asked by Paul (v.17), representing the members that belong to the body in pairs. The question seems to be like a chain: eye/hearing, hearing/smell, etc. The absence of a single member makes the body deficient; i.e., if the parts of the body that are necessary were lacking, it would certainly hinder its proper functioning. Here it is clearly a message to those who think they are inferior and also seems to be a logical move to challenge those who assume that they are the ones who make the whole (body) as it is. Therefore the differing tasks are essential and crucial for the proper functioning of the body.

The members of the body are properly arranged so that each one has its own place (v.18). The phrase νυνὶ δέ expresses the logical 'now then'; as Garland suggests 'it introduces the real situation after an unreal conditional clause: "but as a matter of fact", God made the body with its intricately interconnected parts so that it could perform at its optimum in the world'.[37] In the traditional Hellenistic use of the body metaphor, each one has its own place and the harmonious order in the body is derived from nature. Paul affirms that God has arranged the organs of the body as he willed (καθὼς ἠθέλησεν v.18; cf. 12:11). Fee observes that the emphasis is not on the orderly arrangement of the body; rather it is more likely on the 'divine placement' of each member.[38] As Thiselton suggests, 'to try to rank some gifts as 'more essential' than others, let alone as necessary marks of advanced status to

---

[37] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 595.

[38] Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 611. He refers back to vv.7-11, where the spirit gives the various manifestations to 'each person just as he pleases'. In vv. 24, 27, Paul emphasizes that being 'many parts of the one body' is God's design.

which all should aspire, is to offer a blasphemous challenge to God's freedom to choose whatever is his good will for his people both collectively and individually'.[39]

It is evident (v.19) that the body cannot exist if all the members are the same (without diversity), where we find a thematic echo of v.17: 'If the whole body were an eye, where would be the hearing?' As Fee suggests, 'If all the parts were of one kind, there would be no body at all, only a monstrosity! The concern for diversity can scarcely be missed'.[40]

Paul sums up the argument (v.20) as he has made clear in vv.13-19 that the body should have many members. μέλη is rendered as 'members' (NRSV) and as 'limbs' and 'organs' (REB). μέλη has a more specific physical sense than the word 'members' would suggest. μέν and δέ are translated as 'on the one hand… on the other hand'. It seems that v.20 may have the force of an axiom: many limbs and organs (on one side) and the body (on the other). Barrett interprets it as a fact rather than an axiom by translating: *but in fact there are many members and one body*.[41] Thus Paul has made clear that both diversity and unity are necessary aspects of a body, i.e. the unity in diversity and diversity in unity. Then he proceeds to emphasize the interdependence of its different parts.

5.2.2.3. The Need for Interdependence (v.21)

Paul explicitly states what he wants to convey by the rhetoric of the body. As Thiselton observes, 'not only does the rhetoric of the body reassure those with supposedly "inferior" or "dispensable" gifts that they do indeed belong fully to the

---

[39] Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 1004 (italics by Thiselton).
[40] Fee, *1 Corinthians,* 611.
[41] Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 290; F. Godet, *First Epistle to the Corinthians* (CFTL New Series, Vol. XXX; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1898) 2:214. Godet interprets this as an 'actual fact'. It is a concise epigram as suggested by Meyer, Robertson and Plummer; H. A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians: First Epistle* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1892), 1:376; A. Robertson & A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1914), 274.

body as essential limbs and organs, but *this rhetoric now explicitly rebukes those who think that they and their "superior" gifts are self-sufficient for the whole body, or that others are scarcely "authentic" parts of the body, as they themselves are'*.[42] He continues, 'No subset of gifts or experience constitutes the *esse* of the church, any more than some selected form of ministerial office represents the esse of the church. Both the *esse* and the *bene esse* lie in the mutual respect for, and acceptance of, what God has chosen (12:11) as that which promotes the Lordship of Christ (12:3) and the building up of the church for the common good (12:7), in an equality of *status* of those who owe their being in Christ to the gracious agency of the Holy Spirit as a gift for all (12:13)'.[43] It is made clear that a single gift cannot be used to evaluate other believers. The attitude of self sufficiency is not a part of the attitude of Christ, as Paul describes self-sufficiency as 'having no need' of others. Paul compares the different organs of the body to the diverse gifts, they are 'for the common good' (12:7) and the diversity is so essential that no organ can say that 'I have no need of you' (1 Cor 12:21). The method of personification is employed by Paul as he pictures an imaginary dialogue between the different parts of the body, the eye, the hand, the head, the feet (cf. vv.15-16), and implies that some of the Corinthian believers think they are the essential members of the body. Garland suggests 'eye' and 'head' mean those in leadership roles, while 'the hands' and 'feet' represent the slaves or the labouring class.[44] Paul asserts his point that the body has many members and these several members are interdependent. Each organ needs the other to exist, i.e. one needs another.

---

[42] Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 1005. (Italics original)
[43] Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 1006.
[44] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 595. See Fee, *1 Corinthians,* 610-11; D. G. Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interest and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 179-180.

5.2.2.4. Honouring the Less Honourable (12:22-24a)

Paul speaks about the honourable and the less honourable members of the body in order to demonstrate the need for interdependence. He uses the word ἀσθενέστερα, the comparative form of the adjective ἀσθενής to denote the weaker members.[45] Theissen and others consider it as referring to those with lower status, whereas for C. E. Glad it denotes 'dispositions of character … psychological dispositions or character types revealing aptitudes … and … maturity'.[46] The common understanding of 'weak' (ἀσθενής) has changed in the wake of the challenging thoughts of Glad and Martin. As Thiselton suggests,

> Paul refers to people in the church whose role, or more probably temperament, or perhaps both, present them as less endowed with power or status than others. The "strong" or the "gifted" perceived them as not providing much effective *weight* or *power* in the church's mission, and not much *confidence* borne of *status*. They were insufficiently impressive to count for much, either socially or spiritually, within the church, or in terms of what "contacts" or ability they might show for mission or for speaking with wisdom and knowledge to outsiders. Probably they never did effective mighty works or healing, seldom or never prophesied, and perhaps never spoke in tongues.[47]

Paul before drawing attention to the unpresentable parts (v.23), states that the parts of the body which are less endowed with power and status are essential (ἀναγκαῖα). Possibly Paul calls the less endowed essential parts because the strong and the gifted perceive themselves as the core of the church. It is worth quoting Chrysostom: 'What is meaner than the foot? What is more honourable than the head?

---

[45] Τὸ ἀσθενὲς τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor 1:25); τὰ ἀσθενῆ … ὁ θεός (1 Cor 1:27), where the weak are the goal of God's election. The distinction between the strong and the weak (4:10) and the relation between them (8:7, 9, 10) were discussed earlier in the letter.

[46] C. E. Glad, *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychology* (NovTSup, 81; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 333. Glad suggests that it does not refer to the social or spiritual status of people or to their 'theological positions'. In NRSV, NIV, NJB, and JB, ἀσθενέστερα is translated as weaker or weakest, but in RV 'more feeble' and in REB 'more frail' is used. These translations can hardly be followed as per the suggestions of Glad and Martin in terms of 'disposition of character'. See Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 1006.

[47] Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 1007. Fee suggests that Paul has in mind the internal organs, which are weaker, but protected internally. It is striking that they 'seem' to be weaker and need not necessarily be so. If an organ is removed because of its weakness, it affects the wholeness of the body. All parts, even if they are weaker make the body whole. See Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 613.

For this, the head, more than anything, is the man. Nevertheless … it could not do everything on its own … The greater have need of the less … For nothing … is dishonourable, seeing it is God's work'.[48]

Probably Paul speaks to a society where shame and honour are values and forces, which are less known in our contemporary society. He points to the reversed status of the weaker, less honourable and more shameful members of the body. Paul concludes that the unpresentable parts are given more honour than the presentable parts.[49] The word περιτίθεμεν is translated as 'invest', since it could be understood in two senses, as bestowing or conferring (Prov 12:9, LXX) or as putting a garment around (Matt 27:28; Mark 15:17). Therefore the unpresentable parts are bestowed with honour to make them presentable. Here it is paradoxical as the less presentable parts are adorned with more honour, which challenges the normal hierarchy of values that honour the privileged and humiliate those who are poor in society. Paul envisages the status reversals - the lower being made higher and vice versa; a parallel paradox can be found on the cross.[50] Those who assume that they are gifted because of their knowledge and wisdom are far from being the essence of the church. The necessary and essential members of the church are constituted by the less honourable and unpresentable parts.

---

[48] Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 31:1, 2. Other Church fathers also applied the idea that the believers need to give care, protection and support to those who are in need to follow the footsteps of Christ in serving others. See D. Bonhoeffer, *Christology* (Eng. Trans., London: SCM, 1978); *The Communion of the Saints*: *A Dogmatic Inquiry into the Sociology of the Church* (Eng. Trans., New York: Harper & Row, 1963), and *Ethics* (New York: Macmillan, 1965); J. Calvin, The *First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians* (Edinburgh: Oliver& Boyd, 1960*)*, 268; M. Luther, *Early Theological Works*, (trans.& ed.) J. Atkinson (London: SCM, 1962), 290-94.

[49] Martin notes that 'the genitals may seem to be the most shameful part of the body, but our very attention to them - our constant care to cover them and shield them from trivialising and vulgarizing public exposure – demonstrates that they are actually the most necessary of the body's members, those with the highest status'. D. Martin, 'Tongues of Angels and Other Status Indicators' *JAAR* 59 (1991), 547-89, at 567.

[50] Horrell, *Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence,* 181.

5.2.2.5. Mutual Concern for One Another (12:24b-25)

Paul repeats the argument in v.24, which he has already put forward (v.18) that God has arranged the members in the body according to his will, that God has formed the body together (συνεκέρασεν),[51] and the purpose of joining the body together is not to have bodily rupture (ἵνα μὴ ᾖ σχίσμα ἐν τῷ σώματι v.24).

Thus the outcome of God's creation of the body and its arrangement is in such a way to evade rupture (σχίσμα), which echoes Paul's purpose of writing the letter to the Corinthians in 1 Cor 1:10, where the term σχίσματα (pl.) is used. The opposite of schism is to show care for one another. Collins comments, 'Paul's strategic use of the term is an indication of the careful rhetorical composition of his letter'.[52] ἵνα and ἀλλά (v.25) express the alternative by avoiding the rupture in the body. That is, the ultimate aim is that the members should mutually care for one another (τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων μεριμνῶσιν τὰ μέλη). This could be translated as 'the same care for one another' (NRSV, RSV); 'the same concern for one another' (REB); 'equally concerned for all the others' (JB, RV). It is likely to denote the mutual care among one another (the members of the body), 'who mutually need each other to function as a body'.[53] The care and concern of a person or a group is not aimed at the benefit of the respective person or group, rather at the total care of the whole body. It is likely that Paul has in mind the care and concern that spouses need to have for one another since Paul used the same verb μεριμνάω in 1 Cor 7:32-

---

[51] συνεκέρασεν is first aorist indicative of συγκεράννυμι. For the meaning 'compose the body (by unifying the members so as to form one organism)', see *BDAG,* 952.

[52] Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 465. Collins notes that the term σχίσμα in the sense of rupture is rarely found in the literature of the time, except in a document pertaining to the guild of Zeus Hypsistos in an injunction against religious factions.

[53] Fee, *1 Corinthians,* 615.

34, i.e., care that 'absorbs the attention'.[54] God has formed the body and has joined

its parts in such a way that 'the least' members have more honour (1:27-28).

1 Cor 12:26 gives the practical implication of the body being joined together

as to have mutual concern for one another, i.e., to suffer with those who are

suffering and to rejoice with those who rejoice (συμπάσχει, συγχαίρει, cf.

συνεκέρασεν v.24). If one member of the body suffers, then suffering could be a

common concept in the body politic (cf. 2 Cor 11:29). One can imagine if one part

of the body aches, then the whole body suffers the same stress and pain. 'The mutual

experience of suffering represents a Pauline emphasis as does the mutual experience

of rejoicing (cf. Rom 12:15)'.[55]

5.2.2.6. Individual Members of the Body of Christ (12:27)

The core of Paul's thesis about the body metaphor is reached in v.27, 'now

you are (the) body of Christ and individually members of it' (ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε σῶμα

Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους). There is no definite article (for body) in the Greek

text. Kim suggests,

> It is an urgent business of "now" (δέ) in verse 27 that shifts the mood
> dramatically from body analogy (12:12-26) to an exhortation for the
> community (12:27). Now the Corinthian community should live the
> "body of Christ" in their social, community life.[56]

I would suggest that δέ denotes a shift of mood as well as emphasis of Pauline

purpose of body analogy as relational character. Fee comments, 'Paul is not trying to

say something about their relationship to other churches, but about their relationship

---

[54] Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 1011. Garland suggests, 'marriage means committing oneself in a special way to the existence of another by involving oneself with the spouse in a relationship of care and concern, and, given the Lord's teaching about divorce, it is an irrevocable commitment'. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 333. But Fee suggests the contrast between 'schism' and 'same care for one another' is appropriate in the context of 1 Cor 11:17-34, where the division leads to less caring for others. See Fee, *1 Corinthians,* 615.
[55] Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 465, 466.
[56] Kim, *Christ's Body,* 85. Paul exhorts the Corinthian community to get rid of their spiritual hegemony and work towards achieving a loving community (1 Cor 12:31-13:13). A community finds no meaning in itself without love.

to Christ and to one another. Thus he does not mean *the* body, as if they were the whole, nor does he mean a body, as if they were one among many (true as that might otherwise be). Rather, he means something like "Your relationship to Christ (vv.12-13) is that of being his body"'.[57]

Paul describes God as the planner and creator of the body and that he intends mutual concern for one another. Each believer is related to Christ and to one another as a part (ἐκ μέρους). Each part has his/her function that contributes to the body's well-being.

5.2.2.7. Differing Functions in the Body of Christ (vv.27-31)

Paul explains the differing functions of the members of the body in terms of ordering as first, second, third etc. The relative pronoun 'whom' refers back to members (μέλη, in plural); the whole message about the body is aimed at 'members'. 'God has arranged' (ἔθετο) is repeated as in 12:18 (cf.12:24). This is the only instance in the New Testament where the gifts are listed in hierarchical order. Four of the eight gifts appeared in the list (12:8-10) are the gift of prophecy, powers, healing, and tongues. Does the ordering suggest rank? What do we conclude about Paul and hierarchy?

The body politic in 1 Cor 12 demonstrates the relations between one another; the body is a system of mutual interdependence and the members of the body act in unity with each other. In the context of the spiritual gifts, each member is entrusted to use his/her gift for the common good, motivated by the greater gift (love) that

---

[57] Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 617. In the statement, 'you are (the) body of Christ', the pronoun 'you' takes the emphatic position. Barrett writes: 'the genitive Χριστοῦ is not of identity but of possession and authority; not, the body which is Christ, of which Christ consists, but the body that belongs to Christ…'. Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 292. Also Yorke suggests, 'Paul nowhere makes mention of Christ's personal body; not in v.13 and certainly not in vv.14-26 either. In fact, his σῶμα language in vv.14-26 is completely devoid of Christological content and this is rather strange, to say the least, if Paul were really on his way to announcing metaphorically or mystically the Corinthians are the personal body of Christ Himself (v.27)'. Paul thus summarises in v.27 what he wants to say analogically about the Corinthians on the basis of vv.14-26. Yorke, *The Church as the Body of Christ*, 48.

seeks the welfare of others and does not seek self-interest. Do the unity and mutual interdependence envisage egalitarian notions? It could be taken as egalitarian but the idea is rather of status reversals; the lower the status, the higher the honour. In another sense, it could mean one person taking the position of the other so that the latter is given the honour of the former and vice versa. It seems to be paradoxical because the less honourable are invested with honour and are the necessary parts of the body.

The instruction to honour the weak looks like an attempt to equalise inequality, but the listing of gifts as first, second, third etc. looks like an hierarchical order. Rather than dismissing or explaining away either of these features, we need to explain them both, and that is best done not by saying Paul is looking for an absolute or static egalitarianism, nor by saying he allows or advocates a static hierarchy. Rather, he suggests that whatever hierarchies there are in the body are not to be reinforced but continually compensated for and overturned, by the attention to the least honourable etc. Whoever finds themselves 'on top' at any one time has to keep looking for the needs of the apparently least necessary, and once <u>they</u> are 'on top' they presumably have to do the same. This creates a continually revised and continually challenged hierarchy, a dynamic process which never lets anyone settle down in a position of dominance or 'natural' superiority.

Although Paul presents the body metaphor descriptively in I Corinthians, in Romans he explores its implications in a lucid way.

5.2.3. Romans 12: Exegetical Analysis

Romans 12:4-5 seems to be a shorter exposition of 1 Corinthians 12:12-27. The reason may be the Romans' familiarity with the description of the body as rhetoric used for unity, diversity and interdependence. Although it seems that Paul

here addresses the same type of audience as in Corinth (also he writes from Corinth): 'pneumatics', 'Christians who overvalued certain more evident or spectacular manifestations of the Spirit', his emphasis probably lies on 'the way in which gospel was to transform the lives of Christians'.[58] Rom 12:1-2 seems to be an introduction to the following verses (Rom 12:3f) and signifies complete devotedness of a believer to God.[59]

5.2.3.1. Sober mindedness (12:3)

Devotedness to God manifested in commitment to the community is the main focus of 12:3-8. V.3 highlights the need of sober mindedness (σωφροσύνη) as an essential characteristic in the life of a Christian.[60] Paul admonishes each one in the community about their perspective in relation to others in order to avoid 'thinking beyond' or 'super thinking'. Käsemann suggests, 'Paul characterizes that soberness as the criterion which resists over-evaluating oneself'; while Jewett suggests, 'Paul defines "sober-mindedness" as the refusal to impose the standard of one's relationship with God onto others'.[61] Over evaluating oneself results in the

---

[58] Moo, *Romans,* 759.
[59] Cranfield, *Romans,*2:611; Schreiner, *Romans*, 650; Moo suggests that the 'call to Christian humility and unity is certainly one important manifestation of the transformation in thinking that should characterize the believer'; Moo, *Romans,* 759. However, Käsemann regards the passage (12:3f) as breaking from the preceding verses, since λέγειν suggests an imperative mood designating Paul's charisma - 'through the grace which has been given to me' (cf. 15:15; 1 Cor 3:10; Gal 2:9) and it has a theme σωφρονεῖν, which is indirectly related to vv.1-2: Paul borrowed this term from popular philosophy (Aristotle, *Nicomachaean Ethics,* 1117b.13); and christianized it. See Käsemann, *Romans*, 322.
[60] The repeated usage is notable: ὑπερφρονεῖν (to think proudly) … φρονεῖν (to think) … φρονεῖν … σωφρονεῖν (to think sensibly). σωφρονεῖν (qualifies φρονεῖν) states the way in which one should think (cf. 12:16; haughtiness prevents one from associating with the lowly). The other usages in Romans are 8:5; 11:20; 8:6, 7, 27 (the cognate noun), 11:25 (adjective). The Pauline corpus uses σωφρονεῖν (cf. also 2 Cor 5:13) and its cognates σωφρονίζω (Tit 2:4), σωφρονισμός (2 Tim 1:7), σωφρονῶς (Tit 2:12), σωφροσύνη (2 Tim 2:9, 15), and σώφρων (1 Tim 3:2; Tit 1:8; 2:2, 5), which denotes 'a steady, clear-headed understanding of the believer and his or her world that recognizes the truth of the gospel'. Moo, *Romans*, 760 (fn.12). φρονεῖν was one of the primary virtues in the Greek world. See U. B. Luck, 'σωφρονεῖν κτλ.' *TDNT* 7, 1098-1100; R. M. Thorsteinsson, 'Paul and Roman Stoicism: Romans 12 and Contemporary Stoic Ethics' *JSNT* 29 (2006), 139-161, at 149.
[61] Käsemann*, Romans*, 334. Jewett suggests, 'Christian soberness makes use of all the opportunities being aware of the limits and boundaries, for one's own existence, and that of others and the given situation'. Jewett, *Romans*, 742.

destruction of relationships as it leads to judging others on the basis of one's own spirituality. As Schreiner notes, 'Believers are not to be proud but to have a sober, sane, sensible, and realistic estimate of themselves'.[62]

Here it seems that Paul cautions against haughtiness and the improper evaluation of one's own gift (cf. 1 Cor 12); however, 'prominence is given to the functions which no community can be without and which obviously already enjoy special prestige'.[63] The exhortation is addressed to each one of the community (παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν), as each has been given a measure of faith[64] and to evaluate in accordance with it. Here faith does not denote a special gift to perform miracles (1 Cor 12:9 cf. 13:2), rather the trust each believer has in God; since this is addressed to each member and 'indicate that measure of reliance on God which enables χάρις to come to expression in χάρισμα. It is the confident trust in God which recognizes that all faith and grace is from God which prevents the misjudgement of ὑπερφρονεῖν'.[65]

5.2.3.2. One Body, Many Members (12:4)

The soberness based on one's own faith is an essential element for the church to function as one body; that is implied from γάρ in v.4 ('for just as in one body …

---

[62] Schreiner, *Romans,* 651, 652. Ziesler notes, 'It stands for balance, clarity of vision, and good sense'. Ziesler, *Romans,* 652.

[63] Käsemann*, Romans*, 332.

[64] μέτρον πίστεως is interpreted in different ways. μέτρον is defined as standard of faith as Jesus Christ; those who agree with this view are Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:614; Ziesler, *Romans,* 1989, 296; Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 1993, 646; cf. Moo, *Romans*, 761; Morris, *Romans,* 438 or as the gospel (Stuhlmacher, *Romans,* 192) and those who agree with 'measure' or 'quantity of faith' are Schlatter, (A. Schlatter, *Romans, The Righteousness of God* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 231); Murray (*Romans*, 118-119); Michel (O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 14th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck& Ruprecht, 1978), 296-297); Leenhardt, (F-J. Leenhardt, *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans: A Commentary* (London: Lutterworth, 1961), 308-9); Dunn (720); Schreiner (653); Jewett (741). The latter seems to be more likely as the verb ἐμέρισεν with the noun suggests the measure of something (cf. 1 Cor 7:17; 2 Cor 10:13). As Schreiner notes, 'the phrase relates to the apportioning of an amount of faith instead of apportioning "the standard of faith"'. Schreiner, *Romans*, 653.

[65] Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 722. As Dunn suggests, χάρις is 'the divine commissioning and enabling which comes to concrete expression in Χάρισμα' (720). The self-understanding of faith as a gift of God helps a person to get rid of pride in him/her. 'What prevents pride from cropping up is a sober estimation of one's faith, and this sober estimation is based on the truth that God apportioned to each one a measure of faith'. Schreiner, *Romans,* 653.

do not have the same function'). It is notable that the usage 'καθάπερ…οὕτως' ('just as … so'; v.4, 5) is the same as in 1 Cor 12:12, where v.4 denotes the basis for the comparison, while v.5 refers to the conclusion.[66]

It brings to light the aspect of unity among the members of the same body: the body has many members and all the members do not have the same function. As Jewett comments, 'the two premises Paul sets forth are indisputable from the perspective of everyday experience: that a body has "many members, but all members do not have the same use". The formulation of these premises moves beyond any universal definition of the "we" that are joined together ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι ("in one body/in a single body")'.[67] The use of πρᾶξις (v.4) in Romans is significant (not used in 1 Corinthians), since it denotes exercise (cf. Rom 8:13; Col 3:9), the continual actions that help the total functioning of the body in a healthy manner.

Although it is not clear whether the passage refers to the universal church or the local church, it is probable that the local church is in view, the Christian community in Rome addressed in Rom 16, all who met in several house churches.[68]

5.2.3.3. One Body in Christ (12:5)

How does Paul develop the body metaphor in Romans? Although it seems that Paul is influenced by the use of body as a political metaphor in antiquity, one needs to look carefully at the distinction between the political metaphor and the ecclesiological metaphor. Paul in 1 Corinthians 12 and Romans 12 moves beyond its

---

[66] Moo, *Romans*, 762. 'In classical rhetoric, a *similitudo* (similitude) is a type of argument drawn from everyday experience, as contrasted with an *exemplum* (example) drawn from history or literature'. Jewett, *Romans*, 742. See also Cranfield, *Romans*, 302; D. M. Coffee, 'The function of Homeric Simile' *AJP* 78 (1957), 113-32.

[67] Jewett, *Romans*, 743.

[68] Moo, *Romans*, 763.

Greco-Roman model to the 'body of Christ' and 'body in Christ'.[69] Jewett

comments that while Paul is speaking about one body in Christ (Rom 12), he

employs a metaphorical sense rather than giving a 'realistic identification of the

Christian community with Christ', while Stuhlmacher regards this as 'not merely a

metaphor but a reality which has been established for believing Christians by the

crucified and resurrected Christ'.[70]

It is significant to note the point here as 'the unity of the members of the

body for all their diversity, a unity brought about by the fact that they are all in

Christ, a unity that does not reduce them all to a drab uniformity'.[71] Thus Christ is

the unifying matrix among the diversified members of the body -- 'one body in

Christ', which calls for unity and solidarity between different congregations as one

body. Schreiner suggests, 'Paul surprises the reader by emphasizing unity rather

than the diversity of the body of Christ'.[72] I would suggest that unity and diversity

are important to the body's proper function as Dunn suggests, 'without that diversity

the body would be a monstrosity'.[73]

The unity in Christ is achieved by the interdependence between the members

('each one is a member of others': τὸ δὲ καθ᾽ εἶς ἀλλήλων μέλη), i.e., vertical and

horizontal relationship working together. The expression τὸ δὲ καθ᾽ εἶς 'each one,

individually' denotes that 'each Christian is actually an interdependent "member"

---

[69] See R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Situations* (AGJU, 10 Leiden: Brill, 1971), 249.

[70] Jewett, *Romans*, 743. P. Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*, (trans.) S. J. Hafemann (Westminster: John Knox, 1994), 191. The phrases with the preposition ἐν (in) with Christ and the Lord (including 'in him') as the object are used 165 times in the Pauline letters. The function of the phrase 'in Christ' points to the new identity in the community which holds the believers together and acts as a unifying factor. This formula shows the belonging togetherness 'in the Lord', which implies that the existence of the community is oriented to Christ. For more discussion, see J. D. G. Dunn, *Theology of Paul the Apostle* (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 396-400.

[71] Morris, *Romans,* 439.

[72] Schreiner, *Romans,* 654.

[73] Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 725. The unity of the body does not imply equality of gifts and faith among the members. See Schreiner, *Romans,* 654.

along with all others'.[74] This unity is characterized by the 'in Christ' relationship. The corporate dimension of the body of Christ is emphasized; in Christ the different churches as well as members of the community are joined together to become one reality. As Jewett rightly affirms, 'Christ is the larger reality within which the various congregations and individual members are to find their unity'.[75]

How is this expression (τὸ δὲ καθ᾽ εἷς ἀλλήλων μέλη) different compared to the use in 1 Cor 12:27? In 1 Corinthians the 'members of the body of Christ' is used in a collective sense, but in Romans, it specifies and signifies the members of the body as the members *of one another*. The implication of being members of one another is expressed in Rom 12:9f and 13:8f.[76] Here Paul recommends a more intense form of interdependence in comparison with 1 Corinthians; i.e. being the members of one another (not just of something else they all contribute to), their very identity as a body is composed of the contribution of others. 'So we many are one body in Christ' suggests a common belonging to Christ and by virtue of it the new unity which is formed by being 'in Christ'. 'They are not each one individually, but as a corporate unity, all together in him'.[77]

5.2.3.4. Differing Grace to Differing Charismatic Gifts (12: 6-8)

The use of the body metaphor is explained in the context of the right use of charismatic gifts. The grace is apportioned differently so that the gifts are also

---

[74] Jewett, *Romans*, 744. See A. J. M. Wedderburn, 'Some Observations on Paul's use of the Phrases in Christ and with Christ', *JSNT* 25 (1985), 83-97. Members have no meaning unless they are part of a body that 'one cannot be a "member" of nothing'. Morris, *Romans,* 439. It is also significant that Paul wants each believer to be members of 'someone else'. B. Wannenwetsch argues that being members of one another works in 'the representation of *Charis* and ministry' of others. I think, he focuses on one of the aspects of being members of one another. B. Wannenwetsch, '"Members of One Another": *Charis*, Ministry and Representation: A Politico-Ecclesial Reading of Romans 12', in C. Bartholomew, et.al*., A Royal Priesthood? A Use of the Bible Ethically and Politically, A Dialogue with Oliver O'Donovan* (The Scripture and Hermeneutics Series, Vol. 3; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2002), 197-220, at 220.
[75] Jewett, *Romans,* 744. See also Thorsteinsson, 'Paul and Roman Stoicism', 150, 151.
[76] Refer below 5.3.1. & 5.3.7.
[77] H. Ridderbos*, Paul*: An Outline of His Theology, J.R. De Witt (trans.) (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 371.

differently distributed. Dunn suggests that vv.6-8 are a continuation of the body metaphor in vv.4-5,[78] implying the task or function each one has in the church in relation to one another and that no one has been excluded from a specific task in the church. It is appropriate not to think that the gifts are apportioned between office holders only, since the use of the participle 'having', and the reference to the body with many members, and the use of 'the many' and 'each' (12:5), and 'the grace given to us' (12:6) suggest that each person in the church has a charismatic gift (χάρισμα). The different gifts are to be used with regard to one another so that the specific purposes of the gifts are being fulfilled. Each Christian is a recipient of grace (χάρις) and charismatic gifts (χαρίσματα) are the expressions of the grace received. Jewett observes, 'This rhetorically effective wordplay between χάρις and χαρίσματα, ... resulting in a shift of emphasis away from the more spectacularly ecstatic manifestation such as glossolalia to the sober expressions of the congregational leadership mentioned in Romans'.[79] The gift of 'tongues' is meant for one's own spiritual edification (1 Cor 14), while other gifts (in Romans 'tongues' is not mentioned) work in relation to one another.

How does Paul base his exhortations on mutuality in Romans 12 and 13 other than the discussion on the body metaphor? The following sections focus on this query.

5.3. Love Enhancing Mutuality in Romans[80] (Rom 12:9-13; 13:8-10)

Paul's strategies to bring forth mutuality in the community are very obvious in Romans as he repeatedly uses key words such as ἀγάπη and ἀλλήλους, followed

---

[78] Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 725.
[79] Jewett, *Romans*, 745.
[80] Love can enhance mutuality and vice versa. It could be read in both ways as love increases mutuality or mutual relation increases love, since Paul considers love as an essential ingredient in the Christian life that love should guide all actions (1 Cor 13; Rom 12, 13); the gifts and charismata are irrelevant without it.

by the body metaphor. In Romans ἀγάπη (Rom 5:5, 8; 8:35, 39; 12:9; 13:10, 10; 14:15; 15:30) is used 9 times; ἀγαπάω (Rom 8:28, 37; 9:13, 25 a, b; 13: 8a, b, 9) is used 8 times; and ἀλλήλους (Rom 1:12, 27; 2:15; 12:5, 10a, b, 16; 13:8; 14:13, 19; 15:5, 7, 14; 16:16)[81] is used 14 times (nearly all of them -11 times - in chapters 12-16). The core of the message Paul conveys here is to honour others more than oneself through genuine love. Thus ἀγάπη shows the character of real love as 'love of the higher lifting up the lower' and giving one's self in its totality for others.

In Rom 12:9-21; 13:8-10, love is the prominent theme, where Paul launches into a series of exhortations on the internal life of the Christian community and its relation to the outside world.[82] The following sections focus on selected issues such as genuine love, brotherly affection, honour, generosity and hospitality, identifying love, harmonious living and obligatory love.

5.3.1. Genuine Love (12:9)

Paul exhorts that love should be genuine (12:9), which seems to be the caption of the entire pericope[83] (cf. 2 Cor 6:6; cf. 1 Pet 1:22); in other words, 'love (is) without pretense'. Verse 9a describes the practical implication of vv.1-8. Wilson notes that 12:9 has a gnomic form that gives the definition of love rather than

---

[81] Although it is used elsewhere in the Pauline letters, it is not used as extensively in Romans (1 Cor 7:5; 11:33; 12:25; 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12; Gal 5:13, 15a, b, 17, 26a, b, c; 6:2; Phil 2:3; 1 Thess 3:12; 4:9, 18; 5:11, 15; 2 Thess 1:3; cf. Eph 4:2, 25, 32; 5:21; Col 3:9, 13; Tit 3:3). Lowe notes, 'the ἀλλήλων reciprocal pronoun ... acts as a call to functionalize the theological truth in concrete relationships and behaviours'. S. D. Lowe, 'Rethinking the Female Status/ Function Question: The Jew/Gentile Relationship As Paradigm', *JETS* 34 (1991), 59-75, at 70.

[82] The pericope in 12:9-21 seems to be similar to the love hymn in 1 Corinthians 13, both preceded by the exposition on the body metaphor. Moreover, both portray the different dimensions and implications of love in the day to day life of a Christian. However, mutual relationships are more emphasized in Romans.

[83] Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 739; M. Black, *Romans* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 15; W. T. Wilson, *Love without Pretense: Romans 12:9-11 and Hellenistic-Jewish Wisdom Literature* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1991), 142, 150; Stuhlmacher, *Romans,* 195; Jewett, *Romans*, 758. Käsemann does not agree that the section has love as heading. He suggests, 'It is simply one mode of behaviour among others, not the criterion and true modality of all the rest'. Käsemann, *Romans*, 343.

insisting on the performance of the love.[84] He comments that the individual devotion to God as a result of the gift of salvation is the foundation of charismatic ethic (12:1, 2) and it is built upon 'the love' (v.9).[85] It is likely that Paul has in mind the love that is already in the Roman churches, love among believers.

Most scholars agree that the term ἀγάπη is used more by early Christians than other contemporary writers.[86] Dunn relates the use of the term ἀγάπη to the social context of love feast among the Roman believers.[87] This love is not limited to believers, but it should be offered to strangers and persecutors (12:13-14). Love is the root of all the rest and 'such love is poured into the heart (5:5) of each member of the community (1:7), to be both spontaneous and indiscriminately generous'.[88]

Paul labels love as genuine, without pretense rather than 'sincere' or 'unhypocritical'.[89] Why does Paul use the adjective ἀνυπόκριτος? It may be because he foresees the possibility of corrupted love that deceives, since the adjective is derived from ὑποκρίτης (actor). A similar saying is found in Prov 27:5 and among pre-Socratic philosophers[90] envisaging friendship (a different word is

---

[84] Wilson, *Love without Pretense,* 150-51. As Wilson notes 'let love be without pretense', is the traditional translation of v.9a. The gnomic form has only a noun and adjective and does not necessarily need an imperative verb, which seems to be the same in 12:9a 'ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος'. He cites the famous Delphic maxim as verbless and nounless: μηδὲν ἄγαν 'Nothing to excess', see Jewett, *Romans,* 758. He lists the similar sayings in Cleobulus *Epig.* 1; Thales *Epig. ded.11-13;* Pittacus *Epig.* 11; Periander *Ep.* 11.

[85] Wilson, *Love without Pretense*, 155. The use of the definite article implies the particular nature of love, as a 'well known virtue' (Moo, *Romans,* 775) and to avoid other unwanted interpretations.

[86] V. Warnach, *Agape. Die Liebe als Grundmotiv der neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Düsseldorf : Patmos, 1951), 106-44; Ceslas Spicq, *Agape dans le Nouveau Testament. Analyse des Textes, EtBib* (Paris:Gabalda, 1958-59) 1:208-315; 2:9-305; V. P. Furnish, *The Love Command in the New Testament* (London: SCM , 1973), 102-11; John Piper, *Love your Enemies: Jesus' Love Command in the Synoptic Gospels and the Early Christian Paranesis* (SNTS 38; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979) 4-18, 102-8; Wilson, *Love without Pretense,* 151.

[87] Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 739. Jewett thinks that Dunn is the only commentator to mention the agape meal in the early churches' use of the term. See Jewett, *Romans,* 758.

[88] Jewett, *Romans,* 758. Käsemann defines love as 'being for others' and genuine love is 'whole hearted and disinterested service'. Käsemann, *Romans,* 345.

[89] U. Wilckens, 'ὑποκρίνομαι κτλ,' *TDNT* 8 (1972), 559-71. He thinks 'genuine' is an appropriate translation since the psychological connotation of 'insincerity' or 'hypocrisy' is not used by pre-Christian users.

[90] The maxim in Prov 27:5 is: 'open rebukes (are) better than disguised love'. Among the pre-Socratic philosophers, the maxims are: 'many who seem to be friends are not, and many who do not seem to be

used by Paul). In 2 Cor 6:6, Paul used the same word ἀγάπη ἀνυποκρίτῳ (with genuine love), in contrast to the false apostles who used their gifts for the sake of power and status. Why does Paul use 'genuine' love? It is likely that he wishes the love to be genuine because of his struggles with the opponents (2 Cor 6:6).[91] 'To remain "genuine" in love requires a disciplined commitment to honesty and respect to limits, as the rest of the passage will demonstrate'.[92]

Paul urges on the Romans that genuine love 'hates (ἀποστουγοῦντες) what is evil and holds fast (κολλώμενοι) to what is good' (9b-c). Although the connection between 9a, 9b and 9c is debated recently, denying its logical connection, it is possible that there is a link between them on substantive and grammatical grounds.[93] As Morris notes, 'True love involves a deep hatred for all that is evil, for evil can never benefit the beloved'.[94] Love not only hates evil but also has 'a strong affinity for what is good, so that they seek it fervently and cling to it no matter what the cost'.[95] The genuineness of love can be tested with evil actions because sincere love is always committed to the good of others (cf. Rom 12:21; overcoming evil with good).

5.3.2. Brotherly Affection (φιλαδελφία 12:10a)

Paul continues to emphasize love as mutual responsibility in v.10a; 'love one another with brotherly affection'. Genuine love is necessary for practising φιλαδελφία. In 1 Thess 4:10, Paul used this term in a sense of emotional and

---

are'; 'it is difficult for an enemy to deceive his foe, Cyrnus, but easy for friend to deceive friend'. See *Gnomologium Democrateum* 97; Theognis *Eleg.* 1219-20. See also Jewett, *Romans*, 759.

[91] See Georgi, *Opponents,* 258-64, 315-19. The point here is people can pretend to be nice and kind but without genuine love. See Schreiner, *Romans*, 663.

[92] Jewett, *Romans*, 759. See also Jewett, *Christian Tolerance,* 92-120.

[93] ἀποστουγοῦντες (abhor, KJV) is a strong word for hatred; commentators suggest that ἀπο - gives emphasis to the verb. κολλώμενοι refers to the marriage relationship elsewhere (1 Cor 6:16, 17; cf. Matt 19:5). Barrett argues that the participles (ἀποστουγοῦντες, κολλώμενοι) are imperatival; by contrast Fitzmyer suggests they are not imperatival. See Barrett, *Romans,* 221; Fitzmyer, *Romans,* 653. Cleaving to good is elaborated in vv.10-16 and abhorring evil in vv.17-21.

[94] Morris, *Romans*, 444.

[95] Schreiner, *Romans*, 664.

material sharing. Brotherly love appears to be a uniquely developed notion among Christians. This idea is so strong among the Christians that they consider it as if they are members of a natural family and are bound by love in a special sense.[96] Paul focuses its importance on interpersonal actions and attitudes in Romans.

Verse 10 can be considered as a pair of admonitions which are related to one another. The two parts of v.10 form a structured parallelism and can be interpreted on the basis of each other.[97] Paul moves from the individual focus to the congregational focus, which is evident in the word εἰς ἀλλήλους (one another). Aasgaard observes that Paul is using brotherly love in general and that the mutual obligation among Christians is expressed without bias.[98]

It is also striking that φιλαδελφία is used with φιλόστοργοι; both terms have a φιλο– stem. This term φιλόστοργοι occurs only once in Paul and in the whole of the New Testament. Paul brings forth the family affection (φιλόστοργοι), which denotes warm and familial love as the term φιλαδελφία denotes brotherly love and sisterly love.[99] Paul here compares church to a family that is as close as a

---

[96] The idea of brotherly love is common among the Jews, (which Christians took over) and it is also common among Essenes (it is used for fellow countrymen, members of the religious society, and for friends; see H. F.von Soden, φιλαδελφία, *TDNT* 1, 146). The sense of one family united in love with God as the Father is significant among the Christians, as this sense of familial relationship existed only among the members of the natural family. Morris, *Romans*, 444. See also Moo, *Romans*, 777; Schreiner, *Romans,* 664; Dunn, Jewett, Cranfield, Barrett also agree with this view.

[97] Aasgaard regards the second part of the verse to be interpreted as the explanation of the first part and that the two verse halves form a 'synthetic parallelism'. Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers and Sisters,* 171.

[98] Irrespective of groups or persons, love should be given to all. The repetition of ἀλλήλους: εἰς ἀλλήλους (v.10a) and ἀλλήλους (v.10b) strongly highlights the aspect of mutuality; εἰς ἀλλήλους is significant since it possibly focuses on brotherly love as an internal obligation. See Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers and Sisters*, 172. Aasgaard also suggests that the element of reciprocity is more evident in Romans than 1 Thessalonians possibly because of the internal strife in the Roman church.

[99] The Christian identity as ἀδελφός and ἀδελφή designates the familial language which has its influence in the early Christian communities to show their relationship as that of siblings; this implies 'role ethics' that determines the pattern of behaviour. See Horrell, *Solidarity and Difference,* 113. Aasgaard highlights the emotional element evident in φιλόστοργοι, as φιλ- is repeated, where Paul emphasizes that our attitudes should be affectionate. See Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers and Sisters*, 173.

natural family. All members of the church are united in Christ as brothers and sisters.

5.3.3. Honouring One Another (τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι 12:10b)

The interpretation of τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι has divided scholars into two groups: one group has come up with a meaning to lead the way or 'be the first in conferring honour on others'[100] and the other group interprets on the basis of Phil 2:3 - 'in humility preferring others as more excellent than yourselves'.[101] I suggest that the more viable translation of v.10b (τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι) is 'taking the lead in honouring one another'.[102] The two exhortations in v.10 are related to each other. The prefix προ— signifies or intensifies the verb ἡγεόμαι (lead).[103] This verse can be understood best in the context of social honour in the Mediterranean world, where public recognition was

---

[100] Those who agree with this view are Dunn (741); Fitzmyer (654); Stuhlmacher (195); Moo (777-778), NRSV, RSV.

[101] The difference between the two views is narrow since the verbal root ἡγεῖσθαι is used. Those who agree with the second option are J. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans,* J. Owen (trans.) (Vol. XIX; Grand Rapids: Baker House, 1993), 465; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans,* 361; Barrett, *Romans,* 221; Käsemann, *Romans,* 346; Schreiner, *Romans,* 664. Wilckens, *Römer*, 3:20; Cranfield, *Romans,* 2:632, 633; KJV, NIV.

[102] Jewett, *Romans*, 761. Τιμή is used elsewhere in Romans (2:7; 9:21; 13:7). The related terms are glory δόξα (2:7; 3:7; 4:20; 5:2; 8:18, 21; 11:36), dishonour ἀτιμία (1:26; 9:21), boast καύχημα/καύχησις (3:27; 4:2; 15:17). See also J. Schneider, 'τιμή κτλ.,' *TDNT* 8 (1972) 169-80.

In an article entitled 'The Relationship with Others: Similarities and Differences between Paul and Stoicism, T. Engberg-Pedersen notes there are two types of honour in Stoicism; 'τιμή and δόξα. 'τιμή is to 'be given to others' δόξα is 'one that gets for one's own'. He argues that Paul's argument of 'other-regardingness' is completely one-sided: 'forgetting completely about oneself, thinking instead and only of the others' and Paul missed out the other aspect of Stoicism: 'the wise man ... also remains an individual bodily being'. It is purposefully omitted by Paul that 'Paul wished to make his image of the fully committed Christ-believer as radically one-sided as at all possible' (Arius, SVF III, 112). T. Engberg-Pedersen, 'The Relationship with Others: Similarities and Differences between Paul and Stoicism' *ZNW* 96 (2005), 35-60, at 56, 57. See also T. Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and the Stoics* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000).

It is obvious in Pauline letters that he emphasizes a believer's commitment to Christ to keep its balance in relationship to others and the individualistic aspect is given less importance, probably for two reasons: he wants to conquer the natural tendency to get honour for oneself (Rom 12:3); and that the nature of Christ is to be manifested in every believer (Phil 2:5; cf. Gal 2:20). As P. H. Esler notes, 'Paul's paramount concern with the nature of face-to-face contacts between Christ-followers, who treat one another with ἀγάπη and put the interest of others ahead of their own, is so radically different from anything in the stoic thought that he brings into sharp focus his distinctive vision of moral life in Christ'. P. H. Esler, 'Paul and Stoicism: Romans 12 as a Test Case' *NTS* 50 (2004), 106-124, at 124.

[103] See *BDAG,* 864; *LSJ* 1480. It is a compound verb and it is used only once in the New Testament; take the lead in honouring or be a leader in honouring.

the mark of personal identity.[104] Moxnes notes that in antiquity honour was displayed in 'due balance' among those of the same honour and thus there was a balanced mutuality.[105] But in Paul the standard of honour reverses or 'even transcends the given order': others are to be honoured higher than oneself. It is important to note the Hebraic idiom mentioned by Michel, 'the virtue of taking the lead in greeting others'.[106] Here it has some effect on the congregational situation in Rome, as there is lack of acceptance in their love feasts (see below in chapter 6 on Romans 14, 15). Paul mentions this strategy of honouring others in v.3 'not to think of yourself more highly than you ought to think' and more explicitly in v.16 'associate with the lowly' (τοῖς ταπεινοῖς, which refers to what lacks honour).

The re-evaluation of one's values is to take place in the form of 'honouring others higher than oneself'. If each one takes the lead, then there will be 'sharing' of honour. It would be a good opportunity to demonstrate genuine love, as the competition for honour is transformed in a way to give honour to others. Moxnes comments, 'In the transformation of values, Paul claims that honour is now freely to be granted on the basis of love, regardless of status and merit'.[107] It implies that 'the

---

[104] See B. J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. (Louisville: John Knox Press, 2001), 25-50; R. Jewett, 'Honour and Shame in the Argument of Romans', in A. Brown, G. F. Snyder, and V. Wiles (eds.), *Putting Body and Soul Together: Essays in Honour of Robin Scroggs* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1997), 257-72. See also H. Moxnes, 'Honour and Righteousness' *JSNT* 32 (1988), 61-77, at 73-74.

[105] H. Moxnes, 'The Quest for Honour and the Unity of the Community in Romans 12 and in the Orations of Dio Chrysostom' in T. Engberg-Pederson (ed.), *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 203-30 at 211-13, 220-23. See also Moxnes, 'Honour and Righteousness', 74.

[106] O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (KEK, 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck& Ruprecht, 1978), 384. In P. '*Abot* 4:15 Rabbi Eleazar ben Shammua said: 'Let the honour of your disciple be dear to you as the honour of your associate, and the honour of your associate as the fear of your teacher, and the honour of your teacher as the fear of heaven'. In '*Abot* 4:20 the second century rabbi Mattia ben Harasch taught, 'Be first in greeting every man…'. Jewett, *Romans*, 762, fn. 39.

[107] Moxnes, 'Honour and Righteousness', 74-75. Moxnes observes that Paul relates the internal relations and behaviours of the community to the question of honour and recognition, since Paul instructs them 'to outdo in honouring one another' (12:10), and that honour is not to be awarded on merits and status but only on the basis of 'brotherly love'. The system of society to honour those of higher status is reversed in Paul and those of lower status should be the recipients of honour, from those of the same level or even more by the honourable group. He also notes that Paul's argument is

standards are to be changed, and the tables turned upside down'[108] and that the interests of Christian siblings are to be honoured by renouncing one's own.

5.3.4. Generosity and Hospitality (12:13)

Genuine love has its expression in sharing (κοινωνοῦντες) rather than merely contributing (μεταδοῦντες; 12:8). The verb κοινωνοῦντες in Paul's letters (Rom 15:26, 27; 2 Cor 8:4; 9:13; Gal 6:6; Phil 1:5; 4:15; cf. 1 Tim 6:18; Heb 13:16; cf. Acts 2:44; 4:32; 1 Tim 6:18; Heb 13:16) carries a sense of making financial contributions and sharing other resources. It is unlikely that Paul has the idea of the Jerusalem collection[109], since the Romans were not asked to contribute to the project; rather he possibly reminds the believers of the marks of the Christian life as sharing in the needs[110] of the saints (all believers). As Schreiner notes, 'Paul certainly believed that all those in financial distress should be provided with help, but he assigned priority to those in the believing community (Gal 6:10), in the same way that one should financially assist family members before giving to others (1 Tim 5:4, 8)'.[111]

---

similar to that used in chs. 3-4. 'Behaviour among Christians should reflect God's free granting of honour'. It implies re-evaluation of values for the benefit of others.

[108] Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers*, 173, 4. Aasgaard disagrees with Moxnes that the honour codes of Paul work in the framework of the honour shame system of the city. Rather he notes that the language of the Christian relations employed by Paul is from the context of the family and siblingship. See Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers*, 175.

[109] Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 743; Cf. T. Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6. Leipzig: Deichert, 1910). This view is opposed by Cranfield.

[110] There is a textual problem whether χρείαις or μνείαις is used (needs or remembrances). Most scholars reject the term 'remembrances' but accept 'needs'. The evidence for μνείας (D*F G) is not negligible, but χρείας fits the context better, and μνεία is not used in plural in the New Testament. The notion of remembering the saints as outstanding Christians is not convincing; rather it is more likely to mean to help those who are needy by being one with them. The early church was deeply concerned about the poor, whose situation was desperate. See L. Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 448; the same view is accepted by other scholars like Moo, Cranfield, Barrett and Jewett. Käsemann notes that assistance is to be given to widows, orphans, prisoners, and the needy (see Käsemann, *Romans*, 346) which gives a picture of those who are at a particular social level of the society. I would rather suggest 'needy' does not denote a particular social group as such but it could be an inclusive term to denote people who are in different needs.

[111] Schreiner, *Romans*, 666.

Paul links the practice of hospitality with the quality of sharing to take a lead in meeting requirements (v.10b). The use of the participle διώκοντες indicates the initiative in helping with hospitality; that hospitality could be understood as another form of sharing resources, i.e. by opening one's own house for a guest or stranger in order that he/she feels comfortable, that includes not only giving accommodation but also sharing meals.[112] It is widely agreed that the term φιλοξενία can be translated as 'hospitality'. As Morris suggests, 'Paul is not advocating a pleasant social exercise among friends, but the use of one's home to help even people we do not know, if that will advance God's cause'.[113] However, Paul has in mind that hospitality should be practised not only with regard to evangelistic purposes but also as an obligation for the well being of the community as a body. Christian life has its fruits in communal sharing, caring and supporting.

The practical value of preferring one another will take its form in hospitality and support offered to travelling leaders (Rom 12:13; 15:24; 16:2, 23; cf. 1 Cor 16:6, 11: Phlm 22),[114] which implies their universal significance. A local church is a prototype of the larger family or the body in its broader context. It is not *a* body of Christ but *the* body of Christ (1 Cor 12:27).[115]

---

[112] Ancient society highly regarded the virtue of providing hospitality to strangers; the people of Israel were sojourners in Egypt (Lev 19:34; Deut 10:19), Abraham was a model of hospitality (Gen 18); likewise, hospitality was a key feature of Jesus' ministry (Mk 1:29-31; 14:3; Lk 10:38-42) as well as the early missions (Acts 16:15; 18:3). Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 743, 744. See for more discussion J. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality: Partnership with Strangers as Promise and Mission* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 61-65. The idea of hospitality resonates in Paul's admonition to welcome one another (Rom 14, 15), in greetings (Rom 16:2-16) and Phoebe's welcome as she needs to be welcomed as is worthy of the saints (Rom 16:1, 2).

[113] Morris, *Romans*, 448. The missionaries lack money to pay for lodging, so the need of hospitality was urgent in Paul's days and their travel depended on hospitality; cf. Heb 13:2; 1 Pet 4:9; *1 Clem* 1.2; 10.7; 11.1; 12.1; *Herm Man* 38.10.

[114] Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty, and Survival*, 163.

[115] Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community*, 63.

5.3.5. Identifying Love (12:15)

Relations in the community[116] are very well expressed as Paul admonishes the believers to be one with those who rejoice and with those who weep (v.15). The infinitives χαίρειν (to rejoice), κλαίειν (to weep) are used in an imperative sense. Rejoicing with those who are rejoicing and weeping with those who are weeping are real expressions of love in the Christian community.[117] This is total identification, or in other words, being one with others, i.e. being members of one another (12:5). It is more difficult to rejoice with others than weep with those who suffer. Chrysostom notes that the admonition to rejoice comes first because it is difficult to put into practice,[118] since envy could prevent its genuineness. Here Paul wants the believers not only to be indifferent to the happiness and sorrowfulness of others but also to share with them.

5.3.6. Harmonious Living (Rom 12:16)

Paul states that the believers should live in harmony with one another (τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες) v.16a cf. 1 Cor 12:25 (τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων).[119] Käsemann suggests the community is to be of one mind.[120] The different translations can be 'live in harmony with one another' (NIV); 'thinking the same to one another' (literally in Greek). As Moo rightly suggests,

---

[116] Cranfield thinks that those outside the church are not in view. By contrast Dunn suggests here the community suggests a wider perspective including those outside the church. See Cranfield, *Romans,* 2:674f; Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 756.

[117] Schreiner, *Romans,* 668. I disagree with Morris as he uses the term 'sympathy' to denote the sense of feeling to others (v. 15), since I suggest 'identifying' is more meaningful here in relation to the body metaphor. Morris, *Romans,* 449; cf. Barrett, *Romans,* 222.

[118] Chrysostom, *Homilies on Romans,* 7.

[119] The use of the proposition εἰς is notable in this verse, since it is not used with the phrase (τὸ αὐτὸ … ἀλλήλους) elsewhere in the Pauline epistles (Rom 15:5: ἐν ἀλλήλοις is used after τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν). Calvin, Wilckens (*Der Brief an die Römer*, 3. EKKNT, 6. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978-82), Moo, Dunn and Jewett regard this verse as talking about the relationship of Christians with one another and not to the outsiders; *contra* Cranfield, Leenhardt. It could be assumed that the 'same' attitude among the Christians could also be presented toward all other people irrespective of their status; TEV: 'the same concern for everyone'. Moo, *Romans,* 783.

[120] Käsemann, *Romans,* 347.

The "one-another" language of v. 15 picks up the same theme from v. 10, while the use of the root φρον- ("think") in all three admonitions in this verse reminds us of Paul's demand for the right kind of "thinking" among Christians in v.3 … He is calling us to a common mind-set. Such a common mind-set does not mean that we must all think in just the same way or that we must think exactly the same thing about every issue, but what we should adopt an attitude toward everything that touches our lives that springs from the renewed mind of the new realm to which we belong by God's grace (see v. 2).[121]

The phrase implies that the whole community has the same goal to 'be of the same mind' and in achieving it they strive together, which perhaps concerns a common attitude of humility to one another. This has a lot to do with respect and honour that works in both directions as the preposition εἰς with ἀλλήλους (towards one another) signifies.

The other mark of a Christian noted in v.16 b is not to think highly about oneself, μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες (cf. v.3 to avoid super mindedness).[122] The biggest obstacle to unity is pride (Phil 2:2-4) and that can be overcome by associating with the 'lowly' (τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι). ταπεινοῖς refers to 'lowly people', 'the outcasts, the poor and the needy'.[123] Here it means that haughtiness hinders one's relationship with one another, especially to those in lower status. Therefore Paul is very keen to admonish that a believer should associate with 'all' irrespective of their position and status.

The final exhortation in v.16 is not to be wise in one's own thinking (μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς). It is striking that Paul uses the φρον- root

---

[121] Moo, *Romans,* 782.

[122] The Greek neuter plural ὑψηλά could mean 'high positions'. However, here the phrase 'τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες' hardly refers to high positions rather the same meaning of ὑψηλὰ φρόνει in Rom 11:20. This view is accepted by Cranfield, Dunn, Fitzmyer, Moo and Jewett.

[123] Moo, *Romans*, 783. ταπεινοῖς is regarded as masculine by Godet, Cranfield, Käsemann, Fitzmyer, Schreiner, Jewett. *Contra* Sanday and Headlam, Murray, Michel, Schlier who think that ταπεινοῖς is neuter in connection with neuter τὰ ὑψηλά; TEV 'accept humble duties'. Morris, Barrett, Dunn accept both neuter and masculine options.

The Greek verb συναπάγω (used with the dative) has no instrumental meaning in Rom 12:16 rather an 'associative' sense of meaning, while it has instrumental meaning in two other New Testament occurrences (Gal 2:13; 2 Pet 3:17 cf. Exod 14:6). See *LSJ, BDAG*, Moo, *ad loc. Romans,* 784.

(thinking)[124] and 'the person who is φρόνιμος is characterized by "thinking" and is therefore "wise"… it becomes negative only when the standard by which we judge our wisdom is our own'.[125]

Mutual relations are hindered by pride, and haughtiness springs from high personal esteem. Paul urges on the Romans to avoid the dangers of it by associating with the lowly, which creates a 'mental equality that might allow people to work with each other'.[126]

5.3.7. Obligatory Love (13:8, 9, 10)

In Romans 13:8, 9, 10, the noun and the verb forms from the ἀγαπ−root are used 5 times altogether; ἀγαπή (13:10a, b) and ἀγαπᾶν, ἀγαπῶν, ἀγαπήσεις are used in 13:8a, b; 9. It is used with ἀλλήλους (v.8a), τὸν ἕτερον (v.8b), πλησίον (v.9, 10) showing the sphere in which love needs to be demonstrated. Does it include all people or only fellow believers? ἀλλήλους seems to have the meaning of fellow believers (v.8); however, it is doubtful whether Paul puts a boundary to love them alone, since here it seems that he is widening the circle to the 'other' and 'neighbour' as well. Morris regards 'the other' as having the sense 'any other person with whom I have to do'.[127] In 13:8-10, the object of love is primarily fellow believers, although non-believers are not excluded.[128]

Paul reminds the believers not to owe (ὀφείλετε) anything to others except to love one another (v. 8). The theme of obligation starts in v.7, where Paul asks the

---

[124] Rom 12:16 uses φρονοῦντες two times and the noun φρόνιμοι once. These terms are used by Paul to caution against haughtiness: Rom 11:20, 25; 12:3; 15:5; 1 Cor 13:11; Phil 2:2, 5; 4:2.

[125] Moo, *Romans*, 784. Wise in a positive sense is used in Matt 7:24; 10:16; 24:45; 25:2, 4, 8-9; Luke 12:42; 16:8; 1 Cor 4:10; 10:15; 2 Cor 11:19.

[126] Jewett, *Romans*, 770

[127] Morris, *Romans*, 468. *Contra* Jewett, who suggests that 'neighbour' denotes a Christian neighbour of any cultural background, who is a member of house church or tenement church whereas the 'other' belongs to 'another congregation'. Jewett, *Romans*, 813.

[128] Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 781. Murray, Cranfield and Fitzmyer agree that the 'neighbour' cannot be confined to a believer. See Murray, *Romans*, 160, Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:675; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 678-79.

believers to render to all what is owed (taxes, customs, respect and honour). Paul urges them to clear off all debts so that believers can give over themselves 'to love one another'.[129] As Dunn suggests, this means 'not merely an obligation but a responsive obligation, an obligation which arises from what those addressed have received' (from God).[130]

The obligation of love towards one another fulfils the law; 'the one who loves the other, has fulfilled the law' (v.8b cf. Gal 5:14).[131] Paul has in mind 'not the theology of love or love that fulfils the divine intent, but love as practised among the members',[132] emphasising the relevance of genuine love in the community of believers (12:9f).

Loving one's neighbour as oneself 'sums up' (ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται)[133] all the commandments (v.9). Love is the essence of the Christian life and all laws and commands should be done out of love, avoiding the danger of legalism.[134] The Pauline ethic focuses on love as its centre, and not merely on outward expressions. 'Love does no evil to the neighbour' (13:10a) echoes Paul's previous exhortation to overcome evil with good (12:21 cf. Ps 15:3) and that love is 'the fulfilment of the law' (v. 10), i.e. by loving, one puts the law into practice. This does not mean that love is 'the full content' of law; rather Paul considers that love and law are

---

[129] Ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν (to love one another) has parallels in Greek, Jewish, and Apocalyptic literature (T. *Zeb* 8:5; T. *Sim* 4.7; CD 6:20-21). In v.8 'one another' refers to fellow believers as suggested by Zahn (562), Lietzmann (112), Lagrange (315), (Lagrange, M. -J. *Saint Paul: Épître aux Romains*. Études Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1931), Wilckens (3:68), Jewett (806). Contra Dunn (776), who suggests 'all with whom the Roman Christians would come in contact'; see also Fitzmyer (678).

[130] Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 776.

[131] Jewett, *Romans*, 808. V.8b poses a translation problem as it translates: 'the one who loves the other' or one who loves, fulfils the other law'. The 'other law' translation alludes to the Mosaic covenant, after the Roman law in 13:1-7, and some others assume it as the Jewish Torah (Cranfield (2:675), Michel (409), Wilckens, 3:68, Dunn, 2:776-777). Paul uses law in a generic sense and πληρόω has a sense to 'do' and 'perform' or 'to accomplish its original intent and purpose'; see Jewett, *Romans*, 808, 809.

[132] Jewett, *Romans*, 809.

[133] ἀνακεφαλαιόω is rarely used in secular Greek and other literary sources and only once used elsewhere in the New Testament (Eph 1:10).

[134] Schreiner, *Romans*, 692.

compatible in a wider way as they belong together.[135] Thus Paul's admonition to love one another raises a strong awareness of mutual responsibility, as Jewett suggests, 'the command to love aims at mutuality, with each aiming to meet the needs of others as well as oneself'.[136]

5.4. The Pauline Emphases

As stated in the introduction, Paul urges the Romans to practise their conduct in a Christian perspective. As one body in Christ, each one's behaviour affects the total behaviour of the community; each believer is interrelated to his/her fellow believers in Christ. The unity contributes to mutual interdependence and mutual interdependence contributes to unity, implying genuine love and harmony. This model of relationships in the community works with the help of the grace apportioned to each one 'in Christ', which helps to serve one another as serving the Lord (Rom 12:11) and having the same mind of Jesus (Phil 2:5).

Paul alters the hierarchical model towards that of equalization, where no one is permanently in a superior or inferior position as each one is promoting the other by the reversal of positions: one takes the position of the other. Thus, there is a process of reciprocal relationships, a repeated process of change in position. As Alain Badiou suggests, this may be 'the reversibility of an inegalitarian rule' such that there is a subsequent symmetrisation.[137]

Paul urges believers not to become proud but to stand in awe (Rom 11:20) which could be interpreted in terms of mutuality of honour; i.e., constantly sharing honour, which is paradoxical as there was a competition for honour in the ancient

---

[135] Schreiner, *Romans,* 693. Love as the fulfilment of the law shows the 'performance' or the pragmatic significance of the law and not in a sense of completion; Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 780, 781; see also Stuhlmacher, *Romans,* 210.
[136] Jewett, *Romans,* 813.
[137] A. Badiou, *Saint Paul: The Foundation of Universalism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), 104. The rule looks and is inegalitarian, but it can be and is reversed, so that what is unequal in one direction is made equal in another, resulting in a process of symmetry (what he calls symmetrisation).

world (the notion of superiority). If anyone is honoured, then the other person is jealous of him and wants to achieve more honour than him. It is difficult to be first in honouring (προηγούμενοι- to take lead, Rom 12:10b); rather it is easier and more comfortable to be honoured than to honour others. To be a leader and at the same time to honour others calls forth an interchange in status. Nonetheless, here Paul urges believers not to wait for a second chance but to take the first chance to honour others. Jesus took the form of a slave (Phil 2) and he became poor to make us rich (2 Cor 8:9). Taking the place of others in order to honour them is the most significant expression of love the world has ever seen. Christ took the place of sinners and died on the cross for their sins. Christ has become a model par excellence in honouring others irrespective of their lower status or position (Rom 15:1, 2). Genuine love helps to maintain relationships to one another in the Christian community.[138] In 1 Corinthians it is the greater gift (12:31), while in Romans it is the fulfilment of the law (13:10). The body cannot function properly without the exercise of love; love that circulates all over the limbs and organs helps the body to act in mutuality, to keep intact and to avoid division.

The hierarchical ordering of gifts in 1 Corinthians is subverted by the different gifts according to the grace given by serving the least (Rom 12:3-8; 9f). Another significant development of interdependence is the more clear cut expression of being 'members of one another' (τὸ δὲ καθ᾽ εἷς ἀλλήλων μέλη Rom 12:5 cf. μέλη ἐκ μέρους 1 Cor 12:27). Reciprocal relations are emphatically expressed in Romans by the repeated usage of ἀλλήλους/ἀλλήλων; self sufficiency through ignoring others is unwarranted.

---

[138] Christian life is the practical expression of one's relationship to Christ, reflecting Christ's 'present sovereign dominion in the life of a Christian', implying solidarity, affection and mutuality between the people of the community. Fitzmyer, *Paul and His Theology*, 90.

Paul calls forth an attitude of sober mindedness which indeed creates 'other' mindedness, being the 'body in Christ' and 'members of one another', thus the members of the 'one' body (in Christ). Harmony in the community can be maintained by overcoming evil with good (vv.17-21). Paul applies the Christian value of forgiveness that not only forgives others but also rewards with good. He redefines positive reciprocity as not only repaying good for good but also overcoming evil with good, having a triumph over it. As a matter of fact, this type of nature is difficult to practise without the grace of Christ.

5.5. Conclusion

Paul develops his ethic of mutuality from the fundamental idea of mutual interdependence in body politics to 'the body in Christ', where relationship is based on genuine love towards one another. It points to the being in Christ, the belonging togetherness of the Christian community that holds together people of different status, gender and ethnic origin around one axis. As Barclay suggests in the context of Paul and multiculturalism,

> The foundation of Paul's gospel and the basis of its relativization of all cultures, is his radical appreciation of the grace of God which humbles human pride and subverts the theological and cultural edifices which flesh constructs … The church exists not for its own sake but to bear witness to the grace of God.[139]

The Christian experience is an apparent expression of the grace of God received. It is not only an individual experience but has social and ethical aspects which are derived from incorporation into the body of Christ. The grace we receive from God is not something to be kept as one's own possession but something to be passed on to others.

---

[139] J. M.G. Barclay, 'Neither Jew Nor Greek: Multiculturalism and The New Perspective on Paul', in *Ethnicity and the Bible,* ed. by M. G. Brett (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 197-214, at 213.

The ideals of the kingdom of God such as justice, peace, joy and fellowship indeed uphold the theological significance of mutuality as they involve the relationship to one another (cf. Romans 14:17). The ethical implications of the Christian life are further explicated in Romans 14, 15. How should we evaluate one another? This is the focus of discussion in the following chapter.

Chapter 6

Receiving One Another: A Paradigm of Mutuality in Rom 14, 15

6.1. Introduction

In the preceding chapter the discussion was focussed on the exhortations of Paul on mutual interdependence and its implications for the practical Christian life of a believer in individual and communal dimensions through the metaphorical description of the body and its members (Rom 12, 13; cf. 1 Cor 12, 13). The present chapter discusses Paul's admonition to the Roman community about the particular circumstances in which mutual respect and acceptance need to be practised. However, over decades debate has been going on concerning whether Romans 14, 15 is addressed to any particular situation in the Roman community, since it has some similar arguments to that of 1 Corinthians 8-10. Some scholars argue that it is a generalised exhortation, while others consider it a reaction to the actual situation in the Roman community. I presume the latter opinion, since the theme of mutuality fits well within the context and these chapters (14, 15) speak about the contextual application of his exhortations given in the previous chapters (12, 13). 'Welcome' or 'receive' is a repeated catchword, which we seldom find in 1 Corinthians.

Romans 14:1-15:13 urges on the Romans the need for unity and reinforces mutual relations and acceptance. Mutual relations can be seen as a significant aspect in Romans, which appears here as welcoming others. It seems that differences and diversity in a person's cultural practice may hinder welcoming. That may be the reason why Paul strongly urges Roman Christians to bear one another irrespective of position or status. Romans 14 and 15 seem to be a continuation of the exhortations in chapters 12 and 13 and stand in a way as a crucial link to the long list of greetings in Romans 16.

The paradigm of mutuality is obvious in Romans 14 and 15; this section starts with an exhortation to 'receive one another' (14:1) and reaches its climax in 'receive one another as Christ has welcomed us' (15:7). The present chapter discusses Paul's rhetorical strategy to bring forth mutuality. It is argued that Rom 14, 15 fits in the whole context of the Romans and that it has a specific concrete message to convey in order to enhance mutual love and edification among the believers in Rome. Also, I attempt to discuss to a limited extent how far the Pauline idea of mutuality is different from that of the then existing system of reciprocity. This chapter has three parts: the first part analyses the social context, the second contains an exegetical analysis of the issue of mutual welcome, while the third deals with the Pauline ethos of mutuality.

6.2. The Social Context: The Weak/Strong Dichotomy

In this section, the social context of the passage is studied by identifying the strong and the weak in the Roman context by analysing different interpretations of these groups. The similarities and dissimilarities between Rom 14, 15 and 1 Cor 8-10 are also studied to a limited extent in order to verify the particular occasion and to demonstrate how these chapters fit in the whole context of the letter.

6.2.1. Issues in Group Conflicts

Paul mentions two subgroups, as he refers to 'the weak in faith' (ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει; 14:1; 15:1) and 'the strong' (οἱ δύνατοι; 15:1), who seem to be divided on issues of food, wine and days.

The issues in consideration are two or perhaps three:[1]

1. The 'strong' eat all kinds of food while the 'weak' eat only vegetables (14:2);

---

[1] Moo, *Romans*, 827. Moo considers the third point also possibly be an issue of division among the Roman Christians although Paul refers to it as an example and not as a precise issue among Roman Christians. It would support the thesis that Jewish observance is the main matter of conflict. See. Barclay, 'Do we undermine the Law?', 289.

2. The 'strong' make no distinction among days while the weak value some days more than others (14:5);

3. The 'strong' drink wine while the weak abstain (14:21; cf. 14:17).

The overall purpose of Paul's admonition can be seen as the unity of the church. Paul aims to unite the two groups who are divided in their opinion about the eating of meat, the observance of days, and the drinking of wine (14: 2, 5, 21).

The first matter of dispute is: one person eats all things, while another eats only vegetables (i.e. not meat). The weak in faith probably avoid meat out of their respect for the Jewish Law in a pagan context, due to the unavailability of kosher meat.[2] Another point of disagreement between the strong and the weak is on the matter of days. Here it is implied that the weak believer judges the days as preferring one day to another, while the strong believer considers each day to be the same. It is not certain whether the pagan environment of 'lucky' or 'unlucky' days or Jewish observance of days is in the mind of Paul. However, it is more likely that Paul is here dealing with issues related to the Jewish law; the observance or non-observance of the law is the key issue. As Barclay suggests, 'these verses refer to Jewish scruples (which could be held by Jews or Gentiles) concerning the consumption of meat considered unclean and the observance of the Sabbath and the Jewish feasts or fasts;

---

[2] There are some scholars who disagree that Jewish Law is the subject of dispute. E.g. Reasoner thinks that vegetarianism is the issue between the groups. See Reasoner, *The Strong,* 103f; See also J. P. Sampley, 'The Weak and the Strong: Paul's Careful and Crafty Rhetorical Strategy in Romans 14:1-15:3', in L. M. White and O. L. Yarbrough, *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honour of Wayne A. Meeks* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 40-52 at 41, 42. Kosher laws required the blood to be properly drained from the animal (Lev 3:17; 7:26-27; 17:10-14; Deut 12:16, 23-24 cf. Acts 15:20, 29). One matter of consideration is the Claudius expulsion of Jews in 49 CE, which might have caused the fear of availability of food not tainted with idolatry. Josephus speaks of the Jewish priests imprisoned in Rome as they 'had not forgotten the pious practices of religion and supported themselves on figs and nuts'. Josephus, *Life* 14. See Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 801. Also, Watson thinks that Jewish Christians were not probably welcomed in the Jewish shops. F. Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach* (SNTSMS 56; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 95. I suggest what is at stake is not the availability or unavailability of kosher meat in Rome, but conflict on the issue of the food offered in a Christian's house, i.e. whether it was pure in the sight of those observing the Jewish purity laws. See Barclay, 'Do we undermine the Law?', 291; Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:695. W. Schmithals, *Der Römerbrief: Ein Kommentar* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1988)*,* 103-104.

the wine, if it is relevant, is also a matter of Jewish concern, relating to its use in "idolatrous worship"'.[3] The arguments in line with this assumption are the following:

1. The use of the terms κοινός (14:14) and καθαρά (14:20) are characteristic terms of the Jewish purity laws, while κοινός is used in non-Jewish Greek to mean 'shared,' not 'common' in the sense of 'impure'. Paul explicitly expresses that for those who consider something impure it is impure for them, probably referring to the perception of the weak, while expressing his personal view as that nothing is impure in itself (14:14).[4] The purity laws were considered to be essential markers to create a specific identity different from others, which makes it obvious that here Paul's discussion concerns not only the observance of Torah and the unity of the community but also 'at stake was the whole Jewish conception of holiness and whether a clear line of demarcation must not be drawn between the holy community and those outside'.[5]

2. The discussions in the preceding and the following sections of Rom 14:1-15:6 suggest that the issues are related to Jewish practices in relation to law, election, circumcision, etc. (Rom 2-3, 9-11, 15:7-13).

3. Paul is concerned about the attitude of the Christians as they meet together to eat and not the general abstinence from meat and wine as the peculiar

---

[3] Barclay, 'Do we undermine the Law?', 289. The majority of scholars agree that the main issue under consideration is the Jewish observance of the law. Minear, *Obedience of Faith,* 8-10 ; Cranfield, *Romans,* 2:690-98; Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer,* 3:109-15; Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles,* 88-96; Wedderburn, *The Reasons for Romans,* 30-35; Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 795-806.

[4] Paul affirms and strongly emphasizes this by the words: 'I know and am convinced in the Lord Jesus' (Dunn thinks this constitutes a 'triple emphasis' - I know; am convinced; in the Lord Jesus; Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 818).

Although κοινός in ordinary Greek means 'common, ordinary', the sense of ritual purity is well illustrated in the use of the word in 1 Macc 1:47, 62; Mark 7:2, 5; Acts 10:14 and 11:8, this deep concern was also a matter of fact in the Judaism of the time as seen in *Jud* 12:7; *Jub* 3.8-14; *Pss Sol* 8.12, 22; *IQS* 3.5; *CD* 12.19-20; cf. the Pharisees and Essenes' attitude to purity laws. See Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 818-819; Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer,* 3:109-115.

[5] Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 819.

characteristics of Judaism. As Barclay rightly argues, 'the disputes arise when they do (or do not) welcome one another to meals (14:1-3), and their debates are given urgency not as general discussions of lifestyle but as specific arguments about the food set before them on such occasions'.[6] They are sceptical about the food offered in a Christian's house, who may not be a strict observer of the law, whether in the use of prohibited meat, meat from an animal killed not in the right way or meat related to idol worship (the wine may also have idolatrous connections; e.g. Daniel and Esther kept themselves away from pagan meals).[7] The observance of days also relates to the same problem of 'commensality'. The observance of Sabbath and the days of Jewish feasts and fasts were the possible issues.

6.2.2. The Groups Identified

The different interpretations regarding the identity of the strong and the weak are: [8]

1. The 'weak' were mainly Gentile Christians who abstained from meat (and perhaps wine), particularly on certain 'fast' days under the influence of certain pagan religions.[9]

2. The weak were Christians perhaps both Jewish and Gentile, who practised asceticism.[10]

---

[6] Barclay, 'Do we undermine the Law?', 291.

[7] Daniel 1.8-16; Esther 14.17 (LXX). The problem of 'commensality' is the issue under consideration - 'how observant Jews (and perhaps law-observant Gentiles) can participate in a meal hosted by those who do not scruple to observe the law'. Barclay, 'Do we undermine the Law', 291. See also E. P. Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah* (Five Studies, London: SCM Press, 1990), 272-283.

[8] For these classifications, I am indebted to Moo, *Romans,* 828, 829.

[9] Käsemann, *Romans*, 367-68; Lagrange, *Saint Paul: Épître aux Romains,* 335-40; Reasoner, *The Strong,* 103. Orphism or Neo-Pythagoreans avoided anything with a soul. Some later Gnostics also avoided eating flesh (Irenaeus, AH 1.24.2; Eusebius, H. E. 4.29).

[10] Lenski, *Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,* 812-3; Murray, *Romans,* 2:172-74; P. J. Achtemeier, *Romans: Interpretation A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1985), 215.

3. The weak were mainly Jewish Christians who observed certain practices derived from the Mosaic Law out of their concern to establish righteousness before God.[11]

4. The weak were mainly Jewish Christians who followed a sectarian asceticism in expressing their devoutness, due to some syncretistic tendencies.[12]

5. The weak were mainly Jewish Christians who refrained from eating meat sold in the market place thinking that it was polluted by idolatry.[13]

6. The weak were mainly Jewish Christians who refrained from certain kinds of food and observed certain days out of continuing loyalty to the Mosaic Law.[14]

Paul's categorization of the strong and the weak seems to reflect the Roman usage of the categories that denotes the differences of status, position and power.[15] The strong were a group of believers who have more status, whereas the weak had low status in the Roman churches. This denotes the difference in their socio-

---

[11] Barrett, *Romans,* 256-257.

[12] H. A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans* (J. C. Moore (trans.); Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1876), 2:296-98; Hodge, *Romans,* 417; P. Althaus, *An die Römer übersetzt und erklärt* (NTD 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 138; Black, *Romans,* 190-191. Paul confronts syncretistic false teachers in Colossae and Ephesus, which is apparently a mixture of Judaism and incipient Gnosticism. Colossian heretics advocated abstinence from food, drink and observance of certain days (Col 2:6, 21), while Ephesians insisted on the avoidance of foods (1 Tim 4:3), which may have influenced Timothy to stop drinking wine (1 Tim 5:23). Jewish sectarian asceticism can be found in the 'Therapeutae', who were vegetarians and drank only 'spring water' (see Philo, *The Contemplative Life* 37), and some early Jewish Christians like James the brother of the Lord (cf. Eusebius, H.E. 2.23.5) and Ebionites (Epiphanius, *Haer*.30.15) abstained from eating flesh.

[13] A. Nygren, *Commentary on Romans* (C. C. Rasmuussen (trans), Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 422; Ziesler, *Romans,* 323-326.

[14] This view has become the most widely accepted. See Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer* 3:79, 111-13; Cranfield, *Romans,* 2:694-97; Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 799-802; A. F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986, 231-33; P. J. Tomson, *Paul and Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* (CRINT, Vol. 1; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 236-58; Watson, *Paul,* 94-95; Watson, 'The Two Roman Congregations: Romans 14:1-15:13', in Donfried (ed.), *The Romans Debate,* 203-15; Wedderburn, *Reasons,* 31-35; H.-W. Bartsch, 'Die antisemitischen Gegner des Paulus im Römerbrief', in *Anti judaismus im Neuen Testament*? (ed.) P. W. Eckert, N. P. Levinson, and M. Stöhr, *Abhandlungen zum christlich-jüdischen* (Dialog; Munich: Kaiser, 1967), 33-34.

[15] Reasoner, *The Strong,* 200-220.

economic and political status, probably the numerical strength and possibly not their spiritual superiority.[16] Paul uses the same word 'strong' οὐ πολλοὶ δυνατοί (not many powerful, 1 Cor 1:26) indicating the social status of the believers in Corinth. Theissen suggests that the 'powerful' denotes the influential people in society.[17]

The weakness of the 'weak' connotes the deficit in both theological and social dimensions.[18] The reference to the 'weaker members' in 1 Cor 12:22 denotes the social aspect in relation to honour (12:23-26). It indicates inferior status, power and wealth in comparison with the so-called strong. Epistle to Diognetus (10:5) writes: 'For Happiness does not consist of domination over neighbours, nor in wishing to have more than the weak [i.e., the poor] nor in being wealthy, and having power to compel those who are below you'.[19] Here Paul makes use of the honour and shame language of the Roman world that denotes the diversity in status, power and position in socio-economic, political realms to suit his theological purpose of honouring one another in the Roman churches irrespective of their status.

---

[16] O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (KEK, 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck& Ruprecht, 1978), 443; Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 837; H. W. Schmidt, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (THKNT, 6; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1963), 237. Rom 15:27 suggests that the Gentiles are recipients of the spiritual blessings from the Jewish Christians.

[17] Theissen, *Social Setting*, 72. Josephus used the same word to refer to 'the leaders complaining to Roman authorities about Herod's activities': 'the powerful among the Jews' (Ἰουδαίων οἱ δυνατοί). Josephus, *Bell* 1.242. The 'powerful' is an expression of social and political prominence. Thucydides, *Hist*.1.89.3. See also Jewett, *Romans*, 876.

[18] Josef Zmijewski, 'ἀσθενής κτλ.' *EDNT* 1 (1990) 171; Reasoner, *The Strong*, 218-19. The terms used by Paul to describe the groups seem to parallel Latin terms such as *'inferior', 'tenuis', 'invalidus'* and *'potens', 'firmus', 'validus'* etc. Seen in the perspective of honour/shame in Roman society, the weak were people of lower status compared to the strong with higher status. The weak-strong dichotomy can also be seen in the realms of a person's 'mental and ethical standards'; in the philosophical schools such as that of the Epicurean Philodemus (110-40/35 BC), which works as an educational programme to develop the '"weak" students into mature ones' to achieve the moral improvement of groups as well as individuals; other Hellenistic writers also made use of the topos of the weak and the strong, e.g. Aristides *Or.* 24.14; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 4.26.1; Ps-Arist. *Mund.* 6.396B; Philo *Abr.* 216; Philo *Spec.* 2.141; Plutarch *Arat.* 24.5. See also Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers*, 180-183.

[19] Translation by Jewett, *Romans*, 877. See 1 Clement 10.2. Job 5:11, 15-16 refers to God as the powerful saviour for the powerless; 'the one who (raises) the weak ones to the heights … (and) the powerless one escapes from the hand of the powerful. But there is hope for the powerless ones, but the mouth of the unjust will be stopped'. The term 'powerful' indicates the powerlessness of the opposite group.

For the reasons noted above, it seems that the 'weak', whom Paul refers to here, are those who observe the purity laws and observe the Sabbath (who consider their life style is 'in honour of the Lord'; Rom 14:6), while the 'strong' do not. It is not accurate to title the two parties 'Jewish' and 'Gentile' Christians as such because Paul, a Jew, himself claims to be in the group of the 'strong' (Rom 15:1) and there may be some Gentile Christians who uphold the Jewish laws. Moreover, there is an indication in the letter itself that Roman Christian communities are ethnically mixed, consisting of both Jews and Gentiles meeting together (e.g. the persons greeted in Rom 16).

6.2.3. General or Specific Instruction?

The reason for Paul's inclusion of these issues could be that Paul was aware of a specific issue of division among the strong and the weak. Several scholars refuse to accept this explanation on the grounds that:[20]

1. Rom 12:1-15:13 is general paraenesis, an outline of the gospel ethic that is engendered by the gospel itself and not by the needs of a particular community.

2. The impressive number of verbal and conceptual parallels with 1 Cor 8-10 confirms that 14:1-15:13 is like the rest of this section, general paraenesis. Paul is here giving a generalised version of his advice to the Corinthians about their disputes over idol meat.

3. The difficulty in pinning down the precise religious motivations for the practices of the weak suggests that Paul is not describing a specific state of affairs but an idealized situation.

---

[20] Moo, *Romans,* 827. These reasons are from R. J. Karris, 'Romans 14:1-15:13 and the occasion of Romans', in *Romans Debate*, 65-84; W. A. Meeks, 'Judgement and the Brother: Romans 14:1-15:13', in G. F. Hawthorne with O. Betz (ed.), *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*: *Essays in Honour of E. E. Ellis for his 60th birthday* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 290-300; F. Vouga, 'L' Épiître aux Romains comme document ecclésiologique (Rom 12-15)' *ETR* 61 (1986) 489-91; Furnish, *Love Command,* 115; Leenhardt, *Romans,* 344-46.

However, it is likely that Paul is addressing the specific issues in the Roman community and that Romans 12:1-15:13 is not a general paraenesis, and there is coherence in his arguments.[21] Although the parallels between this passage and 1 Corinthians 8-10 are obvious,[22] there are also obvious differences between the two.[23] E.g., the issue of idolatry is not mentioned in Romans, while it is the main issue in 1 Corinthians.

Table 1. Parallels between 1 Corinthians 8-10 and Romans 14-15

1 Corinthians	**Romans**
a stumbling block to the weak (8:9) πρόσκομμα ... τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν	a stumbling block or offence to your brother (14:13) πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἤ σκάνδαλον
the weak one is destroyed… a brother for whom Christ died (8:11).	your brother is grieved … do not … destroy that one for whom Christ died

---

[21] The similarities are explained by some scholars on the basis of the problems being of the same nature (see Cranfield, *Romans*, 692f; Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 3:109-115; W. Schmithals, *Der Römerbrief. Ein Kommentar* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1988), 494). Aasgaard suggests that Paul is presenting his arguments parallel to those in Antiquity by using 'a standard pattern for how to relate to conflicts of various kinds'. Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers*, 180.

[22] See Table 1. The parallels are found in Karris, 'Romans 14:1-15:13', 73-75; Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer,* 3:115; Cranfield, *Romans,* 2:692-93; Reasoner, *The Strong*, 29-39 ; H. J. Klauck, *Herrenmahl und Hellenistischer Kult. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1982), 281-83.

Aasgaard included the following terminological as well as the thematic similarities between 1 Cor 8:1-11 and Rom 14:1-15:13. They are: a) the disagreement between two groups (Rom 14:1; 15:1; 1 Cor 8:9, 11); b) one group as the 'strong' or 'free' (Rom 15:1; 1 Cor 8:9; 1 Cor 9:1, 3); c) the other group as 'weak' (Rom 14:1f; 15:1; 1 Cor 8:7, 9-12; cf. also 11:30); d) use of relational terms such as 'brother' or 'neighbour' (Rom 14:10, 13, 15, 21; 1 Cor 8:11, 12, 13); e) exhortations to shun offending (Rom 14:13, 20f; 1 Cor 8:9, 13; 10:32; Rom 14:15; 1 Cor 8:12); f) admonition to avoid doing damage to another (Rom 14:15; 1 Cor 8:11); g) the expression denoting Christ's redemptive action (Rom 14:15; 1 Cor 8:11); h) the metaphor of building up (Rom 14:19, 15:2; 1 Cor 8:1; 10:23 cf. Rom 14:20 destroy a building); i) an idea of not self-pleasing (Rom 15:1f; 1 Cor 10:24, 33). See Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers*, 178, 179.

[23] Meeks, 'Judgment and the Brother', 291-93; Reasoner, *The Strong,* 34f., 312-17; B. Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 187; T. Söding, *Das Liebesgebot bei Paulus: Die Mahnung zur Agape im Rahmen der paulinischen Ethik* (NTAbh, 26: Münster: Aschendorff, 1995), 229f; Reasoner, *The Strong*, 35-37.

ἀπόλλυται … ὁ ἀδελφὸς δι’ ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν.	(14:15) ὁ ἀδελφός σου λυπεῖται … μὴ … ἐκεῖνον ἀπόλλυε, ὑπὲρ οὖ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν.
therefore if food causes my brother to stumble, I will never eat meat again, lest I cause my brother to stumble (8:13) διόπερ εἰ βρῶμα σκανδαλίζει τὸν ἀδελφόν μου, οὐ μὴ φάγω κρέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἵνα μὴ τὸν ἀδελφόν μου σκανδαλίσω	it is good not to eat meat or drink wine or do anything by which your brother is made to stumble (14:21) καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον μηδὲ ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκόπτει
Let no one seek their own good but that of the other… be imitators of me just as I am of Christ (10:24; 11:1) μηδεὶς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ζητείτω ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου … μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε καθὼς κἀγὼ Χριστοῦ.	Let each of us please our neighbour for the good purpose of up-building; for Christ did not please himself… (15:2-3) ἕκαστος ἡμῶν τῷ πλησίον ἀρεσκέτω εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν· καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἤρεσεν…

Karris and others suggest that in Rom 14:1-15:13, Paul generalises the situation in Corinth.[24] They consider that there was no strife in the Roman community, and this paraenesis is addressed to a problem that might arise in any community. But there are others who strongly disagree with this argument and suggest that the

---

[24] Karris thinks that the seven imperatives in the first person plural or third person singular (as opposed to six in the second person plural) reveal the general nature of the material. See Karris, 'Romans 14:1-15:13', 73-77; Meeks, 'Judgment and the Brother', 292-93.

differences reflect the specific situation in Rome.[25] From the personal details of the people who were the leaders of the Roman congregations in Rom 16, we can infer that Paul would have known about the situation in Rome, otherwise he would not have included such detailed exhortations. If it was a general exhortation, he would not have given such stress by repeating it several times. He would have been in receipt of the news regarding the situation in Rome through Prisca and Aquila, Epaenetus, the mother of Rufus, Andronicus and Junia etc.

As Barclay rightly suggests the fact that Paul has omitted some specific issues in the Corinthian community (reference to εἰδωλόθυτα) and added relevant issues to the Roman community such as eating of vegetables (Rom 14:2) and the observance of days (14:5) attests that Paul is offering relevant instruction; the detailed description of the theme of welcoming each other; the reference to the two groups; the prominence of the passage at the end of the 'paraenesis'; Paul's siding with the strong group (15:1); all indicate that Paul knew the circumstances in Rome.[26] Barclay agrees that the arguments have some degree of generality (14:5, 15, 21) but this could be explained on 'rhetorical grounds' and the 'diplomacy' of Paul in addressing the problems in the congregations since he had neither founded nor visited the Roman church.[27] In line with this argument, Reasoner observes that the strong and the weak titles might have been common in Rome and Paul would have known about them.[28] It is difficult to categorize the religious practices of the weak in the passage but the themes in the chapters imply that Paul is addressing a specific problem in the Roman community.

---

[25] Wedderburn, *Reason for Romans*, 30-35.
[26] Barclay, 'Do we undermine the Law?', 289. Horrell suggests that Romans 14-15 is 'a carefully constructed and extended piece of argumentation'. Horrell, *Solidarity and Difference,* 167.
[27] Barclay, 'Do we undermine the Law?', 289.
[28] Reasoner*, The Strong*, 58.

This section fits in the context of the whole letter. It has some thematic parallels with the content as a whole. It has continuity with chaps. 2-13 as it deals with the behaviours and attitudes that are appropriate in the Christ community, which Esler calls '"norms" in a social identity sense or more particularly "identity descriptors"'.[29] The theme of love, which can be seen as the basis of the personal relationship in 12:9; 13:9-10 is repeated in 14:15 as Paul comments that a person who does not behave in this way is not walking in accordance with love. As Esler correctly notes, 'Paul is presenting the problems highlighted in 14:1-15:13 as a particular arena for the exercise or non exercise of the ἀγάπη he has just dealt with at length in chaps. 12-13'.[30] The main issue that Paul wants to bring in here is probably to connect the two groups in order to change the attitudes between them by their accepting each other.

6.3. Mutual Welcome: Exegetical Analysis of Paul's Exhortations

6.3.1. Welcome (προσλαμβάνω)

The core message of Romans 14-15 can be seen in the repeated usage of the term προσλαμβάνεσθε. It occurs four times: Rom 14:1 (προσλαμβάνεσθε); 14:3 (προσελάβετο); 15:7 (twice: προσλαμβάνεσθε; προσελάβετο). It is impregnated with meanings that are significant in the relationships between individuals, qualifying mutual up-building.[31] The 'one another' relationship not only strengthens the personal bond but also facilitates the growth of the community. Paul urges his addressees to exercise the practice of welcoming.

---

[29] Esler, *Conflict and Identity,* 339.

[30] Esler, *Conflict and Identity*, 340.

[31] προσλαμβάνω has different meanings: 1) 'to take something that needs a personal need, *take , partake of* food', Acts 27:34; 2) 'to promote one's own ends, *exploit, take advantage of*'; 3) ' to take or lead off to oneself, *take aside'*, Matt 16: 22; Mk 8:32; Acts 18:26; 3) 'to extend a welcome, receive in(to) one's home or circle of acquaintances', Rom 14:1; 15:7a; 14:3; 15:7; Phlm 12; 4) to take or bring along ...with oneself as companion or helper', Acts 17:5. See *BDAG*, 883.

6.3.1.1. Receive the Weak in Faith (14:1)

Paul's exhortation to 'receive the weak in faith' places the weak as the object of his exhortation and implies that the strong are the leading members of the Roman church. To receive means to 'receive or accept into one's society, home, circle of acquaintance',[32] which connotes more than mere acceptance into the church membership, but accepting others as brothers and sisters into the close fellowship of the people of God.[33] The verb in the present imperative possibly suggests a continuing attitude of acceptance. Jewett suggests that the home in the early Christian era may mean the house or tenement church and most likely the love feast, 'since this was the format of the assembly that turned the secular space of a house or portion of a tenement or shop into an arena of sacred welcome'; this concrete context is more helpful for understanding than fuzzy statements of 'mutual welcome'.[34]

Who are those 'weak in faith' to be received? The term implies a group or groups in Rome. The verb ἀσθενέω is used for physical illness, social or economic inferiority, and powerlessness of any kind.[35] The term has a moral connotation in Epictetus' warning: 'the reason is that usually every power that is acquired by the uneducated and weak is apt to make then conceited and boastful over it'.[36] As noted above, the Latin adjectives *tenuis* and *infirmis* denote a low economic, social, and political status.[37] In Horace's witty depiction of a man who declares that he is weak and could not speak on the Sabbath, we find both social and religious inferiority: 'Certainly you know more than I do… I am a small man of weakness, one of many

---

[32] *BDAG*, 883; See also Esler, *Conflict and Identity*, 347.
[33] Cranfield, *Romans,* 2:691. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 798. Barrett, *Romans*, 236: 'receive him into the Christian family'.
[34] Jewett, *Romans,* 888. Jewett thinks that most of the commentators have neglected this social context. Dunn terms this 'mutual acceptance'; Murray as 'acceptance of believers'; Morris as 'whole hearted acceptance'; Stuhlmacher, 'accept one another'. Some others have regarded the common meal as the background of this welcome. See Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 447; Black, *Romans*, 200.
[35] *BDAG* 142; G. Stählin, 'ἀσθενέω κτλ.' *TDNT* 1 (1964), 490-93.
[36] Epictetus, *Dissertations* 1.8.8-9.
[37] Reasoner, *The Strong*, 49-55.

(*sum paulo infirmior, unus multorum*). Pardon me, we'll speak another time'.[38] Reasoner suggests this as a parallel to 14:1, since it shows that 'the person excessively observant in a foreign religion who matched the 'weak' caricature was known to Horace's audience'.[39] The term implies an 'ethical-religious weakness' in the New Testament, since strength shows honour and weakness indicates contempt in the Roman world.[40] The title 'weak in faith' implies the other group is in a more dominant position, and finds fault with the faith of the inferior group, while being themselves more powerful (15:1).[41] Paul is here attesting the fact that the 'faith' of the weak meets the criteria for membership in the church activities and communal meals.

The word 'faith' is significant in his description of welcome since he uses it to describe the disputes between the two groups: 14:1, 2 and 14:22, 23. As seen a number of times in Romans, 'faith' or to 'believe' means a person's response to the gospel (1:5, 8, 16, 17; 3:22, 25-30; 5:1, 2). It is less probable that Paul is here talking about a person's weak faith in Jesus as the saviour and the Lord; rather he is condemning the undesirable implications of their faith in Christ. It does not probably mean Paul challenges weakness per se, since elsewhere he thinks weakness is the opportunity for divine grace (2 Cor 4:7-11; 11:30; 12:5, 9-10). As Moo suggests, 'he is criticizing them for the lack of insight into some of the implications of their faith in Christ'.[42] Those who cannot accept that faith in Christ is liberation from Old

---

[38] Horace *Sat*. 1.9.67-72, cited by Reasoner, *The Strong*, 53-54. See also Jewett, *Romans*, 834.

[39] Reasoner, *The Strong*, 58-61.

[40] See Reasoner, *The Strong*, 58-61.

[41] Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 3:81; Käsemann, *Romans,* 369; T. H. Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric in its Contexts: The Argument of Romans* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 408, 409.

[42] Moo, *Romans*, 836. Barrett as well as Cranfield think that to be 'weak in faith' means lack of trust in God (cf. 4:19), which is less likely. Barrett suggests, 'The weak are *weak in faith*; they are weak, but they have faith; they have faith, but they do not draw from it all the inferences that they should draw'. Barrett, *Romans,* 236; Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:700. However, Dunn suggests, 'the weakness is trust in God *plus* dietary and festival laws, trust in God *dependent* on observance of such practices, a trust in God which leans on the crutches of particular customs and not on God alone, as though they

Testament and Jewish regulations are weak in faith compared with those who worked out the freedom from the same. He wants to lift the 'weak' into the status of the 'strong' with respect to faith by having the former accepted by the latter. 'Paul wants the "strong" to receive the "weak" into full and intimate fellowship, something that could not happen if the "strong", the majority group, persist in advancing their views on these issues, sparking quarrels and mutual recrimination'.[43]

6.3.1.2. 'For God has received…' (14:3)

The attitude to one another could control the freedom of Christians even to reject any one from the fellowship of Christ. In principle they must receive those whom God has received. Here the ethic is that God receives the sinners in spite of their actions or attitudes. Those whom God has accepted became righteous; those who are made righteous have a change of status. The same term for welcome is used here as in v.1a thus showing that the welcome towards one another should be the same as that given by God.

Jewett suggests, 'welcome to the banquet is the crucial issue here, and Paul probably relies on the widely shared tradition of Christ as the host of the Lord's Supper, the master of the love feast, acting in behalf of God to welcome the faithful into the messianic banquet in fulfilment of the ancient prophecies'.[44] Jewett and Käsemann consider that the recipient of this welcome is 'him' (αὐτόν), which seems to be a general reference to both the weak and the strong. But Dunn makes a pertinent observation: the 'exhortation here (v.3c) is a rebuke particularly to the condemnatory attitude of the weak (vv.3b, 4): the one with the much tighter understanding of what is acceptable conduct for God's people would think that God

---

were an integral part of that trust'. Dunn, *Romans 9-16,* 798. Dunn also considers that 'Paul's counter emphasis on faith (14:1, 2, 22-23) is not at all surprising and fits into the overall argument of the letter far more closely than has usually been perceived'. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 800.
[43] Moo*, Romans*, 837.
[44] Jewett, *Romans*, 841.

has *not* accepted the other'.[45] The immediate object of the welcome here is the 'strong'. Paul's wording is similar to that of the Psalms: (LXX Ps 26:10; cf. 64:4; 72:24) ὁ δὲ κύριος προσελάβετο με ('the Lord has welcomed me'). This acceptance in the worship context is described in the context of the Christian love feast (Rom 12:13; 13:10; 14:1).[46]

6.3.1.3. Receiving One Another (15:7a)

The entire exhortation on the weak and the strong beginning from 14:1 has its climax in 15:7, which begins with διό (therefore)[47] to urge them to 'receive one another as Christ has welcomed you' (προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο ὑμᾶς). The admonition to the strong to accept the weak in faith (14:1) and the reference to God welcoming the strong (14:3) is broadened to welcome 'one another' (15:7), which is a very interesting shift of focus. Here the recipients are two groups, the strong and the weak; they need to welcome one another irrespective of their status. This is similar to the command not to judge 'one another' (14:13) and to strive for edification for one another (14:19), where both groups need to invite and welcome others. If only one group has decided to welcome others, there will be an imbalance of proper behaviour. As Jewett rightly suggests, 'The hostility cannot be overcome if only one side participates in this breaking down of barriers, and the barriers themselves can most effectively be dismantled by sharing in sacramental love feasts in which Christ's inclusion of insiders and outsiders is

---

[45] Jewett, *Christian Tolerance*, 129. Käsemann, *Romans*, 369; Meeks, 'Judgment and the Brother', 295. Dunn, *Romans*, 803. It is also significant that Paul is describing here God rather than Christ. In these two chapters 'God' and 'Christ' are used with differing emphasis: God as the final authoritative figure (14:6, 10, 18 and 15:6), whereas Christ as the subordinate figure, who accepts to the glory of God (14:3, 6, 10-12, 17-18, 20, 22; 15:5-6). See Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 803.

[46] See Jewett, Romans, 841.

[47] Διό sums up the preceding discussions and indicates a concluding statement. Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:739; See *BDAG,* 250.

recalled and celebrated'.[48] Thus the task of receiving is applied to both groups as they welcome one another.

6.3.1.4. 'As Christ has welcomed…' (15:7b)

The use of καθώς is significant since the welcome should be in the pattern of Christ: 'just as Christ has welcomed you'; comparing the manner of Jesus' welcome. It means more than 'tolerating' or giving 'official recognition'.[49] 'What Paul has in mind is not simply the fact of Christ's acceptance, but the manner of it (διάκονος v.8): it is precisely the humbling of oneself to a position where one's own opinions do not count and may not be thrust on another (one's master!), which both weak and strong, Gentile and Jew, need to practice'.[50]

Paul is here pointing to Christ who has shown a model of how to welcome others even if they were enemies. He was the host in the love feasts and Christ's death for the sinners shows that the members of the congregations have received an undeserved welcome. This is clear in 15:3 and 15:8f where Jesus did not please himself but he loved those who rejected him and killed him; 'the reproaches of those who reproached you fell on me' (15:3). This may remind us of Christ's attitude to sinners by welcoming them to the feast during his earthly ministry (Matt 9:9-11; cf. Mk 2:13-17; Lk 5:27-32)

It is striking that the same verb προσλαμβάνομαι is used here to describe the redemption of Christ as well as the welcoming attitude to one another in the congregations (15:7a, b). This implies his love to sinners shown on the cross by sacrificing his whole life. A Christian has to follow the footsteps of Christ in loving

---

[48] Jewett, *Romans*, 888; Jewett, *Tolerance,* 29. Paul possibly emphasizes the main aim of the letter, i.e. the privilege of the Jews and the inclusion of the Gentiles within the promise of God. It is more likely that the point is mutual acceptance irrespective of different practices rather than converting the Jewish congregation to Paulinism as suggested by Watson. See Watson*, Paul*, 97-98; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 846.

[49] Moo, *Romans,* 874.

[50] Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 846.

others without pleasing themselves, yet bearing the scruples of the weak (15:1). Christ's welcome is irrespective of ethnic, social and theological barriers as well. There is an echo of inclusivity in ὑμᾶς as it includes various groups in Rome. Jewett suggests, 'it is an ethic of obligation anchored in the ancient views of reciprocity' as he quotes Reasoner who comments, 'Christ's acceptance of the believer forms the basis for the obligation to accept a fellow member'.[51] However, I would suggest this is not 'obligatory' behaviour, but the self-giving of Christ acts as a pattern of conduct to accept a fellow member. It is something to which believers need to tune their character. The ultimate aim of welcome is to the glory of God, i.e. to praise God with one mind and one mouth (15:7c cf. v.6).

6.4. Judging as Hindrance to Welcoming

Judging is the main issue Paul is dealing with that has a negative control over relationships, since his rebuke of judging follows that of his admonition on the act of welcoming, implying that welcome is hindered or completely blocked by judging the brother.[52] These arguments on judging in the diatribe style show that Paul is strongly condemning the destructive actions of a Christian believer to another. It is striking and apparently deliberate that the section on judgment in Rom 14 has parallels to Rom 2 and its reproof of judging (κρίνειν) another (2:1-3; 14:3-4, 10) with a reminder of the judgment seat of God (2:16; 14:10-12).[53]

6.4.1. 'Who are you who are judging…?' (14:4)

The section on judging opens with a rhetorical question (v.4): 'Who are *you* who are judging…?' It is in a diatribe style marked by the colloquial expression σὺ

---

[51] Jewett, *Romans,* 889; Reasoner, *The Strong,* 194.
[52] Κρίνω has meanings such as a) to select, prefer, e.g. Rom 14:5a; b) to pass judgment upon the lives and actions of other people, Matt 7:1a, 2a; Lk 6:37a; Rom 2:1, 3; 14:3f, 10, 13a; Col 2:16; 1 Cor 4:5 ; c) to think, consider, look upon, Acts 13:46; 2 Cor 5:14; 1 Cor 11:13; d) to reach a decision, Acts 3:13; 20:16; 25:25; 1 Cor 2:2; 5:3; Tit 3:12; Rom 14:13b; 2 Cor 2:1; e) to engage in the judicial process; and f) to ensure justice for someone; *BDAG*, 567-569.
[53] Meeks, 'Judgment and the Brother', 296.

τίς εἶ (who are you?).[54] Here it may mean, 'Who do you think you are, you who are putting yourself in the position of judge over another believer?'[55] Each believer is answerable to his own master, who is responsible for the members of his own household. This gives a picture of the master-slave relationship of the Greco-Roman world. The phrase ἀλλότριος οἰκέτης, which is translated as 'someone else's slave or servant', overlooks the difference between οἰκέτης and δοῦλος.[56] Jewett suggests, 'the former denotes a normally inalienable member of the house-hold, including slaves, who function almost as family members, whereas the latter is ordinarily limited to slaves and hired servants, whether in the household or in other service'.[57] The house-hold connotation for believers was used by Paul in 'beloved of God' (1:7), 'children of God' (8:16), 'heirs of God … joint heirs with Christ' (8:17), 'the elect of God' (8:33), 'the children of the promise' (9:8). Probably, the use of the term suggests that his aim is 'not to undermine the status of members of the Roman house and tenement churches but to establish their equality with each other in relation to the authority of their κύριος ('Lord/Master')'.[58]

Paul says that no believer has the right to judge because each believer is a house-hold slave belonging to another. It is to his master (κύριος) that he stands or falls. κύριος is used with the same secular meaning as that of 'master'. This title is significant to the theological argument of vv.4-9; it is used nine times in this passage

---

[54] S. K. Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (SBLDS, 57; Chicago: Scholars Press, 1981), 115.

[55] Moo*, Romans*, 839.

[56] See also Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 803; Moo, *Romans*, 839; Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:698; Jewett, *Romans*, 841. οἰκέτης is used only once in Paul. There is some distinction between οἰκέται and δοῦλοι. Ἀλλότριος is more emphatic than using ἕτερος.

[57] Jewett, *Romans*, 842.

[58] Jewett, *Romans*, 842.

along with the verb 'lord it over' and interchanging with God (Θεός) and Christ (Χριστός).[59]

The ideal of the Christian community is different from that of the Jewish community, since the evaluation of a Christian should be in connection with the Lord. The basis of the Christian commitment is not some written laws that judge those who are not observing them but 'mutual tolerance' even if one does not observe the rules. 'The mutual tolerance demanded by Paul in the Roman churches requires that neither side allow their strongly-held convictions to determine the contours of Christian commitment'.[60]

He directs his words not only to one group since he is aware that both are at fault in their attitude to their fellow brothers and sisters. The one who eats should not despise the one who does not eat, and the one who does not eat is not to judge the one who does (14:3). Despise means disdainful judgment.[61] Paul states that mutual judgment is not valid as long as 'God has received him'. The metaphorical use of the terms 'stand' or 'fall' shows the relationship of the slave to the master. It is the Lord that every Christian should please. Moo rightly remarks, 'Paul here expresses confidence that the 'strong' believer will persist in the Lord's favour. Perhaps Paul's

---

[59] v.3c - 'God has received him'; v.4 - 'to his own Lord he stands or falls'; 'the Lord will cause him to stand'; v. 6 - 'observes the day to the Lord; eats to the Lord; give thanks to God; 'does not eat to the Lord'; 'give thanks to the Lord'; v.8 - 'we live to the Lord'; 'we die to the Lord'; 'we belong to the Lord'; v.9 - 'Christ died and came to life, in order that he might also be lord over both the dead and the living'; v.10 - 'we must all appear before the judgment seat of God'; v.11 - 'as I live, says the Lord'; 'every tongue will praise God'; v.12 - 'give account to God'.
   The theological reasons for not judging are given in terms of a believer's relationship to God (interchangeably using the title 'Lord'). Every believer is related to another believer through God, who is the ultimate authority of the community as well as each believer. The freedom in relation to others is to be used not in destroying others but in constructively up-building, since each one needs to be accountable for his/her actions. The basic model of actions is the welcoming pattern of God (and Christ; 15:7). That every one belongs to God and each one lives or dies to the Lord implies accountability of his/her own conduct towards God because a fellow believer is someone for whom Christ died (14:15). 'The relation of believers to their Lord takes precedence over any difference of opinion between believers … Life and death are much more important differences than disagreement over diet and days; and not even they disturb the relation between believers and their Lord'. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 808.
[60] Barclay, 'Do we undermine the Law?', 302.
[61] *BDAG*, 352.

intention is to suggest to the 'weak' believer that the Lord's approval is attained not by following rules pertaining to food but by the Lord's own sustaining power':[62] 'is able' (δυνατεῖ),' 'points both to the possibility and the power of grace'.[63]

6.4.2. 'Who are you to judge your brother?' (14:10)

The section vv.10-12 of the pericope begins like v.4 with a challenging question: Σὺ δὲ τί κρίνεις ('But who are you to judge?'), which in fact challenges the habitual judgment.[64] The use of δέ (but) and σύ explains the emphasis Paul is giving in this argument, since his main point from v.4f. is to avoid mutual judging. Probably this verse has the same emphasis as that of v.3 since the two major mistakes are indicated as judging and despising (κρίνω and ἐξουθενέω): 'Who are you to judge your brother? … Who are you to despise your brother'? ἐξουθενέω can convey a strong note of contempt, the character of those who see themselves as strong in order to despise those who are weak in their perspective, whereas κρίνω has a sense of 'make a judgment regarding' with a stress on the act of condemning; the weak are condemning the strong.[65] κρίνειν, used eight times in chapter 14 (14:3, 4, 5 (2 times), 10, 13 (2 times), 22), denotes the condemnatory judgmental behaviour of the weak. 'Christian judgment of *things* is valid and indeed essential (v.5), but judgment of *people* must give place to the judgment of God (vv.10-12)'.[66]

The repeated use of 'brother' is striking, since it is used here in v.10 after 12:1 and is also followed in vv.13, 15 and 21; Paul's concern is that the fellow brother is being mistreated. The use of the term 'brother' implies 'brother/sister in Christ'.

---

[62] Moo, *Romans,* 841.

[63] Käsemann, *Romans,* 370.

[64] See Käsemann, *Romans*, 372; Schlier, *Der Römerbrief* , 410; Stowers, *Diatribe*, 115.

[65] ἐξουθενέω has the same connotation in 2 Kgs 19:21; 2 Chr 36:16; Ezek 22:8; Wisd Sol 4:18; Luke 23:11; so also κρίνω in Rom 2:1, 3, 12, 27; 3:7; 14:4, 10, 22; 1 Cor 5:3, 12-13; 11:31; 2 Thess 2:12 cf. Col 2:16. See Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 802.

[66] Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 808. James 4:12 has a similar argument: σὺ δὲ τὶς εἶ, ὁ κρίνων τὸν πλησίον; ('But who are you that judges your neighbour?', which is also somewhat similar to Matt 7:3: τὶ δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρθος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου…; (Why do you see the speck that is in your brother's eye…?).

Here the metaphor applies to both parties (cf. v.13) and the other party is denoted by the metaphor rather than directly addressing the parties, implying 'the obligations following from the sibling status of the other'.[67] Paul instructs them to avoid judging or despising a brother/sister at all in order to avoid this kind of offensive behaviour resulting in his/her ruin (14:15, 21). It implies that the brother/sister should maintain 'mutual loyalty' in order to build up rather than putting a stumbling block before him/her.[68] The repeated use of the 'brother' metaphor emphasizes the attitude of a believer to fellow believers in the context of the Roman churches. The believers belong to the Lord and all are members of the 'spiritual brotherhood of believers'.[69] It is noteworthy that Paul's metaphors move from the house slaves (14:4) to brothers and sisters (14:10). Here the first challenge is directed to the weak, who judge others for not following the law on food and days, whereas the second challenge is aimed at the strong, who are despising others.

6.4.3. 'Let us not judge One Another' (14:13)

The admonition in v.13 is probably to both groups, the strong and the weak. The present hortatory subjunctive κρίνωμεν is used to show that an activity that has been continued must no longer (μηκέτι) be continued.[70] The verb has an object (one another) ἀλλήλους, which makes it clear that the object of exhortation is both groups.

---

[67] Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers*, 214. 'He uses the metaphor in order to further the interests and prerogatives of one party in the face of the other party; no one should be made to fall, whether they are "weak" or they are "strong"'. This clearly emphasizes mutual responsibility towards others.

[68] Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers*, 210. 'It is especially wrong to pass judgment on someone who is a Christian sibling'. Although Paul elsewhere advises to make judgments (1 Thess 5:14a; 1 Cor 5:5, 12; 6:5; 2 Cor 2:6), his aim is to avoid judgments that hinder unity and solidarity between one another.

Paul's use of the brother metaphor has parallels to that of the expectation of the behaviour to a brother in Antiquity. Terence's *Adelphoe* illustrates the 'dynamics and strength' of the fraternal relationship (cf. Plutarch 6.7). Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers*, 70, 210.

[69] H. Freiherr von Soden, 'ἀδελφος κτλ.', *TDNT* 1, 145; Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:709.

[70] *BDAG*, 568.

Barrett argues that the second clause ἀλλά τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον (v.13) describes the judgment that both sides are to make on the basis of Paul's admonitions, since κρίνειν is used in the aorist, second person plural.[71] On the basis of the first clause, Calvin Roetzel argues that Paul is eager to bring to an end the condescending and derisive judgments and to encourage 'a new concern for the brother'.[72] Κρίνειν here means 'to decide' not to put an offence in the brother's/sister's way. That means, deciding not to place a stumbling block before a brother/sister (ὁ ἀδελφός, which includes all believers v.13c). The use of πρόσκομμα (stumbling block) and σκάνδαλον (hindrance) (both words are used in connection with idolatry in Jewish thought but probably not here) explains how judging can be a destructive force in the way of a brother/sister.[73] Christ is referred to as the stone of stumbling (Rom 9:32-33), a citation of Isa 8:14. σκάνδαλον refers to 'cause of ruin' or 'occasion of misfortune' in the LXX.[74] What is the stumbling block in this instruction? Presumably, Paul is concerned about putting an end to negative evaluation of the sibling, i.e. by 'taking care not to place in his way anything that might cause him to fall from his Christian faith and practice'.[75] In sharing common meals, if one group forces the other to go against their conviction, then it would be a stumbling block as far as the second group is concerned.

6.5. Cost and Effect of Welcoming

6.5.1. Obligation: Bearing the Scruples (15:1a)

The strong are obliged to do welcoming at the cost of bearing the scruples of the weak: ὀφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοὶ τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων

---

[71] Barrett, *Romans,* 262.
[72] C. J. Roetzel, *Judgment in the Community: A Study of the Relationship between Eschatology and Ecclesiology in Paul* (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 134.
[73] πρόσκομμα and σκάνδαλον are used in 1 Cor 8:9 and 1 Cor 8:13.
[74] G. Stählin, 'σκάνδαλον, σκανδαλίζω' *TDNT* 7 (1971) 339.
[75] Barrett, *Romans*, 241, 242.

βαστάζειν. The language of obligation is characteristic of Romans while Paul did not use it in I Corinthians.[76] Obligation is defined in the Roman legal context as follows: *Obligationum substantia non in eo consistit, ut aliquod corpus nostrum aut seruitutem nostram faciat, sed ut alium nobis obstringat ad dandum aliquid uel faciendum uel praestandum* ('The essence of obligations does not consist in that it makes some property or a servitude ours, but that it binds another person to give, do, or perform something for us').[77]

Paul declares that he is obliged to 'Greeks and Barbarians' (1:14), whereas the believers are obliged to the Spirit to live as the Spirit wants them to (8:12), and are obliged to love one another (13:8). Why is it stated that the strong category is obliged to bear the other category that of the weak? Probably since he numbers himself among the strong and wants to start the admonition from the strong side to the weak, and he reverses the Greco-Roman system of obligation, where the weak have to submit to the strong. The Pauline system of obligation reverses this cultural peculiarity by saying that the strong are obliged to bear (βαστάζειν) the weaknesses of the weak.[78] It implies that the initiative is taken from the strong group to honour the weak group thereby putting into practice the exhortation to outdo one another in honouring (Rom12:10) by carrying another person's weaknesses. Carrying another

---

[76] ὀφείλω is used in Romans 1:14; 8:12; 13:8; 15:1. Obligation functioned through the patronage system of Corinth; see J. K. Chow, *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* (JSNTSup 75; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992) and is part of an 'ethic of reciprocity', since it controls the moral behaviour of many cultures. 'Ethic of reciprocity' is used by R. P. Saller, and is quoted by Reasoner and Jewett. See R. P. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 19; Reasoner uses the term 'ethic' in the sense of 'moral code'. See Reasoner, *The Strong*, 176; Jewett, *Romans*, 876.

[77] Digest of Justinian (eds. Theodor Mommsen and Paul Krueger; trans. and ed. Alan Watson; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 44.7.3, cited by Reasoner, *The Strong*, 181. It denotes the interpersonal relationship and it is a dynamic behind patronage. The Roman moralist speaks about 'gradations of duty' as 'our first duty is to the immortal gods; our second, to country; our third, to parents; and so on, in descending scale, to the rest'. Panaetius, according to Cicero, *Off.* 1.160, cited by Reasoner, *The Strong*, 182.

[78] βαστάζω has a sense of bear, endure; 'bear patiently, put up with: weakness', *BDAG*, 171. In Galatians 6:2, it is said, 'bear one another's burdens and fulfil the law of Christ' (ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τοῦ χριστοῦ). Another parallel is Matt 8:7 as a quotation of Isa 53:4: 'He took our weaknesses and bore our diseases'.

person's weaknesses implies carrying the weak themselves by placing one's strength in the place of the weaknesses and probably placing oneself in another's position. 'Accept as our own burden'[79] has a sense of identifying with their struggles and weaknesses. It needs more power and strength so as not to please themselves, thereby imparting Christ-like character.

It is striking that he balances the obligation to 'each of us' in pleasing 'the neighbour for good' (v.2). Why and in what ways are the 'strong' obliged to the weak is the question that comes to our mind. Jewett suggests, 'Having received the supreme gift of salvation, granted freely to the undeserving, each recipient has the reciprocal obligation of gratitude to the divine giver and of passing on the gift with the similar generosity to others who are equally undeserving'.[80] The strong ought to bear the scruples of the weak; the scruples may mean any failings that they had to undergo, which they could not bear by themselves, but for which they needed support and help.

6.5.2. Serving the interests of the other (15:2, 3)

The obligation to bear the weakness of the weak should have an essential qualification as 'not to please ourselves' (καὶ μὴ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν; 15:1). The verb ἀρέσκω implies accommodating oneself to someone.[81] Paul reverses the order of pleasing just as he overturns the obligatory system prevalent in Roman patronage; the cultural principle is that the superior class have the capacity to please themselves while those in the lower level lack ability and also as 'slaves and members of the

---

[79] Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:731; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 837.
[80] Jewett, *Romans*, 876. The obligation is defined as a duty that ought to be done as a result of receiving the 'new life in Christ', which is derived from 'faith in the gospel, the gift of the spirit, and membership in the community of faith'.
[81] *BDAG, 129.* Rom 15:1 cf. Gal 1:10; 1 Thess 2:4; 1 Cor 10:33.
Epictetus refers to pleasing oneself: 'Make it your wish then to please your own self, and you will be pleasing to god!' Epictetus, *Dissertations*, 2.18.19. In *Assumption of Moses*, pleasing oneself is given in the negative sense as that of Paul: 'deceitful men, self-pleasing, hypocrites in all their affairs'. *Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*, (trans.) Johannes Tromp (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 16-17.

urban underclass' always work to please their masters;[82] the important Pauline concept of pleasing is that in Christ, those who are able should serve the powerless by not pleasing themselves which has its implications in 'not destroying the work of God' (14:15, 20), pursuing peace and mutual up building (14:19) and keeping away from anything that offends others (14:21).

Although Paul sides with the strong and places the responsibility of bearing on their shoulders (as their first choice), reversing the existing pattern of obligation of the Roman system, he broadens his vision of obligation in the Christian community by sharing the responsibility between both sides -- weak and strong -- with the formulation 'each of us'. This clearly envisions the Pauline concept of community with all the members equally participating in their effort of mutual up-building (12:3-8), which again contrasts with the Roman social system that assumes the powerful are able to act independently.

The mutual responsibility is qualified by pleasing the neighbour (πλησίον) for good and mutual up building. The fulfilment of the law by loving your neighbour is referred to in 13:9-10, while Paul speaks of his apostolic strategy 'to please all people in all he does' (1 Cor 10:33). Neighbour (πλησίον) has a broader definition of 'one's fellow human being,'[83] which means here the fellow believer or, in a much broader context, those whom they associate with.

The pattern of Christ's receiving others without pleasing himself is the fundamental model in relationships to one another. It brings to light that the redemptive action of Christ has not been fulfilled in our righteous mode but in our undeserving and unrighteous mode of character. The aorist verb ἤρεσεν implies

---

[82] Jewett, *Romans*, 877.
[83] Klaus Haacker, 'πλησίον' *EDNT* 3 (1993) 113.

Jesus' selfless attitude in his entire ministry (Phil 2:3-5).[84] Christ did not please himself but as it is written 'the reproaches of those who reproached you fell on me' (Rom 15:3 cf. Ps 69:9). Paul quotes the Psalmist in a way that has Jesus speaking about the reproaches (ὄνειδος means disgrace, scandal, abuse, shame etc.)[85] that fell on him. 'Christ died the most shameful of deaths in behalf of the shamed'.[86] In the context of Rom 15, Paul wants to maintain a 'mutually accepting attitude between the strong and the weak', which 'has the stunning implication that contempt and judging going on between the Roman congregations add to the shameful reproach that Christ bore on the cross for the sake of all'.[87] The two groups should work for mutual honour and integrity by pleasing others rather than judging and despising that tends to shame others.

6.5.3. Love as Core Attitude (14:15)

If one does not care about others and sticks to selfish ideals in the matter of food, relationships in the community could be broken by means of offending others, and the offender is not walking in love (14:15a);[88] the theological reason is not to destroy or continue to destroy the one for whom Christ has died (14:15b). Christ's death for all was mentioned in Rom 5:6, 8 and the inclusive character of his earthly ministry etc. implies the worth of each individual in the eyes of God.

Sigfred Pederson notes that not 'walking according to love' is a sin since 'the love of God through Christ' has not thus accomplished the objective of establishing

---

[84] Barrett, *Romans*, 296; Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:732.
[85] Johannes Schneider, ὄνειδος κτλ., *TDNT* 5 (1967) 238.
[86] Jewett, *Romans*, 880.
[87] Jewett, *Romans*, 880.
[88] 'Walking' (περιπατέω) is a distinctive Pauline metaphor that denotes one's actions and life. Georg Bertram and Heinrich Seesemann think that he has adapted it from the LXX usage; (e.g. Prov 8:20). See Georg Bertram and Heinrich Seesemann, πατέω, κτλ., *TDNT* 5 (1967), 544. Paul used to urge the congregations 'to walk worthily of God' (1 Thess 2:12; cf. 2 Cor 4:2; Phil 3:17).

'a new eschatological reality' in this world of sin.[89] Love can be seen as the continuing, opposite force acting against destruction and acting towards the building up of the individual or the community. I agree with Jewett, as he suggests, 'When people are impelled to act in violation of their individual conscience, no matter how it has been formed in their familial and cultural tradition, they lose their integrity and their capacity to act as moral agents'.[90]

Love is manifested in different realms of a believer's life in excellent manners such as 'receiving' and 'bearing' (14:1; 15:1, 7). ἀγάπη means 'to prefer' or 'to set one good or aim above another' 'to esteem one person more highly than other', which matches God's love for humans.[91] Thus, ἀγάπη shows the character of real love as the 'love of the higher lifting up the lower' and giving one's self in its totality for others. The strong should receive and support the weak in matters of faith as well as their failings. Dunn suggests, 'the golden rule of love of neighbour which has knit together the earlier exhortation (12:3, 9-10, 13, 14-17, 21;13:8-10) continues to be the leading principle governing relationships strained by differences on important matters affecting faith and communal lifestyle (particularly 14:15)'.[92] Love protects the personal as well as communitarian unity and integrity.

6.5.4. Christian Unity

Paul encourages the believers to have the same mind (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν) as that of Christ (15:5). τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν is used (12:16) in the sense of harmony

---

[89] S. Pederson, "Agape - der eschatologische Hauptbegriff bei Paulus". In S. Pederson (ed.). *Die Paulinische Literatur und Theologie*. Anlässlich der 50. jähringen Gründungs-Feier der Universität Aarhus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980, 159-86, at 167. The consequence of not 'walking in love' is the ruin of the brother, for whom also the redemptive action is effected. 'The person is being destroyed' is a metaphorical expression that emphasizes the continual effect.

[90] Jewett, *Romans*, 862. 'To act without regard to one's own conscience is to enter into destruction through the dissolution of the self' through the loss of 'personal unity' and 'integrity'. Jewett, *Tolerance*, 55.

[91] E. Stauffer, 'ἀγαπάω, ἀγάπη, ἀγαπητός', *TDNT* 1, 21-55, at 36. ἀγαπητός is used to show that a person is so dear.

[92] Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 797.

between the groups that allows solidarity by associating with the lowly and not cherishing haughty thoughts in oneself. It acknowledges the same Lordship without eradicating their cultural differences.

Paul is emphasizing Christ as the exemplar for the two groups to follow. The groups with diversities and differences have the Christological motivation for unity between them, if they work for the good and up building of each other by considering others better than themselves and honouring the interests of others; 'let each of us please his neighbour for his good, to edify him' (15:2). For Jewett, 'This produces a distinctive form of same-mindedness because the focus is no longer on achieving unanimity in doctrine or practice but rather on bearing abuse for each other and pleasing each other as Christ did'.[93] The same mind as that of Christ helps to glorify God with one mind and one voice (15:6). Paul encourages the Roman believers to be of the same mind even in the midst of differing strengths, which are manifested in their attitudes to food, days etc.

6.5.5. Christian Community Ideals

Romans 14, 15 are rich in describing the ideals of the Christian community. I categorize these ideals into two groups, since those belonging to the first group are those to which a believer should put in his/her effort, whereas the second category characterizes the free gifts from God. They are:

a. Love (14:15), righteousness (14:17), peace and joy in the Holy Spirit (14:17, 19; 15:10, 13);

b. Patience and comfort (15:4, 5), mercy (15:9) truth of God (15:8), promises (15:8), hope (15:13 twice).

---

[93] Jewett, *Romans,* 884.

Paul, while defining the relationships in the community that would ultimately transform the experience as the reign of God, is speaking in terms of what it does not and what it does make up (14:17). It is not eating and drinking, which are temporary and limited, but it is constituted by righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit that are long lasting and also transferable constructive principles. On the one hand, Paul wants to say that the kingdom of God could not be practised in terms of the destructive behaviours and offensive disposition towards one another. On the other, he wants to emphasize the fruit of the spirit (Gal 5:22) that helps the growth of the community rather than judging and despising on matters that destroy relationships in the community. The synchronization of the three important beneficial community principles such as righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit echoes Ps 84:4 and also describes the desirable attitudes in the community, which need to be controlled by the power of the Holy Spirit. For Murray the three significant terms 'should be taken as the rectitude and behaviour of the believer within the fellowship of Christ'.[94]

The expression 'pursue peace' in 14:19 is biblical, denoting a righteous man in Ps 34:14 (LXX 33:14), ζήτουσον εἰρήνην, καὶ δίωξον αὐτην ('seek peace and pursue it'). Εἰρήνην διώκειν is an idiom in the early Christian speech (2 Tim 2:22; Heb 12:14; 1 Pet 3:11) and may be based on Ps 34:14 (as is clear in 1 Pet 3:11).[95] Käsemann defines 'peace as openness toward everyone'.[96] The God-given aspect and corporate dimension of peace is seen in 14:17, 18; the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking but righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit, thereby indicating that this conduct is pleasing to God and approved by men and women. The plural

---

[94] Murray, *Romans*, 2:194.
[95] Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 824. Εἰρήνη has a corporate dimension rather than an individual dimension, since Paul is dealing with the issues relating to community; there is no peace with God in a divided community (v.17). Elsewhere in Paul 'peace' is used in Rom 15:13, 32; 2 Cor 1:15, 24; 2:3; 7:13; 8:2; Gal 5:22; Phil 1:4, 25; 2:2, 29; 4:1, etc.
[96] Käsemann, *Romans*, 377.

formulation of the things of peace (τὰ τῆϛ εἰρήνηϛ) may point to the different issues in which Paul and his colleagues had to work for making unity and harmony. Apparently, it also indicates Paul's accommodation to different peoples of different status as 'all things to all people' (1 Cor 9:19-23).

6.5.6. The *Up-Building* Metaphor (οἰκοδομή 14:19; 15:2)

Welcoming one another has its result in mutual *up-building*. The change from the third person singular (v.18) to first person plural (v.19) implies that Paul and his associates are examples for the weak and the strong to 'pursue' (διώκειν) peace and the edification of others.

The expression 'to pursue peace' (14:19) has a corresponding expression τὰ τῆϛ οἰκοδομῆϛ 'the edification of one another', which amplifies the significance of the former 'pursue peace'. Cranfield suggests that this expression 'should probably be understood as serving more to fill out and clarify the significance which τὰ τῆϛ εἰρήνηϛ has in this context'.[97] The use of οἰκοδομή is characteristic of Paul's language to denote congregational work (1 Cor 3:9-10; 14:3, 5, 12, 26; 2 Cor 10:8; 12:19; 13:10). In the LXX, the term is used to describe 'God's building of Israel' (Jer 12:16; 38:4, 28; 40:7; 49:10; 45:4; 51:34). There are also parallels in the Qumran community which is described as 'eternal planting of a holy house for Israel and a circle of the Most High' who witness to the truth of the law and 'make atonement for the land and judge the helpless'.[98] Although the metaphor of building is the same, the context in the early Christian communities is different and the task of up-building is broader than in the context of the Qumran community [99] and there are closer parallels

---

[97] Cranfield, *Romans,* 2:721.
[98] *IQS* 8:5-10
[99] 'οἰκοδομεῖν as a spiritual task in a community' in Otto Michel, οἰκοδομέω κτλ., *TDNT* 5 (1967) 140-42. 'Edification defines the unity and growth of the community as the task of every charismatic action of individuals'. Käsemann, *Romans,* 378.

to Paul's *up-building* of the community in Epicurean philosophical communities.[100]

To build up one another includes groups, the weak and the strong, to work for the other side. The ἀλλήλους formula (cf.14:13) calls forth both the groups to unite and work together for mutual edification. Jewett suggests, 'as each group supports the integrity of the other and encourages growth in others, a "mutually nurturing community" flourishes'.[101]

The double emphasis (εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν 15:2) to strive for the good and the *up-building* with the effect of pleasing one's neighbour indicates that Paul is reinstating the earlier exhortations (13:10a), 'love does not do evil to the neighbour', the quality of goodness versus evil that each believer should uphold (12:9), and the need to make every effort to overcome evil (12:21), thereby giving preference to the neighbour. Seeking the good of others results in mutual *up-building*, which refers to the communitarian aspect rather than the individual sense. If each believer seeks the good of his neighbour, this has its effect in goodness and up-building of the community in its total dimension. In 1 Thess 5:11, Paul urges the recipients of the letter to build up each one implying the task and effort of building one another, reversing the cultural paradigm of seeking good for themselves by dishonouring others. As Jewett rightly suggests, 'If each group seeks constructively to encourage the development of integrity and maturity in other groups, rather than trying to force them to conform to a single viewpoint, the ethnic and theological

---

[100] There are 'four dimensions of Epicurean correction practice; one involving self-correction, another when a correction is administered by "others," thirdly, when members report errors to the teachers for them to correct, and finally, when the wise correct each other … a network of social relations in which active participation of friends is presupposed in mutual edification, admonition and correction'. Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 132; (see also 124-132). 'Pauline communal psychagogy' in Romans 14-15 is different from 'Epicurean Communal Psychagogy' in which 'an asymmetrical relationship between the "weak" and "powerful" is assumed but Paul emphasizes the responsibility of the latter and the need of accommodation for both ... to teach members of his communities to implement a certain form of mutual psychagogy'. Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 214.
[101] Jewett, *Romans*, 866; Jewett, *Tolerance*, 139.

diversity in Rome would no longer be divisive and destructive'.[102] It seems that Paul reinstates the implications of the body metaphor here, since the body works for a common purpose in spite of differences and diversities in the tasks of its members (Rom 12). Similarly, οἰκοδομή calls forth unity in the purpose of the community to work for the edification of one another. As M. L. Reid rightly suggests, 'Paul's rhetoric of mutuality thus defines the social reciprocity that exemplifies acceptable and honourable community conduct'.[103]

6.5.7. Sustaining Mutual Identity

Through the admonition not to despise the weak or to insist on them changing their life style, Paul seems to protect the law-observing character of Jewish Christianity. He seems to approve that they could observe the food laws and Sabbath, thereby maintaining their social integrity in the Roman society. However, they need to accept those who are not observing the same; he requires them to relate with the 'brothers and sisters in Christ'. On the other hand, he sides with the strong by explicitly expressing his own conviction that 'in the Lord Jesus' the Jewish laws might be done away with. He does not want the strong to follow the practices of the weak, rather to accommodate them by allowing them to keep their own identity, which is a very significant characteristic of the Christian community.

It is striking that he bases his arguments on the subject of 'the honour of the Lord' (14:4); their actions are in a way related to the Lord so that the weak Christians have to associate with the other group on the basis of their 'common faith in Jesus the Lord'. The law observance as well as the non-observance is 'equally valid' in the sight of the Lord. As Barclay suggests,

---

[102] Jewett, *Romans*, 876.
[103] M. L. Reid, 'Paul's Rhetoric of Mutuality: A Rhetorical Reading of Romans', in E. H. Lovering (ed.), *SBL Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 117-139 at 137. S. J. Stowers interprets the 'principle of faithfulness as adaptability to others'; S. J. Stowers, *A Re-reading of Romans: Justice, Jew, and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 318.

In prayer and worship (15:7-13), in common meals (14:1ff.), in the sharing of prophecy and teaching (12:6-7), financial resources (12:8) and the common kiss (16:16), they are required to express a deep bond of unity with people fundamentally neglectful of the law. They are even expected to welcome Paul and to pool their spiritual gifts with his (1:11-12), just as they are now asked to pray for his visit to Jerusalem (15:30-32). In all these ways, while accepting their right to remain attached to the Jewish community, Paul requires from the weak a deep social commitment to their fellow Christians, even if they do not respect the Jewish law in their conduct.[104]

6.6. The Pauline Ethos of Mutuality

It is very interesting to note the paradigm of mutuality -- 'Pauline love mutualism' as I call it -- since love has an important role in leading to mutual responsibilities. Paul envisages such mutuality in Romans as he urges the two groups in Rom 14-15 in their dealings with one another. This is significantly different from the simple idea of reciprocity and mutualism because it has the procedure of being servants of one another, without pleasing themselves, each side giving priority to the others with the participation of both parties in a dynamic reversal of position like the pedal of a bicycle (a continuous and reciprocal movement, up and down).

The same pattern of mutualism that Paul depicts in Rom 12-13 can be seen in Rom 14, 15 and 16. Paul moves from the plain idea of interdependence to a new pattern of relationship serving one another in mutualism based on love. The manner of Christ is involved as the two groups emerge mutually edified and mutually welcomed, without any necessary change in their mutual identity. The mutual exchange of joy, peace, righteousness, hope, truth, grace, promises etc. takes place. The edification passes on to others as a chain reaction since each and every member of the congregation is involved in this process in its total dimension. In this section we deal with the similarities and significant dissimilarities between the simple idea of reciprocity and the Pauline ethos of reciprocity.

---

[104] Barclay, 'Do we undermine the Law?', 306.

6.6.1. ἀλλήλους: Two way Relationships

Paul's admonition to love and care for each other is significant among his teachings to the community of believers. The main aim is to encourage the believers to have a proper conduct towards each other, i.e. the emphasis is on mutuality. The ἀλλήλους language is carried into chapters 14 and 15 from 12 and 13[105] as Paul encourages the Roman Christians to practise mutual relations to fellow believers, although he distinguishes the community into two groups the 'strong' and the 'weak'. There are four (ἀλλήλους) 'one another' references in chapters 14-15:1-13.

a. Do not judge one another (14:13)

b. Let us pursue matters that lead to peace and to edification for one another (14:19)

c. May the God of endurance and of comfort give to you the power to think the same thing among one another according to Jesus Christ (15:5)

d. Welcome one another, therefore, as Christ has welcomed you, for the glory of God (15:7)

Paul's desire is to urge unity and solidarity among the believers by enhancing mutual relations. He wants to emphasize this in the different dimensions of life of a Christian, i.e. it can be explicit in different forms of love such as affection, generosity, hospitality, identifying with, honouring and forgiving (chapters 12-13). The attitude of sober mindedness (12:3) creates 'other'-mindedness and as members of the 'one' body (in Christ), each one's task of welcoming, bearing and edifying one another is significant; its implication to the community is also remarkable as each one is required to avoid judging that destroys the work of God and ruins the fellow brother/sister.

---

[105] As we have seen in the previous chapter 5 (5.2), internal relationships within the community are emphasized by the word ἀλλήλους.

6.6.2. Dynamic Relationship

The basic idea of reciprocity has the characteristic of two-way relationships, and reciprocity in antiquity can be on equal or on unequal grounds. However, the uniqueness of Pauline mutuality is that there is the dynamism involved by the reversal of positions. Receiving one another includes a repeated process of change in position; continuous change to put others in balance. This type of relationship can be sustained by being servants of one another and by regarding others as brother/sister (sibling).

Servants of One Another: The Christological motivation for the dynamic process of behaviour in welcoming, bearing, pleasing, edifying etc. is the fundamental mode of the community relationships, leading to unity and harmony. Rom 15:1-3 is closely parallel to Mk 10:45: Jesus came to the world 'not to be served, but to serve'. Being servants of one another doesn't work unless one individual/group is ready to accept a lower state which automatically uplifts the opposite group. It needs surrendering of selfish motives for the sake of others. In turn, the recipient of the service intends to serve the donor by going through the same process in return for the same purpose.

The strong and the weak members of the community represent the diversities and differences in a community just like the body, which probably helps the community to follow Christ's pattern of behaviour in the matter of welcoming described in Rom 14, 15. If all the members are either weak or strong, how can the community exercise the character of other-mindedness? The effectiveness of the Christ-like character could be revealed only if it is given an opportunity. Those who have greater strengths are obliged to bear those of the lesser, thereby implying mutuality in the community as seen in the body metaphor: giving more honour to

other members. The implications of being the body of Christ are expressed in receiving one another as Christ has received them all. It seems that the gist of all that Paul has explained regarding being one body in Christ and members of one another is clearly implied in the action of mutual welcoming. The act of welcoming or receiving does imply the denial of one's own motives in order to promote others.

Brother/Sister Metaphor: It is striking to note how Paul brings up relationships to one another by introducing models from the practical realm. If the first metaphor he used in Rom 14-15 is the servant model (14:4), the second pattern of relationship is depicted as the membership of one family (14:10, 13, 15, 21). This emphasizes the strong relationship between those who are knit together in Christ and work for a common purpose. It implies the belonging togetherness of the members[106] and their effort for the common good and lifting up of one another.

Working for the common good involves honouring others rather than oneself. As Aasgaard puts it, Paul's aim in the use of this metaphor 'is to make each party hold the other party in higher esteem than previously'.[107] The singular usage of the brother metaphor probably indicates individual responsibility towards others as well as to God (14:12), that although working as groups, an individual's responsibility towards another individual is part of the responsibility of the whole group to attain its destined purpose. In other words, if a community fails to attain its goal, each and every member of it needs to take the responsibility of his/her failure of mission towards its achievement.

---

[106] See A. D. Clarke, 'Equality or Mutuality? Paul's Use of "Brother" Language' in P. J. Williams, et al., (eds.), *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting: Essays on Context and Background in honour of B. W. Winter* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 151-164, at 164; P. Arzt Grabner, 'Brothers and Sisters 'in Documentary Papyri and in Early Christianity', *Revista Biblica* 50 (2002), 187-202.

[107] Aasgaard, *My beloved brothers*, 214.

6.7. Conclusion

The paradigm of mutuality that Paul emphasizes in Rom 14, 15 is made concrete in mutual welcome. The attitudes of judgment and despising are hindrances to this positive aspect of relationships. Genuine love to a brother or sister is shown by accepting him/her in the present state of existence, even if in the undeserving state, which is the pattern of the cross; Christ made us righteous by bearing all our sins on himself. Evaluating one another is to be made in the pattern of Christ. The Christian φιλαδελφία (Rom 12:10) and κοινωνία (Rom 12:13) are expressed in the form of welcoming one another each retaining their respective identity, in observing or not observing Jewish practices.

The eventual purpose of love mutualism is that it glorifies God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: accept one another to the glory of God (15:7). Love mutualism not only works between humans, but it begins with God bestowing grace through Christ to humans; humans pass on this grace to each other; and it ends in glorification and thanksgiving, thus completing a cycle. Since grace is involved in love mutualism, it can work not only in favourable situations but also in unfavourable conditions. Paul speaks about negative reciprocity (repay evil for evil; Rom 12:17) and positive reciprocity (repay good for evil; Rom 12:17). Love mutualism has the power to love enemies and feed them, overcoming evil with good (Rom 12:21), which is the self-giving model on the cross (loving others and forgiving others by repaying good for evil).

It is probable that Paul wants to follow the same ethos of mutualism in the greetings (Rom 16:1-16). One could even think whether Paul desires to give the Romans a chance to practise love mutualism through greeting one another, to which he points towards some people, who have exercised this love mutualism towards

himself and in the context of the church. Also, Paul urges this love mutualism to work across all the organs of the 'body in Christ', irrespective of gender. Therefore my final attempt is to conclude this thesis by showing that greetings work as a significant model to enhance love mutualism, which also aims to acknowledge the hard work of some people towards Paul and the church, irrespective of gender.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

Towards a Theology of Love Mutualism

As stated in the introductory chapter, the three major issues focussed in this research are the leadership roles of women in the Pauline churches as specified in Romans 16, the disposition of the mutuality reflected in the greetings to men and women, and the way in which the greetings to men and women in Rom 16 relate to the ethos of mutualism in Rom 12-15. The Pauline ethos of mutuality embedded in the greetings to men and women (Rom 16:1-16) seems to be a continuation of the exhortations to the Romans about how to relate to one another in the body of Christ following the model of Christ (Rom 12-15); Paul's positive approach to the roles of women in spite of his prohibitions and restrictions to women's participation in the church and worship elsewhere is especially striking.

7.1. A Retrospect

In Chapter 2, from the analysis of the form of greetings in the Pauline letters against the backdrop of the Hellenistic use of greetings, we noted the significance of the specific form of the greetings (Rom 16:1-16). The second person plural of the greeting verb, used extensively in Romans 16 has the purpose of encouraging mutual relationship.

In Chapter 3, study on the leadership of women in the Greco-Roman world shows that some women of wealth, family and position exerted independence and freedom, although we cannot generalise that all women had independence. The analysis shows that women's leadership roles in the Pauline churches is not countercultural; rather they were part of the culture of the Greco-Roman world.

Chapter 4 analysed the women named (Rom 16:1-16) and greeted with descriptive phrases indicating their leadership roles in the Church and their actions

in relation to Paul. It drew our attention to Paul's acknowledgment of some women, who worked as his associates, and pointed to relationships of mutuality in the greetings.

Chapter 5 examined mutuality modelled in the body metaphor and the recurring 'ἀλλήλους/ ἀλλήλων' in Paul's exhortations (Rom 12, 13). The body metaphor points to the significance of being in Christ and that does not exclude difference but respects difference as well as belonging togetherness. The repeated term 'ἀλλήλους' signifies that Christian experience is not only an individual experience but also has social and ethical aspects which are in fact derived from incorporation into the body of Christ.

In Chapter 6, we came across the contextual application of mutuality in the community as mutual welcoming and mutual *up-building* (Rom 14-15). It seems that differences and diversity in a person's cultural practice may hinder welcoming, which may be the reason why Paul strongly urges Roman Christians to bear one another irrespective of position or status.

As we have provided a summary of findings at different junctures, the next attempt is to draw together the peculiarities of the Pauline ethos of mutuality which encourages the leadership roles of women in the greetings. A discussion on the significance of greetings (7.2) in Romans is followed by the discussion on women in leadership within the structures of mutualism (7.3). Thirdly, 1 Cor 11:1-16 is discussed briefly to understand whether hierarchy or relationality is the main emphasis (7.4), and fourthly, a final remark is made on the Pauline ethos of mutuality in Romans and the further scope of research is outlined (7.5).

7.2. The Impact of ἀσπάσασθε

Ἀσπάσασθε 'you greet' denotes an instruction to greet that forges a web of relationships. Paul's instruction to the Romans to greet the people named and mentioned with descriptive phrases works as an introduction to comprehend their actions with regard to each other as well as to him. The instruction 'you greet' deepens and strengthens relationships between B (recipients of the letter) and C (the recipients of the greeting), thus establishing a mutual bond between A (Paul) and B and between B and C and between A and C.

The persons who do the greeting are not only acting as agents but also as recipients of others, thus there is a web of mutual interaction. Moreover, the descriptive phrases used to portray the actions of the people on behalf of the church and Paul provide strong commendation to the greetings, reinstating positive relations between Paul and the persons greeted. The relational character of the greetings is also significant as the persons are described in relation to Paul, Christ and the church. The belonging togetherness of the community is expressed in the phrase 'in the Lord' that unifies and maintains the new identity of the believers in relation to Christ, irrespective of gender, status, and ethnicity.

Paul's instruction to greet ends in instructing the Romans to greet one another with a holy kiss (Rom 16:16a), that covers all the individuals not specified by name and unifies the people with different perspectives and practices, thereby holding the community together in mutual love, which is the focus of Romans (12-15). Mutuality of relationships in Romans transcends gender discrimination as Paul accepts and appreciates men and women for their toil with regard to the church and to himself. Therefore, this type of greeting builds up mutual love among the Roman Christians in a way that re-positions one another.

7.3. The Women in Leadership within the Structures of Mutualism

The women named and greeted with specific roles (Rom 16) are Phoebe, Prisca, Junia, Persis, Mary, Tryphaena and Tryphosa, Rufus' mother, Nereus' sister and Julia. It is quite striking to note that some women clearly exercised leadership roles and some others actively participated in the ministry of the church as well as Paul's mission (Rom 16:1-16). Their leadership roles and participation are honoured as the same as that of men (or over men) which seems to be well known and taken for granted by the Roman believers. The mutuality of leadership is a remarkable aspect, whether man or woman in relation to the Lord. It is gender-blind without any special limitations to women, thereby appearing in the web of mutual exchange. The practice of mutualism among the leaders can work as a demonstration for the believers to follow in the community.

Paul's appreciation of the roles of these women drew our attention to the fact that these women played leadership roles. Firstly, Phoebe as the διάκονος played an important and significant leadership role in the church of Cenchreae. Her position is further emphasized in the title προστάτις of many as well as of Paul. Her expected role among the Romans could not be limited to the Spanish mission, since πρᾶγμα is not a definite matter in the request for help. Moreover, the chiasm of the passage is woven in such a way as to show the significant aspect of reciprocity. Her action for others needs to be reciprocated and she is a woman qualified for hospitality and help in whatever matter she needs. This gives an insight into Phoebe's contribution to the Pauline mission on the one hand and, on the other, Paul's way of presenting her and his desire to reciprocate her actions on behalf of many as well as himself.

Secondly, Paul's description of Prisca and Aquila as his associates (συνεργοί μου) and as having risked their lives for his sake, obviously state the relationship with Paul. But their action on behalf of Paul brought to them thanksgiving (εὐχαριστῶ) not only from Paul but also from all the churches of the Gentiles. Prisca was a co-worker of Paul and possibly acted as the leader of the church in her house, which consisted of the community of saints. Her contribution was profound as she was beneficial to all the churches of the Gentiles, including both men and women.

Thirdly, Paul describes Junia (with Andronicus) as συγγενεῖς μου and συναιχμάλωτοι and that implies their relationship to Paul and his co-workers. But the other two descriptions ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστολόις and πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ explicitly state their relationship to the early Christian community and their significant contribution to the Christian mission as well. First, Junia is portrayed as an associate of Paul. She is not only an apostle (in a sense of co-worker) but also prominent among them. The reason for her distinctiveness is not specific, but one can make out that the reasons may include her toil (fellow prisoner) and missionary zeal (in Christ before Paul). Second, Paul's description of her as 'prominent among the apostles' seems to imply that Paul himself will get some benefit by sharing in the reputation of those who are associates with himself (cf. Rom 16:3, 4). Thirdly, it reveals the mutual obligation which comes about by being in Christ (cf. Rom 12:5) that places all the human relationships in a deeper context, i.e. we all belong together because we are in Christ/the Lord.

Mary, Persis, Tryphoena and Tryphosa were hardworking women and part of the appreciated and acknowledged team, who had supported Paul and his mission by various means. Rufus' mother was a mother to Paul. Nereus' sister and Julia were

possibly part of the leadership team of a tenement church. Paul's presentation of these women's roles in order to be greeted as well as appreciated by the Roman believers reinforces the Pauline ethos of mutuality.

These women were appreciated for their leadership roles alongside men, and the endorsement of women's roles elsewhere also gives evidence of Paul's positive attitude to women in ministry and leadership. Examples include: Apphia (our sister; Phlm 2); Nympha, greeted with the church in her house (Col 4:15), and Euodia and Syntyche, co-workers of Paul, who shared his struggles (Phil 4:2, 3).

7.4. 1 Cor 11: 2-16: Restriction or Mutuality in Gender Roles?

Having explored Paul's positive approach to women and their roles in the church and to himself (Rom 16:1-16), it is paradoxical to hear Paul's seemingly indifferent tone elsewhere in dealing with the roles of women in the church (1 Cor 11:2-16; cf.14:34f[1]; 1 Tim 2:13f). 1 Cor 11:2-16 posits an apparent ambivalence with regard to gender relations: on the one hand, the text seems to affirm the subordination of women, especially with reference to the veiling of women in public worship. On the other, it seems to affirm mutuality between gender relations. I consider this passage significantly encourages mutuality in gender relations as in the greetings (Rom 16:1-16).

In the first stage of Paul's argument, three parallel statements can be seen (v.3). The head of every man is Christ, the head of every woman is man, and the head of Christ is God. Κεφαλή has been rendered with different nuances -- such as head or chief, source or origin which indicates authority, supremacy and leadership. Judith Gundry-Volf argues that neither merely 'egalitarian' nor merely 'hierarchical'

---

[1] 1 Cor 14:34, 35 appears to contradict Paul's approval to pray and prophecy (11:5) and his affirmation that 'all are able to prophecy in turn' (14:31). I leave the passages 1 Cor 14:34f and 1 Tim 2:13f without further discussion due to the limitation of space and reasons such as arguments on authorship.

interpretations do justice to the complexity of the theological issue for Paul.[2] In this verse rather than a hierarchy, the relation between God and Christ shows order and differentiation as well as mutual and reciprocal relationships.[3] This is neither meant to show subordination nor inferiority rather as Garland suggests, 'it establishes the need for loyalty to the head'.[4]

The second stage of argument is found in vv.4-6, where the participation of men and women in the Christian assembly is explained. Every man who prays and prophecies with his head covered dishonours his head, whereas every woman who prays or prophecies with his head uncovered dishonours her head. As M. D. Hooker suggests, the man or woman who dishonours his or her own head in the literal sense brings dishonour also on his or her metaphorical head.[5]

Gundry-Volf observes that the characterization of the Mediterranean world as a shame/honour society supplies the background for the shame/glory contrast in 1 Cor 11:2-16.[6] Moxnes identifies the shame/glory category as: a) a head covering like that of Romans before their gods in public devotion reduced his self-respect and shamed his own person and b) this shames his head also in the sense of appearing to demean

---

[2] J. M. Gundry-Volf, 'Gender and Creation in 1 Cor 11:2-16: A Study in Paul's Theological Method', in J. Adna, S. J. Hafeman, and O. Hofius (eds.), *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung, Kirche: Festschrift für P. Stuhlmacher* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 151-171. Økland, (*Women in their Place*, 178), argues that these 'verses confirm gender difference on a cosmological level through the drawing of a hierarchy and a clear boundary between male and female'.

[3] Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians,* 803. In 1 Cor 12:4-6, the one God, the one Lord, and the one Spirit shows mutuality, oneness, and distinctiveness.

[4] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 516. Garland agrees with Perriman who concludes: 'The point seems to be … that the behavior of the woman reflects upon the man who as her head is representative of her, the prominent partner in the relationship, or that the woman's status and value is summed up in the man'. A. C. Perrimann, 'The Head of a Woman: The Meaning of κεφαλή in 1 Cor 11:3' JTS 45 (1994), 602-622, at 621.

[5] M. D. Hooker, 'Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Cor 11:10' NTS 10 (1963-64), 410-16, at 411.

[6] Gundry-Volf, 'Gender and Creation in 1 Cor 11:2-16', 155. Wire (*The Corinthian Women Prophets,* 120) argues that 'Paul is not using "glory" to mean "copy" nor even "splendour" so much as honour in contrast to shame. If a woman is the glory of a man, her presence reflects honor on him and also makes the man vulnerable to shame through her'.

Christ or God as his Lord and head.[7] It seems that Paul wants to avoid the distractions in Christian worship from the attention to the self, which makes the person's head a source of shame, as though he wants to focus on the Lord as the central focus.[8] Martin proposes that Paul is anxious about veiling for two reasons: order and sexuality; that veiling situates women in their proper position in the ordered hierarchy of society, which also means that they are not intended to be passive but must participate in their covering. He states three reasons as regarded by Paul, for why women should be veiled: 'the society worries about their social vulnerability; a women's unveiled head constitutes a bodily defect; female sexuality and social order cannot be separated in veiling cultures'.[9]

Watson rightly argues that veiling is the symbol of woman's authority to speak rather than a symbol of division in the Christian congregation. It is agape and not eros that must rule in the public sphere of the congregation and the veil is interposed as the condition of women's speech and of men's listening to that speech.[10] For Watson, the real subject of the passage is togetherness of man and woman 'in the Lord', within the fellowship of agape.[11] In 1 Cor 11:7, Paul asserts that man is the

---

[7] H. Moxnes, 'Honor, Shame and the Outside World in Paul's Letter to the Romans', in J. Neusner, *et al.* (eds.), *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 208.

[8] Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 828.

[9] Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 245. He presents evidence in connection with physiology that the bodies of women are weaker, more vulnerable than men to desire, danger and pollution, and all the more dangerous to the church's body (233). The veil therefore protected women's body from dangers posed by external forces and protected the social body from dangers posed by the female body itself (248). Martin's attempt to present the different ideological expressions of body in the ancient times is interesting. But the question remains unanswered as to what extent we can ascertain that Paul was really influenced by the body ideology of the contemporary times. By contrast, Watson assumes that the appropriate criterion for judging the texts is only through the reality of agape. He argues that if agape is the beginning and the end of Christian faith and living, then it is agape that must provide the final criteria for Christian reflection on sexuality and gender. Watson, *Agape, Eros, Gender*, ix.

[10] Watson, *Agape, Eros, Gender,* 41. See also E. H. Pagels, 'Paul and Women: A Response to Recent Discussion' *JAAR* 42 (1974), 538-549; R. Scroggs, 'Paul and the Eschatological Women' *JAAR* 41 (1972), 283-303, at 297-300.

[11] I support the following arguments of Watson. i) Divine love is the basis of human love and the Christian faith and living should be in accordance with it. (p.1); ii) In the new creation, eros is not at the centre of the relationship of man and woman. The sense of eros is not negated but not seen as the guiding factor in the Christian community. (p.68); iii) Respecting womanhood as 'belonging together'

image and glory of God, the woman as the glory of man. Fee rightly asserts that Paul's use of glory in relation to image and to the mutuality in v.12, means that the existence of the one brings honour and praise to the other.[12] It is likely that Paul assumes man and woman are the glory of one another.

Mutual interdependence between man and woman in the Lord shows the character of relationality and mutuality in the new creation (v.11). There could be no reciprocity or mutuality unless each was differentiated from the other. It is evident that the custom, which Paul is referring to here, concerns gender distinctions in public worship, and that Paul is addressing both men and women. He accepts the status of men and women in Christian worship as both are given the right to pray and prophesy without ignoring the gender distinctions. Judith Gundry-Volf in her discussion of 11:1-16 identifies three "points of reference," "lenses," or "maps" in Pauline dialogue as the order of creation, custom as propriety, and eschatology or the gospel, on which she bases her arguments on honour and shame, and urges "control over the head" and the relationship of mutuality, reciprocity, and gender distinctiveness.[13]

As Paul advises husband and wife in 1Cor 7:3, 4, he gives mutual authority over each other's body, where we see neither a hierarchical pattern nor the pattern of equality, rather mutuality and reciprocity considering the will of the partner in the marital relationship. It is striking to note that Paul addresses both husband and wife urging them to give 'themselves over to each other in their marital commitment'.[14]

---

does not exclude difference. Belonging together acknowledges difference and difference as that of belonging together. (p.3); iv) He opposes the strands of feminism which seems to be in the opposite extreme of patriarchy, which either advocates or presupposes a self-definition apart from man (p.5). See for more discussion Watson, *Agape, Eros, Gender*, 1-89.

[12] Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 514.

[13] Gundry-Volf, 'Gender and Creation in 1 Cor 11:2-16', 160, 162, 169.

[14] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 259. I agree with Garland as he suggests, 'Paul does not frame this relationship in terms of husband's rights and the wife's duties … she is an equal partner … neither can claim to have authority over his or her body and disavow further sexual relationship with the marriage

The basis of this relationship is Christian love that uproots selfish desires and upholds pleasing others and belonging togetherness. Paul wants love to be the basis of mutual relationship in the family and in the community. Love doesn't divide rather it unites all in mutual relationship and also it governs gender issues in the community as a whole and the church and ministry in particular.

If one attempts to establish hierarchy in the man-woman relationship, there is the danger of missing out what Christ has secured for humanity through the New Creation (Gal 3:28). But on the other hand, if one intends to affirm an egalitarian view, there is an apparent danger of pressing homogeneity that excludes difference. A more viable way of reading the text should be with a view that combines sharing in the benefits of Christ's redemption by men and women and affirmation of mutuality in gender relations.

Therefore 1 Cor 11:11, which highlights the interdependence of man and woman 'in the Lord', serves as the hermeneutical key for understanding the text. I consider this text as significant in defining gender relations in the Lord, with its emphasis on the mutual relationship and interdependence of man and woman; hierarchy in one direction is reversed by the hierarchy in the other direction, which supports the Pauline ethos of mutuality in Romans 12-16.

7.5. 'Pauline Love Mutualism': A Challenge to Communitarian Ethics

The model of mutuality which Paul wants to highlight in the greetings to men and women in the church seems to be the first practical step towards the fulfilment of the exhortations to the Roman believers to practise love, welcome and honour to one another (Rom 12-15).[15] The distinctive feature of the Pauline ethos of mutuality is

---

partner'. (*1 Corinthians*, 259-261). See also P. B. Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul's Letters* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2009), 107.

[15] The theme of mutual encouragement is introduced by Paul in the beginning of Romans (1:11, 12): 'mutually encouraged by faith which is in one another, both yours and mine'.

that it is initiated by grace, mediated by love and sustained by the Spirit. It avoids extremes of either an atomised individualistic approach or a blatant collectivism. Rather it promotes a dialectics of person-in-community. An individual is an isolated being, cut off from all external relationships and as such is an antithesis to authentic human existence, whereas to be human is to be a person whose existence is predicated within a web of relationships.

Paul makes it abundantly clear that the well being of a person potentially leads to the well being of the community. Persons with different gifts can up-build the community in the ethos of mutuality. In turn, this enhances the significance of the giftedness of each in the context of mutual affirmation. The believers form a close knit family, who are committed to solidarity and mutual care, and mutuality is rooted in their belonging to Christ.

I call this model of mutuality 'Pauline love mutualism', since love has an important role in leading to mutual relations, which is profound in Romans (12-16) and has a constructive impact on the community. I have defined mutuality as 'relationships of reciprocal care' in the introductory chapter, and now I am able to give a clearer as well as deeper dimension to the Pauline ethos of mutuality. Paul urges on the Romans that their love should be genuine. He begins this ethos of mutualism with the body metaphor (12:3, 4); tries to develop mutual relations (12:9-13) by describing different aspects (outdo one another in honouring, hospitality) and more clearly emphasizes how love mutualism works between two groups (the strong and the weak). The uniqueness of Pauline mutuality is that there is a dynamism involved by the perpetual reversal of positions. The notion of hierarchy is also strange to this model as both parties would act in mutual interdependence. The

hierarchical model is replaced by a mutuality model, where members act in unity and mutuality with no question of permanent inferiority or superiority.

Thus, Paul alters the static hierarchical model of antiquity to that of equalization via a constant process of promoting the other. This dynamic is modelled in the pattern of Christ's service (cf. Rom 15:1-6) as the two groups come out as mutually edified and mutually welcomed (the strong and the weak). The edification passes on to others as a chain reaction, since each and every member of the congregation is involved in this process in its total dimension.

Paul asks his recipients to practice this love mutualism between them, where he introduces Phoebe and a number of people to be greeted (Rom 16:1-16). He points to some people, whom he knows well and whom he thinks special with regard to him and the Roman church. Greeting cannot be done without honouring and the honouring is expected to move in both directions as pendulum of a clock oscillates. Love cannot do wrong to a neighbour but love is the fulfilment of the law (Rom 13:10). Mutualism can be negative or positive -- negative in a sense of judging one another and positive in a sense of welcoming without considering the status -- the strong and the weak. In order to sustain good relationships, one should not think highly of himself and not be of haughty mind (Rom 12:3, 16b).

The attitude of the person who exercises love mutualism should be as if one is serving the Lord (12:11c) and serving Christ (14:18); δουλεύω means enslaved or serving as a slave. Every believer is enslaved to Christ in order to serve others with an attitude of serving Christ. That means, one who exercises love mutualism fulfils the law and serves Christ: A serves under B; B serves under A.

Divine initiative and grace is involved in love mutualism since grace is bestowed on humans to act in mutuality, which brings glorification to God at the

end.[16] Humans are participating with the divine, in the transformative power of Christ to bring glory and honour to God, the Father. This is a challenge to communitarian ethics as it requires divine-human participation and it acts in a way to challenge negative with positive reciprocity. This helps to honour the least honourable in the community and uplift them to the main strata, irrespective of race, colour, sex and status.

In sum, the leadership of women in the church is placed within the structures of mutuality in Romans. Mutuality is the model of relationship Paul wants to urge on Roman Christians and the ethical obligations are guided by the dynamic relationships of 'love mutualism'. Love mutualism works as mutual service to the other that works within the hierarchies by continually reversing them so that the superiority of x to y is continually subverted by the superiority of y to x.

There is clearly scope for further research along these lines, such as the place of grace in love mutualism, and its transformative power in mutual service. Further analysis is needed of the reception of grace in serving Christ as his bond slave, and the manifestation of grace in serving a brother/sister as a bond slave on the mode of working together of self emptying, and the empowering function of grace in believers.

---

[16] See for more discussion, Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in its Greco-Roman Context*, 211-223; J. M. G. Barclay, 'Grace within and Beyond Reason: Philo and Paul in Dialogue', in P. Middleton, A. Paddison and K. Wenell (eds.), *Paul, Grace and Freedom: Essays in Honour of J. K. Riches* (London, T& T Clark, 2009), 9-21.

Bibliography

Aasgaard, R. '*My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!': Christian Siblingship in Paul.* JSNTSup 265; London: T. & T. Clark, 2004.

Achtemeier, P. J. *Romans: Interpretation. A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching.* Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985.

Althaus, P. *An die Römer übersetzt und erklärt.* NTD 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

Arichea, D. C. 'Who was Phoebe? Translating *Diakonos* in Romans 16:1', *BT* 39 (1988), 401-409.

Arlandson, J. M. *Women, Class, and Society in Early Christianity: Models from Luke-Acts.* Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.

Ascough, Richard S. 'Voluntary Associations and the Formation of Pauline Christian Communities: Overcoming the Objections'. In Andreas Gutsfeld und Dietrich-Alex Koch (eds.). *Vereine, Synagogen und Gemeinden im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien.* Studies and Texts in Antiquity and Christianity 25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006, 149-183.

Badiou, Alain. *Saint Paul: The Foundation of Universalism.* Stanford: Stanford University, 2003.

Banks, R. *Paul's Idea of Community: The House Churches in their Historic Setting.* Exeter: Paternoster, 1980.

Barclay, J. M. G. 'Do we undermine the Law?: A Study of Romans 14:1-15:6'. In J. D. G. Dunn (ed.). *Paul and the Mosaic Law.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1996, 287-308.

_____. 'Is it Good News that God is Impartial?: A Response to Robert Jewett, Romans: A Commentary', *JSNT* 31 (2008), 89-111.

_____. 'Neither Jew Nor Greek: Multiculturalism and the New Perspective on Paul'. In M. G. Brett (ed.). *Ethnicity and the Bible.* Leiden: Brill, 1996, 197-214.

_____. 'Grace within and Beyond Reason: Philo and Paul in Dialogue'. In P. Middleton, A. Paddison and K. Wenell (eds.). *Paul, Grace and Freedom: Essays in Honour of J. K. Riches.* London, T& T Clark, 2009, 9-21.

Barnett, P. W. 'Apostle', *DPL,* 45-51.

Barrett, C. K. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians.* London: Adam &Clark, 1968.

_____. *The Signs of an Apostle.* London: Epworth, 1970.

_____. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.* London: A & C Black, 1991.

Bartsch, H.-W. 'Die antisemitischen Gegner des Paulus im Römerbrief'. In P. W. Eckert, N. P. Levinson, and M. Stöhr (eds.). *Anti judaismus im Neuen Testament? Abhandlungen zum Christlich-jüdischen Dialog.* Munich: Kaiser, 1967, 33-34.

Bassler, J. M. 'Phoebe'. In C. Meyers (ed.). *Women in Scripture.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000, 134-135.

_____.'Prisca/Priscilla'. In C. Meyers (ed.). *Women in Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Bauckham, R. *The Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women* in *the Gospels.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich & F. W. Danker. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd (ed.) London: University of Chicago, 2000.

Bauman, R. A. *Women and Politics in Ancient Rome*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Beard, M. 'The Sexual Status in the Roman Republic', *JRS* 70 (1980), 12-27.

Belleville, L. L. 'Ἰουνιαν…ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις: A Re-examination of Romans 16:7 in Light of Primary Source Materials', *NTS* 51 (2005), 231-249.

_____ 'Continuity or Discontinuity: A Fresh look at 1 Corinthians in the Light of First Century Epistolary Forms and Conventions', *EvQ* 59 (1987), 15-37.

Benko, S. *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians*. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1969.

Bertram, B. & H. Seesemann, πατέω, κτλ., *TDNT* 5 (1967), 544.

Best, E. 'Bishops and Deacons: Phil 1:1', *SE* 4 (1968), 371-376.

_____. *One Body in Christ: A Study of the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul*. London: SPCK, 1955.

Betz, H. D. 'Apostle'. *ABD* 1, 309-311.

Beyer, H. W. 'διακονέω, διακονία, διάκονος', *TDNT* 2 (1964), 81-93.

Bieringer, R. 'Women and Leadership in Romans 16: The Leading Roles of Phoebe, Prisca, and Junia in Early Christianity: Part I', *East Asian Pastoral Review* 44 (2007), 221-237.

Bjerkelund, Carl J. Parakalo. *Form*, *Function und Sinn der* parakalo-*Sätze in den paulinischen Briefen.* Bibliotheca Theologica Norvegica 1; Oslo, 1967.

Black, M. *Romans.* 2nd ed. NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.

Boatwright, M. T. 'Plancia Magna of Perge: Women's Roles and Status in Roman Asia Minor'. In S. B. Pomeroy (ed.). *Women's History and Ancient History*. London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991, 249-272.

Bonhoeffer, D. *Christology*. Eng. Trans., London: SCM, 1978.

_____. *The Communion of the Saints*: *A Dogmatic Inquiry into the Sociology of the Church*. Eng. Trans., New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

_____. *Ethics*. New York: Macmillan, 1965.

Bornkamm, G. 'The Letter to the Romans as Paul's Last Will and Testament'. In K. P. Donfried (ed.). *The Romans Debate*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991, 16-28.

Branick, V. *The House Church in the Writings of Paul*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989.

Brooten, B. J. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues*. BJS 36; California: Scholars, 1982.

Bruyne, D. de. 'Les deux derniers chapitres de la lettre aux Romains' *RBen* 25 (1908), 423-430.

Burchard, C. 'Joseph and Aseneth'. In J. H. Charlesworth (ed.). *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2. London: Longman and Todd, 1985, 177-248.

Burer, M. H. and D. B. Wallace. 'Was Junia Really an Apostle? A Re-Examination of Rom 16:7', *NTS* 47 (2001), 76-91.

Byrne, B. *Romans.* Sacra Pagina Series 6. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1996.

Calvin, J. The *First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians.* Edinburgh: Oliver& Boyd, 1960.

_____. *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans.* J. Owen (trans.). Vol XIX; Grand Rapids: Baker House, 1993.

Cameron, A. 'Neither Male nor Female', *Greece and Rome* 27 (1980), 60-68.

Campbell, J. C. *Phoebe: Patron and Emissary. Paul's Social Network: Brothers and Sisters in Faith*; Minnesota: Liturgical, 2009.

Campbell, W. S. *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity*. London: T& T Clark, 2006.

Cervin, R. S. 'A Note regarding the name "Junias" in Romans 16:7', *NTS* 40 (1994), 464-470.

Chapple, A. L. 'Local Leadership in the Pauline Churches: Theological and Social Factors in its Development. A Study based on 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians and Philippians'. PhD Dissertation. University of Durham, 1984, 398-349.

Chow, J. K. *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth*. JSNTSup 75; Sheffield: JSOT, 1992.

Clarke, A. D. *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical & Exegetical Study of 1 Cor 1-6*. New York: Brill, 1993.

_____. *Serve the Community of the Church: Christians as Leaders and Ministers*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

_____. 'Jew and Greek, Slave and Free, Male and Female: Paul's Theology of Ethnic, Racial and Gender Inclusiveness of Romans 16'. In Peter Oakes (ed.). *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002, 103-125.

_____. 'Equality or Mutuality? Paul's Use of "Brother" Language'. In P. J. Williams, et.al. (eds.). *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting: Essays on Context and Background in honour of B. W. Winter*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004, 151-164.

Clemente, Guido. 'II Patronato Nei Collegis Dell'Impero Romano', *Studi classici e orientali* 21 (1972), 142-229.

Coffee, D. M. 'The Function of Homeric Simile', *AJP* 78 (1957), 113-32.

Cohen, S. J. D. 'Women in the Synagogues of Antiquity', *Conservative Judaism* 34 (1980), 23-29.

Cohick, L. Y. *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians: Illuminating Ancient Ways of Life*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2009.

Collins, M. S. 'Money, Sex and Power: An examination of the Role of Women as Patrons of the Ancient Synagogues'. In P. J. Hass (ed.). *Recovering the Role of Women: Power and Authority in Rabbinic Jewish Society*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992, 7-22.

Collins, J. N. *Diakonia: Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources*. Oxford: Oxford University, 1990.

Collins, R. F. *First Corinthians*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999.

Corssen, P. 'Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes' *ZNW* 10 (1909), 1-45.

Cotter, W. 'Women's Authority Roles in Paul's Churches: Countercultural or Conventional?', *NovT* 36 (1994), 350-372.

Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 1978.

Croft, S. 'Text Messages: The Ministry of Women and Romans 16'. *Anvil* 21 (2004), 87-94.

Dautzenberg, G. 'Zur Stellung der Frauen in der paulinischen Gemeinden'. In *Die Frau im Urchristentum*. QD 95; Freiburg: Herder, 1983, 182-224.

Delling. G. 'ἀρχηγός', *TDNT* 1, 487-88.

Diessmann, A. *Light from the Ancient East.* L. R. M. Strachen (trans.). London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910.

Dodd, C. H. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. London: Collins, 1932.

Donfried, K. P. 'A Short Note on Romans 16'. In K. P. Donfreid (ed.). *The Romans Debate,* Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991, 44-52.

Doty, W. G. *Letters in Primitive Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.

Dunn, J. D. G. *Romans 9-16*. WBC 2; Texas: Word Books, 1988.

_____. 'Romans' *DPL,* 838-846.

_____. *The Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

_____. *Theology of Paul the Apostle*. London: T& T Clark, 2003.

Edgar, C. C. *Annales du Service des Antiquités de 1' Egypte* 22 (1922), 13.

Ehrensperger, K. *That We may be Mutually Encourged: Feminism and the New Perspective in Pauline Studies*. London: T& T Clark, 2004.

Ellis, E. E. 'Paul and His Co-workers'. *DPL,* 183-189.

_____. 'Paul and His Co-workers', *NTS* 17 (1977), 437-452.

Engberg-Pedersen, T. 'The Relationship with Others: Similarities and Differences between Paul and the Stoicis', *ZNW* 96 (2005), 35-60.

_____. *Paul and the Stoics*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.

Epp, E. J. *Junia: The First Woman Apostle*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.

Esler, P. F. *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.

_____. 'Paul and Stoicism: Romans 12 as a Test Case', *NTS* 50 (2004), 106-124.

Exler, F. X. J. *The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter: A Study in Greek Epistolography.* Washington: Catholic University of America, 1923, 73-77.

Fàbrega, V. 'War Junia[s], der hervorragende Apostel [Röm. 16, 7], eine Frau?', *JAC* 27/28 [1984/85], 47-64.

Fee, G. D. The *First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

_____. *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Fiorenza, E. S. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. London: SCM, 1995.

_____. 'Missionaries, Apostles, Co-workers: Romans 16 and the Reconstruction of Women's Early Christian History', *WW* 6 (1986), 420-433.

_____. *Discipleship of Equals: A Critical Feminist Ekklesia-logy of liberation*. New York: Cross Road, 1993.

Fitzmyer, J. A. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB; New York: Doubleday, 1992.

_____. *Paul and His Theology*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1989.

_____. 'Some Notes on Aramaic Epistolography', *JBL* 93 (1974), 201-225.

Francis, F. O. 'The form and function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and 1 John', *ZNW* 61 (1970), 110-26.

Friedrich, G. (ed.) 'πρᾶγμα', *TDNT* 6, 638-40.

Funk, W. *Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God: The Problem of Language in the New Testament and Contemporary Theology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Furnish, V.P. *The Love Command in the New Testament.* London: SCM, 1973.

Gamble, H. *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism*. Studies and Documents 42; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

Garland, D. E. *1 Corinthians*. BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.

Garland, R. 'Priests and Power in Classical Athens'. In M. Beard and J. North (eds.). *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*. London: Duckworth, 1990, 73-91.

Gaston, L. 'Faith in Romans 12 in the Light of the Common Life of the Roman Church'. In J. V. Hills (ed.), *Common Life in the Early Church: Essays Honoring Graydon F. Snyder*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998, 258- 264.

Gehring, R. W. *House Church and Mission: The Importance of Household Structures in Early Christianity*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.

Georgi, D. *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians*. SNTW; Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 1987.

Gillman, F. M. *Women Who Knew Paul*. Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992.

Glad, C. E. *Paul and Philodemus*: *Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy*. NovTSup 81; New York: Brill, 1995.

Godet, F.L. *First Epistle to the Corinthians*. A. Cusin (trans.). Vol. 2 CFTL, New Series XXX. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1898.

_____. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Vol. 2. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1880.

Goodspeed, E. J. 'Phoebe's Letter of Introduction', *HTR* 44 (1951), 56-57.

Goodenough, E. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. Bollingen Series 37; 13 vols. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1953-1968.

Grey, M. *Redeeming the Dream: Feminism Redemption and Christian Tradition*. London: SPCK, 1989.

Grubbs, J. E. *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook on Marriage, Divorce and Widowhood*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Gundry-Volf, J. M. 'Gender and Creation in 1 Cor 11:2-16: A Study in Paul's Theological Method'. In J. Adna, S. J. Hafeman, and O. Hofius (eds.). *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung, Kirche: Festschrift für P. Stuhlmacher*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &Ruprecht, 1997, 151-171.

Haacker, K. 'πλησίον', *EDNT* 3 (1993), 113.

Hannaford, R. 'The Representative and Relational Nature of Ministry and The Renewal of the Diaconate'. In *The Ministry of Deacon: Ecclesiological Explorations*. Uppsala: NEC, 2000.

Harland, P. A. *Associations, Synagogues and Congregations: Claiming a place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

_____.'Familial Dimensions of Group Identity (II): Mothers and Fathers in Associations and Synagogues of the Greek world', *JSJ* 38 (2007) 57-79.

Harnack, A. *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. J. Moffatt (trans.). New York: Harper, 1962[1908].

Harrison, J. H. *Paul's Language of Grace in its Greco-Roman Context*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Hentschel, A. *Diakonia im Neuen Testament: Studien Zur Semantik unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Rolle von Frauen*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Heyward, C. *The Redemption of God: The Theology of Mutual Relation*. Washington, D.C: University Press of America, 1982.

Hock, R. F. 'Paul's Tent-making and the Problem of His Social Class', *JBL* 97 (1978), 555-74.

Hodge, C. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1983.

Holmberg, B. *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the primitive church as reflected in the Pauline Epistles.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Hooker, M. D. 'Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Cor 11:10', *NTS* 10 (1963-64), 410-16.

Horrell, D. G. *Solidarity and Difference: A Contemporary Reading of Paul's Ethics*. London: T& T Clark, 2005.

_____. *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interest and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

Horsley, G. H. R. 'Giving Thanks to Artemis', *NewDocs* 4 (1987), 127-129.

_____. 'Maria the διάκονος', *NewDocs* 2 (1982), 193-95.

Horst, J. "μέλος" *TDNT* 4 (1967), 556, 562.

Hort, F. J. A. 'On the end of the Epistle of Romans', *Journal of Philology* 3 (1871), 51-80.

Hurtado, L.W. 'The Doxology at the End of Romans'. In E. P. Epp and G. D. Fee (eds.). *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981, 185-99.

Hutter, D. 'Did Paul call Andronicus an Apsotle in Romans 16:7?' *JETS* (2009), 747-778.

Jewett, R. 'Paul, Phoebe, and Spanish Mission'. In J. Neusner*, et al.* (eds.). *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism*: *Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988, 144-64.

_____. *Romans*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

_____ *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Situations*. AGJU10; Leiden: Brill, 1971.

_____. *Christian Tolerance: Paul's Message to the Modern Church*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982.

_____. 'Honour and Shame in the Argument of Romans'. In A. Brown, G.F. Snyder, and V. Wiles (eds.). *Putting Body and Soul Together: Essays in Honour of Robin Scroggs*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1997, 257-72.

Judge, E. A. 'Cultural Conformity and Innovation in Paul: Some Clues from Contemporary Documents', *TynBul* 35 (1984), 3-24.

Karris, R. J. 'Romans 14:1-15:13 and the occasion of Romans'. In K. P. Donfried, (ed.). *Romans Debate*, (revised and expanded edition). Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991, 65-84.

Käsemann, E. *Commentary on Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

_____. 'The Theological Problem Presented by the Motif of the Body of Christ'. In *Perspectives on Paul*. London: SCM, 1971, 102-21.

Kearsley, R. A. 'Women in the Public East: Iunia Theodora, Claudia Metrodora and Phoebe, Benefactress of Paul', *TynBul* 50 (1999), 189-21.

Keck, L. E. *Romans*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2005.

Keener, C. S. *Paul, Women and Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul.* Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1992.

Keyes, C. W. 'The Greek Letter of Introduction', *AJP* 56 (1935), 28-44.

Keil, J. 'Inschriften'in *Forschungen in Ephesos* III (Vienna, 1923), 94-95.

Kim, C-H. *The Form and Structure of the Familiar Greek Letter of Recommendation*. SBLDS 4; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972.

Kim, Y. S. *Christ's Body in Corinth: The Politics of a Metaphor.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.

Kittel, G. 'συναιχμαλώτος', *TDNT* 1, 196-197.

Klassen, W. 'Kiss', *ABD* 4, 89-92.

_____. 'The Sacred Kiss in the New Testament: An Example of Social Boundary Lines', *NTS* 39 (1993), 122-135.

_____. '*Agape*', *ABD* 1, 381-396.

Klauck, H. J. *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christendum.* Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981.

_____. *Herrenmahl und Hellenistischer Kult. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief.* Münster: Aschendorff, 1982, 281-83.

Kloppenborg, J. S. 'Collegia and Thiasoi: Issues in function, taxonomy and membership'. In J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (eds.). *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World.* London: Routledge, 1996, 16-30.

Koenig, J. *New Testament Hospitality: Partnership with Strangers as Promise and Mission.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Koester, H. 'Ephesos in Early Christian Literature'. In H. Koester (ed.). *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia.* Pennsylvania: Trinity Press, 1995, 119-140.

Koskenniemi, H. *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* Helsinki: Akateeminen Kirjakauppa, 1956.

Kraemer, R. S. *Her Share of the Blessings: Women's Religions among Pagans, Jews, and Christians in the Greco-Roman World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Krauss, S. *Synagogale Altertümer.* Berlin: Benjamin Harz, 1922.

Kümmel, W. G. *Introduction to the New Testament.* Nashville: Abingdon, 1975.

Kurek-Chomycz, D. A. 'Is there an "Anti-Priscan" Tendency in the Manuscripts? Some Textual Problems with Prisca and Aquila', *JBL* 125 (2006), 107-128.

La Piana, G. 'Foreign Groups at Rome', *HTR* 20 (1927), 183-403.

Lagrange, M. -J. *Saint Paul: Épître aux Romains.* Études Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1931.

Lampe, P. 'Persis,' *ABD* 5, 244.

_____. 'Prisca', *ABD* 5, 467-468.

_____. 'Iunia/Iunias: Sklavenherkunft im Kreise der vorpaulinischen Apostel (Röm 16 7)', *ZNW* 76 (1985), 132-134.

_____. 'Julia', *ABD* 3, 1125.

_____. *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.

_____.'The Roman Christians of Romans 16'. In K. P. Donfried, (ed.). *The Romans Debate*, (revised and expanded edition). Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991, 216-230.

Leenhardt, F. -J. *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans: A Commentary*. London: Lutterworth, 1961.

Lefkowitz, M. R. and M. B. Kant, *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Source Book in Translation.* London: Duckworth, 1992.

Lenski, R. C. H. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.* Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961.

Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996.*

Lietzmann, H. *Kleine Schriften*, Kurt Aland (ed.). 3 Vols.; *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur* 67,68, 74. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958-1962.

Lightfoot, J. B. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*. London: Macmillan, 1894.

Lightfoot, J. B. (ed.). *Biblical Essays.* New York: Macmillan, 1904.

Llewelyn, S. R. 'The Christian Letters of Recommendation', *NewDocs* 8,170.

_____. 'Changing the Legal Jurisdiction', *NewDocs* 9, 45-53.

Lohfink, G. 'Weibliche Diakone im Neuen Testament'. In J. Blank & et.al. (eds.) *Die Frau Im Urchristentum*. QD 95; Freiburg: Herder, 1983, 320-338.

Lowe, S. D. 'Rethinking the Female Status/ Function Question: The Jew/Gentile Relationship as Paradigm', *JETS* 34 (1991), 59-75.

Luck, U. B. 'σωφρονέω κτλ.', *TDNT* 7, 1098-1100.

Luther, M. *Early Theological Works*. J. Atkinson, (trans. & ed.). London: SCM, 1962.

MacMullen, R. 'Women in Public in the Roman Empire*', Historia* 29 (1980), 208-218.

_____. *Roman Social Relations.* London: Yale University Press, 1974.

Malina, B. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 2001.

Manson, T. W. 'St. Paul's letter to the Romans - and Others'. In K. P. Donfried (ed.). *The Romans Debate*, (revised and expanded edition). Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991, 3-15.

_____. 'St. Paul's Letter to the Romans – and Others'. Matthew Black (ed.). In *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles.* Manchester, 1962), 225-241.

Marshall, I. H. and D. A. Hagner, *1 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Marshall, I. H. & P. H. Towner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Pastoral Epistles*. Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 1999.

Martin, D. B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University, 1995.

_____. *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity.* London: Yale University Press, 1990.

_____. 'Tongues of Angels and Other Status Indicators', *JAAR* 59 (1991), 547-89.

McDonald, J. I. H. 'Was Romans XVI a separate letter?', *NTS* 16 (1969-70), 369-72.

McLean, B. H. *An Introduction of Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Alexander the Great down to the Reign of Constantine (323 B.C.- A.D. 337)*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2002.

Meeks, W. A. *The First Urban Christians; The Social World of the Apostle Paul.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

_____ .'Judgement and the Brother: Romans 14:1- 15:13'. In G. F. Hawthorne with O. Betz (eds.). *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*: *Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for his 60th birthday.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987**,** 290-300.

Meggitt, J. *Paul, Poverty and Survival*. SNTW; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

Metzger, B. M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. London: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/UBS, [2]1994.

Meyer, H. A. W. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians: First Epistle*. Vol. 1; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1892.

_____. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans.* J. C. Moore (trans.). Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1876.

Michel, O. οἰκοδομέω κτλ., *TDNT* 5 (1967), 140-42.

_____. *Der Brief an die Römer*. KEK, 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck& Ruprecht, 1978.

Michelis, W. 'συγγενής, συγγένεια', *TDNT* 7 (1971), 742.

Minear, P. S. *The Obedience of Faith; The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans*. SBT 2/19; London: SCM, 1971.

Mitchell, M. M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1991.

Moffatt, J. *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, [3]1918.

Moo, D. J. The *Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

Morris, L. The *Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Moulton, J. H. and G. Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-literary sources*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914-1929.

Moulton, W. F. & G. S. Geden. *Concordance to the Greek New Testament*. I. H. Marshall (ed.). Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 2002.

Moxnes, H. 'Honour and Righteousness', *JSNT* 32 (1988), 61-77.

_____. The Quest for Honour and the Unity of the Community in Romans 12 and in the Orations of Dio Chrysostom'. In T. Engberg-Pederson (ed.). *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994, 203-30.

_____. 'Honor, Shame and the Outside World in Paul's Letter to the Romans', in J. Neusner, *et al.* (eds.), *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 208.

Mullins, T. Y. 'Greeting as a New Testament Form', *JBL* 87 (1968), 418-426.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. 'Prisca and Aquila: Travelling Tentmakers and Church Builders', *BRev* 8 (1992), 40-51.

Murray, J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.

Ng, E.Y. 'Phoebe as *Prostatis*', *TJ* 25 (2004), 3-13.

Noy, D. *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe*, 2 Vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Nygren, A. *Commentary on Romans*. C. C. Rasmuussen (trans). Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Oakes, P. *Reading Romans in Pompeii: Paul's Letter at Ground Level*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.

O'Brien, P.T. *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

_____. 'Letters, Letter Forms', *DPL*, 550-553.

Økland, J. *Women in their Place: Paul and the Corinthian Discourse of Gender and Sanctuary Space*. JSNTSup 269; London: T& T Clark, 2004.

Ollrog, W–H. *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter*. WMANT 50; Neurkirchen: Neukirchener, 1979.

Omanson, R. L 'Who's who in Romans 16? Identifying Men and Women among the People Paul sent greetings to', *BT* 49 (1998), 430-436.

Osiek, C. and D. L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House churches*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Osiek, C. & M. Y. MacDonald, *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Chrisitanity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.

Osiek, C. '*Diakonos* and *Prostatis*: Women's Patronage in Early Christianity', *HTS* 61 (2005), 347-370.

Oster, R. E. 'Congregations of the Gentiles (Rom 16:4): A Culture-Based Ecclesiology in the Letters of Paul', *RestorQuart* 40 (1998), 39-52.

Pagels, E. H. 'Paul and Women: A Response to Recent Discussion', *JAAR* 42 (1974), 538-549.

Pallas, D. I., S. Charitonidis, and J. Venencie, 'Inscriptions lyciennes trouvées à Solômos pre*s* de Corinthe', *Bulletin de Correspondance héllenique* 83 (1959), 496-508.

Payne, P. B. *Man and Woman, One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul's Letters*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.

Pederson, S. "Agape - der eschatologische Hauptbegriff bei Paulus". In S. Pederson (ed.). *Die Paulinische Literatur und Theologie*. Anlässlich der 50 jähringen Gründungs-Feier der Universität Aarhus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980, 159-86.

Peristiany, J. G. *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965.

Perrimann, A. C. 'The Head of a Woman: The Meaning of κεφαλή in 1 Cor 11:3', *JTS* 45 (1994), 602-622.

Peterson, J. M. 'House-Churches in Rome', *VC* 23 (1969), 264-72.

Philsy, Sr. 'Diakonia of Women in the New Testament', *IJT* 32 (1983), 110-118.

Piper, J. I. and W. Grudem, (eds.). *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*. Wheaton, Ill: Crossway, 1991.

Piper, John. *Love your Enemies: Jesus' Love Command in the Synoptic Gospels and the Early Christian Paraenesis*. SNTSMS 38; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Plisch, U.-K. 'Die Apostelin Junia: Das Exegetische Problem in Röm 16:7 im Licht von Nestle–Aland und der Sahidischen Überlieferung', *NTS* 42 (1996), 477-478.

Poland, F. *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens.* Leipzig: Teubner, 1909.

Reasoner, M. *The Strong and the Weak: Romans 14:1-15:13 in Context.* SNTSMS 103; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Reid, M. L. 'Paul's Rhetoric of Mutuality: A Rhetorical Reading of Romans'. In E. H. Lovering (ed.), *SBL Papers*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995, 117-139.

Reike, B. 'προΐστημι', *TDNT* 6, 700-703.

Rengstorf, K. H. 'ἐπίσημος', *TDNT* 7 (1971), 267.

Reynolds J. M. and R. Tannenbaum. *Jews and God Fearers at Aphrodisias: Greek Inscriptions with Commentary*. PCPSSV 12; Cambridge Philological Society, 1987.

Ridderbos, H. *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*. J.R. De Witt (trans.). London: SPCK, 1977.

Riggenbach, E. 'Die Textgeschichte der Doxologie Röm. 16, 25-27 im Zusammenhang mit den übrigen, den Schluss des Römerbriefs betreffenden, textkritischen Fragen' *Neue Jahrbüchen für deutsche Theologie* 1 (1892), 526-605.

Rives, J. 'Civic and Religious Life'. In J. Bodel, (ed.). *Epigraphic Evidence: Ancient History from Inscriptions*. London: Routledge, 2001, 118-136.

Robert, J. and L. 'Bulletin épigraphique', *Revue der études grecques* 69 (1956), 152-53.

Robert, L. 'Inscriptiones de Chios du Ier siècle de notre ère', *Études épigraphiques et philologiques*. Paris: Champion, 1938, 133-34.

Robertson, A. & A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1914.

Roetzel, C. J. *Judgment in the Community: A Study of the Relationship between Eschatology and Ecclesiology in Paul.* Leiden: Brill, 1972.

Roller, O. *Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe; ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom antiken Briefe. BWANT* 4/6 (58); Sttutgart: Kohlhammer, 1933, 481-82.

Romaniuk, K. 'Was Phoebe in Romans 16,1 a Deaconess?', *ZNW* 81(1990), 132-34.

Saller, R. P. *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Sampley, J. P. 'The Weak and the Strong: Paul's Careful and Crafty Rhetorical Strategy in Romans 14:1-15:3'. In L. M. White and O. L. Yarbrough (ed.). *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995, 40-52.

Sanday, W. and A. C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary to the Epistle to the Romans.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902.

Sanders, E. P. *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*. London: SCM Press, 1990.

Schlatter, A. *Romans: The Righteousness of God.* Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.

_____. *Der Römerbrief.* HThKNT 6; Freiburg: Herder, 1977.

Schmidt, H. W. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer.* THKNT, 6; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1963.

Schmithals, W. *Der Römerbrief: Ein Kommentar*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1988.

Schneider, J. 'τιμή κτλ.,' *TDNT* 8 (1972), 169-80.

_____. ὄνειδος κτλ., *TDNT* 5 (1967), 238.

Schotroff, L. *Lydia's Impatient Sisters: A Feminist Social History of Early Christianity.* Barbara and Martin Rumscheidt (trans). Louisville: John Knox Press, 1995.

Schreiber, S. 'Arbeit mit der Gemeinde (Rom16:6, 12). *Zur versunkenen Möglichkeit der Gemeindeleitung durch Frauen*', *NTS* 46 (2000), 204-226.

Schreiner, T. R. *Romans*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998.

Schubert, P. *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings*. Berlin: A.Töpelmann, 1939.

Schulz, R. R. 'A Case for "President" Phoebe in Romans 16:2', *LTJ* 24 (1990), 124-27.

_____. 'Junia or Junias?, *ExpT* 98 (1987), 108-10.

Schumacher, R. 'Aquila und Priscilla', *TGI* 12 (1920), 89-99.

Schürer, E. *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, Matthew Black and Pamela Vermes (rev. and ed.). 2 Vols. Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 1973-1979.

Schweizer, E. "σῶμα κτλ.", *TDNT* 7 (1971), 1041.

Scroggs, R. 'Paul and the Eschatological Women', *JAAR* 41 (1972), 283-303.

Segal, A. F. *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

Sevenster, J. N. *Paul and Seneca*. NovTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961.

Sigountos J. G. & M. Shank, 'Public Roles for Women in the Pauline Church: A Reappraisal of the Evidence', *JETS* 26 (1983), 283-295.

Silva, M. *Philippians*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.

Soards, M. L. *1 Corinthians*. NIBC; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999.

Söding, T. *Das Liebesgebot bei Paulus: Die Mahnung zur Agape im Rahmen der paulinischen Ethik*. NTAbh 26; Münster: Aschendorff, 1995.

Spicq, C. *Agape dans le Nouveau Testament. Analyse des Textes, EBib* 1, 2 Paris: Gabalda, 1958-59.

Stählin, G. 'ἀσθενέω κτλ.', *TDNT* 1 (1964), 490-93.

_____. 'σκάνδαλον, σκανδαλίζω', *TDNT* 7, 339.

Stauffer, E. 'ἀγαπάω, ἀγάπη, ἀγαπητός', *TDNT* 1, 21-55.

Stowers, S. J. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Library of Early Christianity, 265; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.

_____. *A Re-reading of Romans: Justice, Jew, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Stowers, S. K. *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*. SBLDS 57; Chicago: Scholars Press, 1981.

Stuhlmacher, P. 'The Theme of Romans'. In K. P. Donfried, (ed.). *The Romans Debate*, (revised and expanded edition). Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991, 333-345.

_____. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. S. J. Hafemann (trans.) Westminster: John Knox, 1994.

Theissen, G. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982.

Thiselton, A. C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2000.

Thomas, W. D. 'Phoebe: A Helper of Many', *ExpTim* 95 (1984), 336-337.

Thorley, J. 'Junia, A Woman Apostle', *NovT* 38 (1996), 18-26.

Thorsteinsson, R. M. 'Paul and Roman Stoicism: Romans 12 and Contemporary Stoic Ethics', *JSNT* 29 (2006), 139-161.

Thraede, K. 'Ursprünge und Formen des "heiligen Kusses" im frühen Christentum', *JAC* 11/12 (1967-68), 124-180.

Tobin, T. H. *Paul's Rhetoric in its Contexts: The Argument of Romans*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.

Tomson, P. J. *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles*. CRINT Vol. 1; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Trebilco, P. R. *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Tromp, J. (trans.). *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

van der Horst, P. W. 'The Jews of Ancient Crete', *JJS* 39 (1988), 183-200.

Verner, D. C. *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles*. SBLDS 71; Chicago: Scholars Press, 1983.

von Harnack, A. 'κοπιᾶν (Οἱ Κοπιῶντες) im frühchristlichen Sprachgebrauch', *ZNW* 27 (1928), 1-10.

von Soden, H. F. 'ἀδελφός κτλ.', *TDNT* 1 (1964), 145.

Vouga, F. 'L' Epître aux Romains comme document ecclésiologique (Rom 12-15)', *ETR* 61 (1986), 489-91.

Waltzing, J. P. *Etude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*, vols. 4 ; Louvain: Georg Olms, 1970, 1:348-49.

Wannenwetsch, B. '"Members of One Another": *Charis*, Ministry and Representation: A Politico-Ecclesial Reading of Romans 12'. In C. Bartholomew, et.al.*, A Royal Priesthood? A Use of the Bible Ethically and Politically, A Dialogue with Oliver O'Donovan*. The Scripture and Hermeneutics Series, Vol. 3; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2002, 197-220.

Warnach, V. *Agape. Die Liebe als Grundmotiv der neutestamentlichen Theologie*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1951.

Watson, F. *Agape, Eros, Gender: Towards a Pauline Sexual Ethic.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

_____. 'The Two Roman Congregations Rom 14:1-15:13'. In K. P. Donfried, (ed.). *The Romans Debate*, (revised and expanded edition). Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991, 203-215.

_____. *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles*. SNTSMS 56; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Wedderburn, A. J. M. *The Reasons for Romans*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.

_____. 'Some Observations on Paul's use of the Phrases in Christ and with Christ', *JSNT* 25 (1985), 83-97.

Weima, J. A. D. *Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings*. JSNTSup 101; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Weiser, A. 'Der Rolle der Frau in der urchristlichen Mission'. In G. Dautzenberg (ed.). *Die Frau im Urchristentum*. QD 95; Freiburg: Herder, 1983, 158-81.

Whelan, C. F. 'Amica Pauli: The Role of Phoebe in the Early Church', *JSNT* 49 (1993), 67-85.

White, J. L. *Light from Ancient Letters.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

_____. 'Epistolary Formulas and Clichés in Greek Papyrus Letters'. In SBL Seminar Papers 2. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1978, 289-319.

_____. 'The Greek Documentary Letter Tradition: Third Century BCE to Third Century CE', *Semeia* 22 (1981), 92-95.

_____.'New Testament Epistolary Literature in the Framework of Ancient Epistolography'. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II, 25.2. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984, 1730-56.

_____. *Light from Ancient Letters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

_____. 'Saint Paul and the Apostolic Letter Tradition', *CBQ* 45 (1983), 433-444.

Windisch, K. H. 'ἀσπάζομαι*' TDNT* 1, 496-502.

Wilckens, U. 'ὑποκρίνομαι κτλ,.' *TDNT* 8, 559-71.

_____. *Der Brief an die Römer*, Vol. 3. EKKNT, 6. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978-82.

Wilson, F. V. 'The Significance of the Early House Churches', *JBL* 58 (1939), 105-112.

Wilson, W. T. *Love without Pretense: Romans 12:9-11 and Hellenistic-Jewish Wisdom Literature*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1991.

Winter, B. W. *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*: *The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

_____. 'Roman Law and Society in Romans 12-15'. In P. Oakes (ed.). *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002, 67-102.

Wire, A. *The Corinthian Women Prophets*: *A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Witherington, B. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Yorke, G. L. O. R. *The Church as the Body of Christ: A Re-examination*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1991.

Zahn, T. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer.* Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6; Leipzig: Deichert, 1910.

Ziemann, F. *De Epistularum Graecarum Formulis Sollemnibus Quaestiones Selectae.* Berlin: Haas, 1912.

Ziesler, J. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. TPI; London: SCM, 1989.

Zmijewski, Josef. 'ἀσθενής κτλ.' *EDNT* 1 (1990), 171.