

# Problems and Prospects with Romans 1:13-14 and the Letter's Implication of a Gentile Audience

J. David Stark

Winnie and Cecil May Jr Biblical Research Fellow

Kearley Graduate School of Theology, Faulkner University

[david@jdavidstark.com](mailto:david@jdavidstark.com)

---

## Abstract

Scholars often consider the implied audience of Romans to have been a mixture of Jews and gentiles, albeit with a gentile majority. Other scholars challenge this thesis, however, and argue that the implied audience is exclusively gentile. Romans 1:13-14 is an important locus in this debate, but four points about these verses require further consideration. These are (1) the case of the elements Paul unites with the τὲ καὶ constructions in verse 14, (2) the variety of complements Paul gives ὀφειλέτης elsewhere, (3) the explanatory relationship of verse 14 to verse 13, and (4) the clearly personal focus of the language that appears with the τὲ καὶ constructions in verse 14. Duly considered, these points argue strongly for an exclusively gentile implied audience.

---

## 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Scholars often read Romans as implying an audience of both Jews and gentiles.<sup>2</sup> In recent decades, however, this hypothesis has come under increased scrutiny. There are compelling reasons why the mixed-audience hypothesis gives a poorer account of the implied audience's identity. Additionally, mistaking the implied audience's identity naturally produces further challenges in the letter's interpretation in questions like the identity of the dialogue partner in chapter

---

1. I am grateful to Andrew Das, Christopher Hutson, Daniel Roberts, Rafael Rodríguez, and Carrie Stark for their comments on this essay's earlier versions. In addition, thanks are due to David Armitage for several suggestions for improved clarity, particularly in the presentation of the summary table below.

2. Space does not permit a detailed bibliography, but for representative examples, see especially §2.2 and §4.1 below.

2, the significance of the discussion of Israel in chapters 9–11, and the possible identities of the weak and strong in chapters 14–15.

As a corrective, other scholars argue that the implied audience of Romans is exclusively gentile.<sup>3</sup> Multiple features in the letter support their view.<sup>4</sup> But elements within the gentile-only proposal remain unrefined in ways that do not allow the proposal's full force to fall.

One example is the treatment of Romans 1:13–14. In this text, advocates of the gentile-only hypothesis find a clear statement that the letter's implied audience is exclusively gentile. This conclusion appears correct, but there are better reasons for it than have yet come forward. These relate to (1) the τὲ καί constructions in verse 14, (2) the variety of complements Paul gives ὀφειλέτης ('debtor'), (3) the

---

3. Thus, there are two primary candidates for the identity of the letter's implied audience: a mixed group of Jews and gentiles, or gentiles only. The implied audience does not necessarily share the demographics of either the letter's actual historical audience or the total Jesus community at Rome. It is instead the audience *as described in the letter*, and others outside this group may also have been present for its first reading(s) at Rome.

4. Credit for pressing this thesis particularly goes to A. Andrew Das, *Paul and the Jews*, Library of Pauline Studies (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003); A. Andrew Das, *Solving the Romans Debate* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2007); A. Andrew Das, "'Praise the Lord, All You Gentiles': The Encoded Audience of Romans 15.7–13", *JSNT* 34 (2011): 90–110, <https://doi.org/10/bwppkc>; Neil Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul's Dialog with Judaism*, LNTS/JSNTSup 45 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990); Neil Elliott, "'Blasphemed among the Nations": Pursuing an Anti-Imperial "Intertextuality" in Romans', in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, ed. Christopher D. Stanley and Stanley E. Porter, SBLSymS 50 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 213–233; Paula Fredriksen, *Paul: The Pagans' Apostle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), <https://doi.org/10.12987/yale/9780300225884.001.0001>; Rafael Rodríguez, *If You Call Yourself a Jew: Reappraising Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014), <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1cgf6rb>; Rafael Rodríguez and Matthew Thiessen, ed., *The So-Called Jew in Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2016), <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1b3t70f>; Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994); Matthew Thiessen, 'Paul's Argument against Gentile Circumcision in Romans 2:17–29', *NovT* 56 (2014): 373–391, <https://doi.org/10/gphg9h>; Runar M. Thorsteinsson, 'Paul's Missionary Duty towards Gentiles in Rome: A Note on the Punctuation and Syntax of Rom 1.13–15', *NTS* 48 (2002): 531–547, <https://doi.org/10/cb7qbp>; Runar M. Thorsteinsson, *Paul's Interlocutor in Romans 2: Function and Identity in the Context of Ancient Epistolography*, ConBNT 40 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2015); see also James R. Harrison, 'Paul's "Indebtedness" to the Barbarian (Rom 1:14) in Latin West Perspective', *NovT* 55 (2013): 311–348, <https://doi.org/10/gf7763>; Jeffrey A. D. Weima, 'Preaching the Gospel in Rome: A Study of the Epistolary Framework of Romans', in *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*, ed. Peter Richardson and L. Ann Jervis, JSNTSup 108 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 337–366; Jeffrey A. D. Weima, 'The Reason for Romans: The Evidence of Its Epistolary Framework (1:1–15; 15:14–16:27)', *RevExp* 100 (2003): 17–33, <https://doi.org/10/gphg9f>.

explanatory relationship of verse 14 to verse 13, and (4) the clearly personal focus of the language that appears with the τὲ καὶ constructions in verse 14. Before directly addressing these matters, however, a brief conceptual and terminological introduction is in order.

## 2. What Might It Mean to Be ἐν the ἔθνη?

In Romans 1:13b, Paul describes his desire for fruit among the Romans like he has previously seen elsewhere. By directly linking his audience (ὁμῖν; ‘to you’) to the ἔθνη (‘gentiles’) as he does (καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς; ‘just as also among the rest’), Paul situates the audience themselves as ἐν τοῖς ... ἔθνεσιν (‘among the ... gentiles’).<sup>5</sup> The mixed and gentile-only positions principally differ over the nuances they assign to this description. For both positions, ἐν (‘among’) has a local force, and ἔθνη refers to non-Jewish people.<sup>6</sup> Interpretations diverge over the specific nuances of ἐν and ἔθνη.

### 2.1 In-Group ἐν and Ethnic ἔθνη

Gentile-only audience proponents interpret Paul’s addressees as ἐν the ἔθνη because they are a subset of that group, because they are members of the larger class of the ἔθνη. Thus, Romans 1:13 names the ethnicity of the letter’s implied audience and gives them an ‘in-group’ location in relation to the ἔθνη. This reading of ἐν naturally pushes ἔθνη in the direction of a class of people. Similarly, interpreting ἔθνη to refer to a class of people naturally pushes ἐν in the direction of designating in-group location.

### 2.2 Intra-Group ἐν and Geographic ἔθνη

Mixed-audience proponents interpret Paul’s addressees as not being members of the ἔθνη but as merely commingled with that group. This interpretation assigns the addressees an ‘intra-group’ location.<sup>7</sup> This reading of ἐν requires interpreters to understand ἔθνη other than as an ethnic designation. And similarly, interpreting

---

5. Greek NT quotations accord with NA28; translations are mine. On λοιπά (‘rest’), see §5.2 below.

6. BDAG, s.v. ἐν §1; BDAG, s.v. ἔθνος §2; Nigel Turner, *Syntax*, vol. 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by James Hope Moulton, 4 vols., (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1908–1976), 260–261.

7. In this reading, one might say ἐν communicates association or sphere rather than location. See BDF §198; Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 372. But this distinction does not alter the argument.

ἔθνη to designate something besides the audience's ethnicity naturally pushes ἐν in the direction of designating intra-group location.

Treating ἔθνη specifically as a geographic reference then comes from one of two metonymies. One is a metonymy of people for the places where they live – for example, ἔθνη as a reference to places outside the Jews' homeland in Palestine.<sup>8</sup> The other is a metonymy of part for whole. In this metonymy, Romans 1:13b has a sense like 'among you, just as also among the rest of those who share the gentile ethnicity that most (but not all) of you possess'.<sup>9</sup>

### 3. A Profile of τὲ καὶ in Paul

With this groundwork laid, it will prove helpful to profile the τὲ καὶ construction throughout Paul's letters and show how this construction in Romans 1:14 supports the in-group and ethnic reading of verse 13. It does so particularly by limiting how the intra-group and geographic reading might support itself from verse 14. The only way of salvaging the intra-group and geographic reading then also proves untenable because of (1) the variety of complements Paul gives ὀφειλέτης, (2) how verse 14 explains verse 13, and (3) the clearly personal focus of the language that appears with verse 14's τὲ καὶ constructions.

---

8. E.g. C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, rev. ed., 2 vols., ICC (1975; repr., New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 20–21, 67–72, 82–85; Francis Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach*, SNTSMS 56 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 102–105, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511555138>; Francis Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 188–191; cf. Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, 2 vols., Historisch Theologische Auslegung (Witten: Brockhaus, 2015–2016), 160.

9. E.g. John M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 455–459; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans*, WBC 38 (Dallas: Word, 1988), xlv–liv, 32; Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 9–13, 60–61; Thomas H. Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric in Its Contexts: The Argument of Romans* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 37–38. Beverly Gaventa falls under this heading also, despite generally adopting Thorsteinsson's punctuation of Rom 1:13–15: "To Preach the Gospel": Romans 1,15 and the Purposes of Romans', in *The Letter to the Romans*, ed. Udo Schnelle, BETL 226 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 183–185, 194–195; cf. Beverly Roberts Gaventa, 'We, They, and All in Paul's Letter to the Romans', *WW* 39 (2019): 269. Although these commentators assign an in-group and ethnic sense to the language in Rom 1:13b, they hypothesise a mixed Jew-gentile audience. The Jewish contingent within this audience cannot ethnically be ἐν τοῖς ... ἔθνεσιν. So, this interpretation is still intra-group and geographic, even if its geography is more social than spatial. For further discussion, see Das, *Romans Debate*, 53–114, 149–202; Thorsteinsson, *Interlocutor*, 87–122.

### 3.1 Instances of τὲ καί in Paul's Letters

The τὲ καί construction may have different interpretations in different contexts.<sup>10</sup> But in Paul, the construction repeatedly appears with a remarkably consistent force. The construction marks specification and has the sense 'namely ... and'.<sup>11</sup> Paul's τὲ καί constructions are mostly easy to recognise. In Romans, nine clear τὲ καί constructions occur (1:12,14(2x),16,20; 2:9-10; 3:9; 10:12).<sup>12</sup> Elsewhere in Paul, τὲ καί constructions appear in 1 Corinthians 1:30, 2 Corinthians 12:12, and Philipians 1:7.

Romans 1:27 – despite first appearances – does not include a thirteenth Pauline τὲ καί construction.<sup>13</sup> Instead, τέ here adds another example to the one in 1:26b and forms an extended τὲ γάρ ... τέ ('for in the first place ... in the second place') construction rather than a τὲ καί construction.<sup>14</sup> The conjunction γάρ ('for') in Romans 1:26b connects to the prior clause. The dual τέ ... τέ ('in the first place ... in the second place') unites two sets of elements with this γάρ.

Two pieces of evidence support this interpretation, although Romans 1:27 has τέ and καί side by side. First, similar constructions appear with similar uses elsewhere in Romans. Under γάρ in 14:8a and οὖν in 14:8b, τέ ... τέ unites elements portrayed as similar.<sup>15</sup> In contrast, one might cite τὲ γάρ ... δέ ('for on the one hand ... but on the other') in 7:7-8, which unites elements portrayed as dissimilar.<sup>16</sup> Grouping elements as similar (with τέ ... τέ) or dissimilar (with τέ ... δέ), Paul links them to the wider context with a suitable conjunction (e.g. γάρ, οὖν). These parallels support reading 1:26b-27 as having a τέ ... τέ construction (not τὲ καί)

10. BDF §444.2, §444.4; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th ed. (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923), 1179; Smyth §§2967-2983.

11. For a summary, see §3.3 below.

12. It lies beyond the bounds of this discussion to consider in depth why τὲ καί is so frequent in Romans. This frequency may derive from Paul's co-production of the letter with Tertius (Rom 16:22). Or τὲ καί may appear so often because Paul feels a heightened need for specification, perhaps because he has not previously visited Rome (Rom 1:13). And he simply chooses to signal specification with τὲ καί more often in Romans than in his other letters. These suggestions are not mutually exclusive, nor do they rule out other factors from contributing to the frequency of τὲ καί in Romans.

13. Some witnesses read ὁμοίως δὲ καί or ὁμοίως καί. BDF §444.1; NA28, 483.

14. Cf. BDF §443.3, §444.1, §452.3; Robertson, *Grammar*, 1179; Smyth §2973. The cumbersome 'in the first place ... in the second place' appears here simply to illustrate the τέ ... τέ construction's correlative force.

15. BDF §444.1, §443.3, §454.3; Robertson, *Grammar*, 1019, 1027, 1179; Smyth §2852, §2961.

16. Smyth §2981. Blass, Debrunner, and Funk correctly suspect that Rom 7:7 needs some reference to ἀμαρτία. §443.3. But this reference comes after verse 7, not before.

because precisely the same situation occurs there, the link to the wider context being supplied by the γάρ in 1:26b.

Second, one might speak of a ὁμοίως τε καί construction in verse 27.<sup>17</sup> But even here, ὁμοίως ... καί falls within the overarching τέ ... τέ framework in verses 26b-27. It thereby stresses the similarity between the upcoming element in verse 27 and the one in verse 26b.<sup>18</sup> Thus, ὁμοίως ... καί fills out a larger τέ ... τέ construction rather than ὁμοίως filling out a narrower τε καί construction. As in Romans 1:27, ὁμοίως ... καί appears in 1 Corinthians 7:3-4, just with δέ interposed instead of τέ. There, the operative construction is not δέ καί ('and also') with an added ὁμοίως ('likewise'). Like τέ, δέ cannot stand first in its clause.<sup>19</sup> Thus, δέ falls between ὁμοίως and καί, and ὁμοίως ... καί further defines the transition that δέ expresses.

Similarly, in Romans 1:27, although τέ and καί stand beside each other, they do not work together as a unified τε καί construction. The qualifying construction at the beginning of verse 27 is ὁμοίως ... καί.<sup>20</sup> That τέ stands in the middle of this construction results simply from the fact that the τέ cannot be first in its clause as it links back to the τέ in verse 26b.<sup>21</sup> Consequently, rather than forming a τε καί construction in verse 27, the καί works most immediately with ὁμοίως and has an adjunctive ('likewise also') or ascensive ('likewise even') force.<sup>22</sup>

Given these factors, Romans 1:27 does not have a τε καί construction. Instead, it has the second part of a τέ ... τέ construction, and ὁμοίως ... καί contributes towards completing this second part. Consequently, Paul has just the twelve τε καί constructions noted above, nine in Romans and three elsewhere.

### 3.2 How τε καί Relates to Case

In each of Paul's ten τε καί constructions outside Romans 1:14, τε καί unites specifiers of another element. In eight of these texts, the specifiers' case matches the case of what they specify. Exceptions to this pattern occur because of (1) a lack of case in the elements that τε καί unites, (2) lexical or syntactical influence from particular words, or (3) attraction of the elements in the τε καί construction

17. E.g. Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2007), 178; Robertson, *Grammar*, 1179.

18. E.g. Jewett, *Romans*, 178. This interpretation coheres with the sense advocated here for τε γάρ ... τέ, but Jewett does not explicitly address the relationship between ὁμοίως τε καί in verse 27 and τε γάρ in verse 26b.

19. BDAG, s.v. δέ.

20. Cf. BDAG, s.v. ὁμοίως.

21. Cf. BDF §444.1; Smyth §2967, §2983.

22. Cf. Cranfield, *Romans*, 126; Jewett, *Romans*, 178; Wallace, *Beyond the Basics*, 670-671.

to the case of another nominal. For an overview of Paul's ten τὲ καὶ constructions outside Romans 1:14 (where the construction appears twice), what they specify, and how their cases are inflected, see Table 1.

### 3.2.1 Examples Where τὲ καὶ Marks Specification with Consistency in Case

In Romans outside 1:14, τὲ καὶ constructions often specify by naming entities included in a larger class (1:12,16,20; 2:9-10; 3:9). 1 Corinthians 1:30 shows how this construction may be extended and unite still more specifiers with τὲ καὶ ... καὶ ('namely ... and ... and').<sup>23</sup> In these seven texts, the case of the elements in the τὲ καὶ construction matches the case of the entity that this construction specifies.<sup>24</sup>

### 3.2.2 Examples Where τὲ καὶ Marks Specification with Inconsistency in Case

In the remaining three texts (other than Rom 1:14), τὲ καὶ unites entities that do not match the case of what they specify. In Philippians 1:7, it is debatable whether the τὲ καὶ construction specifies what precedes (διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς; 'because I have you in my heart') or what follows (συγκοινωνοὺς μου τῆς χάριτος πάντας ὑμᾶς ὄντας; 'because you all are my partners in grace').<sup>25</sup> But

---

23. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 164, <https://doi.org/10.5040/9780300261943>; A. T. Robertson and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, 2nd ed., ICC (1914; repr., Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1929), 27-28; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 190; see also J. David Stark, 'Rewriting Prophets in the Corinthian Correspondence: A Window on Paul's Hermeneutic', *BBR* 22 (2012): 236 n56; Smyth §2977; Turner, *Syntax*, 338-339. Margaret Thrall suggests this text has a 'single τὲ'. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2nd ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004), 838; cf. BDF §444.4. Thrall avoids reading 2 Cor 12:12 this way, however, because a 'single τὲ ... is not a common Pauline idiom. By contrast, Paul is fond of the τὲ καὶ [*sic*] correlation.' *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 838; cf. BDF §444.4. But this rationale suggests that τὲ καὶ (... καὶ) is also more likely in 1 Cor 1:30 than an independent τέ followed by καὶ ... καὶ.

24. E.g. see F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, TNTC 6 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), 91; Cranfield, *Romans*, 81, 114-115; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 33 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 280; Jewett, *Romans*, 125-126, 155-156; Moo, *Romans*, 60, 104-105; Grant R. Osborne, *Romans*, InterVarsity Press New Testament Commentary Series 6 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 37, 47-48; Colin G. Kruse, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 63, 92; Richard N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 207; Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 60-61.

25. Chrysostom favours reading 1. *Prof. evang.* 4; cf. *Hom. 2 Cor.* 13.1; *Hom. Phil.* 1. For reading 2, see Markus Bockmuehl, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, BNTC (London: Continuum,

Table 1: Summary of Translations, Specifications, and Inflections in Paul's τὸ καὶ Constructions outside Romans 1:14

Ref.	Text	Translation highlighting the function of τὸ καὶ	Specified element	Reason for case of elements in τὸ καὶ construction
Rom 1:12	διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ	'through our mutual faith – namely, yours and mine'	Genitive πίστεως	Matches specified element
Rom 1:16	παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε ... καὶ Ἑλληνι	'to everyone who believes – namely, to the Jew ... and the Greek'	Dative πιστεύοντι	Matches specified element
Rom 1:20	τὰ ... ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ... ἢ τε ἀίδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης	'his invisible attributes – namely, his eternal power and divinity'	Nominative ἀόρατα	Matches specified element
Rom 2:9	ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, Ἰουδαίου τε ... καὶ Ἑλληνος	'of a person who does evil – namely, of the Jew ... and the Greek'	Genitive ἀνθρώπου	Matches specified element
Rom 2:10	παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν, Ἰουδαίῳ τε ... καὶ Ἑλληνι	'to everyone who does good – namely, to the Jew ... and the Greek'	Dative ἐργαζομένῳ	Matches specified element
Rom 3:9	Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλληνας πάντας ὑφ' ἁμαρτιῶν εἶναι	'all – namely, Jews and Greeks – are under sin'	Accusative πάντας	Matches specified element
Rom 10:12	οὐ ... ἐστιν διαστολή Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἑλληνος, ὁ γὰρ αὐτός κύριος πάντων	(1) 'there is no distinction – namely, between Jew and Greek – for the same Lord is over all' (2) 'there is no distinction, for the same Lord is over all – namely, over Jew and Greek' (3) 'there is no distinction – namely, between Jew and Greek – for the same Lord is over all'	Nominative διαστολή Genitive πάντων Nominative διαστολή	Lexical pressure from διαστολή for a genitive complement Matches specified element Attraction to πάντων



Table 1 (cont.): Summary of Translations, Specifications, and Inflections in Paul's τὲ καὶ Constructions outside Romans 1:14.

Ref.	Text	Translation highlighting the function of τὲ καὶ	Specified element	Reason for case of elements in τὲ καὶ construction
1 Cor 1:30	ὃς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῶν ἀπὸ θεοῦ, δικαιοσύνη τὲ καὶ ἀγιασμός καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις	'who became to you wisdom from God – namely, righteousness and sanctification and redemption'	Nominative σοφία	Matches specified element
2 Cor 12:12	τὰ ... σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου κατειργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν πάσῃ ὑπομονῇ, σημεῖοις τε καὶ τέρασιν καὶ δυνάμεσιν	(1) 'the signs of an apostle – namely, signs and wonders and miracles – were brought about among you with all patience' (2) 'the signs of an apostle were brought about – namely, by means of signs and wonders and miracles – among you with all patience'	Nominative σημεῖα  Verb κατειργάσθη	Attraction to ὑπομονῇ  Syntactic pressure from κατειργάσθη for a complement indicating agency or means (datives of means)
Phil 1:7	διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς, ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαίωσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου συγκοινωνοῦς μου τῆς χάριτος πάντας ὑμᾶς ὄντας	(3) 'the signs of an apostle were brought about among you with all patience – namely, with signs and wonders and miracles' (4) 'the signs of an apostle were brought about among you with all patience and with miracles – namely, with signs and wonders' (1) 'because I have you in my heart – namely, in my bonds and in my defence and confirmation of the gospel – because you all are my partners in grace' (2) 'because I have you in my heart because you all are my partners in grace – namely, in my bonds and in my defence and confirmation of the gospel'	Dative ὑπομονῇ  Dative δυνάμεσιν  Infinitival clause διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς  Participial clause συγκοινωνοῦς μου τῆς χάριτος πάντας ὑμᾶς ὄντας	Matches specified element  Matches specified element  None; τὲ καὶ unites whole prepositional phrases  None; τὲ καὶ unites whole prepositional phrases

in either reading, τὲ καὶ here unites two prepositional phrases.<sup>26</sup> And, naturally, prepositional phrases do not have case, as do their objects.

In Romans 10:12, there are three possibilities for why the genitive case appears with the τὲ καὶ construction in Paul's assertion οὐ ... ἔστιν διαστολή Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἕλληνας, ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς κύριος πάντων. First, the τὲ καὶ construction may specify the entities between whom Paul denies a διαστολή ('distinction').<sup>27</sup> In this reading, the case of Ἰουδαίου ... Ἕλληνας ('Jew ... Greek') does not match διαστολή, which the phrase specifies. Instead, Ἰουδαίου ... Ἕλληνας takes the genitive case because διαστολή accepts a genitive complement ('there is no distinction – namely, between Jew and Greek – for the same Lord is over all').<sup>28</sup> Second, the τὲ καὶ construction may specify the entities over whom the Lord stands. In this reading, the case of Ἰουδαίου ... Ἕλληνας matches what the phrase specifies (πάντων; 'over all'; thus, 'there is no distinction, for the same Lord is over all – namely, over Jew and Greek'). Third, the τὲ καὶ construction may specify διαστολή, but the case of πάντων may attract the case of the τὲ καὶ construction's elements. In this reading, the translation is identical to the first possibility. But attraction to the case of πάντων supplies a different reason for Ἰουδαίου ... Ἕλληνας to appear in the genitive case, rather than in the nominative like διαστολή.

In favour of the second reading is Paul's general consistency in giving the elements in τὲ καὶ constructions the same case as what those constructions specify. But in favour of the first reading are (1) the proximity of διαστολή and Ἰουδαίου ... Ἕλληνας and (2) the fact that these elements all appear before the upcoming γάρ. These factors tell decisively against the second reading. The only question is whether Ἰουδαίου ... Ἕλληνας appears in the genitive because of lexical pressure from διαστολή (reading 1) or attraction to πάντων (reading 3). Lexical pressure from διαστολή may be the simpler explanation, but one cannot exclude attraction to πάντων, as 2 Corinthians 12:12 shows.

---

1997), 64–65; Marvin R. Vincent, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1897), 9. For additional bibliography for both readings, see Vincent, *To the Philippians and to Philemon*, 9. On the interpretation of the prior clause modified in reading 1, see G. Walter Hansen, *The Letter to the Philippians*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 52–53.

26. τέ follows the preposition so as not to appear first in the phrase. Cf. BDF §444.5.

27. See Cranfield, *Romans*, 531; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 592; Kruse, *Romans*, 414; Longenecker, *Romans*, 854; Osborne, *Romans*, 272; Robertson, *Grammar*, 514; William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed., ICC 32 (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1899), 290–291.

28. Wallace, *Beyond the Basics*, 135; cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, 514–515.

In 2 Corinthians 12:12, there are four possibilities for why the elements in the τὲ καὶ construction have the case they do. First, an extended τὲ καὶ ... καὶ construction specifies the σημεῖα ('signs') mentioned earlier in the verse (cf. 1 Cor 1:30), but the case of the τὲ καὶ construction's components is attracted to the dative ὑπομονῇ ('patience'). Second, the elements in the extended τὲ καὶ ... καὶ construction take the dative case because they explain how σημεῖα ... κατεργάσθη ('signs ... were brought about').<sup>29</sup> Third, the extended τὲ καὶ ... καὶ construction specifies the preceding ὑπομονῇ.<sup>30</sup> In this reading, the case of the elements in the τὲ καὶ ... καὶ construction matches what the construction specifies. Fourth, 2 Corinthians 12:12 has only a simple τὲ καὶ construction whose elements specify the following δυνάμεσιν ('miracles').<sup>31</sup> In this reading, the case of the elements in the τὲ καὶ construction also matches what the construction specifies.<sup>32</sup>

Commentators often prefer one of the first two readings. There, the case of the elements in the τὲ καὶ ... καὶ construction comes about either by attraction to ὑπομονῇ (reading 1) or by syntactic pressure in further describing the means for the passive verb κατεργάσθη ('were brought about'; reading 2). The third and fourth readings both explain the elements in the τὲ καὶ (... καὶ) construction as having cases that are consistent with the cases of what these elements specify, whether ὑπομονῇ (reading 3) or δυνάμεσιν (reading 4).

---

29. Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians: Translated with Introduction, Notes and Commentary*, AB 32A (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 553; Murray J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 875–877; Thrall, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 838–839. Multiple interpreters clearly support one of these first two readings but without distinguishing between the two. E.g. John Calvin, *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, trans. John Pringle, 2 vols., Calvin's Commentaries (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1848–1849), 382–383; David E. Garland, *2 Corinthians*, NAC 29 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 528–530; Colin G. Kruse, *2 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, 2nd ed., TNTC 8 (Nottingham: InterVarsity Press, 2015), 268–269; Ralph P. Martin, '2 Corinthians', in *1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians*, Cornerstone Biblical Commentary (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House, 2009), 363–364; Frank J. Matera, *II Corinthians: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 289–290; Mitzi L. Minor, *2 Corinthians*, SHBC (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2009), 230–231; Thrall, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 875–877; Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 466.

30. C. K. Barrett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, BNTC (London: Continuum, 1973), 321–322. Plummer explicitly opposes this reading because 'in the true text there is no ἐν before σημεῖοις'. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1915), 359. But given how Paul uses τὲ καὶ elsewhere, it is unclear why ἐν is necessary to connect a τὲ καὶ ... καὶ construction to ὑπομονῇ.

31. Mark A. Seifrid, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 456.

32. Seifrid, *Second Letter to the Corinthians*, 456; Wallace, *Beyond the Basics*, 671.

Despite these multiple possibilities, in none of these readings does 2 Corinthians 12:12 use the τὲ καὶ construction differently from what Paul's letters elsewhere attest. 2 Corinthians 12:12 is more ambiguous than other texts, but the interpretive options it presents differ only in number and not in kind.

### 3.3 Summary

Thus, Paul's letters have twelve τὲ καὶ constructions, which consistently have the force of 'namely ... and'. The construction often specifies sub-classes within a larger construct, but other relations are possible.

Outside Romans 1:14, Paul normally gives to the elements he unites with τὲ καὶ the same case as the entity that the construction specifies (Rom 1:12,16,20; 2:9-10; 3:9; 1 Cor 1:30). Consistency in case may also appear in Romans 10:12 and 2 Corinthians 12:12, but the case of the elements in the τὲ καὶ construction may also derive from lexical or syntactic pressure (i.e. from διαστολή in Rom 10:12, and from κατεργάσθη in 2 Cor 12:12). Alternatively, the case may derive from attraction of the elements in the τὲ καὶ construction to the case of another element in the context (i.e. to πάντων in Rom 10:12, to ὑπομονῆ in 2 Cor 12:12). And with τὲ καὶ, Paul may also unite elements that have no case, as in Philippians 1:7.

The elements Paul unites with τὲ καὶ in Romans 1:14a appear in the dative case. The profile of τὲ καὶ in Paul suggests that this case may appear because it matches what the τὲ καὶ constructions in Romans 1:14a specify or because the τὲ καὶ constructions' elements have come under lexical or syntactic pressure from or attraction to another element in the text. As shown below, however, in each scenario, the profile of τὲ καὶ in Paul supports an in-group and ethnic interpretation of Romans 1:13b.

## 4. The (Non-)Function of τὲ καὶ in the In- and Intra-Group Debate

Scholars advocating the intra-group and geographic interpretation of Romans 1:13b typically treat the interpretation of the τὲ καὶ constructions in verse 14a as a separate issue. Scholars advocating the in-group and ethnic interpretation may respond by pointing to the relevance of these constructions for this debate. However, when advocates of the in-group and ethnic interpretation have done so, they have not accounted for the total profile of τὲ καὶ in Paul and therefore have not put their interpretation on its strongest footing.

### 4.1 Advocates of the Intra-Group and Geographic Interpretation

C. E. B. Cranfield and Francis Watson straightforwardly advocate an intra-group and geographic interpretation of Romans 1:13 and use this interpretation to

describe the letter's implied audience. In his introduction, Cranfield finds it 'quite certain' that 'both the Jewish-Christian, and the Gentile-Christian, elements were considerable' in the audience of Romans and contends that arguments for a gentile majority are 'far short of conclusiveness' because καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν (1:13b) may mean simply 'even as ... in the rest of the Gentile world'.<sup>33</sup> Cranfield directly denies an in-group interpretation for ἐν and implicitly adopts the intra-group reading, interpreting ἔθνη geographically as referring to 'the Gentile world'.<sup>34</sup>

Cranfield's commentary on Romans 1:13 simply refers to this assertion.<sup>35</sup> But in explaining 1:14, Cranfield concludes the best reading is that

[t]o all the Gentiles, to those of them who are 'barbarians' no less than to those who are 'Greeks', and to the ἀνόητοι as much as to the σοφοί, Paul knows himself to be a debtor [because] God ... appointed him ἔθνῶν ἀπόστολος.<sup>36</sup>

That is, Cranfield thinks Romans 1:14a names groups of people to whom Paul ministered.<sup>37</sup>

Similarly, Watson finds Romans 1:13 to speak most directly to the intra-group location of Paul's audience:

In 1:13 and 1:15, καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν and καὶ ὑμῖν are used somewhat loosely: Paul does not mean that his readers are ... objects of his missionary activity (cf. 1:8), but is simply addressing them as inhabitants of Rome – hence, 'to you who are in Rome' (1:15).<sup>38</sup>

Watson still more explicitly adopts an intra-group reading of the parallel ἐν οἷς in 1:6, arguing that

ἐν οἷς must mean 'among whom,' either in the sense that the addressees are themselves Gentiles [in-group], or in the sense that they live in the midst of Gentiles [intra-group]. If the former is the meaning, the Roman Gentile Christians are seen here as objects of Pauline missionary activity, just like any

---

33. Cranfield, *Romans*, 20–21.

34. Cranfield, *Romans*, 20.

35. Cranfield, *Romans*, 82–83. Cranfield comments similarly on Rom 1:5–7. *Romans*, 67–72.

36. Cranfield, *Romans*, 84–85.

37. Cranfield, *Romans*, 83–84.

38. Watson, *Sociological Approach*, 103.

other Gentiles. But this seems unlikely, for the addressees are *already* ‘called by Jesus Christ’ (1:6).<sup>39</sup>

Thus, Watson’s intra-group reading of how Paul situates his audience (ἐν) also naturally yields a geographic reading of ἔθνη (‘in the midst of Gentiles’).<sup>40</sup>

Yet this approach has problems. Neither Cranfield nor Watson directly connects this reading to Romans 1:14a.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, it is doubtful that the audience’s already being ‘called by Jesus Christ’ would make them ‘unlikely’ to be ‘objects of Paul’s missionary activity, just like any other Gentiles’.<sup>42</sup> One simply needs to understand ‘Paul’s missionary activity’ as Paul defines it in Romans 1:11–15. Paul’s audience is not ‘just like any other Gentiles’ if by ‘any other Gentiles’ Watson includes non-Jesus followers.<sup>43</sup> Rather, Paul portrays his audience as Jesus followers, which Watson recognises.<sup>44</sup>

Clearly, ‘Paul’s missionary activity’ relates to the Roman Jesus followers differently than it does to non-Jesus followers.<sup>45</sup> But this different relation does not exclude the Roman Jesus followers from falling within this activity’s scope. The portrait of activity in Romans 1:11–15 is perfectly at home with actions Paul elsewhere embraces as relevant to those within the Jesus movement (e.g. Rom 6:21–22; 16:25; 1 Cor 15:1–11; Phil 4:15; 1 Thess 3:2, 6, 13; Phlm 6).<sup>46</sup> Consequently, there is no reason Paul should avoid using similar language to describe his interaction with the Roman Jesus followers, who also fall under his purview.

---

39. Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 189; italics original. Schnabel cites the greetings of Jewish Jesus followers in Rom 16 in favour of a mixed audience. E.g. *An die Römer*, 124. On this appeal’s challenges, however, see Rodríguez, *You Call Yourself*, 293–94; Thorsteinsson, *Interlocutor*, 98–100.

40. Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 189; cf. Alain Gignac, ‘Espaces géographiques et théologiques en Rm 1:1–15 et 15:14–33: regard narratologique sur la “topologie” paulinienne’, *BibInt* 14.4 (2006): 393–400, <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685150677825269>; Schnabel, *An die Römer*, 124.

41. See Cranfield, *Romans*; Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*; Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004); Watson, *Sociological Approach*.

42. Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 189.

43. Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 189.

44. Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 189.

45. Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 189; see Beverly Roberts Gaventa, ‘The Mission of God in Paul’s Letter to the Romans’, in *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Theology, and Practice*, ed. Trevor J. Burke and Brian S. Rosner, LNTS (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2011), 67–69; Gaventa, ‘Preach the Gospel’, 185–189.

46. See also M. A. Kruger, ‘TINA KARPON, “Some Fruit” in Romans 1:13’, *WTJ* 49 (1987): 167–173; Gaventa, ‘The Mission of God’, 67–69; Gaventa, ‘Preach the Gospel’, 185–189; Weima, ‘Preaching the Gospel’, 349–353, 365; Weima, ‘The Reason for Romans’, 21–24.

Watson suggests, however, that Jewish Jesus followers lie within Romans's implied audience because Paul sends the letter πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις (Rom 1:7; 'to all those in Rome who are beloved by God, called as saints'). Watson notes that there seem to have been Jews in the Jesus community at Rome. Watson then concludes that the letter has a mixed audience in view.<sup>47</sup>

Addressing Romans 1:5-7 in detail would take the present argument too far afield, but Watson's interpretation has two difficulties to note briefly. First, Romans 1:5-7, 13-14, and other texts equally, if partially, describe the letter's implied audience. Therefore, the possible broadening effect of πάντες ('all') in 1:7a bears consideration just as does the probable limiting effect of 1:5-6, 13-14. But Watson absolutises the evidence of verse 7a and does not sufficiently account for how verses 5-6, 7b, and 13-14 might describe the audience exclusively as gentiles.<sup>48</sup>

Second, absolutising πάντες in verse 7a overreads this term. Immediately before and after it, there are qualifying and direct references to the audience. In verses 5-6, the audience is ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ('among all the gentiles'). Advocates of the gentile-only hypothesis sometimes note this feature when commenting on πάντες in verse 7a.<sup>49</sup> But noting only this context risks simply absolutising in the opposite direction from Watson. Less often emphasised is that, in verse 7, Paul moves directly from his putatively third-person address πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις into wishing χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ('grace and peace to you'). In addition, verse 15 directly describes the audience (ὑμεῖς) as οἱ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ('those in Rome').

This fact and the two-fold framing of πάντες in verse 7a strengthen two conclusions. One is that οἱ ὄντες ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοὶ θεοῦ, κλητοὶ ἅγιοι (v. 7) describes the audience. The other is that πάντες in verse 7a does not override Paul's other descriptions of his audience. Rather, πάντες works with these other characterisations and stresses Paul's address to all the people within the audience he constructs, without exception.<sup>50</sup>

47. Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 188-189; cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 113.

48. Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 188-189.

49. E.g. Das, 'You Gentiles', 104-105; Elliott, *Rhetoric of Romans*, 71-72; Thorsteinsson, *Interlocutor*, 37-39, 102-106.

50. BDF §275; Turner, *Syntax*, 199-201; Maximillian Zerwick, *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples*, trans. Joseph Smith, SPIB 114 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), §188; cf. Samuel Byrskog, 'Epistolography, Rhetoric and Letter Prescript: Romans 1.1-7 as a Test Case', *JSNT* 19 (1997): 37, <https://doi.org/10/fnrfsz>; see also Silvia Scholtus, 'El marco hermenéutico Paulino en el proemio de Romanos 1,1-7', *DavarLogos* 14.1 (2015): 43-69.

## 4.2 Advocates of the In-Group and Ethnic Interpretation

Scholars advocating the in-group and ethnic interpretation of Romans 1:13b are more likely to highlight the pertinence of verse 14a. But in doing so, they have not put this interpretation of verse 13b on its strongest footing. Their interpretation becomes stronger, however, given (1) the fuller picture of the *τὲ καὶ* construction in Paul discussed above, (2) the variety of complements Paul gives *ὀφειλέτης*, (3) the explanatory relationship of verse 14 to verse 13, and (4) the clearly personal focus of the language that appears with the *τὲ καὶ* constructions in verse 14.

### 4.2.1 Runar Thorsteinsson

Runar Thorsteinsson argues that repunctuating Romans 1:13-15 clarifies how verse 14a specifies the addressees in verse 13b.<sup>51</sup> Thorsteinsson recommends multiple changes to the punctuation of verses 13-15 in NA28.<sup>52</sup> But the key change relevant to the implied audience of Romans is that Thorsteinsson exchanges the full stop after verse 13 for a comma and instead recommends a full stop after *ἀνοήτοις* ('to the foolish') in verse 14a.<sup>53</sup> This alteration clarifies how the datives in verse 14a stand in apposition to *ἔθνεσιν* in verse 13b.

Thorsteinsson's recommendation has advantages.<sup>54</sup> But it also has two material difficulties.<sup>55</sup> First, Thorsteinsson selectively references other *τὲ καὶ* constructions in Paul.<sup>56</sup> Second, Thorsteinsson's suggested repunctuation is actually unnecessary to demonstrate a relationship between *Ἑλλησίν ... βαρβάρους, σοφοῖς ... ἀνοήτοις* ('to Greeks ... to barbarians, to wise ... to foolish') in verse 14a and *ἔθνεσιν* in verse 13b. Whichever punctuation one adopts, the text already signals a connection between verses 13b and 14a, as argued below.

### 4.2.2 Andrew Das

Andrew Das highlights the benefits of Thorsteinsson's punctuation proposal and appeals to Thorsteinsson's same parallels for the *τὲ καὶ* construction.<sup>57</sup> Thus, Das's argument assumes Thorsteinsson's difficulties. To Das's credit, however, he

---

51. Thorsteinsson, *Interlocutor*, 43–45, 106–109; Thorsteinsson, 'Missionary Duty', 545–547.

52. NA28 retains the punctuation in NA27, which Thorsteinsson cites. 'Missionary Duty', 533 n7; see also Thorsteinsson, *Interlocutor*, 43.

53. Thorsteinsson, 'Missionary Duty', 539–544.

54. E.g. Thorsteinsson, 'Missionary Duty', 535–539; see also Das, *Romans Debate*, 62.

55. And weaknesses like these have allowed Watson to contest Thorsteinsson's observations. See Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 188–191; cf. Watson, *Sociological Approach*, 102–105.

56. E.g. Thorsteinsson, 'Missionary Duty', 540.

57. Das, *Romans Debate*, 61–62.



stresses the relevance of the τὲ καὶ construction more than Thorsteinsson does.<sup>58</sup> But only two of Thorsteinsson and Das's examples are from Romans (2:9-10), and Das's conclusion that 'groups linked appositionally by τὲ καὶ modify the *preceding noun*' is not universally true for τὲ καὶ in Paul.<sup>59</sup>

In Romans 3:9, the τὲ καὶ construction appears *before* the element that it specifies (Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας πάντας; 'all – namely, Jew and Greek'). As shown in Table 1, the same may also happen in Romans 10:12 (reading 2), 2 Corinthians 12:12 (reading 4), and Philippians 1:7 (reading 2). Das avoids saying that the τὲ καὶ construction *always* follows what it specifies. Yet the force of the τὲ καὶ construction has less to do with the order of the text than one might suspect from how Das stresses this sequencing in his comments on Romans 2:9-10.

#### 4.2.3 Scholars Who Bypass τὲ καὶ

Other scholars support the in-group and ethnic interpretation of Romans 1:13b without reference to the τὲ καὶ constructions in verse 14. In so doing, these scholars may assume the details of others' work (Paula Fredriksen, Rafael Rodríguez), or they may leave the significance of the τὲ καὶ constructions wholly unaddressed (Stanley Stowers).

For Fredriksen, two factors principally support the in-group and ethnic reading of Romans 1:13b. One is the general body of argument assembled by Thorsteinsson.<sup>60</sup> The other is Fredriksen's conviction that ἔθνη is necessarily personal rather than geographic.<sup>61</sup> Yet neither Fredriksen nor her sources clearly show why ἔθνη in Romans 1:13b cannot function as a geographic metonymy.

Rodríguez more asserts than argues that Romans 1:13-14 describes the letter's audience as gentiles.<sup>62</sup> Quoting Das, Rodríguez acknowledges the essential element of Thorsteinsson's punctuation for verses 13-14.<sup>63</sup> Yet Rodríguez's commentary does not follow this punctuation.<sup>64</sup> So, Rodríguez interprets Romans 1:13-14 to imply a purely gentile audience, but he does not detail his rationale for this reading.

Stowers asserts that "Greeks and barbarians, wise and foolish" is another way of saying gentiles. For Paul these categories encompass all of the non-Jewish

58. Das, *Romans Debate*, 62; Thorsteinsson, 'Missionary Duty', 540.

59. Das, *Romans Debate*, 62; italics original.

60. E.g. see Fredriksen, *Paul*, 246–247.

61. Fredriksen, *Paul*, 155–156.

62. Rodríguez, *You Call Yourself*, 19–22, 197, 233, 261.

63. Rodríguez, *You Call Yourself*, 9.

64. Rodríguez, *You Call Yourself*, 19–22.

peoples.’<sup>65</sup> Citing Romans 1:14, Stowers likens how both Josephus and Paul ‘[make] Greeks the representative gentiles’.<sup>66</sup> In so doing, however, Stowers overrepresents how closely Romans 1:14 describes the ἔθνη in general, as noted below.<sup>67</sup>

## 5. An Upgraded Case for the In-Group and Ethnic Interpretation

Because of these challenges in recent readings of Romans 1:13-14, it is necessary to articulate a better rationale for how these verses construct the audience as gentiles. In short, the punctuation of these verses is an important question. But attention to the total profile of τὲ καὶ in Paul grounds these verses’ construction of the audience as gentiles in the words of the text, not in the punctuation later added to it. Given this profile, the cased elements that τὲ καὶ unites in Romans 1:14a have the dative case due to

- their apposition to ἔθνεσιν in verse 13b,
- their attraction to the case of ἔθνεσιν in verse 13b, while they more closely modify ὀφειλέτης in verse 14b, or
- lexical pressure from ὀφειλέτης for a dative complement.

Pauline usage outside Romans 1:14a shows that, when case is an attribute of the elements in the τὲ καὶ construction and what they specify, the specifiers’ case often matches that of the specified. If this matching occurs in Romans 1:14a, its datives appositionally specify ἔθνεσιν and come in the same clause (per Thorsteinsson’s punctuation).

Other factors, however, may influence the case of the elements in a τὲ καὶ construction. The case may derive from attraction of the elements in the τὲ καὶ construction to the case of another entity. If attraction explains the dative case of the nominals in Romans 1:14a, then it is attraction towards ἔθνεσιν and away from ὀφειλέτης. Romans 1:14a may specify Paul’s indebtedness (v. 14b). But the attraction of the case of the nominals in verse 14a towards ἔθνεσιν means that they partially qualify ἔθνεσιν, even if they primarily specify ὀφειλέτης.<sup>68</sup>

Alternatively, the case of the elements in a τὲ καὶ construction may derive from lexical or syntactic pressure, for example, from ὀφειλέτης in Romans 1:14. Advocates of the intra-group and geographic reading must rely on this explanation of the datives in Romans 1:14a. But even this reading does not ultimately support

---

65. Stowers, *Rereading*, 44.

66. Stowers, *Rereading*, 89.

67. Similarly difficult is Fredriksen’s suggestion that, in Rom 1:14, ‘Paul ... distinguish[es] between “Greeks” and “barbarians,” meaning “all gentiles”’. *Paul*, 114.

68. Cf. Smyth §926.b and the cross-references there.

their position for three reasons. First, Paul does not always give ὀφειλέτης a dative complement. Second, Paul's indebtedness (v. 14) explains his desire to visit Rome (v. 13). And third, Paul's terminology in verse 14a associates the ἔθνη with people, not places.

### 5.1 Possible Complements of ὀφειλέτης

In general, ὀφειλέτης can take either a genitive or a dative complement, and Romans clearly attests both outside 1:14 (8:12; 15:27).<sup>69</sup> Galatians 5:3 also complements ὀφειλέτης only with an infinitival phrase. Thus, lexical pressure might determine the case of the elements in a τὲ καί construction. But Paul did not find this lexical pressure sufficient to require ὀφειλέτης to have a dative complement. For him, whether to give ὀφειλέτης a dative, genitive, or infinitive complement depended on other contextual factors.

Consequently, the datives in Romans 1:14 might simply be complements for ὀφειλέτης. But the fact that they do not appear in the genitive raises the question of whether these complements might, even in this scenario, evidence attraction towards ἔθνεσιν. Similarly, the fact that Paul elsewhere complements ὀφειλέτης only with an infinitival phrase raises the question of whether he might do so also in Romans 1:14-15.<sup>70</sup> And if ὀφειλέτης in Romans 1:14 either has only an infinitive complement or has complements united by τὲ καί whose case has been attracted to that of ἔθνεσιν, the text still attests to Paul's construction of his audience as exclusively gentile.

By contrast, proponents of the mixed-audience hypothesis must tread an extraordinarily narrow path to support their argument – one in which the elements of the τὲ καί constructions in Romans 1:14a *must* complement ὀφειλέτης and *must* take their dative case without influence from ἔθνεσιν. This path, however, narrows to the point of impassability on consideration of the explanatory function that verse 14 has to verse 13 and how Paul associates the ἔθνη with people, not places.

### 5.2 Paul's Indebtedness Explains His Wanting to Visit Rome

Romans 1:13 compares Paul's audience to τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη. Verse 14a may describe the larger category of τὰ ... ἔθνη ('the ... gentiles') so that Paul's audience falls

69. BDAG, s.v. ὀφειλέτης; Robertson, *Grammar*, 536–537; cf. BDF §190.1; Turner, *Syntax*, 239.

70. This possibility generally aligns with Thorsteinsson's recommended punctuation. 'Missionary Duty', 539–44. But space precludes critical engagement with Thorsteinsson's proposal on this point.

within this group.<sup>71</sup> Or verse 14a may exclude Paul's audience and instead define τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη, among whom Paul's audience is not.<sup>72</sup>

Either way, Paul desires καρπός ('fruit') among his audience καθὼς καί ('just as also') among τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη. And the transition between verses 13-14 assumes that Paul's indebtedness to the entities he mentions implies his responsibility also ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίσασθαι (v. 15; 'to bring good news to you who are in Rome').<sup>73</sup> Verse 14, therefore, gives background information to paratactically explain verse 13.<sup>74</sup>

Because verse 14 explains verse 13, the elements that verse 14a unites with τὸ καί naturally align with ἔθνεσιν in verse 13b. The nominals in Romans 1:14a may have the dative case purely under lexical pressure from ὀφειλέτης. But these entities describe either τὰ ... ἔθνη, including Paul's audience, or τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη who resemble rather than include his audience. Consequently, whatever sense one assigns to ἔθνεσιν in verse 13b (whether ethnic or geographic), the same force will naturally apply to Ἑλλησίν ... βαρβάρους, σοφοῖς ... ἀνοήτοις in verse 14a, and vice versa.

### 5.3 Paul Associates the ἔθνη with People, not Places

A consistently geographic interpretation of Romans 1:13-14 proves unsustainable, however, because of the strongly personal connotations of both ἔθνος and the language of verse 14. Elsewhere in Romans, one is hard pressed to find any text where ἔθνος functions as a geographic metonymy (see 2:14; 3:29; 4:17-18; 9:24,30;

71. Marc J. Debanné, *Enthymemes in the Letters of Paul*, LNTS 303 (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 172; cf. Gignac, 'Espaces géographiques et théologiques', 402.

72. Das, *Romans Debate*, 61 n31; Elliott, *Rhetoric of Romans*, 82-83; Harrison, 'Paul's "Indebtedness"', 336-337; Schnabel, *An die Römer*, 160; Thorsteinsson, *Interlocutor*, 46.

73. Cf. Debanné, *Enthymemes*, 172. Simply fulfilling his responsibility may be Paul's goal. More likely, however, Paul considers it a stepping stone towards executing his mission to the Spanish frontier (cf. Rom 15:22-29). Jewett, *Romans*, 79, 111-113, 128-130; Sigfred Pedersen, 'Theologische Überlegungen zur Isagogik des Römerbriefs', *ZNW* 76 (1985): 47-67, <https://doi.org/10/cdq54c>; Stanley E. Porter, 'Did Paul Have Opponents in Rome and What Were They Opposing?', in *Paul and His Opponents*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, *Pauline Studies* 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 149-168, <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047416074>; Hans Windisch, 'βάρβαρος', *TDNT* 1:552-553; cf. Das, 'You Gentiles', 103-104; Harrison, 'Paul's "Indebtedness"', 332-333, 337-339; Weima, 'Preaching the Gospel', 357-358; Weima, 'The Reason for Romans', 27.

74. Cf. Joseph E. Grimes, *The Thread of Discourse*, *Janua Linguarum Minor* 207 (Berlin: Mouton, 1975), 55-60, 82-91, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110886474>; Robert E. Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse*, 2nd ed., *Topics in Language and Linguistics* (New York: Plenum, 1996), 71-74, 109-111; Moo, *Romans*, 61. For a helpful structural analysis, see Weima, 'Preaching the Gospel', 351, 355; Weima, 'The Reason for Romans', 23-24.

10:19; 11:11-13; 15:8-12,16,18; 16:4). A geographic metonymy *might* be possible in 1:5-6, 2:24, 11:25, 15:27, or 16:26. But even here, an ethnic force for ἔθνος is certainly possible, and even probable.<sup>75</sup>

Additionally, verse 14's language resists geographic interpretation and much more naturally exhibits a personal focus. This personal focus is apparent because of how (1) interpreters find it difficult to avoid reading verse 14 personally, (2) similar language to that of verse 14 tends to be personal elsewhere, and (3) Paul elsewhere uses place names when he wants to mention locations.

First, as noted above, Watson does not explicitly address how his intra-group and geographic reading of Romans 1:13b works in verse 14. But the text still pulls Cranfield into a personal reading of Ἑλλησίν ... βαρβάρους, σοφοῖς ... ἀνοήτοις in verse 14a.<sup>76</sup> Support for the intra-group and geographic reading of verse 13b partly comes from taking less than full account of verse 14a. Yet Cranfield's reading of verse 14a shows how that language lends itself to a personal interpretation. On more thorough analysis of the text, therefore, Cranfield's own reading of verse 14a becomes an argument against his reading of verse 13b and for the alternative in-group and ethnic interpretation.

Second, Cranfield's personal reading of Ἑλλησίν ... βαρβάρους, σοφοῖς ... ἀνοήτοις in 1:14a appears to be correct because, where they appear elsewhere in Romans, these terms always describe persons rather than places. Other than in 1:14, Ἕλληνα ('Greek') always appears with Ἰουδαῖος ('Jew'; 1:16; 2:9-10; 3:9; 10:12). Σοφός too always describes a personal entity rather than a place (1:22; 16:19,27). Βάρβαρος ('barbarian') and ἀνόητος ('foolish') occur only once in Romans, but both clearly describe personal status everywhere else in the NT (Luke 24:25; Acts 28:2, 4; 1 Cor 14:11; Gal 3:1, 3; Col 3:11; 1 Tim 6:9; Tit 3:3). Consequently, the four specifiers in Romans 1:14a strongly imply personal rather than geographic referents.

Similarly, in Romans 1:14b, Paul claims he is an ὀφειλέτης. Elsewhere in Romans, language from this root always signals indebtedness to personal rather than geographic entities (4:4; 8:12; 13:7-8; 15:1,27).<sup>77</sup> Consequently, because Paul is contemplating obligation, Ἑλλησίν ... βαρβάρους, σοφοῖς ... ἀνοήτοις are more likely to have personal rather than geographic referents.

---

75. E.g. see the response to Watson about Rom 1:5-6 above and Cranfield, *Romans*, 171, 572-577, 773-774, 811-812. Thus, Fredriksen's assessment of the personal force of ἔθνη in Romans is ultimately correct. *Paul*, 155-156.

76. E.g. Cranfield, *Romans*, 83-85; see also Schnabel, *An die Römer*, 160-162.

77. See also Harrison, 'Paul's "Indebtedness"'; Jewett, *Romans*, 493-494.

Third, had Paul wanted to stress his addressees' spatial location at the end of Romans 1:13, Romans shows he has no shortage of place names whereby he could do that (e.g. 1:7,15; 15:19,24-26,28,31; 16:1,5). Because Paul does not use this explicitly geographic language in 1:13-14, however, a geographic metonymy there becomes less likely. On the other hand, Paul's choice of language that elsewhere has heavily personal associations suggests that one may best understand this language within that domain.

## 6. Conclusion

In summary, scholars often hypothesise for Romans an implied audience with both Jews and gentiles. This hypothesis has challenges, however, and the possibility that the implied audience may include only gentiles has much to commend itself. Central to this discussion is the interpretation of Romans 1:13-14. Scholars advocating an exclusively gentile implied audience have found the better reading of these verses. But none of the main advocates for this hypothesis puts their interpretation of Romans 1:13-14 on its strongest footing.

A full profile of τὸ καί in Paul shows that most explanations of the dative case in verse 14a directly support the in-group and ethnic reading of Romans 1:13b. The only possibility for sustaining the intra-group and geographic reading is by treating the dative elements in verse 14a as specifying ὀφειλέτης and as deriving their case solely from the lexical pressure that ὀφειλέτης exerts. Yet Paul could have given ὀφειλέτης a genitive or only an infinitive complement. In addition, verse 14 explains verse 13, and the key terminology in verses 13-14 is elsewhere consistently personal (ἔθνος, the elements τὸ καί unites, ὀφειλέτης). Consequently, Romans 1:13b-14 strongly supports the hypothesis that the letter has an exclusively gentile implied audience.

## Bibliography

- Barclay, John M. G. *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. BNTC. London: Continuum, 1973.
- Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert Walter Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. *The Epistle to the Philippians*. BNTC. London: Continuum, 1997.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. TNTC 6. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963.
- Byrskog, Samuel. 'Epistolography, Rhetoric and Letter Prescript: Romans 1.1-7 as a Test Case'. *JSNT* 19 (1997): 27-46. <https://doi.org/10/fnrfsz>.
- Calvin, John. *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*. Translated by John Pringle. 2 vols. Calvin's Commentaries. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1848-1849.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Rev. ed. 2 vols. ICC. 1975; repr., New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

- Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, ed. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by Frederick W. Danker. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Das, A. Andrew. *Paul and the Jews*. Library of Pauline Studies. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- . “‘Praise the Lord, All You Gentiles’: The Encoded Audience of Romans 15.7-13”. *JSNT* 34 (2011): 90-110. <https://doi.org/10/bwppkc>.
- . *Solving the Romans Debate*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2007.
- Debanné, Marc J. *Enthymemes in the Letters of Paul*. LNTS 303. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Romans*. WBC 38. Dallas: Word, 1988.
- Elliott, Neil. “‘Blasphemed among the Nations’”: Pursuing an Anti-Imperial “Intertextuality” in Romans’. Pages 213-33 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture*. Edited by Christopher D. Stanley and Stanley E. Porter. SBLSymS 50. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- . *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul’s Dialog with Judaism*. LNTS/JSNTSup 45. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 32. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9780300261943>.
- . *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Fredriksen, Paula. *Paul: The Pagans’ Apostle*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.12987/yale/9780300225884.001.0001>.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians: Translated with Introduction, Notes and Commentary*. AB 32A. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Garland, David E. *2 Corinthians*. NAC 29. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. ‘The Mission of God in Paul’s Letter to the Romans’. Pages 65-75 in *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Theology, and Practice*. Edited by Trevor J. Burke and Brian S. Rosner. LNTS. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2011.
- . “‘To Preach the Gospel’”: Romans 1,15 and the Purposes of Romans’. Pages 179-95 in *The Letter to the Romans*. Edited by Udo Schnelle. BETL 226. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- . ‘We, They, and All in Paul’s Letter to the Romans’. *WW* 39 (2019): 263-273.
- Gignac, Alain. ‘Espaces géographiques et théologiques en Rm 1:1-15 et 15:14-33: regard narratologique sur la “topologie” paulinienne’. *BibInt* 14.4 (2006): 385-409. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156851506777825269>.
- Grimes, Joseph E. *The Thread of Discourse*. Janua Linguarum Minor 207. Berlin: Mouton, 1975. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110886474>.
- Hansen, G. Walter. *The Letter to the Philippians*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Harris, Murray J. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Harrison, James R. ‘Paul’s “Indebtedness” to the Barbarian (Rom 1:14) in Latin West Perspective’. *NovT* 55 (2013): 311-348. <https://doi.org/10/gf7763>.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2007.
- Kruger, M. A. ‘TINA KARPON, “Some Fruit” in Romans 1:13’. *WTJ* 49 (1987): 167-173.
- Kruse, Colin G. *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- . *2 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*. 2nd ed. TNTC 8. Nottingham: InterVarsity Press, 2015.
- Longacre, Robert E. *The Grammar of Discourse*. 2nd ed. Topics in Language and Linguistics. New York: Plenum, 1996.

- Longenecker, Richard N. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Martin, Ralph P. '2 Corinthians'. Pages 265–373 in *1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians*. Cornerstone Biblical Commentary. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House, 2009.
- Matera, Frank J. *II Corinthians: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- Minor, Mitzi L. *2 Corinthians*. SHBC. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2009.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Morris, Leon. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Nestle, Eberhard, Erwin Nestle, Kurt Aland, and Barbara Aland, ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2013.
- Osborne, Grant R. *Romans*. InterVarsity Press New Testament Commentary Series 6. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Pedersen, Sigfred. 'Theologische Überlegungen zur Isagogik des Römerbriefs'. *ZNW* 76 (1985): 47–67. <https://doi.org/10/cdq54c>.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1915.
- Porter, Stanley E. 'Did Paul Have Opponents in Rome and What Were They Opposing?' Pages 149–168 in *Paul and His Opponents*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Pauline Studies 2. Leiden: Brill, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047416074>.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. 4th ed. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923.
- Robertson, A. T. and Alfred Plummer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. 2nd ed. ICC. 1914; repr., Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1929.
- Rodríguez, Rafael. *If You Call Yourself a Jew: Reappraising Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1cgf6rb>.
- Rodríguez, Rafael and Matthew Thiessen, ed. *The So-Called Jew in Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1b3t70f>.
- Sanday, William and Arthur C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 5th ed. ICC 32. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1899.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. 2 vols. Historisch Theologische Auslegung. Witten: Brockhaus, 2015–2016.
- Scholtus, Silvia. 'El marco hermenéutico Paulino en el proemio de Romanos 1,1-7'. *DaLo* 14.1 (2015): 43–69.
- Seifrid, Mark A. *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Edited by Gordon Messing. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Stark, J. David. 'Rewriting Prophets in the Corinthian Correspondence: A Window on Paul's Hermeneutic'. *BBR* 22 (2012): 225–49.
- Stowers, Stanley K. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Thiessen, Matthew. 'Paul's Argument against Gentile Circumcision in Romans 2:17-29'. *NovT* 56 (2014): 373–391. <https://doi.org/10/gphg9h>.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Thorsteinsson, Runar M. *Paul's Interlocutor in Romans 2: Function and Identity in the Context of Ancient Epistolography*. ConBNT 40. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2015.



- . 'Paul's Missionary Duty towards Gentiles in Rome: A Note on the Punctuation and Syntax of Rom 1.13-15'. *NTS* 48 (2002): 531-547. <https://doi.org/10/cb7qbp>.
- Thrall, Margaret. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. 2nd ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Tobin, Thomas H. *Paul's Rhetoric in Its Contexts: The Argument of Romans*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Turner, Nigel. *Syntax*. Vol. 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by James Hope Moulton. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1908-1976.
- Vincent, Marvin R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1897.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Watson, Francis. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach*. SNTSMS 56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511555138>.
- . *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Weima, Jeffrey A. D. 'Preaching the Gospel in Rome: A Study of the Epistolary Framework of Romans'. Pages 337-366 in *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*. Edited by Peter Richardson and L. Ann Jervis. JSNTSup 108. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- . 'The Reason for Romans: The Evidence of Its Epistolary Framework (1:1-15; 15:14-16:27)'. *RevExp* 100 (2003): 17-33. <https://doi.org/10/gphg9f>.
- Windisch, Hans. 'βάρβαρος'. *TDNT* 1: 546-553.
- Witherington, Ben, III. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Zerwick, Maximilian. *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples*. Translated by Joseph Smith. SPIB 114. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.