

## **READING ROMANS MISSIOLOGICALLY**

Dr. William B. Barclay  
Gordon College, Wenham, Maryland USA  
Barclay@gordon.edu

Delivered at Evangelical Theological Society, November 1999

The thesis of this paper is that Paul wrote the letter to the Romans to fulfill his missiological and eschatological purposes of taking the gospel to the ends of the earth. From beginning to end, Paul is attempting to instill in the Roman Christians a missions vision. On the one hand, Paul is seeking the support of the Romans for his own missions activity both in Rome and beyond. On the other hand, Paul is attempting to renew the missions vigor of the Romans themselves, so that they, both independently and in conjunction with Paul himself, will seek to fulfill Old Testament eschatological prophecy in being a light to the Gentiles.

### **Interpretations of Romans**

Interpretations of Romans in the past hundred years have swung between two poles: The older, more traditional interpretation treats Romans as a theological treatise or as Paul's mature reflection on essential Christianity;<sup>1</sup> a more recent interpretation, and one that appears to be winning the day, is that Paul wrote Romans to unify Jewish and Gentile believers in Rome.<sup>2</sup> Both of these interpretations have a number of strengths, but also some insurmountable weaknesses.

The strengths and weaknesses of the older interpretation are well-rehearsed, so I will list them quickly. The strengths: As Moo and others have pointed out, Romans has the quality of a tractate letter.<sup>3</sup> Romans has a flow to it, that, as Moo puts it, "develops by its own internal logic."<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, Paul does not directly mention any particular problem in the Roman churches. It is extremely difficult, therefore, based on the text of Romans itself to determine what situation in Rome led Paul to write Romans.

The problems with understanding Romans as a theological treatise are as follows: Not all theological topics are covered. If Paul is attempting to lay out his views of essential theology there are glaring omissions, such as his views on Christology and a clearly developed eschatology or ecclesiology.<sup>5</sup> A second problem with the theological treatise view is that it fails to give a plausible answer to the question of why Paul sent this letter to Rome.<sup>6</sup> Finally, as Donfried and others have pointed out, all of the letters of Paul speak to specific situations in the

lives of the addressees.<sup>7</sup> Certainly it is possible to see Romans as standing alone in this sense, but the burden of proof rests on those who would attempt to do so, and given the nature of the Pauline letters that we do have, we should continue to search for a plausible situation in Rome that, at least in part, gave rise to Romans.

The second interpretation, the one that is seemingly the most dominant today, is that Romans addresses the problem of ethnic division in the Roman house churches. This view, too, has its strengths and weaknesses.

Strengths include the following:

a. The theme of unity is present throughout Romans, particularly the unity of Jews and Gentiles:<sup>8</sup> In the thesis statement in 1:16-17, Paul proclaims that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation for everyone who believes, first for the Jew, but also for the Gentile. From 1:18-3:20, Paul levels both Gentile and Jew, all are under sin--Gentiles in 1:18-32; Jews in 2:1 (or possibly 2:17) to 3:8.<sup>9</sup> From 3:21 to 4:25 Paul declares the good news, namely, that now the righteousness of God has been made known, that this righteousness extends to both Jews and Gentiles so that both circumcised and uncircumcised can be children of Abraham and heirs of God's promises to him. The Jew/Gentile theme appears again in chapters 9-11, where Paul deals with the place of Israel and contains the warning that ingrafted Gentiles are not to boast over the broken off natural branches. Finally, chapters 12-15 contain numerous exhortations detailing how believers are to live within the body of Christ: They are not to think of themselves more highly than they ought, are to use their gifts for the good of the body, to be devoted to one another in brotherly love, to rejoice and to mourn with one another, to love one another and so fulfill the law and finally to welcome one another just as Christ has welcomed them.<sup>10</sup>

b. Paul does address the weak and the strong in chapter 14. The use in verse 14 of the term koinos, a word commonly used to refer to food prohibited under Mosaic law, may very well indicate that there were tensions between Jews and Gentiles over the issue of table fellowship.<sup>11</sup>

c. Seeing Romans as addressing the problem of ethnic unity, allows us to understand Romans as being motivated not simply by Paul's own situation, but also by the situation of the Romans themselves. This fulfills the Donfried criterion.

d. This interpretation also has the strength of being able to posit a historical cause for division, namely, the lapse of the edict of Claudius and the return of Jews/Jewish Christians to Rome.<sup>12</sup> I'll return to this historical setting below.

On the other hand, there are, it seems to me, insurmountable problems with this view:

a. Paul never explicitly addresses a problem of division. When reading Romans in light of 1 Corinthians or Galatians, this omission seems glaring. In addition, Paul only comes to his exhortation to welcome one another at the end of the letter. If this were the central concern, why does he wait so long to address it?<sup>13</sup>

b. The ethnic tensions view causes interpreters either to overplay the problem of divisions in the Roman churches and to give the problem an undue emphasis that seems out of line with the weight that Paul affords to it. Or, it causes interpreters to waffle on precisely how serious the divisions were in Rome. Thomas Schreiner, for instance, in his otherwise outstanding commentary, seemingly contradicts himself on this issue within the space of only two pages. On the one hand, on p. 20, he states judiciously that “the tensions in Rome should not be exaggerated.” But then on p. 22, when describing that Paul wanted a unified church in Rome so that they could be a base for his mission to Spain, Schreiner writes, “Rome could scarcely be a sending base if the churches were torn apart by strife.” It seems to me that one is forced to engage in this kind of back and forth maneuver if one places an undue emphasis on division. I agree with Moo’s judgment that ethnic problems within the Roman churches should not be exaggerated but rather (if they existed) reflected some of the normal tensions of churches in the first century.<sup>14</sup> But these tensions can not be seen as a central concern of the letter.

c. Positing the lapse of Claudius’ edict and the return of Jewish Christians to Rome is itself beset with innumerable historical difficulties. A typical reading of the historical situation goes as follows: We know historically, both from Acts (18:2) but also from Suetonius (*Life of Claudius* 25.2), that the emperor Claudius issued an edict that expelled Jews from Rome. According to Suetonius, this edict was the result of “the constant rioting of Jews because of the instigation of Chrestos,” whom many historians agree to be Christ. Jewish Christians, therefore, would have been forced to leave Rome, evidenced by the presence of Aquila and Priscilla in Corinth, leaving Gentiles in charge of the Roman churches. When Jews returned approximately five years later, the situation would have been much different. After a period of Gentile dominance, the Jewish distinctives had been diminished and the Gentiles turned proud in their attitudes toward their Jewish brothers and sisters. Thus, Paul exhorts the Gentiles not to be arrogant and not to boast over the Jewish branches (11:18).

There are many problems, however, with this historical reconstruction. Many historians doubt that all, or even a majority, of Jews were expelled from Rome. Indeed, a number of facts seem to preclude this. According to Mary Smallwood<sup>15</sup> and more recently Mark Nanos,<sup>16</sup> the omission of this incident by Tacitus indicates that

Claudius' action was relatively small scale.<sup>17</sup> This incident is also not recorded in Josephus, although Orosius asserts that Josephus does mention it. Josephus could have referred to it in a non-extant writing, but it is equally possible that Orosius is in error.<sup>18</sup> Is it possible that Tacitus and probably also Josephus failed to make mention of such a monumental incident as one in which all the Jews were expelled from Rome? Furthermore, as Robert Hoerber and Smallwood both point out, it is much more in line with Roman policy of the day toward the Jews to punish the perpetrators, not expel entire communities.<sup>19</sup> We should probably, therefore, read the panta in Acts 18:2, which says that Claudius ordered all Jews to leave Rome, as we do in many other contexts in Acts, as “many” or perhaps even “some.”<sup>20</sup> It is difficult to imagine, for instance, all the four-footed animals of the earth being on Peter's sheet in Acts 10:12. (See the convincing discussion of Hoerber on Luke's use of “all” in Acts; 692-694.) We can seriously doubt, therefore, whether the ethnic make-up of the Roman churches would have changed all that much, at least to the point that it would have caused significant upheaval when Jews like Aquila and Priscilla returned after Claudius died.

To read Romans, then, as a response to Jew/Gentile tensions which arose due to Claudius' edict does not do justice either to the text of Romans or the historical situation.

### **The Missiological Message of Romans**

In his book *Gospel and Mission in the Writings of Paul*, O'Brien points out that there has been a paradigm shift among biblical scholars toward understanding Paul as both a missionary and a theologian.<sup>21</sup> This shift has affected interpretations of Romans, as its missiological thrust has increasingly been recognized. In an influential article, Nils Dahl argued that we need to understand Paul's theology in Romans as being a “missionary theology.”<sup>22</sup> Robert Jewett, likewise, through a series of articles has brought attention to Paul's “missionary strategy” in Romans.<sup>23</sup> In his article, “Paul, Phoebe and the Spanish Mission,” he states, “the awareness is dawning in current scholarship that Paul should be understood not simply as a theologian and writer of letters but as a self-supporting missionary actively engaged in cooperative projects with a number of groups and individuals” (142). The recent commentaries of Gruenler, Dunn and Moo also highlight this missions emphasis. Gruenler asserts that Romans is “a quintessential missionary document.”<sup>24</sup> Dunn argues that, in addition to apologetic and pastoral purposes, a

missiological purpose is central to understand Paul's reason for writing Romans.<sup>25</sup> And Moo writes that the various purposes of Paul for writing Romans share a common denominator, namely, Paul's missionary situation.<sup>26</sup>

There is little debate, in fact, that Romans reflects Paul's own missionary situation and is written in part to achieve his missiological goals. He clearly wants to use Rome as a base of missions operation to Spain (15:24). He looks forward to his trip to Jerusalem where much of his missionary activity will come to a head, and wants at the very least the prayer support of the Romans for that endeavor (15:25-32). It is also possible that Paul looks forward to coming to Rome in part to win converts there who can be added to the church in Rome (as some understand Paul's desire to have "fruit" among them in 1:13<sup>27</sup>).

There are numerous other clues in the letter that indicate that Paul's purpose in Romans is primarily missiological. I will briefly mention several.

- a. First, the expression "to bring about the obedience of faith among the Gentiles" is repeated almost word for word in the salutation at the beginning of the letter (1:5) and in the doxology at the end (16:26), forming an inclusio. A similar phrase, "to bring about the obedience of the Gentiles" is also found in 15:18 in the midst of Paul's discussion of his own ministry. Thus, Paul's goal of taking the gospel to the Gentiles frames the discussion of the entire letter.
- b. Second, the two times where Paul comes closest to giving us a clue as to his purposes--1:14-15 and 15:15 (where he says that he has written boldly as a reminder)--also come in contexts dealing with Paul's preaching of the gospel and his ministry to the Gentiles.
- c. Third, Paul's use of the Old Testament indicates that he continually gravitates to those passages that highlight the gospel going to the Gentiles or that reflect Paul's understanding of his own mission in light of salvation history. Richard Hays states, "Isaiah offers the clearest expression in the Old Testament of a universalistic, eschatological vision in which the restoration of Israel in Zion is accompanied by an ingathering of Gentiles to worship the Lord; that is why the book is both statistically and substantively the most important scriptural source for Paul."<sup>28</sup> Many of those references are in Romans. I would argue, along with James Scott and others, that Paul's use of Deuteronomy in Romans reflects a similar eschatological understanding of his ministry.<sup>29</sup>
- d. Fourth, Roger Aus in an article twenty years ago argued persuasively that Spain in Paul's day is the equivalent of Tarshish in the Old Testament. Thus, Paul's desire to take the gospel to Spain would fulfill the vision of Isaiah 66 of the gospel going to Tarshish, which was symbolically "the ends of the earth."<sup>30</sup> I would disagree with Aus that

Paul expected the Parousia immediately after taking the gospel to Spain. Nonetheless, Aus's study highlights for us the importance of Rome in Paul's missiological and eschatological understanding.

The missiological thrust of Romans, then, seems clear. Yet, there are still lingering questions: 1) Did Paul write Romans only with a view to his own missiological purposes, or were there also circumstances in Rome that Paul was addressing? 2) Is a missiological purpose sufficient to account for the totality of the argument in Romans? 3) Is the missiological thrust of Romans related simply to Paul's own ministry and his desire for their support, or is Paul also attempting to spur the Roman believers on to actively engage in their own evangelistic work?

### **Another Look at the Historical Setting**

I propose that we return to the edict of Claudius and look afresh at this event as a possible backdrop for Romans. I have already argued that there are major problems with seeing the edict as the cause of tensions in the Roman churches. A more plausible route of inquiry, it seems to me, is to ask the question, What effect did the edict have on the Roman Christians' vision and zeal for evangelistic activity? This is an important question for a number of reasons: First, it seems clear that the edict was a response to zealous Christian evangelism and the disturbance it caused among a certain Jewish sector or sectors in Rome. The language of Suetonius is strong: The rioting among Jews was the result of "the instigation of Chrestus" (impulsore Chresto). Suetonius' understanding seems to have been that Christ himself was the instigator,<sup>31</sup> which is clearly wrong (and also right, I suppose). But his description does point to the fact that someone is doing the instigating. Mary Smallwood (211) suggests that the "instigators" were Jewish Christian missionaries from outside Rome, which is possible, but given the fact that Aquila and Priscilla were among those expelled, it seems likely that many from within Rome were involved in proclaiming Christ. Second, Robert Hoerber, drawing on texts from Josephus, Philo, Tacitus, Dio Cassius, and others, makes the point that Roman policy at this time was benevolent toward Judaism, yet drew the line when it came to zealous proselytism (694).

In light of the Jewish rioting and the expulsion of some Jews that was the result of Christian evangelism, the Christians in Rome would have faced some daunting questions: Should we continue to evangelize? What should be our attitude and response toward unbelieving Jews, given our past experience with them? These are the precise questions that Paul addresses in Romans, giving them a somewhat unique response (though with plenty of Old Testament support and precedent): While the Jews have place of primacy in terms of God's original call and

purposes, and so are not to be despised, God's purposes for the Jews can now best be accomplished by the gospel going to the Gentiles. The salvation of the Gentiles will lead to the salvation of Jews, as the Jews are made jealous and so come to faith in Christ. So Paul in Romans lays out not only for Gentiles, but especially for Jews who may have been hesitant to embrace it, a justification for Gentile missionary activity. Furthermore, by preaching the gospel to them he attempts to instill in them a missions vision.

In many ways, Paul's mission strategy in Romans reflects his own experience of taking the gospel first to Jews, being largely rejected by them, and then turning to the Gentiles. The mission to the Gentiles does not preclude all evangelistic activity among Jews. In Acts, Paul continued to go to synagogues even after declaring his intent to turn to the Gentiles. In the same way, Romans leaves open the door for evangelism among the Jews. But the primary vision that Paul gives to the Romans is one of world missions, taking the gospel to the ends of the inhabited earth.

This reading brings into focus what many have seen in Romans who have referred to it in one way or another as "Paul's dialogue with Judaism."<sup>32</sup> Contrary to many who understand Paul to be battling or warding off Judaizing tendencies in Rome,<sup>33</sup> there is little evidence of this type of problem. Indeed, Paul's rhetoric in Romans is much more positive with regard to the law and circumcision than it is in Galatians.<sup>34</sup> On the other hand, Paul may indeed be battling a certain sense of Jewish superiority. But it is instructive to see how Paul addresses this. Paul's frames his discussion with a Jew in Romans 2 with decided missiological overtones:

If you call yourself a Jew...if you know his will and approve of what is superior because you are instructed by the law; if you are convinced that you are a guide for the blind, a light for those who are in the dark, an instructor of the foolish... (2:18-20).

One can not help but hear in this passage echoes of Paul's own words that he has been appointed to be a light to the Gentiles.

In a soon-to-be-released book, Walt Kaiser argues that God's call to Israel includes a call to active evangelism among the Gentiles, that their mission was not to be centripetal--inward-moving and therefore passive in their role of spreading the Good News, but rather centrifugal--outward-moving and active in sharing their faith.<sup>35</sup> If he is correct, then Paul in Romans very well could be calling Jewish Christians back to the mission that many Jews had neglected, namely, that of actively taking the gospel to the Gentiles. In fact, Paul's interesting quotation of Isaiah 59:20 in Romans 11:26--"The deliverer will come FROM Zion," not TO Zion--may reflect this idea. The purpose of the Redeemer's coming is not for Zion alone, but also that the good news may radiate from Zion.

But Paul's exhortation goes both ways. Just as the Jewish believers may be loathe to embrace a mission to Gentiles, so Gentile believers, especially in light of recent history in Rome, may despise the thought of Jewish converts. So Paul exhorts the Gentile ingrafted branches not to boast over the broken-off Jewish branches (11:18). This passage is often interpreted today as an indication of ethnic tension in Rome--upity Gentiles boasting over their Jewish Christian brothers and sisters.<sup>36</sup> But this reading rips Paul's statement out of its context. Paul in chapters 9-11 is dealing with the status of UNbelieving Jews, not Jewish believers. It makes more sense then to interpret the root and branch section in light of Paul's missiology, rather than to read in disputes among believers.

### **Summary**

Let me sum up at this point by saying that the missiological thrust of Romans makes sense not only in light of Paul's own missionary activities and goals, but also in light of the situation in Rome itself. Indeed, the missiological purpose of Romans gives coherence to the entire letter. It puts into proper perspective Paul's references to Jews and Gentiles, and especially his wrestling with the status of Israel in chapters 9-11. In addition, Romans serves as a written substitute for what Paul desired to do in person--preach the gospel to the Roman believers. Why do believers need to hear the gospel? The lofty language of Romans suggests that Paul is seeking to instill in his addressees a vision for the gospel and its effects. His explication of the gospel begins with a focus on God's wrath in 1:18-3:20. The fact that Paul highlights the wrath of God, and not simply the universality of sin, draws the reader's attention not to the idea of unity, but rather to the need for provision for deliverance from God's wrath. Paul's own example as one who wishes that he himself could be accursed for the sake of his people displays his missionary passion. It is this passion for his people and the knowledge of their lost state that leads him to missionary zeal in preaching the gospel among the Gentiles so that Jews may be made jealous and come to salvation.

In chapters 5-8 Paul expounds the gospel further in terms of its effects in the lives of believers. Paul's clear intent here is to build confidence in the gospel. The gospel brings release from slavery to sin, confidence of pardon from God's condemnation, and hope of future glory. Chapters 9-11, in the midst of wrestling with the status of unbelieving Israel, continues to instill confidence in the gospel. Paul asks the question, Why have more Jews not believed the message? The answer: It is not because God's Word has failed, but rather is due to the fact that God is his sovereignty has mercy on whom he wants to have mercy and hardens whom he wants to harden. These chapters

also contain one of the most decidedly missiological passages in all of Scripture (10:14-21). The paraenetic section in 12:1-15:13, furthermore, continually points outward, never losing its missiological focus even while discussing internal relationships. I would direct you, for example, to Philip Towner's recent article in the *Fee Festschrift* on the missiological perspective of Romans 13:1-7.<sup>37</sup> The entire parenetic section, in fact, concludes in 15:7-13 with OT quotations depicting the salvation of the Gentiles.

### **Conclusion**

This leads to a final and more difficult question, which I only have time to touch on briefly. The question is, Does Paul in his letter call the Romans to active engagement in the evangelistic task? Explicitly, no; implicitly, yes. The gospel message compels its proclamation. For those who have been gripped by the gospel of grace, they are indebted, as Paul is (1:14), to making it known to others. As O'Brien states, the gospel "serves as the bridge between Paul's own missionary activity and that of others."<sup>38</sup> He continues, "The dynamic of the gospel's logic meant for those believers in Rome and for other Christians...a deeper commitment to its ongoing, powerful advance..."<sup>39</sup> I would suggest a number of avenues for study that point to Paul implicitly encouraging the Romans to evangelistic engagement: His use of autobiography in detailing his own missionary goals;<sup>40</sup> his use of the negative to begin his thesis statement, "I am not ashamed of the gospel"; his call to the Roman believers to present their bodies as living sacrifices, especially in light of Paul's own use of cultic terminology in chapters 1 and 15 when discussing his own missions endeavors. Even the historical situation leads us to conclude that Paul is attempting to spur the Roman Christians to missions work. This historical situation includes not just the situation in Rome post Claudius, but also Paul's uncertainty about whether he will be delivered from the unbelievers in Jerusalem. The Roman Christians, who occupied such a strategic place in terms of geography and prominence, must have an evangelistic zeal to take the gospel to the ends of the earth if Paul is unable to complete his journey.<sup>41</sup>

Ultimately, I agree with Thomas Schreiner's assessment that what is ultimate in Romans is the glory of God.<sup>42</sup> As John Piper points out, missions is not the primary task of the church, be it the first or the twentieth century. Rather, worship is primary. Missions exists because worship does not.<sup>43</sup> Those who are passionate for God's glory will also be passionate for the task of making known the good news of Jesus Christ, and of taking his gospel to the ends of the earth.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>Donfried states, “Up to the time of F. C. Baur, virtually all scholars would have agreed with Melancthon’s evaluation of Romans as a *christianae religionis compendium*.” Donfried, ed., *The Romans Debate* (revised and expanded edition; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), xli. Of the 20th century writers who espouse this position, see especially the works of T. W. Manson, “St. Paul’s Letter to the Romans--and Others,” in *The Romans Debate*, 3-15, and G. Bornkamm, “The Letter to the Romans as Paul’s Last Will and Testament,” *The Romans Debate*, 16-28. For a survey of Romans as an exposition and summary of Paul’s theology, see L. Ann Jervis, *The Purpose of Romans: A Comparative Letter Structure Investigation* (JSNTSS 55; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 15-17.

<sup>2</sup>For this interpretation of Romans, see W. S. Campbell, *Paul’s Gospel in an Intercultural Context: Jew and Gentile in the Letter to the Romans* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1991); N. T. Wright *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1992), 193-257; J. C. Walters, *Ethnic Issues in Paul’s Letter to the Romans: Changing Self-Definitions in Earliest Roman Christianity* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1993); and A. T. Lincoln, “From Wrath to Justification: Tradition, Gospel and Audience in the Theology of Romans 1:18-4:25” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1993 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 225. See also the article by J. P. Sampley, “The Weak and the Strong: Paul’s Careful and Crafty Rhetorical Strategy in Romans 14:1-15:13,” in L. M. White and O. L. Yarbrough, eds., *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 40-52. Sampley states, “All of Romans, from beginning to end, is an apostolic intervention, pastoral in style, in an intramural, ethnically-grounded struggle over leadership and position in the Roman house churches. The entire letter is directed towards helping all of Paul’s readers and hearers to recognize and affirm their unity in the powerful gospel of God” (49-50). See also the recent commentary by T. Schreiner, *Romans* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998). Schreiner refers to this view as the current “majority position” (19 n. 42).

<sup>3</sup>D. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 14. R. N. Longenecker, “On the Form, Function, and Authority of the New Testament Letters,” in *Scripture and Truth* (ed. D. A. Carson and J. Woodbridge; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 104.

<sup>4</sup>Moo, 20.

<sup>5</sup>See Moo, 14; Schreiner, 15-16.

<sup>6</sup>See the questions Donfried poses of the essays by Manson and Bornkamm; *Romans Debate*, xliii-xliv. Cf. Schreiner, 17.

<sup>7</sup>Donfried, “False Presuppositions in the Study of Romans,” *Romans Debate*, 103-4. Schreiner basically endorses Donfried’s “methodological principle,” but points to Ephesians as a possible exception (*Romans*, 20).

<sup>8</sup>In what follows, I have adapted the scheme set forth by J. P. Sampley, “Romans in a Different Light: A Response to Robert Jewett,” in D. Hay and E. Johnson, eds., *Pauline Theology, Volume III: Romans* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 121-125; see also Sampley, “Weak and Strong,” 49-52. I set forth a slightly more expanded discussion of what follows in my work, *‘Christ in You’: A Study in Paul’s Theology and Ethics* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1999), 33, though my position on Paul’s purpose in Romans has changed since that work was originally written.

<sup>9</sup>On this passage, see the work of J. Bassler who argues that the theme of God’s impartiality dominates Paul’s thought in Romans 1-4; *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom* (SBL Dissertation Series 59; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982). In particular, Bassler argues that God’s impartiality shows itself in its disregard for the distinctions between Jews and Gentiles (135-137, 139-160). With regard to 2:1-16, Bassler argues that Paul’s words in 2:1,  $\omega\lambda\alpha[n\eta\rho\rho\upsilon\pi\epsilon\ \rho\alpha\beta\beta\ \omicron\lambda\ \kappa\rho\iota\nu\nu\omega\nu$ , are an expression of “the broadest generic terms possible,” indicating that both Jews and Gentiles are included in the indictment (136). Therefore, 2:1-16 deal with the moralist in general, not the Jew in particular. Moo, on the other hand, argues that all of 2:1-3:8 is Paul’s indictment of Jews (*Romans*, 125-127).

<sup>10</sup>On Romans 12-15 and arguments for healing divisions between Jewish and gentile believers in Rome, cf. W. S. Campbell, “The Rule of Faith in Romans 12:1-15:13: The Obligation of Humble Obedience to Christ as the Only Adequate Response to the Mercies of God” in D. Hay and E. Johnson, ed., *Pauline Theology, Volume III: Romans* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 259-286.

<sup>11</sup>See Moo, 826-833.

<sup>12</sup>In support of this position, see the works of Walters, Campbell, and Schreiner, 12-14. See also W. Marxsen, Introduction to the New Testament (trans. G. Buswell; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 100; and F. F. Bruce, “The Romans Debate--Continued,” in Donfried, *The Romans Debate*, 175-194.

<sup>13</sup>See the discussion of Moo, 14, 18-22.

<sup>14</sup>Moo, 20.

<sup>15</sup>E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews Under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), 212.

<sup>16</sup>Mark Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul’s Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 380.

<sup>17</sup>See also Robert O. Hoerber, “The Decree of Claudius in Acts 18:2,” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 31 (1960), 692.

- <sup>18</sup>Smallwood, 210-11.
- <sup>19</sup>Hoerber, 694; Smallwood, 215-16.
- <sup>20</sup>Nanos, 376.
- <sup>21</sup>P. T. O'Brien, *Gospel and Mission in the Writings of Paul* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), xi.
- <sup>22</sup>N. A. Dahl, "The Missionary Theology in the Epistle to the Romans," in *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977), 70-94.
- <sup>23</sup>See especially "Ecumenical Theology for the Sake of Mission: Romans 1:1-17 + 15:14-16:24" in *Pauline Theology, Volume III: Romans* (ed. D. M. Hay and E. E. Johnson; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 89-108, and "Paul, Phoebe, and the Spanish Mission," in *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee* (ed. P. Borgen et al.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 144-64.
- <sup>24</sup>R. Gruenler, "Romans," in *Evangelical Commentary on the Bible* (ed. W. A. Elwell; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989), 926, 954.
- <sup>25</sup>J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word, 1988), lv.
- <sup>26</sup>Moo, 20.
- <sup>27</sup>See Moo, 61; Schreiner, 54.
- <sup>28</sup>R. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale, 1989), 162.
- <sup>29</sup>James M. Scott, "Paul's Use of the Deuteronomic Tradition" in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993), 645-665.
- <sup>30</sup>Roger D. Aus, "Paul's Travel Plans to Spain and the 'Full Number of the Gentiles' of Rom. XI.25" in *Novum Testamentum* 21 (1979), 232-62.
- <sup>31</sup>F. F. Bruce, "Christianity Under Claudius," *BJRL* 44 (1962), 316.
- <sup>32</sup>E.g., J. Jeremias, "Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen," in *Abba: Studien zur Neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966), 269-71.
- <sup>33</sup>See, e.g., A. J. M. Wedderburn, *The Reasons for Romans* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), esp. 50-54. Wedderburn lists Judaizing tendencies as one of several problems Paul battles against in Romans.
- <sup>34</sup>See J. P. Sampley, "Romans and Galatians: Comparison and Contrast" in *Understanding the Word: Essays in Honor of Bernhard W. Anderson* (ed. J. T. Butler, E. W. Conrad and B. C. Ollenburger; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 315-339.
- <sup>35</sup>Walter C. Kaiser, *Mission in the Old Testament: Israel as a Light to the Nations* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000). I am indebted to Dr. Kaiser for making a copy of his manuscript available to me.
- <sup>36</sup>See, e.g., F. F. Bruce, "The Romans Debate--Continued," in *The Romans Debate*, 180; Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, liii; etc. This seems to be the dominant reading of this passage in current biblical scholarship.
- <sup>37</sup>P. H. Towner, "Romans 13:1-7 and Paul's Missiological Perspective: A Call to Political Quietism or Transformation?" in *Romans and the People of God: Essays in Honor of Gordon D. Fee on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. S. K. Soderlund and N. T. Wright; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 149-169.
- <sup>38</sup>*Gospel and Mission*, 55.
- <sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, 76. For an opposing view, see the works of P. Bowers: "Fulfilling the Gospel: The Scope of the Pauline Mission," *JETS* 30/2 (1987), 185-198; and "Church and Mission in Paul," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 44 (1991), 89-111.
- <sup>40</sup>Numerous recent works attempt to show that the use of autobiography in the ancient world, and in Paul's letters, serve the rhetorical function of exemplification. See, e.g., G. Lyons, *Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding* (SBLDS 73; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985); B. R. Gaventa, "Galatians 1 and 2: Autobiography as Paradigm," *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1986), 309-26; more recently, see the work of Brian Dodd, *Paul's Paradigmatic "I": Personal Example as Literary Strategy* (JSNTSS 177; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).
- <sup>41</sup>See R. Mounce, *Romans* (NAC; Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1995), 27.
- <sup>42</sup>*Romans*, 23.
- <sup>43</sup>J. Piper, *Let the Nations Be Glad! The Supremacy of God in Missions* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993), 11