

Daniel Rodriguez
University of Stellenbosch
drodriguez@bibleleague.org
February 2014

On Γαρ'd: Dialogue in LXX Isaiah and Romans

Douglas Campbell's (2009) *Deliverance of God* challenges many ideas that scholars and Bible readers have assumed for generations. This self-proclaimed "rereading" of Romans is based on Campbell's and other's research into the rhetoric of Paul's day. A term that gets thrown around to describe this way of reading Romans is "Socratic". Campbell argues that Romans is a kind of Socratic dialogue wherein Paul plays the part of the teacher who questions his interlocutor in order to instruct him, like Socrates would a student. Reactions to Campbell's proposal range from excited acceptance to wild opposition. The idea that not every word in Romans represents Paul's voice is not palatable for some.

But that a non-narrative biblical text can express multiple voices is not new. The book of Malachi is a set of six disputes between Malachi and God on the one hand versus the people of Israel on the other hand. In Malachi, different voices are often set off by nothing more than the content of their statements, though there are some lexical helps like forms of אָמַר in some cases (Mal 2:10-16 for example). That the book of Malachi does not represent Malachi's voice all the way through is uncontroversial because Malachi is a conversation. It is also uncontroversial that there are other prophetic dialogues and conversations elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, for example in the book of Isaiah.

While Campbell's rereading of Romans enjoys this support of other biblical—specifically prophetic—texts that express multiple voices engaging each other, Campbell's argument does not enjoy the scholarly consensus of Koine Greek linguistic resources regarding the particle γάρ. Campbell argues that Paul's conversation partner—actually a Jewish-Christian teacher, sent as a counter missionary against Paul's mission—first voices a response to Paul's gospel (Romans 1:1-17) in Romans 1:18-32. Its a famous passage that is often used to show why God is angry or to make an argument for so-called natural theology or to make an argument against homosexuality. And the γάρ in Romans 1:18 is also famous, though only among students and scholars of the GNT.

For the most part there is scholarly consensus that $\gamma\alpha\rho$ makes a "logical connection" (Robertson 1934:443; Wallace 1996:657-658) between what the discourse analysts call the "online" argument or story and the "offline" background information which $\gamma\alpha\rho$ introduces in order to strengthen the online material (Levinsohn 2000:90-93). Or to put more simply as Runge (2010:73) summarizes, " $\Gamma\alpha\rho$ introduces explanatory material that strengthens or supports what precedes... Although the strengthening material is important to the discourse, it does not advance the argument or story. Instead it supports what precedes by providing background or detail that is needed to understand what follows." According to BDAG (2000:189-190), $\gamma\alpha\rho$ is 1) a marker of cause or reason, 2) a marker of clarification, or 3) a marker of inference. Levinsohn (2000:91) writes, "The presence of $\gamma\alpha\rho$ constrains the material that it introduces to be interpreted as strengthening some aspect of the previous assertion rather than distinctive information." Runge (2010:70) also writes of Robertson's explanation of the particle, saying, "Robertson's 'explanatory' assertion has largely been confirmed as the core constraint of $\gamma\alpha\rho$ in modern linguistic treatments." The consensus is that $\gamma\alpha\rho$ logically connects a clause to preceding information by strengthening that preceding information.

So with all the clarity and explanation of what precedes it that $\gamma\alpha\rho$ allegedly symbolizes, why is it that Bible scholars are still uncertain as how to handle the $\gamma\alpha\rho$ in Romans 1:18? In a footnote in his commentary on Romans, John Calvin (1568) wrote that the connection made by $\gamma\alpha\rho$ in 1:18 is "not very clear". In modern times, Roy Bowen Ward's (1997) article called "Why Unnatural? The Tradition behind Romans 1:26-27" voiced the same lack of clarity. Ward wrote in the decade before Campbell's *Deliverance of God* that this lack of clarity could be because Romans 1:18-32 is not Paul's own voice.

So we have some biblical interpreters who say that one is hard pressed to find a logical connection from the $\gamma\alpha\rho$ in Romans 1:18. And then we have Koine linguists who say that all $\gamma\alpha\rho$ does is make logical connections. I think that our grammatical and lexical resources are inadequate. For linguistic description, we need fully usage-based approaches such as grammaticalization, embodied cognition, and other tools from the evolutionary and cognitive revolutions.

It's not my job here to give a lesson on cognition, but I think I need to share with you at least one fundamental fact that my work is guided by. I first learned this fact in my introductory Hebrew

class here at HBU from my dear professor Dr. Jamie Johns: Words don't have meanings. Actually we can reverse the dictum as Reinier DeBlois does and state that in fact meanings have words.

To sum up this paper, let me simply say that one cannot dismiss Campbell's rereading of Romans and specifically his rereading of Romans 1:18-32 based on the linguistic treatments of γάρ because available lexical, grammatical, syntactic, and discourse resources do not account for the rare instances wherein γάρ occurs in a speaker switch in a dialogue. Most of the time when an author wrote a dialogue, particles like οὐν, καί, or δε were often used at the beginning of a response from one of the speakers. These are the words we might expect in a "speaker switch". But in a handful of occasions, γάρ was used instead. We will look at such instances of γάρ in Euripides' *Bacchae* and LXX Isaiah. And I think we will see (or have already seen) the usefulness of discourse work like that of Levinsohn and Runge because these occurrences mostly fit with the established description that γάρ opens material that is explanatory to what precedes it. However, none of the resources specifically treat dialogue or diatribe as a genre, and I will show evidence that in a dialogue, γάρ indeed does occur in speaker switching scenarios. While it is certainly the content of the statements that indicates a new speaker for us readers (or Euripides' helpful headings which Isaiah should have adopted), sometimes authors chose to use γάρ at the beginning of these statements. And as Levinsohn said, choice implies meaning.

In *The Bacchae*, I point to lines 201, 477, 483, 612, 1192, 1329, 1347, 1366, 1374, and 1377 as examples of the particle being used in a speaker switch. I won't discuss all of them here for time's sake.

In Kovacs (2002) interlinear translation and commentary of *The Bacchae*, he translates the dialogue between the deity Dionysus and his unbelieving cousin Pentheus, the king of Thebes. In lines 473-477, Dionysus had been explaining to Pentheus that he is in fact Zeus' son and as such he has acquired certain rites from his father Zeus. Pentheus continues the questions:

PENTHEUS: But those who perform them (the rites)—what kind of benefit do they get?

DIONYSUS: You are not allowed to hear—though the rites are well worth knowing.

PENTHEUS: A clever counterfeit answer this, to pique my curiosity!

DIONYSUS: The gods are hostile to anyone who practices impiety./ἀσέβειαν ἀσκοῦντ' ὅργ' ἐχθαίρει θεοῦ.

PENTHEUS: The god—what did he look like? You claim you saw him clearly./ὁ θεός, ὅρᾳ γάρ φῆς σαφῶς, ποῖός τις ᾔν;

Here in line 477, after ὁ θεός referring to Zeus alone, Pentheus responds to Dionysus frustrating answer with a γάρ phrase. In one of BDAG's subcategories for its first usage of γάρ, the lexicographers note that the particle often occurs in questions. In fact, Lidell Scott (1977:338) identify some instances of this interrogative γάρ as asking abrupt questions. This is the case here, and one can see the information structural connection back to Zeus. In that sense, there is nothing remarkable about γάρ in this context. It does here what anyone who has used BDAG would expect it to do. So all I ask, is that you remember this scene where Dionysus responds to Pentheus in a dialogue and uses γάρ in the phrase. He could have used οὐν and in fact οὐν is used more frequently than γάρ in such cases. But here and in some other places, γάρ is used.

Later in the poem (lines 1344-1347), Cadmus, Dionysus' grandfather, asks Dionysus for mercy. Kovacs' translation reads:

CADMUS: Dionysus, we entreat your mercy: we have wronged you!

DIONYSUS: Late is your knowledge of me: you did not have it when you needed it.

CADMUS: We recognize this. But you chastise us too harshly./ἐγνώκαμεν ταῦτ· ἀλλ' ἐπεξέρχῃ λίαν.

DIONYSUS: Well, I was treated with contempt though a god./καὶ γὰρ πρὸς ὑμῶν θεὸς γεγώς ὑβριζόμεν.

In this case, γάρ is part of Dionysus' adversarial answer to Cadmus. Notice here that Kovacs has opted for the English *well* to set off his translation. *Well* like γάρ can also do logical connecting jobs. But given a sarcastic or argumentative prosody, the connection can be just as easily dismissed as seriously as it is maintained in its prototypical sense. Both are "logical" connectives, though one is more emotional and can show the disdain on the speaker's behalf, which I think is present here.

I think a discourse approach to this instance would say that again this is an unremarkable usage of γάρ opening explanatory material. And that is quite right, but that does not undo the fact that this instance happens in the response of one speaker to another in a dialogue.

Our last example from *The Bacchae* comes from lines 1372-1378.

AGAVE: I weep for you, father.

CADMUS: And I <for you,> my daughter, and for your sisters.

AGAVE: Yes: terrible is the ruin Lord Dionysus has brought on your house, <father>./δαινῶς γάρ <τοι> τήνδ αἰκείαν Διόνυσος ἄναξ τοὺς σοὺς, <πάτερ,> εἰς οἴκους ἔφερεν.

CADMUS: Terrible was the treatment he had from us since his name was unhonored in Thebes./καὶ γὰρ ἔπασχεν δαινὰ πρὸς ἡμῶν, ἀγεραστον ἔχων ὄνομ' ἐν Θήβαις.

In this example, two instances of γάρ occur in a series. BDAG's subcategory 1c for γάρ notes that the particle "is sometimes repeated. It occurs twice either to introduce several arguments for the same assertion... or to have one clause confirm another". This subcategory is where BDAG cites Romans 1:16-18 in the γάρ entry. And this repetition is precisely what we see here in lines 1374 and 1377, except that the second assertion comes from the mouth of another speaker.

In *The Bacchae* γάρ sometimes occurs in a speaker switch. These instances are explained by the so-called discourse-pragmatic functions of γάρ, but I don't think this is a full explanation because it does not account for the fact that this text is a dialogue and the particle begins phrases from a speaker who did not say the original phrase upon which γάρ offers explanatory material.

These rhetorical frames do not just occur in composed Greek literature but also in the translation Greek of the Septuagint. Such dialogues occur throughout LXX Isaiah. Let me give a disclaimer: I am not arguing that the Greek Bible translators intended a rhetorical usage of γάρ in these instances. They are simply instances of γάρ where many scholars have identified a change in voice and I am simply showing the data because I find it provocative. I do not assume to know how or why the LXX was translated the way it was in each book, but I'm sure Dr. Wagner will tell us. Here in Isaiah 1, Yahweh argues his case against his rebellious children Jerusalem and Judah before the court of the heavens and the earth.

Isaiah 1:24-27 (BHS, LXX, NETS)

HERALD לָכֵן נָאִם הָאֲדוֹן יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֲבִיר יִשְׂרָאֵל

YAHWEH הוּא אֲנֹתָם מַצְרִי וְאֲנַקְמָה מֵאוֹיְבָי: וְאֲשִׁיבָה יְדִי עָלֶיךָ וְאֲצַרְךָ כְּכַר סִינַיִךְ וְאֲסִירָה כָּל-בְּדִילֶיךָ: וְאֲשִׁיבָה שְׁפָטֶיךָ כְּבִרְאשְׁתָּה וְיַעֲצִיךָ כְּבִתְחִלָּה אַחֲרֵי-כֵן יִגְרָא לְךָ עִיר הַצֶּדֶק קִרְיָה נְאֻמָּה:

HEAVENS & EARTH צִיּוֹן בְּמִשְׁפַּט תִּפְדָּה וְשָׁבִיָּה בְּצִדְקָה:

HERALD: διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει ὁ δεσπότης κύριος σαβαωθ

YAHWEH: Οὐαὶ οἱ ἰσχύοντες Ἰσραηλ· οὐ παύσεται γάρ μου ὁ θυμὸς ἐν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις, καὶ κρίσιν ἐκ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου ποιήσω. καὶ ἐπαξω τὴν χεὶρά μου ἐπὶ σέ καὶ πυρώσω σε εἰς καθαρόν, τοὺς δὲ ἀπειθοῦντας ἀπολέσω καὶ ἀφελῶ πάντας ἀνόμους ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ πάντας ὑπερηφάνους ταπεινώσω. καὶ ἐπιστήσω τοὺς κριτάς σου ὡς τὸ πρότερον καὶ τοὺς συμβούλους σου ὡς τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα κληθήσῃ Πόλις δικαιοσύνης, μητρόπολις πιστῇ Σιών.

HEAVENS & EARTH: μετὰ γὰρ κρίματος σωθήσεται ἡ αἰχμαλωσία αὐτῆς καὶ μετὰ ἐλεημοσύνης·

HERALD: Therefore this is what the Sovereign, the Lord Sabaoth, says:

YAHWEH: Ah, mighty ones of Israel! For my wrath on my adversaries will not abate, and I will exact judgment from my foes! And I will turn my hand against you and will burn you to bring about purity. But the disobedient I will destroy, and I will remove from you all the lawless and humble all who are arrogant. And I will set up your judges as at the former time and your counselors as at the beginning. And after these things you shall be called the city of righteousness, the faithful mother city, Zion.

HEAVENS & EARTH: For her captivity shall be saved with judgment and with mercy.

In this instance, the heavens and the earth give explanation to Yahweh's previous statement, but in their own distinctive voice(s). Like occurrences in *The Bacchae*, this instance of γαρ still has a logical connection, but in the mouth of another speaker. While most Isaiah scholars agree that Yahweh is speaking in v26 and not in v27, not all agree on whose voice it is in v27. Watts has argued for the Heavens and the Earth, though scholars like Young have said it is more likely the prophet. Again, the connection here is prototypical of γαρ. The final statement in v27 strengthens what precedes it, but from another mouth which is the rhetorical aspect we have yet to account for in our linguistic resources.

In Isaiah 45, Yahweh speaks about Cyrus the Persian.

Isaiah 45:14-15 (BHS, LXX, NETS)

הֵן אָמַר יְהוָה **HERALD**

YAHWEH וְיָנִיעַ מִצְרַיִם וְחֶרֶם-כּוֹשׁ וְסִבְאִים אֲנָשֵׁי מִדְּהַ עֲלִיָּה וְעַבְדֵּי וְלָהּ יְהוָה אֲתַתִּיהָ יִלְכּוּ בִּנְיָמִים וְעַבְדֵּי וְאַלְהֵיהָ יִשְׁתַּחֲוּ אֲלֶיהָ יִתְפַּלְּלוּ אֶת יְהוָה וְאֵין עוֹד אֶפְסָס אֲלֵהֶם:

CYRUS אֵלֶּה אֲמַר אֶל מִסְתַּתֵּר אֲלֵהֶּי יִשְׂרָאֵל מוֹשִׁיעַ:

HERALD: Οὕτως λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ·

YAHWEH: Εκοπίασεν Αἴγυπτος καὶ ἐμπορία Αἰθιοπῶν, καὶ οἱ Σεβωιν ἄνδρες ὑψηλοὶ ἐπὶ σέ διαβήσονται καὶ σοὶ ἔσονται δοῦλοι καὶ ὀπίσω σου ἀκολουθήσουσιν δεδεμένοι χειροπέδαις καὶ προσεύξονται, ὅτι ἐν σοὶ ὁ θεὸς ἔστιν, καὶ ἐροῦσιν Οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς πλὴν σοῦ·

CYRUS: σὺ γὰρ εἰ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ᾔδειμεν, ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ σωτήρ.

HERALD: Thus says the Lord Sabaoth:

YAHWEH: Egypt has worked hard, as has the commerce of the Ethiopians. And the lofty men of Seboin shall come over to you, and they shall be your slaves; they shall follow behind you bound in handcuffs. They will do obeisance to you and pray in you, because God is in you, and they will say, 'There is no god besides you.'

CYRUS: For you are God, and we did not know it, O God of Israel, Savior.

According to Watts, Isaiah 45:15 is the first time Cyrus' voice is heard in Isaiah. Isaiah 44:24-45:13 is Yahweh's introduction of Cyrus as his anointed instrument. Here in 45:15, Cyrus submits to Yahweh's sovereignty, explaining why the resources of these other nations will belong to Cyrus. So again, the particle γαρ is still making logical connections, but in between different speakers. Again, the Isaiah scholars are conflicted on who is doing the speaking in v15, but they are all in agreement that it is not Yahweh as in v14.

Isaiah 58:3 (BHS, LXX, NETS)

לָמָּה צִמְנוּ וְלֹא רִאִיתָ עֲגִינֵנוּ וְנִפְשָׁנוּ וְלֹא תָדָע YAHWEH תֵּן בְּיוֹם צִמְכֶּם תִּמְצְאוּ חֵפֶץ וְכָל־עֲצֻבֵיכֶם תִּנְשָׁו:
JUDEANS: λέγοντες Τί ὅτι ἐνηστεύσαμεν καὶ οὐκ εἶδες; ἐταπεινώσαμεν τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν καὶ οὐκ ἔγνων; YAHWEH: ἐν γὰρ ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν νηστειῶν ὑμῶν καὶ πάντα τοὺς ὑποχειρίους ὑμῶν ὑπονύσσετε.
JUDEANS: saying, “Why is it that we have fasted, but you did not see, humbled our souls, but you did not know?” YAHWEH: For in the days of your fasts you find your own wishes and goad all those who are under you.

Isaiah 58:3 is one verse with two voices. In Watts commentary, the b line is voiced by the heavens and the earth (or at least one of them). One can see this as a possibility, but it is more likely to be the voice of Yahweh (Brueggemann, Childs, Young, McKenzie, and Westermann all agree), though some also take it as the prophet's voice (like Blenkinsopp). What everyone does agree on is that there are two distinct voices here and it is clear that the second voice is set off by ἐν γὰρ in Greek translation. This instance of the particle offers a causal explanation to the question.

Examples like this challenge Runge's (2010:73) notion that a γαρ clause cannot advance new information because within this pericope, the answer is new and striking to the ones who asked the question. Does this advance an argument? I think this shows that the discourse approach alone is not always compatible with the data like this question/answer scenario, but needs to be done in conjunction with genre and rhetorical studies (though I'm sure the discourse analysts will be quick to say that this is offline material). We have previously seen γαρ in a question (*The Bacchae* line 477). Now we also see the particle in an answer to a question. So I think we bibli-

cal languages folk need to spend more time studying typologies across languages—in this case interrogative/response typologies—so we can account for γάρ and other particles with testable methods that offer explanatory power. Individual knowledge of Greek is too intuitive to base grammars and lexica upon and structuralist methods that sprinkle in words like "function" and "cognitive" are not suitable nor honest. We need usage-based methods that can be held accountable by other disciplines.

With this evidence in hand, I think we can re-evaluate Romans 1:18 with an approach that is open to the kind of dialogue in LXX Isaiah and *The Bacchae*.

Romans 1:15-19 (GNT, group translation)

Paul: οὕτως τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίσασθαι. Οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι. δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται, Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

Interlocutor: Ἀποκαλύπτεται γὰρ ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πάσῃ ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων, διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφάνέρωσεν.

Paul: That's why I want so much to tell the Good News to you there in Rome. For me there is no shame in telling the Good News. No, because it is the power God uses to save everyone who believes—the Jews first, and now also the Greek. Yes, the Good News shows how good and faithful God is to do what he has promised. It shows how the faithfulness of one leads to the faith of many. As the Scriptures say, "The one who is accepted by God will live by faithfulness."

Interlocutor: Well, we also see how God shows his anger against all the bad things wicked people do. They show no respect for him, and they do wrong to each other. Their evil lives keep the truth about God from being known. God is angry with them because they should know better, right? They can see what can be known about him. Yes, God has made it clear to them.

Stanley Stowers (2003) has written on the pro-sopapilla or speech in character as a rhetorical device in Romans and I don't need to repeat his words here. Stowers and Campbell do not have identical arguments, but they are similar in their desire to take Romans as highly skilled first century diatribe.

I think this shift in v18 shows Paul's skill in rhetoric and in writing the best philosophy of his day. This γάρ is like some in *The Bacchae*, but this one is so much more sophisticated, in my opinion, than are Euripides' turn of phrases with the particle. Paul plays with γάρ in a series, as we saw in *Bacchae* lines 1374 and 1377, but in v18 a section begins that does not logically connect to what preceded it. Much like an opponent in a live conversation, the interlocutor in Romans 1:18-32 interrupts or hijacks the conversation away from Paul in v18 by continuing the series. I think this is what Stowers (2003) refers to when he talks about Quintilian's statements that

the prosopapilla should not be indicated "in the manner of a comic actor", but rather make distinguishing modulations from the writer's own persona. This γάρ in a series shows the artfulness of Paul's choice to use the particle γάρ in v18 to modulate a new voice, as opposed to δε, οὐν or something else.

I don't want to repeat Campbell's argument here, at least not all of it, but I do want to repeat that Romans 1:18-32 is not about Jesus. Unlike what precedes it, which is about the Good News of Jesus (and that Good News is Jesus is Lord which proves God has kept his promise to Israel) and Paul's desire to come to Rome in v15 so he can talk about the Good News there, Romans 1:18-32 is about some other news and some other delivery system for the news. The news in 18-32 is that God is angry and people should know better than to do wicked because God is clear in nature (even though their lives keep the truth about God from being known, but we can overlook that contradiction for Paul's sake, right?). And since this is clear by nature, there's no explicit need for a messenger, which is incredibly disjointed and unconnected to the sentiment expressed in v15. The last γάρ of the series that starts in v16 is finished in v18 in the mouth of another speaker. Paul strategically crafts a switch in speaker and in fact a switch in gospel! This γάρ plays with polysemic categories in a way that only a diatribe can handle.

So I have shown you instances of composed and translation Greek, in biblical and non-biblical texts, where γάρ participates in a speaker switch. This has only been possible with a usage-based approach in source texts. One cannot come to this conclusion from grammars and lexica. I think the evidence is provocative. The particle γάρ is used in many way, but one pragmatic job that it has done is introduce a response to one participant from another in a dialogue. This makes for rich prophetic and philosophical diatribes just within biblical literature. Campbell's rereading of Romans in light of the diatribe genre cannot be dismissed on a linguistic evaluation of γάρ in relation to Romans 1:18.

Works Cited

- Blenkinsopp, J. 2003. *Isaiah 56-66 Vol. 19b, The Anchor Bible*. New York: Doubleday.
- Bruegemann, W. 1989. *Isaiah 40-66, Westminster Bible Companion*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Calvin, J. and J. Owen, trans. 1568. *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to The Romans*. Public domain. ccel.wheaton.edu

- Campbell, D. 2009. *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Childs, B. 2001. *Isaiah: A Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Danker, F. et al. 2000. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature, Third Edition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Euripides and D. Kovacs, ed. and trans. 2002. *Bacchae, Iphigenia At Aulis, Rhesus*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Liddell, H and R. Scott. 1977. *A Greek-English Lexicon, Ninth Edition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Levinsohn, S. 2000. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek, Second Edition*. Dallas: SIL International.
- Robertson, A. 1934. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament: In Light of Historical Research*. Nashville: Broadman Press.
- Runge, S. 2010. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Bellingham: Logos Research Systems.
- Stowers, S. 2003. "Apostrophe, ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΠΟΙΙΑ and Paul's Rhetorical Education" in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture*, 351-369. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Wallace, D. 1996. *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Ward, R. 1997. "Why Unnatural? The Tradition behind Romans 1:26-27" in *Harvard Theological Review* 90.3. 263-284.
- Young, E. 1972. *The Book of Isaiah, Vol. 3, Chapters 40-66*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company.