

Romans

An English and Hebrew Translation and Commentary

from the original languages
Daniel R. Gregg

All Rights Reserved 2010

www.torahtimes.org

This work is supported by Your Offerings
via PayPal at above weblink.

Paul's Letter to Rome

אגרת פאול השליח אל-הרומים

Chapter 1

פרק א

1 Paul, *a* servant of Messiah Yeshua, *being* called *as an* emissary, and being separated for *the* good news of *the* Almighty, ²which He promiseth beforehand, through His prophets, in *the* holy writings, ³about His Son, that be^eth *born* from *the* seed of David, according to *the* flesh, ⁴that be^eth designated *the* ^aSon of *the* Almighty^a with power, according to *the* Spirit of holiness, by *his* resurrection from *the* dead, Yeshua *the* Messiah, our Lord, ⁵through whom we receiveth loving kindness and ambassadorship, for *a* ^ahearing of faithfulness,^a among all the ^bPeoples, for *the sake of* his name, ⁶among whom are also ye called by Yeshua *the* Messiah; ⁷to all those being in Rome, beloved of *the* Almighty, called holy ones: Loving kindness to you and peace from *the* Almighty Father of us, and Yahweh Yeshua *the* Messiah. ⁸First indeed, I am giving thanks to my Almighty through Yeshua *the* Messiah for all of you, because your ^ofaithfulness is being proclaimed in all the world.

פולוס עבד משיח ישוע, מקרא שליח, ונבדל לבשורת אלהים: אשר הבטיח אתה מקדם, בדרך נביאיו, בכתבים קדושים: אודות בנו, הנולד מזרע דוד, לפי הבשר: אשר המסומן בן-האלהים בגבורה, לפי רוח הקדושה, בתחיה מן-המתים, ישוע המשיח אדגינו: בדרך אשר קבלנו חסד ושליחות למשמעת אמונה בכל-הגוים למען שמו: באשר גם-אתם קרואי ישוע המשיח: לכל-ההם שחיים ברומא אהובי אלהים למקראים קדושים חסד לכם ושלום מאת אלהים אבינו ויהוה ישוע המשיח: בראשונה אמנם אני מודה לאלהי בדרך ישוע המשיח על-כלכם כי האמונתכם מספרת בכל-התבל:

4a or the Almighty Son. 5a-a i.e. hearing *about* *Messiah's* faithfulness, or faithful hearing | b = tribes, people group de-fined by language, culture, geographical limits.

ה'א או לציות | ב = נאמנות: ח'א = הנאמנותכם:

⁹Because the Almighty is my witness, whom I am serving in my^o spirit, in *connection to* the good news of his^o Son, as *to how* unceasingly mention of you I am making, ¹⁰always in my^o prayers asking, if somehow, now at last, I will succeed, by the will of the Almighty, to come unto you. ¹¹For I am longing to see you, so that I may impart some spiritual gift to you, such that you be^eth established; ¹²this yet is, to be^eth encouraged together with you, through each other's^o faithfulness, yours as well as also mine. ¹³Yet, I am not wanting you being unaware, brothers, that often I setteth before to come to you (and be^eth prevented until^o now) so that I may obtain some fruit among you also, even as among the rest of *the* Peoples. ¹⁴To Greeks, as well as also to Barbarians, to educated as well as also to unlearned, a debtor I am. ¹⁵So, ^oaccording to me, *I am* eager also to you who *are* in Rome, to maketh be announced good news. ¹⁶For I am not being ashamed of the good news; for it is *the* power of *the* Almighty for salvation to all that is ^acommitting, to *the* Jew firstly, as well as also to *the* Greek.

⁹כִּי עֵדִי הוּא אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים, אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי עֹבֵד אֹתוֹ בְּרוּחִי, בְּבִשׁוּרַת בְּנֵי אֵיף בְּלִתי חִדְלִי אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה זְכוֹר לָכֶם: בְּכָל־עֵת בְּתַפְלוֹתַי אֲנִי מִתְחַנֵּן, אִם־אֶפְוֵא, עִתָּהּ בְּאַחֲרִית אֶצְלַח, בְּרִצּוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים, לָבוֹא אֵלֵיכֶם: ¹⁰כִּי נִכְסֶף אֲנִי לְרְאוֹתְכֶם, לְמַעַן אֶחְלַק לָכֶם מִקְצֵת מִתְּנֵי רוּחִי, לְהִתְכוּנְנֶכֶם: ¹¹יְזוּאת הִיא לְנַחֵם יַחַד בְּכֶם, בְּדֶרֶךְ הָאֱמוּנָהּ בְּזֶה אֶתְזַהֵ, שְׁלָכֶם כְּמוֹכֵן גַּם שְׁלִי: ¹²אֵד לֹא אֲבִה אֲנִי לְהִיזְתְּכֶם בְּלִתי־יִוְדָעִים אַחֲלִי, כִּי לְפַעֲמִים רַבּוֹת שָׂמַתִּי מִקְדָּם לָבוֹא אֵלֵיכֶם (וְנִמְנַעְתִּי עַד־עַתָּה) לְמַעַן יְהִי לִי כְּלִשְׁהוֹ פְּרִי גַם בְּתוֹכְכֶם כְּאֲשֶׁר גַּם בְּשָׂאֵר הַגּוֹיִם: ¹³לְיוֹנִים כְּמוֹכֵן־גַּם לְבָרְבָּרִים, לְחַכְמִים כְּמוֹכֵן־גַּם לְבְּלִתי לְמַדְנֹת, חֵיב אֲנִי: ¹⁴לָכֵן, מִצְדִּי, חִפְזָא אֲנִי, גַּם־אֵלֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר בְּרוֹמָא לְבִשְׂרִ: ¹⁵כִּי אֵינְנִי בּוֹשׁ מִבְּשׁוּרָה, כִּי גְבוּרַת אֱלֹהִים הִיא לִישׁוּעָה, לְכָל־הַקְּאֲמִיּוֹא, לְיְהוּדֵי רְאוּשׁוֹנָה, כְּמוֹכֵן־גַּם לְיוֹנִי:

16a = giving support

יב'א = עמכם | ב = הנאמנות: טז'א = הנותן תמך; התומך:

¹⁷For *the* ^ajustice of *the* Almighty, in it, is being revealed from ^bfaithfulness to ^cfaithfulness; even as it is being written, ^d“but the righteous by ^efaithfulness shall live.” ¹⁸For is being revealed *the* fierce anger of *the* Almighty, from heaven upon all evil and injustice of men, which are holding back the truth by injustice. ¹⁹because that which *is* known about the Almighty is being manifest among them; because the Almighty maketh it manifest to them. ²⁰For the things, *which are* not seen, about Him, from *the* creation of *the* universe, by way of the things made, being understood, are being perceived clearly, even his ^oeternal power and divinity, such that they be without excuse. ²¹Because as ones that knoweth the Almighty, not as Almighty they glorifieth, or giveth thanks, but they becometh worthless in their ^oreasonings, and be’eth darkened their ^osenseless heart. ²²Claiming to be wise, they becometh foolish, ²³and exchangeth the glory of the incorruptible Almighty into *an* image of corruptible man and birds and four-footed *beast-s* and reptiles. ²⁴Therefore the Almighty giveth them over into the evil lusts of their ^ohearts, to *the* uncleanness of ^odishonoring their ^obodies with themselves.

17a = righteousness | b = His faithfulness | c = our faithful response | d = Hab. 2:4 | e MT+His/his; LXX+My; Paul interprets as both.

“כִּי־צְדָקַת אֱלֹהִים בְּהַ נִגְלָה, מֵאֲמוּנָה א
לְאֲמוּנָה, בְּמִכְתָּב, “וְצִדִּיק בְּאֲמוּנָה ב
יַחֲיָה”:^ג “כִּי נִגְלָה חֲרוֹן אַף אֱלֹהִים
מִשָּׁמַיִם עַל כָּל־רָשָׁע וְאִי־צָדִק הַאֲנָשִׁים
אֶת־הָאֲמֶת בְּאִי־צָדִק הָאֲחֻזִּים: ^טיֵעַן
אֶת־אֲשֶׁר נֹודַע עַל־הָאֱלֹהִים גְּלוּי הוּא
בְּהֶם, כִּי הָאֱלֹהִים גָּלָה לָהֶם: ^ככִּי
הַדְּבָרִים, אֲשֶׁר בִּלְתִּי־נֹרְאִים אָדוּתָיו,
מִבְּרִיאַת הָעוֹלָם, בְּדַרְךְ הַדְּבָרִים
הַנִּעֲשִׂים מִוּבָּנִים, נֹרְאִים בְּרוּר, דִּהְיָנוּ
גְּבוּרָתוֹ הַנִּצְחִית וְאֱלֹהוּתוֹ, לְמַעַן אֵין
לָהֶם הַתְּנַצְלוֹת: ^{כא}כִּי יֵעַן בְּדַעְתָּם
אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים בְּאֱלֹהִים לֹא כְּבֹדוּהוּ, אֹ
הוּדוּ לוֹ, כִּי אִם־הִבְלוּ בְּמַחְשְׁבוֹתָם
וְחָשְׂד לָבָבָם הָאִוִּילִי: ^{כב}בְּהֵת־אֲמָרָם
לְהִיּוֹת חַכְמִים נִכְסְלוּ: ^{כג}כִּי וְהִמְירוּ
אֶת־כְּבוֹד הָאֱלֹהִים בְּלִתִּי־נִשְׁחֶת בְּדַמּוֹת
צֶלֶם אָדָם נִשְׁחֶת וְצֶלֶם עוֹף וּבְעַלִּי
אַרְבַּע־רַגְלִים וּרְמָשׁ: ^{כד}עַל־כֵּן גַּם
הָאֱלֹהִים הִסְגִּירָם אֶל־תַּאֲזוֹת לְבוֹתָם
לְטַמְאַת לַנַּבֵּל אֶת־גּוּיֹתֵיהֶם בִּינֵיהֶם:

יז'א = נאֲמוּנוֹת | ב MT = אֲמוּנָתוֹ = נאֲמוּנוֹתוֹ | ג = יז'א = נאֲמוּנוֹת | ב'א = הקוסמוס: Hab. 2:4

²⁵Who changeth the truth of the Almighty into the lie, and worshipeth and serveth the creature rather than the one that createth, who is being blessed unto the ages. Amæn. ²⁶Because of this the Almighty giveth them over to dishonorable passions; for even their females exchangeth the natural function for that *which is* against nature, ²⁷Likewise besides, also the males that leaveth the natural function of the female, be'eth burned in their desire toward one another, males with males working shame; and the reward (which was necessary) of their error, they are receiving back into themselves. ²⁸And even as they approveth not the Almighty for holding fast, in true knowledge, the Almighty giveth them over to a worthless mind, for doing those things which *are* not being proper, ²⁹being filled with all injustice, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife; deceit, malice, gossips, ³⁰slanderers, haters of the Almighty; insolent, arrogant, boastful; inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹without moral sense; traitors, lacking natural love; unmerciful; ³²who the justice of the Almighty fully knoweth, that those such things doing are worthy of death; not only doing them, but also altogether giving a good approval to the ones practicing *them*.

^{כה} אֲשֶׁר הִחְלִיפוּ אֶת־אֱמֶת הָאֱלֹהִים לְכֹזֵב וְכִבְדּוֹ וְעִבְדּוֹ אֶת־הַנְּבִרָא עַל־הַבּוֹרָא, אֲשֶׁר הוּא מְבֹרָךְ לְעוֹלָמִים, אֱמֵן: ^{כז} בְּגַלְלֵל זֹאת הַסְּגִירָם הָאֱלֹהִים אֶל־תְּשׁוּקוֹת קָלוֹן, כִּי גַם נִקְבוֹתֵיהֶם הִחְלִיפוּ אֶת־הַתְּשֻׁמִּישׁ הַטְּבִיעִי בְּנִגְדַּי הַטְּבִיעִי: ^{כח} בְּאוֹתוֹ אִפֹּן כְּמוֹ־כֵן גַּם הַזְּכָרִים בְּעִזְבָּם אֶת־תְּשֻׁמִּישׁ הָאִשָּׁה הַטְּבִיעִי נִבְעֲרוּ בְּעִגְבֹתָם אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ זְכָרִים עִם־זְכָרִים פְּעֻלִים בְּשֵׁת וְאֵת גְּמוּלָא (אֲשֶׁר הִיָּה רְאוּי) תְּעוֹתָם, הֵם לְקָחִים בְּעִצְמָם: ^{כט} וְכֹאֲשֶׁר לֹא בַחֲרוּ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים לְנִצֵּר בְּדַעְתָּם אֱמֶת כֵּן הַסְּגִיר אֶתְּם הָאֱלֹהִים אֶל־לֵב נִתְעַב לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר אֵינֶם נְאוּיִם: ^ל מִמְּלֵאִים בְּכָל־אֵי־צֶדֶק, רִשְׁעוֹת, חֲמֻדָּנוֹת, אָוֶן; מְלֵאֵי קִנְיָאָה, רִצְחַ מְרִיבָה; מְרֻמָּה מְזֻמָּה מְלַחֲשִׁים; מְלֵשִׁינִים, שׁוֹנְאֵי אֱלֹהִים; מְחַצְפִּים, יְהִירִים, מִתְהַלְלִים; חֲרָשֵׁי רָעוֹת, לְהוֹרֵם סוֹרְרִים: ^{לא} נְבָלִים; מוֹעֵלִים, חֲסָרֵי אֲהָבָה טְבִיעִית; בְּלִתֵּי־מְרַחֲמִים: ^{לב} אֲשֶׁר אֶת־מִשְׁפַּט הָאֱלֹהִים דַּעְתָּם כִּי הַפְּעֻלִים כְּאֵלָה רְאוּיִים לְמוֹת לֹא לְבַד עֲשִׂים אֶת־אֵלָה כִּי אִם־גַּם נְאוּתִים אֶל־הַעֲשִׂים:

כה'א = במקום את:

Commentary on Romans

Prologue

But now apart from the norm, the ^ajustice of the Almighty is made visible, being witnessed by the Torah and the Prophets, ²² that is the ^ajustice of the Almighty, through the ^bfaithfulness of Yeshua, the Messiah, unto all those ^ccommitting *to him*; for there is no distinction; ²³ for all sin and fall short of the glory of the Almighty, ²⁴ ^abeing justicied^a as a gift by his loving-kindness through the redemption which is in Messiah Yeshua; (Rom. 3:21-24).

In the usual administration of justice a person is tried and either acquitted or convicted. The acquitted go free, and the convicted are sentenced. However, sometimes it is considered right to pardon a criminal. The power of pardon is usually left to governors or to the president. Hopefully, officials handing out pardons are being just and righteous. To pardon a criminal there must be some mitigating circumstance. Among other things the criminal should have admitted his guilt. Criminals who seek to be justified (acquitted) at trial, and then are found guilty, still maintaining their innocence should not receive pardons. Further, criminals that seek pardons should have made it clear that they are going to turn away from their evil ways. It wouldn't be right to issue a pardon to someone who is just going to continue in their practice of evil.

In most cases it is right to punish the guilty, but in some cases it is right to pardon them. This is the principle of mercy. A pardon is another word for forgiveness. The judge who punishes the guilty is being righteous, but if the judge can show mercy, then the judge is also being righteous when he pardons. Either way the judge is administering justice. If it is right to punish, then that is justice, but if it is right to pardon, then that is also justice. Either way justice is administered.

The world person will object to this definition of justice. They will argue that justice must be equal. They will argue that there is only justice when all crime is administered punishment as deserved. But this is not Yahweh's justice. The world may think it foolishness to call mercy justice, but with the Almighty, mercy is justice, and to administer mercy where he may is justice. This is because divine justice is in reality divine righteousness. And when it is righteous of Him to show mercy, then that is His justice administered.

Introduction

Πίστις (*pístis*) is not mere belief in a promise, belief in facts, or even just belief or trust in Yeshua. Πίστις is אֱמוּנָה (*emunah*)—faithfulness (in modern Hebrew אֱמוּנָה). By *faith alone* Paul cannot be understood. It requires *faithfulness*. The word comes from the Hebrew root אָמַן (*aman*) which means “to support”. Πίστις, abstractly, is “supportiveness”, the verb πιστεύω “support”, and the adjective πιστός “supportive”; more will be explained on this later, and proofs offered from authorities and linguistic analysis, but for now I explain that the meaning of “support” depends on its object. If one says, “I support your words”, then he means that he believes the words. If one says, “I support you”, then he is declaring his loyalty or commitment to the other person. It wouldn’t do justice to say that “I support you” only means “I believe you”. The necessity of restoring the real meaning of the Πίστις/πιστός/πιστεύω word group comes up over and over again in the translation and commentary, so much so that it alone is a revolution in understanding Paul.

Faithfulness works two ways in Paul. A good many texts have been misunderstood by Christians to refer to believer-faith, when in fact such texts refer to Yeshua’s faithfulness. That is His personal faithfulness—not our faithfulness. Without the soteriological key of Messiah’s faithfulness it is impossible to unravel Paul. A concept like *faith without works* takes on meaning if it is *Yeshua’s* faithfulness without *our* works. Understanding when Paul means our faithful response with good works, and where he means Yeshua’s faithfulness without our works is the *crux interpretum* of Paul. Salvation consists of both *monergism* and *synergism*—His faithfulness alone, and His faithfulness appropriated through our faithful response. This will be explained in a way that respects Torah and the work of the cross.

Δικαιόω (*dikaióo*) has to be the most debated and fought over word in all of Christendom. It is usually translated “justified”, which is misleading in the extreme. This is because the English word is really the Latin *justificāre* in disguise from which it was derived and introduced to English for theological reasons. The primary meaning of the word in Greek was “to administer justice” or to “do justice to” or “for” someone. It will be shown that “justify” in English (also Latin) had this meaning, which is now

archaic. It suffices to say here that by use of the word “justify” Protestant theology claims that they are “declared righteous” in a perfective sense and Catholic theology claims that they are “made righteous” in a perfective sense, and further that both communities believe their concepts the basis for divine acquittal.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The concept of *acquittal* is opposed to the concept of *pardon* (forgiveness). *Acquittal* is legalistic—a fair and just declaration of “not guilty” based on the righteousness of the defendant, or ability of the defendant to make an equitable transaction. A *pardon* is a righteous and just dispensation of mercy to a defendant who has pleaded “guilty as charged”, and is justly given to the sinner that desires to change. With this in mind, it will be shown that to “justify” someone means to “administer justice” to them. If the righteousness of the judge is to administer mercy because the case demands that righteousness manifest with mercy, then the justice administered is mercy. However, if the judge determines that mercy cannot be shown, then the judge “administers justice” directly to the defendant. The word for this is “justiced”. It means that justice/righteousness has been done to the defendant. This requires one to understand that in showing mercy the Judge is being righteous—not in an equitable transaction sense, but an unequal sense, in which circumstances dictate that righteousness means to dispense mercy. Paul explains these circumstances, and this indeed is the major theme of Romans¹.

¹ N.T. Wright, bishop of Durham, comes remarkably close to understanding the concept of justification, but is not quite able to untangle the issue because he is missing a good many pieces of the puzzle (*Justification, 88-91*). To be “justiced” is either to be shown mercy or to be punished. *Justice is administered* either way. Wright chooses of “a declaration which grants them a status” (pg. 91) to describe the result. Very close, but what a *justiced status* denotes is one who has been the recipient of administered justice = mercy via alternate penalty, but we have to keep in mind that this justice is only the righteousness of Yahweh being shown, which since it is mercy, is not to be treated as a commercially equitable exchange. The unrepentant, on the other hand, is not yet justiced. But when they pay the penalty, then they too will have a *justiced status*. Thus we may only speak of “right standing” when we understand that the wicked will get “right standing” also, meaning a standing where in what is right has been done. The judge is just in both forms of justice. What I am saying is that mercy is a form of justice that is righteous. Embracing mercy as administered justice requires us to understand that the righteousness of the judge in doing it is not based on equitable absolutism.

When the sinner has been through the process of being justified, then he has been administered justice. We may call the completion of this a “justified status”. Even the unrepentant will receive a “justified status” at the final judgment. How this works will have to be explained in each text as we come to it.

Νόμος (*nomos*) is the final major piece of the puzzle. Paul uses this word with its full range of meaning ranging from statutory legal system, law all the way to a mere *norm*—the way things are, or the *status quo*. Thus he speaks of the *nomos* of sin and death (=the *norm* of sin and death), and remarks, “but a norm entereth where transgression would increase” (Rom. 5:20). Liddell and Scott define, “**Νόμος**, ὁ, (νέμω) *that which is in habitual practice, use or possession, I. usage, custom*”; thus Paul means no more than that “a custom”, “a habit” or “a norm” entered in. It will become evident that by ὑπὸ νόμον (Rom 6:14) that Paul means “under the norm”. This notion is reinforced by the root νέμω, “A. *deal out, dispense, 2. pay out, distribute*” (LSJ). In the Greek literature νόμος is even equated with punishment and equity since these are things that are distributed or dealt out (cf. TDNT)². *Nomos* means that which “as a rule” applies. This usage of *rule* equates to *normative*, or as “custom” from that which is customary (cf. BDAG, 3rd, pg. 677), and finally *norm*; The third edition of BDAG made a major change in the *nomos* entry by promoting “*custom...norm*” to the first definition, and including a long preface explaining why forcing the term to mean ‘codified statutes’ is an error. Thus when Paul decrees that we are not ὑπὸ νόμον, he means we are no longer *under the norm*, being 1. compulsion to transgress the law, and 2. the penalty of the law. We are not under the norm of the sin nature, but are being delivered from it by Messiah.

So, these three words, Πίστις, Δικαιώω, Νόμος, and their corresponding verbs, adjectives, and nouns, when corrected to, *faithfulness*, *administer justice*, and the *norm*, serve to explain Paul in a straightforward and intelligible manner.³ No longer will any of the complicated antinomian constructions (called theology) that Christians have imposed on Paul be legitimized—systems which left behind a trail of contradictions and

² The fundamental sense of *nomos* always seems to come back to some kind of *norm*. Other authors have proposed “order” as the foundational meaning.

³ There are of course other minor niceties of the Greek language which will be explained in the commentary, which are critical to particular texts.

disputes; systems which misrepresent the Almighty One and the good news of Yeshua; systems which tear down Torah and enslave Israel to disobedience and disloyalty.

There is an abundance of technical information in this commentary, and the order it occurs in, is not necessarily the order in which I would present the subject to someone who is opposed or does not understand. All things are not in the order of relevance or importance, though I have tried to rectify this somewhat in this Introduction. Further, due to the verse by verse nature of a commentary, it is not possible to give an exhaustive presentation of each subject we come to. However, I bring the results of exhaustive studies into each specific text. For instance, on the subject of circumcision, we would have to correct many things in other books, and bring it all together into one paper written in essay format. This mode of presentation cannot be used here. Rather each text here is explained, but the paradigm is not exhaustively explained.

The core of the matter with Paul is the terms Πίστις, Δικαιόω, Νόμος. I think it important that the reader get some notion of the synergistic effect of fixing this words vs. leaving them mistranslated, leaving one less chance to miss the golden point by getting lost in other details:

²¹ But now apart from the norm, the ^ajustice of the Almighty is made visible, being witnessed by the Torah and the Prophets, ²² that is the ^ajustice of the Almighty, through the ^bfaithfulness of Yeshua, the Messiah, unto all those ^ccommitting *to him*; for there is no distinction; ²³ for all sin and fall short of the glory of the Almighty, ²⁴ ^abeing justiced^a as a gift by his loving-kindness through the redemption which is in Messiah Yeshua; (Rom. 3:21-24).

In just a few verses we have the complete range of these words, for Πίστις, the nominal use, “faithfulness”, and the verb used “committing”; for Δικαιόω, the nominal use “justice”, and the verb use “being justiced”, and for Νόμος, a statutory sense, “Torah”, and a sense that merely refers to that which is the usual, or status quo practice: “norm”. One should be able to sense that all the terms are needed to make sense of Paul, and that their devolution into modern theological systems has completely destroyed Paul’s message.

The above passage ranks among the most powerful statements Paul ever wrote. To paraphrase: 21. apart from the the norm—the usual form of justice by which the sinner dies, a different form of justice from the Almighty is made visible—a different justice fully explained in the Torah and Prophets, vs. 22 —a different justice that comes

by the faithfulness—faithful action of Yeshua, the Messiah on the cross unto all those who commit to Him, who support Him,...vs. 24 this different justice is administered --- done for us as a gift, by his loving kindness—his mercy, through the redemption which is in Messiah Yeshua.

†The Hebrew Text

The Hebrew text printed in this commentary is an edited version of the Ezekiel Margoliouth Manuscript, obtained in fascimile from the First Fruits of Zion Archive. It is the only known Hebrew version with cantillation marks, and also the version that is most true to the Greek Manuscripts. It is quite obvious that its author worked directly from the Greek, preserving word order, tense, and all manner of minor details as accurately as can be expected from Hebrew. It is far superior to Franz Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament, and even Bible Society Israel's version. At the bottom of the pile is the Salkinson-Ginsburg translation which qualifies as a paraphrase.

While the Margoliouth MSS is technically superior, it does little to correct traditional mistranslation. For instance despite the fact that the Syriac has אֱלֵא (if not) as the conjunction beginning Romans 3:29, the Margoliouth MSS has אִם כִּי (but). Whereas the Syriac does not deny that a physical Jew is a Jew, the choice made by the later MSS does. So, the MSS while serving as the best starting point, and indeed this saved a lot of work, it still needed editing to agree with the Greek, particularly on two of the three words above (Δικαιόω, Νόμος), and Δικαιόω only because the required definition is archaic in Modern Hebrew.

In many cases, Νόμος has to be rendered with הַנּוֹרְמָה (Modern Hebrew for *the norm*). In reality this is the most “extreme” correction. But then again it is not extreme, because the Syriac Peshitta literally borrowed the word Νόμος into Aramaic in the form of נְמוּסָא (ܢܡܘܣܐ). The word was also borrowed in the forms נִימוּסָא, נִימוּסָא and נְמוּס, defined in Jastrow as “*usage, law; religion*”; wherein examples cited, “the royal usage [norm] of warfare”, and “when you come to a place, follow its customs

[norms]”⁴. Payne Smith (of the Margoliouth family), pg. 340 defines, “**נְמוּסָא** b) *Nóμος*, law, ordinance, custom, usage.” The truth here then is that the Peshitta Aramaic NT borrowed the word *Nóμος*. This tells us a lot. First there was no existing Hebrew or Aramaic word to represent *Nóμος*; and second the existing word **תּוֹרָה** [**ܬܘܪܐ** (**ואוריתא**)] would not do. The modern Hebrew equivalent is **נְוִיָּמָה**, borrowed from the English *norm*.

Cantillation marks represent, 1. accent marks, 2. punctuation marks, and 3. musical notes; wherein I modified or was compelled to add marks, they are true to accent and punctuation; the punctuation value of the conjunctive accents is all the same, but since I am not a Cantor or musician, the work of editing the “correct” notes is left to others, and that is not to mention actually figuring out the value of the notes in the first place.

The English side translation is meant to be most literal to the Greek. An additional reason for this, despite the fact that the English reader should slow down a bit, is that the English corresponds to the word order of the Hebrew much closer, which in turn minimizes the need for a dictionary for those using the translation to learn Hebrew. If we go back to the 16th century, we discover that English word order is indeed much more flexible than the modern norm might dictate. The key is for the English reader to slow down and think about the text clause by clause. For this reason copious punctuation in the form of [;, !?:()] has been placed into the text. These agree very closely with the punctuation accents in the Hebrew version.

†Remarks on Aramaic Primacy

The Hebrew translation is based on the Greek MSS. It is of course nonsense to think that Paul wrote anything in Aramaic to a Greek speaking audience in Rome, other than a loan word or two, or a phrase or two that actually made it into Greek. For example, *Ἀββᾶ* = **אַבָּא** *Abba* in Rom. 8:15, or *ἀλλὰ* = **אַלְא** I am not saying that the solutions here will not work on the Peshitta to some extent. *Namusa* (*Nóμος*) can certainly be explained with the Greek meaning as *norm*, and **יְמִנּוּתָא** (Rom 1:17) =

⁴ *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, Marcus Jastrow, pg. 905.

faithfulness, and מִזְדַּדְקִין = having justice administered. Aramaic, however, is the language of exile (cf. Is. 28:11), as also is Greek, and both are dead languages, and it is Hebrew that is being revived, not Aramaic or Greek. The necessary words from Greek, and Aramaic, have already been borrowed into Modern Hebrew.

An Aramaic based source like the Peshitta has exactly zero apologetical value toward the vast majority of Christians. That's because they have been correctly taught that the Greek is the closest thing we have to original sources. Those at the forefront of attacking the Greek MSS in favor of Aramaic are: James Trimm, Andrew Gabriel Roth. One classic argument is that, “Simon the Leper” (Mat. 26:6) shows the Greek is untrue because “lepers” cannot live in cities or around people. But at least three Peshitta translations (LEW, MGI, MRD) still have “leper”! The best explanation may be that it was a anachronistic nickname referring to a past association with a condition of leprousy.

Another classic argument is Acts 11:28, where the English says, “throughout all the world” (ἐφ’ ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην). It is correctly argued that the famine was only in Judea. This problem is resolved easily by realizing that οἰκουμένην = “being inhabited”⁵ = הַמְּיוֹשְׁבֵת דְּהָאָרֶץ כָּל עַל. The word is a feminine participle that implies γῆ, without stating it, and the implied word means, “3. portions or regions of the earth, *region, country*” (BDAG 3rd, pg. 196). This makes it equivalent to the Hebrew אֶרֶץ. The word “world” is not even involved in the Greek text, just “being dwelled”, i.e. only הַמְּיוֹשְׁבֵת is explicit, and אֶרֶץ has to be supplied. In plain English, the Greek means exactly, “upon all the inhabited *land [in Judea]*”; So Trimm’s proof text for Greek faultiness against the Aramaic is mere self serving incompetence.

There is nothing special, or to be gained from Aramaic that cannot be obtained by translating the Greek, using legitimate Greek meanings, straight into Hebrew. The Greek maps exactly onto the Hebrew root base, and the Aramaic Peshitta actually agrees with the Greek more than those who would pit one against the other want you to think.

⁵ See Thayer’s Lexicon, pg. 411, “fem. of the pres. pass. ptcp. fr. οικεω [sc. γῆ;...]”; the abbreviation sc. means *scilicet* (one may understand, supply). The passive participle would be “being dwelled”.

Romans, Chapter 1

1 Paul ₁ , a servant ₂ of Messiah ₃ Yeshua ₄ , פּוֹלוֹס עֶבֶד מְשִׁיחַ יֵשׁוּעַ, מְקַרְא שְׁלִיחַ, <i>being called as an emissary, and being</i> <i>separated for the good news of the Almighty,</i> וְנִבְדָּל לְבִשׂוּרַת אֱלֹהִים:
--

§1:1.1 Why is “Paul” called Paul (Παῦλος/פּוֹלוֹס) and not Shaul (Σαῦλος/שְׂאוּל)? Acts 13:9 points out that Paul had two names, “Then Σαῦλος, (who also *is called* Παῦλος,) filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on him.” Many Jewish people have two variations of their names. For instance, “Jacob” in English when in America, but “Ya‘akov” in Israel. Dunn speculates that Παῦλος was his legal name as a Roman citizen, and that Σαῦλος/שְׂאוּל was his familiar name from childhood. “Missionaries” (the modern term for “emissary”) often adopt forms for their names more familiar to the people they are working among, so the man from Tarsus went by “Paul” among the nations, but “Shaul” among the Jews.

1:1.2 The phrase “servant of Messiah Yeshua” compares with עֶבֶד־יְהוָה (Deut. 34:5), “servant of Yahweh” for Moses. Also Joshua is called the “servant of Yahweh” (Josh. 24:30). These connections remind us that “Yahweh spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend. And he turned again into the camp: but his servant Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man, departed not out of the tabernacle. (Exo 33:11 KJV). Paul’s usage is sensible since Yeshua is Yahweh in human form.

1:1.3 There term “Messiah” מְשִׁיחַ (*mashiakh*) is a title meaning, “anointed”; it is applied to Cyrus in apparent *remez* רִמְזָה (a hint) for Yeshua, who will build both the city of Jersusalem and the Temple in the age to come (cf. Isa. 44:28-45:1).

1:1.4 If Yeshua had a birth certificate, then it would read Yehoshua: יְהוֹשׁוּעַ, or יְהוֹשֻׁעַ. *Yehoshua* is usually rendered *Joshua* in English. It is not a question of only one form, יְהוֹשֻׁעַ or יֵשׁוּעַ being *right*. Many people have more than one form for their name. For instance, Dan, Daniel, or Joe, Joseph. יֵשׁוּעַ is the popular and more informal form, and יְהוֹשׁוּעַ is more formal. Though the form יֵשׁוּעַ was an Aramaic short form for יְהוֹשׁוּעַ, it has become part of Hebrew.

<p>1 Paul, a servant of Messiah Yeshua⁵, being called as an emissary, and being separated for the good news of the Almighty,</p>	<p>פּוֹלוֹס עֶבֶד מְשִׁיחַ יֵשׁוּעַ מִקְרָא שְׁלִיחַ, וְנִבְדָּל לְבִשְׂוֹרַת אֱלֹהִים:</p>
---	---

1:1.5 There are sects that try to alter the traditional forms. One sect insists on *Yahushua* (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ)⁶ and promotes it so strongly as to cause division and disapproval of the traditional spellings. It’s main argument is based on charging the Masoretic scribes with conspiracy to not only suppress the divine name, but also to suppress all forms of part of the divine name used in proper names. (It was never a secret conspiracy that the scribes respelled the vowels of the divine name.) But it takes an entirely new theory of suppression to charge them with altering parts of the divine name in proper names. This conspiracy theory suggests that original prefix *יְהוֹ- *Yahu-* forms were pointed as יְהוֹ- *Yeho-* forms to hide any resemblance to the divine name. However, this theory fails to explain why the suffix form יְהוֹ- stands unaltered at the end of many names. Apparently ancient Jews had no problem with pronouncing them. It also fails to explain why the short form of the divine name, יְהוֹ stands unaltered separately in the Psalms and other places. One has to assume 1. a secret conspiracy, 2. that it only conspired to make changes at the beginning of names and not the end, and 3. that Jews were only concerned about not saying *Yahu-* at the start of words and not *-Yahu* at the end of names. This is not to say that there were no *Yahu-* forms for other names.

The problem is that the sectarian insistence on these forms for the Messiah’s name is divisiveness for the purpose of making followers of the sect’s leadership who will only listen to the sectarian leadership because they are “right” about such an important matter. For many saying the names right is a matter of getting a particular point of the Torah right so that they may judge themselves faithful to the Almighty One, and everyone else unfaithful. Sects latch on to such ideas because they serve as a shortcut way of telling who is elect and who is not. It makes their followers feel more secure in their *salvation* to have the badge of belonging to the group. Right or wrong, it is not such particular points that will decide whether one is faithful to Yahweh or not. It is an abiding commitment to Yeshua that decides who is faithful, and the ignorance of the faithful one concerning certain points of the Torah, is not a matter of “transgression” since not all have the same maturity, and we who are strong ought to

⁶ A conjectured form that does not occur in the Hebrew Bible.

“bear with the weak” with mercy and compassion, and not cast them off as if they are lawless. For we were once “ignorant”. How much more shall we bear with the ignorance of the weak brother, so long as he is willing to bear with us.

<p>1 Paul, a servant of Messiah Yeshua, <i>being</i> ,מְקַרָּא שְׁלִיחַ, <i>called as an emissary, and being</i> ךְּסוּרָה <i>for the good news of the Almighty,</i> וּנְבִדָּל לְבִשׁוּרַת אֱלֹהִים:</p>
--

†1:1.6 Why does the translation use “Almighty” instead of “God”? Good question! It has little to do with the supposed unfitness of the word God⁷, and much to do with what the original texts actually approved. You see, the Greek word for “God” was θεός, but this was never spelled out as such in the early Greek papyri⁸. In fact, all the vowels were missing. Only as $\overline{\Theta C}$, $\overline{\Theta Y}$, $\overline{\Theta \Omega}$, or $\overline{\Theta N}$ did it appear. In fact, the original texts used a similar device for all the divine names and titles. There were seven to be exact, one for *Father, Son, Spirit, Yeshua, Messiah, Almighty, and Yahweh*, respectively. Scholars call the symbolic letters *nomina sacra*—Latin for “sacred name.”⁹ What is the meaning of these devices? It is fairly simple. The texts were saying in effect, “Substitute the correct Hebrew term here.” The reason is that the divine names are titles were considered untranslatable because it was considered respectful to the Almighty One (אֱלֹהִים) to read the scriptures aloud with the proper names in Hebrew. This reasoning applied principally to proper names, Yeshua, Yahweh, and less so to the titles, Elohim, Ruakh, Abba, Ben, Mashiakh. I think that the four titles were added to the list to make a nice round number of seven basic *nomina sacra*. Actually, there are three Hebrew words represented by the symbol \overline{KC} for Yahweh: 1. “Yahweh”, 2. “Adonai”, and 3. “Adon”.

⁷ Orthodox Jews spell the word God, “G-d” with a hyphen in the middle. Some attempt to point out or derive the word “God” from pagan usage or pagan dieties. Whether correct or not, the attempt to question the faithfulness of those who use the term is divisive.

⁸ The earliest “New Testatment” writings were translated or written in Greek on papyrus, a paper derived from Egypt. Sheets of these were bounding into a book form called a *codex*. The text was written in all capital letters without any punctuation or spaces between words.

⁹ See *The Quest for the Original Text of the New Testatment*, Philip Wesley Comfort, pg. 47-48. *Early Manuscripts & Modern Translations of the New Testament*, Comfort, pg. 10.

I translate אֱלֹהִים the “Almighty” because this is what the word אֱלֹהִים means. The base form of the word means “Mighty One” (אֱלֹהַ), and the plural form on the ending: אֱלֹהִים is a superlative marker.¹⁰ It means “most” or “highest” or “best”. This is translated with the prefix “Al” to form “Almighty”. What the word “God” lacks is a clear reference to the divine attribute of infinite power, and also a clear adjectival use. For example, in John 1:1 “the Word was with the Almighty, and the Word was Almighty (adjectival use)”.

<p>1 Paul, a servant of Messiah Yeshua, <i>being</i> מְקַרְא שְׁלִיחַ, called <i>as an</i> emissary⁷, and being separated וְנִבְדָּל לְבִשׁוּרַת אֱלֹהִים: for <i>the</i> good news of <i>the</i> Almighty,</p>
--

1:1.7 The office of the “emissary” (Greek: ἀπόστολος) is taken from a pre-existing institution of the שְׁלִיחַ (*shaliakh*). The שְׁלִיחִים were emissaries or representatives sent from one Jewish community to another, typically from Jerusalem to a dispersion community.¹¹ The word meant “a sent one”. The שְׁלִיחַ was sent in the name of, and with the authority of the sender. The word only appears in the verb form in the law and prophets for those sent by Yahweh. Yahweh, tells Moses to say שְׁלַחְנִי “I AM *sendeth me* to you” (Ex. 3:14). Jehoshaphat שְׁלַח “sendeth” representatives to teach the Torah (2Chron. 17:7-9) at the end of the sabbatical year. By the time of the first century, however, the representatives themselves were being called “the sent ones” (שְׁלִיחִים) turning a verb into a noun. This term is adopted by Yeshua to designate his emissaries to Israel and the nations. Also, during the time that Paul used the word ἀπόστολος in Greek there was nothing *churchy* associated with it. Later the term was essentially hijacked and redefined by anti-Semitic Gentiles to the point that the modern word “Apostle” cannot be truly returned to its Jewish context. The modern term “missionary” is actually closer to the original sense than the modern sense of “Apostle”.

¹⁰ cf. Gesenius Hebrew Grammar, §124e. בְּרִכּוֹת = (abundant) blessing [the Blessing of blessings]; KJV Ps. 21:6, “most blessed”; See also §124g n. 5, “an indication of *the fullness of power and might* implied in אֱלֹהִים”

¹¹ cf. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, Emil Schürer, “*Apostoli*, Jewish, II. ii. 269, 290, I. ii. 277.”

²which He promiseth beforehand, through His אֲשֶׁר הִבְטִיחַ אֶתְּהָ מִקְדָּם, בְּדַרְדָּר
 prophets², in *the* ¹holy writings¹, נְבִיאִיו, בְּכַתְּבֵים קְדוּשִׁים:

§1:2.1 At the time Paul wrote this, the reader would associate the term “holy writings” with the Torah, Prophets, and Writings, what is today called the “Jewish Canon” or *Tanakh*. Paul bases his arguments on the authority of the Scriptures by constant citation. It is important to know that the Scriptures predicted Messiah “beforehand”. The fulfillment confirms the prediction, and the prediction confirms the fulfillment. This is an arrangement that must be divinely orchestrated. False religion cannot duplicate this kind of objectivity.

1:2.2 It will be helpful to remember that Abraham and Moses were “prophets” (Gen. 20:7; Deut. 34:10) and not to limit Paul’s words to post-Torah prophets. There are some very important prophecies in the Torah, i.e. Gen. 3:15, the binding of Isaac, the fates of Pharaoh’s two servants, Deut. 18:18, and the very important teaching that Yahweh appears in physical form as the *Malakh Yahweh* (cf. Gen. 16:7).

³about His ^oSon¹, that be^eth *born* from *the* ²seed אֲדוּזֹת בְּנוֹ, הַנּוֹלָד מִזֶּרַע דָּוִד, לְפִי
 of David², according to *the* flesh, הַבָּשָׂר:

§1:3.1 The title “Son” was marked in the Greek MSS as *nomina sacra*: **ΥΝ**. It means Yahweh’s own special Son—One who is of the same nature. The English term is capitalized to show the *nomina sacra* status. See below on vs. 4.

1:3.2 Some have questioned Yeshua’s descent from King David on the naive assumption that the royal line ended with Jeconiah (cf. Jer. 22:24-30 where the KJV calls him Coniah). To fulfill the prophecy, none of his seed could pass to Messiah. Since Messiah is the son of Zerubabel, son of Shalathiel, son of Jeconiah, how could the prophecy be true and Yeshua be descended from the royal line of David? Answer: after Jeconiah’s death, a widow of Jeconiah married into the line of Neri, son of Nathan, son of King David, and begat Shalathiel, who became the legal heir of Jeconiah’s by the law of kinsman marriage, but not his biological “seed”¹². This preserved the prophecy

¹² There was never any son of Jeconiah called “Assir”; the word means “prisoner”. The NASB and NET Bible correctly translate 1Chron. 3:17, “The sons of Jeconiah, the prisoner, were Shealtiel his son, ...”. Shealtiel is the legal royal son, produced by the Leverite marriage. The others listed immediately after Shealtiel are not his “seed”, namely Malchiram, Pedaiah, Shenazar, Jecamiah, Hoshama, and Nedabiah. They are the other issue of the Leverite marriage with Jeconiah’s widow. Only the first son of the Leverite marriage get’s the title and name of the dead husband. Because

denying that Jeconiah’s seed would rule on the throne of Judah. But his title, and sonship passes to Shealtiel since he was the kinsman “son”. Jeconiah died childless, since he had no heir when he died, and “Shealtiel” who became his heir was not his “seed”. After “Shealtiel” was made “his son”, Shealtiel married, but then died leaving no heir. Shealtiel’s widow married the next of kin, “Pediah”, and begat Zerubbabel. So the biological line goes: king David to Nathan to Neri to Pediah¹³ to Zerubbabel to Yeshua (cf. Luke 3). And the royal line through Solomon goes: king David to Solomon to Jeconiah to Shealtiel to Zerubbabel to Yeshua (cf. Matthew 1).

³ about His ¹ Son ₁ , that be‘eth <i>born</i> from <i>the</i> ² seed of David ₂ , according to <i>the</i> flesh, <div style="text-align: right;">הַבְּשָׂרָה:</div>	אֲדוֹת בְּנוֹ, הַנּוֹלֵד מִזֶּרַע דָּוִד, לְפִי
--	---

So Yeshua is the biological seed of king David for certain, and could potentially be descended from all the kings down to Josiah if Jeconiah took first cousins for wives, but Jeconiah only passes his “name” or legal title through kinsman marriages to Messiah.

It is clear that transfer of the royal line to Zerubbabel, and from there to Yeshua, via kinsman marriages was approved by the Almighty. In the prophecy rejecting Jeconiah (Jer. 22:24), the prophet describes the image of a “signet” being plucked off Yahweh’s right hand as a metaphor of His rejection of Coniah. But in Hag. 2:23, the same image is used to encourage Zerubbabel, “and will make thee as a signet; for I have chosen thee saith Yahweh of hosts.”¹⁴

Shealtiel also died without “seed”, his next of kin Pediah had to marry his widow producing Zerubbabel.

¹³ Pediah is skipped in Luke’s reckoning, but this is not unusual. In 1Chron. 3:19 he is given as the father of Zerubbabel. Just how the sons of Zerubbabel “Abiud” (Joseph’s line) and “Rhesa” (Miryam’s line) connect to the sons listed in 1Chron. 3:19-20, is not known.

¹⁴ Rabbinic antimissionaries would rather end the Davidic line at Jeconiah than admit that kinsman marriages provide a way around it, or that Zerubbabel was assured that he was accepted by Yahweh in Haggai 2:2. They use their superior knowledge of Jer. 22:24-30 to lay a trap for the faithful in Yeshua, and to deceive them

<p>⁴that be'eth designated₂ <i>the</i> ³Son of <i>the</i> אֲשֶׁר הַמְּסוּמָן בֶּן-אֱלֹהִים בְּגִבוֹ-רָה, לְפִי Almighty^a₃ with power, according to <i>the</i> רוּחַ הַקְּדוּשָׁה, בְּתַחִיָּה מִן-הַמַּתִּים, יְשׁוּעַ Spirit of holiness, by <i>his</i> resurrection₁ from <i>the</i> dead, Yeshua <i>the</i> Messiah, our Lord₄, הַמְּשִׁיחַ אֲדֹנָינוּ:</p>
<p>4a or the Almighty Son.</p>

§1:4.1 Yeshua was raised “the third day”, and also “after three days”. In the first case “day” is defined as a 24 hour calendar day starting at sunrise and ending at the next sunrise—that is, the calendar day for sacrifices. In the second case, “day” is defined strictly as dawn to dusk, only 12 hours, such that “after” means the following night. This following night was still part of “the third day”. This agrees exactly with “three days and three nights”; Yeshua was raised at the end of the third night, just at the earliest dawn, on the Sabbath day (אַחַת-הַשַּׁבָּתוֹת). See Mat. 12:40; Mk. 8:31; Hos. 6:1-2; Lev. 7:15.

1:4.2 Yeshua was “designated” or “declared” the “Son of the Almighty”. This does not mean he became the Son then. It only means that the resurrection, fulfilling the sign of Jonah, was the final proof to Israel of His identity. For it is written:

(Hos. 6:3): “וְנִדְעָה נְרִדְפָה לְדַעַת אֶת-יְהוָה כְּשַׁחַר נֶכּוֹן מִזְצֹאוֹ”

“We must know; we must pursue to know of Yahweh as at dawn is fixed his going forth.” So when Yeshua came out of the grave “in the third day” (Hos. 6:1-2), it was proved that He was Yahweh, the son of Yahweh.

1:4.3 The phrase בֶּן-אֱלֹהִים (*ben-Elohim*) can also be taken in the sense of “the Almighty Son”, which is to say that the Son is of the same nature as the Father. This is because, אֱלֹהִים (*Elohim*) often has an adjective sense. For example, “And the Word was Almighty” (John 1:1). Literally, “Son-Almighty” (υἱοῦ $\overline{\Theta\Upsilon}$) may be turned around in English to form “Almighty Son” (cf. Gesenius §128p-v; Wallace pg. 86). Deuteronomy often uses the phrase, “Yahweh our Almighty” in just this sense, equivalent to “our Almighty Yahweh”. Also, Gesenius states, “There is another use of בֶּן or בְּנֵי to denote membership of a guild or society (or of a tribe, or any definite class). Thus בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים or בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים. Gn 6:2, 4, Jb 1:6, 2:1, 38:7 (cf. also בְּנֵי אֱלִים. ψ Ps 29:1, 89:7)

properly means not *sons of god(s)*, but beings of the class of אֱלֹהִים or אֱלִים;¹⁵ (§128v).

<p>⁴that be'eth designated₂ <i>the</i> ³Son of <i>the</i> אֲשֶׁר הַמְּסוּמָן בֶּן־אֱלֹהִים בְּגִבּוֹרָהּ, לְפִי אֱלֹהִים^a with power, according to <i>the</i> רִוַח הַקְּדוּשָׁה, בְּתַחִיהָ מִן־הַמַּתִּים, יְשׁוּעַ ⁵Spirit of holiness₅, by <i>his</i> resurrection₁ from <i>the</i> dead, Yeshua <i>the</i> Messiah, our Lord₄, הַמְּשִׁיחַ אֲדֹנָינוּ:</p>
<p>4a or the Almighty Son.</p>

1:4.4 When the word “Lord” is used with a possessive pronoun, then it is not the divine name: אֲדֹנָינוּ = our Lord. A study of usages in the Tanakh will show that the use of possessives, *my, their, our, his*, is almost exclusively with *Adonai*, and only a few cases, called the emmendations of the Sopherim, with *Yahweh*. This general pattern allows us to decipher when the nomina sacra **KY** means *Adonai* or *Adon*, and when it means *Yahweh*. See below 1:7.

<p>⁵through whom we receiveth loving kindness and ambassadorship, for a ²hearing of faithfulness,^a among all the ^bPeoples₁, for <i>the sake of</i> his ^o name, הַבְּדָרְךָ אֲשֶׁר קִבְּלָנוּ חֶסֶד וְשְׁלִיחוּת לְמִשְׁמַרְעֵת אֱמוּנָתְךָ בְּכָל־הַגּוֹיִם לְמַעַן שְׁמוֹ:</p>
<p>5a-a i.e. hearing about Messiah's faithfulness, or faithful hearing ה'א א/ו לְצִיּוֹת ב = נְאֻמָּנוֹת: b = tribes, people group defined by language, culture, geographical limits.</p>

§1:5.1 Sometimes, I use the translation “Peoples” for the usual nations. But I will have to define it: a national unit of people defined by common culture language and geographical limits usually much smaller than the concept of the modern nation. Also called a “people group”. Ethnologists have classified about 16,750 Peoples.

1:5.2 “Hearing of faithfulness” means “hearing *about* faithfulness” When the good news of Yeshua’s payment is told to us who commit to Him, then we are “hearing of [His] faithfulness”. Habakkuk 2:4 states, “The righteous shall live by His faithfulness” (MT). The Greek version read by Paul’s audience, “The righteous shall live by My faithfulness” (LXX). Paul repeats this theme in Rom. 1:17 and Rom. 3:22, “...which is

¹⁵ A note of caution. While the grammar is comparable to “son of Almighty” = “Almighty Son” in the case of Messiah, the meaning of *Elohim* is different in the case of “sons of the Almighty” if it be turned around as Gesenius suggests. In such case, it would be “beings of the class ‘mighty ones’”, and not ‘beings of the class Almighty’. We wouldn’t know this from grammar, but we certainly know it from Deut. 6:4, “Yahweh is our Almighty, Yahweh alone”.

through the faithfulness of Christ”.¹⁶ This understanding is absolutely essential to understanding what Paul means by, “faithfulness without works” (Rom. 3:28). Paul is referring to the fact that Messiah’s faithfulness for the work of the cross is not our “work”.

The text has double meaning. It also means “hearing *from* faithfulness”. This second sense can also be expressed, “faithful hearing”. When we commit to Him, then our response is “hearing *from* faithfulness” or “a faithful hearing” of the good news. This sense agrees with, “The righteous shall live by his faithfulness” (Hab. 2:4, MT), where “his” refers to the faithful response of the one committing to Messiah Yeshua.

1:5.3 Paul's presentation is covenantal, which is to say two parts. One part is Yahweh's faithfulness, and the other part is our faithful response. His faithfulness is at first unilateral, because Yeshua died for us while we were yet transgressors, but our response is synergistic—our faithfulness working with His faithfulness to transform us.

1:5.4 (advanced) The phrase, “hearing of faithfulness” is deliberately ambiguous. The sense of the Greek *ὑπακοήν* is a *compliant hearing*, or *submissive hearing*, literally, “under hearing” (*ὑπακοήν* = *ὑπ* + *ακοήν*). From this comes the sense of “obedience”, a translation which obscures the Hebrew sense Paul wishes to convey. In Hebrew, “hearing” is “obeying”. If someone does not obey, then it is implied that he did not hear. The idea of hearing is connected with the will of man. If he does not obey it, then he is not ‘giving’ a hearing to it; his *will* is not submitted to the message. Nevertheless, the content of the message to be heard is vitally important, and by translating “obedience” this is lost.¹⁷

The syntax is ambiguous. As a genitive of quality it transforms to “faithful hearing” (cf. Cranfield, pg. 66 vi. degenerately “believing obedience”). As an object genitive, ‘[giving] heed [to] faithfulness’ (cf. Cranfield, pg. 66 iii, “obedience to God’s faithfulness attested in the gospel”). The grammarians, of course, do not really need to

¹⁶ Quoted Rom. 3:22 from: Daniel B. Wallace, *An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, pg. 114.

¹⁷ Dunn, (*Word Biblical Commentary*, “Romans”) tells us that the Greek word *ὑπακοήν* “was a little known word at this time (see LSJ; MM)...probably as yet another word we owe to Paul” (pg. 17). Paul is using a semiticism here, “The verb *ὑπακούω* still displays its derivation from *ἀκούω*, “hear” (see LSJ, *ὑπακούω*—range of meaning includes “give ear to, answer, heed”; LXX uses *ὑπακούω* to translate *שמע*, “hear”);” (ibid).

use such jawbreaking terms. “Hearing of [with/about] faithfulness”¹⁸ states the whole genitive sense quite clearly. Paul uses a very slight variant in Gal. 3:2 and 3:5 (ἀκοῆς πίστεως) with the same double meaning.

1:5.5 (criticism) Despite seeing the semitic origin of ὑπακούω Dunn fails to apply it when rejecting Gaston, “obedience to [i.e. hearing of] God’s faithfulness”; Dunn also rejects the subjective genitive in Rom. 3:22.

Cranfield also clearly fails to detect the Hebrew sense, “hearing”, or the Hebrew sense, “faithfulness” (support). This causes him to miss the whole point and to argue for the degenerate sense, “the obedience which consists in faith”, which he reduces to a “decision” called “an act of obedience” (pg. 67). Stern (pg. 328) rightly rejects this interpretation of Cranfield, but is too timid to restore πίστεως to “faithfulness” and fails to see “hearing of (about) [Messiah’s] faithfulness” in the text. He ends up with a mere paraphrase of one side of the correct interpretation, “trust-grounded obedience” improved, but still quite weakened by antinomian theology.

Shullam (*A Commentary on the Jewish Roots of Romans*), disconnects us from the literal sense and obvious semiticism by pointing us to “obedience of the peoples” “עמים יקרת” (Gen. 49:10, pg. 34). [The Gen. 49:10 Hebrew יקרת, appears to be construct noun based on יקח. = will be received/taken. The LXX, “And he is the expectation of the nations” seems to agree, and the KJV “gathering of the people”. So the Gen. 49:10 Hebrew should go, “and to Him receiving of the nations”. Judah is restored first, and Messiah is Jewish, so the nations are recieved by Messiah first, then Judah (cf. Gen. 48:19).] So Shullam’s speculation is too tenuous (the word יקרת is nearly *hapax*), and I would also suspect Rabbinic bias taking Gen. 49:10 as “obedience”, especially in light of the fact that the Rabbis want to avoid the Messianic rendition of, “until shall come Shiloh [Messiah] and to him the-receiving-of peoples.”

¹⁸ Wallace states, “Thus, ‘revelation of Christ’ can be unpacked to mean ‘the revelation *about* Christ’ or ‘the revelation *from* Christ.’ ” (pg. 73, Exegetical Syntax). On page 86 he explains the attributive genitive or “Hebrew Genitive” such that “body of sin” = “sinful body”. This applies here also, “hearing of faithfulness” = “faithful hearing”.

<p>⁶among whom are also ye called by Yeshua <i>the</i> Messiah; ⁷to all those being in Rome, beloved of <i>the</i> Almighty, called holy ones: Loving kindness to you and peace from <i>the</i> Almighty Father of us, and Yahweh₁ Yeshua <i>the</i> Messiah.</p>	<p>בְּאֶשֶׁר גַּם-אַתֶּם קְרוּאֵי יֵשׁוּעַ הַמָּשִׁיחַ: לְכָל-הֵהָם שְׁחִיִּים בְּרוּמָא אֱהוּבֵי אֱלֹהִים לְמִקְרָאִים קְדוּשִׁים חֶסֶד לָכֶם וְשָׁלוֹם מֵאֵת אֱלֹהִים אֲבִינוּ וְיְהוָה יֵשׁוּעַ הַמָּשִׁיחַ:</p>
--	--

§1:7.1 The original texts contained symbols for divine names and titles; for the divine name: **ΚΥ**. In the IVth century the scribes changed the symbols, including the symbols for the divine name; in this case to *κυριου*. A modern approximation of this ancient device is to spell LORD in capital letters to indicate the divine name. It is Jewish tradition, and also Christian tradition not to pronounce the divine name. The Rabbis claim that to say the divine name might break the third commandment. The Church wishes to avoid it because it is too closely connected to Israel, and too ‘tribal’. The symbol may stand for either the divine name **יְהוָה** (Yahweh), or for the titles: **אֲדֹנָי** (Adonai), **אֲדֹנִי** (Adoni) or for the honorific **אֲדֹן** (Adon).

1:7.2 The means of knowing which is meant is based on these observations: 1. *Adonai* means *my Lord*, and is almost always used implicitly or explicitly with a possessive pronoun, *my, our, their*, etc. 2. *Yahweh* is used 7000+ times in the Torah and Prophets, and *Adonai* less than 600 times. Therefore, if the *nomina sacra*, **ΚΥ**, is without a possessive pronoun it stands for *Yahweh*, but if with a pronoun then *Lord*. The only exception to this is that in public with Yeshua in person the term meant was: **אֲדֹן**. The closest approximation to this is like calling the Almighty *Señor* in Spanish, which means either “Mr.” or “Lord”. This would have been an acquiescence to Jewish tradition, and the fact that Yeshua was hiding who he really was.

<p>⁸First indeed, I am giving thanks to my ^oAlmighty through Yeshua <i>the</i> Messiah for all of you, because your ^ofaithfulness₁ is being proclaimed in all the world.</p>	<p>בְּרֵאשׁוֹנָה אֲמַנֶּם אֲנִי מוֹדֶה לְאֱלֹהֵי בְּדַרְדָּרַי יֵשׁוּעַ הַמָּשִׁיחַ עַל-כִּלְכֵּם כִּי הָאֱמוּנָה נִתְקַבְּלָה מִסַּפְּרֵת בְּכָל-הַתְּבִלָּה: ח'א = הַנְּאֻמָּנוּתְכֶם:</p>
--	---

§1:8.1 Paul says your “faithfulness” is proclaimed in all the world. Equally good is “your commitment” or “your supportiveness” or “your loyalty”. In ancient Hebrew **אֱמוּנָה** meant *faithfulness*, but in modern Hebrew this sense has been rendered archaic, and has been replaced by **נְאֻמָּנוּת** to express *faithfulness*. The Hebrew text could be

translated **הַנְּאִמְנוּתְכֶם** in modern Hebrew. In Greek the word is **πίστις**. (Please do not trust Strong’s Dictionary on this, nor your fundamentalist preachers.) The Best Lexicon to use in Greek is called BDAG, 3rd edition, and the best Lexicon in Hebrew is BDB. The Greek Lexicon lists “faithfulness” in the first definition for **πίστις**. The word **commitment** is right next to it along with **fidelity** and **reliability** (BDAG, 3rd, pg. 818). **אֱמוּנָה** = **πίστις** = **faithfulness** occurs in the King James Version at 1Sa 26:23 and Hosea 2:20; the noun is further translated “faithfully” in 2Kings 12:15; 22:7; 2Chron. 31:12; and 2Chron. 34:12; The King James Version translates the adjective **πιστός** more than 40 times as **faithful**, but not once manages to translate the noun **πίστις** as **faithfulness**. More modern translations have slowly, but grudgingly corrected this folly. The New American Standard Bible manages to translate **faithfulness** three more times, in Mat. 23:23; Rom. 3:3; and Gal. 5:22. The Hebrew noun **אֱמוּנָה** is derived from the verb **אָמַן** which means **to support**, hence “a support”, “supportiveness” are periphrasis based on the verbal root.

<p>⁹Because the Almighty is my witness, whom I am serving in my spirit, in connection to the good news₁ of his Son, as to how unceasingly mention of you I am making,</p>	<p>כִּי עַדִּי הוּא אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים, אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי עֹבֵד אֹתוֹ בְּרוּחִי, בְּבִשׁוּרָת בְּנֵי אֵיךְ בְּלִתִּי חֲדָל אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה זְכוֹר לְכֶם:</p>
---	--

§1:9.1 The “good news” (**בִּשְׂוֹרָה**) in Greek is **εὐαγγελίω**. The Hebrew term is used for “good news” in 2Sam. 18:22, 25, 27. The verb root **בִּשַׁר** means “1. gladden with good tidings” (BDB). The Greek term **εὐαγγελίω** is composed of two parts, a prefix **εὐ**, meaning “good” or “glad”, and the word **αγγελίω** meaning “message”, the same word from which we get **ἄγγελος** “messenger”.

The word “gospel” no longer evokes this sense in the ear. It is the duty of translators to update language when old meanings become unclear. “Gospel” used to mean “good news”:

”O.E. *godspel* “good news,” from *god* “good” + *spel* “story, message,” translation of L. *bona adnuntiatio*, itself a translation of Gk. *euangelion* “reward for bringing good news.” First element of the O.E. word had a long “o,” but it shifted under mistaken assoc. with *God*.” (Online Etymology Dictionary).

What happens when a word is not in its plain sense, or is not updated to its plain sense in the general language, is that it is culturally redefined as a technical word among its users. In this case “gospel” is a Christian word which denotes the specific good news about Yeshua and the kingdom of the Almighty. While this notion is contextually true for many uses of the word, it is still an adulteration of the word to confer on the word the lexical sense of a specific good news. It has the effect of divorcing the word from its wider biblical context. One can see the discordance in the NASB where the word is translated “gospel” in the NT in 94 verses, and nowhere as such in the “Old Testament”, where it is translated “good news”. These sorts of disconnects come from a latent desire to get a divorce from the Hebrew roots of the Scripture. This is why we have a host of words that have been Christianized, i.e. “church”, “faith”, “apostle,” “gospel”, “preach”, etc.

<p>¹⁰always in my °prayers asking, if somehow, now at last, I will succeed, by the will of the Almighty, to come unto you. ¹¹For I am longing to see you, so that I may impart some ₁spiritual gift₁ to you, such that you be’eth established;</p>	<p>בְּכָל־נֶטַח בְּתַפְלוּתֵי אֲנִי מִתְחַנֵּן, אִם־אֶפְוֵא, עֲתָה בְּאַחֲרִית אֲצַלַח, בְּרָצוֹן הַאֱלֹהִים, לְבוֹא אֵלֵיכֶם: ”כִּי נִכְסֶף אֲנִי לְרְאוֹתְכֶם, לְמַעַן אֲחַלֶּק לָכֶם מִקְצַת מִתְּזוֹ רוּחִי, לְהִתְכוּנְנֶכֶם:</p>
--	--

§1:11.1 Knowledge given in love is a “spiritual gift”. To know the Almighty One, begin with his commandments (1John 2:3-4), and to love Yeshua, show loyalty by ordering one’s life after His life (John 14:21). To be spiritual don’t be anti-intellectual, and to be spiritual don’t go looking for a mystical (unexplained) experience.

<p>¹²this yet is, to be’eth encouraged together with you, through each other's faithfulness₁, yours as well as also mine.</p>	<p>”בְּזֹאת הַיָּא לְנַחַם יַחַד בְּכֶם, בְּדֶרֶךְ הַנְּאֻמָּנוּת בְּזֶה אֶת־זֶה, שְׁלַכֶם בְּמוֹ-כֶן גַּם שְׁלִי:</p>
<p>יב'א = עמכם ב = הנאמנות:</p>	

§1:12.1 Christianity has reduced mutual encouragement to commonly held doctrines, and often at that, false doctrines. If that is all faith means, then I am little encouraged. For it is divisive and lawless. Thankfully, Paul is talking about “faithfulness” in the other person encouraging us. When we see others doing good then that is truly encouraging. And when we are faithful, then we encourage others.

<p>¹³Yet, I am not wanting you being unaware, brothers, that often I setteth before to come to you (and be'eth prevented until now₁) so that I may obtain some fruit among you also, even as among the rest of <i>the</i> Peoples.</p>	<p>אָדָּךְ לֹא אֶבְרָא לְהִיזְתְּכֶם בְּלִיתֵי-יְוֹדְעִים אַחֲרַי, כִּי לִפְעָמַיִם רַבּוֹת שָׁמַתִּי מִקֶּדֶם לָבוֹא אֵלֵיכֶם (וְנִמְנַעְתִּי עַד-עַתָּה) לְמַעַן יְהִיָּה לִי פְרִי גַם בְּתוֹכְכֶם כַּאֲשֶׁר גַּם בְּשָׂר הַגּוֹיִם:</p>
--	---

§1:13.1 The NASB, KJV, NIV all correctly place () around the statement, “(and am prevented until now)”); the thought is an interjection that is interrupting the flow of the main thought. We are so used to having punctuation in English to show us when this is the case that we have forgotten that the original texts had no punctuation. Without the punctuation the statement could be misread such that Paul was predestined to be prevented so that he might have fruit.

1:13.2 Paul was planning to go to Spain, and to visit Rome on his way.

<p>¹⁵So, ° according to me, <i>I am</i> eager also to you who <i>are</i> in Rome, to maketh be announced good news. ¹⁶For I am not being ashamed of the good news; for it is <i>the</i> power of <i>the</i> Almighty for salvation to all that is ^acommitting₁, to <i>the</i> Jew firstly, as well as also to <i>the</i> Greek.</p>	<p>ט"ו לָכוֹן, מֵצַדִּי, חָפֵץ אֲנִי, גַם-אֵלֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר בְּרוֹמָא לְבַשְׂרִי: ט"ז כִּי אֵינְנִי בּוֹשׁ מִבְּשׂוּרָה, כִּי גְבוּרַת אֱלֹהִים הִיא לִישׁוּעָה, לְכָל-הַמֵּאֲמִינִים, לְיִהוּדֵי רְאשׁוֹנָה, כְּמוֹ-כֹן-גַּם לְיוֹנִי:</p>
<p>טז'א = הַגּוֹתֵן תְּמִד; הַתּוֹמֵד:</p>	

§1.16.1 The translation “believing” is misleading. I have replaced it with the much more accurate “committing” for the verb πιστεύω. To commit oneself means to **give your support** to the person committed to. We commit to Messiah. This means we **give our support** to be loyal and faithful to Him. And the biblical Hebrew verb from which all of this is derived is אָמַן; it means “to **support**”, and in the hiphil it means “to **give one’s support**” (תְּמִיכָה לְתַת) or “**make one’s support**” on, in, or to someone. It can also be used to mean giving support (assent) to facts or promises, but usually it means much more than that. It means a complete committing of loyalty to Messiah Yeshua, i.e. to be committing both one’s faithfulness (support, loyalty) to Messiah Yeshua, and also to be committing oneself to Messiah Yeshua’s faithfulness (his support).

1:16.2 (Advanced) Now this can be put on a broader linguistic support. And I mean support, because the root word behind all of this is the Hebrew אָמַן which means

“support” (BDB, def. 1). This is the meaning which unifies everything, verb, noun, and adjective use plus all of the lexical senses. Key usages, establishing the meaning of support are the usages where dependents are being supported, or when speaking of supports (pillars) of the Temple. It is perfectly clear that “believing” cannot support either the temple or dependents.

2Kings 10:1 **הָאֲמָנִים** הָאֲחָאֵב = the supporters of Ahab

2Kings 10:5 **הָאֲמָנִים** = supporters

Esther 2:7 **אֶת־חַדְסָה אָמֵן** וַיְהִי = and he was supporting Hadassah

Num 11:12 **אֶת־הַיֵּנֶק הָאֵמֵן יִשָּׂא כַּאֲשֶׁר** = as when the one supporting carries the one sucking

Isaiah 49:23 **אֲמַנִּיד מְלָכִים וְהָיוּ** = and be'eth kings your supporters

Ruth 4:16 **לְאֲמָנַת וְתֵהִי־לוֹ** = and she was for him as one supporting

2Sam 4:4 **אֲמָנָתוֹ** = his supporter

2Kings 18:16 **הָאֲמָנוֹת** = the supports

Lam 4:5 **הָאֲמָנִים** = those being supported

Psa 12:1 **אֲמוּנִים** = the supportive ones

2Sam 20:19 **יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲמוּנִי שְׁלָמִי אָנֹכִי** = I am from the peaceable supportive ones of Israel

Psa 31:23 **אֲמוּנִים נֹצֵר יְהוָה** = ones being supporting Yahweh preserveth

Prov 11:13 **וְנֶאֱמַן־רוּחַ** = and one being supportive of spirit

1Kings 8:26 **נָא יֵאָמֵן** = let it be supported, I pray

Isa 7:9 **תִּאֲמְנוּ לֹא כִּי תִאֲמְנוּ לֹא אִם** = if not you all will not give support, you surely will not be supported

2Chron 20:20 **בְּנִבְיָאֵיו הִאֲמִינוּ וְתִאֲמְנוּ אֱלֹהֵיכֶם בְּיְהוָה הִאֲמִינוּ** = place support in Yahweh your Almighty so that you are being supported; place support in His prophets

Gen 45:26 **לָהֶם: הִאֲמִין לֹא כִּי** = for he did not give support to them

Deut 1:32 **מֵאֱלֹהֵיכֶם: בְּיְהוָה מֵאֲמִינִם** אֵינְכֶם הַזֶּה וּבַדְבָר = And in this matter not ye *are* placing support in Yahweh your Almighty

Gen 15:6 **וְהָאֱמִיץ** לוֹ וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ בְּיְהוָה וְהָאֱמִיץ = and he placed support in Yahweh, and He counted it to him *as* righteousness.

Now it should be clear that the meaning *support* unifies all the uses in both Hebrew and in Greek. In rare instances the object of the support is only a fact or promise. To support a fact, or support a promise could legitimately be translated “believe”; however, when the object is a person, or implied person in the context, then the *support* implies loyalty and commitment to the person.

<p>¹⁷₁For <i>the</i> ^ajustice₂₋₃ of <i>the</i> Almighty, in it, is being revealed from ^bfaithfulness to ^cfaithfulness; even as it is being written, ^d“but the righteous by ^efaithfulness shall live.”</p>	<p>”בִּי־צְדָקָת אֱלֹהִים בָּה נִגְלָה, מֵאֲמוּנָהּ, לְאֲמוּנָהּ, כְּמִכְתָּב, ”וְצַדִּיק בְּאֲמוּנָתוֹ יִחִי“:</p>
<p>17a = righteousness b = His faithfulness c = our faithful response d = Hab. 2:4 e MT+His/his; LXX+My; Paul interprets as both.</p>	<p>יז'א = נְאֻמָּנוּת ב MT = אֲמוּנָתוֹ = נְאֻמָּנוּתוֹ :Hab. 2:4 = ג</p>

§1:17.1 This verse is something like a thesis statement for Paul. It marks his main point, which he will unpackage.

1:17.2 English has a special problem with the word *righteousness*. The word always seems to denote an inner unseen moral quality. It wasn't so in ancient Latin, Greek or Hebrew. Righteousness in those languages was also an action that was done to another. The proper English term for this is *justice*. Romance languages, like French, Latin, and Spanish have much less problem. The particular problem in Paul is that he uses the original Greek, representing Hebrew terms, with the full range of meaning. We have to make a choice in English, and that choice is for the word “justice” because this word has been less stripped of meaning than righteousness.

1:17.3 The word “justice” then refers to: 1a. the quality of being just [*or* right] in administering justice by way of punishment to the sinner, 1b. the quality of being just [*or* right] in administering justice by way of merciful pardon to the repentant sinner, 2. the moral righteousness of the Almighty himself; His goodness, mercy, loving kindness, wrath, anger, or any other moral attribute.

<p>¹⁷For <i>the</i> ^ajustice of <i>the</i> Almighty, in it, is being revealed from ^bfaithfulness₄ to ^cfaithfulness₅; even as it is being written, ^d“but the righteous by ^efaithfulness₆ shall live.”₇</p>	<p>”בִּי־צְדָקַת אֱלֹהִים בָּהּ נִגְלָה, מֵאֱמוּנָהּ לְאֱמוּנָהּ, כְּמִכְתָּב, ”וְצַדִּיק בְּאֱמוּנָהּ יִחִי־הִיא“:</p>
<p>17a = righteousness b = His faithfulness c = our faithful response d = Hab. 2:4 e MT+His/his; LXX+My; Paul interprets as both.</p>	<p>י'א = נְאֻמָּנוֹת ב MT = אֱמוּנָתוֹ = נְאֻמָּנוֹתוֹ ג = Hab. 2:4</p>

1:17.4 The 1st *faithfulness* is Yahweh’s faithfulness alone expressing his justice corresponding to three definitions of justice; 1a: His faithfulness to himself and his own word to judge and punish wickedness; 1b: His faithfulness to his promise to show mercy to repentant Israel through a reduced and substitutionary penalty paid by Messiah Yeshua. 2. His own faithfulness ready to be taught to us; His own faithfulness, moral uprightness, righteousness.

1:17.5 The 2nd *faithfulness* is the result of His faithfulness to us and in us; this is our faithful response to His faithfulness, obedience to His commandments. This is the result of Yahweh’s justice in Messiah for us and to us; “to faithfulness” means to our faithfulness.

1:17.6 The 3rd *faithfulness* includes both the 1st and 2nd. We live by His faithfulness and by our faithful response. The text is quoted from Habakkuk 2:4, “the righteous shall live by His/his faithfulness” where the term “his” means both Yahweh’s faithfulness, and the faithfulness of the righteous person.

1:17.7 In Habakkuk 2:4 in the Greek version, which is called the Septuagint or abbreviated LXX by scholars, the text says “but the just will live by My faithfulness” (ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται). The Hebrew text says, בְּאֱמוּנָתוֹ = *by his faithfulness* leaving the matter ambiguous on whether the pronoun refers to the just man or to the Almighty. It is quite clear that Paul took the matter as synergistic. For he constantly speaks of Yeshua’s faithfulness, but with the verb form he constantly conditions receiving it on our commitment, which is not just support of facts about Messiah, or support of promises, but support of Messiah, i.e. loyalty to Him expressed in love and obedience.

<p>¹⁸For is being revealed <i>the</i> fierce anger of <i>the</i> Almighty, from heaven upon all evil and injustice of men, which are holding back the truth by injustice. ¹⁹because that which <i>is</i> known about the Almighty is being manifest ₁₋₂among them₁₋₂; because the Almighty maketh it manifest to them.</p>	<p>כִּי נִגְלָה חֲרוֹן אַף אֱלֹהִים מִשָּׁמַיִם עַל כָּל־רָשָׁע וְאִי־צַדִּיק הָאֲנָשִׁים אֶת־הָאֱמֶת בְּאִי־צַדִּיק הָאֲחֻזִּים: "יֵעַן אֶת־אֲשֶׁר נֹדַע עַל־הָאֱלֹהִים גְּלוּי הוּא בָּהֶם, כִּי הָאֱלֹהִים גָּלָה לָהֶם:</p>
--	---

§1:19.1 The knowledge of the Almighty is manifest “among them” (ἐν αὐτοῖς). This can also be taken as “to them” or “in them” in a literal sense. It is “in them” in the sense that their conscience bears witness to right and wrong. It is “to them” in the sense that creation bears witness to Yahweh, and among them because He has his witnesses to the truth bearing witness to the truth.

†1:19.2 The reason for the ambiguity in the passage “to/in/among them” is that used abstractly the Hebrew preposition ב = ל; this is glossed as “in respect to” = “in connection to”; in the abstract the Greek ἐν can likewise switch with εἰς. Compare BDAG ἐν, def. 8, “*to, by, in connection with*” with εἰς def. 5, “*for, to, with respect to, with reference to*” (pg. 291).

<p>²⁰For the things, <i>which are</i> not seen, about Him, from <i>the</i> creation of <i>the</i> universe, by way of the things made, being understood, are being ₁perceived clearly₁, even his ^oeternal power and divinity, such that they be without excuse₂.</p>	<p>כִּי הַדְּבָרִים, אֲשֶׁר בְּלִתִּי־נִרְאִים אֲדוֹתָיו, מִבְּרִיאַת הָעוֹלָם, בְּדַרְךְ הַדְּבָרִים הַנִּעֲשִׂים מִוִּבְנִים, נִרְאִים בְּרוּר, דִּהְיָנוּ גְבוּרָתוֹ הַנִּצְחִית וְאֱלֹהוּתוֹ, לְמַעַן אֵין לָהֶם הַתְּנַצְלוֹת:</p>
כ'א = הַקּוֹסְמוֹס:	

§1:20.1 The text says the truth is “perceived clearly” (νοούμενα καθαροῦται), נִרְאִים בְּרוּר. Why then do all not understand? It is because they have no understanding with which to understand what is in front of them. We expect small children to be without understanding, but through sinful false teaching, indoctrination, and willingness to believe paradoxes and antinomies, man has been taught to set his common sense and reason aside. Man has been taught to “turn off” his understanding. Thus, what is clearly understood, is not comprehended.

1:20.2 When Paul says “no excuse”, he does not mean that there are no logical reasons explaining their choice to reject Him. He means there are no excuses that

logically justify their rejection of the Almighty. Someone may be deceived or reject Him out of ignorance; this may explain the rejection, but if they tried to defend and justify the choice with facts, they would find them lacking, i.e. there are no excuses to justify the rejection. The third definition of Merriam-Webster applies.¹

Many read a doctrine of “total depravity” into the words ‘no excuse’, and treat others as if they have ‘no excuse’, that is, as if all sin is high handed disloyalty to the Almighty. In their treatment of others then, they show no mercy because exigent circumstances don’t matter.

1. **ex·cuse** **1:** the act of excusing **2a:** something offered as justification or as grounds for being excused **b plural:** an expression of regret for failure to do something **c:** a note of explanation for an absence **3: justification, reason synonyms** see apology.

1:20.3 It is also helpful to understand that Paul is indicting the nations at the corporate level here, just as he will indict the Jews at a corporate level in chapter 3.

<p>²¹Because as ones that knoweth the Almighty, not as Almighty they glorifieth, or giveth thanks, but they becometh worthless in their ° reasonings, and be’eth darkened their ° senseless heart. ²²Claiming to be wise, they becometh foolish, ²³and exchangeth the glory of the incorruptible Almighty into <i>an</i> image of corruptible man and birds and four-footed <i>beast-s</i> and reptiles. ²⁴Therefore the Almighty giveth them over into the evil lusts of their ° hearts, to <i>the</i> uncleanness of ° dishonoring their ° bodies with themselves.</p>	<p>כִּי־עַן בְּדַעְתְּם אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים כְּאֱלֹהִים לֹא כְבֹדוֹהוּ, אֹז הוֹדוּ לוֹ, בִּי אִם־הִבְלֹוּ בְּמַחְשְׁבוֹתָם וַחֲשִׁדוּ לְבָבָם הָאֱוִילִי: כִּי־בְהִתְאַמְרָם לֵהִיוֹת חֲכָמִים נִכְסְלוּ: כִּי־הִמְירוּ אֶת־כְּבוֹד הָאֱלֹהִים בְּלִתִּי־נִשְׁחָת בְּדַמוֹת צֶלֶם אָדָם נִשְׁחָת וְצֶלֶם עוֹף וּבְעֲלֵי אַרְבַּע־רַגְלִים וְרֶמֶשׁ: כִּי־עַל־כֵּן גַּם הָאֱלֹהִים הִסְגִּירָם אֶל־תַּאֲנוֹת לְבוֹתָם לְטָמְאֹת לְנַבֵּל אֶת־גּוֹיֹתָהֶם בִּיְנֵיהֶם:</p>
--	---

§1:24 He “gave them over”. Since they chose not to be loyal to the Almighty, he let them be disloyal to each other. Evil lusts are against the created order that the Almighty established. By turning them over to their own decaying reasonings, wherein they sin against his rules, they will experience mutual disloyalty and hatred. Perhaps the negative experience will teach them to repent. For He is not desiring that any man should perish.

<p>²⁵Who changeth the truth of the Almighty into the lie, and worshipeth and serveth the creature rather than the one that createth, who is being blessed unto the ages. Amæn.</p> <p>²⁶Because of this the Almighty giveth them over to dishonorable passions; for even their females exchangeth the natural function for that <i>which is</i> against nature,</p> <p>²⁷Likewise besides, also the males that leaveth the natural function of the female, be'eth burned in their desire toward one another, males with males working shame; and the reward (which was necessary) of their error, they are receiving back into themselves.</p>	<p>^כאֲשֶׁר הִחְלִיפוּ אֶת־אֱמֶת הָאֱלֹהִים לְכָזֵב וְכִבְדּוּ וְעִבְדוּ אֶת־הַנְּבִרָא עַל הַבּוֹרָא, אֲשֶׁר הוּא מְבָרָךְ לְעוֹלָמִים, אָמֵן: ^כבְּגַלְלֵי זֹאת הַסְּגִירָם הָאֱלֹהִים אֶל־תְּשׁוּקוֹת קָלוֹן, כִּי גַם נְקֻבוֹתֵיהֶם הִחְלִיפוּ אֶת־הַתְּשׁוּמִישׁ הַטְּבִיעִי בְּנִגְדַת הַטְּבִיעַ: ^כבְּאֹתוֹתָו אַפֵּן כְּמוֹ־כֵן גַּם הַזְּכָרִים בְּעִזְבָּם אֶת־תְּשׁוּמִישׁ הָאִשָּׁה הַטְּבִיעִי נִבְעֵרוּ בְּעִגְבֹתָם אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ זְכָרִים עִם־זְכָרִים פְּעֵלִים זִשְׁת וְזֹאת גָּמוֹל (אֲשֶׁר הִיא רְאוּי) תְּעוֹתָם, הֵם לְקָחִים בְּעִצָּמָם:</p>
---	---

כ"ה = במקום את:

§1:25 “They changed the truth ... into the lie”. The archtypical example of this in the modern age is evolution and modern cosmology.

§1:26 Paul speaks of lesbianism here.

§1:27 And in this verse Paul speaks of homosexuals who act against the witness of creation as to how a man and a woman should relate.

<p>²⁸And even as they approveth not the Almighty for holding fast, in true knowledge, the Almighty giveth them over to a worthless mind, for doing those things which <i>are</i> not being proper,</p>	<p>^כוְכַאֲשֶׁר לֹא בִּחְרוּ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים לְנֶצֶךְ בְּדַעְתָּם אֱמֶת כֵּן הַסְּגִיר אֹתָם הָאֱלֹהִים אֶל־לֵב נִתְּעֵב לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר אֵינָם נְאוּיִם:</p>
---	---

§1:28 The further one goes into sin, not learning any lessons from the disappointments and disloyalties, and betrayals, hating the Almighty One, rather than seeking the answer, then the more one loses their mind. Their thinking becomes insanity. Their minds become incapable of grasping the truth.

²⁹being filled with all injustice, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife; deceit, malice, gossips, ³⁰slanderers, haters of the Almighty; insolent, arrogant, boastful; inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹without moral sense; traitors, lacking natural love; unmerciful; ³²who the justice of the Almighty fully knoweth, that those such things doing are worthy of death; not only doing them, but also altogether giving a good approval to the ones practicing *them*.

כט מְמַלְאִים בְּכָל-אֵי-צָדֵק, רְשָׁעוֹת, חֲמֻדָּנוֹת,
 אָוֶן; מְלֵאֵי קִנְיָה, רֵצַח מְרִיבָה; מְרָמָה מְזֻמָּה
 מְלַחֲשִׁים: ^למְלַשְׁיָנִים, שׁוֹנְאֵי אֱלֹהִים; מְחַצְפִּים,
 יְהִירִים, מִתְהַלְלִים; חֲרָשֵׁי רָעוֹת, לְהוֹרֵם
 סוּרְרִים: ^{לא}נְבָלִים; מוֹעֵלִים, חֲסְרֵי אֲהָבָה
 טְבַעִית; בְּלִתֵּי-מִרְחָמִים: ^{לב}אֲשֶׁר אֶת-מִשְׁפָּט
 הָאֱלֹהִים דַּעְתָּם כִּי הַפְּעֵלִים כְּאֵלֶּה רְאוּיִים
 לְמוֹת לֹא לְבַד עֲשִׂים אֶת-אֱלֹהֶ כִּי אִם-גַּם
 נְאוֹתִים אֶל-הָעֲשִׂים:

The Greek Tenses

1. Greek present = English present progressive¹
2. Greek aorist = archaic English simple present -eth² (for remoteness).
3. Greek imperfect³ = English past progressive.
4. Greek future⁴ = English simple future.
5. Greek perfect⁵ = made to be + *love* + {d, en, ing}
6. Greek pluperfect⁶ = had been + love + {d, en, ing}

1. Up front, close, and inside the action. Maps to Hebrew participle, MH, BH.
2. Remote, simple action. Maps to Hebrew perfect. MH, BH.
3. Progressive past action. Maps to MH: הִיָּהּ + participle, BH = imperfect.
4. Remote, future action. Maps to MH imperfect (with aspectual loss).
5. Progressive, stative w/emphasis. Maps to Hebrew P stem participle, MH, BH.
6. Past Progressive stative w/emphasis. Use הִיָּהּ + P stem participle.

Guide to Hebrew Analytical

This is an advanced system of identifying all the grammatical elements of every verb, and their lexical meanings. It is best to show how to use it by example. In the first verse is the word [מְקַרְא]. This is parsed out below as [מְ'קַרְא]. The ['] apostrophe separates the prefix from the three letter root. Then follows [= pPpms=being made to be *call* ed.] The root meaning is indicated by the italicized word, in this case [*call*] the code [pPpms] is deciphered by the following table:

f = perfect, m = imperfect, r = imperative, c = infinitive construct, p = participle, i = infinitive absolute
Q = Qal, N = Niphal, P = piel,pual, H = Hiphil, Hophal, T = Hitpael
p = passive, a = active, s=stative

1 = 1st person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person (omitted in case of participles, infinitives)
m = masculine, c = common, f = feminine
s = singular, p = plural,
c = construct (optional at end of participles)

The English words not in italics, e.g: [being made to be ... ed] decipher the stem form according to the following paradigms omitting person, gender, and number. I use the variable *love* to fill the verb slot.

/f/ paradigm: When subject is suffixed on the end of the word:

f = ...eth, th, (eth, th, marks the aspect of the perfect, archaic present tense).

fQp = be'eth *love* d. /Qp = be...d/ (the passive meaning is morphological).

fQs = *be* eth *loved*. /Qs = be...d/ (the stative-passive meaning is lexical).

fQa = *love* th.

fNp = be'eth *love* d OR *love* th self. /Np=be...d OR ... self/

fPa = make th to be *love* d. /Pa=make..to be...d/ (Piel-causitive stative)

fPp = be made to be *love* d. /Pp = be made...to be..d/ (Pual-causitive passive stative)

fHa = give th *love*, OR make th to *love*. /Ha = give, make, bring .../ (Hiphil causitive)

fHp = be made to *love*. /Hp = be made to.../ (Hophal).

fTa = self make th to *love*. /Ta self make.../ (Hitpael).

/m/ paradigm: When subject is prefixed at the start of the word:

m = {BH 0, MH will be, BH may be}...{0, BH ing, BH -es (rare), BH s (rare)}
(durative aspect)

mQa =

will be *lov*ing. (morphological MH; pragmatic mood for BH)

may be *lov*ing. (pragmatic mood for BH)

is/are *lov*ing. (BH; MH uses participle)

*lov*ing (BH; MH uses the participle)

The rest of the /m/ paradigm according to MH only:

mNp = will be being *love*d OR will be *lov*ing self. /Np=be...d/ OR ... self/

mPa = will be making to be *love*d. /Pa=make..to be...d/ (Piel-causitive stative)

mPp = will be being made to be *love*d. /Pp = be made...to be..d/ (Pual-ca. st.)

mHa = will be giving *love*, OR will be making to love. /Ha = give, make, bring .../

mHp = will be being made to *love*. /Hp = be being made to.../ (Hophal).

mTa = will self be making to *love*. /Ta self make to.../ (Hithpael).

The participle /p/ paradigm—no subject attached, just gender and number.

p= ...-ing, () [] optional.

pQp = (one(s)) be [ing] *love*d. /Qp = be...d/ (the passive meaning is morphological).

pQs = (one(s)) *be* [ing] *love*d. /Qs = be...d/ (the stative-passive meaning is lexical).

pQa = (one(s)) *lov* [ing, es]

pNp = (one(s)) be [ing] *love*d OR *love* [ing] self. /Np=be...d/ OR ... self/

pPa = (one(s)) mak [ing, es] to be *love*d. /Pa=mak..to be...d/ (Piel-causitive stative)

pPp = be mak [ing] to be *love*d. /Pp = be mak...to be..d/ (Pual-causitive passive stative)

pHa = (one(s)) giv [ing, es] *love*, OR mak [ing, es] to love. /Ha = give, make, bring .../

pHp = be mak [ing] to *love*. /Hp = be mak to.../ (Hophal).

pTa = (one(s)) self mak [ing, e] to *love*. /Ta=self mak.../ (Hithpael).

The infinitive construct /c/ paradigm—w/o subject, gender, or number.

s= ...-ing.

cQs = *be* ing *love*d. /Qs = be...d/ (the stative-passive meaning is lexical).

cQa = *lov*ing.

cNp = be ing *love*d. /Np=be...d/

cPa = mak ing to be *love*d. /Pa=mak..to be...d/ (Piel-causitive stative)

cPp = be mak ing to be *love*d. /Pp = be mak...to be..d/ (Pual-causitive passive stative)

cHa = giv ing *love*, OR mak ing to love. /Ha = give, make, bring .../ (Hiphil causitive)

cHp = be mak ing to *love*. /Hp = be mak.. to.../ (Hophal).

cTa = self mak ing *love*. /Ta=self mak.. to.../ (Hithpael).

The imperative /r/ paradigm: verb with 2nd person + gender + number (thou or ye) suffixed.

r = must, let

rQa = must *love!* (+thou mas, thou fem, ye mas., ye fem.)

rNp = must be *love* d. /Np=be...d/

rPa = must make to be *love* d. /Pa=mak..to be...d/ (Piel-causitive stative)

rPp = must be mak ing to be *love* d. /Pp = be mak...to be..d/ (Pual-causitive passive stative)

rHa = must giv *love*, OR must mak to *love*. /Ha = give, make, bring .../ (Hiphil causitive)

rHp = must be mak to *love*. /Hp = be mak to.../ (Hophal).

rTa = must self mak to *love*. /Ta=self mak to.../ (Hithpael).

The infinitive absolute is rare, and chiefly confined to BH or literary works, and is used mainly to re-emphasize the main verb by repeating it, i.e, “loving he loved...”

Hebrew Analytical, Chapter 1

v1 מְקַרְא = pPpms=being made to be *call* ed. גִּבְדָּל = pNpms = being *separate* ed. v2 הַבְּטִיחַ = fHa3ms=maketh he *secure*. it = אֲתָה. v3 נוֹלָד = pNpms=being *born* ". v4 מְסוֹמֵן = pPpms=being made to be *mark* ed. v5 קִבַּלְנוּ = fQa1cp = *receive* -th + we. v6 קְרוּאֵי = adj. cstr. mp. = called ones of. v7 יָשׁוּחֵי = that + pQamp = *live* ה' ing. "מְקַרְאֵי-ל" = to + the + pPpmp = being made to be *call* ed + s. Father-of-us. v8 מוֹדֵה = pHa3ms = giving י' *thanks*. מְסַפֵּרְתָּ = pPpfs = being made to be *tell* ed (=told). v9 עֲבַד = pQams = serving. עֲשֵׂה = pQams = making. v10 מְתַחֲנֵן = (self + pTams = *favor*) ≈ (*beseech*) ing. אֶצְלַח = I may + mQa1ms = *succeed*. לָבוֹא = cQa = to *come*. v11 גִּבְכָּסִי = pNpms = *long* ing *for*. אֶחֱלַק = mPa1ms = I may+make to be *share* ed. לְהִתְבַּוְּנֵנִי בָּם = to + □ self + cTa = *establish* + ye. v12 לְנַחֵם = to + cPp = be made to be *console* ed. אֶת־זֶה זֶה = *this with this = each other, one another. v13 אֶבֶה = pQams = willing. שָׂמַתִּי = fQa1ms = set י' teth + I. לָבוֹא = cQa = to *come*. וְנִמְנַעַתִּי = and + fNa1ms = be'eth *prevent* ed. יִהְיֶה = mQa3ms = will *be*. כְּלִשְׂהוּ = all which it = whatever. v15 הִפְתִּיחַ = pQams = *delight* ing. לְבַשֵּׂר = to + cPa = make to be *tell-good-news* ed. v16 בּוֹשׁ = pQpms = being *ashamed*. מְאַמְיֵן = the + pHams = giving *support*. v17 גִּלְגָּה = pNpms = is being *reveal* ed. "כְּתוּבַ כ" = as + the + pQpms = being *write* en. יִחִיָּה = mQa3ms = he will *live*. v18 גִּלְגָּה = pNpms = is being *reveal* ed. הָאֶחָזִים = the *ones* + pQamp = *hold* ing. v19 נוֹדַע = pNpms = is *know* " n. גִּלְגָּי = pQpcs = is *reveal* ed. גִּלְגָּה = fPa3ms = maketh to be *reveal* ed. v20 גִּלְגָּה = pNpmp = being *see* ה' n. הַגְּעִימִים = the + pNpmp = being *make* ה' d. מוֹבְנֵי = pHpms = being made *comprehend* | ה ed. גִּלְגָּה = pNpmp = are being *see* ה' n. v21 בְּדַעַת = in + cQa = *know* ing + them. הוֹדוּ = fHa3cp = give th ה' י' *thank* s + they. הַבְּלִי = fQs3cp = *become* th *vain* + they. וְחָשְׁךָ = and + fQs3ms = *become* eth *dark*.

v22 בְּהִתְאָמְרָם = in + self + cTa = *say ing + them*. לְהִיָּאוֹת = to + cQa = *be*.
 וְנִכְסְלוּ = fNp3cp = *be becometh foolish + they*. v23 וְהִמְיִרוּ = and + fHa3cp = *make th*
change וְדָד + they. v24 הִסְגִּירוּם = cHa = *mak ing shut + them*. נִבְּלוּ = cPa = *make to be*
disgrace, degrade ed. v25 הִחְלִיפוּ = fHa3cp = *maketh pass + they*. וְכִבְדּוּ = and + fPa3cp =
maketh to be glorify ed + they. וְעִבְדוּ = and + fQa3cp = *serve th + they*. בּוֹרְאָהּ = the +
 pQams = *creat er*. מְבָרְךָ = pPpms = *being made to be bless ed*. v26 הִסְגִּירוּם = cHa = *mak*
ing shut + them. הִחְלִיפוּ = fHa3cp = *maketh pass + they*. v27 בְּעֶזְבָּם = in + cQa = *leave*
ing + them. בְּעָרְוּ = fQa3cp = *burn eth + they*. פְּעִלִים = pQamp = *work ing*. לְקַחֲמֵם =
 pQamp = *take ing*. v28 בְּחָרּוּ = fQa3cp = *choose eth + they*. לְנֹצֵר = to + cQa = *keep, guard*.
 הִסְגִּיר = fHa3ms = *giveth shut (~over)*. לְעֹשׂוֹת = to + cQa = *do*. v29 בְּהִמְלֵאָם =
 in + cNp = *being fill ed + them*. מְלַחֲשִׁים = pPa3mp = *ones making to be whisper*. v30
 מְלַשְׁיָנִים = pHa3mp = *ones making to be slander*. מְחַצְפִּים = ones making to be *insolent*.
 מִתְהַלְלִים = ones self + pTa = *giving praise*. סוֹרְרִים = pQamp = *disobey ing*. v31
 מוֹעֲלִים = pQsmp = *ones be ing treacherous*. מְרַחֲמִים = making to be *compassion ed*. v32
 בְּדַעְתָּם = in + cQa = *knowing + them*. פְּעִלִים־הֵם = the + pQamp = *ones work ing*.
 רָאוּ = pQpmp = *being approve ה' d*. עֲשִׂים = pQamp = *do ה' ing*. נִאֲזוּתֵם = pNpmp
 = *being agree d*. הֵם עֹשִׂים = the + pQamp = *ones do ה' ing*.