

- 3- We also noted that the direct object of this verb was the plural pronoun [<]EAUTOU'S which means, "yourselves."
- 4- The translation we derived from this is, "Stop avenging yourselves."
- 5- We noted in parsing the verb that the descriptive present tense indicates that this was currently going on in the Roman church at the time of writing.
- 6- We noted from the vocative plural [>]AGAPnTO'S that those who were producing the action of this verb were believers in the Roman church.
- 7- Believers in Jesus Christ were involved in the ongoing modus operandi of taking out vengeance on those who had wronged them, both believers and unbelievers.
- 8- The use of the negative particle **Mn'**, combined with the imperative use of the participle, makes this statement a command of prohibition: "Stop (**Mn'**) the ongoing practice (descriptive present tense) of avenging (pres/act/part [>]EKDIKE'W) yourselves, members of the royal family."
- 9- Next Paul gives a very good reason for the Roman believers to stop this practice. He introduces this reason with the conjunction **GA'R** used to express cause or reason. It is translated, "For"; "For it stands written in the Old Testament canon as a part of documented Biblical fact."
- 10- The thing which stands written is now quoted beginning with the noun form of the verb we just reviewed:

[>]EKDI'KnSIS = We have just reviewed the verb form, [>]EKDIKE'W where we translated it "avenging."

Here we will translate the noun form "Punishment." Why not "avenge," as is found in the NIV, or "vengeance" as is found in the KJV and NAS?

- E-10/15*
B-10/18A
- 1- The verb is in a context where its action is being prohibited by divine mandate.
 - 2- If this is a prohibited action then it must reflect the explosion of mental attitude sins which developed from outside adversity being permitted into the soul.

- 3- The outside adversity has been defined in verse 17 as evil imposed upon you by others.
- 4- You are not, at that point, to take upon yourself the prerogatives of judging and punishing.
- 5- When you do, your motivation comes not from grace resulting in justice but from righteous indignation resulting in vengeance.
- 7- When Jesus Christ prosecutes the case his objective is not vindictiveness, revenge, retribution or self-gratification.
- 8- When we take on the duties of righting wrongs we do so from the standpoint of stress in the soul. Implosion produces righteous indignation which results in the explosion of vengeance.
- 9- When Jesus Christ prosecutes the case it is strictly a judicial action in which exact process and procedure is followed under the divine policy of grace.
- 10- Our point of contact with the essence of God is His justice. When we are wronged by others they fall under the negative administration of that justice.
- 11- For us, this action is positive since its prosecution of our antagonist results in our, ~~protecti~~ ^{BEING} ~~ed~~ ^{ED} from evil.
- 12- Consequently, when we take on the duties of dispensing justice in place of Jesus Christ we are involved in avenging ourselves and this is as sinful as the wrong we strive to correct.
- 13- When Jesus Christ prosecutes the case then justice is certain and its administration fair.
- 14- The result is the execution of a form of punishment which ~~offers~~ appropriate retribution for the crime committed. ^{RESULTS IN}
- 15- Therefore we translate the verb, [>]EKDIKE'W, "avenging" while we translate the noun, [>]EKDIKnsIS, "punishment."
HUMAN SIN cp/ DIVINE JUSTICE
- 16- Following this noun comes the indirect object from the pronoun:
- [>]EGW' = to Me. This forms an idiom which is best translated: "Punishment belongs to Me."

- 1- The prerogative of punishment is delegated to Jesus Christ who administers it from the source of divine justice.
- 2- When we seek retaliation against individuals for wrongs done us personally, then later we may be manipulated into joining with other allegedly wronged persons and, through crusader arrogance, retaliate against another group.
- 3- This ~~is~~^{was} the mentality of the French Revolution and the Spanish Inquisition. Neither the French nor the Spanish have ever recovered from either.
- 4- Reason: Both societies permitted righteous indignation to erupt into self-righteous zeal.
- 5- In the case of the French aristocracy, punishment may have been warranted but not from human sources.
- 6- In the case of the Spanish Jews the accusations as well as the punishment were completely unjustified.
- 7- In the next sentence our Lord indicates how any legitimate complaints are to be adjudicated. It begins with the future active indicative from the verb:

>ANTAPODI'DWMI = "I will repay"

>ANT- = again; >APODI'DWMI = to give: to give again, therefore to pay back, to refund, to repay.

fut = Predictive; predicts an event which is expected to occur in future time after you have been wronged. If you have truly been wronged then justice will discipline the guilty party and bless you.

act = Jesus Christ, functioning under divine justice, will produce the action of the verb by punishing the guilty.

ind = Declarative; a statement of Biblical fact. Consequently, the believer can relax and leave the matter in the hands of the Lord.

v 19 CTL: Stop (the current practice of) avenging yourselves, members of the royal family. Instead defer to prosecution from the justice of God. For it stands written, "Punishment ~~is mine~~. I will repay," says the Lord. *BELONGS TO ME.*

One of my favorite stories which demonstrates the application of this verse is found in McGuffey's Eclectic Readers. This particular story demonstrates that when punishment is left in the Lord's hands, justice is fulfilled to all involved and in the end all benefit.

E-10/18A

B-10/18B

McGuffey, William H. "The Best Kind of Revenge." In Fifth Eclectic Reader, 266-268. Chicago: (revised edition) American Book Company, 1896.

- 1- Note in this story how the justice of God takes care of several details for all concerned, made possible because the Grant brothers allowed God to prosecute the case:
 - 1- Had the Grant brothers sought to execute their own revenge on the warehouseman then he could have gone bankrupt before signing the acceptance with the third businessman.
 - 2- In that case the third party would not have had the draft to sign over to the Grant brothers, in which case the Grants would have had to take a loss from his bankruptcy.
 - 3- Had the Grants sought to defend themselves against the pamphleteer's accusations then in might never have come to light that he was libelous.
 - 4- As it turned out, the pamphleteer is able to return to business a better man, the third party was able to transfer some of his debt to the Grants, and the Grants were able to clear their name.
- 2- By turning things over to the Lord for prosecution, everyone involved was raised to a higher level, the stability of the community was strengthened, and everyone's reputation was enhanced or improved.
- 3- If the Grants had sought vengeance none of these things would have occurred.
- 4- If they had lowered themselves to the level of their adversary they would have also assumed his standards and been the recipients of similar divine punishment.
- 5- Instead, the Grants took the high road and even went a step further in the honor code by applying the principle of feeding their enemy.

(See Doc: C:\WP\JBG\90SP-J4.62 for continuation of study at p. 1221.)