

Sentence Flow: Romans 2:1-29

Instructor: Lim Kar Yong

Therefore you have ^ano excuse,
Διὸ ἀναπολόγητος εἶ,
(note unusual order)

O man = every one of you who judges.

ὦ ἄνθρωπε = πᾶς ὁ κρίνων

(present participle – πᾶς ὁ + present participle construction signifies gnomic present – a statement of a general, timeless fact.)

(note the use of ὦ + vocative address signifies the pathos of Paul, where the address is much more emphatic or emotional. Note the difference in pathos if without the ὦ. See also Romans 2:3 and Gal 3:1. There are a total of 8 instances of ὦ + vocative in the NT, out of which 5x are in Pauline literature. Note what Zerwick says: This is but a little particle, but it casts such a light on the state of mind of our Lord and of His apostles, that no one, surely, in reading the Scriptures, would wish to neglect its indications.”)

For in passing judgment on another

ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίνεις (present indicative – what happens if it is aorist?) τὸν ἕτερον

you condemn yourself,

σεαυτὸν κατακρίνεις (note present indicative – same root word as κρίνεις – again what happens if it is in the aorist?)

because you practice the very same things = the judge,

τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράσσεις (present indicative) = ὁ κρίνων.

² We know that the judgment of God

οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ

is according to truth

on those those who practice such things.

ἐστὶν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν

ἐπὶ τοὺς (masculine plural accusative) τὰ (accusative neuter) τοιαῦτα (accusative neuter) πράσσοντας (present active participle masculine plural accusative)

- note the usual greek construction

³ Do you suppose,

λογίζῃ (present indicative) δὲ τοῦτο,

O man = you who judge those who practice such things

and

yet do them yourself—

ὦ ἄνθρωπε = ὁ κρίνων τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντας

(note same construction with above clause)

καὶ

ποιῶν αὐτά,

that you will escape the judgment of God?

ὅτι σὺ (note the emphatic “you”) ἐκφεύξῃ τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ;

⁴ Or do you presume
 on ^athe riches of his kindness
 and
^bforbearance
 and
^cpatience,
^dnot knowing
 that God's kindness
 is meant to lead you to repentance?

ἢ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ
 (note unusual order – not parallel with the following – why? What is being emphasized here?)
 καὶ
 τῆς ἀνοχῆς
 καὶ
 τῆς μακροθυμίας
 καταφρονεῖς,
 (note the verb only appears at the end of clause – what is the significance?)

ἀγνοῶν
 ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ
 εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει;
 (verb in present – what's difference would it be if verb is in aorist?).

- Note the distance of the subject τὸ χρηστὸν and verb ἄγει – what's the significance?
- Note also unusual order that the object σε comes before the verb
- Note also the use of the μετάνο word group – unusual for Paul – only used 5x in Pauline literature – Rom 2:4, 2 Cor 7:9, 10; 12:21; 2 Tim 2:25 - and in Paul, it is used in the context of believers, not unbelievers as in Acts)

⁵ But
 because of your hard
 and
 unrepentant heart
 you are storing up wrath for yourself
 in the day of wrath
 and
 the revelation of of the righteous judgment of God (cf. various translations – note NIV, NRSV and NAS)

Note preposition phrase – follows by accusative

⁵ κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου (hapax – hardness of heart, stubbornness as a human characteristics; BDAG: Of the spirit of *harshness, roughness* with which the Holy Spirit cannot live)
 καὶ
 ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν
 (possible for Granville sharp rule here?
 Note the Article-substantive-kai-substantive construction.
 If so, what is the significance?)

θησαυρίζεις (present tense – frequency of present indicative verbs) σεαυτῷ ὀργήν
 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς
 καὶ
 ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ (literally when the revelation of
 righteous judgment [compound word] of God)

⁶ who will render to each one
 according to his works:
 (note most translation begins a new sentence, instead of translating the
 relative pronoun ὃς. Note that NRSV and RSV begins with “for he will...”
 ESV and NET begins with “he will...”. NIV phrase it as OT quotation)

ὃς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ
 κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ·

⁷ to those who ^aby patience
 in well-doing seek for
 glory
 and
 honor
 and
 immortality,
 he will give eternal life;

⁷ τοῖς
 μὲν καθ’
 ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ
 (literally: steadfast of good works – here it means
 active sense – more like perseverance, not simply
 patience. Vigorous form of moral endeavour, not
 passive waiting for divine intervention)

δόξαν
 καὶ
 τιμὴν
 καὶ
 ἀφθαρσίαν
 (how to make sense of the prepositional phrase? What does
 the conjunction καὶ connect?
 τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν to ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν?
 OR
 τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν to δόξαν?
 Or – what could possibly be the object of the participle
 ζητοῦσιν?)

ζητοῦσιν (pre act part m dat plu – what could possibly be the
 modifier of the participle that = with GNC? What then could the
 significance?)

ζωὴν αἰώνιον (note asyndeton; literally: life eternal)

⁸ but

for those who are self-seeking
and
^ado not obey the truth,
but
obey unrighteousness,
there will be wrath and fury.

τοῖς δὲ
ἐξ ἐριθείας (out of ambition/rivalry)
καὶ
ἀπειθοῦσι (pre act part M dat plu) τῇ ἀληθείᾳ

πειθομένοις (pre act part M dat plu – what is the modifier that agrees with GNC? – literally: the ones who persuade... Note there are 1 article and 2 participles. How to decide which participle the article modifies?)

δὲ
τῇ ἀδικίᾳ
ὀργῇ καὶ θυμῷ.
(note asyndeton; literally: wrath and wrath)
Note the parallel structure of 2:7 and 2:8 – both participial clauses end with asyndeton. Both participial clauses with the modifiers of the participle being separated by prepositional phrase.
Do a quick word study on the difference of ὀργῇ and θυμῷ.
What could possibly be the semantic difference? One divine and one human? One with eschatological tinge [e.g., Rom 2:5, 8; 3:5; 5:9; Eph 5:6; Col 3:6; 1 Thess 1:10; 5:9] to it while the other does not??)

⁹ There will be tribulation and distress

^afor every human being of those who does evil,
the Jew ^bfirst
and
also the Greek,

θλίψις
καὶ

στενοχωρία

(note asyndeton again)

ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου

τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν,

Ἰουδαίου τε πρώτον

καὶ
Ἕλληνος·

¹⁰ but

glory and honor and ^apeace
for everyone who does good,
^bthe Jew first
and
also the Greek. (cf Romans 1:16)

δὲ

δόξα
καὶ
τιμὴ
καὶ
εἰρήνη
παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν,

Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον
καὶ
Ἑλληνι·

(note the parallel structure between 2:9 and 2:10. Cf. also 1:16 – Jews and gentiles – it does not matter whether you are a Jew or Greek – if you perform evil, you will be punished. God will treat both equally not on the basis of membership in one group or another)

¹¹ For there is no partiality with God. (cf other translations – God becomes subject)

οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.
(παρὰ follows by dative – functions as close association)

From 2:12-16, Paul makes the case that performance rather than mere possession of the law is assessed by God's impartial justice.

¹² For as many as who have sinned without the law
will also perish without the law,
and
all who have sinned under the law
will be judged by the law.

Ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως ἥμαρτον, (note the change to aorist indicative – note the unusual order)

ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολοῦνται, (future indicative – note the ending of both clauses – all ends with verbs)

καὶ

ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον,
διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται (future passive – who is doing the judgment?
Divine passive?)
(Note the 2 ὅσοι clauses – here Paul places both Jews and gentiles in the same position)

¹³ For ^ait is not the hearers of the law
righteous before God,

but

the doers of the law
will be justified.

οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου
δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ,
hearers of the law is ref to Jewish people as hearing the law
read in the synagogue is part of Jewish religious rites. See
Deut 4:10; 5:27; and the Shema – 6:4.
Hence, here Paul is attacking the Jewish practice of hearing
the law that leads into a claim of an assured status with God
– see Bar 4:3-4 “Do not give your glory to another, or your
advantages to an alien people. Happy are we, O Israel, for
we know what is pleasing to God.”

ἀλλ’
οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου
δικαιωθήσονται. (future passive indicative – Divine
passive?)
note:
1. there is no verb in the earlier clause, but the verb is
present in the clause after ἀλλ’ – why?
2. the contrast – negative and positive statements

¹⁴ For when gentiles,
who do not have the law,
by nature do what the law requires,
even though they do not have the law
they are a law to themselves,

ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη
τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα (note the greek construction here)
φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, (again note the greek construction here,
with the article τὰ bracketing the phrase that comes after it in the genitive: do what
the law requires)
οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες
ἑαυτοῖς εἰσὶν νόμος·

(note the unusual use of the demonstrative pronoun, οὗτοι. The pronoun is in masculine, and
the antecedent is ἔθνη is in neuter. Technically the pronoun should be in neuter, but this is
not the case here. This unusual grammar construction is called *constructio ad sensum*,
constructions according to sense. The agreement is conception and natural in nature that
overrides strict grammatical concord.)

¹⁵ who show that
the work of the law (is)
written on their hearts,
while their conscience also bears witness,
and
their conflicting thoughts
accuse or even excuse them

¹⁶ on that day when,
according to my gospel,
God judges the secrets of humanity by Christ Jesus.

οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται
τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου
γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν,
συμμαρτυρούσης (pre act part) αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως
καὶ
μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων τῶν λογισμῶν
κατηγορούντων
ἢ καὶ
ἀπολογουμένων,
(literally: and between them their thoughts accusing or also
defending)

ἐν ἡμέρᾳ
ὅτε
κρίνει ὁ θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ
τῶν ἀνθρώπων
κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου
διὰ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

(how to make sense of the prepositional phrase ἐν ἡμέρᾳ? Connect it to κρίνει ὁ θεὸς (as in most translations) or to κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου (as in NET)?)

And this is my gospel: on the day when God judges the secrets of humanity through Jesus Christ.

OR

And this is my gospel through Christ Jesus: on the day when God judges the secrets of humanity.

Note the beginning of a series of 5 traits – 3 series. 2:17-18; 2:19-20; 2:21-23, then concludes with OT quotation

¹⁷ But
 if you call yourself a Jew
 and
 rely on the law
 and
 boast in God
¹⁸ and
 know his will
 and
 approve what is excellent,
 because you are instructed from the law;

δὲ
 Εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ἐπονομάζῃ
 (first class condition – assumed true for the sake of argument – this is a subordinate clause, which would require a subsequent main clause. Question is – what could be the main clause? This is puzzling. Some say no main clause, some suggest 2:24, the quotation of OT passage as the main clause. Some say Paul never complete the sentence)

 καὶ
 ἐπαναπαύῃ νόμῳ (cf LXX Micah 3:11: Does not the Lord rest among us - no evil will come upon us – same word ἐπαναπαύῃ used in Micah)

 καὶ
 καυχᾶσαι ἐν θεῷ (cf. LXX Jer 9:22-23)

 καὶ
 γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα (cf. Jewish saying – May it be the will of God; insyallah)

 καὶ
 δοκιμάζεις (approve) τὰ διαφέροντα (the things that really matters – BDAG; differ to one's advantage fr. someone or someth., *be worth more than, be superior to*)

κατηχούμενος ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, (literally – being instructed from the law.)

What is the function of the participle?

1. causal – because you are instructed from the law, as in most translations?
2. temporal – while you are instructed from the law?
3. by means of - by means of being instructed from the law?
4. concession – although being instructed from the law?

Does the participle clause link to only what precedes it, or to all the 5 clauses?

The following 2nd 5 Jewish traits relate to a superior role in relation to others, esp with regard to gentiles. Note the beginning clause and the hint of arrogance. These traits, to Paul, are matter of pretentious assurance and naïve self-confidence

¹⁹ and
you are sure that you yourself are
a guide to the blind,
a light to those who are in darkness,
²⁰ an instructor of the foolish,
a teacher of children,
having in the law ^athe embodiment of ^bknowledge and truth--

τε
πέποιθάς σεαυτὸν (perfect indicative – perfect emphasizing the results or present state produced by a past action; different from Consummative perfect emphasizing completed action of past action from which the present state emerges)

ὀδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν, (infinitive – functioning as predicate accusative – you are...)

φῶς τῶν ἐν σκότει, (infinitive – echoes Isa 42:6-7 where God calls Israel to be light to the gentiles, to open the eyes of the blind)

παιδευτὴν ἀφρόνων,

διδάσκαλον νηπίων, (again – claim of superiority here – tutor is always in authority)

ἔχοντα τὴν μόρφωσιν
τῆς γνώσεως
καὶ
τῆς ἀληθείας
ἐν τῷ νόμῳ·

Note: this is the 3rd series of 5 forms of Jewish boasting – but the form is different – it is presented in rhetorical questions requiring an answer

- ²¹ you then who teach others,
do you not teach yourself?
you who preach against stealing,
do you steal?
²² You who say that one must not commit adultery,
do you commit adultery?
You who abhor idols,
do you ^arob temples?
²³ You who ^aboast in the law
^bdishonor God by breaking the law? Or .

ὁ οὖν διδάσκων ἕτερον (present participle)
σεαυτὸν οὐ διδάσκεις;

ὁ κηρύσσων μὴ κλέπτειν (present participle – note the notion of preaching – herald of good news)
κλέπτεις;

ὁ λέγων μὴ μοιχεύειν (present participle)
μοιχεύεις;

ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἰδῶλα (present participle)
ἱεροσυλεῖς;

²³ ὃς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι, (present indicative)
διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου
τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις·

Note:

1. Note the 4 indicatives from 2:21-22 – functioning as interrogative indication where the question expects an assertion to be made – focuses not so much on the how or the why, but the what. This type of indicative demands a declarative indicative in answer (ie presentation of certainty). It also probes for information.
2. there is a sudden shift to present indicative after a series of indicative + present participle clauses.
3. 4 sentences framed with questions, except the last – what could have been the rhetorical impact on this? How could this be related to the flow of argument from 2:17 till 2:23? However, the last indicative can also be treated as the climatic statement or question based on rhetorical ground – this is the summation of all the 4 questions that gone before. Dishonour god – echoes 1:21-27. Rhetorical effect – would have brought shudder down the spine.
4. Note the flow:
 - From 2:17-18 – it ends with reference to the law
 - From 2:19-20 – it ends with reference to the law
 - From 2:21-23 – it ends with reference to the law
 - Then it is followed by OT citation – how would the rhetorical effect be on the flow of argument? Remember that in 2:17 – it starts with reference to the Jew.

²⁴ For,
"The name of God is blasphemed
among the gentiles
because of you."

as it is written

τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ
δι' ὑμᾶς
βλασφημεῖται
ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,
καθὼς γέγραπται.

Citation from Isa 52:5 – original meaning – God's name was reviled by the gentiles on account of Israel's captivity. In Paul's context – reference is to Israel's transgression against the law.

Check against LXX Isa 52:5 –

δι' ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν
on account of you my name is continually blasphemed among the gentiles

Rom 2:24:

τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καθὼς γέγραπται.
For, "The name of God is blasphemed among the gentiles because of you," as it is written.

Paul alters the sequence to bring the crucial phrase into emphatic position – the name of the Lord to the front. This shift places the emphasis to the honour of God's name. To bring out the point of dishonour God's name, "it is written" is placed at the end of the sentence.

It is also interesting that Paul would have chosen a passage that would bring gentiles into the equation, so that the jews could not claim superiority over the gentiles.

From Rom 2:25-29, a new section opens.

²⁵ For circumcision indeed is of value
if you obey the law,

but

if you break the law,
your circumcision becomes uncircumcision.

²⁵ Περιτομή μὲν γὰρ ὠφελεῖ
ἐὰν νόμον πράσσης·

ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ᾖς,
ἡ περιτομή σου ἀκροβυστία γέγονεν.

²⁶ So, if ^aa man who is uncircumcised
keeps ^bthe precepts of the law,

will not his uncircumcision be regarded as circumcision?

²⁶ ἔάν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία
τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσει,

οὐχ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ
εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται;
(εἰς + accusative followed by λογίζομαι – known as substitution for
predicate nominative; this construction is due to semitic influence.
Usually translated as “regarded/reckoned as...”)

²⁷ Then he who is physically uncircumcised
but
keeps the law
^awill condemn you
who have the letter
and
circumcision
but
break the law.

²⁷ καὶ κρινεῖ ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία
(note greek construction – preposition in between the article and the noun that article modifies)
τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα σὲ

- Note the verb κρινεῖ [future indicative] and the object σὲ is far apart – what is the significance? Also note the verb and subject is in unnatural order.
- Note also the present active participle τελοῦσα. What is the function of the participle?
 - condition – literally: Then he who is physically uncircumcised, if he fulfills the law...

τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου.
(note greek construction – article and noun far apart;
function of preposition διὰ : marker of instrumentality or circumstance
whereby someth. is accomplished or effected, cf. BDAG)

Literally: and will judge the from-the-nature-uncircumcised fulfilling the law you = the though-provided-with-scripture-and-circumcision transgressor of law

²⁸ For ^ano one is a Jew
^bwho is merely one outwardly,
nor is circumcision outward and physical.

οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερωῖ Ἰουδαίος ἐστίν
οὐδὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερωῖ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή,

²⁹ But a Jew is one
^ainwardly,
and
^bcircumcision is a matter of the heart,
by the Spirit,
not by the letter.
whose praise is not from man but from God.

²⁹ ἀλλ’

ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαίος,
καὶ
περιτομὴ καρδίας
ἐν πνεύματι
οὐ γράμματι,
οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος
οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων
ἀλλ’
ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ.