

# Rom 11:11 How Does Ephraim Provoke Judah to Jealousy

Intellectual Property of John Marsing - [www.MyHebrewBible.Com](http://www.MyHebrewBible.Com)

## Contents

Introduction .....	1
Romans 11:11 .....	1
Back to Romans 11:11 .....	2
In conclusion.....	3
Word Study G3863 - <i>parazelloo</i> - (provoke to ) Jealous, Emulation .....	3

## Introduction

### Romans 11:11

**Rom 11:11 KJV** I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but *rather* through their fall salvation *is come* unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy <sup>G3863 parazeeloo</sup>.

In this context, jealousy is being used in a good sense. For Ephraim to provoke Judah, a question needs to be asked what exactly is it that Ephraim has the Judah wants?

**The answer is sovereignty.**

What does the House of Israel aka Ephraim have that is causing this jealousy? Ironically it's the Bill of Divorce which I say is the biblical definition for the concept of hell ... eternally separated from YHVH. So how can this possibly be an advantage? I'm all for the idea of looking on the bright side of things<sup>1</sup>, but this is over the top...or is it?

Before I give my explanation, let me bring in another topics to the conversation that I also write extensively about and that is 1<sup>st</sup> Samuel chapter 8. In that chapter Israel (all of Israel) is asking for a King like the nations, nullifying Exodus 15:18 which says "YHVH shall reign for ever and ever."

An example of this is my investigation into what it means to have an American Birthright. In that discussion I make the case that rights from the Creator (CGUR, Creator Given Unalienable Rights) necessarily points you back to the Mt. Sinai covenant (of which Exodus 15:18 is a precursor). This is important because it answers the *quo warranto* question of our American founding fathers, which is by what authority did they make in terminating their contract with King George of England. The question ultimately gets to the biblical doctrine of the "divine right of Kings". My response to this charge of disrespecting this biblical doctrine is that they in fact were honoring the "divine right of Kings" the difference was that they were going back to YHVH as their King, not the type of King that was established by 1<sup>st</sup> Samuel chapter 8. The question is not did the American Founding Father's challenge that there is a divine right of Kings, but rather who is the King.

---

<sup>1</sup> I like how Martin Luther says "put the best construction on everything".

## Back to Romans 11:11

In Romans, Paul is of course talking about what was the consequences of the ministry of Y'shua and the salvific sacrifice he made. In my article, "[Mat 15:21-28 Salvation is only for the House of Israel](http://myhebrewbible.com/Article/427)" (<http://myhebrewbible.com/Article/427>), I investigate what Y'shua meant when he said "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel". I fully understand that this upsets the salvific doctrines of not only Antinomian Christianity but even those in the Hebrew roots movement. I make my case there, so I want belabor the point in this article, but I ask the question why is the House of Israel specifically mentioned? To me, with my legal analytical mind, it seems clear, Y'shua is overcoming their legal status vis-à-vis to YHVH which was the result of the Bill of Divorce.

I still haven't answered how this is advantageous to Ephraim and not to Judah although it obviously has to do with the work of Y'shua. If you accept that Y'shua undid the legal status of Ephraim being spiritually divorced of YHVH, the question becomes what is Ephraim's new legal status. From a timeline perspective do I, who claims to be from Ephraim, end up after 1<sup>st</sup> Samuel chapter 8 without YHVH as being my King, or do I end up after Exodus 15:18 where YHVH is my King?

I want the later and I make this claim because I'm an American whose claiming his birthright which is founded on the Mt. Sinai covenant and supersedes any king's claim who is operating under the pattern established at 1<sup>st</sup> Samuel chapter 8. By doing this, I'm doing the *nunc pro tunc*<sup>2</sup> thing and am going back in time to a prior and superior status for which now I can claim I'm a sovereign<sup>3</sup>.

So where does this leave Judah?

Speaking as a redeemed Ephramite from the Christian side of the fence, it seems that Judah's aversion to making the claim that Y'shua of Nazareth as the Messiah has been a great stumbling block. As I stated in "[Mat 15:21-28 Salvation is only for the House of Israel](http://myhebrewbible.com/Article/427)" Judah does not need salvation from the consequences of the Bill of Divorce because she did not get that. However, in order for Judah to fully operate as part of the Kingdom of priests, does she need to be "saved" from the earthly Kings? Any good Jew will tell you without much provocation that the life of a Jew throughout the last 1,900 or so years has not gone well for them. Even if they were under the control of 1<sup>st</sup> Samuel chapter 8 style of Christian Kings. It has only been since the last century can they claim a nation for themselves, that being of course the modern nation of Israel.

Are they really sovereign in that country like America had been early on in her beginning? To truly be sovereign you have to be truly right with YHVH. I make the case for this in my article "[Brit Shalom for Judah and Ephraim](http://www.myhebrewbible.com/Article/790)" (<http://www.myhebrewbible.com/Article/790>).

---

<sup>2</sup> *Nunc pro tunc* is a Latin expression in common legal use in the English language. It means *now for then*. In general, a court ruling "nunc pro tunc" **applies retroactively to correct an earlier ruling**. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nunc\\_pro\\_tunc](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nunc_pro_tunc)

<sup>3</sup> Bouvier's law dictionary of 1856. **Sovereign** 1.) A chief ruler with supreme power; one possessing sovereignty. (q. v.) It is also applied to a king or other magistrate with limited powers. 2. **In the United States the sovereignty resides in the body of the people.** Vide Rutherf. Inst. 282. see [www.MyHebrewBible.com/Glossary/Details/197](http://www.MyHebrewBible.com/Glossary/Details/197)

## In conclusion<sup>4</sup>

Am I saying emphatically this is what Paul meant when he wrote this words? No. Paul is a hard read. I do say that my interpretation is a reasonable one and one that has powerful implications because it deals with the law, and the law is the weightier mater.

This is my argument for why Judah is Jealous.

## Word Study G3863 - *parazeloo* - (provoke to ) Jealous, Emulation

παράζηλόω

**Strong's:** From [G3844](#) and [G2206](#); to *stimulate alongside*, that is, *excite to rivalry*: - provoke to emulation (jealousy).

LXX: [H2734](#) charah hithp., [H7065](#) qana pi.,hi.

**KJC Occurrences:** 5; **provoke**, 4: [Rom\\_10:19](#), [Rom\\_11:11](#), [Rom\\_11:14](#), [1Co\\_10:22](#); **emulation**, 1 [Rom\\_11:14](#)

Contrast with zeallos G2205 (zeal jealosly [2Co\\_11:2](#)).

**Rom 10:19 KJV** But I say, Did not Israel know? First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy by *them that are* no people, *and* by a foolish nation I will anger you.

**Deu 32:21 KJV** They have moved me to jealousy with *that which is* not God; they have provoked me to anger with their vanities: and I will move them to jealousy with *those which are* not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation.

**Rom 11:14 KJV** If by any means I may provoke to emulation <sup>G3863 parazeloo</sup> *them which are* my flesh, and might save some of them.

**1Co 10:21-22 KJV** Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils. (22) Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy <sup>G3863 parazeloo G3588 G2962</sup>? are we stronger than he?

---

<sup>4</sup> To hopefully further support my claim I'm working on a document "Romans-11-12-36.doc" but that is very much not completed.