

## Romans

Romans Chapter Nine

Romans 9:6-13

March 6, 2011

This is lesson number **80** in our exposition of the Book of Romans.

### The Theme of the Letter

Romans 1:16-17

“For I am not ashamed of **the gospel of Christ**, for it is the **power** of God to salvation for everyone who believes, for the Jew first and also for the Greek. For in it the **righteousness of God** is **revealed** from faith to faith; as it is written, ‘The just shall live by faith.’ ” Romans 1:16-17

### Title: For They Are Not All Israel Who Are Of Israel

Romans 9:6-13

**But it is not that the word of God has taken no effect. For they are not all Israel who are of Israel, 7 nor are they all children because they are the seed of Abraham; but, "In Isaac your seed shall be called." 8 That is, those who are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted as the seed. 9 For this is the word of promise: "At this time I will come and Sarah shall have a son."**

**10 And not only this, but when Rebecca also had conceived by one man, even by our father Isaac 11(for the children not yet being born, nor having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works but of Him who calls), 12 it was said to her, "The older shall serve the younger." 13 As it is written, "Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated."**

Today’s text explains the doctrine of God’s free choice, or the election of grace. Many volumes of books have been written and many words spoken both for and against God’s absolute sovereignty in the matter of those individuals He chooses to call, justify, and glorify. The question for me and for you is **can** we accept the plain teaching of God’s word?

My intent for this exposition is to simply deal with the text before us. If a person has determined in his mind that he will not accept what this passage teaches then no amount of persuasion, logic, or eloquent words will have any effect on that closed mind.

There are many people, sad to say most Southern Baptists in this generation, who reject the doctrine of God’s absolute sovereignty and instead they bow down to an idol of man’s ‘free will.’

## Romans

They have created a god after their own image that would not dare to violate their imagined 'free will.' There can only be one sovereign will, either man or God, but not both.

Either the God of the Bible has absolute free choice or every man has in himself the ability to frustrate God is His supposed attempt to save every individual in the human race.

### "I Don't Want Free Will" by Martin Luther

"I frankly confess that, for myself, even if it could be, I should not want 'free-will' to be given me, nor anything to be left in my own hands to enable me to endeavour after salvation; not merely because in face of so many dangers, and adversities and assaults of devils, I could not stand my ground ...; but because even were there no dangers ... I should still be forced to labour with no guarantee of success ... But now that God has taken my salvation out of the control of my own will, and put it under the control of His, and promised to save me, not according to my working or running, but according to His own grace and mercy, I have the comfortable certainty that He is faithful and will not lie to me, and that He is also great and powerful, so that no devils or opposition can break Him or pluck me from Him. Furthermore, I have the comfortable certainty that I please God, not by reason of the merit of my works, but by reason of His merciful favour promised to me; so that, if I work too little, or badly, He does not impute it to me, but with fatherly compassion pardons me and makes me better. This is the glorying of all the saints in their God" - Martin Luther, The Bondage of the Will

(Grand Rapids: Revell, 1957), 313-314.

Now if you can bear to stay with me as we move through chapters 9 and 10, and with God the Holy Spirit teaching us, we will see that God is God and that man is responsible to His Creator.

Most of all we will see that God is in no way **unfair** in His dealing with men in God's free choice of those who are His children.

Paul has already introduced God's **free choice**:

## Romans

Romans 8:28-30

**28 And we know that all things work together for good to those who love God, to those who are the called according to His purpose. 29 For whom He foreknew, He also predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. 30 Moreover whom He predestined, these He also called; whom He called, these He also justified; and whom He justified, these He also glorified.**

Then Paul gives the most comprehensive statement of the **final perseverance** of the believer in:

**Romans 8:31-39**

**What then shall we say to these things? If God is for us, who can be against us? 32 He who did not spare His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things? 33 Who shall bring a charge against God's elect? It is God who justifies. 34 Who is he who condemns? It is Christ who died, and furthermore is also risen, who is even at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us. 35 Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? 36 As it is written:**

**"For Your sake we are killed all day long;  
We are accounted as sheep for the slaughter."**

**37 Yet in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him who loved us. 38 For I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels nor principalities nor powers, nor things present nor things to come, 39 nor height nor depth, nor any other created thing, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.**

After this grand statement of assurance Paul discusses the subject of God's sovereign choice.

First in chapter 9:1-5, Paul expresses his anguish over the unbelief of his fellow Israelites. The Jews from the Exodus to the time of Paul had all the privileges and yet the vast majority of them died in unbelief.

At verse 6 Paul begins to deal with the accusation that God has failed to keep His promise to Israel. God made covenants with a people and He promised to keep them as His children.

## Romans

But what was obvious to Paul was that the vast majority of Jews, or Israel, in the past centuries had died in unbelief. And now in Paul's time the Jews were hardened in their rejection of Jesus of Nazareth as the promised Messiah.

### **Has God failed in His covenants of promise?**

What Paul writes in verse 6 is the key to understanding that God's word has not failed:

**But it is not that the word of God has taken no effect.  
For they are not all Israel who are of Israel,**

It was never God's purpose to save all the Jews of any generation, past, present, or future. God justifies individuals!

We need to see the meaning of the phrase the 'word of God' in verse 6.

Usually in the NT the 'word of God' refers to the Gospel but here and in only one other place in the NT it refers to the OT Scriptures.

#### **Mark 7:9-13**

**9 He said to them, "All too well you reject the commandment of God, that you may keep your tradition.10 For Moses said, 'Honor your father and your mother'; and, 'He who curses father or mother, let him be put to death.' 11 But you say, 'If a man says to his father or mother,' Whatever profit you might have received from me is Corban" -- ' (that is, a gift to God), 12 then you no longer let him do anything for his father or his mother, 13 making the word of God of no effect through your tradition which you have handed down. And many such things you do."**

Notice that the passage in Mark Jesus is also dealing with the hardness and unbelief of the Jews. That is why **context** is so very important to get the understanding of Scripture.

#### **For they are not all Israel who are of Israel,**

Back in 2:28-29 Paul introduced the idea of an Israel within Israel. See how Paul states a thing and then comes back to it. Here in chapter 9 is the explanation of who is and who is not a Jew.

#### **Romans 2:28-29**

## Romans

**28 For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, nor is circumcision that which is outward in the flesh; 29 but he is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the Spirit, not in the letter; whose praise is not from men but from God.**

Notice that the genuine Jew is someone who has been circumcised in the heart by the Holy Spirit. To be circumcised in the heart is to be born again by the Spirit of God. Jesus told Nicodemus, "You must be born again."

Paul is dealing with the idea that just because a person is born a Jew or an Israelite that he is safe from the wrath of God. The Jew believed that because they had the law and circumcision that they were God's children.

But the only way that anyone becomes a child of God is by God's free choice and by God calling him or her through the Gospel {chapter 10}.

Lloyd-Jones poses four questions that are based on this error. The error is one of presumption that God saves someone based on his or her lineage or on the basis of his or her works.

1. Is there such a thing as a Christian country?
2. Are children of Christian parents of necessity Christians?
3. Are baptized [water baptism] children of necessity Christians because they have been baptized?
4. Are all who have been baptized, whether as children or adults, and are all who are church members, of necessity Christians?

For they are not all Christian who are of Christians.

**For they are not all Israel who are of Israel!**

There are two Israel's. One is the nation as a whole; the other Israel is made up of those who are the true spiritual descendents of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and they alone are the true heirs of the promise made to Abraham.

God's word has never failed and never will fail:

**For they are not all Israel who are of Israel!**

How did you answer L-J's four questions?

## **Romans**

1. Is there such a thing as a Christian country? NO.
2. Are children of Christian parents of necessity Christians? NO.
3. Are baptized children of necessity Christians because they have been baptized? NO.
4. Are all who have been baptized, whether as children or adults, and are all who are church members, of necessity Christians? NO.

L-J's point is that no one is a Christian because of his or her parents or because of his or her baptism!

For they are not all Christian who are of Christians.

## Romans

**7 nor are they all children because they are the seed of Abraham; but, "In Isaac your seed shall be called."**

There are two meanings to the word 'seed' in this one verse.  
One meaning is the physical "seed" and the other is the spiritual "seed."

Rom 9:7

7

οὐδ’ CCD Neither, <u>3761</u> oud	ὅτι CSN because <u>3754</u> hóti	εἰσὶν V3PPAI they are <u>1510</u> eisín	the <u>9999</u>	σπέρμα NNSN seed <u>4690</u> spérma	᾿Αβραάμ NMSG of Abraham, <u>11</u> Abraám
---	--	---	--------------------	---	---

are they <u>9999</u>	πάντες JMPNX all <u>3956</u> pántes	τέκνα, NNPN children: <u>5043</u> tékna	ἀλλ’ CCV but, <u>235</u> all	ἐν PD In <u>1722</u> En	᾿Ισαάκ NMSD Isaac <u>2464</u> Isaák
-------------------------	---	---	--	-------------------------------------	---

κληθήσεται V3SFPI shall be called. <u>2564</u> kleetheésetaí	σοι OP2_SD thy <u>4671</u> soi	σπέρμα. NNSN seed <u>4690</u> spérma
--	--	--

## Romans

Rom 9:8

8

ΤΟΥΤ' ODENSN That <u>5124</u> Τούτ	ἔστιν, V3SPAI is, <u>2076</u> ἐστίν	οὐ TN not <u>3756</u> ου	They which are <u>9999</u>	τὰ ANPN the <u>3588</u> τά	τέκνα NNPN children <u>5043</u> τέκνα
--	---	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	---

τῆς AFSG of the <u>3588</u> τεés	σαρκός NFSG flesh, <u>4561</u> sarkós	ταῦτα ODENPN these <u>5023</u> ταῦτα	are	the <u>9999</u>	τέκνα NNPN children <u>5043</u> τέκνα	τοῦ AMSG <u>3588</u> τού
--	---	--	-----	--------------------	---	-----------------------------------

θεοῦ NMSG of God: <u>2316</u> Theoú	ἀλλά CCV but <u>235</u> allá	τὰ ANPN the <u>3588</u> τά	τέκνα NNPN children <u>5043</u> τέκνα	τῆς AFSG of the <u>3588</u> τεés	ἐπαγγελίας NFSG promise <u>1860</u> epangelías
---	--	--	---	--	--

λογίζεται V3SPPI are counted <u>3049</u> logízetai	εἰς PA for <u>1519</u> eis	the <u>9999</u>	σπέρμα. NSA seed. <u>4690</u> spérma
--	--	--------------------	--

(Interlinear Transliterated Bible. Copyright © 1994, 2003, 2006 by BibleSoft, Inc.)

There are two different Greek words that are both translated in English to “seed” and the following quotation is the best explanation of how these two Greek words are consistently used by the Holy Spirit. We lose the distinction when two different Greek words are translated into the same English word “seed” or “children.” Most theories of the future of the Jews in a millennial kingdom are refuted when this singular pregnant truth is truly understood.



## Romans

“In order to appreciate to the full the way in which the New Testament writers interpret the concept of the seed of Abraham, we need to examine their writings in more detail than we have done so far. The term “seed” or “descendants of Abraham” is used in three senses in the New Testament. Firstly, it is used of the Seed who is Christ. Paul argues in Gal. 3: 16 ff. that Christ is the seed of Abraham. The rabbinical writers, with a true spiritual insight, saw that “the Christ” who was promised was the true seed of Abraham. “In him,” writes Lightfoot, “the race was summed up, as it were. In him it fulfilled its purpose and became a blessing to the whole earth. Without him its separate existence as a peculiar people had no meaning. Thus he was not only the representative but the embodiment of the race. In this way the people of Israel is the type of Christ, and in the New Testament parallels are sought in respect of the one to the life of the other.” Secondly, there is the literal seed of Abraham. Paul, when speaking of the natural children of Abraham, i.e. of his physical descendants, uniformly uses the Greek word *sperma* (seed) not *tekna* (children) which he always reserves for believers in Christ. If the Greek Testament be consulted at Rom. 9: 7, the distinction can be clearly seen: “Neither because they are *sperma* of Abraham, are they all *tekna*: but, In Isaac shall thy *sperma* be called.”

The same basic distinction is to be found in John 8: 37 and 39. Our Lord said to the Jews, “I know that ye are Abraham’s *sperma*; but ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you.” “They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father. Jesus said unto them, If ye were Abraham’s *tekna*, ye would do the works of Abraham.” We may also note Matt. 3: 9, “And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up *tekna* unto Abraham.” The same differentiation between a literal seed and a spiritual seed is to be found in Gal. 4: 21-31. Thirdly, there is the true seed or spiritual seed of Abraham. Paul quotes the expression “so shall thy seed be” (Gen 15: 18) to show that Abraham is the father of many nations, that is, of a great host of believers drawn out of every race and tribe and kindred who walk in the step of his faith (Rom 4: 18). It is to this seed, the true seed, that the promise in Rom 4: 16 is made sure. “Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure (or established) to all the seed *sperma* ; not to that only which is the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all.” In case we are in any doubt, in Rom 9: 7 Paul says that only some of the literal are also to be found among the spiritual seed, only the children of the promise, “Neither, because they are the seed *sperma* of Abraham, are they all children *tekna*; but in Isaac shall thy seed *sperma* be called.”

Children of Abraham, David Kingdom, Carey Publications, Ltd. 1973, pages 52-53.  
{bolding, italics, and underling mine}

The first meaning of ‘seed’ is a descendant after the flesh.

**... nor are they all children {*tekna*} because they are the seed {*sperma*} of Abraham;**

The other use of ‘seed’ means those who are included in the promise made to Abraham.

## Romans

**... but, "In Isaac your seed {*sperma*} shall be called."**

That is, out of the *sperma* the *tekna* shall be called.

He goes further and says the same thing but uses the word 'children.'

Paul explains that 'seed' and 'children' have two meanings.

In the Greek you can see the interplay of the words *sperma* and *tekna* but when the English translates *sperma* and the *tekna* to 'seed' and 'children' you lose the distinction between the physical and the spiritual.

And that is the basis for this statement:

**... they are not all Israel who are of Israel!**

**8 That is, those who are the children of the flesh,  
these are not the children of God;  
but the children of the promise are counted as the seed.**

**... but, "In Isaac your seed shall be called."**

Now the word 'called' also has two meanings.

Most commentators say that 'called' here means 'counted' or 'reckoned'.

It means that but it also means more than that.

Paul introduced 'called' back in chapter 4.

### **Romans 4:13-17**

**For the promise that he would be the heir of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.<sup>14</sup> For if those who are of the law are heirs, faith is made void and the promise made of no effect, <sup>15</sup> because the law brings about wrath; for where there is no law there is no transgression.**

**16 Therefore it is of faith that it might be according to grace, so that the promise might be sure to all the seed, not only to those who are of the law, but also to those who are of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all <sup>17</sup>(as it is written, "I**

## Romans

have made you a father of many nations") in the presence of Him whom he believed -- God, who gives life to the dead and calls those things which do not exist as though they did;

Do you see that?

**God, who gives life to the dead and calls those things which do not exist as though they did**

The meaning of 'called' {9:7} is that God *calls into being*, in other words God brings them into existence.

This takes us back to Genesis 15, 16, and 17.

God promised Abraham that he would be the father of many nations.

But after what seemed too long a time to Abraham and Sarah, and by this time Sarah was barren, Abraham took Hagar who was Sarah's slave and Abraham and Hagar had a son they named Ishmael.

Abraham loved Ishmael and thought that he was the promised heir.

But God spoke to Abraham and told him that Sarah would have a son and he was to be named Isaac and that Isaac was the promised child.

God called Isaac into being!

**9 For this is the word of promise:**

**"At this time I will come and Sarah shall have a son."**

**Here is God's free choice.**

Both Ishmael and Isaac are the sons of Abraham. Ishmael is loved by Abraham and is the oldest son. But Ishmael is not the child of promise.

## Romans

Something that I learned from Lloyd-Jones here is extremely important.

God did not have before Him two boys, Ishmael and Isaac, and then God made a choice between them.

Isaac was **born because of the promise** so get rid of the notion that God chose one and rejected the other. Isaac was called into being because of the promise.

It is the **election of Isaac that comes first** and then he is brought into being. **He was not chosen after he arrived!**

Paul explains this in:  
Galatians 4:21-31

**Tell me, you who desire to be under the law, do you not hear the law? 22 For it is written that Abraham had two sons: the one by a bondwoman, the other by a freewoman. 23 But he who was of the bondwoman was born according to the flesh, and he of the freewoman through promise, 24 which things are symbolic. For these are the two covenants: the one from Mount Sinai which gives birth to bondage, which is Hagar -- 25 for this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and corresponds to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children -- 26 but the Jerusalem above is free, which is the mother of us all. 27 For it is written:**

**"Rejoice, O barren,  
You who do not bear!  
Break forth and shout,  
You who are not in labor!  
For the desolate has many more children  
Than she who has a husband."**

**28 Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are children of promise. 29 But, as he who was born according to the flesh then persecuted him who was born according to the Spirit, even so it is now. 30 Nevertheless what does the Scripture say? "Cast out the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." 31 So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman but of the free.**

**Isaac was "born according to the Spirit."**

What was true of Isaac is also true of every child of God.  
**Every child of God is "born according to the Spirit."**

## Romans

But, says the unconvinced defender of man's 'free will', Ishmael and Isaac had the same father but they had different mothers. And besides that, Hagar was not an Israelite.

Paul anticipates this objection and being the excellent teacher that he was he takes the case for God's free choice a step further.

**10 And not only this, but when Rebecca also had conceived by one man, even by our father Isaac**

Rebecca had two boys in her womb at the same time. In fact, even though Esau was born just a little before the other boy, that boy, Jacob, is the one through whom the seed is to be perpetuated.

What more do you need to see that being a child of God is not a matter of natural descent and that "... they are not all Israel who are of Israel,"

**Genesis 25:21-26**

**21 Now Isaac pleaded with the LORD for his wife, because she was barren; and the LORD granted his plea, and Rebekah his wife conceived. 22 But the children struggled together within her; and she said, "If all is well, why am I like this?" So she went to inquire of the LORD.**

**23 And the LORD said to her:**

**"two nations are in your womb,  
two peoples shall be separated from your body;  
one people shall be stronger than the other,  
And the older shall serve the younger."**

**24 So when her days were fulfilled for her to give birth, indeed there were twins in her womb. 25 And the first came out red. He was like a hairy garment all over; so they called his name Esau. 26 Afterward his brother came out, and his hand took hold of Esau's heel; so his name was called Jacob. Isaac was sixty years old when she bore them.**

God's sovereign free choice is further emphasized by what Paul says about the choice of Jacob over Esau.

**11(for the children not yet being born, nor having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works but of Him who calls), 12 it was said to her, "The older shall serve the younger."**

## Romans

God's sovereign free choice is not based on anything **foreseen** in the lives of either one of them. And God's sovereign free choice is certainly not based on anything that they did **after** they were born.

It was God's purpose to call a people into being and declare that they are His children. He does that because He alone is God and He alone has free choice. It is God that justifies the ungodly.

This is perhaps the **most important principle** about the choosing and electing on the part of God that Lloyd-Jones made clear to me. It is very likely that you also have viewed this matter in the same way as I did.

Lloyd-Jones helped me greatly on this and he is the only commentator that I have read that brings this out. I am going to quote Lloyd-Jones:

**“God’s electing and selecting is not a matter of an arbitrary selection out of a mass of humanity. Yet I am sure that many have always thought of it like that – that God is confronted by the whole of humanity and that the Apostle is teaching here that God looks at all those people and says, ‘I am going to choose some of them and give them salvation; and I am going to reject the others.’ Now I assert that that is not what the apostle says; it is, in fact, to misunderstand what he is saying.”**

**What God does is to produce a people for Himself.**

**It was God that produced Isaac. It was a miraculous birth. It was not the case of Ishmael and Isaac being born and God looking at the two boys and saying, “I am going to take this one and not that one.” That is quite wrong. God produced Isaac because He had already decided it was through this man whom He was going to bring into being that the seed would be carried on. We must get rid of the notion of God looking at humanity or a collection of people who have already arrived, in an utterly arbitrary and unfair way, taking one out and leaving another, though they are both equally sinners and equally hopeless. It is not that. This is a very positive process.”**

[Lloyd-Jones, Romans 9, page 131.]

**What God does is to produce a people for Himself.**

Remember in chapter 5 where we see that all men are represented in Adam and all men are condemned because of the one sin of the one man.

## Romans

But there is another representative Man in chapter 5, even Christ, the Last Adam. Christ is the Head of a new race.

It **is not** the selection out of the old race; it **is not** a matter of some of Adam's race being forgiven and others not; it is the **production of a new humanity in Christ**. Look ahead a few verses.

### Romans 9:22-24

**22** What if God, wanting to show His wrath and to make His power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath prepared for destruction, **23** and that He might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy, which He had prepared beforehand for glory, **24** even us whom He called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?

God's way of salvation is a positive process.  
His children are a new people born of the Holy Spirit.

They are foreknown and predestined and called into being.  
If you can accept what the Apostle has said about God's sovereign free choice you should not have too much difficulty with verse 13;  
**Ah, but you will.**

**13** As it is written, "Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated."

Paul is quoting Malachi; remember that all of Paul's arguments for the Gospel are based on the OT Scripture.

This is about God's sovereign choice in election and if election of individuals is not the cause of God's calling, regeneration, and justification then there is no Gospel!

The other view is that God made an effort to save every single human and left the results up to man's "free-will."

Now be very careful!

Election is not justification but election is unto justification!

## Romans

And so Paul quotes Malachi:

**Malachi 1:1-3**

**The burden of the word of the LORD to Israel by Malachi.**

**2 "I have loved you," says the LORD.**

**"Yet you say, 'In what way have You loved us?'**

**Was not Esau Jacob's brother?"**

**Says the LORD.**

**"Yet Jacob I have loved;**

**3 But Esau I have hated,**

You will not find much in the way of agreement among the expositors on 9:13. I checked about ten different commentaries on 9:13 and found about twenty different explanations.

How can you get 20 explanations from 10 writers?

“On the one hand it can mean this and on the other hand it can mean that.”

An old deacon once prayed that God would send the church a “One-armed preacher.” No more “On the one hand it can mean this and on the other hand it can mean that.”

The most common explanation of 9:13 is that this is only referring to God’s choice of nations and not to individuals. It is true that two nations came from these two men, and that is what God told Isaac and Rebecca.

As far as this meaning ‘nations’ you surely know that nations are made up of individuals and Paul cannot mean that every individual in the elect nation [Jacob] is a child of God and that every individual in Edom [Esau] was lost. That would contradict all he has just said about ‘seed’ and ‘children of God.’



## Romans

Another common explanation is the qualification of ‘hatred’ to mean ‘loved less.’

Even Lloyd-Jones says this is a qualified ‘hatred’ in that God did not love Esau to the degree that He loved Jacob. Lloyd-Jones uses the quote where Jesus says in:

**Matthew 10:37**

**He who loves father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me. And he who loves son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me.**

**Luke 14:26**

**If anyone comes to Me and does not hate his father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters, yes and his own life also, he cannot be My disciple.**

Obviously the context in Matthew and in Luke demands a relative ‘hatred’ where we must love Jesus more than any filial relationships.

But while what Jesus said is most certainly true, I do not agree that "**Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated**" does not apply to God’s free choice of individuals. Jacob was justified and Esau was condemned!

So I will attempt to be a ‘one-armed’ preacher. All I can do is tell you where I come out after studying this carefully.

The first thing to know is that the **love** of God and the **hatred** of God are not based on human-like emotion. When I hate someone it is sin for me. But God’s wrath against all unbelievers is not sin on the part of God. God is holy!

In the next place, if we soften the ‘hatred’ of God, why not completely deny His holy wrath as many contemporary preachers do?

Someone said, “I can understand why God could hate Esau; but what I can’t understand is how God could love Jacob.”

## Romans

Are we as Esau or as Jacob?

**“If we are as Esau**, and hunger after this world's sustenance, and in our hearts are attached to the goods, amusements, and women of this age, and only add on those qualities which we suppose to be necessary to true religion, just as Esau added a wife from the offspring of his uncle Ishmael, hoping thereby to placate his parents and present himself a true child of Abraham, then we may be certain that we will eventually find ourselves in Esau's place, weeping bitterly but finding no place of repentance (cf. Hebrews 12:15-17).

But **if we are as Jacob**, who for all his many faults and shortcomings nevertheless hoped most earnestly in the blessing promised to Abraham, and yearned and labored for the coming of the Christ, then we may be sure that God's grace will not only give us that which we long for, but will likewise change our very natures so that his gift will be compatible with the state of our own hearts. Thus we see that Jacob, through many difficulties and miseries, slowly grew more fitted to enter into the inheritance for which he so ardently yearned, and thus the trials of this age worked in his behalf, changing his own heart so that he might prove himself an heir of the promise indeed; even as we who have hoped in Christ, and who long for his coming again, may know that all things, trials and difficulties not excepted, are being worked together for our good, and will soon fit us for the glorious inheritance which we in no way deserve, but yet love and hope for (cf. Romans 8:28-39).”

—Nathan Pitchford, *Images of the Saviour from the Pentateuch*

There is a movement called the ‘inclusiveness’ of God that says that all religions are valid and that ultimately no one will be lost in hell.

Robert Haldane makes a good point.

**“If God’s love to Jacob was real literal love, God’s hatred of Esau must be real literal hatred. It might as well be said that the phrase, ‘Jacob have I loved’, does not signify that God really loved Jacob, but that to love here signifies only to hate less, and that all that is meant by the expression, is that God hated Jacob less than He hated Esau. If every man’s own mind is a sufficient security against concluding the meaning to be, ‘Jacob have I hated less,’ his judgment ought to be a security against the equally unwarrantable meaning, ‘Esau have I loved less.’ ”**

Finally, if God did not really hate Esau then the argument for God’s sovereignty would fall away.

Was Esau finally saved?

No, Esau was lost.

Can I prove that Esau was finally lost?

## Romans

The Book of Hebrews has many warnings to those who professed to believe in Christ but who were in danger of forsaking the Gospel and returning to dead Judaism.

If Esau was finally a saved man, what does this warning in Hebrews mean?

### Hebrews 12:14-17

**14 Pursue peace with all people, and holiness, without which no one will see the Lord: 15 looking carefully lest anyone fall short of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up cause trouble, and by this many become defiled; 16 lest there be any fornicator or profane person like Esau, who for one morsel of food sold his birthright. 17 For you know that afterward, when he wanted to inherit the blessing, he was rejected, for he found no place for repentance, though he sought it diligently with tears.**

*In these verses we have the case for the absolute sovereignty of God.*

*The only reason that you can have assurance that you will finally be saved is because God exercised His free choice before the foundation of the world and before you had done anything good or evil that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not according to works but of Him who calls, Him who brings you {calls you} into being.*

**But it is not that the word of God has taken no effect.  
For they are not all Israel who are of Israel,**

The question is not do you believe in election? That is simply a fact of God's word. The important question is do you believe in Jesus Christ as your only hope not to be hated by God as was Esau?

God willing we will continue next time and see that Paul further anticipates rebellion against the absolute sovereignty of God in 9:14.

***What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God?  
Certainly not!***