

Dr. Robert A. Peterson, Salvation, Session 6, Election Systematic Formulations, Number 1: Author

© 2024 Robert Peterson and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Robert Peterson in his teaching on salvation. This is session 6, Election Systematic Formulations, Number 1: Author.

We continue our lectures on the doctrine of salvation, and let us pray together.

Gracious Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, we bow before you; we thank you for your grace; we thank you for your great plan of salvation; we thank you, Father, for sending your son to be the savior of the world, even our Savior. We thank you, Father and Son, for sending the Holy Spirit into our hearts so that we might know, love, and serve you. Bless us, we pray, this day.

Give us grace to walk with you, we ask, through the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen. We're up to the doctrine of election.

We've done some historical reconnaissance, which I will not repeat, and we move to the election. I have a little biblical preamble before we actually start the systematics. God chooses some for service, and we see this in both Testaments, including prophets, priests, and kings.

However, election is not just for service; it is also the means by which God's saving plan is realized. God chose Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob for salvation, not just service, although he did that as well, and he chose Israel to be his people. In the same way, he chose the Church of Jesus Christ to be the children of God.

God's election is not based upon works or foreseen faith but is due entirely to God's free and loving choice. God's election of sinners confirms that salvation is by grace alone, giving all the glory to God alone. Even before I begin to work with this, in the interest of fairness, I want to set forth Arminian views of election.

By now it should be obvious that I'm a Calvinist. I certainly extend the right hand of fellowship to all true believers, and that includes Arminian believers in Christ. I have more important things in common with my Arminian brothers and sisters than not in common.

For example, the Word of God, the Trinity, salvation by grace through faith in Christ, and much more. Nevertheless, we disagree with this particular doctrine. In the

interest of fairness, I want to summarize the three main approaches of Arminian systematic theologies to the doctrine of election, and I want to give references.

I'm going to footnote their writings. Many times, it is said that, number one, an election is corporate and not individual. The New Testament testifies to corporate.

Certainly, the Old Testament speaks of the election of Israel. It is not concerned about the election of individuals. I would agree that the Old Testament is mainly about the election of the nation of Israel, but I also think that, in a minor accord, it is about the election of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

For example, as we just said, it is certainly true since the New Testament is written to the people of God, to the church, and where the doctrine of election comes largely from Paul's letters, and they're written to churches, not individuals. Indeed, the election is corporate, but as we will see, the election is also individual. So a resource, first of all.

William Klein, a brother in Christ who teaches the New Testament at Denver Seminary, wrote a book that needed to be written, *The New Chosen People, A Corporate View of Election*, Zondervan, 1990. I thought this book needed to be written, and it was, and he's a good scholar. I do think, however, that this is what philosophers call a false choice.

Is election corporate? Yes. Does that mean it's not individual? No, it is both. It is both.

As a matter of fact, when I reported to the faculty where I taught after writing a book, *Election and Free Will*, what are some of the things you learned? I said we have rightly emphasized individual election. We have wrongly de-emphasized corporate election. That has to do with the church, with people belonging together.

Actually, it taps into a good postmodern theme. There are many unsavory postmodern themes, but the notion of collectiveness, belonging, togetherness, and people's needs is good. That's biblical.

And ironically, election, which is sometimes assailed at teaching an ugly individualism, is, as a matter of fact, first of all, in terms of the, if you count noses, because the letters are written to churches, not individuals, it is corporate, but it is certainly individual as well. Second, number two, the second Arminian view of election, commonly said and alluded to already in my little tiny biblical prelude, is election is for service, not salvation. H. Orton Wiley, *Christian Theology*, Beacon Hill, 1940 to 43, volume 2, page 339, says these very words.

Election is for service, not salvation. Election is for service in Scripture. John 15, the one place in the Scriptures where the Son of God is the author of election and not the Father.

I have chosen you and ordained you that you should go and bear fruit and that your fruit would remain. That is certainly service. Nevertheless, in that chapter in verses 16 and 19, there's an election of people, Jesus' election of his people for salvation.

Once again, it's a false choice. It is not either or, it is both and. And as a matter of fact, if you count noses this time, election is primarily for salvation and secondarily within the context of the biblical materials.

It is also for service. Arminian views of election, number one, election is corporate and not individual. It's a false choice.

Election is for service, not salvation, another false choice. And, of course, the major view goes all the way back to Arminius himself and is approved by Wesley, who named his newspaper the Arminian deliberately. Number three is election is based on divine foreknowledge of faith.

Wiley again, Orton Wiley, *Christian Theology*, volume 2, page 340. H. Ray Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness, a Wesleyan systematic theology*, Beacon Hill, 1988, pages 435 to 436. Wiley, *Christian Theology*, volume 2, page 340.

Ray Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness, a Wesleyan systematic theology*, pages 435 to 436. These systematic theology books by Wiley are still the standard in terms of size. It's three volumes, and it's a standard.

Dunning, and another one I should mention, J. Kenneth Grider, a Wesleyan holiness theology, Beacon Hill, 1994. J. Kenneth Grider, a Wesleyan holiness theology. Grider and Dunning's more recent systematic theologies are from Arminius's tradition in a Wesleyan mode.

They are both single-volume, oh, 600-page systematic theologies, and they quite frequently refer to Wiley for larger treatments of things, including this. As a matter of fact, there's much to commend in these books, and there's much that I would agree with in these books. Of course, there are things I disagree with, as they would disagree with my book if I ever wrote a systematic theology, but I would be grateful that they include election, all right.

In some Arminian churches, it is totally ignored, but I am not happy that they give a few pages to it. Out of 600 pages, to give three or four pages to a doctrine of election is out of proportion to its biblical emphasis. How about 60 pages out of 600? That's out of proportion, too.

It's overdoing it, and to be fair, as I point the finger, I want to look at the thumb coming back to me. Do Calvinist systematic theologies give enough space to the doctrine of apostasy? Probably not. No, I will say no.

I personally have, however, and I have a book called *Our Secure Salvation*, in which one-half of it is given over to preservation passages and one-half to warning passages, many of which warn about apostasy. So, election is based on divine foreknowledge of faith. I respectfully disagree, and that will be borne out as we study the passages.

Yes, election has to do with foreknowledge. Foreknowledge has to do with election. I'll give more details as far as word studies and so forth, but the proof in the pudding, as always, is systematics must be built upon exegesis.

Exegesis of passages where foreknow or foreknowledge is used in the context of salvation, of soteriology, does not demonstrate that God bases his choice of human beings upon his foresight of their faith or lack of the same. Elections author. Scripture is clear.

Let me go over the systematic grid outline. Elections author. Elections timing.

Elections basis. On what basis does God choose people? Elections scope. Individuals and the church.

Elections goals. Our salvation and God's glory. Election.

Historical election. An eternal election. Election and foreknowledge.

A significant treatment of that important issue. Election and union with Christ. Election and calling.

Election and faith. Election and the gospel, which indeed is a very good place to conclude, because sometimes Calvinists who believe in election, even I would say correctly or basically correctly in their understandings, have not been zealous for the gospel of God's grace. And that is a sin.

Scripture is clear. Our God is a God of salvation. Psalm 68 20.

And salvation belongs to the Lord. Psalm 38. We are not surprised then when consistently in Scripture, God is the author of election.

God chose Abraham out of all humanity. Quote, you, the Lord, are the God who chose Abram and brought him out of or of the Chaldeans and changed his name to

Abraham. Nehemiah 9:7. From Abraham, God brought the nation of Israel, which he chose as his own out of all the nations on the earth.

Did God look forward and see which nation would believe in him? Did he look forward and see which nation would be faithful to him? Boy, those scenarios do not square with the biblical revelation of Israel as a stubborn and stiff-necked people. No, God chose Abraham, who was the son of idolaters, the last chapter of Joshua tells us, Joshua 24. And he chose Israel in spite of their waywardness.

God told Israel to pursue holiness. Quote, for you are a holy people belonging to the Lord your God. The Lord has chosen you to be his own possession out of all the peoples on the face of the earth.

Deuteronomy 14:2. The New Testament distinction between the indicative and imperative is an Old Testament distinction brought into the new. You are a holy nation. That's the indicative.

That's who they are, as God set them apart from all the pagan peoples. But they're supposed to be holy as I am holy, says the Lord. Leviticus 11.

And that's another matter. Their imperative did not match God's wonderful indicative. Deuteronomy 5 is plain.

The Lord did not choose you, Israel, because you were the greatest of the nations of the earth. You were the smallest of all the nations. Most important for our purposes is God's choosing people for salvation.

This theme occurs from the beginning to the end of the New Testament. Matthew 22:14. Many are invited to the feast, but few are chosen.

Matthew 22:14. Revelation 17:14. Those with the Lamb, a biblical symbol for Christ, every time but one in the book of Revelation.

And it's very clear the time that it is not that it's merely a simile, pardon me. Those with the Lamb are called, chosen, and faithful. Revelation 17:14.

Every New Testament passage that addresses election either ascribes election to God or implies that fact by using the divine passive. In between the Testaments, the Jews grew more and more reluctant to use the divine name. They used circumlocutions for the divine name.

So, in James 3, James says, the wisdom from above, of course, he means the wisdom from God, and they used the divine passive. Instead of God blesses the one who, they'll say, and this is in keeping with Old Testament precedent as well, blessed is the

one who, like that. And instead of saying God has chosen you, it says you who are chosen by God, like that.

That is a divine passive; it's a passive voice that avoids the name of God or minimizes the name of God. And if we convert it to an active, God is the chooser, the elector, if you will. Election is the work of God alone.

In every such passage but one, God the Father is the author of election. Never the Holy Spirit. Only one time the Son, John 15 verses 16 and 19.

What I said earlier about the doctrine of the Trinity still holds. Election is the work of the Trinity. You can't separate the persons.

We distinguish the persons, so in the next sentence, I say election is the work of the Trinity, but the next independent clause, but especially the Father and in one place the Son. The New Testament, in general, ascribes to the Son of God works that in the Old Testament God performs. This is true of creation, John 1, Colossians 1.16, providence, Colossians 1:17, Hebrews 1:3, and the Son.

By the Son, all things consist. The Son holds all things together by his powerful word. Judgment, John 5:22-23, the Father has entrusted all judgment to the Son, that they might honor the Son as they honor the Father.

2 Thessalonians 1:7 and 8, the returning Christ comes with vindication and judgment. And it's also true of salvation. The Old Testament ascribes salvation to the Lord as we have seen.

The New Testament ascribes it to the Son of God, John 5:28-29, at the voice of the Son of Man, those who are in their tombs will come forth, their graves will come forth, some to eternal life, some to judgment. Hebrews 1:3, after making purification for sins, the Son sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high. John takes this New Testament tendency, a general New Testament tendency, of ascribing to the Son of God works that in the Old Testament are ascribed to God in a generic sense.

God is usually not differentiated. The New Testament is, the Trinity teaches the New Testament. As I said last in a previous lecture, the doctrine of the Trinity, in a sense, is a subset of the doctrine of grace.

Of course, God has always been the Holy Trinity, so we're not talking about ontology. We're not talking about the way God is, but how he is seen fit to reveal himself. Are there not hints, and sometimes more than hints, that God is more than, that God is a unity, but a plurality within the unity in the Old Testament? Yes, of course. But goodness gracious, the Trinity is fully revealed in the New Testament, especially

when the Son becomes a human being to be our Redeemer, and especially when the Spirit comes at Pentecost.

In that way, those saving events and actions reveal to us the way the mysterious, monotheistic God always has been. But the New Testament ascribes to the Son works of God. John extends this tendency and goes beyond the rest of the New Testament.

John alone teaches that Jesus adopts believers. Always, it's the Father in Paul. According to John 1:12, unless there's a, unless, I'm never saying the Bible has mistakes, but the Bible isn't committed to our standards of spelling and grammar.

In this case, in 1 John, for example, it's really hard to know what the pronouns, who the pronouns refer back to, the Father or the Son, or even sometimes the Spirit. Am I criticizing the Bible? No, I'm just describing the way it comes to us. In the same way, unless Paul, John is shifting reference and antecedents, and when it says he gave the right to become the children of God, it's talking about the Son.

So, it looks to me like in John 1:12, alone in Scripture, Jesus is the adopter. He plays the role of the Father. And Jesus alone in the Gospel of John, in the whole Bible, raises himself from the dead.

It's usually the Father, either directly or by way of the divine passive. A few times it is the Holy Spirit, the very beginning of Romans, for example. And I think 1st Peter 3, that sticky passage in there.

But no question, only in John 2, destroy this temple, and in three days I'll raise it up. John also gives us an inspired editorial comment. He was speaking of the temple of his body.

In John 10, Jesus says, I'm the Good Shepherd. I lay down my life, and I take it up again. In those two places, Jesus does the divine work of raising himself from the dead.

What is the full picture, systematic picture? Of course, the Trinity raises Jesus from the dead, especially the Father, sometimes the Holy Spirit, and twice Jesus raises himself. Well, John alone, and only in one place, presents Jesus as the Elector. By the way, D.A. Carson's *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility, Biblical Perspectives*, Intention, correctly says John paints three pictures of election.

He never uses the word election, never uses the word predestination or the verb predestine, as Paul does, but with three different themes, he communicates the same truth. The Father gives people to the Son. Four times in the Great Priestly Prayer of John 17, this motif undergirds the whole teaching.

I do not pray for the world, but for those whom you've given me out of the world. Like that, over again, the Father gives people to the Son is a way of talking about the Father choosing them. Another way is, although John plainly presents the gospel and God's love for humankind, he'll also say a number of times, a handful of times, he teaches the antecedent or prior identity of the people of God.

As a matter of fact, in John 10, of those who are not the people of God, you do not believe me, John 10:26-ish, because you are not my sheep. Now, would it be true to say, you're not my sheep; therefore, you don't believe me? Yes. Yes.

Oh, you're not my sheep because you don't believe me? Of course, it's true. As a matter of fact, that's more prevalent. But here he says, you do not believe because you are not my sheep.

Whoa. That is, God has his sheep and his; I'll call them goats, his sheep and his non-sheep; let's use goats before they believe. And the sheep believe, and the goats don't.

What is this? It's an implied doctrine of election. My sheep hear my voice, and they follow me, and I give them eternal life, and they'll never perish. No one can snatch them out of my or the Father's hands.

So, three biblical pictures in John that overlap with the Pauline doctrine of election. The Father gives people to the Son, the antecedent or prior identity of the people of God before they believe. As a matter of fact, that's why they believe.

Election is not based on faith. Election results in faith. Acts 13:48.

The Gentiles rejoiced when Paul and Barnabas turned from the Jews to the Gentiles. They quoted the Old Testament, which spoke of that. A verse that alludes to me immediately.

They rejoiced, and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed. We are turning to the Gentiles. Acts 13:46.

For so the Lord has commanded us, saying, I have made you a light for the Gentiles, that you may bring salvation to the ends of the earth. It's true of the Messiah. It's true of the Messiah's people, his apostles.

And when the Gentiles heard this, they began rejoicing and glorifying the word of the Lord. And as many as were appointed to eternal life believed. Notice in passing that this shows individual election.

As many as were appointed to eternal life believed. The appointment results in the belief. What sense would it make to do this in an Arminian fashion? And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed, whom the Lord foresaw would believe.

That is reversing things. That's putting the cart before the horse. No, election results in faith.

It is not based on faith. I'm in John 15, I'm supposed to be. John alone presents Jesus as the elector.

Now, the emphasis on the fruit and of the vine and the branches is not on election. The emphasis is on fruit-bearing. The emphasis in the passage, in its context, is on the disciples' responsibility to bear fruit.

Nevertheless, after emphasizing the disciples' responsibility to bear fruit by remaining in him, the only place that the passage tells us what it means is where Jesus says, if you remain, if you abide, if you continue in my love. So, my understanding is that it means continuing to have fellowship with him. It means to return the love that he has for us, to return it to him in a warm walk, based on love, back to him.

It's loving him back, continuing in covenantal faithfulness marked by love, and in the passage, obedience, and so forth. After emphasizing disciples' responsibility to bear fruit by remaining in him, the true vine, Jesus explains that the disciples' choice of him, which was real, is not ultimate. Yes, of course, Matthew left the tax collector's booth and followed Jesus.

James and John, Peter and Andrew left their fishing nets and followed Jesus. They chose him. Is their choice ultimate? No, no.

It's exactly what he's saying here. Behind their choice of him lies his choice of them. John 15:16.

Now, I'll put it in context again. The emphasis is on Jesus replacing Israel, the vine that failed in its task, Isaiah 5. I went to find fruit. I found rotten fruit.

It's not that Israel was a false vine. They were a weak vine. They were a fruit, unfruitful vine.

Jesus is a true vine. That is, he's the realization, the fulfillment of what Israel was meant to be. He's the true Israel, if you will.

And those who are joined to him spiritually, the vine and the branches are a beautiful picture of union with Christ; they bear fruit as well because they're connected to the

vine, to the true vine. But after saying that, perhaps lest they misunderstand, lest they, lest all the emphasis on their abiding. There's an essay by Leon Morris, which is sort of an older New Testament scholarship.

I have great respect for Leon Morris, who is with the words, with the Lord. Amazing brother, an Australian New Testament scholar, taught himself Greek while his wife drove them across Australia, earned his PhD with an amazing book, and taught for so many years, and helped so many people. I know at times I read where, you know, apocalyptic was all the thing, and people were using it to abuse the Bible.

And he kept waiting for somebody, as he said, more qualified than I to write on this. But when no one was forthcoming, he writes a little book on apocalyptic, and it's good. It helps many people.

Anyway, Leon Morris, in a book whose title eludes me right now, wrote a chapter on repetition, Johannine repetition. Leon Morris studied every time John said something, two times, three times, I'll stop repeating, all the way up to John 15, is the largest time, eight or nine times, John talks about abiding. Repetition, a feature of the Johannine style, is a chapter, an essay by Leon Morris.

Here's his conclusion. It is typical of John to vary his style. Rarely, when he repeats something, does he do it in exactly the same way.

He varied his vocabulary. He varies word order. The epitome is his exhortations to the disciples to abide in John 15, because he says abide, I don't know, eight times or something.

Every time, there's a minor variation. Here is Morris's outrageous but true conclusion. By the way, a little conclusion along the way is John 21.

You know, the third time Jesus said to Peter, do you love me? He didn't use agapao, but phileo, and people make a lot of that. Morris says, no, no. The emphasis is this.

It's not a change in verbs, which the Greek does demonstrate, but the emphasis is Peter was grieved because Jesus did it three times, going over the three times he denied him. The fact that Jesus changes and uses synonyms is quite common in John's vocabulary. By the way, everybody in the Gospel of John, including Jesus, uses John's vocabulary.

I keep getting off the topic here. The Bible is God's inspired word, and Luke in the book of Acts gives accurate summaries of the apostles' messages, not their whole messages, in Luke's words. That's what God inspired.

And in the Gospel of John, we have John speak all the way through. In any case, Morris says it is so common for John to vary vocabulary, word order, and so forth, that that means nothing. It's just vocabulary variation by a good writer.

Did he know he was doing it always? Can't answer that. I can't answer that. Maybe so, maybe not, but he did it.

That is so commonplace that Morris says that if ever Jesus says something in the Gospel of John in exactly the same way, he does it for emphasis. I have found that to be true in the book of the Bible that I have studied the most over the years, having taught my way through it in the English Bible and the Greek text, in so many variations that when I left my first institution of higher education, seminary, they lost a page or so out of the catalog of courses on...anyway, enough on the Gospel of John. Enough.

John 15:16, Jesus says, ESV, you did not choose me. Of course, they did. He means ultimately, but I chose you and appointed you to go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should abide, so that whatever you ask the Father in my name, he may give it to you.

These things I command you so that you love one another. You say, wait a minute, this is choice for being a disciple and for bearing fruit. True enough.

Election is for discipleship and fruitfulness, service. But look at verse 19 in the context of 18. If the world hates you, know that it has hated me before it hated you.

If you were of the world, the world would love you as its own. But because you are not of the world, how did that come about? But I chose you out of the world; therefore, the world hates you. This is an election by Jesus, only here in John and the whole Bible.

In John 15, verses 16 and 19, yes, it's for service, but first of all, it is to belong to him and not to the world, as D. A. Carson shows effectively in *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility*. By the way, he wanted to subtitle the book *In the Gospel of John*. That was his dissertation.

Boiled down, if you believe it. It's a big hogging book as it is. But anyway, he wanted to entitle it *In the Gospel of John*.

The publisher knew they'd sell more books if they left that out. And so, but that's what it is. It's based on the Gospel of John.

So, the one who chooses, the elector, the author of election is God, always the Father, and here in the Gospel of John, the Son. Jesus' election of the eleven, Judas

has already gone out to betray his master, results in their salvation because it entails their belonging to him, not to the world. I'll say it again.

We note that election is for both salvation and service. You did not choose me, I chose you. I appointed you to go and bear fruit, produce fruit, that your fruit should remain, John 15:16.

Thus, it's a false choice for Arminians to say election is for service, not salvation. It is for both, and as a matter of fact, first of all, it is for salvation. The truth that God is election's author is reinforced by a consideration of its timing, election's timing before creation.

I should say in passing that nobody understands, well, the good Lord understands everything about election, but we don't, okay? It is divine, good grief, and it is in the eternal counsels of God. We don't understand it fully or perfectly. The most perhaps perplexing thing is why the Lord chose us.

My answer is because of his love and his will, but all I can say is, as it says in 1st Corinthians 1, as it implies, the good Lord has a great sense of grace and perhaps a sense of humor in choosing us, the stubborn and stiff-necked people. Four New Testament texts place election before or from election. Did I mention my book, *Election and Free Will*? Yes, it's an unabashed advertisement, *Election and Free Will*, PNR Publishing.

I cover every major election text in both Testaments. Twice, Paul teaches that God chooses people for salvation before creation. Ephesians 1:4, God chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world to be holy and blameless in love before him.

Christian Standard Bible, ESV, God chose us in him before the creation of the world that we should be holy and blameless before him. 2 Timothy 1:9, a beautiful passage, often passed over, not a good move, and I didn't mean that as a theological joke when I said passed over. I wasn't referring to reprobation.

Oh, sorry, sorry. God has saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which grace is the antecedent of which was given to us in Christ Jesus, literally before eternal ages. God saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace.

This is the most succinct Pauline statement on the basis of election. Something God foresaw in us? No, he would have foreseen sin in us. He would have foreseen people who were undeserving of being saved.

No, it resides; the basis resides in him. What is specifically in him? His purpose and his grace. That doesn't eliminate all mystery, but it resides, it puts election where it belongs in the mystery of God's own character, especially his purpose or his will, his plan, and his grace, his love, his mercy, his compassion. Nevertheless, that purpose and grace were given to us by Christ Jesus before time began.

Paul affirms God is the elector and that he chose his people before the foundation of the world. When it says that we might be holy and blameless in his sight, it means sanctification. As we'll see later on in these lectures, sanctification is initial.

God sets us apart as his saints. It is progressive and lifelong, and it is final and perfect. Boy, I love the combination of those things because it shows God saving us from the beginning, from our sainthood, through a lifelong process of sanctification, unto the assured goal of entire and perfect sanctification.

What hope that gives to the struggling people of God who look back. You mean you tell me, pastor, I'm struggling because I have the Holy Spirit? Yes, if you didn't have this Holy Spirit, you wouldn't be struggling. You would enjoy your sins without any problem.

And also, as we struggle, we should never forget the goal. God will confirm us in perfect holiness. I cannot imagine having any sinful thoughts, words, or actions in my life, even for a week.

Your imagination is not your canon. Your canon is the Word of God. God says it is so, and you will be holy and blameless in his sight.

Although people disagree and differ, I understand this sanctification, even as the adoption in verse 5, to be final, to be eschatological. Placing an election before creation removes human faith or works from the equation. The Apostle's similar use of election before, in Romans 9:11, sheds light on Ephesians 1:4. The similarity here is not the similarity in time, because in Romans 9, the before is before the birth of Isaac and Jacob.

But it shows a before-ness, if you will, that it shows the significance of Paul using the word before with a time reference. Though her sons, Rebecca's sons, had not yet been born or done anything good or bad, so that God's purpose, the same word as in 2nd Timothy 1:9, God's purpose according to election might stand, not from works, but from the one who calls. Rebecca was told that the older would serve the younger.

As it is written, I have loved Jacob, but I have hated Esau. Romans 9:11, pretty sure it says before the sons were born. Okay, it doesn't seem to use the word before, but it has the concept of before.

Though they were not yet born, the notion of God doing this before they were born shows that his intentions for them had nothing to do with their behavior, with him foreseeing what they would do. ESV, Rebecca had conceived children by one man, her forefather Isaac. You cannot say, well, that the difference between Jacob and Esau is that they are different fathers.

No, they have the same father. Their paternity is the same. Though they were not yet born and had done nothing, either good or bad, so that's not the basis of this divine selection.

In order that God's purpose of election might continue, not because of works, but because of him who calls, she was told, God chose one and did not choose the other. In a similar way, well, let me elaborate; Paul speaks of God's choice of Jacob over Esau before their birth, that is before they had done anything good or bad. God's choice before their birth precluded anything they might do, including believe.

God's choice before their birth guaranteed that his purpose, according to election, might stand. Similarly, God's election before creation means the basis of election is entirely within God and not us. In a word, Romans 9:16, it shows that salvation does not depend on human will or effort, but on God who shows mercy.

Romans 9:11, a very important verse. We will take up a more detailed look at 2 Timothy 1:9 beginning with our next lecture. This is Dr. Robert Peterson in his teaching on salvation.

This is session number six, election, systematic formulations, number one, author.