

# LEXICO-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF בָּחַר IN THE LIGHT OF SALVIFIC GRACE

Olusayo 'Bosun Oladejo (Ph.D)  
&  
Olalekan O. Bamidele

## INTRODUCTION

The field of Biblical Studies has for a long time been bedecked with certain issues which have become sources of serious academic debates and devotional debacles. One of such concepts is the age-long concept of divine election represented by the Hebrew verb בָּחַר. This concept is often addressed as the partiality of God or as the irrevocable sealing of the fate and destiny of men especially as it affects their response to the gospel. Establishing the tenacity of the controversy surrounding this doctrine, Ross reiterates “Election has often been a formidable subject in the Christian community; it has generated much controversy within the church and much misunderstanding outside the church.”<sup>1</sup> Arguments abound as to who can be saved, how they can be saved, and who determines who is to be saved. There have been proponents of the universal applicability of the salvific grace as well as those who posit for selective applicability of salvific grace. One of the texts of scripture often alluded to as the fulcrum of this debacle is the Malachian proclamation “Esau have I hated and Jacob have I loved” (Mal 1:2-3). Other passages include Romans 9-11, Ephesians 2:8-9; and the Servant pericopes<sup>2</sup> of Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>3</sup>

In the light of the above controversy, questions that are being asked include: “Is God partial?” “Are there some people already elected and chosen for salvation while others are chosen for damnation?” “Does the recipient of salvation by grace contribute anything to his salvation process?” “If a man has been elected for a purpose, does he have a choice in the matter?” and “What is the function of the inherent freewill of man in the construal of election theology?” This paper attempts proffering answers to the above questions through a lexico-

semantic study of the Hebrew term for election – בָּחַר (*bachar*) vis-à-vis its implications for the universal salvation. Because of the divergent, controversial and inconclusive nature of the term בָּחַר *bachar*, this work has limited itself only to the concept of בָּחַר as it affects salvation by grace alone and the responsibilities inherent.

To facilitate easier and smoother reading, after the lexical analysis of the term בָּחַר *bachar*, this work employs the use of transliteration for subsequent occurrence of Hebrew words in place of the actual Hebrew terms except where it is absolutely necessary. This work should not be interpreted as taking sides with either Calvinism or Armenianism although some of the thoughts promoted by these two camps may reflect in the analysis of the term בָּחַר *bachar*. Also, it is expedient at this juncture to establish that this work is not attempting to put up a conclusive or exhaustive study of the concept of election; rather it will examine the concept, draw some inferences and probably raise probing questions that may serve as impetus for further studies.

#### LEXICAL ANALYSIS OF בָּחַר

The term בָּחַר *bachar* is a Hebrew qal perfect verb in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person masculine which literally means “he chose, he elected, he selected, he tested, he examined.”<sup>4</sup> Holladay adds that בָּחַר means “to take a keen look at, test, give preference, to be purified in fire, to be more desirable than.”<sup>5</sup> Brown, Driver and Briggs assert that בָּחַר simply means “to choose.” They posit further that it has a strong affinity with the Aramaic בָּחַן (*bachan*), the Arabic *Berum* and the Akkadian *Bechur* which means “to examine, try, scrutinise.”<sup>6</sup> The root בָּחַר and its derivations occur 198 times with this meaning. The core idea is palpably “to take a keen look at”, thus accounting for the nuance of “testing or examining” found in Isa 48:10

and in the usage of the Niphal stem in Proverbs 10:20 where there is the rendition “choice silver.”<sup>7</sup>

Brown, Driver and Briggs opine further that when בָּחַר is prefixed with a בְּ preposition, it implies divine choice as used in the choosing by God of Abraham, Israel (Deut 7:7), the Levites (Deut 18:5; 1 Chr 15:2; 2 Chr 29:11), and David (1Sam 10:24; 16:8-10). In this form, it is also used for man’s choice of his ways as found in Prov 3:31 and Isaiah 7:15-16 among others.<sup>8</sup> Also, when it is used with אֲשֶׁר it connotes the choice of a place of sacrifice, a place to dwell or an action to take as reflected in Deut 12:14,26; 23:7 and 1 Sam 15:15 respectively. When in usage with the מִן preposition and used in the accusative, it means to choose or select from among many as implied in 2 Sam 10:9 and 1 Chr 19:10 but if with a לְ preposition, it means “to choose someone or something for a purpose” as implied in 1 Sam 2:28.<sup>9</sup> Similarly, it can appear with double kamets בָּחַר as found in Ps 78:67 or with holem בָּחַר in the infinitive absolute mostly before a labial consonant and with a sheva – patah בָּחַר in the imperfect masculine singular.<sup>10</sup> The inflected form בָּחֹר *bachur* means youth, young man, choice for vigour and activity while the masculine plural form בָּחֲרִים *b<sup>e</sup>churim* means youth or youthful age as reflected in Num 11:28.<sup>11</sup>

### SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF בָּחַר

Having attempted an analysis of the various ways in which the root and the inflected forms of the verb *bachar* was used in the Hebrew Bible, this section examines its meaning especially as it relates to the concept of salvation and as construed by passages of the Old Testament scripture. According to Ross, Election simply means God’s choice or preference.<sup>12</sup> It means

to be chosen by God for a specific role and it is absolutely unmerited.<sup>13</sup> In making use of the word *bachar* and its various derivations, Old Testament writers unarguably pointed to the choosing of Israel among the nations of the earth to be God's own nation.

Arguing from a functional perspective, Palache opines that *bachar* implies "to cleave, till the ground, (in science) to penetrate," thus suggesting such meaning as "to distinguish." He went further to assert that the word can theologically be understood to imply "to choose from among several available options" and much rarer "to choose after subjecting to rigorous test."<sup>14</sup> This meaning is perhaps the most important Semitic parallel. Buttressing this, Berkouwer reiterates that *bachar* is used only in a few instances without specific theological overtones. An archetypal example of the few instances where the usage of *bachar* was without any serious theological overtone is Gen 13:11, where "Lot chose the plain." It is imperative to underscore, however, that in all of its uses, *bachar* always involves a careful, well thought-out choice as implied in its usage in 1 Sam 17:40; 1 Kings 18:25; Isa 1:29; and Isa 40:20 among others.<sup>15</sup>

Congruent to the above, *bachar* is used to articulate the kind of choosing which bears ultimate and eternal significance. On the one hand God chooses a people (Ps 135:4), certain tribes (Ps 78:68), specific individuals (1 Kings 8:16; 1 Chron 28:5; 1 Sam 10:24; 2 Sam 6:21), and a place for his name (Deut 12:5; etc.). Wright, however, commented that "in all of these cases serviceability rather than simple arbitrariness is at the heart of the choosing."<sup>16</sup> Thus Yahweh chose Israel to be holy and thereby to serve as his witness among the nations. This election is not however based on Israel's greatness but on the greatness of the Lord's love.<sup>17</sup> The choice of Israel is confirmed by the exile and restoration, for in a new way Israel now bears witness of the Lord to the nations (Isa 41:8 ff.; Isa 43:10; Isa 48:10). The scriptural doctrine of divine capacity for choice demonstrates that purpose and personality, not blind mechanism, are at the heart of the universe. Since God carefully chooses certain ones for a

specific task, he can also reject them if they deviate from that purpose as reflected in the rejection of Eli's household from the priesthood and Saul's dynasty from kingship.<sup>18</sup>

Commenting on the dual nature of *bachar*, Kohler remarks that in the same way the Lord chose Israel, so also did Israel choose the Lord as contained in her confession at the covenant renewal in Shechem recorded in Joshua 24:14-24.<sup>19</sup> He also argues that the concept of *bachar* carries the contrasting idea of election and rejection where Israel though once elected, was rejected and later re-elected. To this end, he argues that election proclamation, though prominent in the corpus of Old Testament teachings, is not something indestructible.<sup>20</sup> The usage of *bachar* also has the connotation of a covenant relationship which is reciprocal in nature: the Lord chooses Israel, Israel chooses the Lord; both do it in complete independence and by freewill.<sup>21</sup>

## ELECTION THEOLOGY

Theologically, election is defined as the act of God in determining the destiny of man whether to salvation or to damnation.<sup>22</sup> This definition tends to equate election with predestination and reflects a Calvinistic outlook. The Calvinist position as cited by Wiley and Culbertson staunchly holds that "By an eternal and immutable counsel, God has once for all determined both whom he would admit to salvation and whom he would condemn to destruction."<sup>23</sup> Election in the Calvinistic view is that God has arbitrarily chosen from eternity, some people to salvation and others to eternal damnation. This view has led to the coinage of the term "Unconditional Election" which presupposes that people can remain the elect of God despite unbelief, disobedience or open apostasy and rebellion. One major objection against this view of election – in the sense of divine arbitrary determination of man's salvation or damnation – is its portrayal of God as unjust and partial in his dealings with his subjects.<sup>24</sup>

## ELECTION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Ross remarks that “Election is vitally connected with God’s programme of salvation history recorded in the Old Testament.”<sup>25</sup> The theology of election as reflected in the Old Testament primarily had to do with the nation of Israel and her people. Beginning with the patriarchs, God set his eyes and love upon Israel as a nation and chose her people to be a people for himself among the nations of the earth. Giving an overall description of the election of Israel, Davidson states “The choosing of Israel by Jehovah is entirely inexplicable. It was certainly not due to any loveliness on Israel’s part, for Israel has been a transgressor from the womb (xliii. 8) and her “first father sinned against the Lord” (xliii. 27)” [sic].<sup>26</sup> He went further to say that the choice or election of Israel is one of the most common belief and themes of the prophets. Prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Deuteronomist and the Psalmist all echo repeatedly the construal of Israel’s election and choice as a singular theocratic act of Yahweh.<sup>27</sup> This study employs a three-pronged approach in its study of election theology; the Deuteronomist, Chronicler and the Isaiahic.<sup>28</sup>

Gerhard von Rad, one of the chief proponents of the Deuteronomist’s construal of Old Testament election argues that the Book of Deuteronomy is one of the Old Testament books wherein the doctrine of election is visibly pronounced. He states that “The Deuteronomist’s locus classicus on the doctrine of election is found in Deut 7:6-8.”<sup>29</sup> Buttressing this, Heaton says Israel’s election was part of the Yahwistic faith of the prophets, but in Deuteronomy it is given extra emphasis and a technical term.<sup>30</sup> According to von Rad, the deuteronomistic use of *bachar* was to chastise the kings of Israel using the law as its instrument. It focuses mainly on the election of Israel as a nation chosen to represent Yahweh and teach his law to other nations. Israel was not to emulate other nations rather she was to be an ensign for them in the worship of Yahweh.<sup>31</sup>

On the other hand, the chronicler's use of *bachar* expanded its scope to individuals and offices. Von Rad posits, "The chronicler wrote in order to legitimate cultic offices founded by David." To the chronicler, specific acts of individual election were more important than the singular act of Israel's election. He presented election in a more universal perspective. The Chronicler uses the verb *bachar* 11 times without any literary precedent; having the kings, centre for cultic activities and the levites as its objects of divine election.<sup>32</sup> It is worthy of note that the accounts of the Chronicler were compiled after the exile. Wright was of the opinion that the experience of hardship by Israel during the exile as well as their exposure to the culture, custom and worship of their capturing nations opened them to another aspect of God's elective and redemptive acts.<sup>33</sup> Writing from this enlightened perspective, the Chronicler emphasised individual election as against the nationalistic view presented in Deuteronomy.

In Isaiah, a radical construct of *bachar* was presented which sometimes swayed back and forth between the triangles of election – rejection – re-election. Presenting the Isaiah dimension of *bachar*, Ross advocates for the theological depth of Isaiah 40-66 and appraises its sense of universal election. He argues,

The second volume of Isaiah is certainly the greatest theological book of the OT. It contains a well-developed theology of creation, providence, redemption, God's sovereignty, salvation history, human depravity, God's righteousness and, of course, the concept of election. In Isaiah, election refers primarily to Israel and the Messiah. In choosing Israel, God is not saying that he would discard the rest of the world but that through Israel, his intent of saving the whole world would be realised and Israel would be the instrument of that saving purpose.<sup>34</sup>

As far as the prophet Isaiah was concerned, the nexus of Old Testament election's emphasis is not on election to individual salvation in the world to come but one which incorporates the possible salvation of the whole world depending on individual response to the call of Yahweh.<sup>35</sup> Invariably, the Isaian presentation of election places the responsibility of the fulfilment of the election process on the man or nation whom God elects. Although von

Rad counters this position with the assertion that Israel was elected by Yahweh before she was given the commandments and before she had had any opportunity of proving her obedience,<sup>36</sup> this does not necessarily obliterate the fact that God will not force his decision on any of his elects. Similarly, Isaiah's concept of election establishes that the assertion "Jacob I loved but Esau I hated" does not imply that Edom is outside God's saving intent.<sup>37</sup>

## ELECTION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In the New Testament, the doctrine of election was established under the canopy of salvific grace.<sup>38</sup> Opeloye asserts that "The doctrine of supernatural grace manifested in the crucifixion of Jesus Christ undoubtedly serves as the bedrock of the Christian faith."<sup>39</sup> The New Testament furthered the Old Testament argument that election is solely hinged on the divine love of God. Describing the concept of Salvific Grace, Allred asserts that grace refers to God's undeserved favour to sinful and helpless human beings; it is God's love in action to save sinners where the case is otherwise helpless.<sup>40</sup> Best explains grace in the light of atonement and says the atoning work of Christ by grace implies securing release by paying a price. The price was paid in the shed blood of Jesus Christ and the elects are recipients of that release; they are released from the law but not from the obligation to love God or choose him for their salvation.<sup>41</sup> Similarly, Onwubiko says "Grace means a favour done without expectation of return; absolute freeness of the loving-kindness of God to men finding its only motive in the bounty and free heartedness of the giver; unearned and unmerited favour."<sup>42</sup> Grace is the pipeline through which the undeserving sinner receives God's gift of eternal life.<sup>43</sup>

The belief that salvation is for all by grace is derived from Jn 3:16; Acts 17:30; Romans 11:12; Eph 1:10; 1 Tim 2:6 and 1 Jn 2:2. These passages establish that the expiatory and propitiatory sacrifice of Christ is universal albeit conditioned on belief in God which is an exercise of the human freewill. For example in Eph 1:3-6, a condition is attached to election,

that is, only the Christians who are holy and blameless would be qualified to be among the elect; thus salvation though dependent on divine will also requires human cooperation.<sup>44</sup> This does not in any way promote that salvation can be attained or earned through human works and efforts but rather that man must of his own accord respond to God's offer of salvation by grace. Perhaps a more explicit way of explaining the import of the recipient of salvation's role in the election process can be deduced from Ryrie's paradoxical assertion that "there are unsaved elect people alive today who though elect are now lost and will not be saved until they believe."<sup>45</sup>

Antithetic to the above position is the belief that the New Testament teaches selective and unconditional election, that is, the belief that although grace is universal, salvation is not for all because God has chosen some people for salvation and others for condemnation. Proponents of this viewpoint use Roman 9-11 especially 9:6-23 as the launch pad for this argument. Opeley comments thus:

This passage no doubt explains unambiguously the supremacy of God's will to do whatever he likes. Hence, the choice of Jacob and rejection of Esau as well as the choice of Isaac and the rejection of Ishmael, was not because they had done something good or bad but because of his call. Paul does emphatically stresses that divine election or predestination does not rest on merit but solely on God's call and mercy.<sup>46</sup>

This view lends credence to Calvinism and suggests a fatal sealing of the destiny of men as regards salvation. It implies that no matter how much a person desires to be saved, he cannot be saved unless he has been elected for salvation and no matter how terrible, malicious and atrocious a person is, he would still be saved and converted if he has been elected beforehand for salvation. The Westminster Confession cited by Allred is based on this belief. It reads:

God having predestined certain people to eternal life, he effectually calls them out of spiritual death, renewing their hearts and wills, and giving them power to do what is right...divine grace did not merely make it possible for sinners to be saved as if in the final analysis, it is still the sinner who supplies the finishing touches by choosing to

trust in Christ. Divine grace always achieves its objective without assistance from anyone.<sup>47</sup>

Allred advances this position when he countered the advocates of responsive faith on the part of the elect; he says “faith is a love-gift from God, no one ever seeks after God except those on whom he has already set his love.”<sup>48</sup> In other words, even the elect’s response of faith is preordained by God just to ensure his salvation. The question then arises “If God’s purpose of election takes no account of ‘merit,’ is there no injustice on God’s part?”

### IMPLICATIONS OF ELECTION THEOLOGY FOR SALVIFIC GRACE

From the lexical and semantic analyses of *bachar* and the various interpretations of schools of thoughts on the concept of salvation and grace, it can be deduced that both election and grace have a connect and consonance in that they both have to do with the salvation or damnation of man. The various analyses have shown that a thorough going belief in election paradoxically presupposes a universalistic view of history which should not be pinned down to the choice of Israel as a choice nation alone but also to the generality of human race. If Israel must be pinned down as a choice nation, then it must be to the end that she was chosen for the salvation and incorporation of other nations. The lexical and semantic sense of election portrays it as a choice made from among several options after much consideration of serviceability subject to the preference of the one choosing. It does not in any way connote predetermined, unconditional or irrevocable choosing.

To say election is selectively predetermined would amount to fatalism<sup>49</sup> and that would be contrary to the spirit of Biblical interpretation and revelation. Although, election and by implication salvation, is a divine initiative, its eventual fulfilment and consummation requires the cooperative response of the recipient. In the case of Israel’s election, Israel became Yahweh’s chosen people by virtue of its creation at the Exodus.<sup>50</sup> But even with Israel, the choice of accepting to be God’s elect rested with them because they had the option

to choose between life and death; and between blessing and curse (cf Deut 11:26). Also, there were occasions when they suffered rejection and it was only repentance and returning to their first love that guaranteed a re-election. This establishes that salvation and election though divine initiatives, must be accompanied by response of faith on the part of man.

The analysis of *bachar* also reveals that God's choice of Israel was a legitimate and significant choice; it does not in any way implicate God of injustice or chauvinism. If the choice is by the discretion of the chooser and it is a choice made from among several options, giving consideration to serviceability and subject to response of the elect, the chooser cannot be accused of being unjust or partial. Salvation is the ultimate manifestation of the righteousness of God, His justice and His love expressed in grace through Jesus Christ to sinful and helpless mankind.<sup>51</sup> Israel's choice does not imply the rejection of other nations rather it places a responsibility on Israel to serve as God's instrument of salvation to others; a light to the gentiles. As the God of all the families of the earth (Deut 7:1-11), his choice of Israel was basically for the purpose of extending his grace unto all. His love is not arbitrary, nor is it a mere uncalculating passion; rather it is the highest expression of his ethical being, the synthesis and focus of all his moral attributes.<sup>52</sup>

Similarly, the election of Israel is not a license for her to sin. On the contrary, Israel's privilege exposed the people more directly to Yahweh's righteous rule. Longman opines that "A pivotal moment in the history of God's relationship with his people took place on Mount Sinai"<sup>53</sup> where the election of Israel as God's covenant people was authenticated. The giving of the law marked the commencement of the responsibility of the people in sustaining their election. They would remain God's people as long as they kept his commandment but they would suffer rejection upon disobedience. This negates the position of unconditional election and eternal security which maintains that a person can still remain God's elect even in the

face of flagrant disobedience and apostasy. For grace and election to be true, the recipient must reciprocate God's love with obedience and devotion.

Consequently, the divine initiative in election and salvation by grace does not nullify or deaden the place of the human freewill. While this study is not advocating Pelagianism,<sup>54</sup> it is expedient to establish that God is not a tyrant who decides beforehand the fate of men whether to salvation or to damnation without recourse to their action or inaction. A cursory survey of the scriptures shows that God always bequeaths to man the privilege of choosing to accept his offer or not. The offer of the prophet was that "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Joel 2:32) and John's records show that "whosoever believes in him should not perish but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). If a man is constrained to do a thing then it is not motivated by love but if he does it of his own volition, he throws his entire being and passion into it.

## CONCLUSION

The thesis of this paper as reflected in the analyses of *bachar* and its variant usages in the Old Testament scripture alongside the doctrine of salvation by grace is that election, although a divine initiative is a two-way concept which only finds its fulfilment in the positive response of the elect. On the contrary, when election is understood from the background of God's indiscriminate, unconditional and arbitrary determination of the salvation or damnation of man from eternity, it runs contrary to and violates the spirit of Biblical revelation. The study has examined *bachar* from its various contextual usages and discovers that the correct interpretation of *bachar* does not suggest fatalism, pre-determinism or predestination. God has elected the whole world to salvation and effected this through the vicarious death, and subsequent resurrection of Jesus Christ. For a man's election to however be activated, he

needs to identify with the finished work of the Cross (grace) by, of his own volition and freewill, trusting the Lord Jesus Christ.

It needs be clarified that it is not the trusting that comes first but the sacrifice hence, it holds true that election is unmerited; it is by the design of the elector, in this case God. It is also imperative to note that election is not unconditional hence, the need for humility on the part of the elect. When Israel abused the terms of her election, she was rejected and was only re-elected on the basis of repentance. Similarly, election carries with it a sense of responsibility for the incorporation of the presently “unelected.” This was echoed by Jesus himself when he gave the Great Commission. A serious implication of this for the contemporary church is that the task of incorporating the wild vines into the Olive should not be left for God to do; the church should do the sowing and God should be left to do the nurturing to germination and fruition.

## ENDNOTES

- 
- <sup>1</sup> A.C. Ross, "The Theology of the Election," *Present Truth Magazine* Vol. 45 Article 1, 2012.
- <sup>2</sup> This paper uses the term "Servant pericopes" in reference to portions of the Book of Isaiah that treat the Suffering Servant of Yahweh.
- <sup>3</sup> Deutero-Isaiah is the Biblical Studies term used to refer to the portions of the Book of Isaiah beginning from chapter 40 and running through to chapter 66. This is based on the argument that the Book of Isaiah is not a unity but a compendium of oracles compiled by an Isaiah school.
- <sup>4</sup> Benjamin Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*. (Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976), 76.
- <sup>5</sup> William Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. (Michigan: William B. Eerdsman Pub., 1974), 37.
- <sup>6</sup> F. Brown, S. Driver, and C. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955), 103.
- <sup>7</sup> J. L. Palache, *Semantic Notes on the Hebrew Lexicon*. (Glasgow: Brill Pub. Co., 1959), 43.
- <sup>8</sup> Brown, Driver and Briggs, 104.
- <sup>9</sup> Palache, 44.
- <sup>10</sup> Davidson, 77.
- <sup>11</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>12</sup> Ross, 7.
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid., 9.
- <sup>14</sup> Palache, 78.
- <sup>15</sup> G. C. Berkouwer, *Divine Election*, (Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Pub., 1960), 155.
- <sup>16</sup> G. E. Wright, *The Old Testament against Its Environment*. (Auckland: SCM Press, 1950), 212.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid., 214.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid., 216.
- <sup>19</sup> Ludwig Kohler, *Old Testament Theology*. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1958), 81.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid., 82.
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid., 68.
- <sup>22</sup> Opeloye, M.O "Predestination and Freewill in the Bible and the Quran: A Comparative Appraisal" *ORITA: Ibadan Journal of Religious Studies* XX/1 June 1988, (Ibadan: Oluseyi Press, 1988), 15.
- <sup>23</sup> H.O Wiley, and P.T. Culbertson, *Introduction to Christian Theology*. (Kansas: Beacon Hill Press, 1946), 257.
- <sup>24</sup> Opeloye, 21.
- <sup>25</sup> Ross, 6.
- <sup>26</sup> A.B. Davidson, *The Theology of the Old Testament*. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1952), 170.
- <sup>27</sup> Ibid., 171.
- <sup>28</sup> We have used the coinage, "Isaiahic" with reference to the theology of election as reflected in the second part of Isaiah.
- <sup>29</sup> Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*. (Evanston: Harper & Row Publishers, 1965), 230.
- <sup>30</sup> E.W. Heaton, *The Hebrew Kingdoms*. (Glasgow: Oxford University Press, 1968), 215.
- <sup>31</sup> von Rad, 352.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid., 352-353.
- <sup>33</sup> Wright, 78.
- <sup>34</sup> Ross, 11.
- <sup>35</sup> G. N. Toryough, "God's Rejection of Israel and Inclusion of the Gentiles in the Scheme of Salvation: An Exegesis of Romans 9:30-11:24" *African Journal of Biblical Studies* vol XXVII No 2, (Ibadan: NABIS, Oct. 2009), 52.
- <sup>36</sup> von Rad, 391.
- <sup>37</sup> Ross, 12.
- <sup>38</sup> The term Salvific Grace refers to the doctrine of Salvation for all through Grace alone. This is the primary fulcrum around which all the teachings of the New Testament were built.
- <sup>39</sup> Opeloye, 33.
- <sup>40</sup> Frank Allred, *Rediscovering God's Love*. (Darlington: Grace Publications Trust, 2005), 28.
- <sup>41</sup> W.E. Best *The Saviour's Definite Redemption*. (Texas: WEBBMT, 1982), 5.
- <sup>42</sup> M.C. Onwubiko, *The Biblical Doctrine of Salvation*. (Nashville: Grace Evangelistic Ministry, 2000), 36.
- <sup>43</sup> Ibid., 3.

---

<sup>44</sup> Opeloye, 21.

<sup>45</sup> C.C. Ryrie *A Survey of Bible Doctrine*, (Chicago: Moody Press, 1972), 118.

<sup>46</sup> Opeloye, 25.

<sup>47</sup> Allred, 28.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>49</sup> Fatalism is the doctrine that “every event has been preordained; that the course of events are outside ourselves; that whatever occurs to us does so regardless of what we do; that we cannot act, since events are beyond our control; that there are no alternatives; that deliberation is illusory”

<sup>50</sup> Gerhard von Rad advocates that Israel’s election took place much earlier in Egypt. For fuller details, see Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* vol 1, pp 351-353.

<sup>51</sup> Onwubiko, 1.

<sup>52</sup> Heaton, 171.

<sup>53</sup> Tremper Longman, *Immanuel in Our Place*. (Phillipsburg: P & R Publishing, 2001), 25.

<sup>54</sup> Pelagianism is a theological system that denies the necessity of supernatural grace for man to be able to exercise his freewill. This teaching maintains that by the mere use of the freewill, man is able to believe and act in a salutary manner and still attain eternal beatitude without the assistance of supernatural grace. [See *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* vol II, p715 for fuller details].