My goals in this sermon -

- To show that two of the three views of this text are doctrinally sound but are not the meaning
 of this text.
 - a. 'All Israel' is the sum of all the remnants of physical Israel from every age -No
 - b. 'All Israel' is the spiritual Israel, i.e. the elect from Jew and Gentile -No
 - c. "All Israel" is the majority of the physical nation of Israel in the future -Yes
- 2. To prove or clinch for you that Paul is saying that 'All Israel' means the nation of Israel as a whole will one day turn to their Messiah:
 - a. v. 11. 'Have they stumbled (temporary) that they should fall (permanent)? No! means this
 - b. v.12 'their fullness' means this
 - c. v.15 'their acceptance' means this
 - d. v.25 'blindness until gentiles comes in' means this
 - e. v.26 'all Israel' means this
- 3. To make some observations
 - a. The New covenant is Abrahamic- (Gal 3:13-18,26-29) (not a new tree)
 - b. Covenant children to receive the sign of the covenant (Gen 17 + Eph 2:12-19+Rom 11)
- 4. To make some applications
 - a. Covenant Children need faith -[G-4 vow 3] (v10)
 - b. Jewish evangelism (not apart from but into the olive tree)
 - c. Eschatology (read OT with eyes open)

Conclusion: Mercy! God has done all of this complex arrangement of redemptive history so that grace would be truly grace and that he might have mercy on all. All to the praise of the glory of his grace!

Goal 1. Show that 2 of the 3 views are not correct

1. 'All Israel' is the sum of all the remnant

This is doctrinally true. All the elect from each age would be all the elect. However the question here is not if that is true, but is that what Paul is saying?

While true, it would seem to be a very obvious statement to make, and it seems like it would be an untrue statement on the two following interpretations of the word "Israel":

- a. Physical Israel as a whole: The sum of the elect among Phys. Israel will always be less than Phys. Israel and could therefore not be called All Israel
- b. Spiritual Israel: If all Israel is both Jews and Gentiles then that is not identical to the sum of elect remnant of Israel.

The only way that it can be true is if it can be demonstrated that Paul uses 'Israel' to mean the sum of the Jewish remnant exclusively in this context. <He does use 'fullness of the Gentiles' v25 in this sense, cf v12 'their fullness'>

But rather he consistently uses that name 'Israel' to refer to the nation as a whole and not to the elect part – and he does this explicitly in v7.

This would make Paul's main point simply that there is a remnant. For to say that there is a remnant in every age implies that you can add all the remnants together. He has already said in 9:27-29 that there would be a remnant. It seems unlikely that Paul would use the whole of Romans 1 simply to reiterate that point.

2. 'All Israel' is the spiritual Israel

It is possible that Paul is using this as an inclusio (book ends) from 9:6.

This view is also doctrinally true. If 'Israel' is literally all the elect Jew and Gentile then by definition all the elect will be saved. However it is not surprising, that is, he already said this in Romans 8.

So it would seem redundant to assert that all the elect will be saved which is true by definition.

3. 'All Israel' is the majority of Physical Israel in the future

Goal 2. Prove Physical Israel interpretation #3 of "All Israel"

Vs1-10 At least prove that God has not cast away all the Jewish nation. There will always be a remnant. (Always from the same argument type – 'As long as it is called today' Hebrews 3)

Vs.11 Proves that this state of majority rejection and minority remnant is not permanent.

ObJ. –Unless stumble means the temporal/posian fall, and fall means go to final perdition

Ans. - But that notion contradicts v.7 and makes the non-elect confused

Vs.11-12

Proves that there will not always be this 'fall' and 'failure' statue, but will someday be a state called 'their fullness'.

Obj. vs.13-14 may indicate that 'their fullness' merely means the individual salvation of this or that particular Jew —and what a blessing that must be to the world.

Ans. But I think 13-14 show rather that there are there and proper means to the end of the fullness coming in. And because it is already the case that not all fall as described in 8-10 just as v7 says, 'The elect obtained it, and the rest were hardened' i.e. fell.

Further in verse 12 their fall and failure is contrasted with their fullness. Their fall and failure were never complete or total and so what is being contrasted? Not the loss of some of the Jews over against (the already implied) gain of some of the Jews, but the loss of the nation by and large over against the gain of the nation by and large.

v.15 Proves again that there will not always be the state of 'being cast away' but will someday be a state called 'their acceptance'.

The reconciling of the world is already 'life from the dead' as far as regeneration is concerned – so this phrase must mean something additional or different.

** Perhaps it is a reference to texts like Ez 17:1-14, and s 66:8 etc.

V16-24 Prove that it is the nature of the covenant with Abraham that makes this possible and not impossible.

V25 Proves that the partial blindness on Israel is not permanent but lasts only up 'until the fullness of the Gentiles comes in'

Obj. The phrase 'fullness of the Gentiles' means the sum total of the elect from among the Gentiles

Or a Post-Mil all the Gentiles by and large of that day- This may be hard to prove, so, This is probably true and therefore could not v13 'their fullness' mean the same thing of Israel?

Ans. Yes it could, but that fact is already implied in the notion of a remnant, and Paul's 'how much more' would seem flat for 'their fall', and 'their failure' includes the elect being saved all along. So while the same phrase or word is used, the logic seems to require two different senses.

Obj. Couldn't the phrase 'until the fullness..' mean all the way to the close of the age? For presumably the fullness of the Gentiles –i.e. the last elect Gentile coming to faith would mark the moment before Christ's second coming, and thus the blindness will in effect never be lifted?

Ans. Yes, the phrase could mean that by itself, but Paul's logic would seem to grate against itself harshly for,

- His tone is hopeful over against the blindness: vs 11,12,15,24, and esp 26-29
- Vs26 seems to explain a joyful thing, whereas this interpretation of 25 would be rather finally sad. Yes tone matters!
- The quotations in vs 26-27 seem positive for Israel's salvation over against a final blindness.
- The quotations fit very naturally, smoothly, and logically with a not-final interpretation, i.e. with an 'all Israel of physical Israel' will be saved after the final Gentile (or approximately) is saved- it could mean Gentile nation rather than individual, i.e. something akin to 'a witness to every nation and then the end will come'.

The reason usually for giving an 'until' is to say that such and such will stop being the case and the condition will thereafter be changed. And if we mean finality we usually say 'until the end' or 'forever' or we don't use an until clause.

The force of the quotes in 26-27 is so strong that they would seem inappropriate proofs of the final sad view.

For the logical connection Paul makes is

Kai outos: and in this way; upon this condition being satisfied, thusly

And then supporting it,

'As it is written' i.e. 'A proof of this is...'

"The deliverer will come out of Zion,

And he will turn away ungodliness from **Jacob**;

For this is my covenant with them,

When I take away their sins."

Jacob more naturally refers to the nation of Israel than it does the collective elect from Jew and Gentile among all ages —especially in this context. And likewise the quote has the force of something eventful to happen rather than a summary of what has been happening along the way.

Remember also the Romans 9-11 context. The problem is

'It is not as though the word of God has failed'

And this entire problem arises upon the fact that Israel –Physical Israel- is 'accursed and cut off from Christ'

That is, the Jews not being saved seems to imply that God's promises have been broken. Paul then spends 3 chapters proving that not and how not to the idea that God's word has failed.