

ESAU, BAD; JACOB, GOOD

A SERMON

Preached on Lord's Day Morning March 13th, 1859

By Mister JAMES WELLS

AT THE SURREY TABERNACLE, BOROUGH ROAD

Volume 1 Number 12

“Jacob have I loved; but Esau have I hated.” Romans 9:13

I NOW notice then the character which Esau is intended to represent. First, *Esau in his relative position represents the people of God*; secondly, *in his native character he represents us all*; thirdly, *in his practical character he represents Christ-despisers, truth-despisers*. These are the three things which Esau represents in the various respects that I have stated.

First: ESAU IN HIS RELATIVE POSITION REPRESENTS THE PEOPLE OF GOD. Esau was Isaac's first-born: and in order to make this matter clear, I will just explain to you what we are to understand by the birthright of Esau, which Jacob for a mess of pottage bought, or which Esau sold. We cannot understand that birthright to mean spiritual things; we cannot understand the birthright to mean eternal things; because it is clear beyond all dispute, that it is not our natural birth that can give us any right whatever to eternal things; and I cannot suppose that Jacob was, even at that early age of his life in which Esau sold his birthright, so far gone as to suppose that he could buy eternal things. Nor that Esau himself recognizes anything eternal in the birthright, for he says, “Behold, I am at the point to die; and what profit shall this birthright be to me?” Whereas if the birthright consisted in something eternal, and Esau had at all known that he could not have reasoned in that way. Nor did Jacob in reply say anything that indicated an eternity in this birthright. So that it still remains for us to ascertain what this birthright was. And it was in this character of first-born, as I have said, that Esau was a representative of the people of God, till that position was lost. Now, the Scriptures nowhere explain verbally what that birthright was: still the Scriptures are as plain upon it as though they verbally described what it was. We go to Numbers 3, for instance, as well as many other Scriptures, and we learn there that all the first-born were the Lord's; that the law was, that all the first-born were to be devoted to the house of God, to the service of God, the sacrificial, ceremonial service of God. Therefore, the birthright then, was that of being devoted to the ceremonial, sacrificial service of God. But the Lord was pleased to alter it, and he substituted, when the Israelite came out of Egypt, the Levites, and put them into the place of the first-born; so that the right of serving God in the temple became the birthright of the Levites, through this act of divine authority substituting the one for the other. Now this then, will explain to us what is meant by his birthright; so that Esau, (and this we shall show under the third idea I have given,) lost that birthright; and we shall bring forward another person that was similarly situated, and who also lost his birthright. Now taking this view of it, then, Esau would look upon

these sacrifices merely in themselves; he would look at them carnally; they were sacrifices after the order of a carnal commandment, and it did not require that a man should be spiritual, in order to obey a law which was after the order of a carnal commandment, after the order of a worldly sanctuary; so that Esau's proper business was to atone from day to day ceremonially unto God for daily sins; and this was the birth-right. Therein, then lay the birthright of Esau. Jacob might well wish to occupy such a position as that; for although there was nothing spiritual in it, in itself considered, yet it typified spiritual things; and for that very reason Esau would dislike it, and Jacob would love it, I need not say more here. Esau was the first-born, and therefore in his relative position represents the people of God; and supposing Esau had been a good man, he would have constituted a type of the Lord Jesus Christ, both as the first born, and also in his character as priest. Let me, therefore, say a word or two here, upon the character of the people of God as firstborn. They are called "God's first-born." But let me notice first *the relations*: for the first-born were a type of him, who is called the firstborn: firstborn literally, for a type, and figure, and representation, of those who are God's first-born spiritually. Now, it is said of the Lord Jesus Christ, under this head of first-born, that "He is the first born among many brethren." The idea there intended is this, that the Lord Jesus Christ was born under the law; and a part of his birthright was to do the whole law, for he that was under the law, and was circumcised, became a debtor to do the whole law. Therefore, the Lord Jesus Christ, a portion of his birthright was obedience to God's law. The second part of Christ's birthright was the sins of all his brethren; for as the first born under the law, the second part of the birthright of Christ was that of all the sins of his brethren. The third part was the fire; that as the fire should descend from heaven, and consume the sacrifice, so the curse belonged to Christ, and belonged to no others. Ah, my hearers, what delightful news these are for us to listen to; that the Lord Jesus Christ was made under the law, and became a debtor to do all that law, not one iota of which could we ever reach, and became a debtor for our sins, to pay the mighty debt we owed; our sins became his by that order of mercy, and loving kindness of the blessed God in laying help upon one that is Mighty, and the curse belonged to him; here you see the people free from sin, and free from the curse; and there is Jesus, a Brother born for adversity; "to this end was I born;" he is Jesus, the firstborn among many brethren. Another part of his birthright was the joy that was set before him. And another part of his birthright was, What? say you; you are at a loss now: you don't know what to say. Ah, but I do; another part of his birthright was the possession, the eternal possession, of everyone for whom he died; "Father, I will that all those whom you have given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory." Now, if the Savior had sinned in his life, if the Savior had sinned in his death, if the Savior had sinned in his resurrection; or, if the Savior ever could sin anywhere from first to last, he would thereby have lost his birthright, he would have lost his standing, he would have corrupted everything, seeing he stood the federal Covenant Head of his people. But, as he did no sin, but always did those things that pleased God, and as he was the Son of God in a sense in which none others ever were, he was the Son of God *naturally*, others are the sons of God *by adoption*, here it is, then, friends, that the heirship of Christ stands good; he has done no sin, consequently his heirship cannot be weakened, cannot be tarnished; and sin cannot affect us, because we are one with Jesus Christ; we that are one with him, can no more come short of any of the glory, than Christ himself, because we are joint heirs with him; and therefore, our continued heirship depends not in any shape whatever upon us, but upon the Lord Jesus Christ. If then, my hearer, you are an heir of God, if you are born of God; if eternal life be your birthright, which it is, if you are born of God; if an eternal inheritance be your birthright, which it is, if you are born of God, for it is this birth that constitutes you in a manifest way as an heir of God; let me look at the evidence of it. First, then, is the Lord Jesus

Christ being made under the law, to obey the whole law, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, is that a truth, the need of which I feel? And do I receive that truth in the love of it? Is it my solemn desire before the great God, to be found nowhere, but in the righteousness that he wrought? That is an evidence that you are born of God. And do I receive the blessed truth, that he bares our sins, therefore, I shall not have to bear them; that he was wounded penally; therefore, I shall never be wounded penally; that wrath fell upon him, that he was made a curse, therefore, I shall not be cursed? Do I receive this blessed testimony in the perfection of it, in the eternity of it? And does this position of the Savior endear him to me, as a poor sinner, when I come before. God in his name? As one of our hymns very sweetly says:

“He instead of me is seen,
When I approach to God.”

Oh, my hearers, if we have a spiritual affection to this truth; if we know anything of being brought near to God by this blessed truth, then what is that but a brotherly spirit, a oneness of spirit with Christ. Thus then, you see how much good is indicated in the simple circumstance of the first-born.

But Jesus Christ is the first-born, not only among many brethren; he is also the “first-born of every creature;” or, as the original may be as properly (and Greek scholars of the present day think more properly,) rendered, “He is the firstborn *of the whole creation.*” Then if he be the first-born, he is the heir, for that is the idea; and if he be the heir to the whole creation, then whatever I need, that is in this world, I shall have, because Christ is heir to it all, all belongs to him. And so, the apostle, when looking at this part of the heirship of Christ, says, “All are yours, whether the world, or life or death, or Paul, or Cephas: all are yours, and you are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s.” Oh, what a plea we have then! If we want temporal things, we are to plead Jesus’ name; if we want temporal mercies, we are to ask in the name of Jesus Christ; we are to ask for our daily bread, literally, as well as our daily bread spiritually, in the name of Jesus Christ. He is heir of the whole creation: it all belongs to him, yes, from first to last, for by him were all things created. The Lord gives us so much of it, as seems good in his sight. He could have made his people great in this world, but then that would tend to make them very little for the next. And therefore, while the Lord loves the tents of Jacob, he loves the gates of Zion more. The Lord loves the tents of Jacob well, but:

“He makes a more delightful stay,
Where churches meet to praise and pray.”

And he is also the *first-born from the dead*. He dies no more; death has no more dominion over him. “And because I live,” said Christ, “you shall live also.” And so, the people of God, being heirs with Christ, become heirs of eternal life. He is the first-born from the dead; and hence they are called “the children of the resurrection.” Now we all know he died no more; death has no more dominion over him. He lives by mediatorial right; he lives by a great many rights; he lives by Sonship right; he lives by active obedience right; he lives by sacrificial right; he lives by conquest right; he lives by covenant right; he lives by predestination right; he lives by personal right; for “he is God over all, blessed for evermore;” and whatever rights he lives by except the last I have mentioned, (in that he is God,) we live by the same right; his righteousness, his death, his sonship, his conquest, and what other rights he lives by, we live by. Real religion, my hearer, is to be brought

as a poor trembling wretch, down to the footstool of mercy; and for your soul to be torn to pieces from a sight and sense of what you are, so as to make room in your soul for the great truths of the Gospel, and to make everything apart from Christ as nothing, as vanity and vexation of spirit; and hereby to bring you so acquainted with the unsearchable riches of Christ that you may no longer live a stranger to the Gospel. But I do not think this is much understood now days. “Unto you that believe he is precious.” Recognize him as the Firstborn among many brethren, and if we know him there truly, he will be precious; recognize him as Heir to the whole creation, if we know him there, he will be precious; recognize him in the other characters I have stated, and if we know him there, he will be unto us precious.

Now the people of God are named after Christ in this character of the first born, both in the Old Testament, and in the New. And how are these who are the first-born, brought to God? They are brought to God with weeping eyes; there is real Godly earnestness; they are brought to God with supplicating hearts; they are brought to God by the truths, the new covenant truths of the Gospel; they are brought to God in that way wherein everything is made straight for them. And so, it is written, “With weeping and with supplication will I lead them; I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters.” A contrast to fiery Sinai; a contrast to the fiery commandments of God’s eternal law; and a contrast to the broken cisterns of men, and a contrast to the religions of men. The truths of the everlasting Gospel, setting forth the love, mercy, and salvation of God. “I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters in a straight way;” where everything is made straight for them. Where is that but in him who said, “I am the Way;” the Straight Way. Why, Lord, sin has made everything crooked; circumstances make things crooked; death makes things crooked; Satan makes things crooked; various trials seem to make things crooked. But there is a way in which everything is made straight, and that is in Christ. “There mercy and truth shall meet together, there righteousness and peace shall embrace each other.” You are complete in him. “In a straight way, wherein they shall not stumble.” Let us see then if we have these five evidences. First, “They shall come with weeping.” Did your religion never cause you a sigh, a groan, a trembling, an hour’s mourning? Never cause you an hour’s casting down? Alas, alas, if so, there is something lacking at the very root; and you had better be lacking anywhere than there because whatever you have, if you have not the root, you will wither; but if you have the root, all in time will come right. “With supplication.” Jacob made supplication unto the angel; and there will be supplication, real prayer. “And by the rivers of waters.” So, if you are one of these characters, the truths of the gospel will be like rivers of water in the desert to you; they will be refreshing to you; they will strengthen the weak hand, they will confirm the feeble knee; they will open the blind eye and set loose the stammering tongue. Then it is to be in “a straight way;” and that way is Christ. You cannot make things straight anywhere else; you may try to make them straight in yourself, you cannot; in the world, you cannot; and in the church, there will be crooks as long as the church is in the wilderness. But, in Christ, there we are straight, there we are complete. Then the last point is, “wherein they shall not stumble.” That is a remarkable position for these words; first, there is the straightway; secondly, there is the not stumbling. Why, everything being made straight in Christ, everything being eternally perfected by him for his people, is the very thing the world stumbles at. But the first-born will not stumble at it; they may stumble at circumstances, at themselves, at others, and at a great many things; but not at that. It is then, I say, a remarkable position for the words. Perhaps I am speaking to someone who is saying, Well, I have been like a devil all the week; I have been wretched, and rebellious, and I don’t know what else; and I thought this morning it was hardly any use to come; and then, as it was raining, I thought I wouldn’t come and then I thought, well, after

all I will go; perhaps, I may hear something about there being mercy for me. Well, come, what do you say; what, have these rebellions, and these devil-isms, (and we all experience them at times) done? Have they made you hate the perfection of Christ's work? Oh no, say you; if he saves me, and presents me, who am so crooked, straight and complete, I am sure that I shall through all eternity, hail him, "and crown him Lord of all." These are the first-born, then, "they shall come with weeping, and with supplications will I lead them; I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters in a straight way, wherein they shall not stumble." Now for the reason, for I am a Father to such; for "I am a Father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first born;" there is the secret of it. Never would you have had a weeping eye after Jesus; never would you have had an aching heart after Jesus; never would the truths of the gospel have become refreshing to you, never would you have been kept from stumbling against those truths, but for the great secret that God, from eternity, made you one of his, that God, from eternity, gave you to his dear Son; that God, from eternity, constituted you one of the first-born. Ah, you are saying, from eternity. Now that's where it is. You'd have done very well this morning, if you'd gone preaching on as you began; but you can't go on without bringing this *election* in. Nowhere in the Scriptures is this character of the first-born connected with election; therefore, you ought not to have brought it in. Stop, don't you go too fast, Master Duty-faith; did you ever read the 12th of Hebrews? I think I did, some years ago! Oh, indeed; do you recollect these words in it, "The church of the first-born, which are written in heaven." There it is then; one with Jesus, by eternal union one. Thus, then Esau in his relative position as the first-born represents the people of God.

Secondly: Esau is also called "a *profane* man;" whether he was literally a profligate man we have no proof. You know the word *profane* doesn't always mean profligacy. Hence, we say of common, uninspired history, profane history. We don't mean profligate history, anything improper to read. And hence, in the Old Testament, unconsecrated places were spoken of as *profane* places; that is, common places. Well then, take up that idea, that Esau was a profane person, that is, unconsecrated. And so, we all are by nature. Esau, therefore, knew nothing of vital consecration to God. Real consecration to God is by the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. Hence, the Levites were consecrated to God by a sin offering, by a burnt offering; and by the sprinkling of the blood upon the right ear, or the ear tipped; upon the thumb of the right hand; and the great toe of the right foot tipped; these parts were tipped with the blood of consecration; to denote consecration to God. So, my hearers, if we are consecrated to God, we shall listen to salvation by the blood of the Lamb, the ear circumcised to listen; and so also our right hand, the hand of faith, will be strengthened to lay hold of eternal life by the blood of the Lamb; our feet will be strengthened to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. There is a consecration to which Esau was a stranger, but to which you, if children of God, are not strangers. Esau was a profane person; he was not born of God to feel his need of the good tidings; he was not born of God to feel his need of faith in Christ, he was not born of God to feel his need of a standing place by blood; Esau despised his birthright. We have shown what this birthright was. I hope I have proved what it was. Now Esau despised this, because he saw not the spirituality of it, saw not its typical meaning, Esau was a law-man; he was a responsibility man, sir. He admit his need of a Surety? He come cringing before God with sacrifices? He feel his need of an interposer? Not he! He was a law-man, a responsibility-man. I will prove it presently beyond all dispute. I will challenge any man in the world to prove my argument is worth nothing. I will prove presently what I have said, after I have named another person very much like Esau. When Cain was born, Eve thought she had obtained a person that should offer sacrifices ceremonially and carry on that service that should set forth the ultimate

achievements of the promised seed; and so, she said, "I have gotten a man from the Lord." But she made a mistake; the objects of our choice are not always the objects of the Lord's choice. Now Cain was a law-man; he was under the curse; and, therefore, he was more at home in cursing others than in blessing them; because he himself was under the curse; the law ministered death to him, and therefore, it inclined him to minister death to others. I am a law-man, sir. I am a responsibility-man, sir. Well, says Abel, you are the first-born, and you are the priest, and you are to come with the sacrifice, and to carry on this ceremonial service, as a type of good things; and you know, Cain, that the Lord has said to you, if you do well, shall you not be accepted? and you shall have the pre-eminence, and the desire of your brother shall be unto, you; and you shall rule over the family. Well, says Cain, this is all very well; but I'm not going to cringe: I'm not going to submit to be made righteous by the righteousness of another: I'm a responsibility-man; I've made up my mind about that. Well then, says Abel, you can't be my priest: I can't follow you. If you don't bring a sacrifice, I will bring one. Abel was a spiritual-man, he was not a law-man, he was a Gospel-man; Abel was killed to the law; killed to his responsibility: felt his need of a Surety; brought the more excellent sacrifice. Cain refusing to come in proper order, lost his birthright. Cain brought the fruits of the ground: Cain, despising Christ; Cain, despising the blood of the new covenant; Cain, despising the promised seed; Cain, showing his utter ignorance of the promise to faith, lost his birth-right. The matter is clear enough. Just so, Esau. You never read that Esau built an altar or offered sacrifice; he despised it; and he is a type, therefore, of all those professors. So, the apostle makes it out, "Lest there be any profane person, as Esau; who for one morsel of meat;" any temporal advantage rather than that high doctrine; "sold his birth-right; and afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected." Some have supposed that Esau would have inherited a spiritual blessing but was rejected; but that is not the meaning, as I will prove this morning, if time will permit.

Now I have said that this made Esau the type of those professors that despise the new Covenant, or degrade the new Covenant; for, if there be any poisoned arrows in their quiver, these ministers and men are sure to direct them at the truth of God, at the people of God, and at the order of that covenant without which we cannot be saved. Now Esau, was a law-man. Just listen to me while I prove it, because it is a most, solemn matter, it is an important matter, vitally so. Now in that same Scripture which I have quoted, I never could see until lately, why the apostle brought in what he there brings in, "Who afterward would have inherited the blessing, but was rejected; for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears." "For," there is a conjunction; clearly so, conjoining the two together. "For you are not come unto the mount that might be touched;" that was were Esau was; he did not know it, but he was there; "And that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which voice they that heard, entreated that the word should not be spoken to them anymore; for they could not endure that which was commanded; and if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart; so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake." That's where Esau was; he was a law-man, sir; he was under the law, and that law cursed him; that law worked wrath in his heart. There is no man, mysterious as that may seem, there is no man under heaven, who will so much despise the gospel, as the man that is under the law and does not know it. Why, say you, I think it is sin that makes man despise the gospel. That's true. The criminal part of the conduct originates in sin; but mark the language of the word of God, "The law is the strength of sin; and the law works wrath." But the man does not know what it is that makes him so hate the gospel; he is not so convinced as to know his need

of the gospel. For Esau was a law-man, under the law; and being of a law spirit, he could not prize a gospel spirit; he hates a gospel spirit, being of a law spirit; of a responsibility spirit, he hated a free spirit; being of a doing spirit, he hated that spirit which testified that all was done. Here is the contrast between the bond-children and the free; here is the enmity between the two seeds. I wonder where you are, all of you in this matter. Have you ever been killed to the law, and have you received Christ as the end of the law? Esau was a law-man; he was a despiser of the gospel: and of everything connected with gospel truth. I did intend this morning to set before you what kind of blessing it was that Jacob sought by his mother's advice to obtain.

I shall therefore, close by just setting before you my reasons why I believe that Jacob was a good man when that transaction took place; I mean when he accorded with his mother's advice to obtain the blessing. Some good ministers believe that Jacob was not then a good man; they cannot think that a good man would ever do what Jacob there did; at least, say they, if a good man could do it, We don't believe that he was a good man then; we believe that Jacob was never called by grace until the Lord appeared to him just afterwards going to Padan-aram. That is their argument. Now I have my reasons against that; and they are these; these are my reasons for believing that Jacob was acquainted with God in the early part of his life.

My first reason would be *the pre-natal revelation made to his mother*. The children struggled together in the womb., And she said, "If it be so, why am I thus? And she went to enquire of the Lord. And the Lord answered, Two nations are in your womb, and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger." Now look at Jacob prevailing over the angel, acquiring a new name; see the illustration there that the one should "be" stronger than the other. Look at the illustration of it in the eternal triumphs of all Jacob's seed on the one hand, and the eternal degradation of Esau's on the other. How true, that "there are two manners of people," directly opposed in manners; the one people are responsible people and law people; the other people are a free people, God's people, Christ's people, heaven's people, eternity's people. "The elder shall serve the younger;" the children not being yet born. I think therefore, that this pre-natal revelation, this revelation before the birth, is one reason upon which we may conclude that Jacob in early life, and this revelation was made, I should say, for him, that he might in early life, be brought to know the Lord.

The second reason is *the indicated sup-plantation that took place at Jacob's birth*. He took Esau by the heel. Now they call Jacob very cunning; but we cannot suppose that the little fellow, who was yet hardly born, was so cunning as to do that by his own actual intent; I don't think so; we must go to the scriptural interpretation. Hosea 7, "He took his brother by the heel, and by his strength he had power with God." That is a very early indication that he was to supplant his brother Esau; that his brother Esau should lose his birthright; and therefore, he had no occasion to buy it.

The next reason is *Jacob's association with his grandfather, Abraham, for 15 years*. "Jacob was 15 years old when his grandfather Abraham died;" and Jacob was a plain man, dwelt in tents, stopped at home, and learnt what he could. And do you think his grandfather Abraham failed to tell him of God's dealings with him? I think not. Do you think his father Isaac failed to tell him of God's dealings with him? There they are, these three, all sitting together in the tent; there is good old Abraham, 160 years old; and there is Isaac, an old man; there is Jacob, a little boy; all sitting together in the tent, on a fine summer's evening, after putting the flocks right and so on; not a word

of prayer, think you, not a word of God? I cannot believe that. Therefore, I think that is another reason.

Fourth. *Jacob's attachment to the birthright.* He wanted evidently to have that position that stood connected with the vital blessing. That I would take as a proof that he knew something of the Lord in early days.

Fifth. *The contrast of character actually given and fairly implied.* He was “a plain man, dwelling in tents.” The New Testament says that Esau was “A profane man:” fairly implying that Jacob was not profane.

Sixth. *Jacob's abstaining from ungodly alliances.* When Esau was forty years old, he got married to the daughters of the land; but Jacob could see nothing but ungodly women there; and rather than marry an ungodly woman, he stopped till he was eighty-three before he got married. I take that then, in Jacob's favor, that he was a good man.

Seventh. *His age when he sought the blessing in that way described.* Why, he was seventy-six years old; he was one-hundred and thirty when he stood before Pharaoh; and Joseph at that time was thirty-nine. Now, take thirty-nine from one-hundred and thirty, that would leave Jacob ninety-one when Joseph was born: Joseph was born after Jacob had been fourteen years at Padan-aram; take fourteen from ninety-one, you get down to seventy-seven; so that Jacob was seventy-six, if not seventy-seven, when he sought the blessing. Now, it is not altogether reasonable to think that he would have been all these years an unregenerate man, after all the circumstances I have brought before you. I think, therefore, after looking at all these, it is pretty clear that Jacob was a good man before that circumstance occurred.

Eighth. *The scrupulosity manifested in according with his mother's scheme.* He showed a conscience in it. Why, he said, “I shall bring a curse upon myself, and not a blessing;” and that shows he did not like it.

Ninth. And this is a point that these men, good men, some of them, that say that Jacob was not a good man, seem to have lost sight of, *it is beyond all dispute that Rebekah was a good woman.* She prayed to the Lord before the children were born; and the Lord heard her and answered her; and made the wondrous revelation to her of the eternal distinction between the elect and the non-elect. And, therefore, those who say Jacob was not a good man because he did that, forget that this argument tells with more force against Rebekah than it does against Jacob; because she was the worst of the two, or, if I might venture to use the word, I would say *worser*: Lord Brougham has used the word *worser*; and his lordship is a Parliamentary authority, and that's some authority, you know; she therefore, was the *worser* of the two; and therefore, if Jacob was not a good man what would you say of Rebekah?

And lastly, *there is not anything on his going to Padan-aram in the revelation there made to Jacob that indicates that he did not know the Lord before.* As to his not knowing that the Lord was in that place, he doesn't say he did not know the Lord; before; he did not know he was in that place. Have you not met with the Lord sometimes where you did not expect to meet with him? I have; he has met me and blessed me sometimes when and where I have never expected him, “The Lord was in

this place; and I knew it not.” But, say you, he was afraid. So was Gideon, so was Isaiah, so was John the divine, and fell as dead at his feet. Therefore, there is nothing in the revelation made to Jacob there, that indicated that Jacob knew not the Lord before; though perhaps he never had such a clear and blissful revelation made to him before as was made then.

We must next Sunday morning, come to the sovereignty of God in loving Jacob; and hating Esau. *Men* tell us that God hated Esau for his sins, we must see about that.