



The Grace Proclamator and Promulgator

“To testify the gospel of the grace of God.” Acts 20:24

PUBLISHED AS A MISSION PROJECT OF PILGRIMS HOPE BAPTIST CHURCH

Vol. XIII, No. 10

October 1, 1997

Page

WHOM HE DID FOREKNOW

By Wayne Camp

“FOR WHOM HE DID FOREKNOW, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren” (Rom. 8:29).

I have before me a Sunday School Quarterly in which there is a discussion of the verse that I have used as a text for this message. In that quarterly the writer asks a couple of rhetorical questions, “Whom did God foreknow? Is there any person he did not foreknow?” The context of these questions reveal that he believes that every person of the human race was foreknown of God.

But, I ask, “What about those people to whom Christ will say, ‘Depart from me, I never knew you?’” It is apparent that he did not know these people in the sense of **foreknow** in Rom. 8:29. According to Rom. 8:29, everyone whom he did foreknow, he did also predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son. And, according to Rom. 8:30, all those foreknown and predestinated in v-29 are called, justified and glorified in verse 30. There are no exceptions. God did not lose one person from **foreknowledge** to **glorification**. Read the verses carefully and see if that is not obvious.

(See FOREKNOW, P. 5, Left Column)

CHRIST’S AUTHORITY—WAS IT FROM GOD OR FROM JOHN THE BAPTIST?

By Wayne Camp

I recently received a letter from a brother who asked me a question that I had never been asked before about something I had never heard before. He asked something to this effect, “Do you believe that Jesus received his authority from God or from John the Baptist?” He went on to say that he had read where someone (The article bore no author’s name.) had written that Jesus received his authority from John the Baptist. Needless to say, I was a bit nonplussed that anyone would suggest that the Lord Jesus Christ received his authority from a mere man, albeit a great man.

I now am in possession of that article. It is

titled ***Why A Baptist Church***. After reading it I realized that whoever the unnamed author was, he was possibly trying to establish the idea that authority in the Lord’s work is passed horizontally from men to men and from church to church, rather than authority being passed vertically from God to man. Here is the portion the brother who wrote was questioning:

A Baptist Church is the:

IV. ONLY ONE WITH GOSPEL AUTHORITY:
Matt. 28:18-20.

A. Again we must go back to John’s

THE GRACE PROCLAIMATOR AND PROMULGATOR (USPS #000476) is published monthly (subscription free) by the authority of Pilgrims Hope Baptist Church, 3084 Woodrow, Memphis, TN 38127. Periodical postage paid at Memphis, TN 38101.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE GRACE PROCLAIMATOR AND PROMULGATOR, 3084 Woodrow, Memphis, TN 38127

COPYING PRIVILEGES

Any articles or messages in this paper may be copied and used as the reader sees fit unless otherwise specified before or after the article or message. Our desire is to disseminate the gospel of grace as widely as possible.

EDITOR'S ADDRESS, PHONE NUMBERS AND E-MAIL ADDRESSES

The editor, Eld. Wayne Camp, may be reached at the address given above, or at his home address. His home address is: 2065 Tompkins Lane, Millington, TN 38053-5107.

Church Phone at Home: (901) 876-5015

Church Phone: (901) 357-0215.

E-mail address: RWcamp@cris.com

Visit our Home Page on the Internet

<http://www.concentric.net/~Rwcamp/>

Note: An answering machine is on both numbers. They will answer on the fourth ring. We do not monitor our calls before answering.

PLANNING TO MOVE? If at all possible, please notify us three weeks in advance of your change of address so that we may keep your paper coming. It costs us 50 cents to get your new address from the Postal Service and that may take long enough that two papers are returned at a cost of \$1.00 before we get the correction. This will mean you miss one or two papers. Your help in saving us this expense will be appreciated.

IF YOU ARE IN MEMPHIS we invite you to attend our services:

Bible Study 10:00 A. M. Sunday

Worship Service 11:00 A. M. Sunday

Evening Service 5:00 P. M. Sunday

Mid-Week Service 7:00 P. M. Wednesday

You Are Welcome!

Baptism. He was given authority from heaven, whereby he gave over that authority to the Lord Jesus. Jesus said, *"All power, (authority) is given unto me in heaven and in earth."* **John 3:35, "The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into His hand."**

- B. Therefore, only one church institution can have gospel authority. Hence, only

one has perpetual authority; that is, authority to carry out the Great Commission: This does not mean that all believers outside true church membership do not have the right or responsibility of speaking forth the gospel. But, they do not have the authority to perpetuate the Great Commission.

A Baptist Church is the:

V. ONLY ONE WITH SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY: Matt. 28:18-20

A. Since John was the only man to receive authority from heaven to baptize we can safely conclude that there was only one source of authority and one recipient of it—singular source, singular authority. In other words, anyone having scriptural authority to baptize had to receive it from John. *"There was a man sent from God, whose name was John,"* John 1:6.

B. The only one to receive scriptural authority from John was the Lord Jesus Himself. We have no record of John giving that authority to anyone else.

Let us first focus on this portion of the article. **"Again we must go back to John's Baptism. He was given authority from heaven, whereby he gave over that authority to the Lord Jesus. Jesus said, 'All power, (authority) is given unto me in heaven and in earth.' John 3:35, 'The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into His hand'."**

I affirm that John the Baptist received his authority to do all the work he did directly from God. The argument to prove that Christ received his authority from John the Baptist is made on the first verse where Jesus declared that he had been given all authority in heaven and in earth.

This argument that this authority came from John the Baptist is contradicted by the second verse the author used. John the Baptist clearly declares in that verse that it was the **Father** who had given all things (that would include authority) into the hands of his Son.

Consider these words also, "Since John was the only man to receive authority from heaven to baptize we can safely conclude that there was only one source of authority and one recipient of it—singular source, singular authority. In other words, anyone having scriptural authority to baptize had to receive it from John. *'There was a man sent from God, whose name was John,' John 1:6.*"

The only one to receive scriptural authority from John was the Lord Jesus Himself. We have no record of John giving that authority to anyone else."

The unnamed author says, "**We have no record of John giving that authority to anyone else.**" Actually, we have no record of John giving that authority to **anyone**, not even to Christ. The record the author gave above proved, rather, that Jesus received his authority from the Father, not John the Baptist. In fact, John the Baptist affirmed that Jesus received his authority from the Father, not from him. Some of John's disciples heard that Jesus was baptizing beyond Jordan and many were coming to him for baptism. *John 3:26 And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him.*

The very first words of John's response were, "**A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven**" (*John 3:27*). Obviously, John entertained no notion that it was he who had given Christ his authority. In fact, he affirms that the authority being exercised by Jesus in making and baptizing disciples came directly from heaven. He also asserted that Jesus was above all. *John 3:31 He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the*

earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all. One who is "**above all**" could not receive authority from an **underling**. Authority is always passed downward; never upward. It would be like a President looking to a filing clerk in his office for authority to govern. John further confirms, in the latter part of his response to his jealous disciples, that Christ's authority was from God. *John 3:34-35 For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him. 35 The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.*

Jesus never claimed to receive authority from anyone but God the Father. As God himself he possessed all authority. But as man, he received all authority from God the Father. Jesus confirmed that the source of his authority was the Father. His words are very similar to those of John the Baptist cited above. *Matthew 11:27 All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. Luke 10:22 All things are delivered to me of my Father: and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.*

God himself declared that it was he who would give authority to Christ. *Psalms 89:27 Also I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth.*

Daniel is in perfect harmony with John the Baptist, Jesus, and God the Father when he writes, *Daniel 7:14 And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.*

That God, not John the Baptist, was the source of Christ's authority is obvious from his declaration in the fifth chapter of John. *John 5:21-30 For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. 22 For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all*

judgment unto the Son: 23 That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him. 24 Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. 25 Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. 26 For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; 27 And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. 28 Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, 29 And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. 30 I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me.

There are several things in this passage that obviously show God to be the source of Christ's authority, not John the Baptist.

First, Jesus was sent by the Father, not by John. The unnamed author in his article used the fact that John the Baptist was sent by God as evidence for his assertion that John was the singular and only source from which Christ could receive authority. But, Jesus repeatedly claimed in his teaching that he was sent from God which clearly and obviously affirms that he came from the Father with the "all authority" he declared he had. In fact, the exact expression "sent me" appears in the first four books of the New Testament 39 times and in 38 of those cases Jesus is declaring that the Father sent him into the world. The other time John the Baptist uses the expression stating that he was sent by God. Since being sent by God implies God-given authority, Christ certainly had authority from God to do all that he did, including baptizing disciples. He was not sent by John; John gave him no authority. All things were delivered into his hands by the Father.

The passage shows that God had given him authority and power to quicken whom he would (V-21, 25, 26). This includes quickening the dead in sin and also calling the physically dead from their state of death. The Father had given him the authority to judge all men (v-22).

John the Apostle affirms again what John the Baptist had said as recorded in the third chapter of John. He writes, **John 13:3 Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God**

In his great mediatorial prayer recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John Jesus again affirms that what he did and was able to do and had the authority to do was given him from God, not from John the Baptist. **John 17:2 As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.**

The God-given authority of Christ was also declared by Moses many years before Christ came into the world in his incarnate state. **Deuteronomy 18:18-19 I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. 19 And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.**

When Jesus came into the world he not only came as a prophet and priest; he came as king. This is obvious from Scripture. **Matthew 21:5 Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass. John 12:13-15 Took branches of palm trees, and went forth to meet him, and cried, Hosanna: Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord. 14 And Jesus, when he had found a young ass, sat thereon; as it is written, 15 Fear not, daughter of Sion: behold, thy King cometh, sitting on an ass's colt.**

Solomon tells us "Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou? (Ecclesiastes 8:4). Jesus came a king and his word was authoritative. When he rode into Jerusalem on a

borrowed donkey, he was King. The idea that one of his subjects, John the Baptist, could give King Jesus authority is foreign to the whole analogy of power. Authority must always be delegated downward; it is never delegated upward. John the Baptist declared, "***There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose***" (Mark 1:7) The idea that one so lowly could give authority to one so much mightier than he is inconceivable in the light of these words of John the Baptist. I suspect that John the Baptist would have been aghast had one of his disciples suggested that he could, would, and did give Jesus Christ his authority.

This authority of Christ, as declared by Moses, was also declared by the Apostle Peter. ***Acts 3:22-23 For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. 23 And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people.*** This passage literally radiates forth the authority of Christ. But, Dear Reader, I assure you by the authority of the word of God that the authority of Christ came directly from God; it was not delegated upward to him from John the Baptist.

Due to the misunderstanding of many on this matter of foreknowledge, and at the request of some who have asked that I share this material, I want to deal with the matter of Divine foreknowledge as it is used in our text.

THIS FOREKNOWLEDGE IS OF PERSONS, NOT OF ACTIONS OR EVENTS

There is a vast difference in "***What***" and "***Whom***." The text does not refer to ***what*** God knew; it refers to ***whom*** God knew. In our text Paul is writing of certain persons whom God foreknew. He set his electing love on them. To read into this foreseen faith is to seriously distort the verse. Try substituting ***what*** for ***whom*** in the passage and see if it sounds at all sensible. ***For WHAT he did foreknow, he also did predestinate [to be] conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. 30 Moreover WHAT he did predestinate, them he also called: and WHAT he called, them he also justified: and WHAT he justified, them he also glorified.*** (KJV) Does it make sense? Is it grammatically correct?

We read of God's foreknowledge of his people, Israel. "***God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew***" (Rom. 11:2). We also read of the saints of God as being foreknown. "***Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father***" (1 Pet. 1:2). And, of course, there is the use in our text, "***For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son.***" Even a casual reading of this passage will reveal that a special and specific group of people are the objects of this foreknowledge. It will reveal that the persons ***foreknown*** are the same persons who were ***predestinated*** to be conformed to the image of God's Son. Those ***foreknown and predestinated*** are the same persons who were ***called***. Those ***foreknown, predestinated, and called*** are the same persons who were ***justified***. Those persons who were ***foreknown, predestinated, called and justified*** are the very same persons who were ***glorified***. None were dropped off as Paul progressed from ***foreknowledge*** to ***glorification***.

(FOREKNOW, Cont. from P. 1)

Some, and with valid and biblical grounds, say that the word ***foreknow*** in our text means "***foreordain***." Dr. Ben M. Bogard said, "The word ***foreknow*** in the text (Rom. 8:29) is the same word which in other places is translated foreordain, and rendered thus, the text would read: '***For whom he foreordained, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son***.'"

I call your attention to the fact that this is a foreknowledge of persons. It says nothing of their actions. There is not even a hint of **foreseen** faith in this passage. It is a foreknowledge of **persons**, not of their actions that is the subject of our text, and our discussion.

**THIS FOREKNOWLEDGE OF THESE
PERSONS IMPLIES MORE THAN PRE-
SCIENCE, PRECOGNITION, AND
OMNISCIENCE**

As to omniscience, pre-science, and precognition, God, and Jesus Christ, knew every man. Jesus *"needed not that any man tell him what was in man"* for *"he knew all men"* (Jn. 2:25, 24). In fact *"Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him."* These unbelievers did not surprise Jesus Christ. From eternity he could call their name, and give their address. He knew before he ever came to this earth who would not believe on him. Neither did Judas Iscariot fool him for a second. When he made Judas an apostle, he already knew that the man would betray him for thirty pieces of silver. This knowledge he had from eternity.

Of the house of Judah God said, "I knew that thou wouldest deal very treacherously, and wast called a transgressor from the womb" (Isa. 48:8). No one has ever slipped up on God's blind side for he has no blind side. Every one that will ever die in sin was known of by God and his Christ from the foundation of the world. However, this knowledge is never referred to as **foreknowledge**.

While God knows all men, and Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not and who would betray him, there is a sense in which he does not know such persons. As I suggested in the previous paragraph, **foreknowledge is never used with reference to these persons** for foreknowledge goes beyond mere precognition. Jesus speaks of those whom he never knew. Though they call him Lord, he never knew them. Though they have preached and prophesied in his name he never knew them. Though they have cast out devils in his name, he never knew them.

Though they have done many wonderful works in his name he never knew them in the sense of **foreknowledge**. Therefore, at the judgment of the damned they will hear those sad and tragic words, "I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (Matt. 7:21-23). They were know but unknown. They were known but not **foreknown** as the word is used in our text. Obviously, the word has a deeper meaning than mere precognition.

Since all men are not called **and** justified, then all must not be foreknown in the sense of our text. Notice again, **WHOM** he did foreknow, he also did predestinate . . . Moreover **WHOM** he did predestinate, **THEM** he also called: and **WHOM** he called, **THEM** he also justified: and **whom** he justified, **them** he also glorified" (Rom. 8:29- 30). Now, consider again the following facts that are set forth in these verses:

1. Those **whom** he foreknew are the very same persons **whom** he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son.
2. Those **whom** he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son are the same persons **whom** he also called.
3. Those **whom** he called are the same persons **whom** he also justified.
4. Those **whom** he justified are the same persons **whom** he also glorified.

There is no room for equivocation, evasion, sidestepping, or begging the question. These verses have the same group of people, the same number of people, exactly the same persons in **foreknowledge** as they do in **glorification**. There is not even a shadow of evidence, not a tinge of evidence that some are dropped out along the way. Earlier I quoted a Sunday School quarterly in which the writer asks rhetorically, "Is there any person He did not foreknow?" In his context he indicates that all men, every last person in the human family, were foreknown in the sense and way used in Rom. 8:29. If his suggestion is true, then he has universal salvation. He infers the same universality in another question on the expression "whom he called." He asks, "Whom

does God call: Is any person exempt from this Divine call? Does God call a select few to come to Him for salvation? Or, does he call all men to come to Him in repentance and faith?" (G. F. Crumley, Help for the Teacher, Second Quarter, 1972, Baptist Sunday School Committee of the American Baptist Association, P. 39).

Now, Readers, keep in mind that this S. S. writer was dealing with our text when he asks these questions. He is suggesting that all men were foreknown and called in the sense used in our text. If all men were foreknown in the sense of our text, and if all men are called in the sense of our text, then **all men will be justified and glorified**. Universal salvation, plain and simple!

THIS FOREKNOWLEDGE MEANS TO REGARD WITH AFFECTION AND FAVOR

Foreknow, as used in our text, means "to regard with affection and favor." It means "to set one's love upon another." God set his affections, his love upon those whom he did foreknow and purposed to bless them by calling, justifying, and glorifying every last one of them. God **foreknew** Israel; he set his love on them. **"God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew" (Rom. 11:2)**. This **foreknowledge** is expressed in another way in the writings of Moses. **"The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you . . . But because the Lord loved you . . ." (Deu. 7:7-8)**. The idea of the word includes both love and election. God **foreknew** certain persons, that is, he set his electing love upon them.

He uses this same idea in Amos 3:2, **"You only have I KNOWN of all the families of the earth."** Surely, no one would be so bold as to declare that God did not know of those other nations. He most certainly was cognizant of them. He knew of them before he ever made them. He knew of them after he made them. He knew of them before the foundation of the world. He **knew** Israel in a sense that he did not know these other nations. **"YOU ONLY HAVE I KNOWN of all the families of the earth."** He had set his electing love upon that nation and had done that for no other nation. In another place he says, "I did know thee in the wilderness" (Hos. 13:5). He regarded them with

favor and love in the wilderness. This was the outflow of that love which he had set on them when he chose them.

Consider the case of Jeremiah. God said to him, "Before I formed thee in the belly I **KNEW** thee" (Jer. 1:5). Again we have his idea of foreknowledge. If God only **knew** Jeremiah in the same sense that he knows all men, what is the point in this declaration. He regarded him with special favor; He set his electing love upon him. Having done that, he sanctified him, marked him out for holy use, and he ordained him a prophet. In this verse we have the same kind of knowledge that is found in our text—a knowledge, or foreknowledge that goes far beyond mere precognition or Divine omniscience.

Again we see this foreknowledge exhibited in the case of God's love for Jacob. **"For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth . . . it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated" (Rom. 9:10-13)**. There is a sense in which God knew both of these boys. Yet, he set his foreknowledge, his electing love on only one of them, Jacob.

THIS FOREKNOWLEDGE HAS IN IT THE IDEA OF FOREORDINATION

"The word **foreknow** in the text is the same word which in other places is translated foreordain" wrote Dr. Ben Bogard (Baptist World, Nov. 1972). That this is true is seen in the first chapter of Peter's first epistle. In verse two Peter refers to those who are **"elect according to the foreknowledge of God."** He uses the word used by Paul in Rom. 8:29. In verse 20 of the same chapter, Peter says of Christ, **"Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world . . ."** Here he uses the same word as he used in verse two. In Acts 2:23 Peter says of Christ, "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." What God determined in his counsels he has foreordained and that is clearly the way that Peter uses the word here, although the KJ translators chose to use the

word "foreknowledge" rather than "foreordain." Again, Dr. Bogard translated it in our text, "**For whom he foreordained, he also did predestinate . . .**" (Baptist World, Nov., 1972). Commenting on this, Dr. Bogard said, "It is clear that a Christian was saved in God's purpose before the world began" (Ibid.).

THIS VIEW OF FOREKNOWLEDGE IS SUBSTANTIATED BY MOST THEOLOGICAL WRITERS

The view of foreknowledge which I have set forth is the view that is substantiated by most of those who have written on the subject. I will now give a lengthy list of quotes, with their source, so that the readers may see that this idea of foreknowledge is no novelty of Wayne Camp.

David N. Steele and Curtis C. Thomas are Southern Baptist preachers who wrote a short study of the book of Romans. In it they say, "Broadly speaking there have been two general views as to the meaning and use of the word 'foreknow' in Romans 8:29. One class of commentators (the Arminians) maintain that Paul is saying that God predestined to salvation those whom he foreknew would respond to His offer of grace (i. e., those whom He saw would of their own free will repent of their sins and believe the gospel.) Godet, in commenting on Romans 8:29, asks the question: 'In what respect did God thus foreknow them?' and answers that they were 'foreknown as sure to fulfill the conditions of salvation, viz. faith; so: foreknow as his by faith.' The word 'foreknow' is thus understood by Arminians to mean that God knew beforehand which sinners would believe, etc., and on the basis of this knowledge He predestined them unto salvation.

" The other class of commentators reject the above view on two grounds. First, because the Arminians' interpretation is not in keeping with the meaning of Paul's language and second, because it is out of harmony with the system of doctrine taught in the rest of the Scriptures. Calvinists contend that the passage teaches that God set His heart upon (i. e., foreknew) certain individuals; these He predestined or marked out to be saved. Notice that the text does not say that God knew SOMETHING

ABOUT particular individuals (that they would do this or that), but it states that God knew the individuals THEMSELVES--those who were the objects of God's love, He marked out for salvation.

"The questions raised by the two opposing interpretations are these: Did God look down through time and see that certain individuals would believe and thus predestine them unto salvation on the basis of this foreseen faith? Or did God set His heart on certain individuals and because of his love for them predestine that they should be called and given faith in Christ by the Holy Spirit and thus be saved? In other words, is the individual's faith the cause or the result of God's predestination? . . . it is not His knowledge of future events (of what people would do, etc.) which is referred to in Romans 8:29, 30, for Paul clearly states that those whom he foreknew He predestined, He called, He justified, etc. Since all men are not predestined, called, and justified, it follows that all men were not foreknown by God in the sense spoken of in verse 29" (Romans, An Interpretive Outline, p. 131-132).

In commenting on Amos 3:2 (cited above by this editor), Steele and Thomas said, "The Lord knew about all the families of the earth, but He knew Israel in a special way. they were His chosen people whom He had set his heart upon" (Ibid.).

The same authors quote John Murray's argument on the word **foreknew**. He said, "It should be observed that the text says 'whom he foreknew'; whom is the object of the verb and there is no qualifying addition. This, of itself, shows that, unless there is some other compelling reason, the expression 'whom he foreknew' contains within itself the differentiation which is presupposed. If the apostle had in mind some 'qualifying adjunct' it would have been simple to supply it. Since he adds none we are forced to inquire if the actual terms he uses can express the differentiation implied . . . Many times in Scripture 'know' has a pregnant meaning which goes beyond that of mere cognition. It is used in a sense practically synonymous with 'love', to set regard upon, to know with peculiar interest, delight, affection, and action" (The Epistle to the Romans, John

Murray, Vol. I, pp. 316-318). Murray goes on to cite at least 12 passages which prove his point.

In his commentary on Romans Charles Hodge says, "The idea, therefore, obviously is, that those whom God peculiarly loved, and by thus loving, distinguished or selected from the rest of mankind; or to express both ideas in one word, those whom he **elected** he predestined . . . the predestination follows, and is grounded on the foreknowledge. The foreknowledge therefore expresses the act of cognition or recognition, the fixing, so to speak, the mind upon, which involves the idea of selection . . . So God is represented as looking on the fallen mass of men, and fixing on some whom he predestines to salvation. this is the **PROGNOSIS**, the foreknowledge, of which the apostle here speaks. It is the knowing, fixing upon, or selecting those who are to be predestinated to be conformed to the image of the Son of God" (Commentary on Romans, pp. 283-284).

Perhaps it would also be profitable at this time to look at how some of the translations render **foreknow** in our text.

Moffatt's "For he decreed of old that those whom he predestined should share the likeness of his Son."

Goodspeed: "For those whom he had marked out from the first he predestined to be made like his Son."

Wuest: "Because, those whom he foreordained he also marked out beforehand." Amplified New Testament: "For those whom he foreknew, of whom he was aware." On Rom. 11:2 the ANT renders foreknow "set his heart on before hand."

The New English Bible: "For God knew his own before even they were, and also ordained that they should be shaped to the likeness of his Son."

It is obvious that translators saw much more than mere precognition, or prescience in the word **foreknow** as used in our text.

Another has written, "They were foreknown. God fixed His regard on them, noted them with favor, and this favorable regard is the commencement of the whole process of redemption" (St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,

W. H. Griffith Thomas, p. 226).

On our text A. W. Pink wrote, ". . . those whom he 'foreknew' (i. e., loved and elected) he predestinated 'to be conformed'." (Attributes of God, pp. 19-26). Pink had much more to say on the matter but this will show that he held that there was more than mere precognition suggested in the text.

A. T. Robertson is commonly believed to be the greatest Greek scholar to live in the last two hundred years. He is quoted repeatedly by those who define Greek words. Of our word he says, "**Foreknew (PROGENO)**. Second aorist active indicative of PROGINOSKW, old verb as in Acts 26:5. See Psalm 1:6 (LXXX) and Matt. 7:23. This foreknowledge and choice is placed in eternity in Eph. 1:4." (Word Pictures in the New Testament, Vol. IV, p. 377).

CONCLUSION

Much more could be said on this matter. At one time I had approximately 15 typewritten pages of quotes that affirm what has been set forth in this article. Men may wrest this text and try to make it say that which is not there. But, it is eternally settled in heaven and will stand when this world is on fire. I urge you who may have problems with it to read it and re-read it and see if after many readings it does not still say the same thing.

Human reasoning and human wisdom should never be allowed to supplant the pure word of God in our study. I am reminded of a teacher in a Sunday School class once upon a time. He read Ephesians 1:4-5 and said, "If we did not know better, that would sound like unconditional election." He then began to give all kinds of human reasoning to explain that what, in the word of God, sounded like unconditional election could not possibly be that. When he finished his rambling and reasoning, the verses were still there and they still sounded like unconditional election.

The text for this message sounds as if God set his electing love on a people before the foundation of the world and predestined that people to be conformed to the image of his Son. In time he called and justified, and is calling and

justifying those same people. In the future he will glorify every one of them on whom he set his electing love. Rationalize and reason if you will. But, the word of God will still be saying what it is saying when we are glorified. Believe it lest you make God a liar. Rejoice in it for it is deep and blessed refreshment for the heart and mind of those who love God and his Son, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Bouquets and Brickbats

TEXAS: Thanks for the good work you are doing in *The Grace Proclamator and Promulgator*, especially with the articles on Wine, Promise Keepers, and the Scriptural messages on Starting Churches. You're right on target. Enclosed is a small token of our appreciation for the paper, use as needed.

WWW: I look forward to reading more of your material on your WebSite.

OKLAHOMA: Daughter churches . . . Christ

and His church wife having daughters . . . Whatever happened to the "chaste virgin" "espoused" to Christ? Has the "marriage of the Lamb" come and gone and I missed it?

VIRGINIA: Although I am not at all surprised, I am deeply saddened to see that those Baptists who hold to your position on church successionism have now been branded as "apostate Landmarkers" and "liberal Baptists." I look forward to reading your response to this charge.

TEXAS: I continue to appreciate your Grace paper. Keep up the good work.

IOWA: Bro. _____ did an excellent job of misrepresenting what we believe and what you have written. Bro. _____ has a lot more ammunition than Bro. Wilson, even though it is the wrong caliber. Hopefully, this issue can soon be put to bed for awhile; however, I am afraid that many are going to be left with some erroneous ideas.

VIRGINIA: You have been accused of not believing in church succession because you do not subscribe to the formal, link-by-link concept. Most all of the men that you quoted in your earlier articles believed in church succession, but not in the formal, link-by-link idea. This is brought out by _____ and other writers. It seems to me that all Landmarkers believe in an informal, unofficial, link-by-link church succession. Some Landmarkers insist, however, on a formal, official, link-by-link church succession. The term "church perpetuity" is often used in order to make a distinction between the two Landmark positions. Just a few thoughts.

MASSACHUSETTS: I would like to get on the Mailing List to receive *The Grace Proclamator & Promulgator*. God Bless and Keep staying by the stuff!!!

WASHINGTON: _____ told me that you have a newspaper that you send out. I have read some things on your web page and I am always amazed at how much more you open my eyes to the truth and how you and I believe so much alike. I would love to get your newspaper and read it. If possible could you add me to your mailing list, please?

I would really appreciate your sending it to me. I know that you have a lot of wonderful and truthful things to say. Also thank you so much for the articles you sent me for the research I am doing for my book. May God bless and keep you always.

PLANNING TO MOVE? If at all possible, please notify us three weeks in advance of your change of address so that we may keep your paper coming. It costs us 50 cents to get your new address from the Postal Service and that may take long enough that two papers are returned at a cost of \$1.00 before we get the correction. This will mean you miss one or two papers. Your help in saving us this expense will be appreciated.

Postmaster: Please send address changes to:
The Grace Proclamator & Promulgator
3084 Woodrow St
Memphis, TN 38127
(USPS #000476)

Periodical
Postage Paid
Memphis, TN
38101

Second Annual Bible Conference
 Bethel Baptist Church
 2424 Ridgecrest Dr.
 Choctaw, Oklahoma
October 16-18, 1997
 Eld. Royce Smith, Pastor
 For information call (405) 769-6551

ANNUAL BIBLE CONFERENCE
EAST SIDE BAPTIST CHURCH
 311 Fifth Street • Benton, AR 72015
SATURDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1997
 Theme: What God Has Taught Me
 Speakers: Elders Dale Dean, Garfield Foster,
 Carey Smith, Earl Smith, James Watson
 A noon meal will be served
 Eld. Stephen G. Raines, Pastor
 Phone: (501) 776-8537

ANNUAL BIBLE CONFERENCE
RALEIGH SPRINGS BAPTIST CHURCH
 5322 Banbury • Memphis, TN 38135
October 23-26, 1997
 Theme: Evangelism Our Duty
 Eld. Jack Duplechain, Pastor
 Phones: (901) 372-2799, Fax (901) 388-9035
 E-mail: jdup@concentric.net

SEMI-ANNUAL BIBLE CONFERENCE
CALVARY BAPTIST CHURCH
 285 Whiskey Ridge Road • Paris, TN 38242
SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1997
 No special theme
 The church will provide meals for all present
 Eld. Don Shockey, Pastor

Special Services
SINGINGWOOD BAPTIST CHURCH
 16548 Singingwood Lane
 Bristol, Virginia 24202-5110
October 26-31, 1997
 Speaker: Eld Wayne Camp
PASTOR: ELD HENRY HORTON
 Phone: (540) 628-8423