

# Plan of Salvation - Foreknowledge, Predestination, Foreordination

by John Murray

---

*John Murray's sermon explores the intricate relationship between foreknowledge, predestination, and God's sovereign grace in the plan of salvation.*

**Duration:** 46:07

**Topics:** "Salvation"

---

## Description

In this sermon, the speaker emphasizes the importance of understanding the full knowledge and purpose of God. They explain that it is not just about having a surface-level understanding, but rather a deep knowledge that determines existence. The speaker also highlights the significance of scripture in decoding God's eternal purpose. They emphasize that this interpretation is purely exegetical and not based on predestination. The sermon concludes with a prayer for God to supply all our needs according to His grace in Christ Jesus.

---

## Transcript

Let us pray. O Lord, it is from Thee and from Thee alone that all resource comes, that all our strength is divided. And we beseech Thee that Thou wouldst supply all our needs, according to the riches of Thy grace in Christ Jesus.

For His name's sake. Amen. Now where I was dealing with this passage from Romans 8-29, the first question they had in Romans 8-29, or I ignore it, just wait the day for you and back down to the old wine.

And just as a matter of protest, you see, you can just walk out. Romans 8-29, or I ignore it. Yes.

Yes. I have done that last day. Now there are quite a number of pre-visions of prescience.

And of course there are instances in the New Testament where this verb is used in the sense of foresight, prescience, or knowledge in that diluted sense. Acts 26-5. But you see, there must be in this instance some differentiation.

Quite obvious. And so those who believe that Ponginosko here refers to foresight, they have to supply some differentiating adjunct. And so they say that what is implied is God's foresight of faith.

At least very frequently that is stated, whom God foreknew has believed. Or sometimes stated in this way, whom God foresaw as fulfilling the conditions of salvation. Or whom God foreknew as His own.

Try the modified phrase. And of course it is thought therefore on this view that predestination conditioned upon foresight of those who fulfill the conditions of sovereign unconditional predestination is supposed to be eliminated. Predestination, you can see, is conditioned upon God's foresight of faith.

Now it must be, the rejection of this interest is required predestinarian interest. Not required, but it is quite, see, in those who are in no way prejudicial to God or to His sovereignty, to say that He foresaw. Who would envy God's omniscience, His all-comprehending preciousness? Who with any conception of His all-comprehending preciousness would deny His foreknowledge? But this does not in the least degree interfere.

If you adopt this interpretation, does it in the least interfere with God's sovereign differentiation? Because if it means that He foresees faith, that is the meaning that He foresees faith. You must ask the question, whence that faith which He foresees? Whence that faith which He foresees? And according to the teaching of Scripture, faith to God. Faith is exercised according to Scripture by those whom God enables to believe.

I appeal to such passages as John 3, Ephesians 2, 8, John 3, 3 to 6, 44, 45, 65, Ephesians 2, 8, Philippians 1, 29, Peter 1, 2, faith is created by God, it is generated by God. And so, if God foresees faith in His eternal counsel, He foresees what He has determined to generate. He has determined to generate.

And therefore His determination to generate faith is prior to His foresight of faith. Logically, I have determination to generate faith, and since He does not foresee faith in all indiscriminately, it is simply because He has not determined to generate faith in all indiscriminately. People are jealous, people are jealous for the proper interpretation of one particular word.

To be jealous for the proper interpretation of one word, if they are going to be consistent exegetes, they must be equally jealous for the teaching of Scripture with respect to the origin of faith. Why occupy oneself so jealously with the meaning of one particular term in Romans 8, 29? If numerous, I would deal with the origin of faith, that it is due to God's generating grace. And if it is due to God's generating grace, it is due to His sovereign grace.

And since all do not have thrown back inevitably upon God's sovereign differentiation, to hold to that meaning of pro-ignorance, we don't reject it, if we are governed by a predestined need from God's sovereign differentiation, yet again from God's sovereign differentiation, by adopting this deluded meaning of pro-ignorance. I might say that a hundred times. Not a predestined alien interest that we're dealing with here, because a predestined alien interest is not in the least degree common.

The only question is whether this view is exegetically the most tenable. That's the only question. Whether this deluded interpretation of pro-ignorance is the most tenable exegetically.

All issues. Now, my contention is that exegetically it is not tenable. It's not.

We must be in mind that Hathi-hus pro-igno has no qualifying adjunct, has no qualifying addition. It simply stands Hathi-hus pro-igno. And, therefore, we must suppose that the differentiation which belongs to this clause in any case of which all exegetes recognize must be personal.

I say we must assume that this differentiation which is inherent in the clause in any case is inherent in the very words themselves, unless it's inherent in the words themselves, unless compelling reason to think otherwise. We all have in mind a qualifying adjunct. It's very easy for him to supply it, but very readily he'll supply it.

And, therefore, we must assume that the differentiation is inherent in the clause itself, or particularly in the word itself, compelling reason for thinking otherwise. But there is no compelling reason for thinking otherwise when you take into account the usage of Scripture with respect to that term and its Hebrew equivalent, this character in a sense that means much more than intellectual cognition. And there are numerous beginning with Genesis 18 and 19 back to Abraham.

I have no reason to the end that he may never know the age of five. And God looked upon the children of Israel and God knew them. Psalm 16 Knoweth the way of the right Lord.

What is man that thou takest knowledge of him? Jeremiah 1.5 Amos 3.2 You only, referring to Israel, you of all the nations Hosea 13.5 Matthew 7.23 1 Corinthians 8.3 Galatians 4.9 2 Timothy 2.19 1 John 3.1 Together the most outstanding examples, I think, he knew. Now, of course, there's differentiation in the very term. God wouldn't have said to Abraham, I have known, said of Abraham, I have known him.

It was simply intellectual cognition because in the sense of intellectual cognition he knows all equally, indiscriminately. When it is said of Israel that God knew them and looked upon them in their affliction in Egypt and he knew them, he cannot be mere intellectual. Well, just take Amos 3. God ignited all the families of Israel in a differentiated sense.

You only have I known. Jesus said, I know you, you depart from me. Depart from me, ye workers of Israel.

It's differentiation. But it's a real blatant fact that this term denotes differentiation in its very connotation. For it means to set regard upon, to take note of with peculiar interest and affection and is virtually the synonym of our English term love.

Amos 3.2 You only have I known of all the families of the earth. You only have I loved with this peculiar love. An election could say you only have I elected of all the families of the earth.

Going back to the other passages in the Pentateuch which emphasizes that truth that God did not choose Israel because they were greater in number or because they were better than other people but he chose them just because he set his love on them. You have that refrain in the Pentateuch. So when you come to Amos 3.2 You only have I known The meaning is clear.

You only have I elected. Of course they were better than other people but he chose them just because he set his love on them. You have that refrain in the Pentateuch.

So when you come to Amos 3.2 You only have I known The meaning is clear. You only have I elected. For you only have I set this peculiar love.

The meaning is clear. But the whole point is that there is differentiation in the very term. Frequently used in Scripture.

Now why? Because in old school it is simply a compound not very frequently used in the very same Amos 11 in Amos 3.2 that God cast away his people whom he foreknew that God cast away his people whom he

foreloved that God cast away his people whom he had elected it is simply a compound drawing back this knowledge in this case Romans 8.29 to the eternal counsel that's the only difference the meaning of genoso is not in the list it could be interfered with by the prefixing and therefore you come back to Romans 8.29 Why?

This intensive focus is surely the meaning in this case whom God kept his regard upon from eternity whom God looked upon whom God foreloved whom God foreloved Now may I emphasize again that this is simply an exegetical consideration purely exegetical on the basis of Biblical usage and it's not because we have a predestinarian interest that we're after this but purely an exegetical interest for there is a preponderance in favor of the view that the differentiation is in the very clause itself in the very clause in the very term but there is not only this usage there is not only this and therefore it's inherent in the very term but you do have nevertheless the considerations derived from the context in support derived from the namely that in every other link this golden chain in every other

link of this golden chain the herring for knowledge the destination falling the other link of this golden chain falls upon the determinative action of God the determinative predestination in all this in glory to Him in every other instance it's the action of God and of God alone and it is not only the action of God and of God alone but it is a decisively determinative action on the part of God and of God alone God alone predestinates God alone calls and He effectively God alone justifies and He effectively justifies the irrevocable justification God alone glorifies if that same emphasis upon the determinative originative action of God would appear in pro-egno we would expect we wouldn't expect that this emphasis upon the determinative action of God and the effectively determinative action

of God alone would be reduced at this point at the incept that there is in Romans 8.28 Romans 8.28 a notification that we dare not expect any dilution at the point of foreknowledge Romans 8.29 is a summary statement a summary statement of what you have expanded in verses 29 and 30 namely called according to purpose called according to purpose what our attention is directed to in Romans 8.29 is the determinative purpose of God as a pattern after which the calling takes place no word in the whole of scripture and more particularly no word in all in literature emphasizes the determinative purpose of God more than any word prophesies and when it is called according to purpose the action falls upon the utterly determinative purpose of God in accordance with which calling takes place and then

verse 29 verses 29 and 30 are an unfolding of the element an unfolding of the element implicit in belief called according to purpose in verse 28 and foreknowledge and predestination are an unfolding of the element in purpose unfolding of the element embraced in purpose when we dare not give to either of these elements anything that is less determinative and belonging now foresight measure all through what you have here is not foresight but the foreknowledge that makes difference not the foresight that recognizes but the foreknowledge that determines the concept which the usage of scripture demonstrates namely the whole other and distinguishing love other and distinguishing love see this preposition petrified simply to throw it back where according to the context it belongs eternal now

therefore what we call hush potty-hush pro-ignore pie pro-force we also use always to have here the foresight the horizon and predestination unfolding now it is obvious that there is a certain progression of thought to these additional elements and so that we would never have added pie or horizon unless there were implicit in the action denoted additional elements of truth eternal now that if we interpret foreknow we interpret foreknow in this segment electing love there is no longer any distinction between foreknowledge and predestination no longer any distinction you have to adopt a diluted interpretation of foreknow and

additional that is one of the most amazing content with any respectable exegete where the the distinction lies on the very thesis of text use that to my fault

---

Audio: <https://sermonindex1.b-cdn.net/1/SID1281.mp3>

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/john-murray/plan-of-salvation-foreknowledge-predestination-foreordination/>

# *Grow in Your Walk with Christ*

---

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

**[www.sermonindex.net](http://www.sermonindex.net)**