

What Color Are Your Glasses?

by John A. Bonin

It is axiomatic that as we go through our lives, our mental and intellectual state on any particular day is the "sum total" of all the experiences we have had up to that point. Whether rich man, poor man, beggar man, or chief, our values, morals, ethics and opinions are cultivated by our parents, teachers, friends, experiences, books, movies, TV, etc. While some of these values may cause us to be "cubby-holed" by others into Liberal vs. Conservative, Amoral vs. Moral, Atheist vs. Christian, or Arminianism vs. Reformed,¹ this gives us our own particular "slant" on life, on any particular subject to which we have an opinion. Scholars call this slant our "presuppositions." You may not even know you have a particular presupposition, but after you have formed any opinion on a subject, you have your own slant on it. Some of us become quite opinionated. Remember the old expression, "Looking at the world through rose-colored glasses?" Well, in this particular case they may not be "rose" colored, but we all look at the world through our own filtration system; through our own set of glasses.

This is generally true when reading the Bible. Hopefully, the more we read and study, the more knowledge we acquire on the subjects discussed. Accordingly, the more focused (or restricting) the lens on our own rose-colored glasses becomes, as we delve further into God's Word.

This is particularly true on the subject of the *Sovereignty of God vs. the Freewill of Man* when it comes to the gift of "salvation." There are several "schools of thought" on this – most of them taught by those who think they have Biblical support. Most views are taught in

¹ Arminianism, based on the teachings of James Arminius (1560-1609) taught many things differently than did John Calvin – one of the fathers of the Reformation movement. For purposes of this article, Arminianism teaches that man's "free will" has something to do with whether he will accept Christ as Savior, if only that the person uses their intellect to accept salvation over damnation. The Reformed view teaches that the natural man is totally hostile to the things of God ("Never again will I curse the ground because of man, even though every inclination of his heart is evil from childhood." Gen 8:21, "Furthermore, since they did not think it worthwhile to retain the knowledge of God, he gave them over to a depraved mind to do what ought not to be done. They have become filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, greed and depravity. They are full of envy, murder, strife, deceit and malice." Rom 1:28,29; "...the sinful mind is hostile to God." Rom 8:7, Speaking to Christians: "Once you were alienated from God and were enemies in your minds because of your evil behavior." Col 1:21, "Just as Jannes and Jambres opposed Moses, so also these men oppose the truth – men of depraved minds, who as far as the faith is concerned, are rejected." 2 Tim 3:8, and cannot, by his own volition, accept the Salvation of Christ, except that person be "elect" by God to do so. "...and called to be saints." Rom 1:7, "Therefore, as God's chosen people..." Col 3:12, "But we ought always to thank God for you, brothers loved by the Lord, because from the beginning God chose you to be saved, through the sanctifying work of the Spirit and through belief in the truth. He called you to this through our gospel..." 2 Thes 2:13,14, "...to those who have been called, who are loved by God the Father and kept by Jesus Christ." Jude 1:1. For an excellent, concise reference on Arminianism vs. Calvinism, see Dr. Robert Morey, *The Encyclopedia of Practical Christianity*, Scholar's Press, 2003, Chapter 42.

Christian churches, by well-meaning (and in some cases well-educated) individuals. Obviously, those in conflicting views cannot logically be of one accord with Scripture.

We are going to start this brief article with the presupposition that the Word of God, the Holy Bible, is inerrant as it was written thousands of years ago in the original languages.² Since we are going to be discussing specific verses in the New Testament (NT), we are talking about scripture that was originally written in Koine Greek.³ Since we believe Holy Scripture is inerrant, we must also believe that scripture cannot be contradictory. That leaves us with a couple of "guidelines." First, we must apply the same hermeneutical⁴ standards across the NT when it uses certain words. (The reader will see an example of this as we examine certain verses.) Secondly, when we do not understand or agree with something, that does not make the scriptures wrong. The belief in the *inerrancy of Scripture* makes us point the finger back at ourselves for the blame. It must be us not understanding what It is saying - never Scripture at fault! To apply *human understanding* to something inspired by the eternal God of the universe, "something has to (occasionally) give." That something has to be us.⁵ There are times when it seems that scripture is contradicting itself. May it never be! A contradiction is a "mistake." Since "All scripture is inspired by God" (2 Tim 3:16), He is perfect (Mat. 5:48), His work is perfect (Dt 32:4), and God cannot make a mistake,⁶ then the misunderstanding has to be within our finite minds

² The fact that there are miniscule, insignificant, differences between different modern translations is beyond the scope of this article. There is nothing in the Bible inconsistent with the claim that it is the inerrant Word of God. The inscripturated words are just as truly God's authoritative words as though He had dictated them. Dr. Gleason L Archer, *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*, Zondervan 1982, pg 7.

³ Koine Greek was the language of the common man during the first century. It was similar to the international use of the English language in the 21st century, as it was spoken universally.

⁴ Hermeneutics: (Greek *hermeneutike*, "interpretation"). The rules one uses for searching out the meaning of writings, particularly Biblical texts. Hermeneutics is an effort to filter out inconsistent and biased interpretation. Since the Bible is not unique in its literary forms (using prose, poetry, historical narrative, letters, dialogue, figures of speech, allegory, etc) our hermeneutics should not be unique only to Scripture.

⁵ Humanism: has always deified some aspect of human nature (or human reason) and turned it into the origin of truth, morals, justice and beauty. Three general philosophical views have developed from humanism's commitment to the idea that "man is the measure of all things.

Rationalists: claim that human reason is the basis and judge of truth.

Empiricists: (From Greek *empeirkos*, Latin *empiricus*, "experienced.") That which can be known through sense perception or experience. Philosophical view that truth is obtained through experience. Classical empiricism considers data as derived from the five senses.

Mystics: look within themselves and claim that their emotions can tell them right from wrong, truth from error.

Dr. Robert Morey, [The Encyclopedia of Practical Christianity](#), Scholar's Press, 2003, pg 245.

⁶ Another presupposition, based on the teaching in scripture that the Biblical God is Infinite, Omniscient, Omnipotent, Omnipresent, Transcendent (over time) and Sovereign. Therefore, He is incapable of error. While our puny, finite minds may see something as ostensibly a mistake, it is impossible for God to make a mistake because of the attributes listed above. (As expanded in his excellent book on the subject [[The Nature and Extent of God's Knowledge](#), Christian Scholars Press, 2002], Dr. Robert Morey points out that if you remove just one of the above listed attributes of God, He is no longer God.)

(and/or perhaps those who are teaching us.) A contradiction violates the laws of logic. The logical law of contradiction says that a thing cannot be what it is and not be what it is at the same time and in the same relationship. There are other times when something said in scripture is difficult to understand — like a paradox. This is an apparent contradiction, but you are eventually able to resolve it. This means you should be able to make sense of it, if you examine the big picture (context, culture, etc.) and then narrow it down to the specific verse, keeping in mind that a scripture can have many applications, but only one interpretation. (2 Pet 1:20).

We covered contradiction and paradox. Last comes "mystery." The term mystery refers to that which we do not understand. The Trinity, for example, is a mystery. As one scholar said, I cannot penetrate the mystery of the Trinity or the incarnation of Christ with my feeble mind....I know that Jesus was one person with two natures but I don't understand how that can be."⁷

The subject of the Sovereignty of God vs. the Free-Will of Man, as it relates to salvation, is seen by many Christians as contradictory. Since they know in their hearts that the Word of God cannot contradict itself, many start bending the rules of logic by coming up with theories of "middle knowledge"⁸ or Arminianism to adjust the answer to conform with their own presuppositions – that man has something to do with the process of salvation. (This faulted teaching has been going on for centuries.) A typical reaction by many Christians when they first hear about the "election" taught in scripture is, "That's not fair!", or "That does not seem right that God would do that!" Remember, just because we do not understand a teaching, or even "like" it, does not mean that it is not true. Most of the doctrines of Scripture are very hard on the emotions of man.⁹

In reading these verses, make sure you have your exegesis turned on and your proclivity for eisegesis turned off.¹⁰

This article will assert that, as difficult as it is for human reason to accept, the human *will* has nothing to do with the process of being saved. God does the choosing. The purpose herein is to point-out several verses in scripture, and show how faulty presuppositions (just like faulty logic) can cause the reader to arrive at incorrect conclusions concerning this underlying teaching. (If you are a Christian who thinks you had anything to

⁷ Dr. RC Sproul, Chosen By God, Tyndale House, 1986, pg 46.

⁸ Middle-knowledge. A concept developed by the Jesuit Luis deMolina (1535-1600). deMolina taught that God knew how each person would cooperate (or not) with grace, and determined His elect by looking into the future to see the decisions of each person. In other words, God reacts according to the decisions of mankind. This, of course, reduces God from His position as Sovereign over the universe, and makes Him subordinate to human decisions.

⁹ Dr. Robert Morey, The Encyclopedia of Practical Christianity, Scholar's Press, 2003, pg 223.

¹⁰ Exegesis: (Greek *exegesis*, Interpretation," from *exegeisthai*, "to draw out or to explain.") The act of interpreting or explaining the meanings of verses or passages of Scripture. Eisegesis: Reading meanings "into" a biblical text, as opposed to "out of a biblical text (exegesis). We should always avoid reading into a verse from our preconceived opinions.

do with your salvation – whether it was the act of baptism, or even just the seemingly insignificant mental assent to say "yes," then sit back and re-think what Holy Scripture has to say about that.)

One of the first verses a person on the other side of this presupposition will point to is John 3:16. "*For God so loved the world.*" The word world in the NT never means every human being who has ever lived, is living now and will live in the future. It also refers to the Roman Empire (Luke 2:1), the Gentiles (Romans 11:11-12), the evil world system (1 John 2:15), or to culture in general.

When John says, "the whole world lies in the power of the Evil One," he clearly excludes Christians from being part of that "whole world." In contrast he says, "We know that we are of God but the whole world lies in the power of the Evil One." (1 John 5:19.) Obviously, the phrase "whole world" in Luke 2:1 does not mean that Caesar taxed every human being who ever lived, (is living now and will live in the future.) Neither does 1 John 2:2 refer to every human being who has ever lived, is living now or will live in the future. The word "world" in 1 John 2:15 does not refer to "humanity." In John 3:16 the word is being used to refer to the world as a unit, though sin laden, exposed to the judgment, and in need of salvation, is still the object of His care. The term, by reason of the context and other passages in which a similar thought is expressed, indicates fallen mankind in its international aspect: men from every tribe and nation; not only Jews but also Gentiles. This is in harmony with the thought expressed repeatedly in the Fourth Gospel, to the effect that physical ancestry has nothing to do with entrance into the kingdom of heaven.¹¹

Highly esteemed Christian scholar Gleason Archer says, "...John 3:16 uses "world" (Gr. *Kosmos*, *Lexical form*) in the sense of **all the human race**, as objects of God's concern and redeeming love; but in 1 John 2:15 ("Love not the world") "world" is used in the sense of the organized system of rebellion, self-seeking and enmity toward God, which characterizes the **human race** in opposition to God."¹² (Emphasis added.)

Another verse that is often misunderstood is 2 Peter 3:9. "...longsuffering toward us, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." "Us" is the saved, the people of God. He waits for them to be saved. God has an immense capacity for patience before He breaks forth in judgment (cf v. 15; Joel 2:13; Luke 15:20; Rom. 9:22). God endures endless blasphemies against His name, along with rebellion, murders, and the ongoing breaking of His law, waiting patiently while He is calling and redeeming His own. It is not impotence or slackness that delays final judgment; it is patience, not willing that any should perish. The "any" must (logically) refer to those whom the Lord has chosen and will

¹¹ William Hendriksen, *New Testament Commentary, Exposition of the Gospel According to John*, Baker Book House, 18th printing 2002, pg 140.

¹² Dr. Gleason L. Archer, *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*, Zondervan 1982, pg 65.

call to complete the redeemed, i.e., the "us." Since the whole passage is about God destroying the wicked, His patience is not so He can save all of them, but so that He can receive all His own. He can't be waiting for everyone to be saved, since the emphasis is that He will destroy the world and the ungodly.

Those who do perish and go to hell, go because they are depraved and worthy only of hell and have rejected the only remedy, Jesus Christ, not because they were created for hell and predetermined to go there. The path to damnation is the path of a non-repentant heart; it is the path of one who rejects the person and provision of Jesus Christ and holds on to sin (cf. Matt, 11:28; 13:37; Luke 13:3; John 3:16; 8:21,24). All should come to repentance. "All" (cf "us," "any") must refer to all who are God's people who will come to Christ to make up the full number of the people of God. Again, the reason for the delay in Christ's coming and the attendant judgments is not because He is slow to keep His promise, or because He wants to judge more of the wicked, or because He is impotent in the face of wickedness. He delays His coming because He is patient and desires the time for His people to repent.¹³

"All men" is often misunderstood in 1 Tim 2:4,6. 2:4 "...who desires all men to be saved." The Gr. word for "desires" is not that which normally expresses God's will of decree (His eternal purpose), but rather God's will of desire. There is a distinction between God's desire and His eternal saving purpose, which must transcend His desires. God does not want men to sin. He hates sin with all His being (Ps. 5:4; 45:7); thus, He hates its consequences - eternal wickedness in hell. God does not want people to remain wicked forever in eternal remorse and hatred of Himself. Yet God, for His own glory, and to manifest that glory in wrath, chose to endure "vessels ... prepared for destruction" for the supreme fulfillment of His will (Rom. 9:22). In His eternal purpose, He chose only the elect out of the world (I John 17:6) and passed over the rest leaving them to the consequences of their sin, unbelief, and rejection of Christ. Ultimately God's choices are determined by His sovereign, eternal purpose, not His desires.¹⁴

2:6 "...who gave Himself a ransom for all,..." This should be taken in two senses: 1) there are temporal benefits of the atonement that accrue to all men universally, and 2) Christ's death was sufficient to cover the sins of all people. Yet the substitutionary aspect of His death is applied to the elect alone. Christ's death is therefore unlimited in its sufficiency, but limited in its application. Because Christ's expiation of sin is indivisible, inexhaustible, and sufficient to cover the guilt of all the sins that will ever be committed, God can clearly offer it to all, Yet only the elect will respond and be saved, according to His eternal purpose in due time. At the proper time in God's redemptive plan.¹⁵ (Emphasis added.)

¹³ The MacArthur Study Bible, Word Publishing, 1997, pg. 1959.

¹⁴ *ibid.* pg. 1863.

¹⁵ *ibid.* pg. 1863.

In Heb 2:9, "everyone" is often misunderstood. "...*might taste death for everyone*" - everyone who believes, that is. The death of Christ can only be applied in its efficacy to those who come to God repentantly in faith, asking for saving grace and forgiveness of sins.¹⁶

Reading 1 John 2:2, we find "...*And He Himself is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the whole world.*" Here we go again with the word "world." This is a generic term, referring not to every single individual, but to mankind in general.

Christ actually paid the penalty only for those who would repent and believe. A number of scriptures indicate that Christ died for the world (John 1:29, 3:16, 6:51; 1 Tim 2:6; Heb 2:9). Most of the world will be eternally condemned to hell to pay for their own sins, so they could not have been paid for by Christ. The passages which speak of Christ dying for the whole world must be understood to refer to mankind in general (as in Titus 2:3-4. That is the only logical way we can reconcile this issue without conceding to "contradiction" between various scriptures. Since contradiction is never an option, we have no other choice in this interpretation.) "World" indicates the sphere, the beings toward whom God seeks reconciliation and has provided propitiation. God has mitigated His wrath on sinners temporarily, but letting them live and enjoy earthly life. In that sense, Christ has provided a brief, temporal propitiation for the whole world. But He actually satisfied fully the wrath of God eternally only for the elect who believe. Christ's death in itself has unlimited and infinite value because He is Holy God. Thus His sacrifice was sufficient to pay the penalty for all the sins of all whom God brings to faith. But the actual satisfaction and atonement was made only for those who believe. The pardon for sin is offered to the whole world, but received only by those who believe. There is no other way to be reconciled to God."¹⁷ Only the elect are the ones who will respond to the call of God to be saved. The rest of the world thinks the things of God are nonsense. ("For the word of the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God." 1 Cor 1:18; "But we preach Christ crucified, to Jews a stumbling block and to Gentiles foolishness." 1 Cor 1:23; "For the natural man does not accept the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually appraised." 1 Cor 2:14, emphasis added).

To those who have been taught that the "elect" are decided by God on the basis of His ability to look into our futures, determine if we would have responded positively to the Gospel message when we heard it, and then made us elect on that basis, let's turn to 2 Tim 1:9, where it plainly says that is incorrect. "...*who has saved us and called us to a holy life – not because of anything we have done, but because of his own purpose and grace. This grace was given us in Christ Jesus before the beginning of time, but it has now been revealed through the appearing of our Savior Christ Jesus, who has destroyed death and has brought life and immortality to*

¹⁶ *ibid*, pg. 1899.

¹⁷ *Ibid*, pg. 1965.

light through the gospel.” (Emphasis added.)

The famous theologian, John Calvin, hundreds of years ago, said quite succinctly when he wrote in his commentary of Timothy, " He describes the source both of our calling and of the whole of our salvation. We had no works by which we could anticipate God; but the whole depends on his gracious purpose and election; for in the two words *purpose* and *grace* there is the figure of speech called *Hypallage*, (a figure of speech, by which the parts of a proposition seem to be interchanged) and the latter must have the force of an objection, as if he had said, - "according to his gracious purpose." Although Paul commonly employs the word "purpose" to denote the secret decree of God, the cause of which is in his own power, yet, for the sake of fuller explanation, he chose to add "grace," that he might more clearly exclude all reference to works. And the very contrast proclaims loudly enough that there is no room for works where the grace of God reigns, by which he was beforehand with us, when we had not yet been born. As for the "grace was given us" from the order of time, he argues that, by free grace, salvation was given to us which we did not at all deserve; for, if God chose us before the creation of the world, he could not have regard to works, of which we had none, seeing that we did not then exist. As to the cavil of the sophists, that God was moved by the works which he foresaw, it does not need a long refutation. What kind of works would those have been if God had passed us by, seeing that the election itself is the source and beginning of all good works?"¹⁸

Again, some uninformed opinions would say of Eph 1:4,6, "For he chose us in him before the creation of the world to be holy and blameless in his sight. In love he predestined us to be adopted as his sons, through Jesus Christ in accordance with his pleasure and will – to the praise of his glorious grace, which he has freely given us in the One he loves," that God looked ahead to see who would choose Him! Outrageous. John Calvin said, "How childish is the attempt to meet this argument by the following sophism! We were chosen because we were worthy, and because God foresaw that we would be worthy." We were all lost in Adam; and therefore, had not God, through his own election, rescued us from perishing, there was nothing to be foreseen! The same argument is used in the Epistle to the Romans, where, speaking of Jacob and Esau, he says, "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 because of him that calls." (Rom 9:11) But they had not yet acted, might a sophist of the Sorbonne reply, God foresaw that they would act. This objection has no force when applied to the depraved natures of men, in whom nothing can be seen but materials for destruction. ¹⁹

Also, in relation to the assertion that we are elected because God looked into the future and observed us choose Him, I have the following points:

¹⁸ John Calvin, Calvin's Commentaries, Volume XXI, Reprinted 2003 Baker Books, Commentaries on Timothy, pg. 195.

¹⁹ *ibid*, Commentaries on Ephesians, pg. 199.

- 1) By saying this, you have flipped the meaning of "God's chosen" and turned it into "self chosen". In other words, you are electing yourself. Therefore, the phrase "God has chosen" is rendered impotent by your interpretation.
- 2) It ignores what the Bible says about the depravity or the inability of man (John 6:37-44, 65 Romans 8:6-8 just to name a few) to turn to God on his own. In other words, to say that we can choose God without regeneration is exactly the same as saying that Lazarus helped raise himself out of death and back to life. And,
- 3) The Greek word that is used in Romans 8:29,30 is not the noun "*prognosis*" which is foreknowledge in the noun form. It is in fact "*proginosko*" in the verb form. In other words, God is not just simply looking ahead of time, but rather, he is predetermining intimately and personally ahead of time.

Most Christians are very familiar with Romans 8:28, "*And we know that all things work together for good to those who love God, to those who are the called according to His purpose,*" as is remembered most often when things are not going as we hope for in life. However, most focus on the words "*work together for good to those who love God,*" while skipping right over a very pertinent decree where it says "*who are called according to His purpose.*" (Emphasis added.) If we keep reading into verse 29, we read "*For whom He foreknew, He also predestined...*". There is that word again. Predestined. This is "not a reference simply to God's omniscience – that in eternity past He knew who would come to Christ. Rather, it speaks of a predetermined choice to set His love on us and establish an intimate relationship – or His election. This is an inviolable rule of Greek grammar, called the Granville Sharp rule. It equates "predestined" and "foreknowledge". The term must be interpreted the same in both verses.²⁰

It was at about this point in a rough-draft of this article that a friend of mine (who graduated from Talbot Theological seminary) wrote to me and said, "John, regarding your proposition...your approach is a black or white one; "Sovereignty of God vs. the Free-Will of Man." Is it possible that there is no conflict between the two, i.e. it might be "Sovereignty of God and the Free-Will of Man?" Cannot the two live in harmony with one another? Why does it have to be one versus the other? Is it possible for our Sovereign God to grant to humankind Free-Will of choice so that His human created beings would not be puppets or zombies acting without their own will and choices?" Yes, Bob, that is exactly correct according to Scripture. That is the other side of the equation. It was never *Sovereign God vs. Free Will of Man*. Never one or the other, as so many try to make it. The answer taught in Scripture is "yes," it is both.

The call to salvation goes out to all men, but without the intervention of God (to His elect) no one (not even one) would respond. ("But a

²⁰ The MacArthur Study Bible, Word Publishing, 1997, pg. 1709.

natural man does not accept the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually appraised." 1 Cor 2:14.)

In his excellent book on the Atonement (where he shows a unique, 3-dimensional view of the process of our Union with Christ) Dr. Robert Morey speaks of "the Gospel Call," and "the Effectual Call" of God.²¹ The Gospel Call is the universal call to all men to repent and be saved. (Matt 20:16; 28:19, 20' Mk 16:15,16.) The Effectual Call is God's call to His elect. This is expanded in Mat 22:14; John 6:37-44,65; Rom 8:28-30; 1 Cor 1:24-26; 1 Pet 2:9; 2 Pet 1:10; Rev 17:14.)

The Effectual Call is just as the word "effectual" defines – it has effect. It is of efficacy because God has chosen those particular sinners to repent. These are those that Christ spoke of in John 17:9b "I do not ask on behalf of the world, but of those whom you have given me."

"We must accept human responsibility along with God's sovereignty because both are taught in God's Word. Faith is a gift of the sovereign God while at the same time all men will be held responsible for the duty of believing although they are spiritually unable of saving faith..... The Gospel Call goes forth to all men in general (Acts 17:30) and is urged upon every individual sinner." (Mark 16:15 or Acts 16:31).²²

As we discussed earlier, some things in Scripture are so high above our ability to comprehend that we can never really understand them. The Bible teaches that God is one God in three persons. That (a subject of which many scholastic volumes have been written) is stated so many times in Holy Scripture that the person with an honest heart cannot deny the doctrine. Obviously, there are those who insist they must understand everything with their human minds, or they cannot accept it. (We categorized this earlier in the footnotes as a type of "rationalistic humanism".) The belief that God chose His elect, before the foundation of time, with absolutely no consideration for anything (deed, choice, etc) that elect person did, is plainly revealed in Scripture. To deny that based on the premise that you do not understand it with your human mind is a posture of humanism, rather than *sola scriptura*²³ You must decide, are you going to base your beliefs on your feelings, intellect, personal experiences, or on scripture?

This article is copyright 2004 by John A. Bonin. This article may be quoted, in part or in whole, without permission.

²¹ Dr. Robert Morey, *Studies In The Atonement*, Christian Scholars Press, 1989, pg. 104.

²² *ibid.* page 150.

²³ Latin, "Scripture alone." A slogan of the Protestant Reformation indicating that the church's authority is only the Holy Scriptures and not ecclesiastical traditions or human opinions. This was called the "formal principle" of the Reformation.

You may contact the author through: <http://www.christianfallacies.com/contact.php>

Scriptures Referenced In This Article:

Gen 8:21

Dt 32:4

Joel 2:13

Mat 5:48; 11:28; 13:37

Luke 2:1; 13:3; 15:20

John 1:29; 3:16; 6:51; 8:21,24

Rom 1:7; 1:28,29; 8:7; 8:28,29; 9:11,22; 11;11-12

1 Cor 1:18; 1:23; 2:14

Eph 1:4,6

Col 1:21 3:12

2 Thes 2:13,14

1 Tim 2:4,6

2 Tim 1:9; 3:8,16

Titus 2:3-4

Heb 2:9

2 Peter 1:20; 3:9

1 John 2:2,15; 5:19; 17:6

Jude 1:1

Partial Listing of Verses in the New Testament that Teach "Election" and "Predestination," based on these *keywords*:

Foundation of the world: Eph 1:4; Heb 4:3; Heb 9:26; 1 Pet 1:20; Rev 13:8; Rev 17:8

Foreknew: Rom 8:29; Rom 11:2

Predestined: Act 4:28; Rom 8:29, 30; 1 Cor 2:7; Eph 1:5; 1:11

Elect: Mt 24:22, 24, 31; Mk 13:20,22,27; Lk 18:7; Rom 8:33 Jn 15:16, 19;

Chose: Act 13:7; Eph 1:4

Chosen: Mt 22:14; Lk 12:32; Jn 13:18; Act 10:41; Rom 11:7 Col 3:12;
2Th 2:13; 2 Tim 2:10; Tit:1:1; 1 Pet 1:1; Rev 17:14