
The name has been redacted in this document (heading changed to "Calvinist", name changed to "xyz"), the spelling corrected, and multiple posts of the same sentence have been combined. An unedited version remains in my possession.

-
- Conversation started September 11

9/11, 3:52pm

Calvinist

If you ever need to chat let me know

-
- September 12

9/12, 10:35am

Calvinist

Rom 12:16 16 Be of the same mind toward one another. Do not set your mind on high things, but associate with the humble. Do not be wise in your own opinion. (NKJV)

-
- September 12

9/12, 3:26pm

Calvinist

I was looking into some of the questions about if God can lie/deceive- If that is true how do you deal with passages like Titus 1:2? Proverbs 30:5.... Pure here means true... I Sam 15:29, Hebrews 6:18.



9/12, 5:35pm

Chris Fisher

Xyz, I am not sure if you understand my position on the matter. One of the primary utterances in the Old Testament about God is his faithfulness. Here is Walter Brueggemann in his Theology of the Old Testament:

"Israel's characteristic adjectival vocabulary about Yahweh is completely lacking in terms that have dominated classical theology, such as omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent. This sharp contrast suggested that classical theology, insofar as it is dominated by such interpretive categories and such concerns, is engaged in issues that are not crucial for Israel's testimony about Yahweh and are in fact quite remote from Israel's primary utterance..."

...given the range of recital of adjectives concerning Yahweh in the stylized testimony of Israel, the primary propensity of Israel is to focus on Yahweh's fidelity..."

Israel praises God for being true and faithful. Just their praise for this is evidence that God is not forced to be so. You do not praise a robot for cleaning the floor; the robot had no choice in the matter. Because God is faithful and true, we should praise him for being so.

In 194, Corrie Ten Boom hid Jews from the Nazis. She then lied to the Nazi's concerning this action. Does this make Corrie Ten Boom "faithful" or "unfaithful"? Does this make her "true" or "untrue"? She is definitely true and faithful to the Jews she hid, even though she is lying to the Nazis.

God does the same. God tells us about lying to his enemies. He tells us that He first lies to our enemies and then kills them:

Eze 14:9 And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the LORD have deceived that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel.

In 1 Kings 22, we see this in action where God lies to 400 false prophets at once:

1Ki 22:23 Therefore look! The LORD has put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these prophets of yours, and the LORD has declared disaster against you."

So is God truth, true, and faithful? Yes. Does God lie to his enemies? The Bible says so.

• September 12

9/12, 10:59pm

Calvinist

I believe I understand what you are struggling with doctrinally and I have done some research myself on this issue.

I will add a snippet from an article I was reading..

The prophesy is 'against' Ahab, a particularly evil king of the Northern Kingdom of Israel. He typically gathered false prophets around him (as "Yes" men) and complained about the prophet Micaiah (who uttered the above) that he only 'spoke bad things about him' so Ahab did not consult with him much! (1 Kgs 22.8,18)

2. As we have seen in the later case of Jeremiah and Ezek, this pattern of the rulers only listening to 'politically acceptable' prophets started early. (Remember the "IMPORTANT POINT A" above?) Compare the case of the prophet Isaiah, chronologically between Micaiah and Jeremiah, in 30.10ff: " They say to the seers, "See no more visions!" and to the prophets, "Give us no more visions of what is right! Tell us pleasant things, prophesy illusions. Leave this way, get off this path, and stop confronting us with the Holy One of Israel!"

3. God had already judged Ahab and decreed his death in 21.19, for , among other things, the innocent death of Naboth (22.1-19).

4. The sending of the 'lying spirits' is to EVENTUATE Ahab's judgment (22.20).

5. The actual word for 'entice' is the 'seduce' word we saw in Jeremiah. God asks who will 'seduce/overpower' Ahab in going to his death (no mention of 'deception' yet). A spirit volunteers to be a 'lying spirit' and God grants permission, with a "go and do it". Seduction DOES NOT necessarily include

deception. There were OTHER forms of the verb, and other words that could have brought that meaning out--if so intended, but they are not used in this passage.

6. This 'putting of the lying spirit' is called part of a 'disaster decree (judgment)' in 22.23.

This is a clear case of 'confusion' or false decisions AS A JUDGMENT.

Important Point B (again): In this passage it is even MORE obvious than in the cases of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Notice that this passage 20-23 is BEING GIVEN face to face to AHAB! Micaiah, in the presence of the other prophets and even the king of the Southern Kingdom, is describing this vision IN DETAIL to AHAB! Ahab has every opportunity to reject the lying spirits and accept the true message from YAHWEH! Kaiser makes this point clearly (HSOT:120f): "This principle is further confirmed when we note that the passage in question is a vision that Micaiah reveals to Ahab. God is telling Ahab, 'Wise up. I am allowing your prophets to lie to you.'" In a sense, God is revealing further truth to Ahab rather than lying to him. If God were truly trying to entrap Ahab into a life-threatening situation, he would not have revealed the plan to Ahab! Even so, Ahab refuses to heed God's truth and follows his prophets' advice anyway." Notice that this same dynamic of "if God were REALLY trying to deceive, why would he TELL the people?!" is operative in ALL of the OTHER CASES we have seen!

•

9/12, 11:03pm

Calvinist

Here is the full article. I just realized the part I posted needs the rest of the article to make sense.

•

9/12, 11:03pm

Calvinist

Dear Friend,

Looks like one of your friends has gotten all tied up in this matter, much like a kitten in a ball of string! Let's see if we can work through this and help him see the way this stuff all fits together (but be aware, that there is a responsibility hiding in there, too!)..

The way I would like to approach this is to simply go thru his verses and points, make any relevant comments about the passages/background, and then try to 'put it all together' at the end... -----

Your friend begins...

POINT ONE: Does God lie?

•PR 30:5 Every word of God proves true.

•PR 30:5 - "Every word of God is flawless; he is a shield to those who take refuge in him.

So far, not bad...but there are MUCH stronger verses about God's truthfulness than these two:

• I Sam 15.29: He who is the Glory of Israel does not lie...

• Heb 6.18: God did this so that, by two unchangeable things in which it is impossible for God to lie, we who have fled to take hold of the hope offered to us may be greatly encouraged.

- Titus 1.2: a faith and knowledge resting on the hope of eternal life, which God, who does not lie, promised before the beginning of time,

But the point is fairly obvious anyway...your friend's point is more that the SCRIPTURE doesn't lie--and in this he is correct. The scripture is a faithful and true record. In it, of course, are 'faithful and true records' of human lies, depravity, human sacrifice, betrayal, rape, incest, etc...

For example, when the bible records the falsehood of Ananias and his wife Sapphira (in Acts 5), it does NOT LIE--it reports it truthfully.

POINT TWO: JE 4:10, JE 20:7, EZ 14:9 God deceives some of the prophets

- JE 4:10 - Then I said, "Ah, Sovereign LORD, how completely you have deceived this people and Jerusalem by saying, 'You will have peace,' when the sword is at our throats."
- JE 20:7 - O LORD, you deceived me, and I was deceived you overpowered me and prevailed. I am ridiculed all day long; everyone mocks me.

The above two verses actually don't affirm that God 'deceives' people; they are simply complaints from Jeremiah to God in moments of deep bitterness. These two specific passages are generally considered to be semi-emotional outbursts at God, similar to those given by other leaders in Israel's intellectual history--e.g. Moses in Ex 5.22; Num 11.11 or Job in 27.1; 30.20ff.

So W. C. Kaiser (HSOT:121): "The strong statements of Jeremiah in 4.10 and 20.7 are merely complaints of the prophet who had mistaken the promise of God's presence for the insurance that no evil or derision would come on him or his ministry. However, these verses cannot be cited as the basis for giving any credence to the charge that God is deceptive."

The 4.10 passage is uttered from Jeremiah's OWN sense of impending doom ('at OUR throats') as being himself a resident of the stubborn and about-to-be-exiled Jerusalem. OT scholars consider this to be one in a string of such 'complaints.' So J. A. Thompson (NICOT: in loc.): "Rather we must see in such an utterance not so much a considered judgment, but the spontaneous reaction of a man who felt deeply about the tragedies of life, whether his own or those of others. The same tendency recurs in Jeremiah's later outpourings of soul before God."

The 20.7 passage illustrates Kaiser's point above very well. Notice a few things about the passage and its context:

1. In Jeremiah 1.6-8, the LORD has called Jeremiah to his prophetic ministry: "Ah, Sovereign LORD," I said, "I do not know how to speak; I am only a child." But the LORD said to me, "Do not say, 'I am only a child.' You must go to everyone I send you to and say whatever I command you. Do not be afraid of them, for I am with you and will rescue you," declares the LORD." Notice that Jeremiah had an expectation of 'rescue' even though God elsewhere told him that there would be difficulties (1.18).
2. Our passage in 20.7 uses a special form of the verb (Piel of pth) that is slightly different than 'deceive' but MUCH stronger than 'persuade'--it is the form used for 'seduce' in Ex 22.16.
3. The second verb in 20.7, 'overpowered' is the word "hazaq" which is ALSO used of seduction in the OT (Deut 22.25; 2 Sam 13.11, 14).
4. But Jeremiah notes bitterly, that the 'rescue' is missing...in the 20.7ff text, he complains of how he is ridiculed and derided by the people.
- 5.. He has accused God elsewhere of being a 'deceitful brook': Cf. 15.18: " Why is my pain unending and my wound grievous and incurable? Will you be to me like a deceptive brook, like a spring that fails?" It is obvious here that 'deceitful' means 'doesn't yield the expected results'. In other words, God convinced him to become a prophet, with promises of rescue, but no 'rescue' has been forthcoming! So J.A.

Thompson: "Evidently he had thought that the word of Yahweh would lead the people to repentance. It was a shock to him that his message brought only calumny and abuse." (NICOT, in. loc.)

6. A good summary of this verse is afforded by Feinberg in EBC: "The verb 'deceived' is so bold and offensive to religious sensibilities that some have tried to soften it by translating it 'persuaded' or 'enticed' so that the verse does not seem to verge on blasphemy. In its intensive form (as here), the verb 'patah' means 'to seduce,' as a virgin is seduced (cf. Exod 22.16; I Kings 22.20-22). To be sure, Jeremiah is not accusing God of lying or misrepresentation; but what he calls seduction is the divine compulsion on his spirit. He is claiming that the Lord overpersuaded him to be a prophet. He pleads that, though the Lord overcame his resistance to the call (1.4-10) and he believed the Lord's promises, he has now been abandoned to shame."

Important Point A: Notice also that the rulers were not really interested in TRUE messages from God--they WANTED 'lies'. Their prophets did falsehood and they "LOVED it that way" (5.31). The rulers actually told Jeremiah to NOT speak in the name of Yahweh(11.21)! They told the people to 'pay no attention to him' (18.18). When he did prophesy, instead of paying attention to something that just MIGHT BE TRUE, instead they had Jeremiah beaten (20.1) and tried to execute him (26.7). This is the book that has the famous scene (chpt 36) when the king burns the prophecies of Jeremiah AS HE READS THEM! These rulers were not interested in truth AT ALL--they wanted and LOVED the lies of the false prophets.

Important Point B: Notice also that the rulers STILL HAD A CHOICE. By the very fact that Jeremiah was ALERTING them to the false prophets, they STILL were confronted with BOTH SIDES! God did NOT just leave them to the 'lies'--He stayed in there and witnessed to truth TO THEM to the end.

- EZ 14:9 - "And if the prophet is enticed to utter a prophecy, I the LORD have enticed that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand against him and destroy him from among my people Israel.

Now this passage is closer to what your friend is trying to get at--although there is a BETTER passage which I will bring up in a moment..So, let's look at the context of this text (Ezek 14:1-11):

Some of the elders of Israel came to me and sat down in front of me. 2 Then the word of the LORD came to me: 3 "Son of man, these men have set up idols in their hearts and put wicked stumbling blocks before their faces. Should I let them inquire of me at all? 4 Therefore speak to them and tell them, 'This is what the Sovereign LORD says: When any Israelite sets up idols in his heart and puts a wicked stumbling block before his face and then goes to a prophet, I the LORD will answer him myself in keeping with his great idolatry. 5 I will do this to recapture the hearts of the people of Israel, who have all deserted me for their idols.'

"Therefore say to the house of Israel, 'This is what the Sovereign LORD says: Repent! Turn from your idols and renounce all your detestable practices!

"When any Israelite or any alien living in Israel separates himself from me and sets up idols in his heart and puts a wicked stumbling block before his face and then goes to a prophet to inquire of me, I the LORD will answer him myself. 8 I will set my face against that man and make him an example and a byword. I will cut him off from my people. Then you will know that I am the LORD.

"And if the prophet is enticed to utter a prophecy, I the LORD have enticed that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand against him and destroy him from among my people Israel. 10 They will bear their guilt -- the prophet will be as guilty as the one who consults him. 11 Then the people of Israel will no longer stray from me, nor will they defile themselves anymore with all their sins. They will be my people, and I will be their God, declares the Sovereign LORD."

Notice a couple of things about the passage in its entirety:

1. Verse 5 says that God will answer the idolater "in keeping with his great idolatry." (The punishment will fit/match the crime.)

2. One answer is that the people will be 'cut off' (v8) if they seek a message from the false prophet, and that they will become an 'example and a byword' (this latter phrase is a punishment clause in Deut 28.37, specified for radical rejection of the covenant agreement made between God and Israel as they entered Canaan.)

3. Some false prophets God would stimulate to speak, apparently so that God could judge them as well--by 'destroying' them from among the people of Israel.

4. Curiously, there is no actual mention of DECEPTION in the passage. We have no actual 'hard data' (from the passage itself) to assume that these prophets uttered falsehoods. We have an abundance of data from other passages in Ezek that many of their prophecies were NOT from Yahweh (chapter 13) and even that they 'whitewashed' the evil done by the oppressive rulers of the land (22.28ff).

5. The punishment image from Deut 28 above (#2) has some interesting implications. One of the punishments for Israel's rebellion mentioned in the 'Punishment/Curses' chapter of Deut 28 is that of 'confusion' (28.20, 28). CONFUSION is seen as a punishment from God! "Confusion" is part of God's promised judgment on the nations of Canaan (Ex 23.27; Dt 23.27); it is used as a 'weapon' in God's judgment of armies that fought against Israel in the Exodus and Conquest (Egypt--Ex 14.24; Amorites--Josh 10.9; Philistines--I Sam 14.20); it is sought by the Psalmist as a personal judgment from God on those seeking to harm him (Ps 71.24; 35.26; 40.14; 70.2); and it is prophesied as a judgment on Israel in the messianic age (Is 6.9ff)...more on this in the summary.

6. So W.H. Brownlee (WBC: in loc.): "In the present passage, God punishes the apostate nation by granting them false prophets who lead them to their doom."

Important Point A (again): But notice one other thing--the people, as in the time of Jeremiah, were simply NOT INTERESTED IN TRUTH!--cf. the alarming passage in 33.30f: "As for you, son of man, your countrymen are talking together about you by the walls and at the doors of the houses, saying to each other, 'Come and hear the message that has come from the LORD.' 31 My people come to you, as they usually do, and sit before you to listen to your words, but they do not put them into practice. With their mouths they express devotion, but their hearts are greedy for unjust gain. 32 Indeed, to them you are nothing more than one who sings love songs with a beautiful voice and plays an instrument well, for they hear your words but do not put them into practice." Pure performance art at best--not a passion or commitment to truth!

Important Point B (again): Notice also that the rulers STILL HAD A CHOICE. By the very fact that Ezekiel was ALERTING them to the false prophets, they STILL were confronted with BOTH SIDES! God did NOT just leave them to the 'lies'--He stayed in there and witnessed to truth TO THEM to the end.

BUT THE REALLY JUICY PASSAGE has not been raised by your friend! Let's look at the REALLY TOUGH ONE--I Kings 22.20-23:

And the LORD said, 'Who will entice Ahab into attacking Ramoth Gilead and going to his death there?' "One suggested this, and another that. 21 Finally, a spirit came forward, stood before the LORD and said, 'I will entice him.' " 'By what means?' the LORD asked. " 'I will go out and be a lying spirit in the mouths of all his prophets,' he said. " 'You will succeed in enticing him,' said the LORD. 'Go and do it.' "So now the LORD has put a lying spirit in the mouths of all these prophets of yours. The LORD has decreed disaster for you."

Let's notice a few things about this passage and its context.

1. The prophesy is 'against' Ahab, a particularly evil king of the Northern Kingdom of Israel. He typically gathered false prophets around him (as "Yes" men) and complained about the prophet Micaiah (who uttered the above) that he only 'spoke bad things about him' so Ahab did not consult with him much! (I Kgs 22.8,18)

2. As we have seen in the later case of Jeremiah and Ezek, this pattern of the rulers only listening to 'politically acceptable' prophets started early. (Remember the "IMPORTANT POINT A" above?) Compare the case of the prophet Isaiah, chronologically between Micaiah and Jeremiah, in 30.10ff: " They say to the seers, "See no more visions!" and to the prophets, "Give us no more visions of what is right! Tell us pleasant things, prophesy illusions. Leave this way, get off this path, and stop confronting us with the Holy One of Israel!"

3. God had already judged Ahab and decreed his death in 21.19, for , among other things, the innocent death of Naboth (22.1-19).

4. The sending of the 'lying spirits' is to EVENTUATE Ahab's judgment (22.20).

5. The actual word for 'entice' is the 'seduce' word we saw in Jeremiah. God asks who will 'seduce/overpower' Ahab in going to his death (no mention of 'deception' yet). A spirit volunteers to be a 'lying spirit' and God grants permission, with a "go and do it". Seduction DOES NOT necessarily include deception. There were OTHER forms of the verb, and other words that could have brought that meaning out--if so intended, but they are not used in this passage.

6. This 'putting of the lying spirit' is called part of a 'disaster decree (judgment)' in 22.23.

This is a clear case of 'confusion' or false decisions AS A JUDGMENT.

Important Point B (again): In this passage it is even MORE obvious than in the cases of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Notice that this passage 20-23 is BEING GIVEN face to face to AHAB! Micaiah, in the presence of the other prophets and even the king of the Southern Kingdom, is describing this vision IN DETAIL to AHAB! Ahab has every opportunity to reject the lying spirits and accept the true message from YAHWEH! Kaiser makes this point clearly (HSOT:120f): "This principle is further confirmed when we note that the passage in question is a vision that Micaiah reveals to Ahab. God is telling Ahab, 'Wise up. I am allowing your prophets to lie to you.'" In a sense, God is revealing further truth to Ahab rather than lying to him. If God were truly trying to entrap Ahab into a life-threatening situation, he would not have revealed the plan to Ahab! Even so, Ahab refuses to heed God's truth and follows his prophets' advice anyway." Notice that this same dynamic of "if God were REALLY trying to deceive, why would he TELL the people?!" is operative in ALL of the OTHER CASES we have seen!

POINT THREE: JE 8:8 The scribes falsify the word

JE 8:8 - "How can you say, "We are wise, for we have the law of the LORD," when actually the lying pen of the scribes has handled it falsely?"

This verse probably has no bearing on the issue your friend is concerned about. His obvious assumption is that the scribes are TRANSCRIBING the Law incorrectly, giving us MAJOR reason to doubt the fidelity of the OT manuscripts we have today. Although some of the scribes probably had this function, the vast majority of the ones under address here did not. Rather, they were interpreters of the Law to the common folk, and the 'lawyers' of the day. Their 'pens' completed deeds, and testaments, and contracts. And, along with all the OTHER religious figures of the day (e.g. prophets, kings, priests) they abused this power (23.10-14) and were 'greedy for gain' (6.13)--in contradiction to the Law of Yahweh.

In all likelihood, this verse refers to the practice of NOT ENFORCING the ethical directives of the Law in the day-to-day life of Judah. By doing 'illegal' contracts (e.g. oppressing the poor), they basically 'made the Law into a falsehood' (the preferred translation for the phrase)--see J. A. Thompson: NICOT, in. loc. The scribes of the day had immense power--in military, government, and commerce. (Consult ANY good bible background works under 'scribes' for this information: e.g. ISBE, ZPEB, DNNT.)

Many commentators, however, consider this to be a reference to their TEACHING function, as opposed to the scribal understanding I have described above, and focus on how they were TEACHING the Law to the people in OPPOSITION to the 'punishments/warnings' coming from Jeremiah.

Under either understanding, textual transmission of the early OT documents is probably not in view. The general issue of to what extent we can have confidence in our OT documents is discussed in numerous other documents, but strictly speaking, is NOT CENTRAL to your friend's issue of DECEPTION.

POINT FOUR: 2TH 2:11-12 God deceives the wicked (to be able to condemn them).

2TH 2:11-12 - 11 For this reason God sends them a powerful delusion so that they will believe the lie and so that all will be condemned who have not believed the truth but have delighted in wickedness.

This is the first NT passage the guy brings up, and is a VERY illustrative one. But, practically speaking, it won't add much to the discussion, because most of the points are simply repeats of the earlier points.

Let's look at it in the larger context of the passage:

And then the lawless one will be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus will overthrow with the breath of his mouth and destroy by the splendor of his coming. 9 The coming of the lawless one will be in accordance with the work of Satan displayed in all kinds of counterfeit miracles, signs and wonders, 10 and in every sort of evil that deceives those who are perishing. They perish because they refused to love the truth and so be saved. 11 For this reason God sends them a powerful delusion so that they will believe the lie 12 and so that all will be condemned who have not believed the truth but have delighted in wickedness.

Let's notice a few things about this:

1. This has to do with the End-times and the Anti-Christ, who appears with 'all kinds' of epistemologically-powerful evidences. All sorts of 'extraordinary evidence' will accompany this evil one. (v.9)

2. This power also shows up in every 'sort of evil' that deceives those who are perishing. Notice that this 'deceives' applies to people who are ALREADY perishing somehow. They have ALREADY been confronted with truth and rejected it apparently. Now this 'new' deception comes ON TOP OF that previous rejection (sorta like the OT rulers, eh?). (v.10)

3. The reason for their perishing is NOT said to be 'God' but 'because they refused to love the truth'. This fits PERFECTLY with the OT rulers--who 'loved deceit'! It was rejection of truth that caused 'perishing'. (v.10)

4. IF they had loved the truth, then they would have 'been saved'--and these verses would not have applied to them, and the powerful epistemic forces of Satan (although VERY convincing) would NOT have 'convinced them' (see Jesus' prophecy about this aspect--Mt 24:24: "For false Christs and false prophets will appear and perform great signs and miracles to deceive even the elect -- if that were possible. 25 See, I have told you ahead of time.")

5. "For this reason" applies backward to the rejection of truth; the "so that" applies forward to the condemnation. What this basically does is tie the 'delusion' CAUSALLY to the 'refusal to love the truth' (like in the OT--"we love deceit") and tie it JUDICIALLY to the 'judgment/condemnation' (like in the OT--"confusion")

6. However, we should note that the delusion itself is VERY SPECIFIC in this case--it is "The Lie"--NOT just general falsehood (which we will see in the next verse).

7. In verse 12 we see again that the condemnation/delusion is for those who have ALREADY NOT believed the truth. This is simply not your basic 'open-minded seekers' but rather those who have rejected both TRUTH AND "love for truth". It is not just people who are mistaken (no-truth), but people who are HAPPILY MISTAKEN(!)--the "no truth for me, buddy" crowd.

So basically we have the same dynamics as in the OT passages.

.....

Let's try to summarize the various threads so far.

1. If you reject truth and don't even really want the truth, then you will get (i.e. God will give you) EXACTLY what you want! (The old "be careful what you wish for, you just might get it")

2. Some confusion (not all, by any means!) may be a judgment from God, in keeping with #1 above--cf. Rom 1.25 ("They exchanged the truth of God for a lie") and 1.28 ("Furthermore, since they did not think it worthwhile to retain the knowledge of God, he gave them over to a depraved mind"). But it is ALWAYS in line with what we WANT.

3. God uses a 'permission' ethic to achieve this. In some cases He allowed false messages and false messengers to have access to the 'hearer' (e.g. Ahab, Jeremiah's audience); in some cases He will allow strong epistemic evidences to accompany said messages (2 Thess 2). He permits deceptive influences into someone's life because (1) they ASK for them; AND often (2) as judgment for prior rejection of truth and honesty-values.

Note: When the demons in Matt 8.30 asked for permission to enter the animals, Jesus simply said 'Go' (.31). This does NOT make Him the active sponsor of evil. When he told Judas to do his betrayal "quickly," this did not implicate Him in His own betrayal. God allows us to chose ignorance. He seems to stall it off for a while, but if we become increasingly dishonest in how we deal with information about Him and other truth, eventually He will ethically be driven to 'punish us'--to allow our character to BECOME like the character of our most recent choices (e.g. to reject obvious truth).

4. BUT--by the goodness of God somehow--in each of the cases we have seen, God has along with the deceptive forces, provided INFORMATION about those forces. He has provided truth even about the 'confusion' SO THAT WE might accept truth and change the path of our character. In this act of providing insight and explanation as to the nature and aberrant truth-status of the deceptive messages, God seems to attempt to thwart His judicial actions Himself! He really does want us to know Him.

.....

HIS CONCLUSION: (Note: Every word of God cannot prove true if God deceives anyone at all; the Bible cannot be trusted if the scribes falsify the word. The first reference is mutually exclusive with the other three.

Thus, the Bible cannot be the perfect work of a perfect and loving God since one or more of the above references is obviously untrue.)

(Note: Some versions use the word "persuade." The context makes clear, however, that deception is involved.)

.....

Hopefully your friend will be able to see how this all fits together nicely...

God permits deceptive forces to enter someone's life if they are COMMITTED to deception already, and if they have demonstrated a culpable history of that destructive dishonesty (and so deserving censure-- hopefully corrective...cf. 2 Tim 2.25-26). But even with that permission, God often sends a counter-balancing message of truth--alerting the recipient of the danger of deception.

What is important for ALL OF US to realize is that--Christian or non-Christian--our basic attitude of openness and honesty to the 'data' around us has HUGE consequences for our future access to truth.

I would sincerely hope that your friend will consider this last point carefully, as he evaluates the above evidence.



9/13, 8:28pm

Chris Fisher

Xyz,

When attempting to discuss God and the ability to lie it is first important to define the terms. A lie is quite literally a statement with intent to deceive. Does God make statements with the intent to deceive people? The article you sent me is attempting to explain away critical parts of the Bible that explain that God does lie. 1 Kings 22 is critical in understanding how God operates. We read:

1Ki 22:20 And the LORD said, Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramothgilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. 1Ki 22:21 And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the LORD, and said, I will persuade him. 1Ki 22:22 And the LORD said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also: go forth, and do so. 1Ki 22:23 Now therefore, behold, the LORD hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the LORD hath spoken evil concerning thee.

The scene is simple. God is sitting in heaven talking to the angels. God begins to crowdsource ideas on how to kill Ahab. The angels bounce ideas off God and God evaluates them. One angel suggests lying (saying something with the intent to deceive). There was intent to deceive. God wanted Ahab to believe that he would win in war, whereas he would really die. The link you sent tries to explain this away by looking at word definitions instead of content. In reality God was giving people false impressions through prophecy that he generated. Were the prophets unwilling? Absolutely not. But God planted the seed. Even the God fearing Micaiah also repeated this false prophecy before he told the truth to the King.

We see something very similar in 2 Kings 8, where Elisha gives a false prophecy to one of God's enemies, a dying king. God has anointed the evil Hazael to be king and provokes him into killing the current king. But this is not before Hazael relays a false prophecy from Elisha. Elisha weeps because he knows the evils that Hazael will do, but gives the prophecy anyways.

Tell me if this is a lie: A man decides to go to a party to see his ex-girlfriend. His wife asks him why he is going. Part of the reason the man is going is to see his friend Bob. Would it be a lie to say "to see my friend, Bob"? The statement might be true, but it is a lie because it conceals the truth.

In 1Sa 16:2 God orchestrates this type of lie. When Samuel is afraid of Saul killing him, God provides him an alibi. Samuel needs an excuse to be traveling to anoint David, and God tells him to just explain that he is going to sacrifice. He directs Samuel to bring a cow as evidence.

God has no problems with recording his actions in the Bible. This is not to mention prophecies that failed (Eze 26:7-11, Eze 29:18 and Jdg 1:19). Why is it that modern scholars attempt to explain away the Old Testament? When they do, they try to make universal claims and then try to make specific statements fit their universals. Could the universals be a hyperbole? Is that outside the realm of possibility? Should we force specific text to fit the universal claim? Many of these universal claims ignore context of the source of the universal claim.

Context matters in verse interpretation. 1 Samuel is a good example, although Hebrews 6:18 and Titus 1:2 follow suit (although understanding the Greek is important in those verses).

In 1 Samuel, God is explaining his relationship with Saul. God makes Saul the king. Saul rebels against God and then God repents of making him king. When God says he will not "lie or repent", He is stating that when God repented of making Saul the king that God would not repent again. This is God responding to His creation in real-time.

We read in Samuel:

1Sa 15:29 And also the Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a man, that he should repent.

This verse is nestled between these two verses:

1Sa 15:11 It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king: for he is turned back from following me, and hath not performed my commandments. And it grieved Samuel; and he cried unto the LORD all night.

And,

1Sa 15:35 And Samuel came no more to see Saul until the day of his death: nevertheless Samuel mourned for Saul: and the LORD repented that he had made Saul king over Israel.

Repent is the same word used in all cases. Calvinists ignore verses 11 and 35, but pretend 29 is some sort of universal statement that is always true in every circumstance. But that is not the purpose of verse 29. The purpose is "God will not repent of repenting about Saul". Why does God stand firm? Because sometimes God repents so much that He becomes "weary of repenting" (Jer 15:6).

Your author does injustice when he says that God "permits deceptive forces". God sends those forces; that is what the text states. David was guilty of killing Uriah the Hittite although some other hand did it (the hand of Uriah's enemies). God is responsible for the lies of prophets although the prophets are telling the lies. The only way to accept the text is to understand that not all lies are sins and that God is free to do what He pleases.

•

9/13, 8:46pm

Calvinist

I'm at the college age retreat this weekend so I'll respond when I get home Sunday night or Monday.



•

9/13, 8:46pm

Chris Fisher

That would be great. I am interested in how you understand these verses.

• Wednesday

•

9/18, 10:41am

Calvinist

"The article you sent me is attempting to explain away critical parts of the Bible that explain that God does lie"

It doesn't explain anything away it explains the verse in context you are just rejecting this explanation- IT'S THAT SIMPLE!

"1Sa 15:29 And also the Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a man, that he should repent."

Here is a good article I found on repent and understanding it in the bible.

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/godrepents.htm>

God repents?

brandplucked.webs.com

There are many Bible Correctors out there today who try to tell us that the King James Bible is in error for translating the Hebrew Scriptures in such a way as to suggest that God can "repent".

9/18, 11:14am

Calvinist

It seems to me that you are trying to change the Character and Image of God for some reason. I'm not sure if you are trying to fit God into your personal logic or what but at times we need to take the particulars of scripture and understand the in particulars through them. If scripture clearly states in one area that God doesn't lie and then in another area it seems like scripture contradicts itself then most likely we have an issue with our understanding of the passage that doesn't make sense to us. What we don't want to do is start changing terms and definitions to make our hermeneutics work. Some lies aren't sin for God changes the definition of sin and lie.

Leviticus 6:1-4, "And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, If a soul sin, and commit a trespass against the LORD, and lie unto his neighbour...or hath deceived his neighbour...and lieth concerning it, and sweareth falsely; in any of all these that a man doeth, sinning therein: Then it shall be, because he hath sinned, and is guilty,"

Psalms 52:2-4, "Thy tongue deviseth mischiefs; like a sharp razor, working deceitfully. Thou lovest evil more than good; and lying rather than to speak righteousness. Selah. Thou lovest all devouring words, O thou deceitful tongue."

Proverbs 6:16-19, "These six things doth the LORD hate: yea, seven are an abomination unto him: A proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, An heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, A false witness that speaketh lies, and he that soweth discord among brethren."

It isn't complicated- You are trying to unscrew the inscrutable and your getting really screwed up. What I mean is you are trying to make definitions have different meaning depending on who they are focused at. A lie is a lie, a sin is a sin, omniscience is omniscience the definitions stay constant.

If I were you I would seriously do some self evaluation over some of these verses

Proverbs 26:12

Do you see a man who is wise in his own eyes? There is more hope for a fool than for him.

There are very few people who share your interpretations, "wise in your own eyes."

Proverbs 10:17 Whoever heeds instruction is on the path to life, but he who rejects reproof leads others astray.

In your blog post "God is not omnipresent" you clearly undermine the simple faith of your child through your theology.

I hope this doesn't come off as hard hearted towards you. Your attitude doesn't come off as teachable but as a teacher. You don't seem to want to understand but desire to bring others along. These verses and concepts aren't new to anyone and the only thing that sets you apart here is you aren't satisfied with the explanations.

• Wednesday



9/18, 9:08pm

Chris Fisher

Xyz,

Take a couple steps back and place yourself in my shoes. Here is a brief overview of our conversation so far:

1. You ask about God and deception
2. I give you an intricate and detailed explanation of the Biblical material on the matter, citing 1 Kings 22
3. You respond by copy pasting a poorly formatted website that ignores the content of the instance in question
4. I read your copy-paste and then detail the events in 1 Kings 22. I also point out that the actual events of the verse were ignored in your link and also cite various other instances of God's deception
5. You respond by again ignoring the text to which I was referring!

I feel like I stepped through the looking glass and am now conversing with the white queen. This is not about "does God lie" or "does God tell the truth". This is about: "what does the text say". Let me again lay out the situation in 1 Kings 22:

God is sitting in heaven (how does that work?). He begins by crowdsourcing the angels (how does that work?) for ideas on how to kill the king (why does He want their ideas?). The angels present different ideas until one angel steps forward with a plan. He would convince 400 prophets to tell the king that he would prosper if he goes to war (is this a lie?). God endorses this plan and tells the angel to go do it. The angel tells all the false prophets to say this, they do, and then the king decides to ask a prophet of God the same question. The prophet of God starts by saying the same thing (is this a lie?). The king presses that prophet, and the prophet explains the entire situation to the king (is this a lie?). The king doesn't believe him, goes to war, and ends up dead (exactly what God was trying to accomplish).

Really, the Bible says this. These are the events described in the Bible (scroll up for the direct text). My first direct question to you: is my summary of the events accurate? The words in the Bible describe something; is this what is described? If not, please detail the events in 1Kings 22.

For reference, this event is paralleled in 2 Chronicles 18. When talking about the Bible, we cannot just ignore what the text says. Do you see my frustration?

You are right to wonder how we view verses that "contradict" (general statements verses specific events). How are we to handle these situations? I actually talk about this in a recent blog post. If my

friend says "All of America has gone insane". Is that true or false? Does this mean every individual has gone insane? General statements might be idioms, and if they are contradicted by specifics then we know they are idioms. The Bible uses this "idiom" throughout the text.

My second question to you, in light of Mark 13:32, did Jesus know everything? Yes or no.

The questions we should ask are not "how does this make me feel" but "what does the text say". Please respond to my questions.

•

9/18, 9:19pm

Calvinist

Jesus being God has all the same attributes as the father except Jesus has a physical body. The father is spirit and has no physical body. Your misinterpretation seems to stem from the fact that you don't understand anthropomorphisms. God the father doesn't have physical characteristics. In light of this fact God uses familiar descriptors for our benefit. God doesn't actually have eyes to see, hands to hold, wings to encompass or any other physical expression other than Jesus.



•

9/18, 9:20pm

Chris Fisher

XYZ,

1. Is my summary of the events in 1 Kings 22 accurate?
2. In light of Mark 13:32, did Jesus know everything? Yes or no.

•

9/18, 9:20pm

Calvinist

I don't see your frustration because I believe the answers given are sufficient. It wasn't a lie or deception because the truth was known.

You don't even read the response to understand it.



•

9/18, 9:23pm

Chris Fisher

XYZ,

1. Summarize the events in 1 Kings 22.

2. Does Jesus know the "hour and the day"? Yes or no. Mar 13:32 "But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.

•

9/18, 9:27pm

Calvinist

Was Jesus omnipresent while on earth

Did Jesus need physical food

Did Jesus take on sin

Was Jesus separated from the father for a time on the cross



•

9/18, 9:30pm

Chris Fisher

Xyz, Why are you sacred of the text?

1. summarize the events in 1 Kings 22.

2. does Jesus know the "hour and the day"? Yes or no. Mar 13:32 "But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.

•

9/18, 9:31pm

Calvinist

Why are you so dull to not see that I have answered your question and I am now answering it.

The answer is that while a human on earth he set aside some of his attributes. How else could a baby be god- lacking understanding and powerless



•

9/18, 9:35pm

Chris Fisher

I have asked two very specific questions:

Did Jesus know the "day and the hour"? Yes or no. What does Mark 13:32 say?

Please describe the events in 1 Kings 22.

•

9/18, 9:37pm

Calvinist

Phi 2:5-8 The Humbled and Exalted Christ 5 Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, 6 who, being in the form of God, did not consider it robbery to be equal with God, 7 but made Himself of no reputation, taking the form of a bondservant, and coming in the likeness of men. 8 And being found in appearance as a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient to the point of death, even the death of the cross. (NKJV)

•

9/18, 9:39pm

Calvinist

Heb 2:14-18 14 Inasmuch then as the children have partaken of flesh and blood, He Himself likewise shared in the same, that through death He might destroy him who had the power of death, that is, the devil, 15 and release those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. 16 For indeed He does not give aid to angels, but He does give aid to the seed of Abraham. 17 Therefore, in all things He had to be made like His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. 18 For in that He Himself has suffered, being tempted, He is able to aid those who are tempted. (NKJV)

•

9/18, 9:39pm

Calvinist

On earth Jesus did the will of the father and knew what the father revealed to him.

So the father didn't reveal the day or time so Jesus didn't at that time know it. He set aside and humbled himself.

You know the answer and the argument already.

Reread my first post thoroughly about 1 kings 22 and you will find the answer I believe is true.



•

9/18, 9:42pm

Chris Fisher

So, the pastor claims that Jesus can be omniscient yet not know things. Can God be omniscient yet not know things?

I am not asking you interpretation of 1 Kings 22, I am asking you to list out the events.

•

9/18, 9:43pm

Calvinist

Jesus obviously set that aside.

He became a man



•

9/18, 9:44pm

Chris Fisher

Can God not know something (set it aside) and still be omniscient?

Please list out the events in 1 Kings 22.

•

9/18, 9:45pm

Calvinist

I can go over 1 Kings 22 when I get next to a computer. Its a pain typing on this phone.

•

9/18, 9:45pm

Chris Fisher

thanks

•

9/18, 9:46pm

Calvinist

Yes he can

Your only other conclusion is Jesus isn't god



•

9/18, 9:47pm

Chris Fisher

So, in what way can you or the pastor claim that I am wrong about God's omniscience, if He can set it aside.

•

9/18, 9:47pm

Calvinist

This is where that logically leads



•

9/18, 9:48pm

Chris Fisher

What makes God "God"? Please list out essential attributes that if God did not have, He would cease to be God. Please quote the Bible for evidence.

•

9/18, 9:49pm

Calvinist

Did God the father still know even though God the son didn't?

Is god a Trinity



•

9/18, 9:49pm

Chris Fisher

You just told me that God did not have to? He could have set it aside.

Your claim is that Jesus cannot be God if He did not have "x" attributes. I would like to know where you get "x".

What makes God "God"? Please list out essential attributes that if God did not have, He would cease to be God. Please quote the Bible for evidence.

•

9/18, 9:50pm

Calvinist

Three in one. Even though one part of the trinity didn't know doesn't the whole trinity and each part completely and individually make up god

One part of the trinity obviously set it aside.



9/18, 9:52pm

Chris Fisher

What makes God "God"? Please list out essential attributes that if God did not have, He would cease to be God. Please quote the Bible for evidence.

9/18, 9:54pm

Calvinist

Can God be three separate parts yet whole and one God?

Explain that to me

Can God never change yet take on the form of a man



9/18, 9:55pm

Chris Fisher

I dont get what you are getting at. We cannot explain everything about God. But some people claim that God does not have to be omniscient to be God. You do. What makes you right and them wrong?

9/18, 9:56pm

Calvinist

That wasn't my point. You just got my point.

I said God- specifically Christ could not know something yet God can still be omniscient.

Some of the things in scripture we have to take by faith because we are not god.

Scripture says god is omniscient and it also says Christ didn't know something when he was on earth.



9/18, 9:59pm

Chris Fisher

Joh 16:29 His disciples said to Him, "See, now You are speaking plainly, and using no figure of speech!
Joh 16:30 Now we are sure that You know all things, and have no need that anyone should question You. By this we believe that You came forth from God."

So, are Jesus' disciples saying Jesus knows all things? Does Jesus know all things?

9/18, 9:59pm

Calvinist

God is the one that keeps this all in check. Some things are a mystery



9/18, 10:00pm

Chris Fisher

Joh 21:17 He said to him the third time, "Simon, son of Jonah, do you love Me?" Peter was grieved because He said to him the third time, "Do you love Me?" And he said to Him, "Lord, You know all things; You know that I love You." Jesus said to him, "Feed My sheep."

9/18, 10:00pm

Calvinist

Same fabric from the last question. I don't understand how God can become a man and still be God
He just does and is.



9/18, 10:01pm

Chris Fisher

More to the point: when Jesus' disciples say Jesus "knows all things" are they being literal or figurative?

9/18, 10:02pm

Calvinist

Who knows- maybe they are saying has the capacity or maybe has access or maybe actually.

Doesn't Jesus say he and the father are one.

Is that figuratively speaking or are they one?

Is Jesus God? That's what it really boils down to/

Is there a trinity unity one god?

Can that god have three expressions in one/



9/18, 10:04pm

Chris Fisher

Yes, Jesus is God. But God defined in the Bible is a lot different than the god defined by Plotinus.

- 9/18, 10:05pm

Calvinist

I know you don't understand this concept but have to take it by faith that it is true.



9/18, 10:06pm

Chris Fisher

If I understand your argument it is: "There are some things we do not understand, thus the Pastor and I are right and you are wrong."

- 9/18, 10:06pm

Calvinist

What are you talking about?



9/18, 10:07pm

Chris Fisher

"I know you don't understand this concept but have to take it by faith that it is true." "I don't understand how god can become a man and still be god" "Some things are a mystery" "Some of the things in scripture we have to take by faith because we are not god."

•

9/18, 10:07pm

Calvinist

Right



•

9/18, 10:09pm

Chris Fisher

So what exactly were you getting at? It seems to be that you just want me to abandon the Bible and just accept what the Pastor says without evidence.

•

9/18, 10:09pm

Calvinist

I still don't get your point



•

9/18, 10:10pm

Chris Fisher

When the Bible says Jesus did not know something. I understand that Jesus was God and Jesus did not know something. Not knowing something does not make God not God. That is an assumption that is without base.

Because Jesus was God, He told us that we can understand God through Him. What attributes did Jesus show?

Were they the Greek attributes? Omniscience, Omnipresence, Omnipotence, Immutability?

•

9/18, 10:11pm

Calvinist

My point is that God did know it but Jesus didn't. Jesus and the father are one so technically God did know it



9/18, 10:11pm

Chris Fisher

Or were they human attributes? Love, mercy, righteous anger.

Joh 14:9 Jesus said to him, "Have I been with you so long, and yet you have not known Me, Philip? He who has seen Me has seen the Father; so how can you say, 'Show us the Father'?"

We know God through Jesus, not poorly defined Latin words.

When Calvinists get up in front of church to tell us the attributes of God, how many of those attributes are exhibited by Jesus?

Do Christians care how God defines himself?

- 9/18, 10:16pm

Calvinist

Are you only looking at the little time Jesus was on earth and using that to define the father? Like that is exclusive. Is the father physical?

Was Jesus physical?



9/18, 10:17pm

Chris Fisher

Jesus was physical. Is God spirit? Do you know what Spirit is in the Greek? Wind. Is the wind physical?

- 9/18, 10:17pm

Calvinist

No technically the stuff in the wind is



9/18, 10:17pm

Chris Fisher

The notion that "spirit" is above and beyond space and time is a Greek concept
it is not a Hebrew understanding

9/18, 10:18pm

Calvinist

So Psalms was written in Greek



9/18, 10:18pm

Chris Fisher

nope

You are going to have to direct me to the verse in Psalms that suggests that spirits are outside
space/time

Every time the Bible talks about God, He is located somewhere, doing something, interacting with His
creation

Psa 139:7 Where can I go from Your Spirit? Or where can I flee from Your presence? Psa 139:8 If I
ascend into heaven, You are there; If I make my bed in hell, behold, You are there.

9/18, 10:21pm

Calvinist

Psa 139:7-10 7 Where can I go from Your Spirit? Or where can I flee from Your presence? 8 If I ascend
into heaven, You are there; If I make my bed in hell, behold, You are there. 9 If I take the wings of the
morning, And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, 10 Even there Your hand shall lead me, And Your
right hand shall hold me. (NKJV)



9/18, 10:21pm

Chris Fisher

See how David is showing locations... You are in Heaven... You are in Hell

Those are locations.

Can a spirit be located somewhere?

•

9/18, 10:22pm

Calvinist

Wow you are missing the point in that Psalm. God is everywhere all locations



•

9/18, 10:23pm

Chris Fisher

ok... then He is located in the physical universe, right?

Spirit is located physical places, yes or no?

•

9/18, 10:23pm

Calvinist

And outside it

Everywhere present



•

9/18, 10:23pm

Chris Fisher

So, back to my original statement "you are going to have to direct me to the verse in Psalms that suggests that spirits are outside space/time"

•

9/18, 10:23pm

Calvinist

Through space and time



9/18, 10:24pm

Chris Fisher

You have only showed me verses that point to physical places, nothing that transcends physical places.

9/18, 10:25pm

Calvinist

You are missing the point of the verse and that's not my fault



9/18, 10:25pm

Chris Fisher

I am saying the obvious. The Hebrew concept of "spirit" is not the pagan Greek concept of "spirit"

9/18, 10:26pm

Calvinist

Who cares?



9/18, 10:26pm

Chris Fisher

God might care, because the Bible says He is spirit

9/18, 10:26pm

Calvinist

Genesis: where was god before creation?



9/18, 10:26pm

Chris Fisher

If you try to redefine Him in a Greek sense, how hurtful is that to God, our creator?

9/18, 10:27pm

Calvinist

God used Greek to define himself.



9/18, 10:28pm

Chris Fisher

The Bible does not say where God "was". But the Bible says God has no beginning or end. He always existed. Those are series of times. He was not outside "time".

God did not use the Greek of Plotinus to define Himself.

9/18, 10:28pm

Calvinist

Not in the platonic sense but in a conceptual way using understanding from the old testament as well as the new.



9/18, 10:28pm

Chris Fisher

When you look at how the neo-Platonists talk about god, compare it to the Calvinists, it is spot on.



9/18, 10:28pm

Chris Fisher

When you compare it to the Bible, there is a chasm.

•

9/18, 10:30pm

Calvinist

Its hard to totally define a god that calls himself I am that I am. Other than how he defines himself.



•

9/18, 10:31pm

Chris Fisher

I am the God of Abraham Isaac and Jacob.

He defines Himself by his relationships and by his acts

•

9/18, 10:31pm

Calvinist

No, you're Chris.



•

9/18, 10:31pm

Chris Fisher

God created the world, led the Israelites free.

He defines Himself primarily through His people

•

9/18, 10:32pm

Calvinist

Hopefully not.

Maybe if by through you really mean by means of his people.



9/18, 10:33pm

Chris Fisher

Gen 15:7 Then He said to him, "I am the LORD, who brought you out of Ur of the Chaldeans, to give you this land to inherit it."

Gen 26:24 And the LORD appeared to him the same night and said, "I am the God of your father Abraham; do not fear, for I am with you. I will bless you and multiply your descendants for My servant Abraham's sake."

Gen 28:13 And behold, the LORD stood above it and said: "I am the LORD God of Abraham your father and the God of Isaac; the land on which you lie I will give to you and your descendants.

Gen 46:3 So He said, "I am God, the God of your father; do not fear to go down to Egypt, for I will make of you a great nation there.

Exo 3:6 Moreover He said, "I am the God of your father—the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." And Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God.

Exo 6:7 I will take you as My people, and I will be your God. Then you shall know that I am the LORD your God who brings you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians.

9/18, 10:33pm

Calvinist

So where was god before the foundations of the cosmos?



9/18, 10:33pm

Chris Fisher

I dont know where He was, but that does not mean He was "nowhere"

So God defines Himself by His people and through His people

God's own utterances about Himself center around what He has done for Israel and what He will do for Israel.

9/18, 10:35pm

Calvinist

Yep



9/18, 10:36pm

Chris Fisher

So God cares about His "power" and His "relationship"... that is how we should define God.



9/18, 10:36pm

Calvinist

That doesn't mean that he wasn't everywhere.

God cares about being glorified.



9/18, 10:36pm

Chris Fisher

It doesnt. But we have to ask ourselves, why is that a modern focus? Was that ever a focus in the Bible?



9/18, 10:37pm

Calvinist

It is your focus I don't have an issue with it



9/18, 10:37pm

Chris Fisher

What if it is degrading? What if Calvinists claim that God is force to be everywhere there is a homosexual act.

That does not glorify God.

•

9/18, 10:38pm

Calvinist

Does god see the act?



•

9/18, 10:38pm

Chris Fisher

Claiming God is everywhere means claiming that God is in vomit.

•

9/18, 10:38pm

Calvinist

Figuratively because he obviously doesn't see.

Does god have a physical body?



•

9/18, 10:39pm

Chris Fisher

The question is, can God know something and not be present? Can I know something but not be present?

You said that Jesus is God and Jesus is physical, so I would think you say Jesus has a physical body.

•

9/18, 10:39pm

Calvinist

Step back and ask yourself "what does the presence of God look like"?



•

9/18, 10:40pm

Chris Fisher

Moses saw God. God allowed Moses to see God's "backside"

•

9/18, 10:40pm

Calvinist

I don't understand that



•

9/18, 10:40pm

Chris Fisher

To do that God passed by the mountain and covered Moses with His hand.



•

9/18, 10:40pm

Chris Fisher

Exo 33:21 And the LORD said, Behold, there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock: Exo 33:22 And it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a clift of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by: Exo 33:23 And I will take away mine hand, and thou shalt see my back parts: but my face shall not be seen.

•

9/18, 10:41pm

Calvinist

God doesn't have a hand and he doesn't pass by.

Can God relate to us in any other form than human understanding?

Is God a burning bush?



•

9/18, 10:42pm

Chris Fisher

So what is happening in Exodus 33?

•

9/18, 10:42pm

Calvinist

I don't know but I believe it happened



•

9/18, 10:42pm

Chris Fisher

When God literally says "I will take away my hand" and literally says "thou shalt see my back parts", what does He mean?



•

9/18, 10:43pm

Chris Fisher

Is God telling Moses the truth, is Moses seeing God's back parts?

•

9/18, 10:43pm

Calvinist

Whatever it was it isn't literal because God doesn't have a hand.

It's for our understanding. How else would god communicate with us?



•

9/18, 10:43pm

Chris Fisher

Then what just happened in the text? Did God say those things? Was God lying? What did Moses think happened?

•

9/18, 10:44pm

Calvinist

That is the question you have to struggle with.



9/18, 10:44pm

Chris Fisher

No, I take God at His word.



9/18, 10:45pm

Calvinist

How is god supposed to define himself so we can understand?



9/18, 10:45pm

Chris Fisher

If God tells Moses that Moses will "see His back parts", I think that means that God is showing Moses His "back parts".



9/18, 10:45pm

Calvinist

God is not physical.

He has no back parts.



9/18, 10:46pm

Chris Fisher

What does "physical" mean, is it the opposite of "spirit"... where do you get that definition? And where do you get that "spirits" cannot have "back parts"?

•

9/18, 10:46pm

Calvinist

I have to fly so I can get some sleep.

I'm going to put my wings on and fly away now.



•

9/18, 10:47pm

Chris Fisher

Alright, if the Bible says God is spirit and God has back parts, I think we should assume spirits can have "back parts".

•

9/18, 10:47pm

Calvinist

Oops maybe I just lied to you.

Maybe I don't have wings.



•

9/18, 10:47pm

Chris Fisher

Figurative uses of words are not lies... so when Jesus' disciples said "you know everything" to Jesus, they were not lying.

•

9/18, 10:48pm

Calvinist

Maybe we can assume god is trying to communicate with us in a way we can understand.



9/18, 10:49pm

Chris Fisher

Is that how God operates, that He says we cannot understand His communication?
He made us in His image? What does image mean?

9/18, 10:50pm

Calvinist

He communicates with us in a way we can understand. He uses anthropomorphisms.
Like him not exactly perfect replicas. You can make a statue in your image yet it is different and distinct from you.



9/18, 10:51pm

Chris Fisher

So modern Christians can understand these anthropomorphisms, but the people who spoke with God did not?

9/18, 10:52pm

Calvinist

Sure they did in as much as they had revealed knowledge.



9/18, 10:52pm

Chris Fisher

So Moses talked to God, was that literal? Did He have better or worse knowledge of God than us?
Is it arrogant of modern Christians to assume they know God better than the people with whom God identifies Himself with?

“I am the God of your father—the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.”

How did these people understand God?

•

9/18, 10:57pm

Calvinist

Is it arrogant of modern Christians to say that the Messiah is Jesus the Christ.

Of people didn't have that understanding?

•



9/18, 10:58pm

Chris Fisher

Well, Abraham Isaac and Jacob knew nothing about Christ.

•

9/18, 10:58pm

Calvinist

I believe God reveals himself through all of his scripture.

Right, we do!

•



9/18, 10:59pm

Chris Fisher

I believe so too, but we should not just discount those who literally spoke with God, call their experiences metaphors.

•

9/18, 10:59pm

Calvinist

They weren't.

Because god expresses himself with human characteristics doesn't make it a metaphor.



9/18, 11:01pm

Chris Fisher

Moses, on Mount Sinai, had to talk God out of killing all of Israel. God said He would, and Moses laid down an argument why God should not. God changed His mind, not because it was the best thing to do (the Israelites died in unbelief in the wilderness). He did it because of His relationship with Moses.

9/18, 11:02pm

Calvinist

I'm not sure what your point is here



9/18, 11:02pm

Chris Fisher

Exo 32:9 And the LORD said unto Moses, I have seen this people, and, behold, it is a stiffnecked people: Exo 32:10 Now therefore let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them: and I will make of thee a great nation. Exo 32:11 And Moses besought the LORD his God, and said, LORD, why doth thy wrath wax hot against thy people, which thou hast brought forth out of the land of Egypt with great power, and with a mighty hand? Exo 32:12 Wherefore should the Egyptians speak, and say, For mischief did he bring them out, to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth? Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people. Exo 32:13 Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou swarest by thine own self, and saidst unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven, and all this land that I have spoken of will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it for ever. Exo 32:14 And the LORD repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people.

9/18, 11:02pm

Calvinist

I know the situation.



9/18, 11:02pm

Chris Fisher

I am saying, Moses had a deeply personal relationship with God. He changed God's mind.

•

9/18, 11:03pm

Calvinist

Do our prayers and requests matter to God.



•

9/18, 11:03pm

Chris Fisher

What he says and thinks about God is important to God and to us.

•

9/18, 11:03pm

Calvinist

We have an impact on history through prayer right



•

9/18, 11:03pm

Chris Fisher

God is fuming and wants to kill Israel, is that figurative?

•

9/18, 11:04pm

Calvinist

Explain to me how that works



•

9/18, 11:04pm

Chris Fisher

We do. Did God intend to kill Israel?

Because the future is not set. We are not fated to do things. We can petition God who loves us and responds to us.

God can change His mind, not do things He "thought to do"

•

9/18, 11:06pm

Calvinist

Did God know Moses would pray?



•

9/18, 11:06pm

Chris Fisher

Did He?

•

9/18, 11:06pm

Calvinist

If he did know did he cause Moses to pray.

He is the all-knowing God.



•

9/18, 11:07pm

Chris Fisher

Gen 22:12 And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me.

God says in Genesis, that "know He knows"

He was not quite sure if Abraham would kill Isaac. But He found out, by "seeing" it.

•

9/18, 11:08pm

Calvinist

Calvinist would say essentially knowing must equal causing predestination.



9/18, 11:09pm

Chris Fisher

But did God know before that Abraham would kill Isaac?



9/18, 11:09pm

Calvinist

Yes



9/18, 11:09pm

Chris Fisher

Then how could He say "now I know"



9/18, 11:09pm

Calvinist

He is all knowing.



9/18, 11:09pm

Chris Fisher

Jer 18:7 At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; Jer 18:8 If that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them.

Does God ever repent of something He "thought to do" to people?

•

9/18, 11:10pm

Calvinist

Yep



•

9/18, 11:10pm

Chris Fisher

Yes, so God thinks He will do something, and then the people repent, and God repents of the thing He thought He was going to do to them

•

9/18, 11:11pm

Calvinist

That's another by faith thing. I don't get how our prayers factor in but they do.



•

9/18, 11:11pm

Chris Fisher

If God knew from entirety past, that they would repent, He would never "think He would do something" and then not do it.

The future is not set.

•

9/18, 11:12pm

Calvinist

Because he allows volition some way.

Future is set because it has already happened not yet.



•

9/18, 11:12pm

Chris Fisher

But God thinks one thing, and that thing does not happen, did God know the future?

•

9/18, 11:12pm

Calvinist

Do you think God is linear.



•

9/18, 11:13pm

Chris Fisher

I think God is as He describes: "living".

God is obsessed with contrasting Himself to dead idols. God is dynamic and living.

•

9/18, 11:13pm

Calvinist

How could scripture predict the future?

And static in some ways. Living means you're not dead so that's a static stable condition.



•

9/18, 11:14pm

Chris Fisher

There are plenty of ways to predict the future.

In order to name John the Baptist, God made his father mute until his father named him "John"

•

9/18, 11:15pm

Calvinist

How could john see the future in revelations? Something that was happening that hasn't happened yet?



9/18, 11:15pm

Chris Fisher

John did not see the future and does not claim to.

He saw a vision, a fantastic vision; he was not transported into the future.

9/18, 11:16pm

Calvinist

Give me a break god doesn't guess at the future he tells it the way it happened not yet



9/18, 11:16pm

Chris Fisher

He actually starts Revelation by having "letters" to current churches that no longer exist.

9/18, 11:16pm

Calvinist

I believe he saw the future.



9/18, 11:17pm

Chris Fisher

Here is a prophecy about Tyre: Eze 26:14 And I will make thee like the top of a rock: thou shalt be a place to spread nets upon; thou shalt be built no more: for I the LORD have spoken it, saith the Lord GOD.

and Eze 29:19 Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will give the land of Egypt unto Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon; and he shall take her multitude, and take her spoil, and take her prey; and it shall be the wages for his army.

Did this prophecy ever come to past?



9/18, 11:19pm

Chris Fisher

Eze 29:18 Son of man, Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon caused his army to serve a great service against Tyrus: every head was made bald, and every shoulder was peeled: yet had he no wages, nor his army, for Tyrus, for the service that he had served against it: Eze 29:19 Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will give the land of Egypt unto Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon; and he shall take her multitude, and take her spoil, and take her prey; and it shall be the wages for his army.

9/18, 11:19pm

Calvinist

I don't know my OT good enough but I believe it did. Where did Daniel come from?



9/18, 11:19pm

Chris Fisher

Nebuchadrezzar fails to take Tyre, and God gives him Egypt instead

It is a failed prophecy, and it failed for no apparent reason, and God gives the king a consolation prize

Did God know the future?

9/18, 11:57pm

Calvinist

Yes the prophesy is out of order and the Babylonians do take that area follow the dates

<http://www.easyenglish.info/bible-commentary/ezekiel25-39-lbw.htm>

<http://www.easyenglish.info/bible-commentary/ezekiel25-39-lbw.htm>

Specifically ch26

Sorry my phone died and I had to look for an answer from people smarter and better versed than I



12:12am

Chris Fisher

The prophecy claims Nebuchadnezzar will destroy Tyre. He never does. It is very specific: Eze 26:7 For thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will bring upon Tyrus Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, a king of kings, from the north, with horses, and with chariots, and with horsemen, and companies, and much people. Eze 26:8 He shall slay with the sword thy daughters in the field: and he shall make a fort against thee, and cast a mount against thee, and lift up the buckler against thee. Eze 26:9 And he shall set engines of war against thy walls, and with his axes he shall break down thy towers. Eze 26:10 By reason of the abundance of his horses their dust shall cover thee: thy walls shall shake at the noise of the horsemen, and of the wheels, and of the chariots, when he shall enter into thy gates, as men enter into a city wherein is made a breach. Eze 26:11 With the hoofs of his horses shall he tread down all thy streets: he shall slay thy people by the sword, and thy strong garrisons shall go down to the ground. Eze 26:12 And they shall make a spoil of thy riches, and make a prey of thy merchandise: and they shall break down thy walls, and destroy thy pleasant houses: and they shall lay thy stones and thy timber and thy dust in the midst of the water. Eze 26:13 And I will cause the noise of thy songs to cease; and the sound of thy harps shall be no more heard. Eze 26:14 And I will make thee like the top of a rock: thou shalt be a place to spread nets upon; thou shalt be built no more: for I the LORD have spoken it, saith the Lord GOD.

•

12:14am

Calvinist

Read the commentary

Just because the fulfillment isn't in scripture doesn't mean it didn't happen.

I'm going to bed. Good night

• Today

•



7:10am

Chris Fisher

Seriously though, the prophecy is that Nebuchadnezzar would destroy Tyre. Historically or in the Bible, did that ever happen? Why does the Bible talk about Nebuchadnezzar's failed attempt? It just spent an entire chapter laden with dire prophecies against Tyre. These were not "this will happen in hundreds of years" but it was a judgment against the current generation. Why are your friends so eager to ignore the clear text of the prophecy and the clear text of the Bible? This is not an isolated prophecy in which this happens.

•

8:22am

Calvinist

Many Nations will destroy her- Prophecy fulfilled- You miss it because you are not a good steward of the word of God- It seems like you are Not looking for understanding but just an argument-

1 Corinthians 4:2 Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful

Behold, I am against thee, O Tyrus, and will cause many nations to come up against thee, as the sea causeth his waves to come up. And they shall destroy the walls of Tyrus, and break down her towers : I will also scrape her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock. It shall be a place for the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea : for I have spoken it, saith the Lord God : and it shall become a spoil to the nations. And her daughters which are in the field shall be slain by the sword; and they shall know that I am the Lord." Eze. 26:3-6.

<https://www.ministrymagazine.org/archive/1941/06/nebuchadnezzars-siege-of-tyre>

This is worth a read... and actually read it for understanding not just looking for holes in the arguments.

•

8:24am

Calvinist

I Corinthians 4:1-2 4 Let a man so consider us, as servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God. 2 Moreover it is required in stewards that one be found faithful.

2 timothy 2:15 15 Be diligent to present yourself approved to God, a worker who does not need to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth

• Today



12:45pm

Chris Fisher

Xyz,

You need to evaluate the intellectual honesty of your friends. They researched the failed prophecy in Ezekiel. They knew the prophecy named Nebuchadnezzar (and listed the things Nebuchadnezzar would do and the rewards he would get), but your friends were determined to make the prophecy come true that they tried to use a technicality that is not even allowed by the text and to do so they ignored that the prophecy names Nebuchadnezzar (that is not an innocent omission), and then they wanted to rewrite history itself. Nebuchadnezzar had a 15 year siege of Tyre. He then left to Egypt, never to come back to Tyre. Your friends are ignoring the plain text of the prophecy. If you review this entire conversation, you can see the same theme throughout. The unambiguous text of the Bible is ignored in favor of protecting their preconceived attributes of God.

Your friends bend over backwards to make the clear teaching of the Bible into metaphors or anthropomorphisms. But this does not work. When Moses is on Mount Sinai, he literally talks to God, God literally favors him enough to show Moses God's backside (covering Moses with his hand). Moses is the one writing Exodus and telling us these things. There is no metaphorical interpretation. Moses was not being cryptic. God was not condescending to man. This is straightforward and true words from Moses, who God valued enough to take Moses' advice. When Moses wrote Exodus, what was he communicating

to Israel about this event? But your friends just cannot accept the Bible because they want to make God into their understanding.

There is no text in the Bible that would convince your friends that maybe they are wrong about who God is. Ask them. Ask them what the Bible would have to say to convince them that God does not know the future exhaustively. Any possible thing that the Bible says on the matter, they force out of existence by claiming it as anthropomorphism. Is this intellectually honest?

And besides, figures of speech can't just mean nothing. When God says "now I know" or that "I am sorry I made man" or that "it never entered my mind" or "I will go and see if that is true", what does it mean? Does it mean God always knew or that God did not regret making man or that God always had it in His mind? That is dishonest to the text.

When I answer Calvinists on verses, it is not to say the text doesn't mean what it says, but that the text means exactly what it says. When Jesus "knows all things", that is naturally understood that he has great knowledge. Even Jesus admits to not knowing all things. It is a common figure of speech and any reader can see this. What Calvinists claim as "anthropomorphisms" are only considered figures of speech because they contradict the assumed attributes of God. The entire context of these verses points to these verses not being figures of speech. The intellectual dishonesty is astounding.

Xyz, you need to ask yourself: should we let the Bible define God or should we let some man's theology define God? Me and my house will choose the Bible.

- Today

- 4:26pm

Calvinist

The problem is you don't have the necessary tools to rightly divide the word of truth as a teacher.

Jam 3:1 Chapter 3 The Untamable Tongue 1 My brethren, let not many of you become teachers, knowing that we shall receive a stricter judgment. (NKJV)

I'm done.