

CLASS NOTES - FOREKNOWLEGE OF GOD

Taught By Robert Stapleton



**COPIES OF THIS MATERIAL MAY
ONLY BE MADE WITH
PERMISSION BY AUTHOR**

FOREKNOWLEDGE OF GOD

Robert Stapleton

INTRODUCTION:

1. It is my belief that one should not teach something simply because that is what they were taught, or what they have always believed.
 - A. Actually, the Bible teaches us to:
 1. Search the Scriptures – John 5:39.
 2. Search the scriptures daily, (in order to see) whether those things taught are so – Acts 17:11.
 3. Prove all things; hold fast that which is good – 1 Thess. 5:21.
 4. Study to show oneself approved unto God – 2 Tim. 2:15.
 5. Try the spirits – 1 John 4:1.
 - B. Brother Thomas B. Warren had this to say, “One must be careful that he does not accept a view just because (a) it is a popular view, or because (b) one wants to believe it, or because (c) it involves emotional factors, or because (d) it ‘seems’ right to him, or because (e) it is taught by people one ‘likes,’ or because (f) not to accept it would involve one in a confrontation with exponents of that view.”
Logic and The Bible, p. 72.
 1. As Christians we should carefully consider what he had to say in respect to what we teach.
 - A. I am often amazed at what I hear being taught in Bible Classes.
 1. How many times have you heard about how God “forgives and forgets” without any explanation of what is meant by God “forgetting?”
 2. How often do we hear someone say something about how we should forgive one who has sinned against us, but who has shown no attempt at repentance?
 3. To challenge those who are teaching these things is almost equal to committing the “unpardonable sin.”
 - B. So often it is evident that no thought at all has been given to the subject.
 1. All that is being done is the parroting of phrases long ago taught by others who gave little or no thought to what they were teaching.
 2. I am sure we have all heard the story of the woman who always cut a portion off of a roast before she put it in the pan to cook.
 - A. When asked by her daughter why she did so, she responded, “Mama always did it that way.”
 - B. Now, with her curiosity peaked, she called mama and asked, “Mama, why did you always cut a portion off of the roast before putting it into the pan?”
 - C. To which her mama replied, “Mama always did it that way.”
 - D. Now with her curiosity raised she called her mama and asked her why she always did it that way.
 - E. To which her mama replied, “Well, the roast was too big for the

- pan, so I had to cut a portion off so it would fit.”
3. You see my point here, don't you?
 - A. Rather than just parroting what we have always heard let's study to see if there is valid reason to believe and, therefore, teach what we have always heard.
 2. I am willing to admit that on the subject of the foreknowledge of God I am at odds with many (maybe most) in the church.
 - A. However, it is not the only doctrine that I am at odds with many in the church.
 1. For example:
 - A. I am at odds with those who no longer believe baptism is essential to salvation.
 - B. I am at odds with those who see no problem with the incorporating of mechanical instruments of music into the worship of the church.
 - C. I am at odds with those who have no problem with incorporating choirs, special singing groups, et al into the worship of the church.
 - D. I am at odds with those who do not believe that those who are saved are found only in the church, and that it is the only means whereby one is saved, believing that there are “devout, sincere Christians” in all of the denominations.
 - E. By the way, I am at odds with those who talk about how God “forgives and forgets” without ever taking the time to note that if God forgets, in the normal understanding of the word, then how is it that we read of the transgressions of both Old and New Testament personalities that we would normally say were forgiven?
 1. Since it is evident that He still “remembers” their sins then are they not forgiven?
 2. Or should we look for an additional application or definition of the word forget?
 - F. I am also at odds with those who teach that we are bound, as Christians, to forgive one who has sinned against us, but who has made no attempt to repent of their transgression.
 1. For me to forgive one who has sinned against me, without their repentance, is to make me more forgiving than God, as He will not forgive one who refuses to repent – Lk. 13:3; Acts 2:38; 3:19; 17:30, 1 Pet. 3:9 et.al.
 2. In addition to this, it flatly contradicts Luke 17:3, 4.
 - A. Might I ask here, what part of “if” don't we understand?
 2. Therefore, my being at odds with others on this, or any other subject, is not enough to cause me to set aside my beliefs or convictions.
 - A. Now, if I am proven wrong, then that is another story.
 1. I'll be more than happy to change.
 2. But I want to be proven wrong, not just told I am.
 - B. I have determined to apply the Biblical principles listed above to my study.
 1. Further, I have determined to apply the principles listed by brother Warren to

those studies.

- A. Just because something has been taught a certain way in the church, and by certain people, does not even touch topside or bottom of the correctness of what has been taught!
- 3. The subject of the foreknowledge, omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience of God is a subject that demands more than a little consideration.
 - A. I am afraid that, for the most part, that has been the problem over the years.
 - 1. We have given only a little consideration to it since we thought we had the answers.
 - A. But, at least to my way of thinking, we have not had the answer, especially in view of what is normally taught on the subject.
- 4. As we progress into this study let me quickly assert that I am not denying the foreknowledge of God, nor am I denying His omnipotence, His omnipresence, or His omniscience.
 - A. What I am arguing against is our **definition** of those words and how that **definition** is borne out in an examination of the concepts.
 - 1. To illustrate this let me say I do not deny that such an animal, as a dog exists.
 - A. But if one's description of a dog goes something like "*a dog is a small feathered two-legged animal that flies,*" then I have a problem.
 - 1. Not with the concept of the existence of dogs, but with the definition or interpretation of what a dog is.

BODY:

1. COMMON DEFINITIONS OF KEY WORDS:

- A. Foreknowledge:
 - 1. Commonly understood to mean **total** knowledge or awareness of all things before their existence or occurrence.
- B. Omnipotence:
 - 1. Commonly understood to mean having unlimited or universal power, authority, force, being all-powerful.
- C. Omnipresence:
 - 1. Commonly understood as one being present everywhere simultaneously.
- D. Omniscience:
 - 1. Commonly understood as having total knowledge, thus possessing the ability of knowing everything.

2. DISCUSSION OF MAJOR POINTS:

- A. Foreknowledge:
 - 1. What might be viewed, as the standard interpretation of the concept of the foreknowledge of God is that He knows the future, and that which happens is nothing more than an unfolding of what He knows will happen.
 - A. In a sense those who advocate this position end up limiting God more than those who argue for a more open foreknowledge.
 - 1. We bind God with His having to be "omni" everything, according to our understanding of "omni," and if He isn't, then He isn't God.

2. We end up with a circular argument that says something to the effect, "God is 'omni' everything, and He who is 'omni' everything is God."
 - A. But then we run into a problem when we start facing the facts that God may well be limited in certain areas, as we will explain later.
- B. Why does God have to be "all knowing," "all powerful," "present every where," etc., according to our definitions, in order to be God?
 1. Who said it must be that way?
 - A. For the most part, man.
 2. We have "created" a picture of what God should be, and expect Him to be like that.
 - A. And if He isn't, then He isn't God.
- C. It seems that in our thinking in order for God to be God He must be "all" in all areas.
 1. But this thinking has brought forth some difficult problems as it is related to evil and human freedom or free will.
2. In consideration of foreknowledge a large problem is human freedom.
 - A. The normal understanding of foreknowledge demands that God knows everything, including that which will happen to each and every human being on earth, including where they will be for eternity.
 1. If we hold to the normal interpretation of foreknowledge then we have to admit that if God knows something will happen, it will happen.
 - A. If God knows that a certain event is to be a historical reality, then it must happen.
 1. If it doesn't happen, then God did not know it.
 - B. We have to understand here that such places some "limits" on God, as we will note later.
 - B. An example of this could be if God knows that a person leaves his house at an exact time, and at a certain intersection he will be struck and killed by a specific automobile, driven by a specific person, that has run a red light, then that will occur.
 1. The person in mind has no "choice" in the matter.
 - A. Regardless of what he does, he will die.
 1. Regardless of what the doctors do, he will die.
 2. Regardless of anything and everything, he will die.
 - B. His freedom is dissolved into God's foreknowledge.
 1. By this I mean, that this man could not, at the very last moment, change his mind, only a half block away, and take another route or stop for a donut.
 - C. Be it argued that simply because God knows something does not mean that it must occur, or that He caused it to happen addresses two individual issues.
 1. First, if God knows something is going to happen at an exact time then it must happen at that exact time or He did not know it.
 - A. It is ridiculous to argue that God has complete foreknowledge and

then say something like “Well, God could know something without it having to happen.”

1. If He knows it is going to happen it has to happen or He doesn't know it.
 - A. There is no middle ground here!
2. How could God possibly know something is to happen that doesn't happen?
2. Second, whether God knows something is going to happen or not has nothing at all to do with casualty.
 - A. If God knows that a certain thing is going to happen at a certain time, if He possesses all knowledge, as we define omniscience, it must occur.
 1. Whether He caused it or not is a totally other issue.
 2. I can see an automobile run a red light and know a few moments ahead of time that there is going to be an accident without ever causing the accident, unless I am the driver of the automobile that ran the traffic signal.
 - B. One needs to be careful on this before they find themselves caught up in Calvinism.
 1. If we claim that just because God knows something is going to happen a specific way, and that implies that He is the cause of it, then what happens when we relate this to salvation matters?
 - A. Does God “cause” some to be saved and others to be lost?
- D. In all of this what we end up with is God being locked into a system over which He does not have the freedom to act.
 1. This is what I had in mind when I earlier stated, “In a sense those who advocate this position end up limiting God more than those who argue for a more open foreknowledge.”
 2. It seems more logical to me to see God as the One who has the sovereignty to do as He chooses.
 - A. In making such choices He has chosen to give up absolute or complete foreknowledge for the sake of human freedom.
 - B. This, then, allows room for Him to presently act depending upon man's decision on certain things.
3. Comments by brethren on foreknowledge and foreordination:
 - A. “Our Lord God did not ‘unchangeably foreordain whatsoever comes to pass.’ In fact the Bible reveals that, although God is omniscient, He did not always choose to know all things. In Jer. 19:5 God declared: "They have built also the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind.
Again, it is recorded that God said that the children Judah had ‘built again the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded them

not, neither came it into my heart' (Jer.7:31).

If the theory of foreordination and predestination were true, then God 'unchangeably foreordained' these idolatrous acts which did come to pass. Yet, God declared that He did not command them, He did not speak it, and it did not even come into his mind. How could any person conclude that God 'unchangeably foreordained whatsoever comes to pass' when, in this case, it would be evident that the Lord 'foreordained' things that never came into His mind? From these texts must be concluded that, contrary to the theory of foreordination and predestination, God does not always choose to know all things, although He is an all wise and powerful God." V.E. Howard, Tract - Foreordination and Predestination, Central Printers & Publishers, pp. 6, 7.

- B. "Strange that multitudes of people at least nominally subscribe to this doctrine (i.e. unconditional election, R.W.S.); stranger still that others who reject the basic premise of unconditional election nevertheless argue for some of its tenets because of a vague or mistaken conception of what the foreknowledge of God involves. For example, there are those who insist that 1 Peter 1:19, 20 teaches that the plan of salvation antedated the fall and was provided for man before creation. (A detailed discussion and exegesis of this passage by this writer will be found in *A Commentary on the Epistles Peter, John and Jude*, published by the Gospel Advocate Co.) It is sufficient for our present purpose simply to point out that 'world' in this passage is from the Greek 'cosmos,' an orderly system, hence, age or dispensation. This 'dispensation' was that which preceded the Christian age, announced by Moses, and revealed to him on Sinai. Thus long after the fall in Eden the plan was given and the types which prefigure it were made known.

The projection of a plan to save fallen man into the period prior to the Fall raises immediately and inevitably the question of the free agency of Adam and Eve. If God had already provided a plan to save them from a sin they were certain to commit, in what possible way could they have avoided its commission? If our Lord were indeed a lamb slain before creation for the expiation of the sin of Adam and Eve, how could their action have been other than it was, since not only it but its consequences had already been arranged and provided for in the councils of eternity? In such a view of the case, since our first parents were but passive actors in a drama written and sealed before they had existence, ought not they to be commended for their obedience in dutifully supporting a scheme ordained for them in eternity and which they could not possibly have changed without falsifying God's immutable plan? This conclusion is so obviously and palpably false we may be sure that the premises which lead to it are highly suspect and therefore fallacious. They follow from the failure to make the proper distinction between foreknowledge and foreordination-the difference between knowing of an action and planning it." Guy N. Woods,

- Questions and Answers Vol. II, Gospel Advocate Company, pp. 123, 124.
- C. "Who was foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world, but was manifested at the end of the times for your sake. - The antecedent of the pronoun 'who' is Christ. As a Lamb without spot and without blemish, Christ was 'foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world.' 'Foreknown' means to *know before*; hence, Christ was so recognized from before 'the foundation of the world.' 'Foundation' (*kataboles*, to throw down, thus, the first part of a building; the foundation) indicates here the beginning, and contextually, the beginning of the 'world.' The word 'world' is from the Greek *kosmos*, an orderly system, hence age, or dispensation. Thus, Christ, as a lamb, was foreknown as such from before the beginning of the age or dispensation. What age? Creation, so some expositors affirm, thus projecting the time when Christ was ordained as a sacrifice into the period before creation of the universe. Though such a view is widely held, and many eminent commentators may be cited in support, the difficulties associated with it are, to this writer, insuperable. It is impossible to distinguish between the foreknowledge of God with reference to such a plan of redemption and the *will* that originated it. The two are in the nature of the case inseparable. To project a plan of redemption into the period prior to the fall of man raises immediately and inevitably the question of the free agency of Adam and Eve. If God had already devised a plan for the redemption of man from a sin which was certain to be committed, how could Adam and Eve have avoided its commission? If Christ was a lamb for expiation of sin from before creation, how could the transgression have been other than inevitable since not only it, but the consequences therefore (sic) had been provided for in the councils of eternity. The word 'world,' from the Greek *kosmos*, means an orderly system, an age or dispensation, and as such is often applied to the Mosaic age or dispensation. For examples of such see Luke 11:50; Heb. 9:26; Eph. 1: 4. Thus, Christ, before the beginning of the Mosaic age, and before the intricate and detailed system of sacrifices which characterized it was originated, was ordained by the Father to suffer as a sacrificial lamb in expiation of the sins of the world; and the Mosaic age was arranged and its animal sacrifices provided as types and shadows of the redemption awaiting through Christ. For other references to the foreknowledge of God, see Acts 2:23; 3:18; 4:28. Christ, as a lamb, was foreknown as such from before the beginning of the sacrificial system originating on Sinai, and was manifested (made known, revealed) 'at the end of the times,' i.e., near the close of the age whose sacrifices typified and foreshadowed his own. Such provisions were, so the apostle declares, 'for your sake,' the revelation being for all men." Guy N. Woods, A Commentary On First Peter, Gospel Advocate Company, pp. 47, 48.

- D. "The Greek word that is translated *world* in this passage, which speaks of somebody being chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, literally means 'order, arrangement, regulation, institution, constitution, the world,' etc. From these definitions from Greek lexicons it is clear that the word does not necessarily mean this physical world, the earth on which we live, but just as literally means *institution*. Hence we might render the passage thus, 'Before the foundation of the *institution*.' The whole matter of Christianity was foreknown, foreordained and foretold, long before the foundation stone of the church of God was laid in Zion." David Lipscomb and E.G. Sewell, Questions Answered, pp. 257,258.
- E. Roy H. Lanier, Sr. argues for a complete Foreknowledge of God but turns around and, at least in my opinion, looses the argument with this statement, "Much of the birth, life, and death of Jesus was foretold a thousand years before He was born; and **some** (emphasis mine, R.W.S.) of it was foreknown before the world was (1 Peter 1:20)." 20 Years Of The Problem Page, Vol. 1, Quality Publications, pp. 193-201.
1. At least to my way of thinking you cannot reconcile "all" and "some."
4. Various points about foreknowledge:
- A. There are several things that the Bible asserts on the subject:
 1. God foreknows certain things.
 2. God purposed that he would do certain things.
 3. God is able to do what He plans and wills.
 4. He makes choices about what He will do and about those involved in the execution of His will.
 5. Man possesses a freedom of choice or will.
5. Examination of pertinent Scriptures to the subject:
- A. Genesis 6:5-7:
 1. Due to the actions of man God said that He would "destroy man."
 - A. This appears to be a new decision by God based upon the present actions of those under consideration.
 1. If it is, then how was it that God did not already know He was going to do this?
 2. Why is it that God now (i.e. at the time under consideration) sees the wickedness of man and repents of having made him?
 - A. Couldn't He see that before?
 - B. Why had He not previously "repented" of having created man?
 - B. Genesis 15:13-18:
 1. God states that the seed of Abraham would return to Canaan in the "fourth generation" (v. 16).
 2. Yet, because of the disobedience of the children of Israel it was not until the fifth generation that they actually entered Canaan.
 - A. See Exodus 6:16-20 where the fourth generation only goes as far as Moses, and he did not enter the land of Canaan.

3. If all had gone as God had intended they would have returned in the fourth generation.
 - A. However, the wrong choices of the children of Israel resulted in their not being allowed to enter Canaan for an additional generation.
 4. Why is it, if God foreknew this that He says one thing when He knew it would actually be another way?
- C. Genesis 18:20, 21:
1. Would it not seem strange that if God already knew, and had known it for billions of years, He now chooses to enter the world to see if what He was hearing was true?
 2. The LXX states, “should it not be so, I will still go down, that I may ascertain the exact truth.”
 3. The Chaldee paraphrases the phrase and states “and if they repent, I will not exact punishment.”
 5. “God was about to go down, and convince Himself whether they had done entirely according to the cry which had reached Him, or not.”
Commentary on the Old Testament, The Pentateuch, Keil-Delitzsch, p. 230.
 - A. Why would He need to come down to earth to convince Himself of that which He already knew?
 6. In addition to this, verses 23-33 seem to have no merit at all in so far as Abraham influencing the decision that is made if God already knew what was to happen.
 - A. It is as if God is just now making the decision in accord with the prayer of Abraham.
 - B. Be it argued that God knew that Abraham was going to “bargain” for the people of the plains then his doing so was a certainty, rather than a possibility, and was therefore not made from a free will.
 7. Another thing might be considered, why does God allow Abraham to continue to “beg” for the people of Sodom, Gomorrah and the Plains when He knows what is going to happen?
- D. Genesis 22:1-12:
1. Perhaps Abraham’s greatest “test” of faith.
 2. We can suggest several reasons as to why this “test” was given.
 - A. Most will claim that it was done in order to allow Abraham to know the depth of his faith.
 1. I used to say that.
 - B. But then I paid more attention to verse 12 – “for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou had not withheld thy son, thine only son from me” – K.J.V.
 1. Some may say, as the Pulpit Commentary, “literally, *have known*” but if so why is this phrase not translated that way in any version that I can find?

- A. "for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me." – A.S.V.
 - B. "for now I know that you fear God, since you have not withheld your son, your only one, from Me." – Modern King James Version.
 - C. "for now I know that you fear God, since you have not withheld your son, your only son, from Me." – N.K.J.V.
 - D. "for now I know that you fear God, seeing you have not withheld your son, your only son, from me." – R.S.V.
 - E. "for now I am certain that the fear of God is in your heart, because you have not kept back your son, your only son, from me." – Bible In Basic English.
 - F. "For now I know that you fear God, seeing you have not withheld your son, your only son, from me." – World English Bible.
 - G. "Now I can see that you do respect and obey God. I see that you are ready to kill your son, your only son, for me." Easy To Read.
 - H. "Now I know that you fear God, because you have not withheld from me your son, your only son." – N.I.V.
 - I. "for now I know that you fear *and* revere God, since you have not held back from Me *or* begrudged giving Me your son, your only son." The Amplified Bible.
 - J. "for now I know that you fear God, since you have not withheld your son, your only son, from me." N.R.S.V.
2. The closest that I can come to what they claim is Young's Literal Translation where it states, "for now I have known that thou art fearing God, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only one, from Me."
- A. But it appears that even this translation makes it something that is present at the time, and not something of the past.
- E. Exodus 4:11-16:
- 1. Why did God go through this ordeal if He foreknew the outcome?
 - A. Just to embarrass Moses?
 - 2. Why was He angry with Moses if He had billions of years already to know what Moses would do?
 - A. It seems evident that the Lord's anger was something that just then came about due to the actions of Moses.
 - 3. It seems more logical to say that God became angry with Moses because He now knew his lack of faith.
- F. Exodus 10:3:
- 1. Why does God ask Pharaoh how long he would refuse to humble himself if He already knew?
- G. Exodus 16:4:

1. Why “prove” the people if He already knew what they would do?
 - A. It is evident that they did not follow His commands – Gen. 16:27, 28.
 2. Why doesn’t he just tell Moses that the Israelites were a bunch of jerks, and He was tired of their unwillingness to do as He says?
 - A. He could have said, “Moses, I have looked at this situation for billions of years and Israel is without doubt the most ungrateful people I have seen. They won’t do what I, through you, tell them to do, so there is no reason to continue with this matter. Let’s just cut to the chase, and get them wandering around in the wilderness until they all die off.”
- H. Exodus 32:7-15:
1. First, we have a similar situation as before.
 - A. It appears that God comes to a present knowledge of what the people are doing – verse 9.
 - B. Because of this God determines to allow His wrath to “wax hot against them” and “consume them” – v. 10.
 2. But He changes His mind – verse 14.
 - A. If God knew ahead of time that he was going to change His mind about destroying the people, why tell Moses that He was going to destroy them?
 1. Wouldn’t that be deception?
 2. If God knew that Moses would pray, and ultimately change His mind, then He deceived Moses into believing a lie.
- I. Exodus 33:3, 5:
1. Here we see a similar event as in the previous chapter in that God is angry with the people of Israel again and determines to “consume” them.
 - A. And yet He does not do so.
 1. Idle threats?
 2. Scare tactics?
 2. The statement “that I may know what to do unto thee” seems like the statement of a decision just made.
 - A. It seems evident that God clearly intends to destroy Israel.
 3. But God later changes His mind – verse 17.
 - A. Now, why go through this if He knows what He is about to do?
 - B. There is clearly an air of deceit here if God tells Moses He is going to do something, knowing all along He will not do so.
 1. On the other hand, if, following the beseeching prayer of Moses, He changes His mind then that is another story.
- J. Numbers 14:11-22:
1. In verse 12 God threatens to “smite” the people while in verse 20 God, after Moses’ prayer, pardons them.
 - A. Was Moses deceived by God into believing one thing while all

along God knew differently?

K. Numbers 16:20-26:

1. God intends to destroy the people, yet because of the prayer of Aaron and Moses, He does not do so.
 - A. Were they deceived into believing one thing while all along God knew better?

L. Deuteronomy 8:2:

1. It seems that the various means of “proving” the people indicated to God what He did not already know, i.e., “what *was* in” their “heart.”
 - A. When they chose to reject His commandments then it was evident to God where they stood.

M. Deuteronomy 9:13:

1. If God foreknew for billions of years that the people were “stiffnecked” why was it necessary for them to be “seen” of Him?
2. In claiming that by “seeing” them He came to the knowledge of their “stiffneckedness,” when He already knew it, does it not seem to push the envelope of honesty?
3. Why did He not just say, “I have known them forever, and they are a stiffnecked people?”
 - A. It keeps coming to me that God is capable of explaining in terms understandable to man what He wants man to understand.
 - B. Yet, in many of these cases we end up with God saying one thing while meaning something totally different, if we apply the normal understanding of foreknowledge to all of this.
 1. The Bible says, “Now I know...” and we say, “No, that is not what He meant.”
 - A. What He meant to say was, “I have known this all along.”
 2. Sounds an awful lot like what the Baptists do to Acts 2:38!
 - A. The Bible says, “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins” and the Baptists come along and say, “No, that isn’t what He meant. What He really meant was ‘repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ because you have experienced the remission of sins.’”
4. What is it that causes us to believe that we can correct God?
 - A. We speak of the inerrancy of the Scriptures, but we don’t seem to believe that.
 1. We keep on telling God what He meant to say.

N. Deuteronomy 11:21:

1. How is it if God already knows the day of one’s death that it could be said that their days have been “multiplied?”
 - A. If God knows, then only He knows, so how are they “multiplied?”

O. Deuteronomy 13:3, 4:

1. Another of those passages that speaks of God having “proved”

someone and then coming to “know” something.

A. If He foreknew their love from eternity then why say what is said here?

2. Notice the sentence structure.

A. If God wanted it to be understood that the “proving” was done so that they would know of their love could He not figure out how to say that?

1. Couldn’t He just as easily said, “for the Lord your God proveth you, to make known unto you whether you love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul?”

B. With that possibility in mind, do we not see some deception in the original statement if God was really saying something different?

P. 1 Samuel 15:11:

1. Why does God leave the impression here that He is surprised that Saul “turned back from following” Him if He knew this already?

2. Why is God repenting of something that He had known was going to happen?

Q. 2 Samuel 7:11-13:

1. Why does God say what He says here about the kingdom if He knew Solomon and his descendants would do as they did?

2. Notice the time frame here – “forever” – verse 13.

A. Was it?

1. If God already knew that it would not last, why say what He says here?

R. 1 Kings 21:17-29:

1. In verses 19 & 21 God clearly states to Ahab that he was going to die and that evil was to come upon his house.

A. Yet, in verse 29 God changes His mind because Ahab humbled himself.

2. If God knew all along that Ahab was not going to die soon, and that the evil spoken of was not coming in his lifetime, was He being honest in telling Ahab otherwise?

A. Could not God say that His intentions were for Ahab to die, and evil was to come upon his house, but since He knew he would humble himself these things would not come about?

B. Was it that He had to scare him into humbling himself?

1. But does that justify being untruthful?

2. Do we want to discuss “situation ethic” here?

S. 2 Kings 20:1-7 (see in conjunction with Isaiah 38:1-5):

1. In verse one Hezekiah is told by God, through Isaiah, to “set” his “house in order” because he was about to die.

A. In verse five God hears the prayer and sees the tears of Hezekiah.

B. In verse six God tells Hezekiah that He is going to “add unto” his “days fifteen years.”

2. If God knew ahead of time that He was going to extend the life of Hezekiah was not Isaiah placed in the position of lying to him?
 3. Also, as with Deuteronomy 11:21, how could years be added to the life of Hezekiah if God knew all along the outcome of this situation?
- T. 2 Chronicles 32:31:
1. Hezekiah is “tried” in order for God to “know all *that was* in his heart.”
 - A. If God already knows all things, why must Hezekiah be tried?
 2. Nothing is said here that would suggest that it was done in order that Hezekiah might know what was in his heart.
- U. Job 2:3-6:
1. It would seem that if God already knew what Job was going to do then Satan was an idiot for doing what he did as he would know what God knew.
 2. That would be like betting on a sports activity that you knew was fixed and you were betting on the losing team.
- V. Psalm 14:2:
1. Why is God “looking” down from heaven at men to “see if there were any that did understand, *and seek*” Him?
 - A. If He has the degree of foreknowledge and omniscience that is claimed should He not already know this?
- W. Proverbs 9:11:
1. How is it that man’s days may be “multiplied” and his years “increased” if they are known by God before he is even conceived?
- X. Jeremiah 7:31:
1. It would seem that if God knew of the wickedness described here it would not be logical for Him to say that the thought of it had not come into His heart or mind.
 - A. It is suggested by some that this passage may mean, “it never came into his heart to have children offered to him” - Commentary On The Whole Bible, Matthew Henry.
 1. We might say, “He never dreamed that such would happen.”
 - B. But if we are addressing the issue of the omniscience of God then how was it that God knows everything, but something such as this never came into His mind, regardless of how it “never came to His mind?”
- Y. Jeremiah 19:5:
1. The same point as Jeremiah 7:31.
- Z. Jeremiah 25:4:
1. If God knew ahead of time the end of what Judah would do, why would He continually send prophets to them?
 - A. Especially, in those cases where the prophet would be killed and He knew it?
- a. Jeremiah 26:2, 3:

1. If God knew ahead of time what Judah would do, why say “If so be they will hearken, and turn...that I may repent?”
- b. Ezekiel 12:1-3:
 1. Does it make sense for God to say, “it may be they will consider” when He knows better?
 - A. That would be like me throwing a rock into the air and saying, “It may fall.”
 2. If I know something, or if God knows something, there is no “may” to it.
- c. Ezekiel 22:30, 31:
 1. Why is it that God is searching for a man that He knows was not going to come?
- d. Joel 2:12-15:
 1. How is it that God might “turn and repent” if He knows He won’t?
 - A. Would this not be a case of God giving false hope?
- e. Jonah 3:4-10:
 1. If God foreknew that Nineveh would repent then did not He instruct Jonah to preach a lie?
 - A. How could God have Jonah tell the people that Nineveh would be destroyed in forty days when He knew better and still be telling the truth?
- f. Jonah 3:10:
 1. Did God intend to destroy Nineveh or not?
 - A. How could He repent of His plans to do something that He knows He never planned to do?
- g. Matthew 21:1-3:
 1. Why say “if,” if there was no possibility of it being any other way?
 - A. Keep in mind, if God knew ahead of time that there would be one who asked then it was set.
- h. Matthew 24:36:
 1. To understand the point here one must come to a conclusion on whether Jesus is deity or not.
 - A. If so, how is it that He does not know the time of the second coming if deity knows everything, as we translate these words?
- i. Mark 14:36:
 1. Clearly, we see the possibility was still open for future change here or there is not much merit in what is being said.
- j. Romans 10:21:
 1. Why continue to “stretch forth” His hands knowing they were disobedient and that they would remain such?
 - A. He knows they will not listen, but continues to reach for them?
- k. These, along with many other Scriptures, cause, at least to me, some doubt when it comes to this issue.
 1. Also, keep in mind I am arguing for a **God-imposed** limitation on His

- foreknowledge, which allows man to make free will decisions, and then God acts based upon what man has chosen to do.
2. My point is, God could have, should He have chosen to do so, had foreknowledge of all future activities, but it could have affected man's free will.
 - A. God could have, had He so chosen to do so, had total control over man so that he would do exactly what He wanted him to do.
 1. But where would free will be at in such a rule?
 3. I am not saying that God could not do these things if He so chose.
 - A. All I am saying is that God has self-imposed these limitations on himself under certain circumstances.
 1. In other words, not in every case do we see God making this choice, as there are clear instances where God chose to know what was going to happen - Isaiah 44:28.
 4. As an example of self-imposed limitations consider Genesis 9:8-17.
 - A. Can God destroy the world again by water?
 1. Yes.
 2. No.
 - A. Yes - He has the power to do so.
 - B. No – He has self-imposed a limitation on Himself that He can never, even though He has the power, destroy the world by water again.
 6. A consideration of the phrase “from” or “before the foundation of the world.”
 - A. Much of the confusion that is found concerning the subject of the foreknowledge of God surrounds what is meant in a hand full of passages that speak of the “foundation of the world” – Mt. 13:35; 25:34; Lk. 11:50; Jhn. 17:24; Eph. 1:4; Heb. 4:3; 9:26; 1 Pet. 1:20; Rev. 13:8; 17:8.
 1. Granted, when one first looks at these passages, in the English language, it would be easy to accept the concept that they are speaking of the concept of time, before the creation of the material universe.
 - A. But it has to be remembered, the New Testament was not written in English.
 - B. So, then, what we have to do is to come to an understanding of what the original language meant.
 - B. The word “foundation” comes from the Greek noun katabole (Καταβολη) (verb kataballo) which means:
 1. “A deposition, i.e. founding; fig. conception: - conceive, foundation.” James Strong, Greek Dictionary of the New Testament, MacDonald Publishing Company, p. 39.
 2. 1. “A throwing or laying down” 2. “a founding (laying down a foundation).” Joseph Henry Thayer, Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Zondervan Publishing House, p. 330.
 3. “A casting down; laying the foundation, foundation; beginning,

- commencement.” The Analytical Greek Lexicon, Zondervan Publishing House, p. 214.
4. “Foundation, beginning.” A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament, William Arndt and Wilbur Gingrich, The University of Chicago Press, p. 410.
 5. “Old word from *kataballo*, to fling down, used of the deposit of seed, the laying of a foundation.” A.T. Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament, Baker Book House, p. 517.
- C. From this we see that *katabole* may well be translated “casting down” or “overthrow.”
1. It is distinct from “themelios,” which means the foundation of a building or the first principles of a system of truth (Thayer, p. 287).
 - A. Themelios is never used to speak of the world (*kosmos*) or the earth (*ge*).
 2. It seems that rather than speaking of the laying of a literal foundation (or beginning) the word *katabole* applies to a foundation related to life or establishment of a system.
 - A. The word is translated “cast down” in reference to what was going on in Paul’s life – 2 Cor. 4:9.
 - B. It is translated “foundation” in reference to “not laying again the foundation of repentance.” – Heb. 6:1.
 1. The meaning is clear in that it is indicating that the doctrine of repentance, which had been previously taught, was not to be cast down but, instead, was to be allowed to continue.
 - C. The word *katabole* is translated “conceive” in reference to Sarah having conceived – Heb. 11:11.
 - D. The word *katabole* is translated “cast down” in reference to Satan – Rev. 12:9, 10.
 - E. So we see that even though the word is translated “foundation,” the problem is what is meant by the word.
- D. Much of our present-day theology is determined by this word.
1. When we approach numerous doctrines found within the New Testament we do so with our interpretation of something happening before or from the foundation (i.e. beginning) of the physical world.
 - A. We see Christ slain since, before, and from the beginning of the world – Heb. 9:26; 1 Pet. 1:20; Rev. 13:8.
 - B. We see the prophets slain from the beginning of the world – Lk. 11:50.
 - C. We see certain individuals chosen before the beginning of the world – Eph. 1:4.
 - D. We view the names of the unfaithful having not been written in the Lamb’s book of life from the beginning of the world – Rev. 17:8.
 1. Implied in this is that we would see the names of the faithful

- having been written in the Lamb's book of life from the beginning of the world.
- E. We see the kingdom having been prepared from the beginning of the world – Mt. 25:34.
- E. A quick look at the passages under consideration:
1. Matthew 13:35 (*"I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world."*):
 - A. You may want to look at Psalm 78:2 in reference to this passage.
 1. Note that the phrases "*dark sayings*" and "*secret*" are in reference to the same thing.
 2. Then the phrase "*of old*" is paraphrased as "*from the foundation of the world.*"
 - B. So we get some help in understanding what Jesus was speaking in reference to when we look at the passage in Psalms.
 1. The "*dark sayings*" were things pertaining to the law, but which had been kept from the fathers.
 - A. Now, Jesus is no longer keeping these sayings hidden.
 2. The phrase "*from the foundation of the world,*" in conjunction with what we see here, speaks of the "world" being the nation of Israel and the "foundation" being the system of Law given to that nation.
 - C. You may also want to note Romans 16:25 and 1 Corinthians 2:6-8 in reference to Matthew 13:35.
 1. Note that the "*princes of the world*" did not know Christ.
 - A. This provokes the question of who are the "*princes*?"
 1. The answer is the Jews.
 2. So this tells us, then, what Paul had in mind when he wrote of the "*world.*"
 - A. It is not the physical world, but the Jewish system.
 2. Matthew 25:34 (*inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world*):
 - A. The question we begin with here is what is in the mind of Jesus when he spoke of a "*kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world?*"
 1. To properly understand what Jesus was referring to we need to understand what the kingdom is here under consideration.
 - A. The concept of a kingdom is seen in various ways within the Bible.
 1. At the time of the giving of the Law to the nation of Israel the theocratic kingdom of God was extended to them.
 - A. However they rejected it.
 - B. Even though Jesus later came to "*save his people*"

from their sins” (Mt. 1:21) they continued to reject this offer – Mt. 23:37-39.

1. It should be noted that even in this offer there was no offer of a physical kingdom – Jhn. 18:36.
2. Now, with the institution of the church/kingdom there is again the offer of a kingdom – Mt. 16:18, 19.
 - A. It is a spiritual kingdom for those who will comply with the things necessary for entrance into it.
3. The word kingdom also can have reference to heaven, which is what is under consideration here.
 - A. “...references to the Kingdom fall into two classes, the first, in which it is viewed as present and involving suffering for those who enter it, 2 Thess. 1:5; the second, in which it is viewed as future and is associated with reward, Matt. 25:34, and glory, 13:43. See also Acts 14:22.” W.E. Vine, Vines Expository of New Testament Words, MacDonald Publishing House, p. 634.
 - B. So what Jesus is saying here is that the “sheep” (i.e., the righteous) are to inherit heaven when he comes again.
2. Having noted that, we need to see that there are two alternatives in so far as time is concerned in respect to when heaven was prepared for the righteous.
 - A. From the foundation of the physical universe, although as we will see later, we run into a problem with the word “world.”
 - B. Or from the foundation of the system of law given to those to whom Jesus spoke.
3. Luke 11:50 (*That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation.*):
 - A. In verse 51 Jesus pinpoints two “prophets” – Abel (Gen. 4:10) and Zacharias (2 Chron. 24:19-22).
 1. From the mentioning of Abel people assume that Jesus was speaking of the time of the creation of the physical universe.
 2. However, Jesus had earlier mentioned that it was the Jewish “fathers” who had killed the prophets (vrs. 47, 48), and all know that Cain, who was not a Jewish “father,” killed Abel (Gen. 4:8).
 - B. It seems, at least to me, that the matter under discussion here is cleared up when we recall that Abel was the first martyr and Zacharias was the last according to Jewish arrangement.
 1. So what we have here is an expression that makes reference to

the O.T. Scriptures instead of a historical picture.

2. Compare these two phrases:

A. *"The LORD look upon it, and require it"* – 2 Chron. 24:22.

B. *"That the blood of all the prophets...may be required of this generation"* – Lk. 11:50.

3. In this we see Jesus making reference to the 2 Chronicles passage.

C. Again, the word "world" is in reference to the Jewish nation as opposed to the "world" in general.

1. The Law, given to the people of Israel, was the "foundation" of the nation of Israel.

4. John 17:24 (*Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.*):

A. Connect this passage to John 17:5, where Jesus states, *"O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."*

B. Again, if we approach these passages with the view that the word "world" applies to the Jewish system, then what Jesus is simply saying is that before that system was instituted, he was loved of the Father.

B. Omnipotence:

1. A more simplified definition that would be easily understood for this attribute of God is God is able to do all that is **logically possible**.

A. This does not mean that God can do anything or everything, only that which is possible.

1. "By affirming that God is omnipotent (proposition W1), I wish to uphold the views: that God can do whatever is possible to be done (that is, he can accomplish whatever is subject to power), and that (in harmony with his perfection in goodness and in justice) he will do only what is in harmony with the absolute perfection of his own nature. By affirming proposition W5, I wish to hold that there are some things which simply cannot be done; i.e., some things simply are not subject to power-not even to infinite power!... Rather than saying that God cannot do the things just referred to, it would be more in harmony with the truth to say simply that such things cannot be done at all! God is infinite in power, but power meaningfully relates only to what can be done, to what is possible of accomplishment-not to what is impossible! It is absurd to speak of any power (even infinite power) being able (having the power) to do what simply cannot be done. God can do whatever is possible to be done, but he will do only what is in harmony with his nature." Thomas B. Warren, *Have Atheists Proved There Is No God,*? pp 27, 28.

B. Clearly, there are things that God cannot do even though He is

omnipotent:

1. He cannot destroy the world again by water – Gen. 9:11, 15.
2. He cannot lie – Titus 1:2; Heb. 6:17, 18.
3. He cannot sin – Jas. 1:13; Heb. 4:15.
4. He cannot change His attributes – Mal. 3:6; Heb. 13:8.
5. He cannot save without blood – Lev. 17:11; Heb. 9:22.
6. He cannot save a person without his consent – Lk. 31:3; 2 Pet. 3:9.
7. He cannot deny himself – 2 Tim. 2:13.
8. He cannot be tempted – Jas. 1:13.
9. He cannot act against His nature.
10. He cannot destroy himself.
 - A. Since God is an indestructible Being it would not be logical for Him to be able to destroy Himself.
11. He cannot create a married bachelor.
12. He cannot create a flag that is both red all over and blue all over at the same time.
13. He cannot draw a squared circle.
14. He cannot overrule man's freedom of choice.
15. He cannot eliminate evil so long as earth time exists.
 1. As we see, the things that God cannot do are things within the realm of contradictions to His nature, or not logically possible.
2. One should be careful in a discussion of the infinity and omnipotence of God.
 - A. When it is implied that God can do anything (or everything) then you immediately run into a contradiction with the points raised above.
 1. What really needs to be done is a clarification of the terms under consideration.
 - B. Pushed to its limits the word "infinity" would carry with it the concept that God possesses absolute Omnipotence, which would have to present itself in His being capable of exceeding the boundaries of logic and doing that which is against His nature.
 1. What needs to be understood is that Omnipotence does not, per se, imply infinity in power.
 2. Actually, the word infinite is found only three times in the Bible – Job 22:5; Psalm 147:5; Nahum 3:9.
 - A. Of those three times only once is it connected to an attribute of God's nature – Psalm 147:5.
 1. And there it is in reference to God's understanding and not His power.
 2. There is no disagreement that God is great in power!
 - A. But there is a difference in saying that He is great in power and that He is infinite in power.
 3. In Psalm 147:5 we find two attributes of God mentioned; power and understanding.

- A. When one considers the passage and these attributes they see that only the understanding of God is said to be infinite.
- 3. There is no place in the Bible that teaches that God is infinite in power.
 - A. It seems significant, at least to me, that if God intended man to understand that He was infinite in power that He nowhere says so in the Bible.
 - 1. If it is argued that Revelation 19:6 claims such infiniteness then a further study of the text needs to be made.
 - A. It does say that God is omnipotent, but, again, there is a difference between infinite and omnipotence.
 - B. God is not infinite in power as is seen in His inability to sin.
 - 1. Further, it is seen in His inability to do that, which is contrary to His nature.
- 3. If one properly studies the nature of God they will see that the laws of logic are the fundamental laws of God's nature.
 - A. This is true because God is Logos – Jhn. 1:1.
 - B. The importance of this point is seen in the statement we made earlier in that omnipotence is defined, as God being able to do all that is logical.
 - 1. God is capable of doing the physically impossible so long as it does not contradict the laws of logic, or other areas of His attributes.
 - 2. For example, God formed man out of the dust of the earth and “breathed” life into his nostrils – Gen. 2:7.
 - A. That is physically impossible.
 - 1. I could make a mud man and breathe into “his” nostrils for years and “he” would never stand up and walk.
 - C. The above points are valuable when one undertakes a study of Matthew 19:26 where Jesus states, *“With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible.”*
 - 1. Indeed, all possible things are possible with God, but what about the “impossible?”
 - A. You say, “Everything is possible with God?”
 - 1. Really?
 - A. Can God lie?
 - 1. Of course not, it is impossible.
 - B. Can God save a man without the shedding of blood?
 - 1. Of course not, it is impossible.
 - C. Can God destroy the world again by water?
 - 1. Of course not, it is impossible.
 - B. Well, then, is everything possible with God?
 - 1. “The possible things are.”
 - A. Huh, wonder why I didn't think of that?

2. When it comes to God's power to do things it must be understood that there are restrictions in place.
 - A. Such things as the nature of God, laws of logic, physical laws, etc. all play a part in what can or cannot be done by God.
- D. We might give some thought to Paul's words to the Philippian church, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me" (Philippians 4:13).
 1. Could Paul do all things?
 - A. Yes.
 - B. No.
 2. Depending upon what you are saying he could do.
 - A. He could not do that which is contrary to deity's will for him through the power of deity.
 - B. He could not do the "undoable."
 1. Could he conceive a child within "his" womb?
 3. So we see a limitation here.
- E. What about the "all authority" given unto Jesus in Matthew 28:19?
 1. Are there no limits to that authority?
 - A. Did/does Jesus have authority to countermand the commands of the Father?
 - B. Would we affirm that he has the authority to direct Christians to murder those who were in opposition to Christianity, just for the sake of murdering them?
 2. The point that I want us to see is that even though the passages speak of "all," they are still limited.
 - A. Therefore, why can there not be a limit to the "all power" (omnipotence) of deity in other areas?
- C. Omnipresence:
 1. Keeping with the easier definitions that we have been giving I would contend that omnipresence means that God is capable of being anywhere and everywhere that is possible for him to be.
 2. Our problem in understanding the "omni" attributes of God is how we approach the study.
 - A. The heathen poet Simonides, when asked by Hieron, king of Syracuse, around 500 B.C., the question "What is God," asked for a day to think on the matter.
 1. At the end of the day he asked for two additional days to consider the question.
 2. Following the conclusion of the two additional days he asked for four more days to consider the question.
 3. This continued for an extended period of time until, after several weeks, the king asked, "Why are you taking so long to answer my simple question?"
 4. To which Simonides replied, "The more I think of God, the more he is

still unknown to me.”

3. When we speak of the omnipresence of God we indicate the belief that God is not limited by space – Psa. 139:7-10; Prov. 15:3; Jere. 23:23, 24.
 - A. We accept the view that He is universally present to all of space at all times.
 1. Not an implication that He is found in all the infinite reaches of space.
 - A. We can say that He is not present in all space, although He is present to all space.
 4. Pantheism argues that God is in everything.
 - A. If we say that the omnipresence of God demands that He be in all things then we must accept the philosophy of Pantheism.
 5. Deism argues that God is the creator, but only oversees the creation from a distance and has no involvement in it today.
 - A. This makes God some sort of divine “clock-maker” who sits back and watches His “clock” tick down.
 - B. This view eliminates any concept of providence, which has God involved in His creation.
 6. As with the other “omni” attributes of Deity we must understand that God may well “restrict” the attribute of His omnipresence.
 - A. In other words, it is God who chooses where He may or may not be found.
 1. It would be foolish to argue that since God is omnipresent this implies that He must be as much in hell as He is heaven.
 - A. Or that He is as much in the life of the non-Christian as He is the life of the Christian.
 - B. Psalm 139:8, and Acts 2:27 and 31, in the K.J.V., do not teach that deity is to be found in hell.
 1. Note these passages:
 - A. Psalm 139:8 - “If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there”
 - B. Acts 2:27 - “Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.”
 - C. Acts 2:31 - “He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.”
 2. In Psalm 139:8 the word “hell” should be understood as “Sheol” as it should be understood as “Hades” in Acts 2:27 and 31.
 - A. Both Sheol and Hades refer to the intermediate state of the dead following death and before the final judgment.
 - B. This state includes both “paradise” (Lk. 23:43), Abraham’s bosom (Lk. 16:22), and torment (Lk. 16:23) or Tartarus (2 Peter 2:4).
- D. Omniscience:
1. Here, too, a much easier definition of which to understand omniscience would be that God possesses knowledge of everything that is logically knowable.
 - A. One author explained it this way, “Thus, in the act of creating us truly

- free, it could be said that God limited his knowledge, or limited his power.” John Sanders, Open Theism.
2. It seems best that we say that the concept of Divine Nescience **does not** argue that God is **unable** to predict what an individual will choose.
 - A. Instead, God, under certain circumstances and conditions, chooses not to predict what an individual will freely choose to do since this is unpredictable.
 1. In other words, God will not predict that which is unpredictable.
 - B. Part of our problem in understanding this subject is that we enter the discussion carrying the baggage of a wrong concept of foreknowledge.
 1. We see God knowing, before the beginning of time, of the need for a Savior and a plan of redemption.
 - C. The idea of an open foreknowledge or Divine nescience includes the assumption that choices based on free will are unpredictable.
 1. Thus, God does not predict that which in its very nature is unpredictable.
 3. Is Jesus God (i.e. deity)?
 - A. If you answer yes, and you should (John 1:1, 14) then does He possess omniscience?
 1. One would probably answer something like, “Well, if He is God He does.”
 - A. And that would be a good answer.
 - B. Now with that in mind lets look at a few passages in view of the common definition of omniscience.
 1. Matthew 24:36 - *“But of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only.”* A.S.V.
 2. Mark 13:32 – *“But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.”* K.J.V.
 - A. What is meant by the phrase *“neither the Son?”*
 1. Well, if words have any meaning at all, the Son (i.e. Jesus) does not know when the end is coming.
 - B. It can be debated all day and all night as to the reason He may not know of the time frame of this event, but the point is, He does not know.
 1. If He chose not to know, He still doesn’t know.
 2. If He willed Himself not to know, He still doesn’t know.
 3. If He, by emptying Himself (Phil. 2:7), voluntarily surrendered His knowledge of this event, He still did not know.
 3. Luke 2:52 – *“And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man.”*
 - A. How is it that Jesus *“increased in wisdom?”*
 - B. If He, as God, possessed total omniscience, with man’s normal understanding of omniscience in mind, how could this be?

4. John 17:21 – *“That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.”*
 - A. Why is it that Jesus prays for a unity that, if He possesses total omniscience, He knows is not going to become a reality?
5. Hebrews 2:18 – *“For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.”*
 - A. Why was it that Jesus needed to suffer in order to be able to “succour” those who are tempted?
 1. There seems to be a lack of know-how in regard to “succouring” man until Jesus actually went through what man goes through.
 - B. Before Jesus came to earth how was it that deity knew about temptation?
 1. When I speak of knowing here I speak of having first hand knowledge of what it is like to be tempted, not just knowing that such exists.
4. Is the Holy Spirit Deity (i.e. God)?
 - A. Again, if you answer yes then you have properly answered the question.
 1. He could not possibly be anything other than Deity and fulfill such passages as John 14:26; 15:26; 16:13.
 - B. As Deity, does He possess omniscience?
 1. Huh, yep!
 - C. Lets look at one passage in view of the commonly accepted definition of the word omniscience.
 1. 1 Corinthians 1:10 – *“Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.”*
 - A. How is that the Holy Spirit, who possesses omniscience, directs Paul to “beseech” for that which He knows is not going to happen?
 - B. Doesn’t that, at least, border on deceit?
 2. Of course it can be argued that he does so even knowing that it would happen, indicating his desire for such to become a reality.
 - A. But why express it that way?

CONCLUSION:

1. I am sure that there are many who would not be willing to come to the same conclusions that I have on this matter.
 - A. However, I do believe it merits consideration.
2. Clearly, I do not see this as an issue for which we would want to divide over.
 - A. Do your own study, draw your own conclusions, and let me know what you think.