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**Jeff:** Okay. So this is going to be our last week in Jonah. And I’m not really sure where we’re going next; I’ll have to let you know that. But what I want us to do is, I want us to finish up this last lesson that we started last week. And if you remember I want to just kind of jog your memory a bit. This is in the middle of the last point that we were on and we sort of hastened through it. But I said to you that God is the Ruler, and that means He is sovereign over all things. And then I gave us a list of passages to look up that indicate that He is sovereign.

And then I had us go back to Jonah. And in looking at Jonah we see that God is sovereign over all these things that appear in the story, whether it be the wind or the worm or the plant that grew up. All these things are from the hand of the Lord.

And at that point I asked you just a simple question. I asked you, “What is God’s providence?” And I think that’s an important question. And this is a good answer that comes from the Westminster Shorter Catechism. This was just before we ended the last time and it kind of pushed us through very quickly. But it says, *“God’s providence is His completely holy, wise and powerful preserving and governing every creature and every action.”*

And that’s a concept that a lot of people can embrace at least intellectually. But when that begins to work itself out in one’s life it doesn’t always find an easy spot in our thinking. And yet when we look at all those passages that we looked at the last time, it’s a hard doctrine to sidestep. It certainly is one of those things that is clearly taught in Scripture. But again I don’t think that it’s the intellectual side of this doctrine that’s difficult for us to take in. As someone just told me last week, I think it’s actually that when something tragic happened in the life of this family this person said to me, “I woke up this morning shortly after the event and I said to myself, ‘Oh, this is the next chapter that God has for us in our lives.’”

And there’s a sense in which that can be received through the grid of God’s providence with some semblance of—can I say it?—ease. And I don’t mean to make light of any situation. Or one can actually chafe against the God who gives the situation, as if we can change the tide by our reaction to it. And in fact we can’t, and you know we can’t change life’s events by our reactions to them. We can either suffer under them in ways that we don’t need to suffer because we are trying to get out from under them, or we can allow God to shape us through them. And that’s really what I’m trying to press upon you as we think about God’s providence in this particular lesson. God is sovereign; He has a good end, a good *telos* in mind for us. But it is oftentimes the most difficult thing for us to embrace that providence in the midst of it.

I’ll say this last thing before I move on, and that is this. I remember sitting across from a couple. They had been married not a long time, but not a short time either. I can’t even remember now how many years they had been married. But I was counseling them because of infidelity in the marriage. And I remember the husband just wanting to get to the end of it. His wife was the one who had the affair. He just wanted to get to the end of the process.

I remember telling him that if you don’t actually take some time now and try to embrace what’s happening to you, recognize some things that are being said, and sort of live in the moment, if I can say it that way, the end isn’t going to be so sweet. But if you can actually live in the moment and sort of articulate and listen and embrace what’s happening and really try to work through it, when you get to the end of this you’re going to be better off, rather than trying to resist it and just kind of want the end. “I want the end!” And I think that oftentimes that’s what we want; it’s just to get me through this.

But anyway, that’s God’s providence. And this comes to us in Psalm 55:22: *“Cast your cares upon the LORD, and He will sustain you.”* Peter picks this up in 1 Peter chapter 5. And he basically doesn’t say this. But he basically says, *“Cast your cares upon the Lord, for He cares for you.”* So what he is giving to us is what he has embraced himself. And that is that in the midst of God’s providence he has come to know God’s care over his life in a way that’s quite magnificent.

And again some of these places that are articulated in the Scriptures help us. I won’t say this. God does know the number of hairs that are on our heads, but He seems to have lost some of mine. *(Laughter)* And some of yours as well. That’s obviously a joke. *(Laughter)* And then a sparrow doesn’t fall on the ground apart from the will of the Father. And you know, when you think about a sparrow, of course the sparrow is the cheapest of all birds in the sense of the first century. And so God doesn’t allow this bird that is almost incidental in life to fall to the ground apart from His will. And certainly He will not permit one day of our lives to fall to the ground apart from His will.

And so he says to Jonah at the very end, “Should I not have compassion on the things that I have made?” And you know, all of a sudden, when you take in all of this Scripture that we took in the last time and you get to this final end point, you realize that this is a wonderful capstone to this story. God is basically summoning all things revealed about His character. And He says to Jonah, “Should I as Creator not have compassion on all the things that I have created?” *And so that’s a wonderful thing. But that was the lesson that kind of winds us down to where we really finished in haste the last time. But do you have anything that you want to talk about or any questions you want to ask before we move on to this next point? No? Okay.*

All right. The third point is that *God is consistent in His dealings with men.* And we would expect this to some degree. But in Jonah chapter 4 and verse 2 Jonah says, “This is why I made haste to Tarshish, to flee to Tarshish.” And what he is really saying, at least what’s underneath the surface of all this, is “God, I knew what kind of God You are. And I know that You deal consistently with people.” In other words, “I know Your character. And Your character doesn’t change. You’re not the kind of God who selects this attribute for the day and this attribute for tomorrow. No, You are the kind of God who is, because all that is in God is God.” And God doesn’t change in what we call His immutable attributes. And so Jonah says, “I know this about You, and so that’s why I fled to Tarshish.”

And what is it about God that we can say when we talk about this idea of Him being consistent in His dealings with men? Well, we can talk about God being faithful to His own nature. God is faithful to His own nature.

Now that’s something that Jonah recognizes and actually emphasizes in this case. I want to show you something in another Old Testament text that is quite striking. And I think that sometimes it mirrors us; sometimes it doesn’t. But it’s the example that we find in Malachi, right? I want you to think about Malachi, and I want you to think about what is said about God there in that prophecy. In that prophecy listen to what Israel—the church—says about God and to God.

In Malachi 2:7 Israel says, *“Everyone who does evil is good in the sight of the LORD, and He delights in them.”* That’s amazing, because at this point in Israel’s unfolding history what we find is, we find them accusing God of being inconsistent with His nature.

Now that’s amazing! And I think that is maybe something that characterizes us in our worst moments. In our worst moments, when you think about Jonah, you think about Jonah’s worst moment. Jonah’s worst moment is that he’s accusing God of being inconsistent with who He is. But when you think about Israel, in their worst moment they are accusing God of being absolutely contrary to what He has revealed Himself to be in other instances.

Now I don’t know if that contrast hits you in the way that it hits me. But it hits me because it’s far easier to deal with someone who actually represents God consistently and well in their thinking, and their behavior is outside of that. In other words, they know who God is and they know what God expects, what He demands. They know how He treats people who repent--all of that sort of thing—versus the person who actually says that God is not who He claims to be.

That’s amazing when you think about it. And that’s the way Israel was acting. So much worse than Jonah is the people of God at this moment. They are accusing God of acting contrary to His very nature.

Now what does God say to that? Now this takes us back to our point. God says in Malachi 3:6, *“For I, the LORD, do not change.”*

Now I want us to think about that for just a minute. In Scripture we find some good examples of what this means. And yet we call it God’s immutability. That’s just a fancy name for what Scripture reveals about God and His consistency. God is immutable; He does not change.

We are different. We are mutable creatures, that is, we are changing. And Ted already indicated that when he asked who is 70 or 75, who is 110, right?—that sort of thing. He has already indicated that to us. So Scripture indicates to us that God is immutable.

Now if God is immutable, if He is unchanging, He is consistent in His dealings. What do we make of our text? And that leads us to the language of revelation that I want us to talk about that’s our final point, the language of revelation that we’re going to wind things up with.

I think one of the things that we need to consider when we think about the language of revelation is that we oftentimes end up in mystery. And I mentioned this to you one time before. Hopefully it’s something you remember. I said to you that when we think about God we think about what we call the Archetype. And *Arche* is the word in Greek that is the word “ruler” or “beginning.” And in this case I want you to think about the beginning. That is, He is the Source of all knowledge.

Now when we think about God we think about God in distinction from all that He has created. Now all that God is is God. But what God created is not God. All that God is is infinite, right?

Now that’s a word we use to try and capture what we can’t capture. In other words, how can we capture what God is except to use created language to do it? Infinity isn’t part of the creation. But we try to use that language to capture who God is. It means that He is beyond measure, right?—that sort of thing. So God is infinite; creation is finite.

Now if creation is finite, (you’ve heard this Reformed expression before), “*the finite cannot contain the infinite.”* Now we oftentimes think about that in various contexts. But one of the ways that the Reformers originally meant for that aphorism to be understood was in relation to the Creator/creature distinction, especially in terms of knowledge.

Now what that means is this. The knowledge that God has about Himself cannot dwell within the finite mind. In other words, how is it that we can know God in the same way that God knows Himself? It’s impossible to do; it’s impossible.

So what we have is that we have what’s called an *echtype* knowledge. And when you think about *ech,* think about the Greek proposition “from.” This is, this knowledge is from the Archetype. But it isn’t archetypical knowledge. It’s not the infinite knowledge that God possesses by Himself. God alone possesses knowledge of Himself.

But how is it that we can possess this knowledge of God? It’s only in an accommodated way. And so God grants knowledge of Himself that is accommodated to us that’s accommodated to finite creatures.

Now when you have that being the case, there is always going to be something of a divide between the Creator and the creature. In other words we are never going to have the same knowledge of God because we aren’t the same being as God.

Okay, now that being understood, we understand that the language that revelation uses to talk to us about God has to be true but accommodated.

**Ted Wood:** And limited?

**Jeff:** And limited.

**Ted:** It may be significantly limited.

**Jeff:** Significantly limited. I mean, when we think about it—and we’re going to do that today—when we think about some of the different aspects of God, we oftentimes will say that it has to end in a mystery because we can’t go further than this. And that’s what I want us to think about today.

But before we give up and call it a mystery I want us to press into what we find in this text just to see if we can wrap our minds around it in some way. Now we talked a little bit about this. One of you asked a question early on that sort of got us into this subject. But obviously we were anticipating where I was going at the very end, so we’re going to take a look at this last point.

So first of all we need to remember the message that was preached to Nineveh. Remember that in forty days, unless Nineveh repents it will be overthrown, right? And I said to you that this idea of “overthrown” had a dual meaning. That is to say that you can understand it reflexively or you could understand it passively.

Now if we understood it passively that would mean that God was going to overthrow Nineveh. But if we understand it reflexively that means that the Ninevites would overthrow themselves. They would hear, they would repent, they would respond to the knowledge of the message, okay? So it’s reflexively or passively. That was the way that the message was presented.

Now the Ninevite perspective is what we have to take in mind when we listen to this message, right? Because this message is not being preached to God; it’s a message from the infinite God who has archetyped the knowledge of Himself preached to finite creatures: that is, repent or perish, right? That is, overthrow yourselves or be overthrown. And so we have to think about this from the Ninevite perspective. And that means that they have a choice to make. Are they going to repent and live, or are they going to become calcified in their sin and be overthrown?

Regardless of God’s sovereignty and His immutability, and His consistency in the dealings He has with men, we have choices to make. For instance, if I say that *“The lot is cast into the lap, and it’s every decision is from the hand of the LORD,”* and if I say to you something like this: if I take something just as insignificant as, say, the casting of a lot, and I say to you that God ordained that I would do this before the foundation of the world, I am completely 100% convinced that at the very foundation of the world God planned that I would wiggle my finger before you. But I am equally convinced that I had to choose to make the wiggling of my finger an illustration for you to understand the responsibility of the Ninevites. I’m going to do it again. I made a choice to do it.

And yet, from the very foundations of the world, God planned and purposed that I would use that illustration and wiggle my finger in front of you three times, right? I had to make that choice. And yet this takes us into a philosophical conundrum, right?

What we say—and I’m not going to enter into this for very long; I’m going to enter into this just ever so slightly—is that what we think of when we think about the problem of choice in relation to who God is in all of His sovereignty, is that we find that there are two basic options. There is what’s called *libertarianism,* and there is what is called *compatibilism.*

Now libertarianism basically says this. It says that for my choice to be free it cannot be affected by anything that would affect it. In other words, a libertarian cannot believe in original sin because the imputation of sin to the individual and to the cleft of humanity would impinge upon my human freedom. Therefore I can’t believe in the imputation of original sin, right? So the libertarian style of free will says that “I’ve got to be me.” *(Jeff sings the words.)* I have to make my choice, and it has to be unhindered by any other thing.

But compatibilists say this. Compatibilism says that my free choice is compatible with God’s sovereignty. So for instance in Genesis chapter 50, when you get to the culmination of the story of Joseph, and the brothers say, “Please don’t kill us!”, Joseph says, *“You intended it for evil, but God intended it for good.”*

Now think about this. If you get to the end of that story you could go back in time. And you could sit down with Joseph’s brothers and you could say, “Now let me ask you something. You heard Joseph; you heard the brothers. God intended what you did for good.” God planned and purposed it from the foundation of the world to save not only your family, but many other people. “Tell us. You threw your brother into the pit. That was you. Did you mean to do what you wanted to do?”

And they would have said, “Yes, we did. We threw him into the pit; actually we wanted to kill him. Not all of us wanted to kill him, but we did get to do what we wanted to do. We probably restrained ourselves from doing all that we wanted to do.”

And so that’s compatibilism. Compatibilism is that God does exactly what God wants to do. And yet somehow in the whole we do exactly what we desire to do in the moment that we do it. That’s a compatibilistic way of thinking about sovereignty and freedom of the will.

And so the Ninevites do exactly what they wanted to do. And if that is to repent, they want to repent. If that is to rebel, they want to rebel.

You know, it’s sort of like this. Have you ever read *The Great Divorce* by C. S. Lewis? This is kind of a fun book to read. It’s a great exercise in thinking about individuals, and actually more than that. It’s a bus trip from hell to heaven. And he says, “This is only fanciful; it’s not theological. I’m not trying to make theological statements here.” But there are theological statements being made. But you have to take him in fun or else you’ll take him as a heretic. Anyway, I digress.

So this bus trip goes into heaven. And the people that were on the bus are people who want the benefits of heaven, but they don’t want the God of heaven. And so what you find is, you find that these people who are in hell want to be there. That’s the choice they made and they are sticking to it; that’s the idea. They are happy to be there because they made the choice to be there.

So the Ninevites have to make a choice. They have to overturn themselves or be overturned. It is for God to know the future and for us to live in the present moment. We can’t all sit down and say, “I’m not going to do anything else today because God foreordained that I would sit here all day long today,” right? Somebody is going to come looking for you. And if you’re married it’s probably going to be your wife. *(Laughter)* And she’s gonna tell you to get home right now!

But I also just want to quickly say that there is no divining. In other words, God says to us in the Old Testament that it’s not for you to seek the secret will of God. The secret will of God is off limits for you.”

What is the secret will of God? What will happen to us the minute we walk out that door. What’s the secret will of God? The very next second that you live. I mean, the bottom line is that if one of us drops dead from a heart attack in thirty seconds, none of us knew it. And it wasn’t for us to divine. Man, I’m hoping that I live through the next 22 seconds! *Laughter)* None of us know the future. And God says that you’re not intended to know the future.

What is yours is to live faithfully in the moment. That is yours to do. God has revealed His revealed will, and that is, for instance, the commandments and all the other things that go along with it in the Scriptures, and that is to guide our present day.

So if you say, “God has ordained that I’m going to sit here the rest of the day and do nothing,” then you’re breaking the commandments by doing that, right? You’re breaking the commandments by doing that. If you don’t go to work, then you’re breaking the commandment that if a man doesn’t work, he doesn’t eat, right?—that sort of thing—and so on.

So the issue for Nineveh is one of sin, and they need to repent of that sin. Now I want to pause and just take another example; I want to show you something in 1 Samuel chapter 15.

Now 1 Samuel chapter 15—First of all, am I okay? Does anybody have any questions or any thoughts about this? No? Okay. Yes?

**David Miller:** I think I recently heard the teaching that Nineveh had a complete or a full solar eclipse. *(Unclear)*

**Jeff:** Ah! You’ll have to show me; I didn’t realize that. That’s an interesting historical fact.

**Ted Wood:** From the date of Jonah how can we know that?

**Jeff:** Yeah. Well—

**Ted:** A solar eclipse is a rather common occurrence.

**Jeff:** Yeah. Well, you know, it is true. You know that people say that Christ was not born in 1 B.C. Why? Because we know that Herod died in 4 B.C. Do you know how we know that Herod died in 4 B.C.? A solar eclipse. But what is lesser known is that there was an eclipse in 1 B.C. that scholars don’t use to date. I don’t know why, but it’s really interesting to think about those kinds of historical things as markers for dates.

Anyway I want us to think about 1 Samuel 15 a minute. Notice that Saul is not faithful. This is that tragic story when he offers a sacrifice. Samuel shows up and Samuel says, “I told you not to do that!” And this is what God says through Samuel. *“I regret that I have made Saul king, for he has turned back from following Me, and has not carried out My commandments.”*

“I regret that I made Saul king.” Now that’s the same word that Jonah 3:10 uses when it says “relent.” Remember Jonah 3:10; what does it say? *“When God saw what they did, how they turned from their evil way, God relented.”* And some translations will say “God repented *of the disaster that He had said He would do to them, and He did not do it.”*

**Gary Craig:** It says John 3:10 on the screen.

**Jeff:** Oh! I did this the same time that I wrote “doe” instead of “do.” *(Laughter)* So God regrets, relents, repents. And yet in our text what does it say? It says in 1 Samuel 15, *“I regret*—relent, repent—*“that I have made Saul king.”* That is to say that there’s an apparent change in God. That’s what we might be led to say, right? We might be led to say that there’s an apparent change in God.

Now let me just be back to this for a second. When we think about God, remember that God is immutable. There is no change in God. God decrees the end from the beginning. And so God is unchanging. And yet the text seems to indicate this change in God, that is to say that the way God communicates to a finite community is in an accommodated way.

You know, this is so funny. Once a month we have “ask the pastor” at our church for the teenagers. And so the teenagers all filed in. And there’s a really good group of teens. And so I’m sitting there beside this one teenager and he kind of has his hands folded. You see his head, and he has just asked a question or two. And he goes, “I just can’t figure out why everything is a narrative format in our lives.”

And I thought to myself: At this age I wouldn’t have cared that it’s a narrative format. *(Laughter)* I said to him, “It’s because God created time.” *(Laughter)* There’s a story being told the minute God leads’ one second leads away to another. And it was just so funny to see him relate the two concepts of how we think about life in terms of narrative. And yet we have to think about it in terms of narrative because that’s the way God created, right? We have to think that way.

.Now this is an accommodated way of talking. Now let me show you something. In that same chapter, in verse 29 of 1 Samuel 15, it says this: *“And also the Glory of Israel will not lie or change His mind, for He is not a man, that He should change His mind.”* The same text.

Is that a different message about God? Absolutely not. But I’ll tell you what it is. Didactically it is God saying, “I am not a man that I should change My mind.” That’s a didactic teaching portion about who God is. But the narrative, the story, is *“I regret that I made Saul king.”* In other words, “How am I going to accommodate myself to help these people to understand that what Saul did is bad?” Go ahead.

**David:** In other words He’s saying, “I chose Saul to be king, but it is regrettable.” It’s about the same.

**Jeff:** It’s about the same. So now think about it; think about this. God accommodates Himself. *“I, the LORD, do not change.”* He accommodates Himself to be understood by His creation. In other words, as Calvin says, He lisps to us. He accommodates Himself to us. Or theologically we say this. When we run into a text of Scripture—one that says that God has hands or arms—we don’t say that God has hands or arms. We say that’s an anthropomorphism—that is, an attribute of man attributed to God literarily. In this case we say this is an anthropopahism. We say that it is a human emotion attributed to the divine. In other words, these are accommodated patterns of speech so that we understand what we can’t understand.

Now is this different from this? Or should I say it like this: Are we going to get to heaven one day and find out that God was an entirely different God than He is? No, we’re not going to find that at all because we’re always going to need the help of echetype knowledge. When we get to heaven it isn’t like we’re going to become God and so have an infinite knowledge of God like God. No, God is always going to communicate to us in this accommodated way. He has to because we’re creatures, and we’re never going to be anything but creatures.

And so the answer is: Does God repent? No, the answer is that God does not repent like a man. In other words, as Calvin says, He’s lisping to us. He’s accommodating His language to us, and He’s using it in this accommodated way.

Let me give you one more illustration of this, okay? Does that make sense to you? Is that good?

**Ted:** Jeff, are you saying then that this is the accommodated word of God?

**Jeff:** Yes, it has to be.

**Ted:** It has to be.

**Jeff:** It has to be. And you know, one of the things I would say to you is that when we say that is the infallible, inerrant word of God, what we mean is that the Holy Spirit of God inspired men to write it. But it has to be accommodated from the very beginning because human language is created. Human language is not eternal; human language is created. So at the very start of this it’s an accommodated word. Yes?

**Roger Myers:** So how is Unitarianism like open theism? Is it part of that whole theology?

**Jeff:** Well no, it’s not directly part of it. But what you do find is that they actually run together because for instance, there’s a guy who wrote *Determined to Be Free* by John Lennox. He’s a philosopher; maybe you’ve heard of him. John Lennox is an Englishman. Do you know him?

**Ted:** He debates atheists.

**Jeff:** He does. And he’s a philosopher who is very adept at debating. But he’s a philosopher and not a theologian. And that’s where he runs into problems, because in his book *Determined to Be Free* what he does is that he basically takes that position of the libertarian, and he basically says that original sin—that is, imputed sin—can’t be real. It can’t be the case because that would impinge upon my libertarian-style free will. But what he does is that he realizes that if I say that, that puts me in the Pelagian camp. Pelagius was a heretic of the fifth cen4tury who denied original sin.

**Ted:** Also an Englishman.

**Jeff:** Yes, also an Englishman. *(Laughter)* And so what he does is, he says that this isn’t Pelagianism. But it is Pelagianism.

I have discovered for instance that William Lane Craig is a phenomenal debater. Craig has a Ph.D. in theology and a Ph.D. in philosophy. And I have found him to rely on his philosophy much more than on his theology, which is why, for instance, he says what I’ve been telling you here. He says that this no longer exists. Once God created He had to become a temporal God. You can’t maintain the distinction any longer. And so he actually gives up on God as distinct from His creation because he can’t see any way philosophically that God can exist and play a part in creation other than to be part of the creation.

**Gary:** I just wanted to add that John Lennox is a mathematician.

**Jeff:** Yes. And you know that’s a strike against him. *(Laughter)* So for instance, we all know about the accommodation of language. I’ll just give you an example here. When we think about language we think about it either being univocal or analogical. And there’s a third category; it’s something that hopefully none of us are. It’s the category that words never have a direct meaning in correspondence to another usage of them; it’s contradictory. But univocal and analogical are important for this particular point.

If I say a word is univocal, what I mean is that it has the exact same meaning in every instance. So if I say that my dog is a good dog, and God is a good God, I mean that in the exact same way. And we would all say, “Wait a minute.” My dog is a good dog does not mean the same thing as when I say that God is a good God, because when I say that my dog is a good dog I mean that he brings me my paper. He gets my slippers; he’s obedient when I call him.

That’s not what I mean when I say that God is a good God, right? When I say that God is a good God I mean that He’s sovereign and compassionate in all of His ways, right? That’s what I mean. So we are not people who are talking about a univocal use of language.

However, there has to be some univocal aspect to language between how I understand God and how I understand general life. In other words, there has to be some commonality in the word *good.* But it’s analogical. That is to say that I take the word *good* that has overlap, for instance, between expressions about God and expressions about my dog. But I say there’s an analogy; there is something that can be extracted that’s common to both, and yet entirely different.

So what I have to say is this. I have to say that language is univocal in the sense that it provides a basis for me to understand the archetype and the echetype. If you will, it’s a bridge. If it’s not, then how can I ever understand any instance of the word *good* unless somebody fully and finally divides it out for me? I can’t.

But when somebody says that he’s a good guy, he doesn’t have to define it for me. I know generally what that means. But then they say to me, “Let me tell you what I mean by that.” And I say, “Well I don’t think I would have thought that with regard to that person. But I get what you mean now,” right? They’ve now defined it; it’s that same sense. There’s always a univocality, but there’s always an analogy. There’s always something that can actually be flushed out and enlarged in the use of it. And so that’s how accommodated language works; we can’t get around it.

And so there are some things to remember. First of all God is God. God is able to govern all things. God cares for His people. All these are just to recap. And God uses Jonah to bring us to Christ. And we see that in many ways in the book of Jonah. And in Christ we see the fullness of God’s care toward us. And so that kind of brings us to the end of Jonah. Is there anything that you may want to think about before we wrap up with Jonah?

**David:** I think I might have misunderstood the quote from Malachi. Can you put that back on the screen?

**Jeff:** Yeah. I think it was Malachi 2:7 or 2:17.

**David:** I thought you were saying—

**Jeff:** Malachi 2:17 says:

*“You have wearied the LORD with your words.*

*But you say, ‘How have we wearied Him?’*

*By saying, ‘Everyone who does evil is good in the sight of the LORD,*

*And He delights in them.’”*

So they have wearied God by accusing God of delighting in evil.

**David:** Can you put it up on the screen?

**Jeff:** Oh, sure.

**David:** I thought you said that this is what God was saying.

**Jeff:** Oh, no, no, no. Israel says this to God.

**David:** I just misunderstood you.

**Jeff:** 2:17; I put 2:7! A lot of mistakes. Israel said to God,--

**Ted:** My family member who is a progressive Christian wearies Him. “Everyone who does evil is good in the sight of the LORD,” because we’re all good.

**Jeff:** Ah!

**David:** *(Unclear)*

**Ted:** No, they were created good and they made mistakes, and they learned from those mistakes.

**Jeff:** Yeah. That’s Harold Kushner, right? I forgive God because God is growing like we are.

**Ted:** You wrote John 3:10 instead of Jonah 3:10.

**Jeff:** I did.

**Ted:** But John 3:10 is apropos because it says: *“Are you a teacher of Israel, and yet you do not understand these things?”* *(Laughter)* You hit it.

**Jeff:** Okay, right. Okay, let me pray and then we’ll close. Father, thank You for this day and for the blessing of life in Christ. And Father, thank You for giving us men like Jonah who are pointers in their lives unwittingly to Jesus Christ, for instance how He had himself cast overboard, making himself a propitiation for the sailors. It’s a remarkable picture of the Lord Jesus. Father, we are so thankful that we don’t simply have pictures, but we have the Lord Himself who has offered Himself as an atoning sacrifice for the sins of His people. We’re so thankful for that. And Father, as we bow before You this day, we pray that You will bless us and strengthen us in that knowledge of the gospel, that we might live our lives purely out of it. And Father, we pray that You will do t3his even for Your own glory. So we ask it in Jesus’ name. Amen.

**Brave Men:** Amen. *(Applause)*