

Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 118

Q&A 16

September 17, 2016

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)

Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)

Episode Summary

Dr. Heiser answers your questions.

Transcript

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 118—our 16th question-and-answer show. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey Mike, how you doing?

MH: Very good, Trey, how are you?

TS: I'm doing very good, although I lost my first fantasy game. I think was it to your brother... what's the name of the team? Something about Vikings?

MH: Oh yeah, that's him.

TS: That's your brother?

MH: Yeah, it's pretty lame isn't it?

TS: We had the two highest scores. I would have beat anybody else but your brother.

MH: Yeah, well I lost my first match up in the Naked Bible League... but on a better note, the Naked Bible fantasy baseball league—the playoffs started this week and I'm winning my matchup right now, so I might make it to the finals.

TS: Well, there you go.

MH: The Grumpy Cats, you know

TS: Is that the name of your team, the Grumpy Cats?

MH: That's the name of my team, yeah.

TS: I figured it would be something about pugs.

MH: No, no... not yet. The Snorting Pugs... maybe next year. Yeah, I have a team in one of my brother's other leagues called the Dung Beetles, but we probably won't go with that... and they stink, too, let me tell you! They're bad. (laughing)

TS: Well, good luck in your baseball league, but I'm but I'm happy to see you losing in the football league.

MH: Yeah well, it's only one game... it's a long way to go.

TS: No time to panic. Well alright, Mike I want to mention an email we got from Matthew, who teaches at a Calvary Chapel Bible College in Southern California and he sent us an email about his students talking about, ah, Get Naked... Bible Podcast.

MH: Oh yeah, yeah... I should have told you before we started to not read it.

TS: He says my campaign, my plan, is working and that it's spreading across the campus and all the students and kids are talking about Get Naked... Bible Podcast.

MH: Well, consider the audience—teenagers... yeah.

TS: It's perfect! We need to make shirts; we need to...

MH: No, we're not making shirts for this.

TS: Yeah, we need to get this campaign going full steam!

MH: (sighs)

TS: It's awesome! Alright Mike, well I just want to say thank you again to Matthew and all his students there at the Calvary Chapel Bible College of Southern California thereabouts and encourage them to keep listening to the show. Listen to your teacher Matthew. He did good by getting you hooked on our podcast and spreading the word. Y'all are Getting Naked... I'm proud of you all keep it up and...

MH: Yeah, I will pray for all of you—including Trey.

TS: Honestly, thanks for listening. We appreciate that. That's awesome.. thanks guys. Alright, hey Mike—let's mention some news here about your Supernatural book. You want to do that?

5:00

MH: Oh yeah on a better note (laughs)... the higher note here... yeah... I've been able to negotiate with the publisher, Lexham, to get translation rights for *Supernatural* to be non-exclusive. One of the things we'd like to do with Miqlat, the nonprofit, is to have *Supernatural* (again, that's the lite version of *Unseen Realm*) to have that translated into, really, some of the more—in terms of numbers—widespread languages in the world, but especially places where the church has to be underground, otherwise off the radar. I'm thinking like places like Iraq, Iran, in China, and that sort of thing. So I'm now able to look for translators. I want an Arabic translator. I have one lead, but we haven't gotten a commitment yet because it's 30,000 words. It will cost me, like, \$3,000 for each translation. But we are committed to producing four or five of these. I want Arabic, I want Farsi, I want to find a translator for Chinese... right now we have two lined up. One is Spanish. Of course, Spanish is a huge language all over the world. There's a person I know who has stepped forward who does Dutch translation, so that's not the underground church but, hey, if he wants to do it—well let's do it! I have another person lined up for French. We're going to try to do as many of these as we can, but what I really want to focus on is trying to get the content of *Supernatural* into Muslim countries and into places where, like, Chinese is spoken—places where the church just has to be off the radar. So my goal is to give away the translation for free and encourage people to copy it. You know, to transmit it on thumb drives, to store it online, to move it digitally in any way, shape, or form that they deem necessary or convenient. So we're trying to infect the world, as it were, to infect especially these places with the content of *Supernatural*. So I wanted to bring that up because this is the kind of thing that we need donations for. Miqlat—this is what it exists for. It exists to produce content—specifically the content that our listeners appreciate (Divine Council worldview stuff). And also then to network people who are interested in that kind of content. And so this is a big project I've been thinking about ever since *Supernatural* was published. So it's a year now. And if I can get that translated into some of these pretty serious languages, especially in some of these very specific areas, that would be great. Because we're never going to charge for it. By all means, copy it, disseminate it, distribute it—whatever you want to do. Just get it out there. So this is the first big step towards doing that.

TS: Absolutely. And we appreciate everybody that's currently donating to Miqlat. We encourage you, if you have not, to donate. This is a direct result of your donations—being able to get *Supernatural* in the Middle East and countries like that for free would be awesome. China and the places that wouldn't normally have access to this kind of content. So that's a good cause.

MH: Yeah, we appreciate the donations. We have enough that's been donated to get a couple of these initial projects off the ground. But they're not cheap. It's \$3,000 a pop. But this is what we're going to do. So we have sort of two that are in the works now, and I'm going to be actively looking for translators in these languages for this purpose—to give the content away for free.

TS: Awesome. Well, that's good stuff. All right, Mike. Let's jump into our questions here. The first couple are from Travis. I'm going to just go ahead and read it all, then you can tackle them. First question is:

Mike, what are your thoughts on modern-day abortion being an unwitting or willful sacrifice to Moloch? Would a miscarriage/stillborn/aborted baby go to heaven having not been physically born into the world? To ask another way, is the soul/spirit imparted to the body at conception or upon physical birth. And does the Bible address the idea of a grace period for young children and their need for salvation in order to enter heaven? Would their fate fall upon the belief of their father or mother, or are they just out of luck? Is there any biblical merit to the idea of an "age of innocence" for children?

MH: Let's take the first part about abortion being an unwitting versus a willful sacrifice to Moloch. I don't think there's... There might be somebody out there who goes in for an abortion thinking that "Oh, this is my offering to Moloch, or to a god." I basically don't think that's going to be the case, but you know, I'm not omniscient so maybe there's somebody out there that thinks that. Do I think that there's a sinister, evil, supernatural mind somehow at some place at some point or stage *propelling* the abortion narrative. Yeah, I do. I do think that there's a supernatural evil element involved in this. When I say that, what I mean are things like people just being taught today that the contents of a woman's womb is not human. That's sort of this trigger point for justifying abortion, even beyond this whole notion of the woman saying "it's my body" when it's actually not. If we're talking *science* here—let's try to do some science here. The contents of the She's the host, but it's not her body that's being destroyed. It's someone else's body. Genetically, the contents of the womb are human. That's all that it ever can and will be. It won't transform into something else genetically. It is human. And it's alive. If you put the contents of a woman's womb on a Mars rock, you'd say you had discovered Martian life and win a Nobel Prize. It's living. It grows. It is becoming what it was intended to be. It's not the same as swabbing your cheek to get human cells there, because they will die. They won't grow into anything else. So it's different than that. Again, these are all scientific statements that are all very straightforward, very provable, very well-known. But nevertheless, people are taught the opposite. So I think that whole effort to get people to *dehumanize* humanity is something that's very sinister and evil, and I think supernatural evil does have a role to play in that whole process. I don't think that's a stretch at all.

10:00

Now the whole thing about the eternal destiny of the stillborn, the miscarried, the aborted baby. We can add, as well, babies that are born with severe mental incapacitation—that they'll never actually be able to believe, that sort of thing. I put them all in one category. The best answer to this is to go up to the Naked Bible Blog. I did an extensive series of posts on Romans 5:12 (and we'll provide the

link to this on this episode's page). One of them dealt specifically with the fate of the unborn—infants and other human beings who cannot believe. Now I'm not doing to go through that whole series on Romans 5:12, but I'll basically give you the highlights. Romans 5:12 says:

Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all sinned. [MS: or "all sin," as some translations will have]

There you go. Well, this verse has been taken for, not centuries but millennia, in the history of the Christian Church—and this goes back to the church fathers, so I'm going to lay this at their feet. This verse is used to teach the idea that every human being after Adam inherited Adam's guilt. This is the typical articulation of the Doctrine of Original Sin. The Doctrine of Original Sin has become sort of transformed into the doctrine of the transmission of Adam's guilt to all people. The verse never says that Adam's sin, the guilt, was transferred to other human beings. It never says that. Let me read it again:

Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man...

Okay, we know who that one man is, it's Adam.

...and death through sin...

So there was sin that we have, now death is part of the picture, and I would say it's human death because the rest of the verse is about humans, not animals or microbes.

...so death spread to all men.

Did you catch that? *Death* is what spread to all men, all humans. Not guilt. Death. The text says death. Romans 5:12 is about the transmission of mortality to all humans. Once Adam and Eve sin they're driven from the Garden, they're cut off from the source of life, the presence of God, Eden, all that stuff. They are now going to die. That's what God told them. It's about *death*. It's not about the transmission of *guilt*—moral guilt before God. Now that makes a huge difference because if you believe that every human being inherits guilt because of Adam, well then a baby that gets aborted that isn't in the Body of Christ or is cut off from believing in Christ, either because of death or their mental incapacitation—they're going to go to hell! Pastors, people who are sensitive to this, will invent pastoral responses to not say that. They'll say, "Oh, well, God makes an exception." Well there's no verse for that! God loves cute babies, so therefore they're in heaven. It's bluster. It's contrived. It's made up. Or they'll say, "Well, God will make sure that you don't remember the death of your stillborn child and you won't remember that it's in Hell now." Again, there's no verse for that. And there are lots of verses

that are evidence for the fact that we will remember our lives and relationships here in this life in the next life. Again, these are contrived answers because people are trapped by a flawed view of Romans 5:12.

15:00

I have also talked on the blog about how this really impacts Jesus. Jesus is a descendant of Adam. He is the son of Adam, the son of David. He's *human*. So where does Jesus get off in not inheriting Adam's guilt. And everybody says, "Oh, the virgin birth, the virgin birth!" Well, I've got news for you: Mary was human. She was a descendant from Adam, too. Where's the verse that says the sin nature, or Adamic guilt, flows through only men? There is no such verse! These are theological inventions. It also doesn't work to say, well, Jesus was just kind of put into the world by God—plopped in there. Well, that's nice. Then Paul gets to be wrong in Romans 1:3, where he says that Christ is descended from David according to the flesh. Jesus is either human—a descendant of Adam—or he's not. Either the genealogies are correct or they're not, or they're lies. They're not lies. They are real. They mean something. But if you're going to take the traditional view of Romans 5:12, Jesus inherited Adam's guilt. Now the Catholic Church saw this problem very clearly and so this is why they invented the doctrine that Mary was sinless. There's no verse that says that. But that gets Mary off the hook and, therefore, it gets Jesus off the hook in that thinking, that theological approach. Again, these are contrivances because of the way the church fathers (specifically Augustine but he's not the only one) influenced the Church to think about Romans 5:12. What I'm saying is look at the verse. It never refers to guilt. At all. It's a mortality problem.

Now my view—and you can go read the whole series of posts, because if I'm going to get emails now, "Well, Mike, what about where it says that all have sinned and come short of the glory of God?" All those things are true. The biblical view is that guilt isn't transmitted to people by what someone else does, including Adam. We become guilty before God when we sin. And every human being is going to sin. There is no avoidance of sinning. Every human being will sin. The only exception to this was Jesus, because he also happened to be God. No other human being can say that, so all humans—if they're allowed to live—will sin against God and will become guilty before God. That's why every human being needs Christ.

Now if we think about this a little bit more we have situations where you have to define, well what is sin? Does it involve the act of the human will? Do you have to knowingly rebel against God? I would say, yeah you do. And people will bring up sin language in the Old Testament. Hey, go listen to our Leviticus series on the podcast. The "sins" there are not about moral impurity but about ritual impurity. People get confused by the language of a lot of Old Testament verses that really don't apply to moral transgressions at all. To have a moral transgression you have to have an act of the will. And an infant that's two days old is not morally, willfully rebelling against the revelation of God in some area. It's just not doing that. So there is a biblical, theological argument to be made for *innocence*. The

aborted fetus never sinned. The child that's one or two days old and then dies doesn't sin. The child who is severely mentally incapacitated can't exercise the will to rebel knowingly against God. I'm saying they're innocent. There is that category. Now they don't go to heaven because they're sinless or innocent as though they're good enough. No one goes to heaven on the basis of any merit of their own. At all. Period. Zero.

20:00

So what about the fate of the unborn? We have to ask ourselves, why do people go to Hell? why do they not have everlasting life? And the answer to that is they become guilty before God and they weren't able to participate in the means by which they are forgiven and joined to Christ. Well, why do people need Christ? Again, the answer is because they're guilty before God, and we know that Christ is the only way of salvation. How do people become guilty before God? The answer is, we sin. Those who die, never having sinned, they're in a different category. Think with me here. Again, I'm just summarizing a very long series of posts here. Everyone at the Last Day will be raised—both the saved and the unsaved. Read the end of the book of Revelation and other passages, this is crystal-clear. Everybody gets raised—some to eternal life, some to damnation. Everybody gets raised. Of those that get raised, why do certain ones experience damnation and don't have everlasting life? The reason is because they were guilty before God. They have committed some offense against God that hasn't been taken care of. We understand that clearly. But if that isn't the case, if you're raised at the last day and you are not guilty before God, by definition (using biblical language here) you do not suffer the second death, which is damnation. You are taken to be with the presence of God, not because you were good, not because you earned anything. You have eternal life because of Christ's resurrection. That is the only reason *anyone* is raised at all. I'm just throwing together a bunch of biblical statements here. It's because of the resurrection. I have met people who have people in their family where a pastor told them, "The child you lost in stillbirth is in Hell" and it destroyed their faith. I think that's abominable. I can honestly look somebody in the eye and say, "Look, your baby, whether you had an abortion or whatever you did, your baby is with the Lord." Not because God makes exceptions. Not because they're good enough. Not because they're cute. Not even because they never had the opportunity to sin. They are there because—yeah, they're not guilty before God, but they're raised with Christ like everyone else. It's just that when some are raised, then they get, Revelation—put in the Lake of Fire. And others go to be with the Lord. The only reason anybody's going to wind up in the Lake of Fire is because their guilt has not been taken care of. The innocent don't have guilt. Therefore, by definition, they are raised with Christ to eternal life. That's what happens to them. That's the fate of the unborn. So, yeah—there is this idea of innocence. We aren't given a number, and I don't think we can be given a number as far as the age. You have to examine, what does God view as rebellion against him that would incur guilt before him? Again, there's no silver bullet answer to that. All that I'm saying is that Romans 5:12—which is the reason the question even comes up—this whole idea of guilt being transmitted to every human being on the basis of Romans

5:12, that is the proof-text for the doctrine. And there are other verses. And look, don't think you're going to surprise me with them in an email. I know all of them. I've commented on all of them in the series on Romans 5:12, either in the posts or comments to the posts. I'm not missing something here. This is something that—it sounds crazy—but I think the Church has fundamentally misunderstood, and it really has some tragic consequences for people's life circumstances. And not only that, it gets you into real theological trouble with Jesus being a descendant of Adam. Other than those things, it's okay! (laughs) It's not okay. It's a misunderstanding that produces this question, and what I'm saying is that you don't need to worry about Romans 5:12 putting aborted babies in danger of damnation in Hell. They are not guilty before God. The verse never says they are.

25:00

Psalm 51: "In sin my mother conceived me." Yeah, well we know that the act of intercourse isn't the sin, but how about we do—just like we do in Genesis 1:26—the *bet* of predication. We'll have a grammar spasm here. How about we take the predicatory view of the preposition *bet* there as sin. Or better, you could translate the same word in the verse as "a sinner" my mother conceived me. That's absolutely true. Every human being will sin. If they're allowed to live, they will sin. Invariably, inevitably, they will sin. So Psalm 51 is perfectly consistent with what I'm saying here. Again, I've been down the road and back on all these verses. If I get emails, I'm just going to give you a link to the series on Romans 5:12. But it's an important issue, it's an important doctrine, these are important questions. So that's the quick version of how I would approach that. But to really get a better articulation on it, read the link that we'll provide. And I would recommend reading the whole series.

TS: That's disappointing that babies don't get in because they're cute. I was kind of relying on that one for myself. (laughing) So I might be in trouble with that one if cute's out... I need to rethink this. All right. The next one's from Kenneth in Fort Hood, Texas.

What does the Bible, interpreted in the proper Ancient Near East context, have to say about gender roles and serving in the military or combat? Specifically, what does the Bible say about women serving in the military or in war? How might it apply to today's culture as more and more combat roles are open to female soldiers?

MH: The Bible doesn't have anything directly to say in opposition to women serving in the military and that sort of thing. Broadly speaking, in the context of the ancient world—not only even the biblical world but just antiquity in general—this wasn't the norm. There is evidence of female warriors in the Ancient Near East. There are very few. There are no companies or brigades of them, but they do pop up from time to time. One thing you might want to look at—it's a very basic source, but Wikipedia actually has an entry on women in ancient warfare that gives you a few names, that sort of thing. But they're the exception that sort of prove the rule. In the Bible you have women like Jael killing Sisera—again, they're

the exceptions. And she's not even a soldier. She's more opportunistic... he's sleeping, she drives the tent peg through his head, so on and so forth. Does that count? Well, probably not really, but women do military things on occasion. But there's no statement against it in the Bible. Culturally it just wasn't the way it was done. There are some reasons for that. There's patriarchy involved. There are gender roles, which doesn't necessarily equate to patriarchy (for those listening). Gender roles in the sense that men viewed it as their responsibility to protect women—their wives and women in general—because they're going to bear children and that's going to obviously perpetuate the family, the town, the village, the tribe, whatever it is. So men were viewed as the protectors in that culture. And a big reason for that was because of the nature of combat. Ancient combat was close combat. It was largely hand-to-hand. And women are not going to overpower men. By and large, that is just not going to happen. Now yeah, I'm a fan of the Black Widow in the Avengers, truth be told. She's awesome—one of my favorite characters. But that isn't what's going on. That's a comic book. You don't have a ninja training for average women, either today or especially in the ancient world. You're not doing this. So we have to divorce our thinking from Hollywood and from comic books here. Ancient warfare was close combat. You used spears, you used swords, you used knives, you used your hands, your fists, whatever. And by and large, women are just not... they'd get decimated. They'd get slaughtered and destroyed in combat of any scale. It just doesn't fit.

30:00

Now today's military—combat's a little bit different. We use things like rifles. (laughs) It's not close combat. Women can shoot very effectively. They can operate machines that also propel things over the distance of miles to kill people. It's just not the same. You don't have to depend on hand-to-hand combat in most circumstances, and so it's a lot easier for women to make contributions in terms of the military and to serve in the military. And they can do it. They're perfectly capable of operating the same killing devices that men are. So it's quite a different world. So I don't have any problem with women being part of modern warfare because of the way it is. They can certainly function like this and do very well, be just as good of a shot as some guy. Just to tack on the end here and repeat the point: There's no prohibition against women doing these sorts of things in the Bible. There's no prohibition against women defending themselves or their families, or their property, or their friends, or their town, or their people, or their nation. There's no prohibition. It's just in practical terms, because of the nature of combat, and also because of the view of women in general as the ones who needed protection because warfare was so physical and close combat. It just wasn't part of the picture.

TS: Phil asks:

In thinking about glorified bodies for believers, what is Dr. Heiser's thought on why Jesus would have retained scars from the crucifixion, in spite of having a completely new glorified body post-resurrection, or maybe that's

not true for us? Then again, what does this say for those believers who've been dismembered or otherwise scarred?

MH: I think that, in the case of Jesus, what happens in the narratives and in the way he's portrayed is deliberate. I think it's also deliberately selective in terms of the wounds that Jesus has in the resurrection body. It's deliberately selective to authenticate that this was, in fact, Jesus. Now you note in the descriptions of the resurrected Christ that the other wounds of the crucifixion are not there: the whippings, the scarred brow from the crown of thorns, the punches and beatings and all that stuff. None of that's present with Jesus' resurrected body. He is completely whole and new in the sense that that stuff is gone. But the wounds of the cross are present. I think that was providential, that God did that to authenticate that this isn't somebody else. This is specifically Jesus. So the wounds of being nailed to the cross, the spear in the side, remain to prove/authenticate that this was, in fact, the same person who was crucified: Jesus of Nazareth. So consequently, I think those instances are exceptional and that glorification will involve wholeness and healing, because the rest of Jesus' wounds are healed. Again, the only ones that remain are to authenticate who it was. So I think in the case of our own bodies, we don't have to worry about having a glorified body that still is dismembered. I think we'll be made whole, we'll be made new. We'll still be identifiable. There are indications of Scripture here and there, little comments about heavenly scenes and what-not where people are identifiable and people know who they are, so I think we'll be intact and recognizable and whole and complete.

TS: We have another Travis, and he has three questions. I'll ask you the first one since it's real short and then I'll read the two next ones together since they're related. First one is:

I just got done listening to Episode 68 (Fern & Audrey) and you all use the term "DID," but I don't remember hearing you define it.

MS: When we did the podcast I wanted Fern and Audrey to sort of define that, and they did in the episode when they referred to dissociation. "DID" is Dissociative Identity Disorder. When they talk about dissociation that's what they're talking about. And dissociation, if you recall the episode, is the brain's God-given (and they emphasize that—this is not a *d*isorder)... They don't like Dissociative Identity *D*isorder because in their view it's a God-given ability of the brain to dissociate one's self from the trauma that one is experiencing. If you remember some of the illustrations that they gave... the one I always use (this might be in the podcast) is we all have the experience that we're driving around the road and we get to the point of our destination and we don't remember how we got there. We can't retrace our steps. We just sort of go on auto-pilot and our mind is, like, somewhere else. Well, that's a mild form, a mild illustration of dissociation. Your mind dissociates itself and therefore your conscious memory, conscious experience, of what's happening to you—it takes you away from that

35:00

trauma (that traumatizing event) and your mind is somewhere else. And their view (and I agree with them) is that this is a God-given brain function. The brain does this when people are traumatized, and so that's why they don't always have conscious memories of these sorts of things. The brain can do this. The problem is that when they're repeatedly traumatized, that this other place that their mind goes to becomes like a new identity and it can be gone to for reasons other than to escape from trauma. There can be sort of a deliberate alteration of the person or the identity. Dissociative Identity Disorder used to be called Multiple Personality Disorder. The more technical, accurate, clinical definition now is this "dissociation" because this is a brain function. But again, they're really big on the fact that this isn't something wrong with you, this is actually your brain doing something it's capable of doing. The problem is that you've been ritually abused or ritually traumatized and now you might prefer to be that other person. You might prefer to essentially live that other identity. You can actually deliberately do that, or you sort of get trapped in that, that sort of thing. So there are those sorts of associated problems with it. That, in a nutshell, is what DID is. We'll post another link. It's not terribly lengthy. It's a post that I wrote for a website called "All About God." They asked me to write one about ritual abuse because they wanted to help support Fern and Audrey and their funding to help ritually abused people, and they've had a number of clients come in directly as a result of Miqlat funding. Directly. Hopefully in a few weeks we'll get to talk to Fern and Audrey again, and I'm sure they'll share some of that. We'll post the link to that article on "All About God." That will explain a little more about ritual abuse and the kind of things Fern and Audrey encounter in their clients. And also the people reading through that, you might even detect some of that in yourself and it may be helpful for you to understand, you know, some issue you're dealing with, too. So I would recommend listeners to go read through that, at least to become more familiar with what Fern and Audrey do.

TS: All right, Travis' next two questions are:

The experience the disciples had in going out two-by-two and casting out demons seems to be more exorcism types, rather than the coming alongside, loving and empowering a person. Why do you think it seems to take a prescribed tact, rather than what 99 percent of counselors and pastors think is the best approach by praying, Scripture memory, and doing more aggressive approaches? For instance, if my pastor had a counselee who was abused and had blocks and personality issues and the pastor was just doing a Scriptural, prayerful, direct approach, encouraging the person to pray and ask God to help them—but that's not the right way to do it—why wouldn't God just look past the wrong way of doing it and help them anyway?

MH: The first thing here is, yeah, what we see in the Gospels is basically exorcism. It's not the kind of thing that we're talking about here, so I would agree with that statement. The next thing I would say is I think the questioner might be

misunderstanding what Fern and Audrey are saying isn't as effective. Nobody's going to say that going to biblical passages, memorizing them, repeating them to yourself—those that are going to have a direct relevance to help the person with whatever they're struggling with—nobody's going to say that that's unhelpful or wrong. What they're going to say is counter-productive are prayers of renunciation. Prayers of renunciation can be formed using Scripture, so maybe that's the point of confusion, I don't know. I can't recall Fern and Audrey bringing up a specific prayer of renunciation. I've seen these things, and I've literally seen one that's twelve pages long. It's just ridiculous to insist that the person pray this prayer of renunciation. First of all, they're not possessed. There's a disconnect there. Fern and Audrey have had the experience of people praying these long prayers, either by reading them off or by trying to do it through memory/memorization, and when this renunciation tactic doesn't work, the thought that immediately overtakes people is that "I must have done something wrong. I must have said a wrong word. I must not have read it well enough. I must not have read it *often* enough." In other words, Fern and Audrey object to this because it makes failure the victim's fault *again*. It just compounds the sense of guilt that they have—that God isn't helping me because I'm not doing something right, that sort of thing. That's what they object to.

So the use of Scripture is actually what Fern and Audrey do. But they don't just say, "quote this Bible verse," or "memorize this Bible verse." What Fern and Audrey actually do, and again it sounds a little zany, but they teach people biblical theology. That's what they do. They help them to think better about what a passage *says*, what it *means*, how it fits into a larger theological picture as opposed to just repeating the words. Now, they would tell you (and I would tell you with them) that renunciation approaches and Scripture memorization if it goes no further than that... In other words, there's a difference between memorizing Scripture and knowing what it means. Again, I'm not opposed to memorizing Scripture, but let me just be blunt: you are better off knowing what a passage means than you are memorizing it. You just are. If you had one or the other—hey, you can memorize these words or you can really know what it means and then internalize it—I think that's kind of a no-brainer decision as to what would be preferable there. And so what they try to do is literally to try to teach people how to think biblically, theologically. This is what first attracted them to the Divine Council stuff, because as they began using some of that with their clients, not only did they say, "Our clients just understood the concepts and the language." Because in the case of those who had been ritually abused if they had some connection to a Satanic cult, or if they were being programmed just to think bad theology, they were able to really detect and appreciate and internalize and process a lot of the Divine Council stuff very quickly. In other words, it mattered to them in significant and almost immediate ways in some cases. That's what sort of drew us together, those 6, 7, 8 years ago—whatever it is. They just saw that it was very useful, so they actually focus on helping people think well—helping people think better, specifically with theology. So you have to use Scripture for that (again, they're not going to oppose that), but they're going to emphasize

content and understanding and internalizing that over just reciting verses. They're two related things, but they're not the same.

45:00

On a broader scale, they're going to meet people and know people that the renunciation approach helped. There's no silver bullet here. Certain things are going to click with some people, other things won't. They're just deathly afraid of working with people and doing things with them where the person will think that they've done something else wrong, because that's one of the fundamental lies that victims are told: "This happened to you because God is displeased with you. This happened to you because God doesn't love you. This happened to you because you're evil and wicked and you deserve this." These sorts of lies that people are told... and so Fern and Audrey are very careful to not do things that create those kinds of traps. But, again, they're going to know people that, yeah, this approach helped them, and God bless them. It's wonderful that people get helped. This takes me (this is just me personally talking now), I think we really need to ask ourselves, "What do we mean when we talk about God 'helping people.'" This might not be lurking behind the question. It jumps out to me hearing the question, but this whole concept of God helping people, I think, needs a little bit of thought. We could just as well ask why God bothers to use human intervention or people in any way. What I mean by that is, if you really think about it, the fabric of human existence and life with God (being alive, being created, and having God as part of the picture) has human interaction built into it. That's the way human life was designed. God didn't create humans to be bystanders. We sort of presume that "God helping" means direct divine intervention and that it bypasses human effort or interaction. So when people aren't helped, then "God didn't show up," so to speak. I just don't think that's the right way to think about God helping. When we talk about God helping people, we're not talking about, "Oh, God didn't show up." Because when we talk about God helping people, what we really mean is, "I didn't see direct divine intervention." Well then, why do we even care about human interaction at all? If God helps people through direct divine intervention, he doesn't need people. So the whole process is kind of ridiculous for us to involve ourselves in people's lives. We don't need to do that because if God really wants to help them, God will directly, divinely intervene. He doesn't need people. He just directly does this. God helps. Again, I'm not saying that the questioner thinks that, but this is just coming out of me because I really do think this is something we all talk about that isn't very well examined. The whole way that God helps is *using people*. He's using his imagers, or his Spirit. I talked about this in *Unseen Realm*. God is actively, all the time engaged in helping. That doesn't mean he jumps into every life circumstance and decides to intervene directly or not. God is always helping. How? He can use his Spirit that indwells believers to prompt them to do this or that (or not do this or that). He fundamentally (and, frequently, I think this is the norm) uses other people, especially other believers, in the lives of other people. That's God's means of helping. It's not direct divine intervention, but that's how God gets things done. He can use non-human imagers—the guardian angel story. That stuff does happen. But the norm, when people get helped in a spiritual

50:00

sense or even in a very material sense, it's because of other people. This is the way God has built humanity. This is the way God has fashioned, has designed, the way human life should be—interaction. God influencing people to help other people. So when I think of God helping, I don't think of direct divine intervention, even though we talk about it that way. When I think of people not getting helped, I don't think, "Oh, I guess God didn't show up. He took the day off, or he had something better to do." Again, that's a very theologically skewed and, I think, flawed way to think of God helping. What I think of is, "Well, I hope and I believe that God will use other people to come into this person's life, or have input into this person's life, and get them help. And I sure hope that the people that God is actively influencing will obey, will take a risk, and actually do something to help this person!" Again, it's just a different way of looking at things. I've said before (and in my novels I try to make this a theme): Providence and sovereignty are just huge in the way the world works and the way it's designed to work. The whole concept of us being God's imagers, God's replacements, God's proxies on this planet, by definition means that God's ministry to people has humans built into it. Yeah, God could be everywhere at all times directly, divinely intervening in every problem. But God has not built the system that way. He uses *imagers*, human or non-human, and his Spirit. I think we just need to be a little more careful. I don't want to go too far on this sort of thing, but I think we need to start looking at our life having dozens, hundreds, thousands, of ripples. Everything we do (or don't do when God prompts us to do it)—our obediences and our disobediences—ripple out into the fabric of life, as it were. And being obedient to God in one place will be of assistance to some person in that immediate moment, and then that can ripple out through that person to another person and to another person and to another person, ad infinitum. This is how God has designed things, not direct divine intervention on his part, but using his imagers, his proxies, to bless and heal and help, in whatever way, other people. So again, this might be a bit of a hobby horse with me. I just think it's a real misconception to look at someone who wasn't helped by some method and assume that God failed, or God didn't bother. That's just flawed theology. It really is. But it's very easy to think that way. Again, we need to step up and put yourself in the gap. When you see somebody not getting help, maybe you were Providentially put in that place to see that thing didn't work so that you could jump in and *do* something. Maybe that's the whole Providential reason the thought even popped into your head—so that you could play a role. I don't know. I'm not God. I'm not in charge of the Providences of everyone's life. But if we thought more Providentially...if we thought about our lives rippling out through other lives on a moment-by-moment, day-by-day, week-by-week basis, it might change the way we think about this. I should stop, because I could go on a long time about how we think about God's activity in the world. I just think that the way it gets thought of too often divorces us from the equation... gets us off the hook and makes God a convenient target, when God is not the target. This is the way God has made things, made us to live. So we might want to think about actually living that way.

TS: Henry, in LA, California, has a follow-up to a question we received on Episode 96:

Someone asked you whether bones of the biblical giants were ever found. He's confused. He thought the whole Nephilim story is based on the Mesopotamian Apkallu myth that was Judah-cized as a polemic. If that is the case, why didn't Mike simply say there *wouldn't* be any bones of the Nephilim in the first place? We wouldn't expect archaeological evidence of a story based on a prior myth.

55:00 MH: I think the confusion here is the word "based on" as opposed to being the point of reference. The Apkallu story from Mesopotamia is the reference point, it's the touch point, it's the back-drop, the back story for the biblical commentary on and explanation of the sons of God and the giants and the post-Flood giants. It is the reference point. That doesn't mean that these biblical accounts are "based on" a myth: "that never happened, so these never happened." That isn't what I'm saying, so I think that might be the point of disconnect. Maybe to helpfully, hopefully, illustrate it, I think there were such individuals as the Nephilim. Let's take Goliath. I don't think Goliath story, is a non-historical thing. I don't think it's a myth. I don't think it's a fairy tale. I think the confrontation between David and Goliath happened. I also don't think that the large Anakim targeted in the conquest were fictional beings, and that isn't what I'm saying in the book or have said elsewhere. All I'm saying is that the way these people get talked about and the way their origins get talked about and their role in biblical history, all that stuff—that goes back to the Apkallu story. The Apkallu story provides the framework for understanding what the bible says about these things because it's the back story, these are the touch points. The biblical writers are responding to a Mesopotamian version of events; what Mesopotamians believe about X, Y, or Z. They're denying the validity of Mesopotamian thinking and Mesopotamian religion at certain points.

So none of that means that we would never expect to find a Nephilim or Anakim, or in the case of Goliath, a Rephaim skeleton. I don't expect, really, such skeletons to have survived from periods earlier than the Monarchy, especially, because the cultures of Canaan didn't embalm. Just think about it. Let's just go back to 2000 B.C. until the first century, so a 2,000-year period. Let's just restrict it to Canaan, the "Promised Land," and the Transjordan area. How many people do you think lived and died in that 2,000-year span, two millennia? It's going to be, at the very least, hundreds and hundreds of thousands. I would say, if you did the math, you're going to wind up with a few million people. We don't have a few million skeletons that have been discovered by archaeologists. A tiny fraction of all the people who ever lived in that 2,000-year span have been recovered. Most of those are fragmentary in some way. Why? It's because they didn't embalm. The natural conditions weren't optimal by accident to preserve a skeleton. You just don't have that many, period. So I wouldn't expect there to be hordes and hordes and hordes of giant skeletons dotting Canaan, because there aren't

hordes and hordes and hordes of *regular* skeletons dotting Canaan. If you looked in the database of human remains at Tel Aviv University (I think that is the place that keeps this database), it's very rare to have any skeleton recovered in any archaeological dig older than 1000 B.C. And that's just because of nature. People die, their bones turn to dust. They don't get preserved unless you do deliberate things to preserve them. And the ones that do get preserved are typically preserved because the conditions in which that body fell or was buried happened to be optimal for some reason. There are environmental factors there. The math just doesn't work to expect hordes and hordes and heaps and mounds of skeletons waiting to be discovered. It just doesn't work that way because of these factors. So I don't expect there to be an abundance of giant skeletons. You might find one occasionally here and there—that wouldn't shock me. And again, when I'm talking giants, I'm talking people who were between 6 and 7 feet tall, because the average height of the skeletons that have been found for men were a little over 5 feet... 5'3", 5'4". I'm not inventing that figure, that figure is the result of actual measurements that are kept in database records of human skeletons from this period in these places. I don't have to invent the number. That is the number.

1:00:00

So, that's kind of a roundabout way to address the question. I think the fundamental disconnect is the difference between "based upon" and the reference point, and then the whole thing about the skeletons is—you know, they might be out there. I don't know. If a really bit skeleton has survived... there's not going to be many of them because there aren't very many skeletons, period. And those who would fit into this class (the Anakim, for instance) are going to be a fraction of the original population. It's not the whole population of Canaan. It's not even close. There's nothing in the Bible that ever says that, although you have people running around that talk about all of the people that the Israelites had to drive out were giants. It never says that! It specifically says that Anakim were encountered in the land in various places. That's all it says. A few of them get away and escape to the Philistines, from which comes Goliath. The giant thing almost becomes like Plato's Atlantis. Plato has like three lines on Atlantis but now I can buy whole books of Atlantean technology, Atlantean civilization, Atlantean education, Atlantean science. Where does all this material come from about Atlantis? The answer is: people's heads. Because Plato had like three lines about it. Nobody's digging this kind of stuff up where lots of other people are talking about Atlantis, as if these are like factual records. It's literally made-up. And unfortunately, we get a lot of this kind of thing in biblical and Christian circles about giants. We do mental extrapolations and then we treat them like they're discoveries or "research." No, "it came out of your head" is really what we're talking about here. I try to be data-driven, and that's how I approach the subject and this question.

TS: Greg has a question here:

After your podcast on the tribulation, I am convinced that I need to acquaint myself with Second Temple literature. It seems to hold the key to so many

questions. What is the whole body of this literature? Where do you recommend that a novice start? Can you outline a quick plan for becoming acquainted with this body of literature? And also, what languages were these works originally written in?

MH: Well, fortunately, you can read this material in English, so in theory it doesn't take much to become acquainted—if by acquainted we mean giving it one or two read-throughs. You could do that in a few weeks if you had the time to do the reading. Let's go back though to what it encompasses. Second Temple period literature... the date ranges... let's just use round numbers here. Let's just say 500 BC to 70 A.D. or 100 A.D. (so let's just tack on the other 30 years there). That's the date range, so it's stuff written during that span of time. Typically, that includes these groups (this is just the way modern people have grouped them):

- The Old Testament apocrypha (there are New Testament apocrypha that we don't count in this because that's later than 100 A.D.) This would be books like *Tobit*, *1 and 2 Maccabees*, you know that kind of thing—just the apocrypha.
- Then there are the pseudepigrapha. That's another category or collection of books.
- The Dead Sea Scrolls, and specifically what I mean there is the non-biblical material. So Dead Sea Scrolls basically have two kinds of material: the Bible or commentaries about certain biblical books that have lots of biblical content in them. But let's just lop off copies of the Old Testament. What you're left with, then, are items that are either produced by the people at Qumran—and that tends to be called sectarian literature—that would be stuff they wrote about themselves and their history and their beliefs (whoever the people at Qumran were). The non-biblical stuff also includes stuff that they collected that somebody else during the period would have written but they had copies of it or made copies of it... things like *The Book of Enoch*. Nobody claims that the people of Qumran wrote the *Book of Enoch* but they had copies of Enochian material there. They kept it. Think of it as a library or a repository. So there's biblical and non-biblical. The non-biblical stuff from Qumran among the Dead Sea Scrolls would be included in Second Temple literature. There's lots that's available in translation in English.
- Another example would be Philo, the works of Philo. He would be in the first century A.D. He was a very famous Jewish writer known for allegorical interpretation, trying to reconcile the Hebrew Bible with secular pagan Greek thinking and material. So he adopted the allegorical methods to marry the two.
- Josephus is another example of Second Temple literature.

1:05:00

Those are really the Big Five: apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, non-biblical Dead Sea Scroll stuff, Philo, and Josephus.

Now you could make that list, write it on a piece of paper, and go look on the internet for English translations of that stuff, and you could read all of it. It's available for free. You don't have to pay for it. Published translations, especially more recent ones, are going to be better because all of these things are preserved in more than one manuscript—in some cases in more than one language and so scholars come through that stuff and have to do textual criticism and judgments on which reading is the best and all that stuff, just like your Old and New Testament. So modern translations are better. But if you don't have money to spend on that stuff, you can do pretty well using stuff that's out there online. I would also recommend, though, getting introductions to this material. You can buy a book like Larry Helyer's, who has a book called *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period: A Guide for New Testament Students*. It's published by IntersVarsity. It's an introduction to Second Temple literature. So that's a good book to have because he'll talk about this material, and that helps you build a framework for approaching it—knowing when it was written, what the books are about—before you jump into them. What were the historical circumstances? What were the occasions of the material? What are things to look for as you read? All that. So Helyer's book is a good guide. There are other guides that are more beefy, but Helyer's book is a paperback. It's probably still 400 pages or whatever. There are other bigger books that are a lot more expensive, but Helyer is one I recommend. He is an evangelical. Most of the time that isn't going to matter. I think in this case it really wouldn't matter. The only reason I bring it up is because if you're reading an academic book on this stuff, they just devote a lot of space to stuff that the average person is not going to care about. What's the redaction, the editorial history of the *Book of Enoch*? How did these manuscripts come together? Who did the editing, and why? What portions are authentic? Who cares! You just want something that deals with the text of these books as we have it, because you're going to read them and you just want to know, what in the world is the thing about? What is it saying, what are its circumstances, so on and so forth. Because when it comes to the usefulness of this material for interpretation, that's the kind of thing you're going to get in academic commentaries and journal articles. Things like that. But you can get a good acquaintance just by getting a basic guide and then reading the stuff.

If you wanted to break it down into the Big Five contenders here, you could buy an introduction to just the apocrypha. I recommend David DaSilva's book. It's the most current. David's a good Second Temple scholar. He's a guy I happen to know. There are other ones, but I think his book is the best for right now. Pseudepigrapha... you could get Charlesworth's two volumes. This one has all the pseudepigrapha, at least up until the point of putting that book together—the ones that anybody cared about. It has them all in there, they all have introductory material: who wrote it, what's the best guess for when it was written and who wrote it, what's it about, what kind of theological emphases does it have. So that's a good introduction, the two-volume set by Charlesworth. The same for Dead Sea Scrolls. You can get books about the Dead Sea Scrolls. You could go

with a one-volume introduction like Helyer, or you could start to drill down into the specifics. It just depends on how much time you have to read this stuff, and do you want current translations or are you content with stuff that's free on the internet. It's more or less up to you. Now we have a link for this, too, that I'll give Trey. Some of these books that I mentioned (and others that I didn't mention) are included in my Recommended Reading list on my website, so we'll make sure that there's a link to that on this episode page, as well.

1:10:00

The last thing, as I recall, is the question about languages... what languages were these works originally written in. For the most part, if you're talking about the original compositions of these books—whether they be apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, whatever—it's going to be Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, those are the Big Three. Now, a number of these books can also be found—they were preserved in other languages because they were translated into those other languages. Things like Coptic, Syriac, Latin, Ethiopic in the case of the Book of Enoch, Book of Jubilees, things like that. But as far as the original composition it's going to be either Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek.

TS: All right, our last question is from Joe:

Mike, you provide a lot of insight into very natural reasons that the Bible says what it does. Your explanations make very good sense, and they have demystified a lot of how I understood inspiration and the role of the Bible in the lives of Christians today. What evidence do we have that the Bible is uniquely inspired and special from any other document from the ancient world, or even today? What reasons do you believe that God has provided this collection of writings as a way to communicate with his people today or humanity at large? What advice do you have for Christians who do not have the level of training that someone with your credentials has—in their personal study and how to apply it to their lives and to their relationship with God directly?

MH: I would like to think that what I do... Joe used the word "demystified." I hope that doesn't mean "de-supernaturalized" because I take a very supernatural view of inspiration. On the other hand, I hope it *does* mean I've "de-X-Filed" it. (laughs) I hate to use this term but I'm going to use it. We have a bizarre, cartoonish way of thinking about inspiration: people getting zapped and their minds going blank, and they're automatic writing—a paranormal view of inspiration. That I *do* want to debunk because it needs to be debunked, because there are so many ways that can be undermined. If people are thinking that's what inspiration means, then their faith is going to be harmed as soon as you show them how those ideas and approaches don't work with what you actually find in the biblical text. For maybe new listeners who are kind of wondering, "What in the world does he mean?" If you go to the Naked Bible Podcast, go up to the "Start Here" tab at the top, and one of the videos is "How Mike Approaches Scripture." I recommend watching that because it will tell you just exactly what I mean by what I've just said.

1:15:00

So I'm focusing here a little bit on the word "demystified." Again, I hope it means I've "de-X-Filed" it. But it shouldn't mean that I've "de-supernaturalized" it. How do you think the inspiration process worked? I have recommended in the past that how we need to think about this is this: we need to think about Providence. Our God needs to be bigger and, frankly, less cartoonish and bizarre. Inspiration means that God, in His omniscience, knew that he wanted things written down for posterity, and he knew who he wanted to do that. And so from the moment a person was born, God was interacting and using his imagers or his Spirit... in Paul's case you have more of a direct, divine intervention—he has to basically assault Paul and appear to him personally to put him on the right course. That isn't typically the norm. Typically, God is working in the lives of the people who will be the writers of Scripture from the time they're born, moment-by-moment, their education, how they were thinking, what they experienced, what they saw, what they heard, what they read, what they were taught. All this stuff contributes to who that person is and where God (Jesus) finds them at a certain point in their life to call them into ministry or whatever. Our lives are the result of a long, long series of events. All I'm saying is, there's an intelligent mind behind all that, and it's called God. And so we need to stop being a "wicked and adulterous generation that seeketh after a sign," that wants something spectacular. God doesn't often work with the spectacular. But that doesn't mean God is not at work. God is constantly at work, and it's this Providential process of bringing a person to the right time, the right place, the right occasion, the right moment so that when they are prompted to write something down they have been prepared for that every step of the way. They are the perfect choice for what God wants written down. There are many hands that we'll never know their names that contributed to this thing we call the Bible, at various stages of how it was put together as a totality. That is not non-supernaturalistic. That is supernatural at every step of the way. What it doesn't do, though, is divorce humanity from the process. What I'm suggesting is if you divorce humanity from the process of inspiration, you undermine the doctrine and make it vulnerable to criticism. Because the cartoonish approaches (the automatic writing, the downloading, the mind-dumping of every word and syllable) are just demonstrably assailable. That's why I go after the X-Files view of inspiration. But I don't want people to think that leaves you with a non-supernaturalistic thing. It doesn't. The way I look at Scripture is, what I'm holding in my lap or looking at on my screen—that is the result of countless acts of the Providence of God and oversight of God to make sure that the final product was what God wanted. Period. God was happy with the result.

Now we could talk about things within the content that for me distinguish it from everything else. The easy ones are things like fulfilled prophecy. That takes a divine mind to make all that work out. It's not just seeing the future. We have too simplistic a view of fulfilled prophecy: "It means somebody saw the future." Well, you could have some competing divine being dispensing information to some Joe-Blow over here, some guy, and he can get stuff right because there are

disembodied divine beings and they can do that on occasion. So it's not just seeing the future, being able to predict something. Fulfilled prophecy, when correctly understood, is not just an isolated event that somebody saw before it happened. It is the network of events that leads somewhere intelligently, directly, and intentionally—where things work out the way God wants them to work out and says they'll work out. It's statements and things written by people—dozens of people who lived hundreds and thousands of years apart—coming together and converging in a very particular way—that show that there was one mind behind it all, moving the circumstances to produce a certain outcome. You have to have sovereignty for that. You have to have Providence for that. So, again, when I say "fulfilled prophecy," I'm thinking big-picture and the whole narrative of God's activity in history, not just isolated events. So that's one thing. I'm just speaking for me now. The interconnectedness of the ideas and the concepts—the intelligence—to me sets Scripture apart from anything else because there were so many hands over so much time in so many different circumstances that just come together. To me that says we have a really big God to be able to pull that off. That's not a happenstance that can happen without divine activity, divine supervision, so to speak.

1:20:00

Thirdly... I'll just wrap it up with this one because I think this is really fundamentally a significant one—maybe the most significant one—and that is the Gospel, the coherence of the content of Scripture. What is Scripture about? Ultimately it's about who God is, what God wants to do, why we're here, all that sort of stuff. The big picture stuff I talk about in *Unseen Realm*. The centerpiece of that is the coherence of the Gospel. The content of the Bible is the only sacred book, period, that really has a coherent answer for how people can rightly relate to God. What do I mean by that? Well just think about it. Every other religion asks imperfect, fallible beings to become perfect or non-fallible so that they can please a perfect, infallible being and get to heaven. That just doesn't make any sense. That's asking people to do the impossible. That's defining salvation as an impossibility and saying, "Well, tough... that's what you've got to do! You want to be in heaven with a perfect, holy God? Well, you'd better be perfect and holy. Do the best you can." In other words, all of the other systems are somehow works-oriented. They somehow put the onus on the person, on the hopeful participant, on the worshiper—whatever you want to call the person who wants to get to heaven. Every other system makes that individual accountable for achieving this final end. And to do that they have to please a holy, perfect being. But they're not holy and they're imperfect—in fact, hopelessly imperfect. So how does that make any sense? To me it doesn't make any sense. What we see in Scripture, we have the only alternative, and that is that a perfect, holy God wants to be with people badly enough that he will solve their problem for them and just ask them to believe that he did. It's the only approach that offers any hope and any coherence. It takes people for exactly what they are and doesn't forget what they are. In fact, it confronts people with what they are—that they need God to act on their behalf to take care of an insurmountable problem: their sin, their offense against God, overcoming death, the resurrection. None of these things are

possible to the human being. But all other religions either make it central or a really, really, really important part of getting to heaven—the positive afterlife. That just makes zero sense when you really think about it. When I look at Scripture, I can look at all these other things about what it is, but I also want to include what it actually says. To me, those three things I've mentioned are fundamentally what separates the Bible from anything else.

TS: All right, Mike, that's all the questions we have for this week. And next week, we're back in Ezekiel. Is that right?

MH: That's correct. I think we're going to do two chapters, 10 and 11 are on the schedule.

TS: If you have not already subscribed to the newsletter, please go and subscribe, if you will.

MH: We should mention that, I'm glad you mentioned it. Because I am going to try my hand at live-streaming. Yes, you heard that correctly—Mike's going to try to do something technical! (laughs) Live-streaming on YouTube, and I will not be posting, though, or mentioning on the podcast when those live-streaming occur. I will only reveal when those events occur in the newsletter. So if you want to, perhaps, participate in the live-streaming or just watch it, you need to subscribe to the newsletter.

TS: All right, well go subscribe to that newsletter and give us a review or rating wherever you listen to the show. And I want to thank Mike for answering our questions and thank you all for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast. God bless.