

# **The Naked Bible Podcast 2.0**

**Number 96**

**“Q&A 11”**

**Dr. Michael S. Heiser**

**With**

**Residential Layman  
Trey Stricklin**

**April 18, 2015**

## **Q&A 11**

Our 11th Question and Answer episode!

Link referenced: [AllAboutGod.com](http://AllAboutGod.com)

**TS:** Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 96, Q&A 11. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey Mike, how are you doing this week?

**MSH:** Good but it was a brutal week, let me tell ya. Double grading whammy but it's always this particular week in the eight week sequence. It kind of works this way. On the one had I did nothing productive that I care about but I'm here. So this will make it possible to avoid a total loss during the week.

**TS:** Well, I'm glad you're here because if you weren't, that would leave me to answer these questions and I'm not sure what would happen on that show.

**MSH:** That might be entertaining.

**TS:** The last show with David Burnett was good. We're getting good feedback from that one. And I just wanted to let everyone know that I put a link on the show page to David's PayPal so if anybody wants to help support him with his endeavors and his graduate payments and anything, you can go over to Naked Bible Podcast.com, go to the episode page, episode 95, and you'll see a link for David. So if you'd like to contribute and help David out please do so.

**MSH:** It's a long way away. The conference is in November but they're expensive. I know his circumstances. He doesn't anybody like a school paying for it so anything would be helpful.

**TS:** I know he's received some donations already so much appreciated and feel free to go over there and help him out. Also, I want to mention all about God.com, they're going to help us out here with the Fern and Audrey and other things as far as helping get the campaign funded. And I'll put a link to that as well on this one, episode 96 and that's all about God.com. Mike, why don't you tell us a little bit about them.

**MSH:** The CEO behind all about God.com has offered to your help improve some web traffic for the go fund me campaign for Fern and Audrey. And part of that process was we had to come up with a one-page, can't remember how many words it is, about 1500 word description of the kind of thing that they deal with. So what is ritual abuse, satanic ritual abuse? What is dissociative disorder? What is trauma based mind control? So I wrote that up. There are scholarly sources for that in a couple footnotes but the important point is it's not designed to be an academic paper.

It's an introduction to what it is. This is the sort of thing they run into every week, literally every week. So the CEO at all about God.com said if you write this up, I'll put this page online and we'll do what we can to have it be a tractable in terms of being searchable for the kinds of things that are addressed in the article so that we can get a good search ranking on Google and whatnot to help direct people to the campaign. So there's going to be a link I guess along with this episode right to that particular page so you can go read it. It's not long but it will give you good an overview introduction to what it is Fern and Audrey encounter on a weekly basis.

**TS:** And please go support their ministry. I really like what they're doing. They're using search engine optimization to help people come to Christ. So basically anybody searching information about Christianity or Jesus or you name it, they're going to stumble upon all about God.com where they can receive answers and whatnot and get help. So if any of our listeners would like to help support that ministry as well, please go to all about God.com and support their ministry as well. I know they appreciate it and we appreciate their help.

**MSH:** It's kind of remarkable. If you snoop around on their website a little bit, you'll find out that their goal really in sort of quantifiable terms is to try to get decisions for Christ, more decisions for Christ than dollars spent on what they do on an annual basis. And they're able to do that and they get a number of people who decide to follow the Lord through to their website. I think it was over a million last year and the way they know that is because that count is based upon people who read a particular page and then send them an e-mail saying yes I made this decision. There are things they can do to try to disciple people but eventually we've been in conversation with them.

The people at allaboutGod.com are familiar with the podcast. They're familiar with my content, very warm to it, appreciative to it. So we've actually had conversations about what can we do to help each other in terms of content that I produce to help disciple people or just teach people. And then that's their skill set, how can they help us. So this is the beginning of that and we thought the Fern and Audrey episode was a great place to start because the people behind all about God.com are familiar with the kind of things that they do. And so they get it, they understand what Fern and Audrey are doing. And so we're at the beginning but it's a good example of the kind of thing that Miqlat, the nonprofit, this is what it's for.

It's not just so that Mike can get his time back, even though after this week would I love that. But that's ostensibly what people would think of as far as Miqlat. But it's really about this kind of thing, networking with people who are just doing ministry somewhere and using skill sets to help each other and basically raising awareness so that we know who's doing what and the thing that unites them all is they care about my content. They're benefiting from it. They get it. They want it to be part of what happens in church and whatnot. And so it's just finding those people to help each other, help Miqlat grow so that I can devote more time to what we're trying to do here. This is the beginning of it and we're trying to take baby steps with the time that we have and this is just another one of those examples.

**TS:** Let's get into the questions. We have about a dozen so let's start with the first question from Corby. In Kyle Greenwood's book, *Scripture and Cosmology*, he says that the Old Testament writers' view of the heaven, earth, and seas was not figurative or metaphorical. They believed the three-tiered cosmos was the nature of creation. Obviously, this view of the cosmos is wrong. However, to what extent does a Deuteronomy 32 and Divine Council worldview depend upon this Ancient Near Eastern worldview? In other words, how does a Divine Council worldview not suffer as part of the fallout from the collapse of Ancient Near Eastern cosmology? The elohim are real gods but the where of their existence from an Old Testament view is not, for example.

**MSH:** I think the main thing to think of here is that on the one hand, we can judge Ancient Near Eastern cosmology as true or false, it's not scientifically correct, by virtue of the tools of science. I've commented on this before. So things that an ancient text, the Bible included, what it says

about the natural world, we have tools to actually be able to evaluate that. But the Divine Council worldview itself is not dependent on Ancient Near Eastern cosmology because it really has to do with the activity of beings, namely God and the sons of God in this case, the activity of divine beings in relationship to the affairs of humans.

So you can have no cosmology or some different cosmology or modern cosmology, it doesn't matter what the cosmology is. It's not going to affect whether the divine world, the non-natural world can intersect with the natural world. So I don't see any sense of dependence at all. Part of the question is about the aware of their existence and I've comment number of times that all of this kind of language for the spiritual world, we're not talking about whether the cosmology is correct or not. We're talking about spiritual world now. We are forced and the biblical writers are forced, because they were humans, to use the language, the verbiage of place to any talk about the spirit world. God's not going to give the human writers some vocabulary that no one to whom their writing would ever understand.

They can't have specialized vocabulary that God zaps into their head. This is what we really call the spirit world. Use this word with no vowels. He's not going to give them vocabulary that no one else will understand. That defeats the enterprise of communication, which is ultimately why we have scripture. So we're forced to use the language of place as though heaven was a where location, the heavens, the spiritual world that had like latitude and longitude where you could measure the number of miles into the atmosphere or something like that. None of it is actually like that. The verbiage borrows from these sorts of conceptions but none of them are correct. If I tried to articulate the spirit world using correct scientific cosmology, I'm going to miss the mark as widely as if I'm an ancient person because the spirit world by definition does not have latitude longitude. It doesn't have breadth and depth and all this kind of stuff. It's a different thing that is separable from the vocabulary and experience of space or location. I think it's a good question but behind the question, we have to remember just the vocabulary disconnects and the conceptual disconnects and really the realm disconnects in the case of the nature of this question.

**TS:** The next one's from Travis and he has about three questions so I'll read them all here real quick. In Matthew 12, we see just what Mike was talking about. Jesus cast out a demon and the people say, "can this be the son of David". The Pharisees explanation was that Jesus's power was from Beelzebub rather than God. The first question would be, is there anything in Jewish sources to suggest what they were thinking here? The second question would be, Jesus suggests that the Pharisees sons were casting out demons. What was the Jewish understanding for how they did it? And finally, the unforgivable sin of verse 32 seems tied into answering the Beelzebub argument. Does this give any insight to what blasphemy against the Holy Spirit means?

**MSH:** Well, I think those two things in tandem and before we get into that, I should say something about the third part was something about the unpardonable sin. That actually, frankly needs to be its own episode so that's pretty long. The first two things about, if I can recapture the question here, Jewish sources that might suggest what they were thinking when they asked this question and how the Pharisees sons were casting out demons. I think that probably the best answer to both of these is probably go listen to Naked Bible Podcast episode 87, which is the episode on exorcism of demons as part of the messianic profile. Can this be the son of David?

That tells you it orients the Pharisees thinking because they associated the act of casting out demons somehow for some reason with the son of David. That whole episode 87 addresses that and it has to do with a particular reading of passages like 1 Kings 4:29-34 that connect Solomon with specifically speaking and writing certain things that were considered in the Second Temple Jewish period to be, for lack of a better term, spells or incantations against evil spirits. We talked about in that episode some Dead Sea scroll material. We talked about the extra Psalm from the Septuagint and from Qumran, Psalm 151 that gets into all this material. So there was this belief that I'll put it in a twofold way. There were two ideas, there are two ideas operating here. One is that the son of David, who is also the son Solomon, the Davidic line, would be able to do this based on this notion of Solomon having the power in Second Temple Jewish tradition to cast out demons or to bind them with spells.

And so since that stuff was in Jewish tradition not only asserted but there are also a number of texts that would be sort of closer to the rabbinic period, the rabbinic material later than the stuff we talked about in episode 87 that actually kind of inscripturates or writes down some of those spells. That would be an answer to the second part of the question, how are your sons able to do this? Well, they followed this spell over here. It's not a claim that every Jew who would be casting out demons is a descendent of Solomon, like I'm a messianic candidate even though that's part of the picture. It's not the whole picture. Some of this stuff is supposedly written down and recorded and "preserved" from what Solomon wrote. So the easy answer if I were Pharisees getting this question, I would say here are the spells right over here. This is just what we used. We use these either prayers of renunciation or prayers of this or that to cast out demons. We have these things.

We've inherited these things. This is part of our tradition and these things are traceable to Solomon. But for someone to do this, we would associate this as having some attachment to Solomon, the son of David, all that kind of stuff. So I think both of those questions are tied up in that material, which we got into in that particular episode, episode 87. So if you're interested in this topic, that would be where I would direct you first. We could at some point do a later episode on maybe some of the pseudopigraphical texts that cast Solomon as just kind of a great wizard. That's part of his great wisdom. It sounds bizarre to our ear but think about it. If Solomon like was the guy who knew everything, he was the wisest man in the world, he knows how to do this stuff, too. He'd be kind of dumb if he didn't. His knowledge would be incomplete if he couldn't deal with this problem so that was the idea sort of behind the reason that Solomon gets cast this way.

**TS:** Our next one is from Mattias in Stockholm Sweden. I was recently approached by an atheist on Numbers 31:17. That really is a nasty piece of Scripture. It makes some sense from a Divine Council worldview but it's still hard to chew. How would you explain the command to kill all except the virgins that they got to keep> this atheist wanted to infer that it was for sex slavery.

**MSH:** He quotes Numbers 31:17.

<sup>17</sup> Now therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman who has known man by lying with him. <sup>18</sup> But all the young girls who have not known man by lying with him keep alive for yourselves.

**MSH:** So that's Numbers 31:17-18. Now, as far as the male children, which he's not really directly asking about, that was a very common practice to your cut off a dynastic line, cut off an armed opposition in the years to come or whatnot, very common in the Ancient Near East. It's harsh but it's part of the culture. It's part of what you do. Every woman who has had sexual relations with a man, they were particularly singled out typically, not just in the Bible but generally, because the whole saying to Solomon about if you multiply wives they'll turn your heart away from the Lord or basically what you should be doing. That can apply and it does apply in other cultures. But in terms of the Israelite stuff, it has a very specific religious connotation in terms of idolatry since that the people in question, numbers 31, in the context they're dealing with a particular peoples in particular places that were tied to idolatrous practices.

So the assumption that would be made, and apparently was made, is that women who had been sexually active, yeah they might've been like sort of just married but there was a sexual component to a lot of the religious rights of the day. And so the Israelites would have viewed any woman who was not a virgin with suspicion that she could have either lost her virginity or been active in a sexual activity that was part of an idolatrous relationship to another god. So those women were often excluded from marital candidacy because of the fear of idolatry, bringing idolatry into the camp. So that would've been the rationale behind their elimination, which leaves in verse 18 those who have not had sexual intercourse with a man. Now the question that of the atheist guy gave our questioner about sex slavery, there's no sex slavery in this passage. If you were a virgin, you were marriable.

And if you were married by an Israelite man, then you became a member of the Israelite camp, which means you were entitled to the rights and protections of the Israelite society. It doesn't necessitate a sex slave like sex trafficking situation so that's an assumption that is brought to the passage by that particular question, who was questioning Mattias. So I think it's a mischaracterization on that level. It's obviously harsh but I would take this back that when you see these familiar practices, when you see these cultural practices, especially if they are associated with idolatry specifically, I think on the one hand, here we are with the Moabites. On the one hand, you could say there is some logic to the fact that this is what we do in conquest in our patriarchal Semitic culture. This is how we do things and there are lots of other things that are familiar to and related to, part of, that world, the world of the biblical person, the world of the biblical writer at the time.

And they just sort of on one level are what they are. In other words, God doesn't come to Moses or any other biblical author and say I'd like to use you to write something down but you need to change your culture first. You need to rid your culture of this particular element that it is offensive or someone living later might consider offensive or the Gentiles who are going to read this stuff later might consider offensive or whatever. You need to change your culture first and then we can work together. God never does that and a lot of the stuff that winds up in Scripture, especially in legislation, especially legal kind of things and this is part of it. You have legality, conquest, warfare, the rules of war and all that kind of stuff, on one level it just is what it is. And God doesn't say nobody else does this but we're going to institute this thing where we go to a city and you get to kill people. It's not foreign at all. On the other hand, on the other side, there is a "theological" rationale to this because of the issue with idolatry. If you did have a situation, especially with the women and there elsewhere in the travels of the Israelites and archaeologically speaking, too, might as well throw that in, that there were associations of sexual

practices by certain people in certain places that were directly linked to idolatry then this is something you don't even want to mess with.

And so you eliminate this part of the refugee population, that sort of thing. So it has a rationale. It's distasteful to us I think for good reasons because it's very harsh. It's life or death situation. I look at something like this and think I'm glad that the theocracy was planned to be obsolescent from the beginning. And that usually startles some people but that is true. The theocracy and these laws that go with it and the culture that goes with it, the patriarchy that goes with it, was designed from the beginning to be obsolete. It was designed to go away. How do we know that? We know that because of the Abrahamic covenant, because when God disinherits the nations and he starts Israel with Abraham, he makes the covenant with Abraham and says through all the nations will be blessed. We know what the meaning is behind that, that they're going to be brought back into relationship with the true God. We know in salvation history how God had planned for this to work out. We know to fulfill the covenants, God has to become a man, and that's going to happen later.

It's not going to happen now, all this kind of stuff. So that they were sort of built into the flow of salvation history, the plan of God to bring all things full circle, the non-necessity of the theocracy because we include all these other things, Gentiles and what not. So there's planned obsolescence built into this which makes sense because God doesn't inspire a particular culture. The people who he uses have a particular culture and some elements of it, we can look at and say that's just terrible, and I think rightly so. But God doesn't inspire a particular culture that was a necessity to carrying out the plan of salvation. He just worked with people where they were who they were at the time that he decided to do so and then plan to phase out certain things that would eventually eliminate these other sorts of things.

It's just the way it was. So that might not be a comfortable answer but that is the picture that emerges when you look at the whole system of salvation history as a whole, as an entirety. It's not married to a culture which ought to tell you from the get go that biblical theology is not necessarily dependent on or endorsing of a particular cultural practice. You get these harsh rules, they're designed to insulate Yahweh's people from other gods and part of the way you do that is to have this kind of thing happen. So it's harsh, it's distasteful but it's not something that God looks at and said we need to keep doing that. That needs to be a big part of the gospel, killing off our enemies, that kind of thing. That just wasn't the case at all. The plan to bring the enemies to a relationship with him we don't need this. But it is the way it is at this moment in time.

**TS:** Our next one's from Sean and this question's important to him because he's an artist who sometimes creates work for video games and fantasy novels and he wants to know should he decline to paint an angel or demon because he wants to know, how should Christians take the second commandment today? Are depictions of Jesus like the Last Supper or images in stained glass windows at church sinful? What about other divine beings?

**MSH:** You also get this question like in association with groups like Jehovah's Witnesses and whatnot, at least I've gotten it in that context because of the graven image command. The command says you shall not make for yourself a carved image or graven image or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath or that is in the water under the earth; you shall not bow down to them or serve them. I think the last phrase, which is actually



verse 5, is the key issue. The key issue here is idolatry because let's think about it. God himself commands the Israelites to violate this.

They do make a carved image or a graven image. They do make a likeness of something that is in the heavens. What is that thing Mike? Well, it's the cherubim. That's the most obvious answer but they also are commanded to make the brazen serpent. God tells them to do these things, which ought to tell you that the emphasis to the command isn't so much on the making of the thing. It's on the second part of it, don't bow down to them or serve them or worship them. So the issue is actually idolatry. It's not specifically the fashioning of the thing. You could fashion something if you don't worship it, okay. You don't worship it. You haven't violated the command. Now I know people who are in this artist situation. I have friends who, believe it or not, they are, without giving names, the inspiration behind two of the characters in the Portent, my second novel. The character names are Clarisse and Ward.

But those two individuals whose first names are obviously different, they run a tattoo parlor and they refer to themselves whimsically as sheep in wolves clothing as opposed to the other way around. And they do run into situations and they question people a lot and if they are asked to create an image, create a tattoo where they suspect that this is some part of an occult issue with this person, this is something that is going to be, maybe people don't bow down to it but you get the idea that this is a faith statement in a dark way for this person, they will refuse to make it. And I think that's a pretty honorable decision on their part because they're trying to obey the second commandment with the emphasis on idolatry. And so I would recommend the same strategy for this person.

If you think that what you're creating is going to draw attention away from God, draw worship or adoration away from the true God, even though the person doing it might not think of themselves as an idolater, it's not really with what they think of themselves. It's what you the artist are thinking your work might be used for. And as you talk to people, I think you have to do that to discern what their thinking and if they make it clear that this is sort of an idolatrous statement on my part, I want this so that I can do that, and what they want it for is going to give worship to some lesser being, then I think you're on good grounds to refuse it. But in principle, just the art for the arts sake, without the element of idolatry, I don't think you're going to have a problem with the second command.

**TS:** Janine wants to know how do you think people came to believe in other gods? With all the specific names of other gods and even further, pictures, images of other gods, it seems to me that these guys had to have made an appearance of some kind at some point.

**MSH:** I don't necessarily think that's the case because everyone, especially in the ancient world, had this conception or belief that there was a world beyond them, in other words, a spiritual world. And the assumption was that this world had beings in it that were intelligent and there was more than just one and they had to exist in hierarchy because we're intelligent beings over here, and so we don't function well in chaos. That isn't the way our society or our culture runs. We have leadership. Everybody's not a chief. You have to have good Indians here. Not everybody can be the boss. And so we take these natural social relationships, hierarchical relationships, from our world and it is reasonable to assume that on the basis of the way we live, order and whatnot instead of chaos, that that's the way the spiritual world operates.

This is why you have in all major cultures, you not only have an animate spiritual world but it has some order to it. It has some hierarchical sense to it. And when you do that, when you distribute tasks among the hierarchy then it's very natural to assume there must be a deity behind this thing in the natural world that we really don't understand because we're not scientists. There must be a deity in charge of rain. There must be a deity in charge of fecundity. There must be a deity in charge of fire. They're not doing science and so out of their own natural world and their own experience of the way intelligent beings relate to each other, they are naturally going to assign deities to be behind certain things and to be doing certain things. Now the deity doesn't have to make an appearance for any of that.

That's why I answered it the way I did. I'm not going to rule out spiritual encounter because I embrace the notion of a spiritual world and I have no reason to suspect that a being in the spiritual world would never bother to make itself known, would never encounter a person, especially when solicited. I can't make those assumptions, either. So I think I can say to Janine they probably did make their presence known at some point but I don't see it as a necessary thing to have ancient people believing in and thinking about other gods if that makes some kind of sense. The iconography of other gods is often going to be associated with some imagined task they have, something that whatever the population group, and it can differ among population groups, people groups, especially across continents. The one who's in charge of rain, there's going to be something about the way we draw this god or this idol that we erect for it. There's going to be something that illustrates its function as we perceive it to be. It's also going to be connected to geography.

There might be a main geographical feature, a main natural resource that the god is thought to be in charge of. That can become part of its iconography. It may have some sort of perceived attribute, intelligence, speed, whatever, physical strength, whatever it is and so you're going to pick an object that for you, for your culture, reminds you of that attribute. So that's how we get this iconography of deities. Now if you have cultures living in near proximity to each other, you're more apt to have sort of a deity exchange, in other words, Semitic religion Baal was the storm god, was the god in charge of the heavens. So when that region gets conquered, let's say ancient Syria or some part of Canaan gets conquered by a foreign power, well they're going to say since we conquered you our god that's in charge of rain now owns this place and so there's going to be is overlap. And the longer you have this sort of cultural interaction, you can actually have names merge. You can have sort of deities merge into another separate deity that accommodates both of the earlier ones. This is how polytheism and idolatry sort of works with cross-cultural contact. It's obviously less common if we're talking about something that goes on in the Middle East versus something in China are because you're going to have minimal if any cultural contact at all. You don't have to have an active appearance, sort of like a weekly showing up of deities for people to create idols and have these conceptions.

**TS:** Margot in Santa Barbara California writes Mike, some who hold that it is possible to calculate the year of jubilee in the present time say it is occurring now, running from the day of atonement in 2015 to the day of atonement in 2016, and also that it is the 70th jubilee. Do you have an opinion on this and what do you think would be the significance of our tracking jubilee years after the first coming of Christ? I'm wondering if the second coming would similarly coincide with a jubilee since Satan will be bound in the millennium of Revelation 20, a quasi-Edenic will begin?

**MSH:** The short as this is none of us have an idea what's going on with this jubilee stuff so we shouldn't pretend that we do. And so I'm not going to pretend that I do. We did an episode on the jubilee stuff and I think it was episode, it was Leviticus 23 and 25 so it's episode 83 of the podcast. And in that episode, we attached an article by Ben Zion Wacholder, who was a professor at Hebrew Union for many years, called Chonomessianism: The Timing of Messianic Movements and Calendar of Sabbatical Cycles. Now I posted that and we talked about it deliberately because on the one hand, there can be systems, and this is the important term, systems plural, of how you would use jubilee cycles to calculate something related to the Messiah. But what a lot of people today, a lot of evangelicals today, who are in the popular prophecy movement or whatever, if that even has a name, they assume certain things about the jubilee cycle that will tie it into a rapture or a Pre-Trib rapture or a certain concept of the tribulation, a certain interpretation of Daniel 9, whatever.

Wacholder points out that there are various ways you can do that and he actually illustrates one in the article that basically undermines and destroys all of that stuff, in other words, all of the current use of the jubilee thinking to tie it into a future millennium or a rapture or some other feature of evangelical eschatology. You can use the very same idea and work the jubilee cycle so that it ends in the intertestamental period, or, he also talks about Christians do this, it ends with the first coming of Jesus. Both of those options have nothing to do with something in the future. So in other words, this feature, this jubilee idea, there is no guarantee, there is no necessary conclusion to be drawn, that it relates in any way to eschatology or end times. It might but nobody actually knows that because you can work out very neat systems that have other terminus points, other endpoints, that if you are one of these evangelical prophecy guru people, you're going to be real disappointed with the outcome. But it is just as coherent and "consistent" as any other view.

So my assessment of all this is that it's kind of a waste of time. I filed this under the blog series, an obsession with eschatology is a waste of time. This is where I put this whole jubilee idea. Yes, I know it's interesting. It might be mildly entertaining or whatever. There's this mystical mystery kind of thing going on with it as there are in other things in prophecy. If you like that stuff, enjoy it. Think about it, study it, read about it. I don't have any problem with that. But what I have a problem with is if you think you've solved it, because yeah, it's going to look beautiful until it gets critiqued by the other options because they look beautiful, too, and there's no way for us to, we'd have to be omniscient to know which system is the correct one or even if we ought to be doing this in the first place. The fact that you can take this idea out of Leviticus and you can tie it to other things like weeks and calendar, whatnot, the fact that you can do it doesn't necessarily mean we're supposed to, in other words, there's no instruction verse in the Bible that says if you want to figure out eschatology, you need to take the jubilee thing and do something with that.

There's no instruction manual for this that says that or anything else. And so that's where I leave it. Who knows? The answer is who knows, and if you try to get married into this, I think there is more productive uses for your time. And I'll say it as well, the same thing is true of using astronomy in biblical prophecy. Now, for those who have read the Portent and those who listened to me before, I'm interested in this but I'm always very clear to say, and there's a reason why I did not reproduce future dates in the novel, is because people will read my novel and think Mike has figured it now because Mike's a Bible scholar. So Mike, when's your next book coming

out about the second coming of Christ and how astronomy helps us figure this out? I'm not going to do that because we don't have a single verse that tells us we should be using astronomy to figure this out.

There's just zero. We don't have a single verse that says the astronomical elements of the first coming of Christ that Mike says hey Revelation 12, that's what it's about, and I do believe that, but we don't have a verse that tells us that the signs in Revelation 12 play any role at all in what's going to happen in the future. There is no verse like that. Trey, maybe we should do this, like to raise money for Miqlat or something. I should come up with that. You're into astronomy. We could work the system here and make some money but we're not going to do that. We're just not going to do that. It's irresponsible. I think it's deceptive on a certain level and it's the same thing with this jubilee stuff. So, if you like it, if it gets into your Bible, be warmed and filled and enjoy that, have fun with it, but don't marry the gospel to it. Don't let it consume your time, that sort of thing.

**TS:** There has to be something to the Vatican being so interested in astronomy.

**MSH:** The Vatican's been interested in astronomy since the days of Galileo. They condemned him then they're talking out the other side of their mouth. They had astronomers looking into these things while over here they're saying we should look at this other there. They just do that. They just play the game. I personally think that the Vatican, especially the Jesuits, the Jesuit interest in astronomy I don't think is any different than the Jesuit interest in biology or anthropology or anything else. This is the "academic" wing of the Catholic Church. I think they do these kinds of things, I'm going to try to be as broad as I possibly can here. I think they endorsed scientific inquiry within their own ranks because they want to sort of be at the forefront of discovery for certain things so that they can render commentary on those things according to the theological system of the Catholic Church before anybody else does. They want to control the narrative. And to me, that's a very kind of normal understandable human thing to do.

I don't assign any particular conspiratorial bent to the fact that the Vatican has astronomers interested in astronomy. They do all this is kind of stuff in other areas because I think they want to be on top of the subject matter so they can be the first to comment that the church, we knew about this from the beginning and we're not denying this or that science and here's how we need to understand this. Here's how it fits within Catholicism. Here's how it goes with his papal bull over here and this statement that the Pope made over there. We're on top of it. We're not Neanderthals here. We got this covered. We're not country bumpkins here. We are after all knowledge and God is the God of all knowledge including the natural world. We have complete coherent theological system. That's why you should be Catholic because we do have everything covered.

**TS:** Aliens are our space brothers as well.

**MSH:** So they're already down this road of baptizing space aliens. Every time I hear that I just want to growl or something. I roll my eyes but that is a direct reflection of their approach to original sin and salvation. In other words, it's a component thought so it's very natural that a Catholic would think that. They're assigning, linking the intelligence issue, an intelligent alien

with the image of God, which makes us brothers, space brothers. Therefore, somehow the atonement has to be some issue for a space alien. So we need to make sure they're covered in the atonement so that we need to baptize and take care of original sin if they have any. They've got all of these things covered already.

They've just been down this road and back. And they do this with all sorts of disciplines charitably because they think that's their responsibility. If you believe the church is the repository and the protector of all truth, you're going to do this. If you didn't believe it, why would you do it? But if you do believe it, you're certainly going to do it. So on one level, I think charitably again, they're doing it because they feel some responsibility. But a little more jaded I think they just want to control the narrative so that they can appear to be the religious place to be that's on top of everything that the world is into. We're there. We're not like some group over here that's just still believing in the flat earth or something. We're not that. We're over here where the real science is. So I think that's just part of it. I tend not to be terribly conspiratorial on that. I don't see it as a shocking thing. They've been into science for centuries. Why would this be any different?

**TS:** Our next three are from Greg in California. First one is, where do I find more information on the archaeological evidence for giants?

**MSH:** I'll tell you where you won't find it. You don't find it on the Internet. You just don't. To date, when it comes to the biblical world, to date, we don't have any known examples of giant skeletons in the Middle East. And for those of you who haven't read Unseen Realm and you say I saw this YouTube video Prof. Jonathan Tubb of the University of London. He found two female skeletons over 7 feet tall. Read the Unseen Realm because I've corresponded with Prof. Tubb. Prof. Tubb did not find that. That's a misunderstanding. I reproduce the actual e-mail on the companion website Unseen Realm whereas in the book, I just have the text of the e-mail. There's nothing like this to date like a specimen or something like that. Now we obviously have specimens of really tall humans in other parts of the world and whatnot.

They exist but to date, we don't actually have a scientifically endorsed like we actually did real lab session on this thing, of some remains of a giant that's any taller than extraordinarily tall people of today, 7-8 foot range, that kind of thing. So I don't see anything revelatory necessarily about such a discovery. When it comes to the biblical world, I'll be honest with you. Just think about it. There've been millions of people who have lived in Canaan, Israel, Syria Palestine, whatever term you want to use, Middle East. There've been millions of people who have lived there, lived and died, since the biblical days. But if you actually go to the database of human skeletal remains in Tel-Aviv, the people who actually keep the stuff that archaeologists find, there are very few. There are a couple thousand that have survived and it's extraordinarily rare to have anything older than 1000 BC, which is half a millennium too soon for the conquest account. You say why is that Mike?

That must be proof that it never happened. No, it's proof that they didn't embalm. Most of the people who have ever lived in this area of the world from biblical times are literally dust. Their remains are literally unrecoverable. So the fact that you don't have these sorts of things doesn't mean really anything because you don't have the physical remains for the "normal" people that lived either. So like they didn't exist as well? It's an illogical argument. Where can you go for the stuff? That's about it. There's really no place you can actually go to learn about the

archaeological evidence for giants because what you're going to get in books are modern specimens. Some of those are going to be outright hoaxes. If you go out on the Internet and look for this stuff, you're going to find basically Photoshop stuff. You're going to find 19th early 20th century newspaper accounts and I collect these things, but can we like go look at that specimen now? Where was it stored? I remember the Smithsonian absconded with all of them. It's just a fact and you can buy books on this, too.

I have them. The 19th century was known to be basically, most of your major newspapers in the 19th century were National Enquirers, let's just put it that way. It's a known journalistic phenomenon for this time in the country's history. So I'm willing to believe that some of these things were real and hopefully the specimen went somewhere that you could actually go find and look at it but most of the time, they are literally just making stuff up or they're misidentifying things. I blog a lot about this on Paleobabble. A lot of these, the presumed remains, are the remains of mammoth or something like that because when you take the tusks out and the trunk rots away, it looks like a Cyclops. And you can reassemble the bones so that it appears to stand upright. These are called Provo Citian fossils, Provo Citian specimens in the anthropological literature. They're well known. But you'll see this stuff trolled out on the Internet like it's a giant from Genesis 6. It's not. It just isn't. I don't really know any other way to say it. But evidence for Giants skeletal, they're very evasive and what you do run into that might have some merit is modern. It's more recent. So that's just the situation for what it is.

**TS:** And wasn't the average person's height back then low five feet?

**MSH:** Yeah I have it in the book. I can't remember the exact number but I have the book and the references and the articles on it but the average for cultures that did embalm like Egypt, we have a lot more specimens. The average height of the male was like 5 1/2 feet. For the Canaanite, the Middle Eastern specimens, it's a little shorter. And all these factors are due to life expectancy, to disease that they can't prevent, certain conditions, nutrition was a huge factor. Since all these things for us have improved, we grow bigger and stronger than ancient people. It's just an issue of public health on a broad scale, control and treatment of disease, quality of food, variety of diet, all these things are factors.

**TS:** Basically, if you made it to 6 foot, you're a giant.

**MSH:** Yeah, if you're 6 1/2 feet tall in the biblical world, that was extraordinary. That was freakishly tall, which is why in Unseen Realm that when I write about this that it's not taking anything away from the narrative to think that if we go into Canaan and we run into places where there are clusterings of people that are 6 1/2 feet tall or so, and we're sitting here we're looking around like who's the tallest one among us? You're 5'3"? You're going to feel like you're going get your butt kicked really fast if you go into this place and try to do hand to hand combat with these people. It is a mismatch. It's as much of a mismatch as it sounds, especially if they're a warrior class and you're not. Where have you been for the last 40 years, walking around the desert. You're not training for combat. You're not defending anything. You're not fighting. You're not training to be a soldier.

These people are. They live in walled cities. They're used to this stuff. And who are you? You're a squirt that's luckily if they can handle a sword. You're just going to get destroyed, left to

your own ability. It's a real threat. When we point these things out, the height differential, you not need 8, 9, 10, 13 feet tall because there's nothing archaeologically that supports that. I know that this creationist website over here has the giant femur bone, the femur bone of a giant and the giant that had this femur must've been 15 feet tall. That's nice. Did they have it tested? Can you show me the lab results because if you don't do that, you're dishonest. If you don't do that, I suspect you have something to hide. I suspect that'll be an animal remain, a prehistoric animal remain. I'm just being blunt. It really bothers me that Christians who have these objects and who tout them refuse to let anyone verify them. That tells me you have something to hide and you shouldn't. People who name the name of Christ shouldn't be pulling that that kind of stuff. It's just dishonest.

**TS:** Wasn't Goliath like 6'6" or something?

**MSH:** In the Dead Sea Scrolls, he's around 6'6-6'9 depending on how you take the cubit, and also in the Septuagint. The Masoretic Text is the one that has him at over 9 feet. But the Dead Sea Scrolls have them shorter. But for his day, he's enormous. He's enormous.

**TS:** Absolutely, but in today's time, 6'6, I wouldn't classify that as a giant.

**MSH:** He's a second-round draft pick.

**TS:** Exactly, he's got good nutrition, he took his vitamins, and he can dunk the ball. Let's get to Greg's second question and that's on Scriptural Authority. How do we as Christians assert that the Bible is distinguishable from any other so-called holy literature?

**MSH:** For me, this is about testing the coherence of its truth propositions. That's my short answer to that. So here's your holy book. What does it tell me about God or the gods or salvation or whatever point it has, and historical statements, record keeping, it's all a factor but let's just focus on the theological statements. All of the Bible's theological statements about the existence of God and what God does and things like incarnation and the deity of Christ and all this kind of stuff, these things have been hashed out for literally millennia by the best thinkers that Western civilization has ever had. And their logical and theological, philosophical coherence has been tested and approved over and over and over again.

So this is the first thing I want to know. So if we have a competing truth assertion, truth proposition from some other holy book, if it's different than something in the Bible, then it needs to be probed to see which one is more coherent. That's the way I would approach the whole question. There are bigger issues like can we trust the sourcing, the composition, that kind of stuff. There are other factors here as far as how'd we get this book in the first place? If you're talking about the Urantia book, there's lots of ways to disqualify that. If you're talking about an ancient book, then there are other things you have to consider. The bottom line is about truth propositions. I think that's what distinguishes the Bible from a lot of these other books in significant ways.

**TS:** Real quickly, what's your thoughts on the Urantia book?

**MSH:** I think it's most likely an amalgamated forgery. What I mean by that is I think it has modern origin and that its content is drawn from Theosophical literature of the day with rewriting. I suspect that if you put all of the Theosophical literature of the late 19th century or early 20th century into a database, and I have actually looked into this and it would be a monumental task because there's thousands and thousands of publications. It's not just Madam Blavatsky. That's the familiar stuff but there were hundreds of people writing stuff about Theosophy in those periods. If you put that all into a database and then you ran searches through it for let's say word combinations, more than three or four words in a row from the Urantia book, I don't doubt for a minute you're going to get hits, in other words, that the content of the book will have been drawn from these sources. That's doctoral dissertation waiting to happen. The technology exists for it. You just have to do the grunt work. It's in public domain. Somebody could do that, digitize it, put it into one resource and start running scripts through it.

**TS:** Well, Greg's last question is, on Michael's assertion that evolution is not a theory in crisis, I heard him say in one Q&A that he has done a lot of research on the topic and that he believes in a type of evolution but not necessarily Darwinian evolution. I'd be interested to hear more of his views on this and also be interested in any sources he might suggest for reading on this topic.

**MSH:** First of all, it's not my assertion. I was quoting Todd Wood who is a young earth creationist, 24-hour solar day young earth creationist, run-of-the-mill Ken Ham kind of creationist. Todd would cringe if he heard me say that. I apologize Todd. It's for illustration purposes only. But Todd, what is the guy who said, he's a biologist. He has a PhD in biology. His special focus is genetics. That's what he did his dissertation on. He did comparative work on the chimp genome and the human genome. He is the one who says evolution is not a theory in crisis. Mike Heiser doesn't say that. Mike Heiser's not a biologist or a geneticist. It's Todd Wood so if you want to take it up with Todd, good luck with that because he's very honest about it. Now as far as what I believe, I don't really know. What I've said is I'm open to the idea of God using evolution as a process. That's it in a nutshell. If he didn't do that, I'm as open to that as anybody else, too.

I just don't know. I'm just not offended by the idea that God could have done that. That's very kind of normative under the creationist umbrella. Not everybody's a young earther. You got older earthers that like evolution and old earthers that don't like evolution. You go all sorts of varieties. It's not just one or two. And since I don't have the training in this field to really be able to evaluate what's said as opposed to what's not said, I don't have the tools to evaluate this. I'm willing to let other people work on it, fight about it, hash it out, and I have read a lot of it. I find it really interesting. The historical Adam thing is sort of what lately I've been most interested in. And I do think it's legitimate to say that the science of statistical genetics is still in its infancy. So in other words, I don't think the statistical genetics stuff that denies a single pair of humans, I don't think that's conclusive and it has been criticized coherently by some people at the Discovery Institute. That's where Stephen Meyer is at and a few of the people that are well known, Darwin's Black Box, Michael Behe, that sort of thing.

I've read a lot of this stuff and am interested in it but I am just a lurking amateur so I will let other people hash it out. But when Todd Wood, and he doesn't accept evolution, he just thinks that there must be a better way to understand this, something better will come along, but he says the model of evolution itself actually has some clear explanatory power and it's not a



theory in crisis. So he objects to, this would be strong but this would be the way he characterizes it, and I don't know if it's true or not. This isn't my field but I know that he feels that some of the rhetoric about this is not honest. That's what he objects to and so he wants to be clear that from a geneticist's perspective, some of these things that are said about evolution are not true. It is not true. But on the other hand, he doesn't like evolution. He doesn't buy it. But he sees it has powerful payoff in certain respects and so we need to be thinking about it very closely. So that's just where he's at. I'll give you another example of this.

The whole soft tissue in the T. Rex thing, the woman who discovered that is a Christian and she's a Christian that used to be a young earth creationist. Now she is an old earth creationist because of her own work. When you get these creationist websites that say Mary Schweitzer is wrong. This is what it means. This is what the sample says. Look dude, she's the guy who published the research. It's her discovery and it's her research. I think she's a better commentator on it than some guy running a creationist website. I'm sorry but it's just incoherent to think otherwise. She submitted her work to peer review. People know she's a Christian. The University that hired her knows she's a Christian. Her advisor, Jack Horner, the guy that doctor grant from Jurassic Park is based on, knows she's a Christian and really likes her. If you're ever into this, read *How to Build a Dinosaur* by Jack Horner. He talks about Mary Schweitzer in the book very affectionately, sort of gives her story as part of his story as her mentor. But it's just dishonest to take this woman's research and say it doesn't mean what she says it means and what her reviewers reviewed and said yeah, this is good science, but yeah, you know better than she does, better than the person who discovered it herself. Come on. It's just not honest. It's not becoming for believers to do stuff like this.

**TS:** Dolly's question is regarding the reading and interpretation of Exodus 3:15 and I'll read that real quick.

<sup>15</sup> God also said to Moses, "Say to the Israelites, 'The LORD, the God of your fathers—the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob—has sent me to you.'

"This is my name forever,  
the name you shall call me  
from generation to generation.

**TS:** Now Dolly takes it that the text means Yahweh has sent Moses, me, to the Israelites, you, but there's a different reading that interprets the me as the angel of the Lord. Is this correct or just reading too much into the text?

**MSH:** I don't know what different reading would be. Is she referring to some sort of like a Septuagint reading because I read it as God's saying here's what you tell these people. Tell them that I've sent you, because he names the Lord. So I take it the first way. I think it's kind of transparently, that's the case. But I don't know of any other reading that would sort of be different. So I think it's over reading the text there. But if there was some sort of manuscript

information, maybe she came across something in a book or whatnot, I'd like to see it if somebody footnoted something or another. I'd be interested in seeing it.

**TS:** The next couple are from Grant. First one is while the Bible makes it clear case for the other gods being creations of Yahweh, are there any other traditions that maintain that their gods are creations of the supreme Creator God?

**MSH:** The only one that sort of would, it depends on how you frame the question here actually. You will get other religions that sort of start the ball rolling in terms of generating the other gods. In many cases, it's with sort of an original pair because the analogy to that is procreation. You need a god and a goddess, like in Ugarit. El and Ashtaroth are the parents of the other gods, the sons of El. So that's a familiar male-female pairing but you get something like, well, I don't know if I want to say the Memphite theology works here or not because there is verbal creation by the word-of-mouth but it really refers to the natural world there. But you do in some religions have this sort of thing or place like the primeval sea that, for lack of a better way of putting it, births or produces the other gods. And so was that a single entity producing the other gods? Is that how they would've looked at that? Well maybe, maybe not, so the short answer is yeah, you can find that but it's not really ever cast as something that here you have this god who creates, he's the lone thing that is uncreated and eternal. That's what you have in the Bible. God is the Creator of all things, visible and invisible. He's the lone uncreated thing. You won't get that but you will have sort of in a few examples there will be sort of like a single point of origin. That's probably the best way I can answer that.

**TS:** His second question is I thought there was compelling evidence to show that Peter's vision in Acts 10 had nothing to do with food, I am wondering what passages he is referring to? Acts 15:21 seems to imply that after Gentiles new to Judaism start attending synagogue and follow the initial four guidelines of the Elders that they would hear Moses preached every Sabbath. To me, this implies that they will have the opportunity to gradually hear why the dietary instructions will be a blessing to follow. I guess I don't view the instructions as the Torah implies as something to be liberated from. God repeats over and over that the consequences for following instructions is blessing. Why would I want to be liberated from blessing? I suppose I view the Torah as something that some of Judaism's adherence used to manipulate people by connecting Torah observance with salvation but that was not God's intent then or now. The problem as I view it is man's proclivity for legalism and not the Torah. Christianity is plenty prone to legalism despite claiming that they have thrown off the law.

**MSH:** I have some problems with the wording of the question but I also have some agreement with the wording of the question. I agree that the point of the Law is not to produce salvation. I would agree that someone who knows the Old Testament well, either in antiquity or now, would not be reading the Law thinking if I do these things, I will merit salvation. In other words, I don't know how you could do that and even have the covenants in your head at all because salvation is initiated by the God of Israel by grace. God is really going to have to be the judge here. It's not a videogame where you just pile up points and then God says well I don't really like you but I got to let you in here because you have enough points. That's not what the Torah is, so I agree with that. Some of the other things I think are a little odd. I don't know what the

compelling evidence to show that Peter's vision Acts 10 has nothing to do with food. Rise Peter, kill and eat? That's pretty clear to me that the food laws are being set aside or dispensed with or, at least, shown to not be something God really cares about anymore because it leads to Gentile salvation so these things aren't part of a relationship with God anymore. Rise Peter, kill and eat, you eat food so I don't know what the compelling evidence there is to divorce food from that. Acts 15:21, it says this,

<sup>21</sup> For from ancient generations Moses has had in every city those who proclaim him, for he is read every Sabbath in the synagogues.”

**MSH:** That doesn't say to me that the Gentiles are having Moses proclaimed to them. I am not even sure that that's what the questionnaire is thinking but I thought I should throw it out. To me, it's just a statement who proclaims Moses. The Jews do and guess what, those are the ones who are in the synagogues. So it's still a statement about Jews. It's not a statement about Gentiles, which is what Acts 10 is about. We're going to ask the Gentiles to do certain things so that they don't offend Jews but verse 21 isn't about proclaiming Moses to the Gentiles. That's just not what the verse says. Having said that, I think what Paul says this is kind of the way, this is going to sound goofy, but I think I'm going to agree with Paul here and that is look, if you want to observe a day, observe the day. If you don't, don't.

If you're going to say I can eat this or not or drink this or not, possible reference to the food laws, go ahead. Either shun it or accept it. Paul's verdict is we don't let these things redefine the gospel in either direction, either the absence or presence of these things. They're not the gospel in any regard and you need to do what draws you closer to God either way. I'm sympathetic to certain things that I've seen happen in like messianic congregations that I've been in, things that if I had a church, that'd be kind of a neat thing to do. I think it would be neat to follow the Jewish calendar just because it gets us into the Old Testament. I don't think there's anything wrong with that. It's certainly no substitute for the gospel. If you don't do that, there's something wrong with you. You better check your relationship with God. I just don't go there. But I see a lot of the people who are really into this somehow either connect it to the gospel or if they don't do that, they somehow look at themselves as somehow being more spiritually committed than someone who doesn't.

I think both are a mistake. I think God allows you to do as your conscience tells you. Whatever draws you into a better relationship with the Lord, that's what you should do. So I tend to sort of just leave it there. There is a lot of legalism so I'm kind of agreeing and disagreeing at the same time. I agree that if you're in a situation where your church wants to do the Jewish calendar thing or wants to preach against eating this or that, if this is where you and your people are at, fine. Don't make it legalistic. Don't make it about salvation, and don't pretend that you're more spiritual than somebody else. If you can do that and do those things, I think God's fine with it. That's where you're at, worship me, honor me, follow Jesus, do all that stuff and just let it there. Guard yourself against making it something it shouldn't be.

**TS:** The last question is from Slash. Would you ask Mike to comment on this footnote from the Enochic Watchers template of the Gospel of Matthew on page 63, note 145 Leviticus 18:15, by engaging Tamar for sex, he uncovered the nakedness of his daughter-in-law. Leviticus 20:12 repeats the prohibition and identifies it as capital offense. If a man lies with his daughter-in-law,

both of them should be put to death. What I don't understand is why this was called anachronistic violations of the Holiness code in Leviticus 18?

**MSH:** So he doesn't understand why the author of the book, this is Richter's dissertation, why she would refer to it as an anachronistic violation of the Holiness code? There's a couple of ways, a couple directions you can go with this. I don't know what's in Richter's head here but it is probably going to fall in one of two directions here. So if you think that Leviticus was written prior to the book of Judges, which it would be a very traditional view because you have Law of Moses, Mosaic stuff, and then the book of Judges written sometime later, quite a bit later, couple hundred years or few centuries, whatever, then it wouldn't make sense to call what Judah does in Judges as anachronistic because you're assuming the Levitical laws existed already. So there are lots of scholars, though, who don't.

They think the Levitical laws are much later than Judges. And so it could be that Richter, that's her perspective on the Holiness code of Leviticus, that it authored much later than the book of Judges, and if she does think that, and she may, that may be what she's thinking here in this statement, then she would call it anachronistic because of when she believes one was written as opposed to the other. I'm not sure that's what she's thinking but it certainly could be what she's thinking. If the questioner is asking something about other than the chronology, then I don't know that I can hazard a guess but that seems to be the angle of the question to me anyway, to my ear.

**TS:** Guess what, Mike? That's the word of the day, anachronistic. There you go. That's the word of the show right there.

**MSH:** We need the, boy this is going to date me, the Groucho Marx's secret word where the duck would fly down from the ceiling and you'd win something. Nobody's winning anything here.

**TS:** That's it for this show so let's switch gears here and you got an event coming up in LA. That's this weekend isn't it?

**MSH:** Yup, April 23. The details are up on the website [DRMSH.com/events](http://DRMSH.com/events) and then you'll see the link for San Juan Capistrano. It's about an hour from Los Angeles. Now if you go up there, you'll notice there is a link that you can register online for this event and there's some statement about seating is limited. The room that we were originally assigned only holds 50 people. I have heard that there've already been more registrants than that so they're either going to cram people into that room, it's in a Christian school complex, or we might be able to move to a bigger room. So if you're still interested in coming and haven't registered yet, I would still try the link. I would still register. It's free. It's not going to cost you anything. You're not going to lose any money. But hint hint, if you're going there, get there early so they don't have to squeeze you in with a shoehorn. That's all I know. I think it's fair for me to tell this audience if there's any among you that are planning on coming, get there a little early to make sure you get a seat.

**TS:** What about your book giveaways, got an update on that?

**MSH:** There is a second book giveaway. I got a lot of e-mails. There were a few things on the blog, comments that said the book giveaway lasted less than a day. What happened? It was supposed to last a few more days till 14<sup>th</sup>. And what happened was that when you set this thing up with Amazon, you have to put in a number of responses and then Amazon determines the random distribution of the prize. So the number I put in there wasn't very high. I think I probably put in something like 1000 and that didn't work real well. It hit the max in just a few hours and so it awarded all the books. So the next time around, and it should already be live, but the next giveaway is a book about the Watchers, and I increased that number quite a bit hoping that the giveaway process would last the full seven days that Amazon allots to it. So hopefully we won't have that problem but if it just gets beaten, I'm going to have to put in some ridiculous number in the future to try to not have this happen again. But I don't think it will happen again. I put a few thousand or something.