

# **The Naked Bible Podcast 2.0**

**Number 97**

**“Q&A 12”**

**Dr. Michael S. Heiser**

**With**

**Residential Layman  
Trey Stricklin**

**April 24, 2015**

## **Q&A 12**

Our 12th Question and Answer episode!

**TS:** Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 97, Q&A 12. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the cult leader, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey Mike, how are you doing?

**MSH:** Thanks for that Trey. I shouldn't have told you that. In case people are wondering, I was called a cult leader this week so congratulations are in order I guess. Somebody that says my material is cultish so thanks for that. Be warmed and filled. What I wanted to say was I must be a really inept cult leader because I don't have any money and I don't have a harem. I don't have weapons.

**TS:** Was that from a fellow Christian?

**MSH:** Yeah, nobody I know. Someone just had to give me the good news in an e-mail something that they heard in their church.

**TS:** In the church, it's getting better. Alright Mike, I noticed we got some more reviews and ratings so that helps us a lot. Those ratings and reviews help others find us and/or decide to listen to us so we appreciate those who champion the podcast and help those discover this great content. I want them to listen to the podcast so they can hear questions like this because we got a dozen or so questions again. The first question up is from Jason from Costa Mesa, California, He wants to know is there sex in heaven?

**MSH:** Does he have a reason for that?

**TS:** he gives a bunch of reasons but we're going to leave it there so you can have more time to talk about sex in heaven.

**MSH:** This probably is related to the thing in the Gospels about the Sadducees, the whole marriage question, who's husband will this woman be so on and so forth. So the marrying and giving in marriage and all; that. That's what I would suspect anyway. When I've answered this question in the past, I haven't categorically said things like there's no sex in heaven. My real estimation of this is that we don't have any commentary on this in Scripture which tells us that, biblically speaking, this is not either an important question or it would sort of be cast as a silly question, just as assigning no relevance to it. What I'm really trying to say when I deal with this question either in the book in Unseen Realm or other places that heaven isn't a realm where there is embodiment that requires procreation.

That's typically, I think, the major concern here but obviously the questioner or other questioners make it more pleasure oriented or recreational oriented. But typically when scholars address this or even some ancient texts, that's kind of the point. We don't have the need to produce the next generation in heaven because it's not an embodied terrestrial existence. We don't need to do X,Y or Z. like we do to maintain our life here because that's the place of eternal life. So it just sort of gets taken off the table because the things that require us to do, to maintain our self and our lives, are just no longer in play when you get to heaven. Now we'll know from previous episodes, obviously, there's some sort of embodiment. I think it goes beyond the visual. We look like we have bodies in heaven. I think there is real embodiment. We've spent some time

going through 1 Corinthians 15 about that. But whatever the embodiment is, it's different and it's qualitatively different.

But you never actually get a discussion. When I say a discussion I mean any sort of exegetical thing that you can kind of hang a discussion on. You don't get any part of Scripture that really says this glorified embodiment somehow allows for or enhances sexual activity. You don't get anything like that. It's not even a consideration. It's not something that's even on the table. So that's kind of where I would leave it. I don't like to speculate on stuff like that. I don't have anything to hang a position on other than to say there's just nothing going on about this. There is embodiment when you have a divine being become embodied to come to earth. Now they're on the terrestrial plane. The context is different. You're in the terrestrial world. You're not in the heavenly world. In the terrestrial world, you have not only the capacity to do these things but you also have the activity going on because there's necessity to it.

You come to earth. You're a divine being, you can eat meals. You don't have to eat in heaven. You don't have to sustain your life but you could do it because you're on the terrestrial world. The divine being is now on the earthly plane. You don't see it in reverse, where in the heavenly plane we do the same things we do in the earthly plane. There's just nothing like that. So you get a treatment of bodily capacities when divine beings come to earth but you don't get the opposite in Scripture. So I think that's kind where we have to leave it, which isn't a denial but it's also not an affirmation. Who knows?

**TS:** Jason does bring up a point about the sons of God. Did they have a libido since they found the beauty of human women and came down and married, so they had some form of desire there to start that.

**MSH:** Yeah, and books like Enoch actually make that kind of transparently clear. There's this lust element. Scripture doesn't but books like Enoch certainly do, other sources like that. I kind of file this in the category that since we're talking about the divine realm, I can't really coherently say the divine realm can't do XY or Z. So if it can do XYZ, like become embodied, then I also don't have any reason to conclude that the embodiment that is chosen lacks certain capacities that normal human embodiment would.

I take it as some sort of embodiment that operates in the terrestrial sphere along with humans where these capacities are part and parcel of that that particular embodiment situation. Now when it comes to the Genesis 6 thing, this is one of the reasons why some people still prefer a supernaturalist view but they prefer what would be called the mythic view, that is, the sexual language in Genesis 6:1-4 is euphemistic. It's used to convey the idea that the sons of God, other divine beings, rival divine beings, rebellious divine beings raise up their own human populations to oppose the people of Yahweh. So it is still a supernatural view but it takes the sexual language euphemistically. And some people preferred that because it kind of circumvents or avoids questions like this. I'm just open to both possibilities.

The reason I put both of them in Unseen Realm's because I think people should know about both of them. The only thing I sort of reject is that we can't look at Genesis 6:1-4, and any of these other in angelic embodiment of kinds of things where you have elohim beings, divine beings become embodied and do certain things, I think it's illegitimate to strip the supernatural character out of that just for the sake of being able to sort of put on the shelf and dismiss the passage now, which is something like what the Sethite view does. It makes the discussion go

away, kind of thing, in its totality. So that I object to and nobody in antiquity looked at it that way in either Testament. And so that's a little bit different than this. So I just think if we're going to take the supernaturalistic worldview of the biblical writer seriously, we should do that. But in this case, for some of these things, there is more than one way to look at some of this, especially the sexual language.

**TS:** Just a couple more points Jason brings up is doesn't the form of one's body reflect its function? Paul metaphorically asserted that no part of the body is useless but each part is indispensable.

**MSH:** The context for that is he's using the analogy of an earthly body with an earthly context, an analogy of the human body, if we don't have blood in the resurrection body, if we have bodies like Jesus did. He's not leaking blood out of his hands. Does that violate what Paul says? I guess blood's no more use anymore? Of course not, one is not a commentary on the other.

**TS:** His last point is related to the motive of the sons of God for mating with human women. Could it be that they felt unsatisfied with non-procreative sex in heaven and wanted to establish a name for themselves and if so, doesn't this mean that sex in heaven, if it exists, results in no creation of life and thus, no name to establish a competing family line?

**MSH:** In other words, is it just for pleasure, that kind of thing? Who am I to say yes or no? I don't know because we don't have any material about it. In some of the Enochian literature you get this sense that once the Watchers come to earth and they get human embodiment, then they experience these human impulses and urges and they want to act on them. So there's a little bit of an element of that because they have this terrestrial embodiment, but does that work in the other direction? We're just working with no data here so I'm perfectly comfortable when I don't have something to hang a view on just saying I don't know.

**TS:** Okay, our next question is from Hiram in Puerto Rico. What difference can you point out between glorified believers and the angel of the Lord from the Old Testament? I got a little confused on that from the last chapter of the Unseen Realm in the Revelation 3:12 interpretation given when it was pointing out the glorified believers bearing the name. I thought that was the key point for this angel to be Yahweh embodied?

**MSH:** What I would say in relation to Revelation 3:12, let me just read it.

<sup>12</sup>The one who conquers, I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God. Never shall he go out of it, and I will write on him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem, which comes down from my God out of heaven, and my own new name.

**MSH:** I think we have to draw attention to the fact that this doesn't say that God puts his name in the person, in the believer. So that right away is sort of a difference between the wording here in Exodus 23 where my name is in this particular angel. So we don't have that language here that God puts his name in this believer. In the New Testament era, the Spirit resides in the believer.

But I think the language here just generally is pointing to making, look, I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God.

So you've already got this sense earlier in New Testament books that the church, Christians individually and corporately, are the temple of God. So I tend to think this language kind of echoes that and what's in the believer. The reason we're the temple is that we have the presence of God dwelling in us in the Spirit. You say that does sound kind of like what's going on in Exodus 23 except for it's the only circumstance where you see that and it refers to this is being that is not human, this being that is nonhuman and is coming in an embodied form. And God telling Moses this person here, this angel, this messenger, this being I'm sending on the way to lead you to the land is me. We only don't have in the Old Testament this sense of the Spirit taking up residence in each believer. In the Old Testament, it's much more unusual, much more localized. So I'd say that plus the slight difference in language here I think distinguishes the two ideas.

**TS:** Our next one's from X-Avian 251 was wondering what Mike's thoughts are on the geographical location of the Garden of Eden. What do you think of the idea of it being underneath the present-day Persian Gulf?

**MSH:** Well, none of the proposed orientations or the proposed locations for the Garden of Eden, there've actually been a good number of them, none of them are really completely satisfactory. There is a sort of a plausibility scale. Some of them are just totally wacky and others have sort of gotten academic attention because the geographical indicators in Genesis 2. From what I've read, I think this is probably some location near, at, or presently covered by water underneath the Persian Gulf. I think it's fair to say, and I'm not alone here, but I think it's fair to say this is the one with the least problems. And so as of today, it's probably the view that is kind of the most or at least has the most potential to be the answer to this question. But beyond that, I don't think we can say anything with certitude.

**TS:** Next one's from Jonathan in the UK. What are your thoughts on the identity of Allah of the Muslims, a distorted view of Yahweh, a rebel elohim who passed on revelation to Mohammed or something else?

**MSH:** I think that Allah in the Koran is more or less a distorted view of Yahweh because so much of the Koran draws on the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament for that matter and recasts the single God that Muslims worship and follow. So I think that probably has the most explanatory power, at least in terms of the content of the Koran. If you're talking about the radicalized thinking and certain hyper-literalistic interpretations of jihad in the Koran, and I certainly think it's within the realm of possibility that that is demonically motivated and engineered but that's a bit of a different question than saying when we read about Allah in the Koran, is that just a really distorted picture of the single God, knowing that in their geographical context.

Plus, folks, I don't know if you realize this but you ought to read the Koran. And if you read the Koran, one thing's going to become very clear. There's a lot of material in the Koran that comes out of the Old Testament and the New Testament. So that tells you they have the same sort of monotheistic orientation point. And so that is what leads me to say that they have

just taken the true God, the God of the universe so speak, the Creator God, and recasts him and refashioned his character to be something more favorable to the religious predilections of whoever produced the Koran. I don't think we need to see anything more mystical in it than that. But as far as the behavior that's attached to it and the way certain things get articulated within Islam by some who want to use it as a tool for jihad, I think certainly there's some demonic stuff going on. I think that's a distinct possibility

**TS:** The next question is from Matthew and then the one after that's from Lindsay. They're kind of asking the same questions. I'm going to read the one from Matthew first and then follow it up with Lindsey's question. And Matthews question is, he would love to hear Mike's take on what the Seraph are, particularly in relation to the bronze snake incident in Numbers. Lindsay wants to know, should we imagine there being any kind of physical resemblance between real divine beings and their representative images have found throughout history, that is, do Seraphim really look like snakes with wings?

**MSH:** Do they really look like snakes with wings? This really takes us in all sorts of things. Boy, this is one of those cases where I wish there were certain journal articles that were sort of publicly available. I'm racking my brain here. This one might actually be publicly available because it's from Biblica. So if you want to google BIBLICA and then journal and put in the last named PROVENCAL, I think his first name is Phillip but I could be mistaken. There is an article on the term seraph, the seraph terminology, and I think this is really a good article because it goes into the zoology behind the terminology and there's a lot of good material in this journal article about how the biblical term seraph, which is often kind of assumed to be the verb to burn, sort of that typical view kind of overlooks the fact that we also have a noun here and we have an Egyptian term SRF, for lack of being able to illustrate hieroglyphs here.

But we have an Egyptian term of the same consonance that means snake, specifically, this idea of a winged serpent isn't really a serpent with wings like a bird. It comes from cobra imagery where when you're looking at a cobra, the skin on the sides of it can become sort of flanges that protrude from its body on either side. That is where the ancient Semitic idea of the winged serpent comes from because it looks like its got appendages. This terminology from Egypt really covers both the burn and the serpent because you have certain parts of the Middle East where you had spitting cobras, and if you were hit by the venom, it would burn, or if you were bitten, it would burn. So the fiery serpents, they're not like serpents that are flames floating around in the sand. It's metaphorical language for the pain that it inflicts and you have the same situation going on here.

So you have seraph, to burn. You have seraph, the serpent, and they're kind of like two sides of the same coin. So as far as the terminology, I think that is the right way to understand the term itself. It's not just burn. It also is serpent. And so when you go to the biblical seraphim and the question is, is this actually what a seraphim looks like? Well, on one level, if you're Isaiah and you're in the throne room of God and you encounter a seraphim, shouldn't this be the way they look like? The problem with that is you have a seraph, SRF in Egypt, this particular term is also used of a divine throne guardian. You say why is that a problem, because the Bible not only uses that term for a divine throne guardian, but it also uses cherub Acadian, which in Mesopotamian thinking is also a throne guardian. SO you can't really have a throne guardian that looks like a serpent.

Did it change its appearance when it looks like a cherub, a winged kind of bovine character or something like that, or a winged leonine character, depending on the Mesopotamian iconography. I don't think we can look at this material and say while walking down the road someday and I'm encountered by a seraphim, this is what they're going to look like. I don't think that's the point. I think these terms are used of divine beings whose specific role is thought to be guarding the throne of the Almighty. You say why the two different orientations, why the two different terms, why the two different iconographical appearances? Well, I'm going to leave the statement at what I'm going to say here. We'll see if anybody picks up on why this would be controversial.

But you're going to see cherub, the Mesopotamian term, used in texts that were composed in a Mesopotamian context because that is going to communicate with the immediate audience of the day. When the biblical writer uses cherub cherubim, people are going to know instantly what that is and what its role is because they've seen that in the throne iconography of the particular location that they're in. If you use the SRF, seraph in Egyptian, if you use that, well, that's a good indication that that text was composed in some historical context where the Egyptian iconography, the Egyptian trappings of royalty would have been seen and understood and evident. And so that is why the biblical writer uses an Egyptian term in one text and a Mesopotamian term in another. It has to do with the context in which the original readers would've been familiar at the time of the writing of the text. Now I'm going to leave it there and we'll see if listeners pick up on why that might be a controversial statement. And if it is, you can send that to Trey and we can comment on it in the next Q&A but I don't think any of these descriptions can really be used to sort of zoologically classify divine beings because divine beings by nature are not actually embodied.

You say if they came here to earth, could they, if a throne guardian came to earth and they wanted a human to know it was a throne guardian, could they pick that appearance so someone familiar with their Bible would know that that's a throne guardian over there? I suppose so. I suppose that could happen. But what you typically see is these are heavenly visions where prophets or whoever are transported into the divine realm. That's how the role of this particular divine being is telegraphed by the one who views it. But by nature, they're not embodied. They don't have forms of creatures that would correspond to sort of the terrestrial life. But when we're writing about those things, that helps to communicate what they do in the spiritual world so that's why this kind of language is used. I don't know if that really helps but that's my perspective on it.

**TS:** Lindsey's second question is, if after Jesus's return we are to take the place of the rebellious divine council members and rule the nations (Rev 2:26-27), of what whom do the nations consist? Does Mike agree with the pre-mill idea that resurrected glorified saints will rule over a still fallen world that includes unglorified unbelievers? If not, who's around to make up the nations?

**MSH:** I view the final consummation of the kingdom to be the new Eden, and that's really all I can say. I know that doesn't conform to either necessarily of the options that the questioner put into the question. In that respect, I don't follow either traditional pre-millennial thinking or traditional amillennial thinking. I think that the final form of the kingdom is going to be on earth and I view it as the new earth. So who's occupying the nations? The answer would be



people, glorified people. I don't think you have to have bad guys to be able to rule over the nations, to be able to displace and replace the rebellious sons of God and reconstitute the divine council.

I don't know why you need fallen people to do that because the whole idea of ruling over the nations is you maintain, go back to Eden, you maintain, you administer, and you enjoy the world, the creation that God has made. You enjoy it for what it is. You maintain it and care for it. You do whatever God wants you to do for it and with it, using the original Edenic setting, the original Edenic commands as a model. We're not told a whole lot about how this is going to work but I don't see the necessity of having fallen people in a future millennium. I actually don't like the term millennium even though I believe in a coming earthly kingdom because to me, millennium is too short. If I'm identifying with the new earth, the globalized Eden, it's too short. We're not going to limit it to 1000 years.

So the one hand, I affirm this element of what premillennialism traditionally has affirmed, a coming future literal kingdom, however you want to say that, and that amillennialism I just don't seem to like. They're preferring the kingdom being now, totally, period, then we go off into heaven, whatever that is. I think the biblical idea of heaven is actually the new earth. So if that fits in somebody's system, that's nice. If it doesn't fit in somebody's system, that's okay, too. I don't worry about how I'm sort of tip toeing through systems too much.

**TS:** Brian has a pair of questions, and first one is, Dr. Heiser has been on the Trinity podcast in the past with Dell Tuggey. Dell's a Christian Unitarian and I don't think Dr. Heiser interprets Scripture this way but I could be wrong.

**MSH:** Correct, I'm not a Unitarian. That was easy.

**TS:** All right, second one is, I wonder if Dr. Heiser would have any guidance on the scholar George Hawkins. A friend of mine bought his Pember collection and I wondered about the quality of his work.

**MSH:** I can't really comment on him because I've not heard of him so that was easy, too. We need more questions like that.

**TS:** Can you talk about the Pember?

**MSH:** I don't know a lot about Pember as well. I know that we have this sort of old Earth creationist model. I'm not sure if Pember, was Pember a gap theorist? I can't recall specifically if Pember adopted the gap theory or not. If he did, then a lot of listeners are going to know that I'm not positively predisposed to the gap theory.

**TS:** I have his book Earliest Earth but I can't remember.

**MSH:** I kind of think he is but I don't want to tag him with that without actually going back to look it up but that's probably all I can contribute to that question.

**TS:** Earliest Ages, I need to go back and read that one.

**MSH:** I'm just not sure where he's at.

**TS:** The next one is from Jad in Melbourne, Australia, and apologize if I butchered your name. Here is his question, and this is an important one. How should I approach talking to members of my church about much of the subject matter that is discussed in your work? I'm frequently told by my older brothers and sisters in Christ whenever I hint at some of these topics that I shouldn't bring up subjects that could cause the faith of others to be lost or weakened. Who should I go to to talk about these things with at all?

**MSH:** So I'm being a little sarcastic here but I'm also being, there's an element of sincerity here, too. I I don't know how it would harm the faith of other people to know their Bible better. Now if you're talking about things like the book of Enoch or something like that, I can see that little bit more because that's an external source to Scripture. But for the life of me, I really don't understand how walking up to someone and saying let's devote ourselves for a month to studying Genesis 6:1-4 and see if the sons of God and the Nephilim were like just normal people or something beyond that. How does that harm someone's faith? Faith in what? If you're linking the Gospel to stuff like this, you've got bigger problems than Mike's book. Then you don't understand the Gospel.

If he means harming the faith of someone to being something like making people have questions about Bible passages, well, that's sort of a byproduct of having a pulse to be honest with you. If you're a thinking adult and if you're devoting yourself to reading Scripture, I don't know how you could read Scripture and not have questions pop into your head because the alternative of that, if questions never pop into your head, then it's like saying everything in the Bible that I'm reading here is self-evident. There are no questions. I understand everything completely and perfectly. I just don't know how anyone who would be a sincere reader of Scripture could ever think that. So I don't really quite know how to approach the question other than throwing out those random thoughts. I guess on a bad day if I were at this person's church small group and got his question, I would say look, if you really believe this thing that's sitting on your lap is the word of God, why wouldn't you want to know all that you possibly could about it?

And if you have questions, and you're bound to have questions because the Bible just transcends a surface self-evident reading. I've never met anybody who reads the Bible that didn't have a question about it. So how does wanting to get an answer to a question, how is that a questionable enterprise if you really believe this is the word of God? I don't understand the approach of anyone who would believe that and then would turn around and say I don't want to know too much about it. If I have questions I don't really want to probe it too much. I don't really want answers to these questions because that might generate other questions and I don't really want to know too much about the word of God, do I? I just don't get it. I don't get the whole approach, the whole premise, the whole mindset. And I feel for the questioner in this struggle because I still get this. I'm not sort of like living off in my, well, maybe I'm living off of my cult commune here and I never come into contact with real people here that have these sorts of questions. Of course that's just absurd.

I still do get these kinds of questions and then I can see on people's faces that I interact with that they're a little disturbed. And when you ask them the question, well of course I want to

know about the Bible. And then my follow-up question's well then, what's the problem? This is part of growing as a Christian. This is part of hungering for truth. God bothered to give you truth and why you would want to sort of turn the spigot off at some point I don't understand. It really comes down I think to sort of comfort level kinds of things with people. They like the feeling that they have everything kind nailed down.

They like the feeling that their pastor has sort of got everything under his belt and if it's important, the pastor will tell me about it. But I don't see how that really honors the idea that God has given us this thing we call the Word of God. We are commanded to study it and to show ourselves approved, all the verses that we know. And yet somehow, our process of doing that is having it dispensed to us through an authority figure. I just literally have difficulty comprehending that even the whole approach, the whole hesitation but I know it's real.

**TS:** Our next one's from Andrew and he writes, I often hear preachers say in salvation context that we must contact the blood of Christ in baptism. I can find no such passage that claims we must contact it or that it is even contactable. If we follow the allusions to the meaning of the sacrifices and offerings in Leviticus, it doesn't even appear at the blood and the worshiper ever contact each other. The only reference I can find where men and blood are connected is in Exodus 24. Do we contact Christ blood in baptism as is suggested from pulpits or are they selling snake oil?

**MSH:** This one's easy, too. They're selling snake oil. I have never actually heard this idea contacting the blood of Christ through baptism, very strange. And the questioner says I can't find a single verse for this. Well. That ought to tell you something. I would assert to the questioner and the people selling him the snake oil that if we can't find our theology in the biblical text, by definition, it isn't biblical theology. So that's just sort of an axiomatic thing. To be able to call your theology biblical you actually ought to be able to find it in there somewhere. So that would be my answer to that but that's a very strange idea. It has me wondering if it's sort of like code language for some other idea that might be more familiar but I don't want to read into the question.

**TS:** Okay, our last question is from Jay in Midland, Texas. If you were granted an audience with Paul the apostle after the resurrection and you can only ask him one or two questions, what would you ask him?

**MSH:** This has me wondering, after the resurrection means like when Paul was alive post-resurrection or after like when we all get to heaven. Is there any indication in the question there's a distinction there?

**TS:** No.

**MSH:** I'll assume that it's when I'm in heaven and I get to see Paul or something like that. What would I ask Paul? Boy, I thought I had, something just popped into my head and now the question doesn't make any sense. I thought a good question would be what are you doing up there, but if I'm there, I already know that. If the point of the question is when I get to be there

with Paul, I really wouldn't have any questions. What else could he mean? Help me out here Trey.

**TS:** Maybe when he was still alive.

**MSH:** Read the question again.

**TS:** If you were granted an audience with Paul the apostle after the resurrection, so let's say here on earth.

**MSH:** So I'm living back when Paul's there. So Paul's not in the resurrected body. Paul is Paul and we're living after the resurrection of Christ, so that's how we're reading it now?

**TS:** Let's go with that.

**MSH:** So if I went back in time and I talked to Paul post-resurrection, what would I ask him? Boy, I've never actually even thought, I feel like I'm in a Star Trek episode where I could be Captain Janeway and say, I swore at the Academy I would never do that time travel thing. I don't know how many of our audience are Trekkies but I've never really thought about this time travel thing. What would I ask Paul? The short answer is I don't know. So you thought this was a good question to end with Trey. I have no idea what I would ask him. I might ask him if he, this is something I suspect. I suspect that Paul believed that he wouldn't die until he reached Spain. So I might actually ask him that, but that presumes he's had his call to be the apostle to the Gentiles and sort of has that kind of rooted in his heart, in his mind.

But if I knew that, if he was on his missionary journeys somewhere, that would probably be something I'd ask him, about the whole getting to Tarshish thing. Is this how you define completion? And while we're getting into these epistles, I'd ask him something like do you think that there is a future for national ethnic Israel or is the Israel of God now only the church because that's a key eschatological question that I don't think Paul is his clear on in his Epistles. So I might ask him for clarification of that particular issue. It's just such a thorny one. Now that I've said the word thorn, another thing pops in my head. Was the messenger of Satan sent to buffet him that he writes about it, was that a opposer? Was he was being oppressed by entities or was it just sort of an expression that refers to some physical malady, something like that. So there's a few. Those are things I'd want to know. But depending on are you a Christian yet or not, that might be the first one out of my mouth if we just ran into each other in someplace and I knew it was Paul. I want to know that one first.

**TS:** I'd probably ask if he prefers Saul or Paul.

**MSH:** What was the argument about when you had to split up there over John Mark? What was that all about?