

Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 220

Q&A 30

June 16, 2018

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)

Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)

Episode Summary

Dr. Heiser answers your questions about:

- Can the Bible be considered fully human and fully divine, like Jesus? [2:25]
- Why demons seemed to have a specific notion about when Jesus was supposed to exercise authority over them [9:40]
- Alternative teachings to demons as disembodied Nephilim [18:45]
- The Feast of Booths in the future [21:20]
- Evidence for others besides the magi recognizing the astronomical signs of messiah's birth [25:00]
- The sexual sins that take place after destruction [32:25]

Transcript

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, episode 220: our 30th Q&A. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey, Mike, how you doing this week?

MH: Pretty good. Here we go again—another Q&A. So we keep motoring through them.

TS: It's amazing 30th. That's a big round number: 30.

MH: That's a little hard to believe. Maybe when we hit like 50, we'll have a Q&A where we don't ask a question, just to make it different.

TS: We need to add up all the questions that you've answered.

MH: That would be interesting. It would be interesting.

TS: I'm sure it's in the hundreds. Thirty times probably at least five to ten per episode... It's got to be in the hundreds, a couple hundred maybe.

MH: Yeah, we should try to figure that out. We could give somebody a prize for asking the 500th question or the 1000th question or something like that. You've got so much free time, you know. We'll give you something to do.

TS: I'm like, you now, I'm where I need an assistant. It's getting nuts.

MH: No, I know.

TS: I want to tell everybody out there, you can still email me at TreyStricklin@gmail.com, and I promise you I get your questions. I apologize. I probably need to do an autoresponder like Mike does, where I just can't respond to every single one. I get so many emails now that it's just impossible to respond to every one, unless I made it a full-time job to do so. So just know if you email me at TreyStricklin@gmail.com, I do get your emails and I appreciate them and I promise you when I can I will respond to you. Alright, Mike you ready for the next round of questions?

MH: Yep.

TS: Okay. Our first one is going to be from Tom in Irving, Texas—a fellow Texan. Again, if you're around that area in August, come to our Naked Bible Conference.

MH: Well, let's just tell Tom we're not going to answer his question unless he comes to the conference. How's that?

TS: Ooh, boom, blackmail! I like it. Or just say we'll save your question for the conference and get your answer at the conference. I like that. All right. So here's Tom's question:

2:25

I'm very much aware of Mike's of view of inspiration and agree humans are very involved and so is God's sovereignty. Indeed, it seems that scripture is 100-percent the work of the human author, but also 100-percent the work of God. It occurs to me that there are clear parallels to the written revelation (the Bible) and the incarnate revelation (Jesus). Our theology tells us that Jesus is both fully human and fully God and there are no trade-offs or losses of either humanity or divinity. Is it fair to say that the written word is fully human and fully divine, just as Jesus is fully human, but also fully divine? Is that a fair observation? And does that help anyone better understand Mike's view of inspiration?

MH: Well, I would certainly say scripture is 100-percent the work of human authors and it's 100-percent the work of God, in terms of Providence, sovereignty, and whatnot. Because you wouldn't be able to speak coherently about really anything happening that escapes God's notice or his sovereignty. Of course, it gets you into how you define sovereignty and whatnot, in light of free will, but sovereignty is not absent. Let's put it that way, even though it's subject to

definition.

However, I'm really not comfortable with describing or assigning divinity to a book, and the reason for that is divinity, as I think of it, is a quality of a supernatural being—in other words, a living entity. So that's why it works with Jesus on both sides—human and non-human, human and deity—because he is a living being either way, either incarnate or not incarnate (God as spirit all that stuff). So that's why the language of divinity works for me.

5:00 Since I parse divinity that way (about being a quality of a supernatural being or a being created in God's likeness)... Like us. We're created in God's likeness and we can speak of ourselves as being divine, especially in our glorification. But again, we're living beings. So that's why I hesitate to take that term that works so well with living entities and assign it to an inanimate object like a book or a manuscript or something like that. So I don't really like that language for that reason, even though I affirm that God didn't take a day off or a minute off while he was engaged in Providentially overseeing the process by which we get this thing called the Bible. So I think you can still affirm that, but again, I would be very wary of using a word like the Bible is “divine” just for that reason. It's a semantic thing for me, so I just don't think the word fits inanimate objects really. You have holy vessels, of course, and a word like “sacred” works with an inanimate object. Scripture is certainly 100-percent sacred. But again, I just don't like the word “divine” when used of an inanimate object, so maybe that's just me. But you're asking me so that's how I look at it.

Now, having said all that, I would express the idea a little bit differently. I'd say that the final product of the process of inspiration is fully human, since it came by virtue of human hands, and fully acceptable to God. That is, it fully accomplishes what God had in mind and contains no errors in terms of its truth propositions. I've said things to this effect before on the podcast. I can't expect everybody to have heard all that, but that's sort of the way I would express it. Scripture is exactly and fully what God had in mind, so it's this thing produced at the end of the process of inspiration. I do not view inspiration as an event. I view it as a process. There are many hands that touch this thing we call scripture that contribute to producing the final product—this thing that we assign sacred status to and call it the Bible—most of whom we'll never know and who aren't even alluded to in the pages of the text itself. But God prepared each writer, each editor, each person who had played some role in giving us the final product... God Providentially prepared people for that moment—that touchpoint—that contribution to this thing we call scripture, this thing we call the Bible. So Providence is a big deal for me. Process is a big deal.

So I would say that at the end of all that God was happy. It was what God wanted it to be and it contains no errors in terms of its truth propositions. Now I distinguish truth propositions, as many listeners will know, from the means by which those propositions are expressed or communicated. In other words, the

thing claimed (that's a proposition)... The thing claimed and the means of making the claim are not the same. They're not the same items. They're different things. They're different but related things. So for example, a Biblical writer can say something that doesn't conform to what we know that's true about Earth science. I'm speaking in generalities here. The scripture writer can make an allusion to something that we know is demonstrable contrary to physical, natural reality. But who cares, because that isn't the truth proposition. It's a means by which the biblical writer is moving toward expressing and asserting a truth proposition. And I believe that scripture's truth propositions are not errant. I believe in inerrancy in that that way. Everybody gets to define inerrancy and all that stuff, and we all know that if we've spent any time looking at the subject. This is why I'm comfortable with using a word like "inerrancy" of scripture—because the things that it asserts, that it demands that we believe, these truth propositions—they are without error. But the means by which they are expressed might be a different story, okay? So I think that's a necessary distinction. It's a coherent distinction because the thing that is claimed is not the same as the means by which it is claimed. This is a simple lesson in coherent thinking (logic) that I think applies really well to scripture and does not impede on scripture's authority at all, because authority is rooted in truth propositions, not the means by which those propositions are expressed.

TS: Dennis has our next three questions. And the first one is:

9:40

Any insights on why the demons that Jesus cast out seem to have a specific notion of when Jesus is supposed to exercise authority over them?

10:00

Yeah, I would say the reason they have a sense of this is likely the Old Testament—specifically Day of the Lord passages. My point is not that demons are subscribers to every little scrap of scripture that comes along and, "Hey, did you read the latest? We're like doomed into the abyss until the end of time!" But I think as people talk about that and as they think about it... I think a divine intelligence—a supernatural intelligence—is going to run into that idea and be told that idea by God himself. God isn't gonna tell them one thing and prompt scripture writers to write something down that's different. There's going to be consistency there. So we don't want to turn this into a cartoon, but the information should be available. So that's why I think you get this sense. Of course, you could say this is all the writer—the writer can read the Old Testament, and this the way the writer cast his story. Well, sure you can say that, too. But since I believe demons are real supernatural intelligences that interact with human beings and, of course, interact with God, and God is going to be consistent with the sentence he pronounces on them and telling humans what sentence he pronounced on them... God's going to be consistent there. It's not a surprise that they know they're under a curse and that the Day of the Lord is what they've got to look forward to. So you have Day of the Lord passages in the Old Testament that specifically telegraph the idea that it's at that time that the

supernatural forces that are hostile to God are going to get judged, along with the wicked on Earth, in terms of people. God's going to clean house in both places, and there are passages that allude to this. Just a couple, and then I'm also going to mention a couple Second Temple passages, like from Enoch, that say the same thing. And Enoch's getting it from the Old Testament, too. So you have Isaiah 34:1-4.

**Draw near, O nations, to hear,
and give attention, O peoples!
Let the earth hear, and all that fills it;
the world, and all that comes from it.
²For the LORD is enraged against all the nations,
and furious against all their host;
he has devoted them to destruction, has given them over for slaughter.
³Their slain shall be cast out,
and the stench of their corpses shall rise;
the mountains shall flow with their blood.**

Yeah, that's very earthly because they're bleeding, and then we have:

**⁴All the host of heaven shall rot away,
and the skies roll up like a scroll.
All their host shall fall...**

I've mentioned before (this would be like Naked Bible trivia time) that the phrase in Hebrew "their host" (*saba*) with a third person plural suffix attached to it... In the Hebrew Bible that is a morphological form that in context is always about supernatural hosts, not earthly hosts. And I didn't come up with that. That's the work of Joel Reemtsma. I've mentioned his ETS paper a few times on the podcast before. He did his dissertation in this area, specifically Isaiah 34 and its relationship to Psalm 82.

Isaiah 24:21 is another one of these. Let me just read that quickly.

**²¹On that day the LORD will punish
the host of heaven, in heaven,
and the kings of the earth, on the earth.**

God cleaning house in both realms is pretty clear, in Isaiah 24:21. So in view of this teaching, this is why I think we read what we do read, coming from the demons. And think about the context: Jesus shows up and they know who this is—the Son of the Most High. Like, "Duh!" Of course, they're the only ones that

refer to Jesus with that language. They know who this is and they don't necessarily know what the plan is, but they assume... Look at what they assume: they assume that the son of the king (who is the Crown Prince; he is, in fact, the king; he's the co-regent)... He shows up. So, ergo, therefore, it must mean that the Day of the Lord is upon us, because that is the time when God rectifies all things. The wicked are punished, the righteous are vindicated, and the Kingdom of God returns to earth. So when they see him show up, that's what they're thinking. And they're asking, "Give us a little more time. Don't wipe us out." They know that this is eschatologically what the picture is, and in one sense they're right. The Kingdom has come. Jesus himself uses that language. But what they don't know is real important: he has to die. Again, this becomes part of the matrix of ideas that prompts them (and, of course, Satan) to kill him off, and they're duped because they don't know that that his death is actually the thing that is the plan—the linchpin of the plan—because you can't conquer death unless you have a resurrection, and you can't have a resurrection until you have a death. So you have to have God incarnate die and rise from the dead to fix this problem. But all that they're tracking with is the Kingdom stuff and again, largely it's because of the Old Testament.

You get this in Enoch. I'll just read one passage in Enoch. I was going to read a couple, but just for the sake of time we'll just restrict it to 1 Enoch 10. You get this, again, in the Second Temple Period. People in the first century are going to be familiar with this as well. So we'll flavor this with a little bit of Old Testament and a little bit of Second Temple literature. 1 Enoch 10:12 says

When they and all their children have battled with each other, when they have seen the destruction of their beloved ones burying them for seventy generations underneath the rocks of the ground...

This is the judgment of the Watchers passage: bind them for seventy generations. Again, seventy is the number of totality.

... underneath the rocks of the ground until the day of their judgement and of their consummation until the eternal judgment is concluded. In those days, they will lead them into the bottom of the fire and in torment in the prison where they will be locked up forever. And at that time when they will burn and die, those who collaborated with them will be bound together with them from henceforth unto the end of all generations and destroy all the souls of pleasure and the children of the Watchers, for they have done injustice to man.

Again, this is God's pronouncement of judgment on the Watchers. So the Watchers are sent to the abyss; they're in prison. They're going to be there for seventy generations. Then when that's up, then they're going to be there permanently, they're going to get destroyed, so on and so forth. So this is what the language of demonology (again in the gospels in some of these passages) is

tracking on. And isn't it interesting that you have a similarity between the gospel ideas of what the demons and the Gospels are expecting to happen to them? You have an overlap here with this material in Enoch. And again, it's connected to the Watcher story. This takes us back to the whole paradigm of Second Temple Judaism that demons in the Gospels are the departed spirits of the Nephilim—they're in the abyss and all this kind of stuff. So yeah, we've talked about this, really at length because of *Reversing Hermon*. Archie Wright's book, *Origin of Evil Spirits* is the book to get on that particular topic. Of course, Archie is going to be with us at the Naked Bible Conference, and hopefully we'll have him on the podcast before we hit the conference.

So it's very consistent thinking between what we read in this this area in the Gospels and what we read, both in the Old Testament and in Second Temple literature.

TS: And also, Mike, we were there at that location—the site of Jesus casting out those demons.

MH: Which is in the area where Legion—that whole story—happened. Yep. Yep, you get to see stuff like that.

TS: So that's crazy. Just for me personally, now that we're talking about... we get a question like that and I go right back to that location. If you haven't gone to Israel, people, you need to go because it turns out the Bible is true.

MH: It was nice not to see anybody naked running around and screaming or something like that. That would that be a little upsetting there. [laughter] See now, there was your opportunity for one of these “get naked” comments you're always doing, and I laid that out. I gave you the softball.

TS: That was a softball. Yeah. I dropped it. I apologize. I was going with the need to go to Israel, and you're talking about going naked. So I think our roles have flipped here. You've become the uh...

MH: I've lost my mind. Okay?

TS: Okay. Here's Dennis' second question:

18:45

Are there any other alternative theories or teachings regarding the origins of demons in Second Temple literature or other relevant literature other than the disembodied Nephilim?

MH: Well, the only one that's really secure—that's not problematic in terms of the idea—is Philo of Alexandria. Wright is going to discuss Philo in his book. I'll just read how Archie Wright describes Philo's view of all this “origin of evil spirits” stuff. He says:

Philo is the lone voice in the Alexandrian Diaspora during the Second Temple period that has a different view, whose views differs considerably from the tradition set forth in the book of the Watchers.

20:00 So yeah, there is one. There is an alternate view, but it is a lone voice crying in the wilderness. So Philo of Alexandria did not buy into the Book of the Watchers stuff for the origin of demons. So if you want to read him, you could get Archie Wright's book. He's gonna he's gonna track through some of that material, or some book on Philo or whatever. Some scholars would toss in something in a line in Josephus, specifically in the *Jewish Wars*, book seven, line 185, apparently depending on which text you read (so there's a text-critical issue here). Apparently, some of the some of the manuscripts defined demons as the spirits of wicked men, which enter the living and kill them unless aid is forthcoming. Other texts say it's just the spirit of the wicked. So it lacks the word *anthropos* in the text. So the "spirits of the wicked" could be wicked anything. And, of course, the disembodied spirits of the Nephilim would of course be wicked. Josephus could be very consistent on that point, but there's a manuscript issue. If you look at like *Nice*, the *Nice* edition of Josephus in the critical apparatus is going to suggest that *anthropos* was added to "correct" or help the text. So *anthropos* could be a secondary term, and I think given the significant uniformity of Second Temple Judaism on this matter, it probably is a late addition. But the only one that's secure—the only departure from this that isn't embroiled in issues like text-critical readings—would be Philo of Alexandria.

21:20 **TS: It seems fairly clear to me that the Passover happening during Christ's death and resurrection and the Feast of Weeks (Pentecost) seem to have played some sort of prophetic role and perhaps are meant to help us understand these events more clearly by the feast that they are connected with. Do you believe that the Feast of Booths will play a similar role in some future event, since it has not been connected with anything as significant as the Passover and the Feast of Weeks?**

MH: Yeah, you have Passover, of course. You have the typology issue—Christ is the Passover Lamb. So that was kind of obvious and has nothing to do with the future. That's the crucifixion. Yeah, the Feast of Weeks/Pentecost is the New Covenant coming of the Spirit. That's what happens in Acts 2. So that's pretty easy. As far as the Feast of Booths/Sukkot, the best way I can answer this is to say to go listen to episode 206. We did an episode called "The 70 Bulls of Sukkot" (the Feast of Booths). It zeroed in on a passage in Numbers 29:12-34, in which scholars have noticed that there were 70 bulls offered. Since it's 70, it draws attention to the Deuteronomy 32 Worldview—the Table of Nations and all that kind of stuff.

So we went through all of that material. Critical scholars like to say that this part of the Feast of Booths celebration.... These were 70 offerings to the gods of the nations, sort of to pacify them. So you have this residual polytheism going on in Numbers 29. I don't buy that at all. I think, again, for the detailed reasons go listen to episode 206. I think the 70 bulls are offered not to the gods of the nations, but to commemorate deliverance from all other gods hostile to Israel, because that's what the Feast of Booths is about. It commemorates the deliverance through the wilderness. The wilderness is the bad place. The wilderness is under dominion of hostile supernatural forces. This is why when Israel goes through the wilderness, the Presence... Yahweh is with the camp. Outside the camp is a different story. So God guides them to the promised land, Yahweh's portion for his people Israel, and surrounded by all the other nations that are under dominion of other gods because of Babel and Deuteronomy 32—all that stuff.

So what I think is going on with this passage in Numbers 29 is that the bulls are offered to commemorate Yahweh's deliverance—his triumph over all other gods. He kept his people safe. It has nothing to do with offering *to* foreign gods. I think that's just a really significant misreading of the text. So we're not offering the bulls to kiss up to the other gods or to ask Yahweh for a show of common grace to those other gods or anything like that. (You'll read this in rabbinic material. Just listen episode 206.) But the whole idea is to thank Yahweh for his deliverance. So that is how I'll handle that here.

For details on Sukkot, there are passages that connect the observation of Sukkot with a future time when the nations are regathered and reclaimed and all that. So again, I tie that all in with the Deuteronomy 32 worldview—the reclaiming of the nations. So for the details go to episode 206.

TS: Our next question is from Ed:

25:00

If the magi, who were not Jewish, recognized the signs of the heavens as foretelling the birth of a Jewish King, were there not any other astrologers who recognized this? In particular, it seems like many sects of Judaism in the Second Temple period, such as the one at Qumran, felt they were living in the time of the coming of the Messiah. Are there any extra-biblical references suggesting that others saw these particular signs and interpreted them as announcing the imminent coming of the Jewish Messiah?

MH: Yeah, I'm gonna refer Ed and anyone else who's listening to another article. I'll put this... It may already be there because I brought this up before (I just can't remember which episode), but there's an article by Beckwith on the Jubilee chronology and the Qumran calendar and having something to do with the Messiah. I can't remember exactly what the title is, but the author's name is Beckwith.

The short answer is yeah, there were other people who, by virtue of the calendar system they were using and their beliefs about the calendar, were expecting a messiah. Specifically, I have in mind here that the sect at Qumran (whether they be Essenes or somebody else that's not really an issue here)... Whoever they were, they were using a particular calendar. They were using a mathematical calendar and not a strictly astronomy-based calendar.

So the short version of this... I know I've mentioned this before on the podcast, I just can't recall exactly where that was. You read in the Second Temple *Book of Jubilees*, and you read in certain Dead Sea Scrolls how history is divided into certain periods. The *Book of Jubilees* claims that history is divided into Jubilees. That's why it gets its name. So you have these Jubilee cycles. And the people at Qumran... this was very important to them—these 49-50 year cycles dividing up history. Now what the people at Qumran did was they used a mathematical calendar, not one that was tied specifically to astronomy. They divided up the year into four quadrants of 90 days between each one. They would put a day... So now you have a 364-day calendar. They knew that this did not conform to the strict observation of the heavens. They understood that (again Beckwith goes into great detail in his book—not just the article but his book: *Calendar and Chronology, Jewish and Christian*). So they were aware of this, but they didn't care because they viewed this particular mathematical calendar as reflecting the mind of God. You say, "Well, why would it reflect the mind of God?" Because if you use their calendar... They started their calendar on day four of creation. That was the first calendar day. You say, "Why day four?" That's when the sun was... The timekeepers were invented then, so they that's when they started their calendar. That was the first day for them. And if you plug in this numerical system, what it produces is that for them (for the people at Qumran) every Sabbath, every Festival, every Passover in the Israelite calendar always happened on the same day of each year. It never varied. It was perfect and they would mock... This is why the people at Qumran separated from the Pharisees in the Second Temple period. They fought with them over calendar, because the calendar used in the mainstream Jewish community was an astronomical one and it required the addition of a 13th month every so often to help calculate the date of Passover. And the guys at Qumran would say, "This is a human calendar. You're fiddling with this calendar. It doesn't work because you invented it. You're not going with the mathematical precision that God created at the very first. This is a flawed human calendar. We're not going to use a calendar that you have to tinker with. What God intends us to use is something that is untinkerable, and you don't need to tinker with it." So they actually split; they left. These are priests. They left the priesthood of Jerusalem, which is where the temple was, and they went out to live in the desert. And then for the rest of their time there they pretended to have a temple where they observed their calendar in the desert, because they believed that the order of the universe—the mathematical perfection of the mind of God—should be lived out and mimed on Earth. They believed that they were connected to the angelic priesthood. "This is what the

30:00

angels in heaven are doing. They're doing these things up there and on the certain days and in certain intervals. It's always regular, so we need to connect to them. Heaven and earth need to be connected.”

So they're down there in the desert conducting rituals without a temple, and they produce these esoteric writings about the heavenly temple, their temple, and all this kind of stuff. This is what they're doing. And you look at them and you think, “These are crazy people.” Well, they might have been crazy. But look at the reason why they're doing it. They believed that their calendar reflected the perfect order that God intended.

Now you say, “How does all that relate?” Well part of that calendar were these Jubilee cycles. And they actually... Beckwith lays this out in his article, that beginning with day one... The 100th (and that was another sacred number to the people at Qumran... again, you can read Beckwith for why), but the 100th 49-year cycle (that would be 4900 years)... At the end of that grand set of Jubilee cycles, the messiah would appear. And if you just plug their system in, they were expecting a messiah sometime. It varied because “are we going to use 49 or 50” and all that kind of stuff. So Beckwith is playing with the math here. They were expecting the messiah, according to their system, sometime between 10 BC and 2 AD. 10 BC and 2 AD is how Beckwith lays it out.

Again, take the view of the birth of Jesus that I've already for here: September 11th, 3 BC. It falls in that window, so right around the time of the birth. Let's say you don't buy the September 11th, 3 BC, but somewhere in there... The consensus view has Jesus born in 6 BC or 4 BC or something like that. You're in that time window. So this is part of the reason that there was this expectation, certainly among the people at Qumran. And, of course, people are going to go out and they're going to talk about what the nutcases out in the desert are doing and what they're saying. So these speculations would have circulated to some degree within the interested community back in the city of Jerusalem and in wider Judea. So this is directly related to calendar—just how they marked time. This is what they were expecting.

TS: Joshua has our last question:

32:25

Directly after the Deluge and also the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, there are sexual sins: Noah's nakedness and Lot's drunken incest. Is God trying to indicate that no matter how much he destroys the problem physically, the problem remains, and what man needs is a spiritual remedy instead?

MH: You know, I'm not completely sure what Joshua is angling for/asking for here. And here's why, based on the wording of that question. Here's what makes me uncertain about what the point of the question is: nobody was destroyed in the Noah episode. I mean what happens with Noah—the sexual sin there—is

after the flood. So Ham isn't destroyed and Canaan isn't destroyed. Canaan is cursed, but nobody's destroyed. Nobody's destroyed in response to Lot's sexual sin with his daughters-in-law, either.

So I have to confess, I'm not really following the question, and I would even add that in the Sodom and Gomorrah story, we presume... Again, that's a dangerous word, but we presume that God is looking to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah because of their sexual sin—because of homosexuality or something like that. It kind of actually never says that. You do have homosexuality in the picture after the two angels get into the city and they have that episode with Lot. You know, the men surround the house and say, “Come out, and bring those two guys out here that we may know them.” And that is sexual language. It's a brewing incident of homosexual rape at the very least, but that's after they get to the city. We actually have nothing in the biblical text that says that the city was targeted because of sexual sin. So even there, in my head there's a disconnect between the data of the text and the question, so I'm not really sure what Joshua is asking for here.

35:00 I would think there are lots of reasons why Sodom and Gomorrah were targeted, one of which was the sexual issues, but I don't want to confuse the targeting with what happens afterwards or what doesn't happen afterwards in the case of Ham and Canaan and Lot and his daughters in-law. Nobody gets destroyed there. So beyond that, I'm not really sure how to answer the question, other than to just say for sure the solution to sin isn't behavioral reform. So if that's the question—that these stories can teach us an idea like the real solution for sin is heart change or having a new heart (you know, following the Lord or something)—that's certainly true. And it's not just behavioral change, or even necessarily judgment, because people are hard-hearted. They need new hearts. So if that's the point of the question, yeah, but I'm actually not sure that I'm tracking correctly on what
35:00 Joshua was asking.

TS: Mike, I'll just take a stab at the question, and the answer is “Yes.” There you go.

MH: [laughs] There you go.

TS: It's “Yes,” so, you're welcome, Joshua. All right. Well that is all the questions we have for this episode. And is there anything else that we need to discuss?

MH: Nope, I think we're good.

TS: All right, sounds good. Well, we appreciate you answering our questions and I appreciate everybody else listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God bless.