

## Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 239

Q&A 33

October 27, 2018

**Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)**

**Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)**

### Episode Summary

Dr. Heiser answers your questions:

- Is Cathy Burns accurate in her statement that only the late Ethiopic copies of 1 Enoch 1:9 contain the portion “quoted” by Jude, and not one of the older extant Aramaic and Greek copies? [3:00 time stamp]
- Do you believe Goliath was capable of salvation and that he is the “thou” enemy of Psalm 9? [5:30]
- Do you believe giants are the “foes” who want to “eat up [David's] flesh” in Psalm 27? [7:45]
- Do you believe Peter's apparent disapproval of cosmetics is rooted in Enochian material? [19:40]
- In light of Romans 13, does the Divine Council have an effect on our governing authorities? [32:20]
- Should Romans 13 be used as a blanket endorsement for allowing the government to do as it pleases? [35:05]
- What is Zechariah 11:17 trying to say about the idol shepherd? [42:15]
- What are the fallen angels trying to do in the last days?

### Transcript

**TS:** Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, episode 239: our 33<sup>rd</sup> Q&A. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey, Mike, how are you doing this week?

**MH:** Can't complain.

**TS:** You never do. Every time I ask you...

**MH:** Maybe if I tried hard enough, I could. [laughs]

**TS:** I'd like for you to say, "I could complain." I would like to hear what you would complain about, for once.

**MH:** Well, not having enough time. So I guess I could complain. [laughs]

**TS:** I gotcha. I hear you. Mike, I wanted to remind our listeners again that Friday, November 16<sup>th</sup> at 7:00pm in the Upper Room at the Colorado Community Church, we're going to be doing a live Q&A. We would love for everybody in the Denver area... It's free of charge. It's free to the public. Anybody can come. We're going to film it, record it for the podcast, and we hope that you show up with your questions in hand and have a good night.

**MH:** Yeah. It should be fun. All of these little get-togethers have been fun, so I would not expect anything different.

**TS:** Alright, Mike. Well, Halloween is this week, just around the corner. So I assume you're dressing up as a pug again.

**MH:** [laughs] No, I'm not dressing up as a pug again. I usually go as the adult, so I'm ready. I'm ready early.

**TS:** So basically you're dressing up as a scholar. How about this year, I dare you to dress up as a layman. [MH laughs]

**MH:** You'd be surprised. I'll wear my Red Sox hoodie or my Packers hoodie to work. I look like anybody else. I guess I'll ask you...

**TS:** If anybody asks you, you could say, "I'm a layman."

**MH:** If anybody asks me, I'll do that and see if anybody gets it.

**TS:** Yeah, report back and see. [MH laughs] Well, hey, Mike, we want to steer our listeners, or at least mention our Peernormal podcast, because we just did a Halloween episode and we think you all would enjoy that podcast, as well.

**MH:** Yeah. We went through some articles on the Celtic festival of Samhain. That's basically what we think of as Halloween, where it derives from. And there are some interesting nuggets in there that actually relate to deities and even some Divine Council worldview stuff. So you might want to check it out.

**TS:** Alright, Mike, well, we've got some good questions here from our listeners, so let's jump in with Tim from Missouri. His first question is:

3:00

**Is Cathy Burns accurate in her statement that only the late Ethiopic copies of 1 Enoch 1:9 contain the portion "quoted" by Jude, and not one of the older extant Aramaic and Greek copies?**

---

**MH:** Well, I don't know who Cathy Burns is. Boy, I don't want to sound harsh here, but if you're an Enoch scholar, I probably would have come across your name before, so I have to assume she's not. But I *do* know that her statement is incorrect. So she's wrong. The statement is, in Greek... Let me just read it. This is really exciting stuff here. I'm going to read the Greek line from the Logos edition of the Greek pseudepigrapha, which I was one of the editors for. 1 Enoch 1:9:

<sup>9</sup> Ὅτι ἔρχεται σὺν ταῖς μυριάσιν [αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς] ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ,

which is:

“Because [or that] he comes with his myriads [his hoarde] and his holy ones...”

5:00 So it exists in Greek, and if the questioner (Tim) or Cathy Burns wants to know, the Greek is from the Akhmim papyrus of Greek Enoch (also known as Codex Panopolitanus), so it's a real manuscript. It's Greek. It also survives in part... Part of 1 Enoch 1:9 survives in Aramaic. Here are a couple of sources. You could consult Nickelsburg's commentary on 1 Enoch. He's going to have this citation: Józef Milik's book on Enoch. You're going to have other text-oriented books and commentaries on Enoch. Specifically the Dead Sea Scroll is 4QEn<sup>c</sup>, column 1, line 15. It refers to the myriads of his holy ones. So yeah, she's wrong.

**TS:** So you burned Burns. [MH laughs] I don't know if you watched *That 70s Show*, but...

**MH:** No, I've never seen it, so that one just went right by me there.

**TS:** Alright. Well, Tim's next two questions are about Goliath, so I'm going to combine those two questions if that's alright with you.

**MH:** Sure.

**TS:** The first one is:

5:30 **Do you believe Goliath was capable of salvation?**

And two:

**Do you believe Goliath is the “thou enemy” of Psalm 9?**

**MH:** Well, I'm not sure what Tim means by “capable.” I don't see any reason why Goliath could not have turned from his gods and turned to Yahweh, if that's what he means. The giants weren't the Watchers. They're not consigned to the abyss

and can't be redeemed and all that sort of stuff. So we're dealing with two different groups here. So this is one of these hypothetical questions. "What would the world be like if God would never had made it? Somebody else would have made it." It's kind of a pointless discussion. But if the question is, "Could Goliath have turned from his gods?" well, I suppose so. We'll never know. But there you go.

"Do you believe Goliath is the "thou enemy" of Psalm 9?" I didn't hear a verse in there. That would help if I had a verse reference. But as I look at Psalm 9, I'm going to guess that it's a reference to Psalm 9:6:

**<sup>6</sup>The enemy came to an end in everlasting ruins; their cities you rooted out; the very memory of them has perished.**

So I'm guessing "the enemy" there in ESV is "thou enemy" that the question refers to. If you scroll back up a little bit, let's just get some context here. Psalm 9 has the superscription "A Psalm of David."

**I will give thanks to the Lord with my whole heart;**

**I will recount all of your wonderful deeds.**

**<sup>2</sup> I will be glad and exult in you;**

**I will sing praise to your name, O Most High.**

Then he starts talking about enemies (his enemies and the nation's). God rebukes the nations. He turns his enemies back, so on and so forth. And then we get to verse 6:

**<sup>6</sup>The enemy came to an end in everlasting ruins...**

I don't see any way to restrict the content of Psalm 9 to Goliath, so I would say no, I don't think it refers to Goliath. There's really nothing in the text that would make me think that.

7:45

**TS: Do you believe giants are the "foes" who want to "eat up David's flesh" in Psalm 27?**

**MH:** Let's take a quick glance at Psalm 27 here. And I think I already know why the questioner is asking this. The short answer is, "No." I'm going to open up an article here because I know of a point of reference here that we can make available to people who subscribe to the newsletter. I would say no because I think a literal reading of this is a misreading of the text. I think what the questioner is asking is... Because you have references in Enoch to the giants eating people. So that later book (1 Enoch)... I don't want to say it's being read back into Psalm 27, but it sort of *is* being read back into Psalm 27. There's

nothing in Psalm 27 that would lead me to think that we have literal eating going on here. Let me approach it this way. Let's think about the giants in David's day. As far as scripture makes any comments about any giant person... In David's day, there were very few of them. There was no way to exegetically justify limiting the psalm's comments here to a handful of people. You could also say conclusively the cannibalism tradition from Enoch (which is later) isn't the biblical one. We don't have any biblical content about the giants eating human flesh and all that sort of thing, so a later tradition is being read back into Psalm 27. And I don't know how you'd limit Psalm 27 to that or even how you'd justify reading a later text back into the old one. But let's unpack it a little bit. I said that there were very few giants. Let's go back to that point. The passage I'm basing that on is 2 Samuel 21:18-22. I'll just read that:

10:00

**<sup>18</sup> After this there was again war with the Philistines at Gob. Then Sibbecai the Hushathite struck down Saph, who was one of the descendants of the giants.<sup>19</sup> And there was again war with the Philistines at Gob, and Elhanan the son of Jaare-oregim, the Bethlehemite, struck down Goliath the Gittite, the shaft of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.<sup>20</sup> And there was again war at Gath, where there was a man of great stature, who had six fingers on each hand, and six toes on each foot, twenty-four in number, and he also was descended from the giants.<sup>21</sup> And when he taunted Israel, Jonathan the son of Shimei, David's brother, struck him down.<sup>22</sup> These four were descended from the giants in Gath, and they fell by the hand of David and by the hand of his servants.**

Now if you look at that, there are a couple of problems here. This section (this passage) actually has a number of text-critical problems in it. And the English translation actually reflects that. First, we don't have David slaying Goliath the Gittite in verse 19; we have Elhanan, the son of somebody who isn't Jesse. So right there, we've got a problem. If you count the names, you have Saph, Goliath, and then a man with six fingers on each hand. You only have three. But the verse ends by saying, "These four were descended from the giants in Gath..." If you count the "he" in "he taunted Israel" in verse 21 as a separate guy, then you have four, so I guess you could handle that that way.

I would say in general for the textual problems (one or two of them, anyway—specifically the one about David), if you Google "Bible Study Magazine," my last name—"Heiser"—and "Goliath," you should find the magazine article I did on this for Bible Study Magazine. It has nice graphics that illustrate the text-critical problem and the solutions. At any rate, at most, you've got four. Four people. Four giants. There's nothing that connects them to Psalm 27. There's nothing that connects Psalm 27 to them or to any other giants. So right away, you have to intentionally read one thing into the other without any textual evidence. You

also have to read the later book of Enoch with its cannibalistic references back into the Old Testament, without any justification that I can see. Positively stated (and here's this article I'll refer people to), the idea of "eating flesh" is likely not literal because you have certain references in the Old Testament... Psalm 14:4, for instance:

**Have they no knowledge, all the evildoers who eat up my people as they eat bread and do not call upon the Lord?**

Is that really a reference to cannibalism, or is it an idiomatic expression? I say it's an idiomatic expression because "eating" vocabulary, just generally, is a metaphor in the Old Testament for general military conquest. A really good source for this is Matthew Goff's article. The title of his article is "Monstrous Appetites: Giants, Cannibalism, and Insatiable Eating in Enochic Literature." That comes from the *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 1:1 (2010), pages 19-42. That is actually accessible via Google Scholar. I've put it in the folder for our newsletter subscribers, but you can actually find that on the internet if you use Google Scholar to do your search... Not just Google, but Google Scholar. If you don't know where that is, put "Google Scholar" into Google, and you can click the link for Google Scholar. Once you're there, put in the search terms "Goff," "appetites," "cannibalism," and you're going to find it on academia.edu. So you can get this article for free. I'm going to read a good portion of it (a paragraph or two) just so that you get the idea that "eating" vocabulary (the vocabulary of "consumption" or "eating") is a metaphor in the Old Testament in general for military conquest. It doesn't require cannibalism at all. So Goff says:

15:00

There is also extensive biblical imagery that depicts military violence as a form of eating. Killing people with swords is commonly referred to in the Bible (more than 70 times) as slaying "with the edge of the sword" or literally "with the mouth of the sword". While this root meaning of the preposition might not necessarily have been alive in the mind of Early Jewish authors, they had ample biblical tradition to draw from that construes violence with 'mouth' terminology and metaphors of eating. A double-edged sword is described as having "two mouths" (e. g., Judg 3:16). The image of the 'mouthed' sword appears in Prov 5:4. This is explained by Michael Fox [MH: who just so happened to be my advisor in Wisconsin; he wrote two commentaries on Proverbs.], who writes: "The blade of the sword is thought of as a 'mouth' that 'eats' its victims.

The Hebrew Bible also contains metaphors that depict military violence as a form of consumption. A clear example is in Daniel 7. The second beast of this chapter is a ferocious bear with large teeth who is told (by God, presumably): "Arise, devour many bodies" (7:5). As is well-known, this was not intended to be understood literally but rather as a symbolic depiction of the second kingdom in the book's four kingdom sequence. The bear is usually interpreted as a reference to the

Median kingdom [MH: the Medo-Persian kingdom], which is urged to conquer Babylon. Its consumption of humans is a metaphor for the military violence carried out by this kingdom. The violence and power of the fourth beast is also conveyed by eating: “It had great iron teeth and was devouring, breaking in pieces and stamping what was left with its feet” (v. 7). The beast eats with its powerful iron teeth. Zechariah 9 also contains a good example of violence described as consumption. In this text God is the divine warrior who marches into battle. He sounds the trumpet and appears against the assembled Gentile enemies (vv. 13–14). While he is on the battlefield, his people “shall devour and tread down the slingers; they shall drink their blood like wine, and be full like a bowl, drenched like the corners of the altar” (v. 15).

Let me just stop there for a second. What he’s saying here is, “The Medes and the Persians, when they conquered Babylon, they didn’t eat the people, literally.” In Zechariah 9, which is this... It’s the sound of the trumpet, folks. This is either a Rapture or Second Coming, depending on your eschatology. I’m not going to go down that rabbit trail. But at the Second Coming, we’ll say, we don’t come back with the Lord and eat people. It’s not literal. This is the language of victory and conquest, generally. Back to the quote, just to wrap it up. Goff says:

In Daniel and Zechariah images of eating flesh and drinking blood convey the totality of destruction that is inflicted by an army.

I would say that’s the way we need to read Psalm 27 because we have all this scriptural precedent for reading Psalm 27 that way. There’s no evidence that we should be thinking of giants here or literal eating, or anything like that. Now, just to wrap this question up, I just want to add that we use these same kinds of expressions. If you look it up in Webster or a dictionary on the internet... I like to use The Free Dictionary. It’s usually what comes up on an internet search. We use phrases like, “to eat one’s young,” which when we use it in our own day, it refers to neglect or harsh treatment of the members of a group or your children. It refers to something unfavorable. To eat your young is to treat someone just terribly that you should be treating well, especially if they’re your own family, and you metaphorically devour them—you destroy them. We use idioms like, “to eat alive.” “That one team just ate that other team alive.” It just means that they just wiped them off the field. They destroyed them. The victory was so overwhelming. So I think that’s what we have here, and we have plenty of precedent for it in the Old Testament, for a metaphorical understanding of “eating” vocabulary as just general military conquest.

**TS:** I’ll have to use “military conquest” after I eat a dinner to describe my eating habits. [MH laughs]

**MH:** And it may truly be a conquest. [Laughter]

**TS:** Alright, Mike. Tim's last question here is:

19:40 **Do you believe Peter's apparent disapproval of cosmetics is rooted in Enochian material?**

**MH:** I have to assume that the verse here is 1 Peter 3:3. Let me just read that. Peter says:

20:00 **<sup>3</sup> Do not let your adorning be external—the braiding of hair and the putting on of gold jewelry, or the clothing you wear—**

The verse actually doesn't refer to or mention cosmetics. I know it often gets used this way, but it actually doesn't mention cosmetics. It's the braiding of the hair and certain items of jewelry and clothing. Think about what the verse actually says. I'll go back and read verse 3 again:

**<sup>3</sup> Do not let your adorning be external—the braiding of hair and the putting on of gold jewelry, or the clothing you wear—**

Does it really demand that women stop braiding their hair? Is there a command in there to stop braiding your hair? Or to stop wearing clothing? [laughs] Is Peter commanding women to stop wearing clothing or jewelry? No. It warns against those things superseding inner beauty. Look at verse 4:

**<sup>4</sup> but let your adorning be the hidden person of the heart with the imperishable beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which in God's sight is very precious.**

The point is that we shouldn't read verse 3 without reading verse 4. The other issue... The real issue in verses 3 and 4 (other than just being a shallow woman) was the idea that we need to cultivate what's inside versus cultivating what is outside (things that people see). You could say, "Well, Mike, people see cosmetics, too." That's true. They do. But it's not in the verse. I don't write the New Testament; I just read it. It's not in the verse. And I don't see a command to stop braiding hair, stop wearing clothing, and stop wearing jewelry. What I *do* see is Peter's concern that these things should not be the basis of your identity and who you really are (which I guess is another way of saying identity). But rather, let your adorning be the hidden person of the heart.

Now, when it comes to Enoch, we know just because of what's actually in the Enoch passage that Enoch condemns... The list that you get in Enoch is really angling for something that transcends the lists that he actually gives us. For instance, in Enoch the real issue with the jewelry and the cosmetics... (Enoch *does* mention cosmetics, even though the passage in Peter doesn't include that.) What's really Enoch's concern is seduction (immorality). You say, "How do you



know that, Mike?" Well, look at what else is in the passage. Back to 1 Enoch 8:1. We read this in an earlier episode:

Asael taught men to make swords of iron and weapons and shields and breastplates and every instrument of war. (1 Enoch 8:1)

Let's just stop right there. In case you hadn't noticed, the Israelites used weapons in their battles in their conquest under Joshua. They're using swords and shields. They wouldn't be doing that with God's blessing if the whole idea of how the Watchers corrupted humanity was only taken in this rigidly literal way. If it was, "Hey, this is what the Watchers taught people, so we're never making a sword. We are never making a shield. We are never making a breastplate, because if we do that, then we're going along with what the Watchers wanted in human self-destruction." The larger point is violence. It's warfare. It's shedding of blood unjustly and wantonly. It's killing. It's murder. Because these are the instruments of violence and bloodshed. They're perfectly welcome to create these things and use them in a just manner, in a way that God would want them used (in self-defense, or in this biblical case, taking the land, plus the whole thing about targeting the Anakim). There's a good use and there's an illegitimate banned use. But to just look at the items like a grocery list, the only way to obey them is to eliminate them entirely. No, they have context. There's something that's being aimed at here. So when 1 Enoch 8 continues...

He [Asael] showed them metals of the earth and how they should work gold to fashion it suitably, and concerning silver, to fashion it for bracelets and ornaments for women. And he showed them concerning antimony and eye paint and all manner of precious stones and dyes.

25:00

...what's he's really going after here (and this is the way the Second Temple Jewish community interpreted it across the board) is that these things will lend themselves to (potentially, and in the lives of many people) being seduced by the woman who uses these things. This is why certain women (of bad character) would do this—to seduce a man. It doesn't mean that you can't find ever a legitimate use for this.

This is where Peter comes in. Even if you *can*, this should not be your identity. Your identity should be in these other things that God values—the things that God really cares about. To be honest with you, the only way to really understand the mentality here (the approach to this whole Watcher teaching idea) is to be familiar with the fact that for all these things there was a "good" alternative. There was a good, legitimate knowledge of these things as well. And to understand that, all of that is traced to Second Temple traditions about Enoch. Enoch is viewed and cast in the wider Enochian literature as the rightful dispenser of divine knowledge over against what the Watchers taught people, in the same spheres of knowledge.

The easiest example is probably the knowledge of the heavens. For Second Temple Jews, Enoch was the astrologer/astronomer. (They didn't really make a distinction between those two terms like we do in the modern era.) Broadly speaking, it's the idea that God (or illegitimate gods) can communicate through the heavens. It's a form of divination, where you look at the heavens and then you interpret them. That's astrology. There was a legitimate thing about that that Jews viewed as Enochian. Enoch was the one who was taken to heaven by God. He didn't see death. And if you read the Enochian literature, Enoch is like the astronomer/astrologer par excellence. This is why the Qumran Essenes derived their calendar from Enochian material. Their study of the heavens revealed the mind of God in its perfect order and precision. They assigned all glory to the single God of the Bible (the God of Enoch), whereas what the Watchers traditions are doing is, "No, all of these celestial objects are, in fact, divine beings and you need to follow *them*, not their creator." It's idolatry. There are two sides to the astronomy/astro-theology coin. One is evil and idolatrous. The other one is not.

It's the same thing with all these other technologies. There are two sides to them. I could go down the astronomy path a lot because I'm still working on this astronomy/astral prophecy book. But Abraham in Second Temple tradition was viewed as a master astrologer/astronomer. Why? Because the teaching was that he inherited his knowledge from Enoch. He knows who created the heavens and he knows what they're trying to communicate. The Essenes and other Jewish sects would have viewed Abraham as someone *able* to parse what was happening in the heavens correctly. You get this, "as in heaven, so on earth," and, "how the stars are worshipping God up there, that's how we need to worship down here." God's giving us hints about what he's up to, and how God is propelling time and human history. All of this derives from astronomy. And in the Jewish Second Temple tradition, Abraham was a master at this. Now, the Bible never says that, but this is the idea. There was a good source of heavenly knowledge (of forbidden knowledge, of special knowledge) and that's Enoch. And there's a wicked source (those are the Watchers).

30:00

So if you don't have any frame of reference for both sides of the coin, when you go back and you read something like 1 Enoch 8, you think, "We should just be throwing all this stuff out." Well, there's a reason why Israelites and Jews didn't. Because they *did* have both sides of the coin in their heads. There's a reason to have weapons. It's okay if our women braid their hair and wear jewelry. But wanton violence and sexual seduction are bad. That's the bad side of the coin for those things. So each one of these things... Medicinal herbs. Israelites forbade the use of using plants for healing? No, there are passages in the Old Testament where they certainly do that. If they're producing altered states, if they're the *pharmacopoiia* variety (which Paul talks about), that's bad. It's good and it's bad. There are two sides of the same coin. And we often lose this, because we don't get deep enough into the content. Just read the first four verses of Psalm 19:

### **The heavens declare the glory of God...**

There's like ten verbs of communication there. This is why Paul quotes Psalm 19:4 in Romans 10:18, explaining why everyone should have known that Jesus had come, that there was a birth of the divine king. And his proof text for that is Psalm 19:4. They have their heads in this material, but there are two sides of the coin. And so we need to be careful to become familiar with that. This is why I usually say in my talk about whether Enoch should be in the canon, "No. Who cares what kind of status it has?" You should read material that biblical writers read, because if you read that material and you understand it (you get a certain feel for it), then you're going to be able to be a better reader (a more intelligent reader) of your Bible. It's kind of that simple but yet it requires work, so it's not an easy task. It's a simple task, but not an easy one.

So consequently, I would say it's not coherent to say that 1 Enoch 8 or 1 Peter forbids all jewelry or cosmetics or colored clothing or dyes (the use of dyeing)—that we should all wear white. No, it doesn't forbid these things. We'd all be in violation, as would the builders of the tabernacle. They dyed their fabrics. "Didn't they know about the Watchers? They sinned! They're following the Watchers!" No, that's ridiculous. Just like the Israelite army isn't following the Watchers when they're creating swords and shields. We would all be in violation, as would most of everybody else in the Old Testament that God blesses and honors and says nice things about. It's not an all-or-nothing proposition. There are two sides to this—two sides to the coin. So I think we need to keep that in mind when we're looking at passages like 1 Peter 3 and a few other ones, too.

**TS:** Our next two questions come from Dina, and she would like to better understand Romans 13.

32:20

**In light of what I have learned about the Divine Council and their role in being appointed over the world, does that mean they have an effect on our governing authorities?**

**MH:** Well, I would say... I'll answer it this way, just by... Let's start with the Deuteronomy 32 worldview. That might be unfamiliar to some. If it *is* unfamiliar to a listener, go to the podcast landing page, and up at the top where it says, "Are you new here? Watch these videos," those are the videos you need to watch. One of them is about the Deuteronomy 32 worldview. So the Deuteronomy 32 worldview is where the nations were allotted to other gods and the gods to the nations as a punishment at Babel. That's what's behind Daniel 10—the prince of Persia and prince of Greece (all that sort of stuff) are supernatural beings. And so, generally speaking, scripture does teach that there are supernatural influences behind geo-political entities. On another level, there are also people who aren't believers—in other words, people who aren't indwelt by the Holy

Spirit, who are going to be more subject to (potentially) the influences of supernatural powers of darkness. They're running the nations, too.

So you've got two problems. You've got a supernatural problem and you've got a human problem. I think it's an over-reading of the situation to presume that supernatural forces are behind every political move or geo-political situation. Because you have two problems: you have a supernatural intelligence that scripture describes as being behind empires, countries, and governments, but you also have humans. You have plenty of humans in the picture, too, who are fallen and corrupt. So we should not assume that everything we see a government do or say has some demon behind it or some supernatural character behind it. That's an over-reading of not only the situation, but also the text. Scripture is pretty clear that all of us are quite capable of seeking self-gratification, power, autonomy, etc., because of our flesh, and that doesn't stop when we hold political office. It's the most normal thing in the world. In other words, Deuteronomy 32 doesn't take the human factor off the table. They both have to be on the table. So, yeah, supernatural intelligences do have an effect on governments (the powers that be), but we have no way of seeing how that works at any given point or in any given circumstance. I think we're just better off remembering that we've got a supernatural problem here and also a very human problem.

**TS:** Her second question is:

35:05

**I realize it is out of context, but we have many instances in the Old Testament of disobedience to authority, such as Moses and Pharaoh, the Israelite midwives, Daniel, and others. I have heard this passage preached as a blanket endorsement for allowing the government to do as it pleases and that it is all part of the plan so just suck it up and look the other way.**

**MH:** Yeah. To me, the key word in the question here is "allowing" the government to do as it pleases. All governments are not the same. All governments are not created equal. If you live in a government that allows you the mechanism to protest your own government's actions, then you have the government's permission to do so. You're not violating Romans 13 by living out the rights that you have at your government's own creation or permission. So that would be incongruent to say that Romans 13 says, "Don't ever pipe up about the evil that the government is doing." That's absurd.

Now a lot of people don't live in that situation. They live under a dictatorship or some sort of oligarchy or Banana Republic kind of situation. I think morally (hopefully what we get into in a few minutes here will explain why I say this), you're not being asked by God to not expose sin. You're not being commanded by God to not expose evil. You're supposed to do that. And there will be context where doing that puts you at great personal risk. And some of the examples that the questioner alluded to fit that bill. In some respects, the questioner answered her own question. The examples that were listed here (the midwives, Daniel, and

Moses) tell us that there are exceptions to obedience to authority that God honors. The common denominator in these situations would be that people who are trying to obey God are forced to sin otherwise. And in that situation (when your government—when the powers that are over you—are trying to compel you to do evil), then you ought to disobey because God is the higher authority, and the higher authority *does* say things to Christians in the New Testament like, “expose the works of darkness,” and “resist that which is evil.” It just depends on our earthly circumstances as to how much potential harm that puts us in when we do those things.

So if you are being compelled (the vocabulary here is important) by your government (by the powers that be) to do evil, then you need to obey the higher authority, which would be God. Now, you have to be willing to take the consequences in certain situations. And guess what? The New Testament tells you that’s what’s going to happen. There’s all sorts of discussion in the New Testament about suffering for righteousness’ sake, like Jesus did. This would be one of those, at least potentially.

Now, disobeying when you’re being compelled to *sin* is different than disobeying a law when you’re *not* being compelled to sin. For example, the government might do evil with your tax money. And trust me, our government does. [laughs] The government may do evil with your tax money at the same time it does not force you to personally to participate in that evil. So the government can be funding evil, and that’s one thing. It’s quite another thing for the government to turn around and say, “We just took your taxes to do this evil thing, and now we are going to force you to participate in that evil thing.”

40:00 We have scriptural precedent for this sort of situation. The Roman Empire... This wasn’t a Christian government, okay? [laughs] The Roman Empire, to whom Jesus endorsed paying taxes (when he said, “render unto Caesar that which is Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s”)... And New Testament writers (Peter and Paul) say the same thing: “Pay your taxes.” The Roman Empire, to whom Jesus endorsed paying taxes, certainly did a lot of ungodly things with that money. Nevertheless, Jesus said, “You’re supposed to pay your taxes.” The modern example would be our government, here in the U.S., uses tax money to subsidize Planned Parenthood. That’s evil. But based on the scriptural analogy, yes, we are supposed to pay our taxes. We are not scripturally justified, therefore, to disobey the government by refusing to pay taxes. Otherwise, what Jesus said in the context of the Roman Empire wouldn’t make any sense. Jesus said, “Pay your taxes.” To the Jews who were paying taxes to Rome, Jesus doesn’t turn around and say, “Well, if you pay that tax, you’re like a participant...” No, he doesn’t say that. That’s the kind of thing preachers say just to guilt people out or push some agenda or whatever. And it’s not what Jesus said. There’s a difference between what an evil person does with a thing you give him and what you do.

And the flip side of that is the compulsion issue. If the government would turn around and say, "Yeah, thanks for the money. Now, we are going to force you to perform an abortion. That's something different. That's being compelled to enact—to do—the actual evil. And by scriptural example, yes, that should be resisted and you're willing to take the consequences. So you *would* be justified in disobeying a law that compelled you to perform the abortion (or whatever the government is taking money for to promote some evil cause). So there are different things here, and compulsion is an important element of this. At the very least, look at these examples with Jesus and the examples that the questioner brought up. It's very clearly incoherent to use Romans 13 and say that you should not expose evil and you should not resist evil. That's just incoherent. You do what your government allows you to do. If you're being compelled to sin, then you resist that, and you may suffer for doing what's right.

**TS:** Our next two questions are from Phillip. Question 1:

42:15

**In the Acts podcast, Dr. Heiser said that idols were thought of as a house or a dwelling place for those particular gods they were fashioned after. In Zechariah 11:17, it says, "Woe to the idol shepherd that leaveth the flock! the sword shall be upon his arm, and upon his right eye: his arm shall be clean dried up, and his right eye shall be utterly darkened." What is this verse trying to say in regard to the idol shepherd? With my new understanding of what an idol is, it almost sounds like the "idol shepherd" will be indwelt by one of the divine council.**

**MH:** I'm not sure what translation is behind the translation that the questioner (Phillip) is using, but to say the least, it could be better. Maybe it's King James, and in this case it's just not helping at all. The word translated "idol" here is *elil*, which in both other Semitic languages and elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible means something like "defective," "worthless," or "vain." Something like that. Job 13:4, for instance:

**<sup>4</sup>As for you, you whitewash with lies;  
worthless physicians are you all.**

The word for "worthless" there is *elil*. Job isn't saying that his physicians were idols (blocks of stone and wood) or that they were fallen supernatural entities. No, it's just doctors. They're not helping him. They're worthless. They're useless. So we shouldn't over-read this passage as though the speaker has a shepherd over him who's an idol. Zechariah is talking about the people of God, and that's Yahweh's turf. That's not territory allotted to another supernatural being. So that context should tell you that we don't really have an idol (like a figurine here with the entity residing in it) in view. Rather, *elil* is considered best translated something like worthless or vain or useless, like it is elsewhere.

Jeremiah 14:14 is another example:

**<sup>14</sup> And the LORD said to me: “The prophets are prophesying lies in my name. I did not send them, nor did I command them or speak to them. They are prophesying to you a lying vision, *worthless* divination, and the deceit of their own minds.”**

So it's just this idea of vanity, uselessness, worthlessness. It doesn't have to refer to a figurine or some entity. Then I would say, consequently, I don't see anything going on in Zechariah 11:17 that has anything to do with the lesser gods or other unfallen members of the divine council.

**TS:** Alright. The last question from Phillip is:

45:05

**The study on Leviticus and how the land could become polluted got me thinking about the Divine Council. I have often wondered what the fallen angels' plan is in the last days. The typical explanation is that they just want to kill or convert as many Christians as they can, but that really doesn't fit in to their time being short and acting in haste, nor does it do anything to save themselves. I think if anything they would want to protect their kingdom that is now under siege. Their actions should primarily be about saving themselves, not destroying us humans. Are there any indications from the Bible of things that bolster their reign in defense against our siege? Are there any indications in the Bible of a method or a stalling to temporarily retain the legal rights to their allotted land?**

**MH:** They don't have any legal rights to retain, because a few episodes ago in Colossians we talked about the passages that associate the resurrection with the nullification of the status of the old sons of God over the nations. Yes, that status was originally given by the Most High, and the Most High has now nullified it, withdrawn it, and delegitimized it because of the work of Christ in the resurrection and the ascension. So they don't have any rights to retain here.

However, I agree with the trajectory toward the end of that question. The idea of stalling, I think, is on target. Personally, I don't think that the agenda of the gods of the nations (we'll just use that terminology—principalities and powers) is killing off believers because nowadays, that's like sending them to heaven. Well, thanks a lot! I don't think the agenda is killing off believers as much as it is forestalling the fullness of the Gentiles, because it's the fullness of the Gentiles which “delays” the Day of the Lord and the return of Jesus. The Day of the Lord (the final Day of the Lord) and the return of Jesus are married in scripture (in biblical eschatology).

The Day of the Lord... Maybe we should devote a whole episode to the Day of the Lord, because this seems to keep coming up a lot. That is the time viewed by

the prophets when the righteous are vindicated, the wicked are punished, the nations are... It's a reset button. The nations are brought back into the family (into relationship with the true God). There is no more rebellion. It's a reset button. It's both judgment and reward. And it's married in the Old Testament to the concept of messiah. (There's "*The*"—par excellence—"The Son of David" and all that.) In the wake of the New Testament events (New Testament theology), it's therefore married to the Second Coming of Christ. Both of those things (the Day of the Lord and the Second Coming) are in a holding pattern, scripture says, because God is looking for the fullness of the Gentiles to be brought in—the Gentiles being brought into the family of God. Paul says in Romans 9-11 in a couple of places... He connects that idea (this is a Mike word; this isn't a Pauline word) with Jews coming to their senses and reconsidering the messiah. The Jewish nation (those who are sons of Abraham—sons of the patriarchs—by flesh, physically), there is a partial hardening on them (Paul uses the word "hardening" there) so that the Gentiles can be brought into the family. This is the fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant in Genesis 12:3, that through the seed of Abraham, who is Christ (Paul says in Galatians), all the nations will be blessed. They're being brought back in. When that happens, whenever God decides, "we have enough of them now," then, presumably, Israel (physical Israel, I would assume) has some sort of awakening or some sort of other revival to come to their senses and embrace the messiah.

50:00

Now, we know from Romans 9 that that's not going to be everybody. That's not going to be all the Jews. Romans 9 is very clear about that. But those two things (this fullness of the Gentiles and the revival of the ethnic people of Abraham) are precursors to the Day of the Lord and the Second Coming. Now it would be in the best interest... [laughs] If you were one of the principalities and powers, the thing that you don't want to see happen is the salvation of the nations—the salvation of people all over the world. This fullness of the Gentiles idea, that's what you want to forestall. That's what you want to stop. That's what you want to slow down. You know you're not bigger than God. You know that a punishment has been decreed upon you (Psalm 82). This is why Psalm 82 ends with, "Rise up, O God; take back the nations." You know that as long as you can put that off, you're going to retain your position—even though it's delegitimized, even though you don't have any legal claim here anymore to these nations because God is now seeking them to come back into the family. You want to forestall this as long as possible. It's life extension.

So I don't know if it was on a Q&A podcast or what context it was. Somebody asked a question one time about, "Do the principalities and powers think that they can win?" My answer was, "It depends how you define victory." [laughs] Do they think they're bigger than God and can defeat God? No, they're not idiots. But a victory is keeping the ball rolling—the whole guerilla warfare thing. Always have an army in the field. Never go away. If that's the way you define victory, well then, yeah, we can see something of a plan emerge from certain things said in scripture. My argument would be that all of this is linked to the fullness of the



Gentiles idea. The reference to the devil knowing his time is short... Well, yeah. If you actually go look up where that's said, it's Revelation 12:12. This I talk about in *Unseen Realm*. Let me just read you Revelation 12:12:

**<sup>12</sup>Therefore, rejoice, O heavens and you who dwell in them! But woe to you, O earth and sea, for the devil has come down to you in great wrath, because he knows that his time is short!**

This is the war in heaven thing that erupts after the birth of the messiah. So this war has been going on. We say, "The devil knows his time is short." Well, he knows it's definite. Since I read Luke 10 about Satan, "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven," to me that is the end of the legitimacy of his accusing believers before God in his council. That's over with, because now the messiah has come and God is going to have his way. Jesus *is* going to go to the cross; he *is* going to die for the redemption of humanity. So he [Satan] is a prosecutor without a case. Anyone who is a member of Jesus' kingdom (the kingdom of God), the devil has no claim over them anymore. What's the claim of the devil? It's death. It's permanent estrangement from God. That's over with because the messiah is going to die and he's going to rise again. And all those who are united to him will rise with him. He has no case anymore. He has nothing to say, so "Get out of here. Be gone. Go bring your accusations somewhere else." He doesn't have an audience anymore. God isn't listening.

So since I look at Luke 10 there, Revelation 12:12 is signifying the same sort of thing. The "short time" means the clock has been ticking since Jesus launched the kingdom of God during his incarnation. So now it's been 2000 years since then. Are we any closer to the fullness of the Gentiles being brought into the kingdom now than we were then? I can't answer those questions because I'm not God. My point is that the end of the present circumstances comes whenever God decides, "Okay, that's what I had in mind. The fullness of the Gentiles has been brought in. Now my people Israel have a chance to believe in me again."

55:00

Something happens where they're going to turn to the messiah, however that works. We're not really given a full description of that in the New Testament. But all of that comes in connection with the precursor to the Day of the Lord, which is an event or series of events that is the reset button. All those things are connected in the New Testament. It's the end of the salvation plan. From there, we get the new heaven and the new earth. We get the final judgment, both of unbelievers and also the beast and the false prophet (all the bad guys, including the Watchers in the abyss)—all this stuff. All that's done away with. But those ideas are interconnected, and we have this precursor thing called the fullness of the Gentiles that's still in operation. So if I wanted to stall the program—if I wanted to extend my influence (my life, really)—that's what I would do. You keep people from entering the kingdom. You don't need to kill them off. You keep people from entering the kingdom. Because that's the greater concern here. So I

do think that the questioner's instincts in that regard are on target. I think that's the trajectory that you would want to follow in answering that question.

**TS:** During one of the questions, Mike, you mentioned your astrology book you're working on. Any status update on that?

**MH:** Oh, boy. [sighs] I would like to think that it will be done by the first quarter of 2019. That has become my putter project. There are just things that keep moving in front of it. I chip away at it. So it's ultimately going to depend on how much I want to put into it. That's a factor as well. But that's what I'm hoping for, that that thing will be done by the end of the first quarter in 2019.

**TS:** Alright. I'll keep on you about that. [Laughter] I'm anxious to read that one. I just want to remind everybody again about Friday at 7:00pm, November 16<sup>th</sup> at the Colorado Community Church Upper Room. You can get that location at their website: [www.ColoradoCommunity.org](http://www.ColoradoCommunity.org). We hope everybody comes out. That's only in a couple of weeks, Mike. So we hope you come out and ask some good questions. We appreciate you answering our questions this week. And I just want to thank everybody else for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God Bless.