

Naked Bible Podcast Transcript
Episode 245
ETS Conference Interviews, Part 4
November 20, 2018

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)
Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)
Guests: Dr. Carl Sanders (CS)
Dr. Ronn Johnson (RJ)
Dr. Karl Kutz (KK)
Dr. Rebekah Josberger (RJB)

Episode Summary

In this episode we sit down first with Dr. Carl Sanders and Dr. Ronn Johnson to talk about rejected ETS papers (!) and the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament; next we chat with Dr. Karl Kutz and Dr. Rebekah Josberger, authors of an important new first-year **Hebrew grammar**.

Transcript

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 245: ETS Conference Interviews, Part 4. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Well, Mike, we're still here!

MH: We are still here.

TS: Quatro—four. [laughter] I guess this is a magical episode, if that makes sense. But it doesn't. We've got two Carls for this show—one with a "C" and one with a "K." Maybe we should rename this show.

MH: We could. Whatever you want to do. Now, on the episode, though, we have Carl Sanders and Ronn Johnson. Listeners will probably recall that we talked to Carl and Ronn last time, sort of just riffing on some theological topic. We decided we're going to do that again. We picked a different topic, and I think people will find it interesting and useful. I don't think it's a stretch to say we'll all learn something. So I think that'll provide some good insights as to the kinds of conversations that people have here. Scholars just love to talk shop, so you're going to get a little glimpse into that. Then the Karl with a "K" is Karl Kutz and Rebekah Josberger. They both teach at Multnomah and they have come out with a new Hebrew grammar. I wanted to have them on specifically because Karl had taught a class that I was in at the University of Wisconsin in Madison at the beginning of my doctoral program—what the department sort of cast as a second-year Hebrew class. His approach to Hebrew is kind of unique and it has

sort of earned a reputation as being a method that really prepares people better for serious scholarly study—graduate study in Hebrew in programs around the country. But then, also, for just pastors to sort of learn the language in a better way—learn how to read Hebrew and just handle things better. Everybody says their grammar is different. In Karl's case, and Rebekah, his teaching partner (she also teaches Hebrew there at Multnomah and has sort of adopted and furthered Karl's methodology)... This new grammar, I think, is going to gain a reputation as probably the premier tool for learning biblical Hebrew in the first year. So we wanted to have them on and sort of introduce that book to our audience because a lot of people in the Naked Bible audience want to learn Greek and Hebrew, and here's a good chance to get in on the ground floor of an important new resource.

MH: Welcome back. Again, we're in Denver at the annual meetings of the Evangelical Theological Society. For our audience, we have two familiar voices. You have heard them probably every year we've done this. Carl Sanders is with us to my immediate right. To the far right is Ronn Johnson. For the sake of people who aren't familiar with either of these two (since the podcast grows, that happens), Ronn might be more familiar than Carl because Ronn has been rolling out this series on the Bible's Big Story on the blog. But for those who need to get caught up, I'm going to ask both of you to briefly introduce yourselves. Carl, we'll go first with you. And then we're going to sort of throw something to the wind like we did last year. Go ahead, Carl.

CS: Okay, my name's Carl Sanders. I'm a professor of theology at Capital Seminary. I'm located in the Washington, D.C. area. We're connected with Lancaster Bible College up in Lancaster, PA, but I'm at a satellite campus. I've taught at a number of different schools, various venues.

MH: What do you teach?

CS: I teach theology primarily. I do some stuff with theology of culture recently—quite a bit with that (technology and things like that).

MH: You're so trendy, Carl. [laughs]

CS: I know. So trendy. It's amazing! I also, oddly, have written a paper that was published last year on Greek pedagogy, so how I got to that from theology...

MH: With Peter Gurry. We had an interview with Peter earlier.

CS: I didn't do it with Peter, and Peter's not necessarily a fan of my approach.

MH: Oh, okay! [laughs]

CS: But he's like most Greek professors. They look at me and they say, "Why are you writing about this?" But I have known Mike for a long time, and I've known Ronn for a long time, as well, because he's my brother-in-law, too. [background talk, laughter]

RJ: You married my sister.

CS: He can't remember his family relationships. This is not starting well. [laughter]

5:00 **MH:** Lots of common friends and common enemies, he says!

RJ: I currently don't teach or pastor right now.

MH: It's probably actually nice to not take things back home with you and all that.

RJ: I'm a total free agent, which is different. It really is different. You don't sense any nervousness when you say things anymore. There always was that whenever you talk.

MH: I mean, you're teaching in your local church?

RJ: Yes, but it's a nondenominational church and very welcoming of the moving of the Spirit. [laughter] I can say what's on my heart and my path is more important than my destination in this church, which I love.

MH: Well, speaking of the Spirit...

CS: There's a transition for you!

MH: There's a nice little segue for us. You had two papers... was it two or one?

RJ: Two papers.

MH: You had two papers that were rejected this year, so we want to talk about those. [laughter]

RJ: I'm not going to presuppose bad reasoning, but there's a lot of papers here.

MH: They've got a lot of them, yeah.

RJ: But I thought at least one of them was right on target. The other one was called "The Big Story of the Bible." I was simply going to take my blog that I'm doing with you and get it done [laughter] in time for a paper. Which I do need to

get it done, anyway, because I'm teaching on it at church in January. But that was summarily rejected. I'm not sure why.

MH: See, I would comfort you by saying I've had papers rejected, but that's probably not really comforting. [laughter]

CS: I think we all have, and sometimes I think the ones that are the best get rejected, so there you go.

RJ: But the second one I thought was right on topic. I entitled it something like "The Corporate Coming of the Spirit." My thesis (I wrote it down here) is that the Old Testament would have prepared people in the New Testament for not an individual coming of the Spirit into them, but instead a corporate coming of the Spirit upon groups, thus indicating that they're in the family of Abraham. So I thought it worked well, but maybe just for time or size it didn't fit.

MH: It's a good topic to discuss because this is one of those topics that there are a lot... Maybe not a lot, but there are several crucial questions and really not a whole lot of clear answers. So the whole topic of the Old Testament and the Holy Spirit (or the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament is usually how it's phrased)... To me, that topic is connected with what's new about the New Covenant. If you go back and you look in Ezekiel passages and Jeremiah, these two things are very obviously connected. The New Covenant has something to do with the Holy Spirit. And you get to the New Testament and you could point to Acts 2 or other passages. But once you get into the topic other questions that are related come up, like, "Well, if people in the Old Testament weren't indwelt, how could they be the people they were, in terms of godliness?" Because we get this New Testament talk about the flesh versus the Spirit and that you need to be Spirit-empowered to be godly and what-not. So while you're creating one connection that looks really good, you're creating a disconnect somewhere else. That's just sort of how this one goes. So what do you guys...

RJ: Can I give you my four propositions?

MH: Let's hear them, and then we can disagree with them. [laughter]

CS: That's what we did last year!

RJ: Proposition #1: The Old Testament individual loyalist was eventually (by the time you get to the end of the Old Testament) considered to be part of a corporate group. It's variously known as "remnant" or "elect" or "his people" or "God's people/God's family," something like that. So I don't think there's any debate about Proposition #1. It's just a textual flow of the argument.

Proposition #2: It was to this corporate group that Jeremiah and Ezekiel promised a new heart and spirit (Joel 2, as well). "I will put a new spirit among you" is the actual phraseology—not "in you," but "among you."

So my two propositions so far, coming out of the Old Testament, would be that an individual indwelling would have been off the radar of the Jewish mind. They wouldn't have been thinking about that.

Proposition #3: Jesus told Nicodemus that being born from above or being born again was a corporate promise from Ezekiel 38 and the Dry Bones. "Marvel not that I say to you, ye [plural] must be born again." I think Nicodemus would have taken the shock value of that to say that Israel, in Jesus' opinion, had to undergo a transformation of loyalty in order for the kingdom to really come. Of course, he misunderstood this as a new birth in the physical sense, but I'm arguing in #3 that Nicodemus fell into line with that corporate understanding of the Spirit—thus a new heart, thus being born again.

10:00 **MH:** So there's some sort of corporate transformation. Okay.

RJ: Right. He wouldn't have understood that, nor did Jesus mean it to be an individual rebirth.

Proposition #4: At Pentecost, the coming of the Spirit was interpreted by Peter to fulfill the corporate promise of Joel 2. Again, as you read Acts 2, I don't sense that... Where you can justly argue with me is, "Well, doesn't corporate include individual?" I would say, not if the word "among"...

MH: What's the preposition there, do you know?

RJ: *en hymin*... It's usually translated "among." Why couldn't it be "among you?" Well, just think of Acts 2. At Pentecost, this corporate sight of tongues of fire...

MH: How about the Old Testament passage? What's the preposition there, do you know?

RJ: *kerev*

MH: Oh, okay. So it's the same one in Psalm 82: among. Yeah, right.

RJ: So that's my thesis—my idea. Each subsequent coming of the Spirit in Acts (five times) and in all of Paul's letters is speaking to this corporate identification of God's hand of approval upon a group (noticeably the Gentiles as Paul is moving through their cities) and one by one as the Spirit comes *en hymin*—among you. That's how it'll say it in the Epistles ("among you," plural). But as you see it in Acts being played out narratively it's a corporate thing. Nobody personally does something to show the Spirit coming inside of him. It's simply a way of the writer

saying that the Spirit came to this group and then this group, and when he comes to you in the Epistles, I would still take this as a corporate thing (to the Galatians or the Ephesians or whatever). They remembered, then... When Paul would say "the Spirit among you," they would think back to the day in their community that, whether through Paul or some other apostolic figure...

MH: Is this the laying on of hands?

RJ: The laying on of hands for Timothy. There was some kind of visible moment where before usually a Jewish audience (or at least Jewish eyes) a Gentile or Gentile group was approved as participating in the New Covenant through this coming of the Spirit—usually associated with signs.

MH: Some sort of discernible event or happenstance.

RJ: "They saw the grace of God," it said one time, as though it must have been physically interpreted. Well, that was the thesis of my paper.

MH: Right. Carl? [laughs] Carl, were you on the committee that rejected this?

CS: Exactly. [laughter] I'm on no committees. I just receive the rejections. I mean, there's a lot of things that I like or elements of this I really like. I certainly think what happens in Acts specifically... It's quite clear that the pouring out of the Spirit is always meant to be a sign of something new—of entrance into this New Covenant reality, this New Covenant community for Gentiles. And that's exactly how Peter argues in Acts 10 and 11. He says, "We saw what happened. Who are we to say no to this?" Right? It's interesting, I think, as well, when you look at Cornelius (and I'll just focus on that story for a minute) because Cornelius is a God-fearing Gentile. So I consider him "saved" if you want to use that language.

MH: He's a believer.

CS: He's a believer, right. He's righteous. This is not a conversion story in one sense in Acts 10, although it's often preached that way. I've done a paper on that in the past.

RJ: I would call that a sacred space story. To bring up the blog, I would call that a sacred space moment in Acts 10 and 11, where Peter gets the vision and you go through all this stuff and the Holy Spirit sanctifies Cornelius in the model that's being played out there.

MH: He has faith, but it needs to be... I don't know if the right word is "directed." The object of faith needs to be clarified.

CS: The metaphor I used in my classes is "needs to be upgraded"—the software. He gets upgraded to the New Covenant experience of salvation. Obviously, he's

a believer but he's a Gentile believer. He's already kind of on the fringes in some respects because he's not directly part of the covenant community. So he's got what we'd call salvation but not the full experience. And so there's something that's happening in Acts where Jews and Gentiles are now both experiencing this new reality—this better reality.

RJ: How about the Epistles? That's where I'm curious if you would agree with me on the Epistles.

15:00

CS: In some places I would. It's interesting. Someone told me (and I wasn't there, so if I misspeak I apologize to Walt Kaiser right now), but he did a paper where I think he was arguing for corporate indwelling as being the predominant metaphor. At least someone told me that. So in light of our conversation earlier, I thought of that. So this is not a new idea.

RJ: How about like the filling of the Spirit, then? See, to me, you could get away from this individual... even fruit of the Spirit. When Paul brings that up, notice how relational those fruits are. They're not me personally sitting in a room getting filled by this inanimate being.

MH: The gifts of the Spirit are not the filling of the Spirit. Because the gifts tend to be... Not every Christian is going to have the same gift. Whereas, the fruit of the Spirit is obviously corporate.

CS: And it's interesting, though. There is this corporate focus in the New Testament that we miss a lot just because we're Westerners.

RJ: Do you think there's any personal relationship?

CS: I expect there's at least something. I'm going to go to 1 Corinthians 6 as my one passage that I think may be into that, because he's talking about your body being a temple of the Spirit so don't engage in immorality.

MH: Right. Your body is sacred space, just as the corporate body is sacred space.

CS: I don't think it has to be either/or. I think it could be both realities. I certainly think the corporate thing is often missed. I think I mentioned this the other day when we were talking, that I have students all the time who quote 1 Corinthians 3 as a passage talking about how we individually are God's temple. And if you read 1 Corinthians 3, it's obvious that that's the corporate reality—the Church. The problem there is the division of the church. And if you're dividing the church, you're transgressing Christ's body and you're subject to judgment, so there's certainly that there. But I think it's interesting that in 1 Corinthians where I read it as being a very communal/corporate book for the most part, but there are these

hints of individuality. I think 1 Corinthians 6 might work. But I think the corporate is something we're really lacking a lot.

RJ: How about Nicodemus and the "born again" being corporate?

CS: That one I haven't thought about in the same way.

MH: If it's plural, that's very interesting because he would sort of be speaking to the Jewish community through this proxy.

CS: And the other tricky thing is this is John reporting this to his audience, so there can be an editorial presentation...

MH: Both the Jew and the Gentile need the (to use the metaphor) object of their faith upgraded. Because they could both be... Again, to use the language of *Unseen Realm*, their believing loyalty is fixed on the God of Israel. But they have to be convinced that we can shift our believing loyalty to Jesus. It's not really a shift away from one thing to another. It's the same thing but yet it's different.

CS: It's refocused in a certain way, right? And I think it is interesting if you look up Paul's preaching and it describes what happens when he goes to the synagogues, he's showing that Jesus is messiah and he's not doing the Romans Road and John 3:16...

MH: We talked earlier with David Capes, who is one of the major figures in the Early High Christology movement with Hurtado and whatnot. The corporate thing is going on there, as well. If they're identifying Jesus with Yahweh (I know Capes and others would say "as Yahweh," and I would say that, too), then they have to understand that the object of faith is actually the same, but it's still different. But they can't reject one and hold the other and have that be good. They have to make this transition. Everybody who's in the corporate people of God by definition have to make that transition.

CS: I would argue, I think, that part of the story is that they do make that transition when they're presented the proof of who Jesus is as shown from scripture.

MH: And that's why he's presented as the messiah.

RJ: And this also allows for a transitional ending to the story (at least post-apostolic), where the coming of the Spirit on these Gentile communities doesn't seem to have to continue. It can be a transitional way of God showing his approval through Acts. And then I wouldn't expect it in my modern church setting, so I wouldn't even preach the coming of the Spirit passages to a modern audience. I don't think I need to.

MH: So you would say that, okay after a few decades of this, where it becomes clear, at least within the believing community, that the Gentiles are full heirs (to use Paul's language), that that becomes a self-evident thing that doesn't need repetition?

RJ: Acts 11 becomes a "no duh" moment. All the Gentiles now are in. In fact, the Church becomes predominantly Gentile, and thus you don't need this coming of the Spirit.

20:00 **CS:** I don't know if you ought to talk about... But when it comes to churches that argue for like a current experience... let's say the baptism of the Spirit—a second blessing or whatever different models of that. It seems to me there's a category here... because they're trying to upgrade something that's already been upgraded.

MH: I think that's a good way to put that—a category error.

CS: I appreciate part of what they're trying to... but they've already been brought into that New Covenant reality. They don't need it again. Just like I wouldn't go to my computer store and ask them to upgrade me to the software I already have...

MH: Right. You're not going to have a higher status. You're not going to have a higher membership.

CS: So it just seems to me that's been kind of a detour that maybe was unfortunate from my perspective. I have good friends in that tradition. But that's at least how I process it and how I talk about it.

MH: I'm comfortable with the corporate talk because I'm not an either/or guy, I'm a both/and.

CS: [unintelligible] an either/or guy here, Ronn, I'm sorry! [laughing]

MH: Well, I don't know that he is an either/or guy, because...

RJ: I'm not.

MH: Well, Ronn gets... Just a personality observation here, okay? [laughter]

RJ: Meyers-Briggs

MH: Ronn is really good at detecting things that are missed or neglected or minimized, and then he grabs it and he says, "Look at this!" And when people listen to that, they can get the impression that he's an either/or guy. It would be very easy to do that. And in some of these things, you may be an either/or guy.

But again, you want this thing to be seen and heard so it becomes this drum beat. [laughter]

CS: And occasionally we can talk you down from that, Ronn. [laughter]

RJ: My wife does, too. How about indwelling of the Spirit? To me, I could also do that as a corporate issue.

CS: This gets into the Old Testament thing for us.

MH: So okay, how would you approach that?

RJ: The Ephesian people in Acts 19 after they experience the Spirit, they are now indwelt. That dwelling concept means he's come, he lives in this *ecclesia*, and as you go home at night, you're not carrying the Spirit with you individually, you're part of a group that has the Spirit.

MH: Can an individual quench the Spirit? Because you get some of this command language.

RJ: Now there's where I get into... My personal view is the *sarx/pneuma* back-and-forth of Paul strikes me as a Greek Hellenistic vertical versus horizontal way of living. And you can put a small "f" on flesh and a small "s" on spirit so that living by the Spirit is basically living vertically. Living by the flesh is living horizontally. You could have used this language on the streets of Ephesus and they would have understood it in their dualistic world.

MH: In the Old Testament you do get this language, even though Old Testament believers are not supposed to be indwelt. You get this "they grieved the Holy Spirit" and this language, and it's corporate when you go back in these Old Testament examples.

RJ: "The nation grieved" the Spirit.

MH: Like Psalm 78.

CS: Part of the challenge here (and this is maybe something not so much textual but just kind of conceptual) is we're using language like "indwelling."

MH: Right, are we taking New Testament language and asking questions of the Old Testament?

CS: But also even that language that we're talking about is metaphorical, right? Because this is where we know it's not like the Spirit is localized in the sense that... I'm a theology guy, sorry—all those "omni" words, right? But God is omnipresent, right? So it's not like the Spirit before he indwells me, I've got a barrier that prevents him from being physically present.

MH: I believed before but I really couldn't walk with God before I had this event.

CS: So indwelling is a metaphor for something, right? And we can talk about or wrestle with what that is. But it's not geography.

MH: What if it's only to reinforce the concept... Depending on how ferocious our friends are eschatologically... Maybe it means nothing more than that we need to take your attention away from a physical temple to now you are sacred space.

CS: That's where I think if you go back to the Old Testament, what did God indwell in the Old Testament? The tabernacle, the temple. And what was that indwelling for? It was a sign of relationship and blessing.

MH: And presence.

CS: And protection.

MH: Covenant.

CS: Covenant relationship and all of that. So I think indwelling in the New Testament is meant to be (and that's why Paul uses temple language, too, right?)...

MH: He wants them to make the association.

CS: It's the same kind of thing, but now it's not associated with a place. Now the sacred space, if you will, is this group of people. Because it's not localized in the same way.

MH: And the whole "Christ is the Spirit" thing... that's part of the way the New Testament talks about this stuff: "Where two or three are gathered, I am in your midst."

25:00

RJ: Right. Well, Christ in you. That's also there, too.

MH: You get that kind of language where Christ... My thing is, just as Jesus is-but-isn't the Father, or he is the Father but he's different—he's the same but different. You get the same kind of thing going on with Jesus and the Spirit, and that's why we get this kind of language. It's not like we're replacing the Spirit or doing away with that. They're the same, but yet they're different.

CS: Thinking about John 14-17 (Jesus in the Upper Room Discourse)... He talks about "I'm in the Father and the Father is in me" and all of that, and "I'm going to be in you and you're going to be in me." That kind of language describes this very intimate relationship. I think that's a different way of making the same kind of

point. Again, what I always end up having to disabuse my students of is a geography kind of idea—that all of a sudden God shows up so he's never been present before. So when we get to the Old Testament, I think Old Testament believers obviously had the Spirit at work in their lives or they couldn't be [unintelligible]. So how do we describe that? Do we impose Systematic Theology categories on that? It feels to me, as a systematician that that's where it's at.

RJ: And that's where I'm...

CS: We're trying to force the Old Testament to talk about things in ways that maybe aren't appropriate.

MH: I've kind of drifted to that position that we are imposing categories.

RJ: Let me throw another one at you: the idea of sanctification. In the Old Testament, that was a precursor to worship. You would sanctify before you entered sacred space. Wouldn't that be the normal read of the New Testament? Sanctification doesn't happen after you're justified, as we often categorize in our theological thinking. Sanctification takes place, in my mind in the New Testament, when the Spirit comes to Ephesus and says, "These guys are clean, even as Gentiles." And now sanctification is a one-time event, thus, that allows people to be and enter sacred space at will, and we shouldn't use the word "thus" as some kind of a progressive getting-more-godly thing. That whole idea to me would be very foreign to...

MH: It's not a defiling act, where a Gentile would be in relationship with God.

CS: This is another one of those systematic things where I don't think... I mean, there are more places in the New Testament where "sanctified" is used in kind of a definitive "already happened"...

RJ: I think it's always.

CS: Maybe it is always.

RJ: I think it's always.

MH: How about the whole notion of when Paul either commands or states something about being "conformed to the image of his son?"

RJ: That, to me, would be more of a progressive, becoming, living as though you really are what you know you are. That, to me, is different.

MH: In 1 John 3, there's still a future...

[Crosstalk]

RJ: But does he use the word "sanctify" there, or no?

CS: I don't think he does. I think that's where the terminology stuff is tricky. I don't know why systematics...

RJ: Well, "this is the will of God—your sanctification" I take to mean to a Thessalonian (mostly Gentile) audience, it was the will of God for time immemorial that he would sanctify you Gentiles. That's how I take 1 Thessalonians 4:3.

MH: That's real consistent because the Deuteronomy 32 Worldview is an aberration.

CS: It's interesting that you mention that passage because I pulled it up earlier because I was thinking about it. Because right after he says this ("you reject the Spirit because God has not called us to impurity but to live in holiness"), then he says, "our God who gives you his Holy Spirit" in 1 Thessalonians...

RJ: And I would take that as a corporate thing.

CS: And then notice what he says: "About brotherly love you don't need me to write to you because you yourselves are taught by God to love one another." That's New Covenant language. It's an allusion to a New Covenant kind of language in the Old Testament. So it's the Spirit/New Covenant/holiness. They're all kind of bound together in the way Paul talks.

MH: How do you think this helps... Your New Covenant language in Jeremiah 31, where it says something to the effect of "no longer will someone say 'know the Lord' because they will all know me." It has to be corporate, but it still has to be confined to this group.

30:00

RJ: It leads to loyalty. I think coming out of Jeremiah 31 and the new heart idea and Ezekiel 36, in both of them you have the result of the New Covenant being loyalty. So the problem that led to exile is now undone. What caused the exile has been changed so that now the loyalty is there. Again, it's not this behavior issue. It's not sin management. It's not the atonement issue, to me. It's disloyalty—idolatry is what's going to be the heart of the matter in the New Covenant, and the promise will be that you'll know it when you see it because the nation will now be loyal to one God.

MH: Yeah, there's a lot to like about that. I don't feel any tension with that. As long as you're not saying, "Let's get rid of everything individual." There's still going to be... By definition, there has to be some of that.

RJ: Some of what?

MH: There has to be some individual sort of flavor or component somewhere because you still have to make a decision, for one thing.

RJ: Oh, yeah. As far as the individuals who make up the remnant, they're going to be individual loyalists within the nation—totally, totally. That's definitely where I'm going.

MH: But corporate stuff makes a lot of sense.

RJ: What I'm going away from is the Reformed Protestant Western idea that I get born again by individually accepting Jesus passively (something he did on the cross or in his ministry). I'm arguing that would have been very foreign to their thinking coming into the New Testament—that being loyal to Yahweh to them was an aggressive choice of the individual in spite of sacred space or lack of it. Like a John the Baptist down by the river. He's arguing for loyalty to Yahweh.

MH: Or a Gentile.

RJ: Or a Gentile. And so, when we get to any kind of discussion about who is saved, who isn't saved, to me that's solved in the Old Testament. We're not having to rehash that in the New Testament. To me, the book of Acts and most of the Epistles are about table fellowship. It's who's allowed to sit at the table as an actual heir of the kingdom. Remember, Peter already knew that Cornelius was okay with God. He was a Gentile God-fearer. But Peter didn't think he belonged at the table. To me, that's the crux of the matter that Acts 11 on, and I would say Romans and...

MH: And Paul's rebuke to him is really about this fellowship, yeah.

RJ: I think the Damascus Road experience was a table fellowship question to Paul. "What do you want me to do?" All three renditions of Paul's Damascus Road experience, the one common denominator in all three is Gentiles. I think that's what he struggled with—these dead, pagan, wicked people can be right with God but they can't be right with me because I'm a Jew.

MH: Or these Christians are defiling Yahweh in some way by inviting Gentiles in.

RJ: Absolutely. Yep. So I think that's the missing element of the Protestant Western model. They don't put enough emphasis on the table fellowship question that should, in my mind, drive most of the discussions, even then of sanctification of the Spirit. To me, that's a Gentile... They're okay at the table because they're sanctified by the Spirit. Just a lot of these pieces, to me, are answered by that.

MH: Are you going to actually continue to work on this?

RJ: It'll be part of the blog.

MH: All right. I would resubmit it, too.

RJ: [laughs] I'll try. Well, why waste it on the academy, as you told me, remember? [laughter]

CS: There is some of that!

MH: I know, I'm getting my own words thrown back at me here. Okay, yeah, I think it is more useful to people who would care, but there is something to be said for having done this before your peers and your peers say, "Ah, that's really worth thinking about."

RJ: Well, you know what it's like, Mike and Carl. You think something's true and you test-drive it biblically and it makes sense to you and you say, "I think this actually works," and then you kind of look up and say, "Who do I tell this to?" Because if I tell it to him, he'll say it doesn't fit and just walk away. If I tell it to my church, they'll tell me to stop teaching it because it's not creedal. If I tell it to my denomination, I'll get defrocked. Who do I tell it to? So you can put it out in a journal and it'll sit in the back of a library. Maybe that's the way to go, but...

MH: I like the test-drive thing because... A lot of people don't know that I test-drove a lot of the concepts that *Unseen Realm* is becoming known for. I did papers here. And again, my purpose was, if there's anything I'm missing here somebody who's interested enough to come to this paper is probably going to point it out. So I thought that exercise was worth it.

CS: There is a sense, too, that you just have to realize that some things... Like I said, people hold on... It's hard to change people's minds. Let's just be honest. It's hard to change my mind, so I'm not holding myself up as this great model, right?

MH: We know. [laughter]

CS: We all are like this, right? It's just a human condition. One of my favorite quotes (I saw it in an article—I think it was about Noam Chomsky's views of language and whatever and it was talking about scientific progress)... I think I've shared this with you, right?

MH: This is good.

35:00

CS: You just throw these ideas... You sow them. Some people hear them. A few people think about them. But scientific progress is made one funeral at a time.

RJ: That's true.

CS: Theological progress or Biblical Studies or whatever... The reality is that if you've been teaching something for 30 years...

RJ: Yeah, are you gonna switch?

CS: Are you really going to switch, particularly if it involves a significant switch? I mean, you can tweak it on the margins. I can change my view of this aorist—that's not a big deal, right? But am I going to change my whole theological framework?

RJ: Do we have any examples of a well-known Millard Erickson kind of guy who's been writing for thirty years and makes a paradigm shift and just says, "I apologize. I was totally wrong."

CS: I'll give you a small one. I don't know if this is a big one, but it's a small example. Tom Schreiner a couple of years ago actually preached a message at Southern's chapel on why he switched from Amillennialism to Premillennialism. It's a smallish one. It's not a matter of orthodoxy, but that's a pretty substantial switch. He did it humbly and graciously, and he's a serious guy. He's written, obviously, advocating a particular view of eschatology before that. And then he says, "I've changed my mind and here's why." So there are some examples, but the bigger the issue the harder it is and the less likely people are to come out and say it because...

RJ: This reminds me of one of the reasons I was... When I lost my licensure (or didn't get it) they listed reasons why. One of them was "We sense that you're prone to change your mind." And I remember thinking, "Isn't that good?" [laughter] I didn't know how to take that.

CS: This reminds me of an email I got once that told me that though they didn't think I held a particular view, they thought I was open to the possibility of moving in that direction. And that was the kibosh, okay? So the idea that you could change your mind—that evidence could... I think we ought to not be afraid of the truth, right?

RJ: Sure.

CS: If we believe we're pursuing truth, the reality is that we don't have it all right. None of us does. I mean, I love what N.T. Wright says about this. I heard him (I think it was at a conference a couple years ago) and he said, "When I began lecturing when I was young, I'd begin every class saying 'ten percent of what I teach you in this class is wrong. I just don't know what ten percent.'" [laughter] Because I wouldn't teach it otherwise, right? And he says, "Now I say 20 percent." [laughter] There's a certain humility in recognizing I'm wrong about some things. I should be willing to change my mind about certain things.

RJ: Do you think being under a doctrinal statement at a school subconsciously keeps you from going down a path...

CS: Yes, it certainly does. Anytime you're in any kind of creedal or semi-creedal situation, sometimes you just choose not to pursue it. You have an inkling that there's something there but you say, "It's probably not profitable for me to focus my attention on it."

MH: I'll get to that later.

RJ: It may be profitable, but you may lose your job.

CS: I might lose my job, so let me focus on other areas that I think are productive that won't cost me my job. I think that's fair. [laughter]

RJ: I should have thought of that earlier!

MH: We should have had this conversation two years ago!

CS: My conversations with people over the years... I know Mike and probably you, Ronn, as well, would say... I know lots of people like... Or "I'm seventy percent sure of this thing, but I'm not a hundred percent sure." That's good enough to sign the doctrinal statement. [laughter]

MH: It's like sabermetrics applied to doctrinal statements.

CS: But it is a challenge, right? Because you want to be... On the one hand it's an integrity thing. If I totally disagree with something, I have to have integrity with that. And that's important. I don't want to discount that. But we also have limited time. I could study a million topics. Why would I study this one that could cost me my job when there's a bunch of other ones that are just as interesting, just as productive and useful for the church and for the academy? And that's okay! I don't think that's bad. It's just kind of a real-world thing. But it is constraining.

RJ: I wasn't as prepared, as I have experienced how being a free agent... You've been one a long time...how different that feels.

CS: Yeah, you sit around... I just turned 60 this spring, so I'm getting to be an old guy.

MH: Congratulations.

CS: Yeah, it's great. But you start to say, "In 5 years, 10 years, when my career is done, will I suddenly decide I want to think about these things?" And I don't know. I could imagine saying maybe... I don't know. I'm not quite sure what I think about that some days. I wrestle with that because I want to be a person with

integrity. But I also believe in truth and I believe in pursuing truth and I don't think there's anything wrong with pursuing truth, and I'm not afraid of the truth. I think some people are afraid of the truth because it might not match up with the ideas they already have. So I'm not afraid. I refuse to be afraid of the truth.

40:00 **MH:** Yeah. Well, that's a good note to end on, especially with our audience. That's basically what we do. We try to examine things, look at things, probe it. Yeah, two years down the road we might discover something new and that's good—it's not like an indictment that we really thought poorly two years ago.

CS: Well, sometimes we did. [laughs]

MH: There are a few times, but sometimes there is this one little nugget that really takes you in one direction or another.

RJ: I'd like to say even here, as I've told you personally, I've noticed in your clientele—the people that listen to you... It is an incredibly astute group. I'm honored... Whenever I email with someone, I'm always amazed at how careful-thinking they are. And if they disagree, they do it lightly... which I wasn't used to. [laughter]

MH: They're not going to go tell their mom?

RJ: Yep. I would say things in class and get back to my office and get a phone call from their parent before I stepped in the door sometimes. I got so gun-shy after a while. But thank you.

MH: Good. Well, thanks again this year for sharing with us.

CS: Glad to be here.

MH: There's lots of papers you could go to and lots of other things you could have—lots of other arguments.

CS: Papers? What's that, Mike?

MH: [laughs] The things that Ronn gets turned down for...

CS: That's why I don't go...

RJ: We'll try again.

MH: Thanks a lot.

RJ: Thank you.

MH: Welcome back to the annual meetings of the Evangelical Theological Society. This is our last day, and I think this is our last interview of the day. We're thrilled to have Karl Kutz with us and Rebekah Josberger. If you have listened to the interviews up to this point, you know that they have written a Hebrew grammar because I've mentioned it before. I'm enthusiastic about it. I'm endorsing it. Just go out and buy it—all that good stuff. But we wanted to have them on so that they can talk about how it was born and what's different about it. But before we get into that, I want to ask each of them to introduce themselves. Tell our audience who you are, what you're doing, just give us a little brief bio for each of you so they're oriented in some way.

RJ: Okay, hi! I'm Becky Josberger. I currently teach at Multnomah University in Portland, Oregon. I teach Old Testament and Hebrew and I love what I teach.

MH: That helps. [laughter]

RJ: Yeah... oh, man! I really enjoy it. I graduated from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. I did my dissertation under Dr. Daniel Block about 10, 11, 12 years ago. Since then I've been at Multnomah. This is my tenth year. Interesting tidbit about me: I've worked on some grammars as editor and TA and things like that before, but I always swore I would never write one. [laughter] I'm very, very, very proud of this one, though. We've been working on it for about nine years.

KK: And I'm Karl Kutz. I teach at Multnomah University, as well. I did my PhD studies at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, under Michael Fox and focused on Hebrew Scriptures and Septuagint. I've been at Multnomah now for 21 years and am chair of the Biblical Languages Department.

MH: That just really made me feel old! [laughs]

KK: I'm sorry about that, Mike.

MH: Because I had you for what was marketed by the department as the second year of Hebrew. I can't believe you've been there for...

RJ: And let me ask you, since Karl was your teacher, do you still read Hebrew?

MH: Oh, yeah!

RJ: Okay. I ask everyone who had Karl because it's my number one goal!

MH: It was a good class. The thing that stood out to me was sort of your... We had to do this—the reproduction method, reproducing forms. Even if you're not spending time every day reproducing forms, the principles of it are still relevant for parsing and things like that.

RJ: I just wanted to clarify that I have read your work and I already know you read Hebrew. [laughter] But it is the number one question I want to know.

MH: Points for you.

RJ: Thank you. It's the number one question I ask when I hear that someone has been Karl's student because Hebrew is often considered a very difficult course and, in my observation, it's been one of the least-used courses post-graduation unless someone is going on to do a dissertation in that topic or something.

KK: And I think Becky's question really answers part of what drives this grammar. When I was a graduate student teacher at the University of Wisconsin years ago, I was first teaching Hebrew and there were a couple of things that really made a difference for me. One was Paul Manuel's work on the vowel changes in Biblical Hebrew that, for me, just explained why things happened. And I thought, if beginning students could experience this information in a way that was brought to their level as a first-year student, it would alleviate a lot of memorization and help them understand why Hebrew worked the way it did so that it would promote long-term retention. And then the second issue was, I had searched and searched to find a Hebrew grammar that had an extensive translation set of exercises. Weingreen was really the only thing that was available that had that. So we really wanted to capture getting students into the text early, having lots of translation so that you can have the kinds of dynamic dialogue about text—about understanding translation, about seeing them in the process of trying to figure out how Hebrew works—and to do so in a way that if life just gets in the way, when they come back to Hebrew they're not trying to face this daunting task of re-memorizing loads and loads of forms, but understanding it so that it comes back quickly.

RJ: My brain is going off like fireworks because there are so many things I want to say. But one of the questions we get is, "Why is your grammar distinct?" One of the things we did before we ended up finding Lexham was to go around and talk to publishers about producing this grammar years ago. What we found was that there are already too many. So why another one? [laughter]

MH: "We've got one of those..."

RJ: Yeah, it makes sense. And I said already that I really didn't ever want to write one. But after being here at Multnomah for a while and seeing that it worked... One of the things that makes it so unique is... Karl mentioned cutting down on memorization. But our students will sometimes complain about memorization,

45:00

which is basically one paradigm, a couple of forms (four per paradigm for all the rest of the strong forms), and vocabulary. We'll go in and show them all the paradigms that we had to memorize.

MH: Is that what you do? You show them the other grammars?

RJ: So this is your choice: you may learn *these*, or you may continue *this way*. And their complaint is always good-hearted. (I'm interjecting this. I'll get to the second thing I was going to say in a second.) Man, the way the students love Hebrew is what has me most excited about it. And this is the second piece: by the fourth week of first year, they're reading about a chapter at a time of graded biblical Hebrew—the Joseph narrative, one chapter a week, so it's a continuous story. This has never happened before, but we had a very quirky class yesterday before I left. I walked into the classroom and the students had built a fort! This is college and graduate students. They had brought blankets in, they were over the tables and chairs, and we sat under the fort because it's that time of year and everyone's tired. It was a goofy... But it was great because we were laughing about, "What gave you this idea?" And they said, "This is our favorite thing we do, and we want to be comfortable and have fun while we're doing it." I'm like, "Reading Hebrew is your favorite activity of the week!" And that's how I feel about it, but these are not all Bible students. These are counseling students, TESL students, spousal enrichment... Hebrew is not required anywhere at our school. But they were reading... I think it's chapter 44 or chapter 45 of Genesis—almost straight biblical Hebrew at that point. They just said, "We get to get caught up in the story and then we see the grammar concept you were talking about and it finally makes sense," which is also an encouragement that you don't have to teach very well for it to work [laughing]. But it's so FUN for them!

MH: So you're at the university and you mentioned it's not required. So these are undergrads?

RJ: Graduate and undergrad—they're merged in our program.

KK: We merged the program about ten years ago and we blended undergrads and grads in the same classroom. The undergrads have four credit hours and the grads three credit hours for a four-hour-per-week course. It's been an incredible opportunity because the grad students tend to be OCD. They can parse like nobody's business. The undergrads always struggle with parsing, but they can read the socks off of a grad student any day of the week.

MH: Wow.

KK: The blend has created what they call the "Hebrew Family." They get together and read together and mutually complement each other's strengths to where they begin to see things actually related to life—that you don't have to try and become somebody else. You can capitalize on your strengths. You can

bolster your weaknesses. But collectively, they just keep falling in love with Hebrew. Although it's an elective program, we offer 14 semesters of Hebrew and we typically have between 15 and 30 in our opening Hebrew classes.

MH: That is really crazy.

RJ: It's awesome!

MH: For an elective course of really anything to have a consistent number...

RJ: And how many are in your upper division?

KK: I have a Job elective right now that's advanced seminary and we have six in there.

RJ: And I had an advanced Deuteronomy and we had twelve last year, all year. So they really stick with it, they love it. They'll audit it sometimes just to be part of it because they've fallen in love with scripture.

KK: We had one student who was an MDiv student and she got excited about Hebrew. She audited it first. We just kind of talked her into trying it. She fell in love with it, enrolled in the MDiv program, and we had to keep convincing her she ought to get to her main curriculum. She took every Hebrew class we offered except for one (Rabbinic Hebrew). It took her a few years to finish her MDiv. She just absolutely fell in love with the Hebrew language and communicating it to other people. Our advanced students love to spend time with beginning students, and we have kind of a life-on-life mentoring that goes on, where we pour our lives into the students but then the students, in turn, just do life with one another. They augment what's going on.

MH: Do you have any concern about other professors adopting your grammar?

KK: Not at all.

RJ: I do. [laughs]

MH: You do?

RJ: [To Karl] Of course you don't, you're great at marketing! I do.

MH: There's some personal flavoring going on here.

RJ: Well, one of the things is the community piece. We have tried to convey that in the instructor guide that we're working on right now. We do a couple things uniquely. Students translate five hours a week and that's it, and then they draw a line. And I don't care if they got three verses or finished the chapter, as long as

there's improvement and encouragement and lack of frustration. So we set goals. We know what language acquisition is like.

KK: It's long-term, and you don't have to spend 15 hours a week on it in order to make it happen. In fact, in the classroom we want to be able to see the student in action when they're puzzled—when they're up against a text that they've never seen before so that we can figure out how their brains work and how to help them as an individual clarify how they approach a text.

MH: Are they graded on the amount that they do?

RJ: Of course not. Five hours = 100%.

MH: So your amount is time, not lines.

RJ: It's time and method. And this is the other piece. There has to be room to fail. Our answer key is in our exercise book. Lexham kind of pushed back on that, but in order to be taught, the student has to have a desire for that information. When you're wrestling through something and you want to know the answer, that is the time to tell them what it is! The next week in class, they may have forgotten what they were even struggling with. So we have students... In brief, we just have them translate in pencil. We have them go back and correct their work in pen. Any correction they make that they do not understand after they've seen the error, they highlight that. So then we know their level of comprehension. How many times have you gone to parse a word and not known what it was, looked it up, found it, and thought "I knew that."

KK: So the student typically enters the classroom having read the passage (in terms of translation), having corrected it based on what they saw, annotated it to try to figure out what they missed or whatever. Then as we enter the classroom, we're going back over the same material on some level, but the types of questions are incrementally beyond just that opening encounter with the text.

RJ: Unless they can't word their question, which is what the highlighting helps us with. We can look at the page and go, "Oh, I bet you were confused because this is a guttural!"

MH: So the handbook for instructors is in progress?

KK: Correct.

MH: And what's the timetable for that?

KK: The workbook itself is supposed to be out in the beginning months of this new year. The instructor guide should be out by the end of the spring.

MH: Is that saleable or do you have a companion website for the product?

55:00 **RJ:** We have to check with our publisher. No idea! [laughs]

KK: It's a very important piece.

MH: Let's be honest. Instructors expect to get things for free.

RJ: Yeah! Let's be honest. We asked Lexham to publish this and sell it as inexpensively as possible, because we feel the pinch. But the other piece of that instructor guide... You asked about fear of other people teaching it. I won't give the whole back story, but when I came to Southern I had lots of Hebrew from excellent instructors, but I knew there was a lot I didn't understand. And then I'm a brand-new teacher, female on top of that, rather young at the time, and you have to hold some sense of confidence. And yet I felt none. I knew there were things I didn't understand. One of the things that Karl did as a mentor (although he acted like he wasn't a mentor, but he was) was give me the space to figure out that I was safe and I could finally ask questions about why something worked the way it did without someone thinking I don't know what I'm talking about. That probably took about a year for me to even ask a question or venture to translate something on sight, even though I was teaching it. Scary! In the classroom, you can prepare for that. For the student and the teacher, there has to be a freedom to fail and make mistakes. Even in the classroom, I think one of the reasons our students believe they can do it is because they know me well enough to know that if I can, they can. It makes a huge difference for the student, and professors are going to have to be willing to look at something and say, "Gosh, I'm learning some of this along with everyone else." The first five chapters besides the alphabet and the sounds of the vowels were pretty much all new to me when I started teaching in this program.

KK: I think that's why my initial answer when you asked the question about, "Is this transferrable to other instructors" was yes. Because from my vantage point, the issue is not trying to create something that displaces everything else as much as to offer something that can constantly be morphing to meet the needs of profs with whatever obstacles they might find in implementing it. This is an ongoing conversation for us. I've been committed to thinking about teaching Hebrew for almost 30 years, and it's not going to stop with the publication of the grammar. As we move forward, we want to be able to offer resources that help people to understand why we do what we do. There are so many little parts to even the way the textbook is laid out, that if we had the time to explain the pedagogy behind that would play a minor role in everything that happens. So I think the instructor guide... I envision email conversations and phone conversations with people to try and help in whatever way to make this as accessible as possible. I hope people fall in love with it just because their students get into the text early, they read a lot, they get excited about the biblical text and the kinds of questions they have are augmented because of it. One other thing I might add is that

because the graded reader of the Joseph narrative preserves as much of the MT as possible, they're being confronted with Hebrew idioms and cultural items from the very outset. They're very aware of the fact that it's a cross-cultural experience at every stage of the process. We have some amazing conversations about what translation is and how it works and how you perceive Hebrew idioms and the way they look at either syntax or just ideas. It's been incredibly rich that way.

MH: Have you guys considered... I don't know how Multnomah looks at recording (I'm talking about video here) what goes on in a classroom and putting it on a website for free. But the reason I bring this up is I want to know how you would assess... A lot of this is interactivity (what goes on in a classroom). What about the independent learner—somebody that says, "I just want to learn Hebrew. I want to buy this grammar." Can they self-teach?

1:00:00

RJ: That's why we wrote it the way we did. Both of us were self-learners, at least for the initial beginning of Hebrew. Karl was a successful self-learner, I was an unsuccessful self-learner. But we wrote so that students, if they're driven and willing to work at something, yes—we have a number already that have done that.

MH: The interactivity is what I was wondering about.

KK: The grammar is set for the publishing of the workbook here in the next few months. Once that is firmed in terms of its digital format, it is going into a digital version that will include audio recordings of every translation, every Hebrew word in the entire grammar and workbook. It will also have interactive videos, animations that depict the historical development of Hebrew, how to read Hebrew aloud and understand it. I think in the long-run, the potential for instructional videos or things that can augment that is definitely on the table.

RJ: I do, too. The one thing I want to be careful of is ever giving the idea that there's only one right way to teach Hebrew (because there's not). Just like we believe that each person in our classroom is able to learn the language—at a different rate, for sure, but they all speak at least one language and they all language acquisition skills... It might take a little longer, but they can learn it. I also think that instructors can all teach, and they don't have to look like I do. I hope they don't look like I do in the classroom! [laughs] They don't have to look like Karl looks in the classroom. Our styles of teaching are incredibly different. He lectures for about 20 minutes and then...

KK: I do most of it inductively as we're going through the passage. Whereas Becky tends to...

RJ: Oh, I've got to see every eye in that classroom light up. And I'll slow down and we'll do it again and I can be obnoxious sometimes. Each of us spends about an hour a week (well, 20 minutes or an hour) in the grammar portion and

then three hours of just reading. But everybody has their own strengths. Language is relational and it's built for relationship. I think we lose that piece so often in the way that we teach languages. So other instructors can teach it.

KK: One thing that might also be helpful to mention is that because the grammar weaves in so many advanced concepts in a fundamental way from the very beginning, we are very aware of the fact that the book not only introduces the student to the points that they need to take away from each chapter, but it's layering things that we see payout for long down the road. In fact, in some cases, our students will be in their third or fourth semester of Hebrew and they'll look at us and think, "Oh! That's what a *piel* does!" So we recognize that there are elements where we're just laying groundwork. That may be one of the more difficult aspects of the grammar. If an instructor is more used to a grammar that only gives the student what they can digest at that moment and then waits, they might feel a bit overwhelmed by the information that's in there. They'll need to navigate and say, "At this point, the student needs to know the noun endings and the suffixes for pronouns." Boom. And then the verb paradigm. And that's the bottom line. And a student can do just fine with that. But there's so much else there that, whether a student assimilates it at that point because they happen to be linguistically adept or whether it starts to pay out two semesters later, I think that's the beauty of what's in the grammar.

MH: Well, thanks for spending some time with us. I'll be honest with you: I intend to read through the whole thing. I can identify with what you're saying because there you are in a classroom. I have a PhD in Hebrew Bible.

RJ: I was hired to teach Hebrew! [laughs]

1:05:00

MH: There are things I really don't know or understand. It's just... You've got to know that everybody feels that way, but you're not supposed to convey that in any way. So I'm quite sure it'll be a refresher of some of the things you did in our second-year class and picking up these explanatory—these little connectors, that you can connect one thing to the other. So that's my intention. For our audience, we get questions a lot, "How can I learn Greek? How can I learn Hebrew?" And it's really nice to be able to recommend this one because I feel like I have some minimal experience with it. But again, we hear... Going through the UW program you get students from Multnomah and you were there and there's this impression (I'm sure you've heard this) among many students that the people who went through this particular program just seemed to have it down a little bit better for some reason.

RJ: Because they do! [laughs]

MH: Right. And so again, that's one of the reasons... I mean, years ago we had this conversation about you considering Lexham for your grammar. So now I finally get to say, "Well, there it is so go get it."

RJ: One more comment, too. We talked about this in our faculty meeting yesterday. Multnomah Hebrew has turned out some exceptional students. I'm just... wow.

KK: People teaching at prestigious universities. But that's not the only student we're targeting.

MH: You're not just looking for your doctoral protege.

RJ: No!

KK: We're not! In fact, at the University of Wisconsin, one of the students that has always been on my mind was somebody who came to me and said, "The university gave me an exemption from language because I have a fourth-grade reading acquisition level, but I want to learn Hebrew." And I saw him go on and learn Hebrew and the learning of Hebrew and the way we were doing it in the classroom actually changed his mode of learning in other classes, and he eventually went on and got a Master's degree in national defense and went on to work for the State Department.

RJ: And we have one of those right now. She's here beginning the interview process for PhD programs in Hebrew and Old Testament.

KK: I never thought she would go there.

RJ: And she's amazing! And she's also our best tutor, because our first- and second-year students who feel like they aren't getting it because there's so much each week thrown at them... She just says, "Yeah, I didn't get it then, either! It's okay! Can you write this paradigm and can you read this translation?"

KK: On top of that, there's always been this tendency to think that if somebody's going into ministry, what you do is you give them the minimum amount they need to kind of get the gist of it and then use it. But you can't use it if you don't understand it! And so the other side of what happens in our classroom is that we've got people who are not thinking about graduate school at all. They just want to do ministry. They want to be a pastor or they want to be involved in some other kind of ministry while they have a marketplace job and they develop the skills so that they can just be equipped as individuals. I think that's some of the most exciting part of what goes on.

MH: Well, thanks again. I'm glad we did this.

RJ: Thank you!

KK: You're welcome.

MH: Glad you guys could make it right off the plane! [laughter]

KK: Well, thank you very much.

MH: Thanks a lot.

TS: All right, Mike. I always enjoy listening to you, Ronn, and Carl talk. It's always fun to watch you three just talk shop.

MH: Yeah, we go back a long way, so we can poke each other in the eye in a fun way, and we always do.

TS: It's very entertaining. All right, we appreciate it. And I just want to thank everybody for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God bless.