

Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 331

Q&A 39

July 4, 2020

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)

Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)

Episode Summary

Dr. Heiser answers your questions:

- Could Deuteronomy 32 refer to “sons of Israel” instead of “sons of God” based on God’s foreknowledge of how many there would be in the future? [Time stamp 5:00]
- How few is “few” in Luke 13:22-30? [15:50]
- If the ancient people were so wrong about what the physical world is like, how can I trust them when they describe what the supernatural world is like? [18:05]
- Why are the sons of God in Genesis 6 called angels in the New Testament? [20:05]
- Does Psalm 8:5 (humans are “a little lower than the angels”) make the terms for angels and *elohim* interchangeable? [22:20]
- How would an Israelite think about humans being a little lower than the heavenly beings in a divine council worldview? Is it more about location or about position? [24:20]
- Were Second Temple Jews concluding that there was something unique about Cain, based on Apocryphal writings that his skin glowed? [27:10]
- Is Isaiah 43:3-4 intended to be a hyperlink to Deuteronomy 32 and Yahweh’s disinheritance of the nations? The term “Jeshrun” is used for Israel in both places. [32:40]

Transcript

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 331: Our 39th Q&A. I’m the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he’s the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey, Mike! What’s going on?

MH: Well, it’s hot here. [laughs]

TS: Yeah?

MH: Surprise, surprise. [laughs]

TS: Yeah. And hot to you is...?

MH: Well, I mean, I grew up in Pennsylvania, so you know... I know what 90s weather is and high humidity. But nobody else (other than my wife and myself) in the house has really experienced that. So it's kind of like a thing that's really noticeable to them.

TS: Are they melting? Are they complaining? What's going on?

MH: No, my oldest (Amy) likes to go out and sit outside. Calvin hates it. Simi is sort of ambivalent. She can sort of take it or leave it. But Drenna likes it. She says in Florida it's like being... She still feels like she's on vacation every day. "Because it's the sun. We went to a sunny place. We would only do that if we were on vacation," if you're in Washington State mode. So that's what it feels like to her.

TS: Well come talk to me when you hit triple digits. [MH laughs] Because Texas...

MH: Yeah, we've seen that in New Mexico. Yeah, we've taken a couple of Roswell trips. But there it's dry. I don't know what that's going to be like when it's 100° here and it's 90% humidity. I guess you just don't go anywhere.

TS: I wonder what the aliens feel about the hot weather in New Mexico. I bet they have a lot of sunscreen.

MH: They just crashed. They didn't really stick around. Or they can live underground in the underground base.

TS: That's probably why they crashed! It was so hot, their air conditioning went out, and they crashed. I guarantee you that's what happened.

MH: Yeah. Maybe we reverse-engineered their air conditioning to improve our own.

TS: That's exactly right. Get more efficient. We're on to something, Mike! Think about it!

MH: [laughs] That makes so much sense. [laughs]

TS: You're flying around in the sun, close to the sun, and all these stars... You've got to have good A/C! And then the reverse, you've got to have good heat when you're out in the middle of the cold of empty space. You've got to have good heat.

MH: Yeah, they perfected this. They perfected climate control.

TS: Yeah, insulation. Perfect. That's exactly... Probably that new foam spray that you can get in your house now: aliens.

MH: Yeah, there you go.

TS: I'm telling you.

MH: Yeah, if it's useful, we have to give them credit for it. I guess that's how that works.

TS: Yeah, there you go. Well, Mike, anything else?

MH: I'll be getting an email from Coast to Coast AM this week about being on the show, if somebody listens to this conversation.

TS: I haven't listened to Coast to Coast AM in a while. Have you?

MH: No I haven't. And I haven't been on for probably three years.

TS: You need to get on there for your *Demons* book.

MH: Eh, I just... I don't know. George is just going to want to talk about ancient aliens. That's... You know. It doesn't matter what the topic is. Plus now that I'm on the East Coast, the show is, like, 2:00 a.m. to 5:00 a.m. It's like, "Do I really want to do that?"

Well, with this scintillating introduction to our Q&A... [laughter] I'm sure people are really, "Let's do the Q&A now, please!"

TS: Yeah, absolutely. Well, I wish we had an alien question to start it off with, but we don't.

MH: No? Well. Are you sure? We can search through the archives for "alien". You might find one.

TS: That's true. I can make one up.

MH: I got them in Q&A at the Awakening School stuff. We tried to discourage that. But every once in a while, one would get through. You know? So it is what it is.

TS: You've got to at least try.

MH: Yep.

TS: Alright, well, let's just jump in here. Our first question is from Vuyo from Butterworth, South Africa. I know I didn't do your name justice. But Vuyo—that's pretty neat—sent an email. There's a small town called Butterworth in South Africa. That's pretty neat. Alright.

MH: Yeah. I wonder if Mrs. Butterworth... [laughs] Okay, I couldn't resist that. You can edit that. If Mrs. Butterworth lives there.

TS: Oh, yes! Butterworth. I got you. The syrup. I got you.

MH: We can get rid of that...

TS: [laughs] Okay. [MH laughs] Vuyo asks:

5:00

I have a question concerning the Deuteronomy 32 cosmic geography worldview and its foundation being founded on the proper translation being "sons of God" as opposed to "sons of Israel." I am more in favor of sons of God, it's more coherent and fits the mosaic of the story of the Bible, but your argument for that is my concern. I don't think it's incorrect. But is it not possible for God with his omniscience, with his foreknowledge to be able to foreknow the number of the sons of Israel and thus divide the nations according to that number and thus maybe have "Sons of Israel" as correct? How would you debunk that?

MH: Well, there are several ways. First of all, God's foreknowledge and omniscience has nothing to do with what the text actually says. There is no early textual evidence for "sons of Israel." The oldest textual evidence we have (Dead Sea Scrolls) is "sons of God," and whatever was behind the Septuagint, same thing. So none of that has anything to do with omniscience. The text is what it is (was what it was) regardless of that. So we can't wonder about how we might approach an incorrect reading (or a reading that didn't exist when the book was composed) in light of God's attributes. It's actually a nonsensical question in that regard. So... I'll try to rephrase it so it's more clear: our theological musings about something that wasn't in the Bible to begin with doesn't make a whole lot of sense. So that's the first thing.

Moving on from that point, there are a couple of things that could easily be said here. There were more than 70 children of Israel that went down to Egypt. Let's just start there. The 70 in verses referring to that pilgrimage is not an actual number. It's actually artificial. You say, "What do you mean by that?" Well, when we did the series on Exodus, we talked about Exodus 1:5 (and I'm going to read that). I'm reading from the ESV.

⁵ All the descendants of Jacob were seventy persons; Joseph was already in Egypt.

So there you get the reference to the number 70. And when we talked about that in the podcast series on Exodus, I noted that “descendants,” which is literally “those who came out of (or out of the loins of) Jacob” — those who came out of Jacob... That language refers to Jacob’s direct seed (his sons and their children who were in direct lineal descent). So it doesn’t refer to other children who are outside who weren’t “in the loins of Jacob”. If you look at Genesis 46:26 in this regard...

²⁶ All the persons belonging to Jacob who came into Egypt, who were his own descendants [MH: that’s the same Hebrew term there... it’s יֹטְסֵׁ (yōtse’ê) — “to come out of”], not including Jacob's sons' wives, were sixty-six persons in all.

You’ll actually get a different number there than the sons of Joseph. You can get to 70, which is what the passage does. But the key ideas there are, not including Jacob’s sons wives... So we have an issue here. There is some artificiality to the number 70. If you want to take the language strictly for what it says, it refers only to those descendants who directly came from Jacob. It doesn’t say anything about wives. The women aren’t included—so on and so forth. So it’s not a real number. The real number is going to be a bit larger.

So have an indeterminate number. We don’t actually know how many there were in reality. Because even if you went back and looked at the names of the wives of the sons of Jacob, you’re going to find out that not all of them are listed. We don’t get the wives for all of the sons, and so on and so forth. We don’t get a lot of information about who’s actually “in Israel,” who actually makes the trip with Jacob.

So the number is artificial. And that’s a problem for this, “Well, God knew omnisciently how many...” And the reason it’s a problem is because the other view (sons of God), which is the one that was actually in the text to begin with, we have a concrete number there. We had 70. Because all we need to do is count the known nations at the time in Genesis 10. Genesis 10 and 11 (the Babel incident from which the Deuteronomy 32 worldview springs)... Every biblical scholar who’s ever drawn a breath knows that those two chapters are related (the Table of Nations and the division of the nations—it’s very obvious). So we have an actual real number there. And if we wanted to drill down into the larger Canaanite worldview for polemic reasons, we would discover that the sons of El (the Canaanite El) at Ugarit were 70. These things aren’t just coincidental and accidental. But we don’t have a concrete number if we’re going with sons of Israel. Because we just don’t know how many went down to Egypt. The number that we’re given is artificial. It doesn’t include a lot of the womenfolk (and if you

10:00

wanted to be real picky there could be some other outliers there too). So you have a disconnect there.

I would also say that the notion that maybe God in his omniscience knew that there would be 70 Israelites go down there (that's the point), none of that has any coherence at all when you get to Deuteronomy 32:43. What I mean here is that the 70 Israelites being used to by some (not by Vuyo, but by some) to deny the "sons of God" reading in Deuteronomy 32:8, they forget about verse 43. Because the plural *elohim* of verse 43 was also eliminated at some point in what would become the Masoretic Text when verse 8 was [eliminated] (the reference to the sons of God). So how do 70 Israelites account for what we read in Deuteronomy 32:43? Let me just read the passage. Because it's the same passage—the same textual issue in both places. And I point this out in my articles. I don't spend too much time on this in *Unseen Realm*. But in my journal articles I do. Verse 43 says:

**⁴³ "Rejoice with him, O heavens [MH: Or "O heavenly ones"];
bow down to him, all gods [*elohim*],
for he avenges the blood of his children
and takes vengeance on his adversaries.
He repays those who hate him
and cleanses his people's land."**

It's a direct attack... It's a Deuteronomy 32 attack on the gods that seduced the Israelites way back earlier in the chapter (32:8, 32:17). If you're going to eliminate the supernatural element from verse 8, or say, "Well, that's really a reference to the Israelites," how is *this* a reference to the Israelites? How does it work in verse 43? And of course the answer is, "It doesn't," whereas the other view certainly does. And that would make sense, because verse 8 (the sons of God) and verse 43 (the plural *elohim*)... That's what the text said. That's what was in the text.

I could also ask, "Well, you know, if we have sons of Israel here, then where does Daniel get his theology? You know, Daniel 10, the prince of Persia, prince of Greece, these supernatural princes that are opposing Israel's prince, Michael (later called the archangel)... Where does Daniel get this notion that earthly empires...? Behind those empires there was a supernatural intelligence or power that was ultimately assigned to or attached to this geopolitical entity. Where does Daniel get that? Does he just make it up? It just pops into his head? No, he gets it from Deuteronomy 32 (the sons of God thing). If those are just humans, I don't know where Daniel's getting his theology. You completely destroy the connection, which is actually important because when Paul quotes Deuteronomy 32:17, he's talking about other *elohim* (which the Septuagint has as demons). And that's in verse 17. Where does Deuteronomy 32:17 get the idea? Well, it

gets it from the preceding verse in verse 8. Again, this is all a coherent whole that only makes sense if it's "sons of God." And that's good, because guess what? That's what it was according to all of our most ancient textual evidence. That's what it was. So you could also say, Well, "Daniel gets his theology from Psalm 82." Well, that's wonderful. Where does the Psalmist get it, in verse 8 when he asks God to rise up and take the nations as his inheritance? "Well, I thought God owned everything." Actually, it makes sense if you allot the nations to other sons of God. So where does the Psalmist get that idea if it was about Israelites? Again, you could make this idea (this trajectory) look dumb. [laughs] Okay? Let's just be honest. And I know that's not Vuyo's trajectory. Because, in his question, he obviously understands the textual issue with the reading. But at the end of the day, omniscience has nothing to do with what was actually in the text. And to propose the alternative makes no sense at all for a number of these reasons.

TS: Roy has a question about Luke 13:22-30:

15:50

Just wondering Mike's take on "few" being saved. Jesus doesn't actually say that few will be saved in this Luke passage, but there are a number of other passages that seem to imply or say that the "remnant" will be few (few will find it; workers are few; many called but few chosen; etc...). And then the end of the Luke passage references the first being last and the last being first.

So I guess what I'm wondering is, "how few is "few"?"

MH: [laughs] Well, the honest answer is, I have no idea! I can't assign a number or some kind of quantity when that information isn't given. I think the key, though, here is... Roy used the word *remnant*. The people of God are always a *subset* of the rest of humanity. And I think it's quite clear they are a small subset. If you want to go back to our first question on the Deuteronomy 32 worldview... Hey, it's one nation amid all the other ones. And even in that one nation, a lot of those people don't even wind up to be believers. They wind up forsaking their loyalty to the God of Israel (to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob) and go chasing after some other gods. So even in that subset, there's a subset. So it's a small number, relatively speaking, to the whole. But I can't quantify it in any other way than that. Remnant theology is something that runs through the entirety of the Bible (this subset idea).

And I'll throw out one other thought here. Since remnant theology *does* run through Scripture, it's one of the reasons why I wonder about the general coherence of universalism. But that's a different subject. But the pattern is always the opposite of universalism [laughs], you know, if I could put it that way. So I think patterns are important. They teach us some things. And this one is quite regular.

TS: Alright. Rob has a question:

18:05

If ancient people were so wrong about the earth being inside of a dome holding back chaotic waters, why should I accept their views on supernatural beings or unseen realm as being correct? I'm struggling to be consistent in how I interpret the Bible. So they were wrong about the physical world but correct about the spiritual world? How do I reconcile this?

MH: Well, the fuller answer to this is on my website. It's under the FAQ. Go to www.drmsb.com. Look at the FAQ, and it's the last question in the FAQ. So I'm not going to repeat that here. People who are listening to this episode can just go up and read it.

In a couple of sentences, how you approach this is that the natural world is subject to the tools of science and the tools of human inquiry because we are part of the creation and we have the faculties to examine the creation and learn about it. None of that is true in the spiritual world. The spiritual world is not subject to the tools of science. It is not subject to human inquiry. Why? Because we're not part of it. So there's a fundamental disconnect between what is said about the natural world by people—by human writers... Their knowledge is quite limited, even in the world that they belonged to. It's ultra-limited (as in basically nonexistent) when it comes to the spiritual world. The only way people know anything about the spiritual world is what God reveals to them. It is not discoverable with human faculties. So that is the fundamental difference. And that's why the two conclusions can cohere together. Again, for more, just go up to drmsb.com, look under FAQ, and it's the last question.

TS: Ross wants to know:

20:05

Why are the sons of God who committed sin (in Genesis 6) called sons of God in Genesis 6, yet called "angels" in the New Testament (like Jude 6 and 2 Peter 2:4) and not "sons of God" if they (sons of God and angels) are different, which we know they are?

MH: Well, they're not different. This is a misunderstanding of terminology. An angel is a different term. It's a job description. "Sons of God" is not a job description. It is a description of rank. So over in the spiritual world, all members of the spiritual world (all inhabitants of the spiritual world) get referred to sometimes by what I would call ontological terms (terms that tell you what they are). They are spirits, for instance. They are *elohim*. They're all this. But they can get called different things to either convey what they *do* or where they *rank*. So they're not different entities. They might have different rank. They might have different jobs. Let me use myself as an example. I can be referred to as a "man", "husband", "father", "son", "uncle", "leader", "servant", "boss", and "employee" in the same paragraph, but it's still just me. Those terms... And there are ontological terms in that list I just gave you and there are functional terms in that

list. The different terms don't mean that every term refers to a different person. Or in this case, the different terminology used of the rebels of Genesis 6 don't mean that they're different groups.

In addition, Peter's getting his vocabulary from the Septuagint (Greek translation of the Old Testament). In Genesis 6:2, that's what it reads. It reads "angels". He's writing in Greek, so that what he uses. In my *Angels* book, I discuss in the first chapter these terminological buckets. And there's a lot of confusion in this regard, and I think that's at the heart of this question.

TS: Ross also wants to know:

22:20

Does Psalm 8:5 where humankind is called a "little less than the angels" (which in the original is "elohim") make angels and elohim interchangeable?

MH: Yeah. The answer again is the Septuagint. The vocabulary in the Hebrew Bible (the Hebrew terminology) was a lot more varied and a lot more nuanced than Greek. As the Hebrew Bible gets translated into Greek (that's the Septuagint in the Second Temple or the intertestamental period), the translators there don't always have a different Greek term for each Hebrew term. They begin to start using *angelos* (angel) as just an umbrella (a catch-all) term. "He's talking now about some member of the heavenly host. We'll just call that an angel." So that's what happens in the course of putting the Hebrew Bible into Greek translation. And since New Testament writers (like the author of Hebrews) are going to be using the Septuagint, they don't correct it. They don't alter it. They just use the Septuagint. This is the Bible that the people they're writing to are going to be reading, because everybody in the first century world that was literate could read Greek. You can't say that about Hebrew. That was definitely a minority reading language, even in the Jewish community, where the main language was Aramaic by this time. It was not Hebrew. Hebrew, of course, is going to be retained by the religious class (the scribes and the Pharisees)—the more professional class. But the average person is either going to be reading the Septuagint (everybody reads Greek) or they're going to be reading a Targum (which is an Aramaic translation). So this is just a phenomenon of translation.

TS: Our next question is from Dave.

24:20

In Psalm 8:4-5 it says of man, "yet you have made him a little lower than the heavenly beings and crowned him with glory and honor." How would an Israelite think of this in a divine council worldview? Is the concept "made him a little lower" more about location, on the earth, OR does it have to do with position and authority? Is there some connection to the position/location of the nachash?

25:00

MH: Yeah, I think lower here is a way of saying “lesser”. Most scholars (and I’m in this bunch here) would take this ontologically, therefore. In other words, a supernatural being (Psalm 8 has *elohim*—“a little lower than the *elohim*”) is superior to an embodied earthly being. So I take it as an ontological statement. The reference wouldn’t be related to God’s presence, because God was present in Eden. So it’s not a distance thing from God. Heaven is a lot higher than the earth, if we want to even conceptualize it physically. So that really doesn’t fit. There’s no distance factor here, because God was present with these beings he created, even though they’re lower (they’re lesser). So I don’t think there’s a distance factor here. Even taking the heavenly idea or the presence of God idea metaphorically (let’s just broaden it to the spiritual world) to refer to the heavenlies or something like that, that’s a lot different than the physical world. But that world and the physical world are combined in Eden, because God has come to earth.

So I think the only thing that really fits is the ontological perspective. “A little lower than the *elohim*” means just lesser. You could say “a little” lower. Well, okay. How much is “little?” How much is “much?” I think the “little” there is worded that way because God does create humanity in or as his image. So the language is designed to communicate both a similarity, but also just a lower (lesser) ontological status.

And lastly, I don’t think this has anything to do with the *nachash* specifically, because it’s a statement about humanity’s created status. It’s not a post-fall statement. It’s not something that would be said in the context of Genesis 3. It’s something that is stated in the context of human creation.

TS: Our next two questions are from Matthew from Appleton, WI. The first one is:

27:10

Why is there an apocryphal tradition in the different versions of *Life of Adam and Eve* of Cain being born with some kind of glow or skin radiance? How does this relate to 1 Enoch where Noah is born glowing and talking? In the Enochian narrative, Lamech (Noah’s father) is afraid that his newborn son is a product of the Watchers. Were Second Temple Jews drawing the same conclusion about Cain? Is this a byproduct of their understanding of Genesis 4:1 or is there something else at play?

MH: You know, I have my pseudepigrapha open (the Charlesworth edition) for the sake of this Q&A. And searching for all of the reference for Cain in the *Life of Adam and Eve* (either the Greek version or the Latin version, at least the versions that are in Charlesworth’s pseudepigrapha), and I can’t find any reference to what Matthew is talking about, about Cain being born with glowing skin. So I guess that’s my answer. I would need some kind of passage reference. Because I’m just not seeing a single example. Now that’s a whole lot different than Noah in 1 Enoch. That’s *very* clear. In fact, for those who are interested in

this, it's 1 Enoch 106. And I'll read a little bit from Nickelsburg here (his commentary on Enoch) about this description of Noah. In fact, why don't we just, just so that people can get a little feel for this... Let me just open up Charlesworth here to Enoch (instead of *Life of Adam and Eve*) and I'll just read a little bit of this. Because there's no ambiguity in this instance, whereas the other one, like I said, I can't really find a single reference to this. But chapter 106 of 1 Enoch says:

¹And after some days my son, Methuselah, took a wife for his son Lamech, and she became pregnant by him and bore him a son. ²And his body was white as snow and red as a rose [MH: How can you be both white and red? Maybe it's pinkish in places. Who knows.]; the hair of his head as white as wool and his *demdema* beautiful;

It's a foreign word (*demdema*) and then "was beautiful". That term (*demdema*)... There's really no English equivalent. It's going to sound funny. But it refers to a big head of curly hair. So if you're thinking, like, an afro, that's essentially what it is. [laughs]

...and as for his eyes, when he opened them the whole house glowed like the sun—(rather) the whole house glowed even more exceedingly.

Then it goes on to describe Noah, and just the gloriousness of his face. Down in verse 5:

30:00

His eyes were was like rays of the sun. His face was glorious.

And then in verse 6:

It does not seem to me [MH: his dad says] that he is of me, but of angels, and I fear that a wondrous phenomenon may take place upon the earth in his days.

[Laughs] So this sort of freaks Dad out to see Noah in 1 Enoch 106. So this is what Matthew is talking about in his question. But there's nothing like this that I can find used of Cain in *Life of Adam and Eve*. So I would need a verse reference. But back to Nickelsburg. Nickelsburg summarizes 1 Enoch 106 this way. He says:

Lamech reacts in terror to what he perceives to be the incarnation of a forbidden angelic conception, but he learns that the child's unearthly beauty is actually symbolic of his divinely sanctioned salvific function...

So later on in 1 Enoch 106, these things are symbols of Noah's righteousness and basically his destiny to preserve humanity through the Flood. Nickelsburg adds:

Noteworthy, especially in 1QapGen 2 [MH: that's the Genesis Apocryphon, which is another story besides chapter 106 of Enoch where Lamech wonders, "Hey, is this my kid or is it from the Watchers?" It's another kind of text like that], is the similarity between Lamech's suspicion of his wife and Joseph's concern about Mary's mysterious pregnancy in Matthew 1. [MH: So Nickelsburg compares those a little bit.] In addition, in both sets of stories the supernatural conception of the child is at issue. In the Noah stories a forbidden supernatural conception is denied; in Matthew and Luke a conception by the Holy Spirit is affirmed...

Strikingly, the canonical accounts [MH: Matthew and Luke—the Gospel accounts] about Jesus' birth are completely lacking in the kind of legendary details about the child's appearance that are present in the Noah story.

So I think that's worth pointing out. This is the kind of internet theology you'll get. "Oh, Jesus' birth is just like what happens with Noah in the book of Enoch." Well, actually it's not. It's quite a bit different. So I thought it was worth adding that detail from Nickelsburg. So I don't know how else to proceed with this question. Because like I said, I just searched for the name Cain in the *Life of Adam and Eve* and I don't have anything. I can't find anything that sounds like what I just read about Noah from 1 Enoch 106.

TS: Matthew's second question is:

32:40

Isaiah 43:3-4 uses language that made wonder if it is intended to be a hyperlink to Deuteronomy 32 and Yahweh's disinheritance of the nations and His choosing/creation of Israel. I noticed in the very next chapter, Isaiah 44:2, that Isaiah uses the term Jeshurun for Israel. This term is found *only* in Deuteronomy 32 and 33. Is there something here?

MH: I actually have two studies on this. One is a journal article. The other one is a chapter from a book. So I went back and looked at this. I'll just read the titles because I'll stick them both in the protected folder, if people are interested in reading these. One is by Ronald Bergey. It's called "The Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32.1-43) and Isaianic Prophecies: A Case of Early Intertextuality?" And the other one is by Hyun Chul Paul Kim. The chapter is called "The Song of Moses in Isaiah 40-55." And that's in a book called *God's Word for Our World: Biblical Studies in Honor of Simon John De Vries*, which is a 2004 title. Neither of those studies note any connection or suggest any connection for Isaiah 43:3-4. And if you actually look at the passage, I wouldn't expect any, because both of these studies are linguistically oriented. In other words, they're looking for actual vocabulary in the Hebrew text. Let me just read Isaiah 43:3-4 so that people don't wonder why the question was asked and why I'm saying it this way. So Isaiah 43:3 says:

**³ For I am the LORD your God,
the Holy One of Israel, your Savior.
I give Egypt as your ransom,
Cush and Seba in exchange for you.
⁴ Because you are precious in my eyes,
and honored, and I love you,
I give men in return for you,
peoples in exchange for your life.**

35:00

So you could read that as this idea of Yahweh taking Israel as his own (that's Deuteronomy 4:19-20 that parallels Deuteronomy 32:8) and, by definition, sort of giving away some of these other countries. And I think that's what Matthew's question is about. But you don't have any actual vocabulary connections between those two verses in Hebrew and back in Deuteronomy 32. So I'm not surprised that neither of these studies note this, even though you *could* read it and imagine a conceptual connective idea.

I think there's probably a better... I would say there are better ways to interpret the language of Isaiah 43 than to reference Deuteronomy 32. But just going with these studies, they're linguistically oriented, and so I'm not surprised that they didn't note this.

However, the Jeshurun example (from Isaiah 44:2)... And that term *is* only found elsewhere in Deuteronomy 32 and 33. They both note that connection. That seems to be much more explicit (again, because of the vocabulary connections). So I'm going to read a little section from Kim. He comments about Jeshurun here. He says:

Concerning the echoes of Jacob [MH: that's obviously a term for Israel] and Jeshurun in Deuteronomy 32 and Deutero-Isaiah [MH: Isaiah 44], it is true that the term and notion of 'Jacob' cannot be seen as anything unique. Admittedly, Israel has been called 'Jacob' in numerous parts of the Hebrew Bible, all the more in the prophetic literature...

And he just proceeds to give us a grocery list of references. And he says:

Nonetheless, as the simple name 'Jacob' along with 'Israel' often depicts the mysterious servant in Deutero-Isaiah, the significance of this name in the Song of Moses cannot be quickly dismissed where the name likewise conveys both individual and collective nuances.

So let me just stop there. So he's noting here that "Jacob" and "Israel"... There's both a collective and an individual sense. And then he shifts to Jeshurun, which is hardly ever used. So there's a little bit of a nuance there. He says:

More importantly, this name [MH: (Jacob and Israel)] occurs in parallel with the peculiar name 'Jeshurun' [MH: so that helps identify it] in Deut. 32:14–15 and Isa. 44:2. The name 'Jeshurun' occurs only in two other places in the Hebrew Bible (Deut. 33:5, 26)! In all these passages, the names of Jacob and Jeshurun occur in parallel. In addition to the fact that these appellations occur in pairs, both names are associated with the imagery of YHWH's nurturing and fostering YHWH's people... [MH: He has some citations there.]

It is possible and likely that the names Jeshurun paired with Jacob were commonly used in other traditions and transmissions. In the extant canonical shape [MH: the Hebrew Bible as we have it], however, finding such a parallel only in these two sources is remarkable. Calling and identifying Jacob as YHWH's allotted inheritance and the archaic name Jeshurun simultaneously demonstrate that one author may have been well aware of, and quite possibly (or even deliberately) alluding to, the other.

I'll just stop there. So that's Kim's way of saying, "Yeah, there's got to be a connection here. Isaiah pretty much has to have Deuteronomy 32 and Deuteronomy 33 in mind to use this unusual term." So in regard to the second one, yep, there's a connection there that takes us back into Deuteronomy 32, specifically the allotment idea. But as far as the previous one (the earlier citation—Isaiah 43:3-4), neither of these studies think there's anything to that.

TS: Alright, Mike, another good round of questions. And don't forget, you can send me your questions at TreyStricklin@gmail.com or Trey@NakedBible.com and I'll put them in the queue. Again, we apologize that we can't get to everybody. We've got tons of them. But I do my best to try to pick them out. So there you go.

MH: Yep.

TS: Well, Mike, I wanted to bring up some happy news. And that is, I was just looking around at our stats out there. It's just iTunes specific. But I noticed that we were actually in the "Christian" category...

MH: That's good. [laughs]

TS: [laughs] We were ranked 7th in Ireland, 4th in Poland, and 4th in New Zealand. And we were actually the #1 Christian podcast in Slovakia.

MH: Sweet.

TS: How cool is that?

MH: That's pretty cool. All that's pretty cool, when you really think about the geography there. Wow. That's crazy.

40:00 **TS:** And not just that, but that in Slovakia we were 44th in all of podcasts (in its entirety).

MH: Wow.

TS: And also in South Africa, we were 200th in all of the podcasts in its entirety. And in the Philippines, we were 138th of all the podcasts out there in the world. That's crazy.

MH: Yeah, that is.

TS: So we appreciate those countries listening to us. So shout-out to all of them.

MH: Yeah, absolutely.

TS: Slovakia making us #1.

MH: It's remarkable.

TS: We appreciate everybody out there listening to us. So that's pretty cool.

MH: Yeah, absolutely.

TS: Alright, Mike, again, from your #1 podcast in Slovakia, thanks again for listening to the Naked Bible...

MH: Right.

TS: [laughs] And for everybody out there listening to the Naked Bible Podcast, God bless.