

Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 358

Q&A 43

January 9, 2021

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)

Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)

Episode Summary

Dr. Heiser answers your questions:

- Is Christus Victor or Satisfaction theology more in line with what the early Church thought? [Time Stamp 9:15]
- When Jesus' feet were anointed and wiped with a woman's hair, how does that relate to the idea that a woman's hair was thought of as a sexual organ? [12:45]
- What are your definitions of the beatitudes? [16:20]
- Is the word "beloved" in Hebrew related to the name "Mohammed" in Arabic, and is the prophet in John 1:21 related to Mohammed? [26:15]
- Does the parable of the tenants in Mark 12 have a connection to Psalm 82? [33:00]

Transcript

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 358: Our 43rd Q&A. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey, Mike! What's going on?

MH: 2021 is here, Trey.

TS: Yeah. Hopefully it's...

MH: What can we say? On the calendar, we're just a few days shy now of it being a year since we moved [to Florida]. So on the one hand, it's gone by pretty quickly, but it's just... Man, I'm glad to have 2020 in the rearview mirror, for all sorts of reasons, obviously.

TS: Yeah. Not only that (one year from y'all moving), but it's been six years, Mike, for the podcast. How crazy is that?

MH: That *is* pretty crazy.

TS: Six years, that's over half a decade.

MH: Gosh. Right, that *is* over a half a decade. I saw what you did there. [laughs]

TS: I don't know how I feel. We're getting old.

MH: I sense some math that didn't... Yeah. So you're going to relate it to our age, okay. Well. That's fair.

TS: I don't know how I feel about this. It's just... Six years is a big number.

MH: Well, you could look at it... I mean, we're going into the seventh year, so what should we do with that? Is that like the number of perfection and completion, or is it like the seven-year tribulation? [laughs] What do we do with that?

TS: I don't know. We *are* in Revelation. Maybe we should go that way with it.

MH: You see, now, you threw me a softball there. Because it's like, yeah, we're in the book of Revelation. And you will not find in the book of Revelation (just like you won't find anywhere else in the New Testament) the number seven in the same verse as "tribulation."

TS: What? Conspiracy!

MH: You know, I mean, it's just one of those things. [laughs] We can tweak prophecy systems. Everyone assuming the 70th week of Daniel is the tribulation, even though no verse actually says that. I mean, it could be right. But it could also be quite wrong.

TS: Yeah.

MH: So thanks for that softball, Trey. [laughs]

TS: Speaking of conspiracies, I forgot to ask you, but last month, did you hear about that former Israeli space security chief talking about aliens?

MH: Yeah, yeah, I did.

TS: What are your thoughts on that?

MH: Do you want my cynical thoughts or my more serious thoughts?

TS: I want both.

MH: Okay. Well, my cynical thought is, he's old, he has a book to sell, and probably needs money to put his grandkids through college. My more serious thought is, if he is of sound mind, I'm betting that he has run across data and maybe anecdotes within government documents and stuff, kind of like Gary

McKinnon found (he's the UK hacker that hacked into the Pentagon years ago) for proof of something going on in space, like a secret space program. That's my guess. In other words, he's misinterpreting the data that he has access to, and he's assuming that it's about aliens when it's actually not. This is the bucket I file in these STS videos and space station videos of things flying around in Earth's upper atmosphere that shouldn't be there. I think we've been in space for a long time. And I'm not talking about NASA. I'm talking about the military industrial complex. I can't get the Wernher von Braun quote out of my head when I see stuff like this. I don't even know... Here we are on the Naked Bible Podcast talking about UFO stuff. But von Braun of course...

TS: After six years, we've earned the right.

MH: Yeah, we've earned the right. You know, von Braun came over here in Operation Paperclip. He was an SS officer—a Nazi—and head of the U.S. rocketry program, host of Walt Disney's *World of Tomorrow*. I remember seeing him on TV as a kid. He was the #3 person at NASA and he was in the SS! You know? But toward the end of his life, supposedly von Braun became a Christian. There are these stories. But his personal secretary toward the end of his life was a woman named Carol Rosin, who's still alive. And there was sort of a deathbed confession on von Braun's part. He told her that, "Basically, here's what's going to happen. Here's the plan. First it was the Russians justifying military build-up." (Think of the Cold War here.) "Next it's going to be asteroids and meteors. We need to have certain exotic weapons to fix that problem. And then it's going to be the climate—the environment. And last of all, it's going to be aliens." And his famous quote is, "It's all a lie."

5:00

Now Carol Rosen believes that when von Braun said that, he meant to say that it's a lie that the aliens are bad guys. "They're good guys and we shouldn't be shooting at them." But I think what von Braun meant is the *whole thing*. These are all cover justifications to weaponize space—a new Cold War in space. That's what I think is going on. And that's what I think the Israeli guy has stumbled onto or knows about and is misinterpreting it as aliens.

So that's my take on it. I'm really not impressed with any of the Tic Tac, To The Stars Academy stuff. I mean, there are still real journalists alive (I know that's hard to believe in this day and age)—people who actually do investigate claims that people make. And if people are interested, they can just google Tyler Rogoway. And he blogs and writes for a place called the War Zone. Just put his name into a search engine with "Tic Tac," "UFOs," "TTSA," "AATIP," and you're going to find some really interesting stuff. You're going to find patents on both our part and the Chinese for things that look awfully like the Tic Tac, and lots of other coincidental elements that may or may not be the real story behind all of this. But at least somebody's looking. At least somebody's asking the questions that need to be asked and isn't just buying the party line. So there are still a few people out

there like that. You know? Again, that's my take on it. How that winds up on the Naked Bible Podcast I don't know. But...

TS: That's alright. Everybody knows we're into paranormal. So it's all good. Did you see the new UFO documentary that's...

MH: No, no. Nothing's ringing a bell here.

TS: Okay. Well, it just came out.

MH: The first thing I will look at, though, is who produced it and who paid for it.

TS: I think Jacques Vallée is on it, too. Um...

MH: That used to be a good thing, but not so much anymore. [laughs]

TS: Yeah. [searching internet] Well, I can't find it.

MH: If they're doing Vallée, then basically it's, "We've made this movie to (I guess) make money, but we're not going to really discuss anything new, because all this stuff's been in print for, like, 30 years."

TS: Well, Mike, why don't we turn our attention to the Bible.

MH: To what we're supposed to be doing? [laughs]

TS: Right.

MH: See, I know tactically what you're doing is, you're trying to make people *thankful* that we're not talking about Fantasy Football. And it may have worked. So we can, like, do what we're supposed to do now. And maybe people will go, "Well, UFOs was better than that Fantasy Football stuff."

TS: Well, that's sure. That is true. But unfortunately, the *real* reason why we don't talk about Fantasy Football, Mike, is because we didn't do good. We both missed the play-offs.

MH: Yeah, neither of us made the play-offs.

TS: Right. So that's why we don't talk about it. It's because... I missed the play-offs by, like, two points, twice. I'm so upset. I don't want to get into it. I'm trying to forget about it, Mike. [MH laughs] So let's just move on to our questions.

MH: Yeah. I... I hear ya. I hear you. I hear you.

TS: It's not a good subject right now, Mike. It still hurts. Still stings a little bit. [MH laughs] Alright, well, why don't we get into your questions here.

MH: I feel your pain.

TS: Yeah. I know. We've got six of them here from some good people. The first one, Mike, is going to be from Mike from Boston, whom we've met. I remember going up there. Remember, six years ago? The SBL conference? And we did a live meet-up. And Mike was there.

MH: Yep.

TS: That was fun. A long time ago. Alright, Mike's question is:

9:15

Does Mike believe that the material he covers in *Unseen Realm* and *Reversing Hermon* give more credence or viability for the Christus Victor theology stance versus the Satisfaction theology stance? Which view in his opinion stays more in line with his understanding of the Second Temple Jewish era thinking of the early Church. If none, why?

MH: You know, the last part of that. The Second Temple Jewish thinking and early Church thinking are largely disparate. I mean, they do have some overlaps. Your Venn diagram does occur there. But if you're looking at both of those things, there is no "yes" answer to that. So which is more in line? Because they both thought different things so you have to pick one. Or at least one is closer than the other. But more broadly, I'm not actually sure precisely what this question is about. It sounds like it's about the views of the atonement. Christus Victor theology, depending on what you're talking about... is that the Ransom Theory? Is it something bigger than just the atonement? I don't know. I can't tell by virtue of the question. Satisfaction theology, does that refer to penal substitution atonement view? Again, I don't know. So basically, I just need more detail for the question.

But for the sake of the episode, I'm going to assume that this is about atonement. So it looks to me like this is a question that gets into the same old debate about atonement views. I see *all* views of the atonement as contributing something to understanding the atonement. I feel no compulsion at all to pick one. It's just, like, "Why do I have to pick a view of the atonement when it's so multi-faceted?" It's like forcing me to pick *one* view of eschatology. It just makes no sense to pick one view. Typically, though, people want to land on a view of atonement that isn't penal substitution. (Again, I'm presuming Satisfaction is pointing to penal substitution.) And they do that, frankly, to just avoid penal substitution, because they have bought into the rhetoric (I think) of not just militant atheism, but maybe they just feel icky that it's like human sacrifice. Okay? That is terribly wrong-headed. It's just terribly wrong-headed to look at it that way. But anyway, I'm operating on a series of assumptions here. This might be the furthest thing from the point of the question.

Now I don't feel any need to avoid penal substitution. Substitution really can't be divorced from the atonement, but that isn't the *only way* to think about the atonement. I mean, all the other views contribute something. So if you're interested in this, and I am hitting the mark here (again, I'm just guessing here about atonement), I would recommend reading the short (it's actually really short, it's like 100 pages) but really good book by Simon Gathercole defending penal substitution. It's excellent. Gathercole is a seasoned New Testament scholar. Again, he's not going to argue that this is the only way to see things. But it is quite wrong to say that the atonement can and should be understood without penal substitution as an element.

TS: Dorn wants to know about...

12:45

How might what Mary of Bethany in John 12:1-7 and the sinner woman in Luke 7:36-50 did with their hair relate to the idea in 1 Corinthians 11, that a woman's hair is essentially genitalia or a sexual organ?

MH: Yeah. For listeners to whom this sounds utterly bizarre... I'm trying to remember the episode number now. But if you go to Google and put in "NakedBiblePodcast.com" and put in "head covering," you're going to find an episode we did on 1 Corinthians 11 with the head covering. That's the broader context for this question.

15:00

Now getting to the question, I don't think these passages have anything to do with the idea that I talked about in 1 Corinthians 11. I also don't think the Gospel writers would have had that idea in view in these passages at all. And the reason is simple. In 1 Corinthians 11, Paul is writing to Gentiles and is referencing Greco-Roman medical texts. In Greco-Roman medical texts... (Again, if people go back and listen to that episode on 1 Corinthians 11... And I do recommend not having kids around when you listen to that.) In Greco-Roman medical texts, a woman's hair was viewed as an element of the fecundity process. The longer your hair was, the more able—the more apt—you are to get pregnant, because they believed that the long hair drew the semen up into the woman's womb and then the results ensued—she'd get pregnant. People like Hippocrates, which is a name we're familiar with even today, they wrote about this. This was their view. And so I think Paul is referencing... And the point of the episode is that some of the vocabulary in 1 Corinthians 11 can be looked at this way. I think what Paul is doing there to a Gentile audience is drawing on Greco-Roman medical texts and throwing that into the mix about his discussion of the *parabolan* (the head covering). And the point of what he's doing is modesty. And there's this line about, "Because of the angels," and we talk about how that hearkens back to the Watchers story and the sexual transgression. "Don't flaunt your sexuality. Be modest. Be loyal to your husband." This is what Paul's getting at. And this is a vehicle by which to have that discussion.

I don't think any of that is in view in these Gospel passages, because they're not writing to Gentiles. This isn't the Jewish view. This is the Greco-Roman medical text view—a view common among pagans, if you will. But Greco-Roman stuff. Now, I think Paul, having read that stuff and being familiar with it, Paul seems to have adopted the same thinking. But there's no vocabulary or there are no other clues in these other Gospel passages that Jesus is, for instance, being solicited. It's very evident in the context that he's not. They're repentant (whoever these women are). And so on and so forth. There's nothing like this going on in those passages. The context of 1 Corinthians 11, especially to the Corinthian church (which had just about every problem of sexual immorality that you can think of) is quite different than the Gospel passages. So I don't think there's any contextual or textual reason to look at these Gospel passages in the way we would look at 1 Corinthians 11.

TS: Tom says:

16:20

I've read a lot of commentary on the beatitudes and I wonder what your definitions of them are.

MH: I'm a little thrown off by the wording here. I don't know what is meant by "definition." *Beatitude* is a modern label that extends from the phrase "blessed is" or "blessed are." So it really doesn't have or need a definition. A beatitude is a saying that emerges from these passages of the Gospels where Jesus says, "Blessed is," "Blessed are." I mean, that's uncontroversial. It just sort of is what it is.

However, if the question is what they mean, like, "What's the point of the beatitudes?" that would take a few episodes on the podcast to go through. So it's not something you can really address in a Q&A. I would say generally, though, the beatitudes represent (and I'm getting this line from R.T. France, I believe) the paradoxical values of the kingdom of God. That's kind of a good phrase that sticks in the head. Basically, a citizen of the kingdom of God is going to look at life *this way*, and it's going to run quite contrary to expectations of people who are *not* citizens of the kingdom of God. Now I'm going to open up France and his commentary. This is my favorite Matthew commentary (R.T. France's commentary). It's not that I agree with him on everything. I would disagree with him on certain things that we don't need to rabbit trail on here. But I really like the commentary. But to illustrate the point that if you're talking about the meaning, it's pretty complicated, and it would take a few episodes to unpack this. So France writes:

These eight statements...

And he has a footnote about “some people say there are nine; some people say there’s...” Whatever.

These eight statements are clearly designed as a coherent group. The epigrammatic form of the eight pronouncements, “Happy [MH: or “blessed” in most translations] are those who...”

It’s a quality in the present tense. Happy are those who are doing whatever.

... for it is they who...

And then there’s a future verb—“who will.” There will be a result. So happy are those who are presently in this state or situation or mindset, and then there’s something out in the future. He says:

That programmatic form is repeated each time in the beatitudes with only very minor variation. The first and the last of the group both have the same second clause.

So if you list the eight, the first one and the eighth one have the same second clause, which says, “For it is to them that the kingdom of heaven belongs.” And France says:

This forms a framework which sets the tone for the promises which come in between.

So the context for the beatitudes is very obviously kingdom living, if you just want to put it that way. But you can see, even from that, that... “Well, what does that mean?” And you have to keep the “already, but not yet” thing in your mind here. That never goes away, by the way. It’s just one of the fundamental points—the fundamental mindsets or things to keep in mind—as you read the Bible to understand a thing. So I’m going to read a little bit more from France. Because he gets into some background information. Again, I’m just trying to illustrate why this is complicated. Old Testament background to Matthew’s Beatitudes. France writes:

20:00

Not only is the beatitude form familiar from the Old Testament...

Which is a question nobody ever asks. “Hey, does this sound like something in the Old Testament?” On this podcast, that’s what you’re looking for.

Not only is the beatitude form familiar from the Old Testament, especially the Psalms, but the content of these beatitudes also echos familiar Old Testament passages and themes. Isaiah 61:1-3 tells of good news to the poor. Note that in Matthew, “good news” has already been defined in terms of the kingdom of

heaven in Matthew 4:23. So Isaiah 61:1-3 tells of good news to the poor and of the comforting of those who mourn (Isaiah 61:4). Verse 5 reproduces the LXX wording of Psalm 37:11. Verse 8 reflects the pure in heart [MH: he's in the beatitudes now] who seek the face of God in Psalm 24:3-6. More generally, the qualities commended echo closely the character of the righteous or the meek or the poor. Those terms get used interchangeably. These people (the meek or the poor) feature so largely in the Psalms and elsewhere as the true people of God whom he will ultimately vindicate against the proud and the wicked who oppress them.

Now let me just break in here. The idea isn't, "If you don't have money, you're destined for heaven." The idea of the poor and the oppressed and the poverty stricken in Scripture is largely due to, "They have been done wrong by wicked leadership—wicked governance—and ultimately the gods who govern the nations, or the evil shepherds of Israel. So when you have unrighteousness done to you, God is on your side, because he doesn't like when unrighteousness is done to people. It's not that the gospel all of the sudden becomes, "Hey, if you're poor, you're saved." No, that isn't the point at all. The point is that if you (by virtue of something done to you unjustly) are in hardship or being oppressed, God sees that and he is on your side of that whole question. And this is basically a character assessment. It's not about salvation or something like that. Anyway, back to France. He says:

In other beatitudes, while there may not be such direct verbal echos, the teaching reflects that of the Old Testament, especially the Psalms. "For those who hunger and thirst for righteousness" look to Psalm 42:1-2, Isaiah 55:1-2. For the reciprocal principle of mercy to the merciful look at Psalm 18:25-26. For the peacemakers, there's Psalm 34:14. However paradoxical these blessings may seem to those who view things from the world's point of view, the divine perspective of the kingdom of heaven has been well-prepared for "already" in the psalmists accounts of the qualities and experience of the true people of God. Note also the comparable descriptions of those who may approach God's Holy Hill in Psalm 15 and Psalm 24:3-6.

So basically, what he's saying is, the beatitudes have a lot of very clear Old Testament contexts and antecedents. France also elsewhere in his commentary talks about the eschatological character of the promises. So we just talked about the "already." Now what about the "not yet"? Eschatology here a little bit. He writes:

A distinctive feature of the beatitudes and of those of Luke 6:20-22 is that they not only list the qualities commended but they also explain that commendation by a promise appropriate to each quality. The second half of each line is as important as, and indeed is the basis for, the first. All but the first and the last are

expressed as promises for the future. And the question is often raised whether that future is envisaged as fulfilled within the earthly sphere or whether it looks to compensation beyond this life. The third beatitude, with its echo of Psalm 37:11 raises the issue particularly acutely: “inherit the earth” [MH: or perhaps the land]. It sounds more concrete than a purely heavenly reward.

Let me just break in here. Yeah, unless we’re talking about the new Eden. Then it’s both. Okay? Back to France:

25:00

So are these beatitudes speaking of benefits now in this age and not only in the age to come? That is the language Jesus uses in Mark 10:30, but we shall note that Matthew 19:20-29 avoid such an explicit dichotomy. It is worded in such a way that it can be read as only speaking of heavenly reward [MH: so you’re going to get both]. On the other hand, the present tense used in verses 3b and 10b (“it is to them that the kingdom of heaven belongs”) warns against a purely futuristic interpretation and suggests that the simple dichotomy between “now” and “then” may miss the breadth of Matthew’s conception of the blessings of the kingdom of heaven. The kingdom of heaven has already arrived for Matthew (Mt 4:17), and so these are people who are already under God’s beneficent rule. The advantages of being God’s people can then be expected to accrue already in this life, even though the full consummation of their blessedness remains for the future. The tension between “now” and “not yet,” so familiar from much of the New Testament [MH: thank you, Dr. France], may appropriately be seen as running also through the promises of Matthew 5:3-10.

Again, this would make a good miniseries (the beatitudes). But as far as what they mean, there’s no way to adequately even get into any of that in a Q&A. It requires a lengthy treatment. So if that’s the intent of the question, you’ll just have to wait until we get into these at some future point.

TS: Our next question is from Asha. And she actually had a friend who is Muslim bring up these two questions. And the first one is:

26:15

1) He believes that Mohammed is prophesied in Song of Songs. He said that the word “beloved” in Hebrew is “Mohammed.” He said the Christians are saying that these are different words. However, her question is, are the two words (“Mohammed” in Arabic and “beloved” in Hebrew) related linguistically?

2) And second, she also said her friend asked her who is the prophet in John 1:21. He’s implying that it is Mohammed.

MH: Yeah. Well, just like there’s Christian Middle Earth (where there’s all sorts of wacky stuff said about the Bible), there is Islamic Middle Earth, too, where you

get wacky stuff either said about the Koran or in an apologetic appeal with respect to Islam. I hate to put it this way, but I'm just going to be blunt. This is nonsense.

First, Arabic as a written language dates to a period well after the composition of the Song of Solomon or the Old Testament just generally. What used to be spoken and written was something that scholars call South Arabian. And South Arabian was contemporary with the biblical period, but classical Arabic (as in the Koran) dates to the Common Era (A.D. or C.E.). The earliest argument (and this is sort of an extreme view of people within the linguistic inquiry) is that classical Arabic is as old as 100 B.C., which is still much later than the Old Testament—centuries later. Let's recall when the Koran was written—the 500s A.D., you know? So classical Arabic existed when the Koran comes along, but it had not existed for very long. It's a literary language. Again, there's no one-to-one correspondence here.

There's also a semantic problem, though. So you have a language history problem and you have a semantic problem. The Hebrew for "beloved" (and all you have to do is look at this in a concordance or with software or whatever) in these passages is *dod*. The literary Arabic equivalent would be *daad*, which means "foster father" or "play," as in making a joke. So no, it doesn't share the same meaning. And it certainly doesn't mean "Mohammed." And I doubt Asha's Islamic friend would want to say that Mohammed was a joke or someone to be trifled with or at.

So you have a history problem in the language, you have a semantic problem. When it comes to John 1:21 (we might as well just read that)...

¹⁹ And this is the testimony of John [MH: this is John the Baptist], when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, "Who are you?" ²⁰ He confessed, and did not deny, but confessed, "I am not the Christ." ²¹ And they asked him, "What then? Are you Elijah?" He said, "I am not." "Are you the Prophet?" And he answered, "No."

30:00

So the question is, "Who is the prophet here?" And Asha suspects her friend is angling that this prophet is Mohammed. Well, wouldn't that make the question utter nonsense? Because if John is writing 500 years before Mohammed is born, how would it refer to Mohammed? So that's one problem. It's also not worded as any prophecy. But it is tied into an Old Testament prophecy. And so maybe Asha's friend knows that there's prophecy in the picture here. And it hearkens back to Deuteronomy 18:15. And this is the passage "a prophet like unto Moses." I'm going to quote verses 15-18, because there's something in here that obviously is going to divorce this from Mohammed. [laughs] This is Moses speaking to the people:

¹⁵ “The LORD your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your brothers—it is to him you shall listen— ¹⁶ just as you desired of the LORD your God at Horeb on the day of the assembly, when you said, ‘Let me not hear again the voice of the LORD my God or see this great fire any more, lest I die.’ ¹⁷ And the LORD said to me, ‘They are right in what they have spoken. ¹⁸ I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brothers. And I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I command him.

What’s the significance of “the prophet that God will raise up from among their brothers?” This is spoken at Sinai. He’s a Jew! The prophet that Deuteronomy looks forward to is a Jew. So that kind of rules Mohammed out. [laughs] There are no Muslims in the Old Testament, obviously, because Mohammed isn’t born until centuries after the close of the Old Testament period. And it’s also centuries after the New Testament period as well.

Now immediately, of course, we know that Deuteronomy 18 is fulfilled with Joshua. “Joshua. Yeshua. Hmm, where have I heard that? Oh, yeah.” You know, this is the name, of course, of Jesus—*Jesus* in the New Testament and *Jesus* in the Septuagint. And those two things are designed to align with each other, both historically literarily, and just to ring in the ear of anybody who’s going to hear this, especially when Jesus starts preaching and it becomes known who this guy is. This has nothing to do with Mohammed. It’s centuries irreconcilable. Mohammed wasn’t a Jew. He’s not from the tribes of Israel. I mean, it’s utter nonsense. It makes no sense at all. So, “No.” [laughs] Like I said, there’s also Islamic Middle Earth along with Christian Middle Earth and just secular Middle Earth. *Lots* of crazy stuff on the internet that you’ll run into that you can just safely ignore and disregard.

TS: Our last question here is from Josh. And his question is:

33:00

The parable of the tenants in Mark 12 is directed at the Jewish ruling class. But I’m wondering if there is also a connection to Psalm 82 and the corrupt elohim over the nations. Thematically, the parable seems to connect corrupt lesser rulers who refuse to recognize the highest ruler and are judged.

MH: Yeah, I don’t believe this has any clear connection to Psalm 82 or the Deuteronomy 32 worldview. And there’s sort of an obvious reason for this. But before I get to that... If you look at the passage, there’s no shared vocabulary between this passage (Mark 12—I’m talking about the Septuagint here), and the relevant Old Testament passages for Psalm 82 or Deuteronomy 32. For example, words like “vineyard”—the Greek words behind “vineyard” and

“tenants.” They don’t pop up in passages relevant to the Deuteronomy 32 worldview.

But the biggest problem is that the lesser rulers of Mark 12 are not Gentile powers or obviously the cosmic powers over Gentile nations. It’s very clear that he’s talking to the Jewish leadership. So that alone sort of disqualifies it. It’s a significant disconnection. Plus you don’t have anything else to go on.

Now on the other hand, yeah, thematically, this is about judging leadership. But again, it’s leadership over God’s people (i.e., Israel) in the Gospel context. It’s not leadership over the nations. But it’s still judging corrupt leadership. So there’s a conceptual analogy there between what Psalm 82 and what Mark 12 is talking about. But there’s no textual or theological or even contextual relationship between the two. Because the Deuteronomy 32 worldview is about the earthly and cosmic powers of the nations, and this is about Jewish leadership here.

35:00

TS: Alright, Mike. That’s it for this week. That’s all the questions we have for this episode. We appreciate you answering our questions and everybody sending your questions. Again, you can send those to TreyStricklin@gmail.com. And we appreciate it. And with that, I want to thank everybody for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God Bless.