

Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 400

Revelation Q&A, Part 1

November 20, 2021

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)

Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)

Episode Summary

Dr. Heiser answers your questions about Revelation:

- What might our lives and vocations be like on the new earth? [9:25]
- Should Leviathan and Behemoth be grouped together, and how do those relate to *Zīz šāday*? [14:05]
- Did John have access to OT scrolls on Patmos? [19:00]
- How can a person exist in eternity if they have not been bestowed with eternal life? [29:00]
- What do you think of Beale's position that Satan's binding is specifically limited to the way God's plan of salvation won't be stopped? [33:00]
- Does Paul's statement that we are to judge angels in 1 Corinthians 6:2 have a connection to Revelation, Deuteronomy 32, and Psalm 82? [38:40]
- Could John have had the Aramaic Song of the Lamb Targum in mind when he wrote Revelation 15? [42:10]
- Can you see a reference to Messiah ben Joseph in Revelation 12? [46:15]
- Which of the beasts (land or sea) is cast into the Lake of Fire, and is the other the False Prophet? [51:40]
- Is there any relation to the mark of the beast in Revelation and reference to the hands and forehead in Deuteronomy 6:8? [55:10]

Transcript

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 400! I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Mike, we made it! Four hundred! Congratulations!

MH: Yeah, congratulations. I think that the thing that we can say is, "We both made it! We're both still alive!" [laughs]

TS: Yeah. We're here! We made it. It was touch and go there, but we made it to the big 4-0-0. I can't believe it. Seven years' worth. Four hundred episodes. I mean, that's easily over 400-something hours of content. So that's...

MH: Yeah. Oh, yeah.

TS: That's a lot of stuff.

MH: Yeah, I'll remember that the next time somebody complains about me selling a book somewhere. [laughs] Like I don't give anything away for free, you know.

TS: Boy, that's the truth.

MH: "Okay. Well, there's this book, or, like 400 hours of podcasting."

TS: Boy, I'm jeally. I'm jeally of all the people who just now discover... And I get emails every now and then where some people have binged the *entire* 400 episodes in one year.

MH: Yeah, I've been told that, too. That's just crazy. You might need therapy if that's you. But I don't know, before or after. Maybe both.

TS: Well, you know, when we first started this, Mike, there just wasn't enough content by you out there. So I am thrilled to death that I have personally accomplished my goal, which was just to get your content out there—just anything. Because man, I knew you had to do more. And here we are, seven years later, 400 hours plus. I mean, I feel like we've accomplished our goal.

MH: Yeah, and we've done all the things that the Bible study public has been crying out for, like Leviticus. You know? [laughs]

TS: Obadiah.

MH: Obadiah. [laughs] All the greatest hits of the podcast.

TS: Hey, there's not too many places you can go and get content on those books. And especially by you. You know, people are interested in you. I mean, you're the Old Testament scholar expert here, so, you know, we value your thoughts. So having an audio commentary, basically, is just invaluable.

MH: Yeah. I can remember sitting down... Well, I can remember being at work when somebody proposed the idea to me of having a podcast. And of course, then they had to tell me what a podcast was. You know, this was at Logos years... It probably would have been eight or nine years ago. And then when I found out I thought, "Why would I ever do that?" You know? [laughs] "Why would anybody want a podcast on biblical studies?" But then the logic kind of dawned on me. And I was already getting complaints from customers, people, email... People weren't getting fed. There was just a content dearth. And so I thought, "Well, I guess that does make a little sense. And I remember sitting there trying to come up with a name. And "Naked Bible" popped into my head. And I thought,

“Well, that’s probably going to be offensive to some people. But that’s good.”
[laughs]

TS: Yeah, I love it!

MH: Some people need to be offended, I guess. [laughs]

TS: Absolutely.

MH: But then we tried it. And I originally tried to script everything and it just... I didn’t have the time for it. It was just too much. Plus, I was the one that was sort of trying to fake my way through editing it. And then after 30-some episodes, I just quit. I couldn’t do it. And then you called me up one day and told me I was stupid for quitting. [laughs]

TS: [laughs] I didn’t say that!

MH: It was pretty much that simple, you know? [laughs]

TS: No, I certainly didn’t say that. But you know, it was...

MH: No, you were pretty close. “This is a terrible decision,” or whatever you said. [laughs]

TS: No, I didn’t say that. Come on, now. You’re going to get these listeners on my back. No, absolutely not. But I did feel like, by me doing the heavy lifting, that would free you up to do what you do well, and...

MH: Yeah, we even have transcripts. I remember when you proposed the transcript idea, it was, like, “How in the world are we going to do that?!” You know.

TS: Yeah.

5:00

MH: So yeah, we started out the mechanical way, and then we got humans. [TS laughs] So the humans are superior. Let’s just put it that way.

TS: Absolutely. A huge thank you, Brenda, who does our transcripts, and Becky. Brenda’s been with us for five years now. So thank you for that, and we appreciate the hard work that they do for the transcripts.

MH: We may let her out of the house at some point this year... [laughs]

TS: Maybe. Maybe. We’re not quite done. You know, we’re not stopping at 400. So we’re going to keep going. We’re going to get to 500, Mike. Plus.

MH: Yeah? Well, Lord willing, we will. That's the plan, anyway.

TS: That'll be year nine—that's another two years—for us to get to 500.

MH: Gosh.

TS: These are such huge milestones. I'm so sad that we didn't... You know, we originally planned to have our 400th episode celebration at our conference on October 30th, but obviously that didn't pan out. But hopefully, Lord willing, we'll have a conference next year.

MH: We can plan on it. I mean, that's the goal. Certainly.

TS: Cross your fingers. We're going to try.

MH: It would be nice to be able to do it.

TS: Absolutely. I guess, Mike... I reached out on Facebook, at least. And we've got several people here who have commented. So over the next... We probably plan to have maybe four parts here on our Revelation Q&A. We appreciate everybody that sent in their questions. We got a *lot* of questions. I don't think we're going to be able to get to *all* of them. But Mike has certainly gone through them and picked the best ones. So we've got probably four episodes' worth, which is great. And in between those questions, Mike, I'm going to sprinkle in some of these comments from people congratulating us on our 400th. And I mean, again, let's just get into it, if you're ready to...

MH: Yeah, let's do it.

TS: Our first comment is from Michael. And he says:

I feel so blessed to have found Dr. Heiser and the podcast. His insights have really opened up my study of the Bible and helped clear up some things that had always bugged me.

So thank you, Michael. And then Kevin says:

Thank you, gentlemen! I hope an adoption of your approach to the Word happens quickly within the Church, helping sharpen our understanding of it. I pray the Divine Council worldview is exposed and refined and soon finds a proper place with believers everywhere. God bless you both. Shalom, shalom.

So thanks, Kevin. Those are two good comments, Mike.

MH: Yeah.

TS: We appreciate that. That's what makes it worthwhile, is our audience, that's for sure.

MH: Yeah. It's the goal. I mean, exposure... People who have been listening a long time know that we're not... You know, the reason we called it "Naked Bible" was we're just trying to do biblical studies—biblical theology—without filtering anything through creeds or denominational preferences. So we don't shoot at any denominations here, and we don't endorse any either. It's just, we're going to set that aside and just try to focus on the text. And that has broad appeal to people throughout all the traditions that you could think of, within the Church—the believing Church. So you know, I think that alone struck a nerve, that we're not here to defend turf in that respect, and just try to focus on the text. "What can the text sustain?" is always the question. Not, "How do I defend this pet perspective by some denomination?" That's never the question. The question is always, "What can the text sustain?" So yeah, just those two comments I think capture what we're trying to both do and what we like to see.

TS: Yeah, and Mike, people were commenting on our last episode (the Revelation 21-22, Part 2). They could hear the pug snoring in the background. [MH laughs] So I just want to make sure that people know it's not me. Because people are like, "I think Trey is sleeping."

MH: Yeah, it's the pugs. Norman is not here. He was on my lap, and he snores. Mori doesn't make any noise at all, but Norman is notorious for that. It's better than him barking.

TS: Yeah. Trust me, I've had to remove a lot of snoring. So if you hear some snoring, just know it's not me. [MH laughs] I don't want to get blamed for it. [laughs] Alright. Well, here we start our journey on a four-part Revelation Q&A. And Patti has our first question. She says:

9:25

I'm very curious as to what we will actually be doing in the new earth besides worshipping Jesus the King and fellowshiping with one another. Other than what Revelation 21 and 22 tells us, and based on your study and knowledge of scripture how do you envision what life and vocation might look like in the new Jerusalem and new earth in daily practical living? In what ways will it differ from God's original plan and mandate for mankind in Genesis?

Jesus said there is no marriage. There would be no need for procreation to fill and subdue the earth. What would the vocation of a kingdom of priests even look like with Jesus in our midst?

10:00

MH: Yeah, I think the short answer to this is we're going to do whatever we want to. [laughs] Um, you know, we'll be doing everything Adam and Eve would've

been doing in Eden, except again, there's no need to go outside of Eden and fill the earth and all that. It'll already be populated. But I'm talking about in terms of both enjoying and caring for creation. You know, just enjoying it for what it is, what it was intended to be. And yeah, our relationships with fellow imagers, it transcends fellowship like we experience today. We won't have all of the things, both in terms of our personality and things that we have to think about. But we talk to other people in terms of people having their own agendas and their own personality flaws or things that we don't want people to know. You know, fellowship today is marred by the condition that we're in, just living in a fallen world. We won't have that either, so even that's going to be better.

But I think for sure it's not a worship service. I think it's life in the fullest. That's why I say we're going to be doing whatever we want. You know, Jesus is present. We don't have the confinement of our traditional embodiment. I think that'll be one of the biggest new things. We're going to have bodies like Jesus did with its properties and capabilities, which I think from the Gospels means that we can be anywhere we want at any given point. We don't have physical barriers, like we do in the embodiment we experience now. We also don't have the threat of anything that is anti-Eden. There is no disease. There is no evil. There's nothing like that. There's nothing to inhibit our enjoyment of the Lord and the world that he's made. You know, we aren't omniscient. Let's remember this, too. Just because we're glorified doesn't mean... The Trinity doesn't expand when believers are glorified. Okay? We're never going to *be* God. Okay? But we *are* glorified. We are made like Christ, as much as that's possible without being a member of the Trinity. So we aren't omniscient, so there's plenty to do. There's plenty to explore. There's plenty to know. There's plenty to enjoy. So there's that aspect. We aren't lording it over each other. We need to think of life in Eden and shared rulership of the new earth under Jesus as partnership with him and with each other. We all have equal status. The fallen gods are judged and removed. We *own* the new earth. It's ours. So we can do what we want to in it and with it and enjoy it.

TS: I hope there's Playstation in heaven, Mike. Because...

MH: [laughs] You might be part of Playstation.

TS: Or football. I hope there's football. Because I still kind of want to play Fantasy in heaven.

MH: God forbid we wouldn't have Fantasy Football, right? [laughs]

TS: [laughs] Alright...

MH: Jesus is doing the facepalm right now as we speak.

TS: I draft Jesus as my quarterback. How does that work? [MH laughs] And he plays for the Cowboys, Mike. I'm sorry. Not the Packers.

MH: Gosh.

TS: [laughs] Alright. Bryan has a comment for us. He says:

You brought me a much healthier, correct understanding of the Bible when I needed it most. God bless you.

Thanks, Bryan. And then Toby says... This is a good one. This is what I was talking about earlier:

Started listening to the podcast from Episode 1 at the beginning of this year. I've been blessed by 400 episodes of biblical theology content and dot-connecting, and my worldview will never be the same again for the better. Thank you for your work in illustrating the cosmic plan of God in Christ according to the Scriptures and our role in it.

Four hundred, that's a lot of listening, Mike.

MH: Yep. You're welcome. The others, I would say the same thing. You're welcome. And thanks for listening.

TS: Absolutely. Seth has our second question:

14:05

My Revelation question may be a little bit out there, but it has to do with the chaos beasts, Leviathan and Behemoth, being served for dinner during the marriage supper of the lamb. First, am I understanding this correctly by grouping those two together with the supper, rather than just the Leviathan? Second, if Leviathan is of the waters, and the Behemoth is of the land, does the Ziz sādāy of the sky in Psalms 50:11 and Psalms 80:13-14, as well as Jewish mythology, have any relation to the supper and those beasts?

The NET bible suggests that Ziz sādāy could refer to locusts or insects, but I've been curious how, or if, the Ziz has further context in the Bible.

15:00

MH: Yeah, I mean, the two do relate together. One is the sea chaos beast; one is the land chaos beast. And there's two to telegraph the idea of totality, that the world in which we live—the fallen world, the anti-Eden world that we now inhabit—doesn't have sort of an unpolluted zone. I mean, it covers both land and sea. Everything is a threat and not quite what God would want it to be, whether it's land or sea. So that's why there are two images, and they can be taken

together. When chaos is overcome, when it's metaphorically devoured in association with the marriage supper of the Lamb, it's a complete reversal. So yes, they're both taken together.

As far as the *Zīz šāday*, I know of no commentator or reference source (something like the *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*) that takes *Zīz* and *šāday* or *shaddai* (it depends what dialect you're going to be referring to there)... I don't know of any commentator or reference source that takes either *Zīz* or the phrase as supernatural cosmic creature names, unlike Leviathan and Rahab, which you get plenty of references to that. Generally, the term refers to animals in the wild, whether they're flying creatures or land creatures. So just wild animals, things that are not domesticated. If you look this up in a lexicon like HALOT (the *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*), which the four-volume... (I think it's four-volume. I'm so used to having things in digital, I forget how many volumes there are.) But the one from Brill that's the industry standard, there's a homograph issue here as well. Again, homographs are words that are different but they are spelled exactly the same way. So *Zīz* has a homograph. There are two *Zīz* words in the Hebrew Bible. One does refer to a cricket (a tree cricket) or a locust. It can also refer to small creatures, like bugs just generally, that ruin the fields. Just a general reference. The other *Zīz* refers to the nipple or the teat of a cow giving milk. So they're quite different in meaning, but they're spelled exactly the same way. And the second one there, it might sound odd, but *Zīz* is considered (at least one of the *Zīz* words) derivative in terms of Canaanite dialects with *dod* or *shod*, which is the word for "breast." So that's where you get the reference to the cow giving milk. And you can find its Semitic cognates. And a language like Ugaritic will have that word with that particular meaning.

So that's typically how it gets treated. It doesn't occur that often. There's nothing in the context of these Psalms that would suggest anything otherworldly going on. Again, they're not connected with other familiar chaos metaphors. So I would say that I don't think there is any association with Behemoth or Rahab and Leviathan when it comes to this particular term.

TS: Alright. Bill has a comment. He says:

Hi, Mike! Your teaching has helped me understand the weird parts of the Bible that most people avoid are important and add to our understanding of the normal parts. I was never satisfied with any of the systems and now I know I'm free to do without them. God bless you with continued health.

MH: Thank you.

TS: And Clint says:

I never thought that even the first few pages of Unseen Realm would totally change the way I read and study the Bible, but here we are.

MH: [laughs] Yes, here we are. I never thought the first few pages would change my life either the way it has. [laughs] Yep, but here we are.

TS: Alright. Anita and Charles have our next question.

19:00

We're wondering if Paul [sic] had access to the scrolls while in prison on Patmos as he makes so many references to OT scriptures?

MH: Yeah, obviously they mean John, because John is the author of Revelation and not Paul. But again, given that typo, I know what's behind the question. Like, "Can we be sure that John had access to the Scriptures?" Well, it's pretty evident that he did, because he cites them everywhere. And that sort of flies in the face of what we presume (and that's a key word here) was John's situation. Yes, he is in exile on Patmos, but this isn't like the Tom Hanks film. What was it called? When Hanks winds up on the desert island? I can't remember the name of the title right now.

TS: *Castaway?*

20:00

MH: *Castaway!* Yeah. That's what we kind of think John had for a situation. Like he's put out on a desert island, and, "There you go, John. Good luck." But that is not what Patmos was. Now I'm going to quote from Aune's commentary on Revelation. Some of his comments about the phrase "I was on the island called Patmos," which John writes early in the book. Aune writes:

Patmos (now Patino), one of the Sporades islands, is thirty miles or forty-five kilometers in circumference and is located thirty-seven miles west-southwest from Miletus, fifty miles from ancient Ephesus. During the Hellenistic period, Patmos, along with the islands of Lipsos and Leros, were part of the territory of Miletus. The territory of Miletus consisted of the city of Miletus, the surrounding countryside, and the islands (Saffrey, *RB* 82 [1975] 388–91, with inscriptional evidence). These three islands were also designated as the φρούρια, "fortresses," of Miletus [MH: now that's an important... they all have something to do with fortresses], since the city was a major maritime power and these islands protected her Aegean side by guarding the entrance to the Latmique Gulf where Miletus was located. Beginning with the second century B.C., Patmos and the other two islands were populated by a garrison of reliable Milesians, called φρούροι, whose leader was designated a φρούραρχος, or "commandant," who functioned as a resident governor for Miletus. [MH: In other words, Aune concludes] Patmos was certainly not a deserted island.

It had a population. It was a military garrison/outlook, even though it was on an island. You had a native population there that went about its business. It's near a couple of locations where there were certainly large churches by John's day. And so it's entirely possible that someone could've gone to Patmos and visited John and given him a copy of the Scriptures or had conversations with him. He's not in a prison. He is not allowed to go visit any other place. It's like house arrest. "You live here now and you're not allowed to go anywhere else." I mean, nobody's going to take John on a ship and take him off the island because that's going to be severely punished by the authorities. He's stuck there, not part of the church group that he was originally part of, and so on and so forth. So his life is definitely disrupted. Church tradition is it that John was supposed to be executed and the method to execute him was boiling (like boiling in oil or something like that). And supposedly, according to the tradition, he survived that. And so it freaked people out that there was something otherworldly about John. And so that led up to this exile. "Well, we're not going to try to kill him anymore. We're just going to stick him on this island and let him live there, because we're kind of freaked out by this guy. He's not going to live here anymore." So that was deemed his punishment, to separate him from the community that he knew. But there's no indication that he was isolated or alone or that people couldn't reach him with something like manuscripts or copies of the Scriptures.

TS: Matthew says:

Yahweh bless you. You are a great teacher. Our Father's faithfulness is more apparent to me now than before, thanks to you. I'm especially thankful for your approach to the text and your courage to speak, even when what you say is contrary to tradition.

Karen says:

Thanks to the podcast, Mike and Trey, for helping me fall in love with the Bible and with the Lord of Hosts all over again.

TS: You bet, Karen. Our next question is from Linda from Belfast, Northern Ireland. I wish I could do an Irish accent, but I can't.

MH: Oh my gosh. Ireland is one of those places I would just love to see.

TS: Oh yeah, absolutely.

MH: You know, I have this mythology in my head about Ireland. I like the green. All the women have red hair. I have this thing for red hair. Anybody who reads my fiction knows that. And tea. So none of those things are probably prominent, but... I go over with my wife because she has her hair colored, you know, this way I like it. So that's a trip I keep thinking, "Man, we've got to go over there."

You're going to look great there. We're going to have all the tea we want."
[laughs] You know?

TS: Yeah, absolutely.

MH: It's so stupid, but there you go.

TS: Well, while we're in the middle of it, Mike, I forgot to ask you about Halloween. Tell us real quickly about your Gandalf.

25:00

MH: Yeah, for Halloween I was Gandalf. I mean, what else could I be? Because I'm Gandalf. You know? In Christian Middle Earth, I'm Gandalf. So yeah, I gave away... We used Halloween to give away copies of my *Stranger Things* book, you know, *The World Turned Upside Down: Finding the Gospel in Stranger Things*. Yeah, we probably gave away 30-40 copies. The rule was, when you come up to the door, there I am as Gandalf. I've got the sword, thanks to Judd Burton. I've got a real sword. I've got the staff, which is a serious staff. I mean, it's a weapon. It might be more lethal than the sword. I've got the full get-up. My daughter was Galadriel, with the elf ears. And they were awesome. And my son-in-law was the Demogorgon (we had to throw *Stranger Things* in there). So the rule was you come up to the house; you will not pass to candy unless you take a book and say hello to the Demogorgon. [laughter] And then you can have some candy.

TS: I'll bet kids loved that.

MH: Yeah. Oh, it freaked a couple of them out. Because the Demogorgon in costume, all he had to do was crouch in a bush and just stay there. And it inflates. So people thought it was just a lawn ornament, because you could hear the whirring sound of the little engine inflating it. But then when it would move, it just freaked them out. Like, "Oh, there's somebody in there! It's real!" You know? [laughter]

TS: That's awesome.

MH: Yeah, we had some fun with that. "Say hi to the Demogorgon, and he's lonely. Go over there to the bush and crawl into the bush where the Demogorgon is." [laughs]

TS: That's awesome.

MH: "Then you can have some candy." But yeah, that's what we did. And believe it or not, on Halloween, we met someone who follows the podcast. There was a couple who came up with... They had a little kid. They were dressed like Christian crusaders. And they had some pretty cool costumes. And you know, we

went through the little routine, “Here’s a book, and you get some candy, and say hi to the Demogorgon.” [laughs] And later the woman came back and said, “I’m really curious what the relationship of the book is to you.” She goes, “My husband listens to his podcast.” And then they both did. But he apparently is a fan and he’s read the books. So she’s wondering, “What’s the relationship between the two?” I said, “Well, the relationship is I’m Mike.” And she had no idea. So it was a good costume. She had no idea it was me. So I signed another book for her husband. And there you go. We actually had somebody who is in the audience in our neighborhood. And there’s a second person in our neighborhood that listens to the podcast as well. His name’s Erik. So shoutout to Erik. But he came over and added some music to our little get-up. It was fun. But again, hopefully somebody will read the *Stranger Things* book, either the parent or one of the kids, and get saved. You know, that’s the whole point.

TS: How cool is that to find out Mike Heiser lives in your neighborhood? That’s a...

MH: I guess it’s cool. You know, I didn’t expect that. It’s happened a few times in the grocery store, but never at the house on trick-or-treat.

TS: Yeah, Mike, you’re just cool, man. How does it feel to be cool?

MH: Like I would tell my kids, “I’m not famous; I’m *nerd* famous. There’s a big difference there.”

TS: Did you ever see *Three Amigos*? You’re not famous; you’re *infamous*.

MH: Oh, infamous. [laughs] Yeah, I’m that, too. [TS laughs] I qualify there as well. [laughs]

TS: Alright, well, let’s get back to Ireland here. Linda from Belfast, Northern Ireland. She has a question about Revelation 19.

29:00

You touched on the subject of annihilation/eternal punishment, saying interestingly, that both are on the table.

My question is, if we were banned from the garden and the tree of Life and if only the righteous in Christ put on immortality, how can a person exist in eternal punishment if they have not been bestowed with eternal life?

MH: Yeah, this is one of those questions that’s a little mind-bending or a little heady. I would approach it this way. Eternal life and everlasting death really would not be thought of as the same thing. Because death is not life in the biblical mind. Death is the absence of God’s presence. God is the life-giver. And

30:00

if God is nowhere in the picture, you don't have life. You have only death. And you say, "What about the time element? What about..." Well, again, they're not thinking like physicists, like exploring some sort of quantum reality for duration of this or that. They're thinking about presence and absence of God. So they didn't so much think of eternal life as something you would time, like it's a biological or physical phenomenon that, "We're going through time and we're not aging," and all this sort of stuff. These are physicalized ways of thinking about eternal life. They didn't really think about it so much as that as life forever with or without God. Eternal life meant we spend all of our days in the presence of the Lord, in his house, as it were. Because of this, the incongruity I see with everlasting death is that in the biblical material, death itself is destroyed. And it really has to be destroyed, or at least you can make a good argument that it has to be destroyed, because of this whole thing of restoring everything back to the default setting of Eden. Originally in Eden there was no death. There was no separation from God. Because God is there. It was God's house.

So again, it has this qualitative aspect to it of God being present. And then when it comes to everlasting death, you miss out on that. God is not present. And that is accomplished (if I can use that word) either in the traditional view, where we have everlasting torment, or in an annihilation view, where you're destroyed. The sinner, the unrighteous, the unbeliever, is destroyed. And that lasts forever. They're never going to come back. They're destroyed. They are no longer alive because they're no longer present with God. They're no longer in relationship with God, nor can they be. So that's actually conceptually more of what's going on than the time and duration aspect. And again, to me, the incongruity I think is, you get this language at the end where death itself and Hades is destroyed. How can you have people continuing to die in an everlasting sense? So that almost makes this "duration" idea outweigh the presence or absence of God. Now I don't think theologically that's where they're at. But again, there is some uncertainty here as to how to take the language, which we talked about in the Revelation series. But that's why I would answer this question that way. Because I think they thought a little bit differently about it than we are inclined to.

TS: John says:

Been with you since Episode 1. Such a blessing.

Mark says:

So often while listening, I ask out loud, "Where has this teaching been for my whole Christian life?" Many thanks to Mike, Trey, and everyone who works so hard to make the Bible come alive, week after week.

Brad has a question about Naked Bible 393: Revelation 20.

33:00

[The] podcast left out the strongest point Beale attempts in what the "binding of Satan" is.

To Beale, Satan's binding is specifically limited to the way God's plan of salvation won't be stopped—the word will go out and be successful in God's plans. I was surprised you didn't refer to Matt. 12:29 and Mark 3:27 and their OT reference points, as Beale's strongest attempt to establish his position.

MH: Yeah, honestly I don't think that part of Beale's response, which ultimately comes from, I think, the source with Beale and Carson, the shorter version of their commentary (I think)... But I don't think this part of Beale's response makes much sense, to be pretty well blunt about it. I think the wider view that I tried to articulate in Revelation 19-20 is better. And I actually agreed with it, though I'd say my argument on the specific prohibition (what Satan is not allowed to do) is better. It makes more sense than what Beale has. So yeah, they can put in what they want, but ultimately, I think when it comes down to what Satan is prohibited from doing is best defined not in "theologese" (theological language), where we get to theologize about it. I think that the question of his binding is defined in the text. And how do we do that? Well, we look at what he does when he's unbound. That'll tell you what he was prohibited from doing. And what he does when he's unbound is he gathers the nations and leads them against Zion. That's the one thing that he's not permitted to do.

35:00

So to me it has a very easy, very text-based answer and illustration that renders Beale's theologizing on this point irrelevant. Okay? I don't find it persuasive at all. You know, the bigger part of his approach to the chapter I do think makes sense. So I didn't include it just to criticize him. I don't see any point in doing that.

So you know, if this is what Satan is prohibited from doing and we see it because of what he's allowed to do once he's unbound, again, I think that is the best way to go. It's a text-driven answer. And ultimately it makes sense. Because why would God prohibit that? Well, as we answered in Revelation 20 in that episode, God prohibits it because he wants to give the Great Commission time to be accomplished. Because if Christ ascends to the heavens, and the next day Satan says to the nations, "Oh, let's go! We've got to go attack Zion now!" then it's over. That is going to be met with destruction, and the Great Commission has no time to spread. Again, to me this makes perfect sense, especially in light of a Deuteronomy 32 worldview, where the nations are healed and brought back into relationship with God.

So I think that just has far greater explanatory power than appealing to some point of theology and extrapolating to it from the phrase about Satan being bound. Again, I just think it doesn't have as much value. But I didn't want to drop that in just to make it sound like I'm critical of Beale's position. You know, as far

as the appeal to the Gospels, well, you know, the goal of the series was the use of the Old Testament in Revelation. So I'm not going to go through every Gospel passage. But I would say, even if I did, I'm going to say what I just said: that Beale's ultimate theologizing of this point makes less sense than what I've offered here, especially given the wider context. But as far as his approach to the kingdom and to Revelation in these chapters, I agree with it, even though I used Kline for the most part to articulate it. But Beale is aware of Kline's work. I just think Kline does a better job of sort of zeroing in on the real issue—that you have Ezekiel 38-39 used of events that occur both before and after the second coming. And so that forces a recapitulation perspective in these chapters, specifically Revelation 16-20. And that makes good sense, and Beale's going to follow that. I just don't think he did as well as Kline does in articulating it specifically in relationship to Armageddon being the mount of assembly—Mount Zion. I think Beale could do much better there if he followed Kline. But anyway, in summary, that's where I'm at on that.

TS: Krista says:

Thank you for all you do. You have allowed me and my husband to have more thoughtful conversations about Scripture. Sometimes we stay up late into the night with conversations about the latest podcast that heard. It helped us grow closer.

That's awesome.

MH: Yeah.

TS: Quincy says:

Thank you for *all* you do for his kingdom. I look forward to a new teaching each week. Dr. Heiser, you have been a huge part of my growing deeper in my relationship with Jesus as I gain even more insight and understanding from you as to how interwoven all 66 books of the Word are with one another. You helping me think like an Israelite or an apostle as I read the Bible has truly aided in a better understanding of what my takeaway should be from the passage and often real and applicable to life ways. It will be an honor to meet you and Trey in eternity.

Absolutely.

MH: Yep.

TS: Kenny asks:

38:40

In the latest Episode 393 you said, “We assist in announcing/ carrying out the judgment in Daniel 7.” I immediately remembered Paul saying, “Do you not know that we are to judge angels?” 1 Cor. 6:2.

I’ve heard lots of silly exegeses on this passage but never directly connected to Revelation, Deut. 32, and Psalm 82. Is this connected to what you’re saying? Am I seeing the mosaic correctly?

40:00

MH: Yeah, the short answer is, “Yes, you are.” And I would say, specifically see the episode or listen to the episode on Revelation 20 about why Satan was prevented from deceiving the nations, which a few minutes ago we just commented about. Yeah, all these things are interrelated. The reclaiming of the nations... Who rules the nations now? Again, it’s the gods. I mean, their authority has been nullified through the resurrection and ascension, but they’re still fighting for their turf. They’re still opposing the Great Commission. And ultimately, they are going to be judged in connection with the second coming (the Day of the Lord punishment). Again, these are all Old Testament prophecies as well. And once they’re displaced, they’re replaced by us. This is why Revelation 2-3 has us inheriting the... We become the point of reference to messianic prophecy about ruling the nations with a rod of iron. Jesus says in Revelation 3, toward the end, right around verse 21 I believe, that he’s going to have us sit with him on his throne to rule the nations. Well, we’re the ones that are put over the nations. This is language that Revelation 2-3 also uses. And so that means they’re displaced. The cosmic powers of darkness are displaced. And so yeah, we are going to witness that. We are going to play a role in their judgment. So all these things are related, before Psalm 82 and in conjunction with Psalm 82 being carried out with the death of the gods and so on and so forth. So your sense of that is good. But we actually get into that a little bit in that episode on Revelation 20. Again, this is still the current situation. This is all attached to the second coming, which is attached to the fullness of the Gentiles. And why is that the case? Because of God’s commitment to humanity. God is not going to change the rules or the parameters. He’s not going to cheat. He doesn’t need to.

TS: Nick says:

I’ve listened to the whole Naked Bible catalog, and my reading and understanding of the Scriptures is forever changed. I’ll never read it the same, and that’s a good thing. Thanks, Dr. Heiser and Trey! May the Lord continue to bless your work.

And Mike says:

The Naked Bible Podcast has been life-changing for my approach to the Word of God. I’ve been truly blessed by the podcast and I hope there will be 400 more

coming our way. God bless you, Dr. Heiser and Trey, and may you both be healed completely.

Absolutely, Mike.

MH: Yep.

TS: We've got 400 more to go, at least. Minimal. [MH laughs] Alright...

MH: They've been ordered... It's like a drive-up, like Sonic or something. He's ordered them up, so now we've got to deliver.

TS: Absolutely. Looking forward to it, too. Alright, Chris has our next two questions. And the first question is:

42:10

Have you read any of the material surrounding the Aramaic Song of the Lamb Targum with reference to Revelation 15? It would seem to fit the context of the deliverance of the children of Israel from Pharaoh through the crossing of the Red Sea. The Targum is a reference to the David vs Goliath account and would bring into play a backdrop of comparing the Man of Sin with both the Pharaoh and Goliath (Nephilim/Rephaim connection) and the Greater Moses and Son of David deliverance. Whether John had that in mind or had read that would be the question.

MH: Yeah, I'd never actually heard of it until I got this question come in. So I went and looked it up. And there's a... I think it's 1993. Let me just open this up and look at it real quickly here. It doesn't have the date on it here. But it's *Journal for the Study of Judaism, Volume XXIV* (I think that is 1993) about this particular Targum, Aramaic Song of the Lamb. And it is just as Chris describes it. The Targum itself is about the David and Goliath episode. And there are some interesting things going on in this Targum. I don't really see that great of a connection back to Pharaoh as I do with the David and Goliath thing, because it's more explicit. But that link is certain.

What I'm trying to say here, in the little bit as I read through that article about the Targum, is that there are certain things in this Targum that will sort of fit the victory over the antichrist theme—victory over the Man of Sin. And what it tells you at the very least... I mean, there's no way to know if John knew this text. I've not seen anything specific. And this is why sources like Aune and Beale are good, because they ferret out all this Second Temple and early Jewish material, and even later Jewish material. And this hasn't come up at all. So either they're unaware of it, or they didn't see any point of connection to it. And I've never heard of it in other sources as well, being something John read.

45:00

Now with that in mind, the article that I did read talked about the dating. And there are things about the Targum that do securely date it prior to 70 A.D. So if you're approaching Revelation, where that date is important, it's possible John could have seen this. But a lot of other scholars date it even earlier—earlier than 70 A.D. So it's a possibility, but there's no way to really know for sure. What's interesting to me about it is, since Goliath is in this Targum... And a Targum is an Aramaic translation, and they often get very interpretive. They're almost like commentaries in some respects. They're more than translations in a lot of respects. The interesting thing here is that you have a Jewish writer that would connect the David and Goliath story with the victory of the ultimate David (the Messiah) over his archenemy (the Man of Sin—the antichrist figure). He would connect David and Goliath with Messiah and the antichrist. And that gives it this flavor, that there was some Jew somewhere, sitting out there thinking that Goliath, of course (who is descended from the Rephaim and the Nephilim), was somehow typologically related to the antichrist. Now I get into this kind of thinking along other lines (again, the Targum wasn't part of this) in my book, *Reversing Hermon*. So I know this thread existed, and this would be another point to it. But that's about all I can say at this point. I don't think there's any way to know whether John really read it or not.

TS: Chris' second question is:

46:15

Can you see a reference to Messiah Ben Joseph in Revelation 12? The clear and obvious comparison of John's vision with Joseph's dream would appear to show that connection. The Genesis 37 account shows Joseph as the one the Sun, Moon, and Stars bow down to, in Revelation it is the son who is born that the sun, moon, and stars ultimately bow down to. Thinking through the Incarnation and earthly ministry of Jesus this would be one of the clearest references to Messiah ben Joseph in the NT.

MH: Well, I think it's possible. I mean... And the reason I think it's possible is because some of the Messiah ben Joseph stuff is so abstract. But once you see it unfolded, it's hard to unsee it. I mean, you can see how somebody would go to a particular passage in the Old Testament and how Messiah ben Joseph would fit. I mean, you can see the coherence of the idea, even when it gets fairly abstract. So I would say that I think this is a possibility, even though the celestial objects in Revelation 12 aren't bowing down to the child. They're part of a new creation. So I'm not really sure how much you can press the details of any of these sorts of things. But again, some of this stuff tends to be pretty abstract. So I think to be fair to it, we have to consider it a possibility. But that's the word I would use. It's *possible*. Certainly in the book of Revelation, the returning Christ is referred to as the Son of David three times. So, I mean, John's obviously aware of the Messiah ben David and not just Messiah ben Joseph. But again, given the other material in the New Testament... And for those out there listening

to this Q&A and you have no idea what we're talking about here, you need to go back and listen to the earlier interview with David Mitchell. And the title of the episode is "Messiah Ben Joseph." There is a tradition of the messiah coming from Joseph—a messiah from Galilee that would die. I mean, it's crazy stuff. But within Judaism (and it has its hooks into various Old Testament passages), there is this tradition, that messiah would be the son of Joseph, not just the son of David. And they don't compete against each other. They're two sides of the same coin. So given that, go back and listen to that episode if you haven't already. But John certainly knows Messiah coming from David. Could he have known messiah ben Joseph? Well, sure. Because it's in places in other passages in the New Testament and the Old Testament. So I think it's a possibility. But I think that's probably the best we can say right now.

TS: Annette says:

Fantastic, well-reasoned resource for understanding the true message of the Bible and character of **the** one and only triune God. Thank you, Mike and Trey and all the contributors for revealing a Lord so much greater than I previously recognized. God richly bless you.

And Bea says:

My husband and I, very old Christians, are amazed every week at the information Mike gives. So absolutely amazing that he and now Trey keep it going in the midst of cancer treatment and Covid. So thankful and grateful for two of God's greatest soldiers.

Mike, true story: on the episode on the New Perspective on Paul...

MH: Yeah, the interview with Dr. Yinger, yeah.

TS: Yeah. I edited that podcast and then went straight to the hospital.

MH: [laughs] Oh, gosh!

TS: So I managed to get that done and then limp into the hospital. [laughs] So that's... I thought that was...

50:00 **MH:** I'm sure Melissa was thrilled with that.

TS: Yeah, I told her... I was checking my oxygen. And I told the Lord, "Just get me to 90 briefly and I'll go do the podcast." Because I didn't want to miss it, because it was ready to go. So I knew that if I went to the hospital, I probably was going to be stuck there. So boom, my oxygen shot up briefly. So I ran in and

it took me two or three hours to get the podcast done. And then I was like, “Alright, let’s go.” So we went to the hospital. And then I was there for a week.

MH: Gosh. Well, you know, I can’t be too critical. This is, like... When I was in grad school, I had this mentality [laughs] that I would never... I worked full time in grad school for 15 years. And I had this thing that, “I am *never* going to turn in an assignment late.” For those of you who are baseball fans, it became like my Cal Ripkin streak. Like, I couldn’t do it. I had to do crazy things to keep the streak alive. The worst it ever got was I didn’t sleep for three days in a row, working on something to turn it in on time. But it’s so absurd when I look back on it and think of it. But yep, I get it. [laughs]

TS: Yeah, absolutely. Hey, yeah, I’m not going to let the podcast go unpublished. I know the people want it. That’s how important it is to us, Mike. So I think calling us “soldiers” is perfect.

MH: You do crazy things when you have to.

TS: Absolutely. Alright. Our next question is from Abraham. And he asks:

51:40

Two Beasts are presented, one arising from the Land and one arising from the Sea. Only one is cast into the Lake of Fire. Which one? Is the other one renamed False Prophet or is the Dragon cast into the Lake while incarnate in the other one?

MH: My take on this is that both of the beasts represent the same thing, which is chaos, defined as “anti-Eden in all its glorious, terrible, terrestrial fallenness—everything that Eden is not supposed to be, and life as God intended it is not supposed to be.” So I think both beasts represent the same thing. I don’t want to call it an ideal, but the same state of chaos. So Revelation 13’s two beasts, you get a unified chaos symbology. It’s akin... By having two beasts (the one in the sea and the other one from the land) it expresses totality. It’s akin to phrases like “heaven and earth” or “land and sea” to express totality. So I think that’s why we have two. The false prophet I don’t think is one of those two beasts.

But the point in Revelation 13 about the two beasts is, again, to symbolize the totality of the chaos threat. All the earth and sea—the whole world—is under dominion of chaos. You therefore don’t need two death scenes later. When the beast is destroyed in Revelation 19:20, well then the reader knows that chaos is destroyed. Again, the reason we have two is just to express its totality—the extent of the chaos—not over-literalizing this into two literal monsters or two phases or two something. When Revelation 19-20 lets us know that the Lord has returned and the end of all things anti-Eden has come, well then, that’s everything then. So the reader knows that chaos is destroyed because it is the final showdown. It’s the final battle against Zion. The Lord returns, and then all of

these cosmic bad guys are judged. They're destroyed. They're thrown into the lake of fire and so on. So the totality of that, I think, is also successfully communicated on the back end when things run full circle in the book to the same degree as the totality is expressed beforehand. And it just happens that beforehand, John uses more than one chaos metaphor. He uses two. But the whole point is totality on both sides of that.

TS: Jennifer says:

I love Jesus more because I understand Scripture more because of this podcast. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

And Rebecca says:

Naked Bible Podcast is my favorite resource of all time, and it has changed my life. Mike's view on the supernatural has expanded my understanding of Scripture and opened up a whole new level of theological awareness. Been listening a long time. You guys have been with me through seminary, difficulties, and a season of incredible spiritual growth. I'm grateful for your contribution to my life. Thank you.

MH: That's awesome.

TS: Alright. Our last question is from Paul from New Hampshire.

55:10

I was doing some research on the Shema in Deuteronomy 6:8. Is there any relation to the mark of the beast in Revelation and reference to the hands and forehead in Deuteronomy 6:8?

MH: Yeah, I think so, and we mentioned that briefly in the Revelation 16 episode about the mark. You know, Israelites bore the name of Yahweh, but not literally. We get that from the priestly blessing in the book of Numbers, when the name of the Lord is bestowed or placed upon the people of Israel. So that's a nonliteral idea, and that's closer to what the mark actually is. But the reference in Deuteronomy 6:8, I think, is still related in some way. So if you look at Deuteronomy 6:8, it doesn't say that Israelites *wear* the name. The content of what eventually wound up being phylacteries that they wrapped around their head or their arms were the commands of God. That's what Deuteronomy 6:1 says. Not just the Tetragrammaton. So the parallel between the two isn't precise. But because the Shema is included in Deuteronomy 6:1-6:8 (you get it in there), there is still, I think, a loose parallel—or better, maybe an object lesson to be had, but ultimately bearing the name via the high priestly blessing. "You were supposed to be a kingdom of priests as an Israelite. You're supposed to represent Yahweh to the nations. You're supposed to represent Yahweh to each other. You're supposed to be a shining example of what life in Eden—life the way

God wants it—might look like.” This is the whole point, to draw attention to what the true God is doing on earth with humans, in this case only now through Israel after the Babel debacle. And the nations are outsiders and they’re under judgment. They can join, but they have to forsake all other gods and become part of this community where the truth about the true God is known and is taught.

So all of that is really conceptual. It has nothing to do with bearing a physical four consonants. There’s no passage that ever says that they did that or they were branded as such. More broadly in Deuteronomy 6, it’s the Word—the Word of the Lord—which is defined in Deuteronomy 6:1 as his commands. So I do think there is some relationship, even though the parallel isn’t that precise. And I don’t think we should get lost in the Deuteronomy object lesson either. Because again, ultimately imaging God—being a representation of God—bearing his name... See, bearing the mark has a direct relationship to bearing the name. Because in Revelation 13, that’s what you’re doing. The name is a number. The number is a name. You’re bearing the name of the beast. Well, to bear the name of Yahweh didn’t mean that you were taking a physical mark. It meant that you had aligned yourself with him and were his representative. It shows your believing loyalty. And so I think that’s the point of what’s being described with the beast. Those who “bear the name” of the beast are those who are aligned with the beast. They have chosen to assign their believing loyalty to the beast and its false promises, whatever it says it’s going to produce. They’re buying the lie and they’re sealing their fate by doing so. Again, I think that’s the greater point. And the Deuteronomy 6 material is sort of an object lesson too, at best.

TS: We’ve got a few more comments here, Mike. Guiseppe says:

Love the podcasts! And I’ve shared pieces with others as well. And some have picked up *Unseen Realm* to read as well. Happy 400th!

Rod says:

Such a great resource! Faith-enriching.

And finally, Josh has:

One word: “transformational.” Thanks to Dr. Heiser’s teachings, I’ll never look at the Bible the same way again. The episodes with Exodus pulled me in and the *Unseen Realm* sealed the deal. Thanks, Mike and Trey! Life-changing.

MH: Well, yep. Thank you, and you’re welcome.

TS: Yeah, absolutely. Well, again, congratulations, sir! 400! We did it!

1:00:00

MH: It's a milestone. When you align it to the calendar—to the years—yeah, it's kind of amazing. Because I do remember very distinctly asking somebody, "Why would I want to do that?!" [laughs]

TS: Crazy.

MH: Like, "You moron." [laughs] It would have been Eli at work. Thanks to Eli for intelligently answering that question for me. [laughs]

TS: There you go. Perfect. Alright, well, you know, you started it in 2012—those first three episodes. So that's ten years. So Naked Bible Podcast has been around for a decade now. That's pretty incredible.

MH: Yeah, and you can tell. When we talk to people (especially other scholars) about doing interviews, there are a number of them that have heard of it or that listen to it already, which... It's not like we go to conferences and take polls, "Hey, have you ever heard of Naked Bible Podcast?" We don't do that. But it just shows you the reach. By the time the professors get it, it's permeated the laity, which is our target audience anyway. We're not after the scholar. We want to break the conspiracy of hoarding information that goes on in the world of scholarship and share it with people. Anybody who's interested in Scripture, we want to open the gates—pull back the curtain, so to speak. Whatever metaphor helps. This is what we're about. Give normal people—people who aren't going to go out and get PhDs, but they care and they want to know Scripture... There's no excuse for people remaining untaught when there's so much information out there that they could be getting. So we want to put a dent in it. That's the objective. We want to put a dent in it. We're not going to worry about denominational preferences and theological systems. We care about the text and what it can sustain. And getting reactions like people are thrilled now... They get more out of their Bible. They've rediscovered the joy of discovery when it comes to Bible study. And their relationship with the Lord has grown. That's *exactly* what we want to hear. That's exactly how we know we're hitting the mark.

TS: Absolutely. And in some ways, Mike, I feel like we're just getting started. I mean, there are so many things we have planned that we want to do. The last seven years... Look, I've raised two kids and have a full-time job, and there's lots of things that I haven't implemented yet. But we're going to... I mean, at least we get an episode out there basically every week. But there's so much more we want to do.

MH: Oh, yeah.

TS: And honestly, we're just getting started. So...

MH: Yeah, you wait till the year turns. Wait till the year turns, Lord willing. It's contingent on health considerations, obviously. Keep praying in that regard. But I'll just say it again. Just wait till the year turns. We have some very specific things that we want to do, and you're going to find out about them.

TS: And again, I want to thank everybody for listening, man. Because it's the audience that keeps us going. I can't tell you... I don't respond to many emails because I'm just so inundated with so many. But I so appreciate the people who take the time to email me and tell me how much the podcast means to them, how much it's helped them, and all that stuff. I mean, that's the fuel that keeps the fire going. Because I know how much this means to so many people, and that makes it all worthwhile, Mike. And 400... Congratulations to you, sir. It's been awesome and an honor to serve here.

MH: It wouldn't have been possible without your intervention, Trey. And I don't know. I wish I could go back, because I feel like you *did* tell me it was stupid. But... [laughter]

TS: I might have said your Fantasy team was stupid. [MH laughs] But it's awesome. It's been fun.

MH: Whatever you did say, it was on target and appropriate, so... [laughs]

TS: Well, I'm just glad you took me up on it. So here we are, seven years later. I mean, 400, that's impressive, you know? I mean, *rarely* a week missed, only here recently because we've been knocked down. But we're not out.

MH: Yep. Nope, we're not.

TS: Alright, sounds good. Well, again, man, we appreciate all the work you've done. And thanks for all the listeners. And you know, tell your friends and family. Let's grow this thing. We're just getting started out there.

MH: Absolutely.

TS: So if you're a listener of this podcast, your task is to tell ten more people about the podcast. So when we get to episode 500, we'll double our audience size. So they've got over 400 hours' worth. I'm so jeally, again, people who are just now listening. Man, that's awesome. I wish... [MH laughs] I mean, again, Mike, there was not that much content around of your stuff. So the fact that we've produced over 400 hours of your content makes me like a little giddy Christmas kid, [MH laughs] you know, waking up with... I mean, honestly, I wish I had discovered you now, and I'd have 400 hours to listen to all that stuff. I'd be ecstatic.

1:05:00

MH: For those of you who have never seen Trey, it's a little hard to imagine him as a giddy little kid. But I'll try.

TS: [laughs] Yeah, yeah. Just put that in your head: me in my pajamas. [MH laughs] Alright, well, again, congratulations. 400. That's awesome. We will continue our Revelation Q&A next time. And with that, I want to thank everybody for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God Bless.