

Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 442

Jude Q&A, Part 1

September 11, 2022

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)

Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)

Episode Summary

Dr. Heiser answers your questions:

- How can we see the Epistle of Jude from a practical point of view? [6:15]
- How does Gabriel fit into the hierarchy of angelic beings, and what determines angelic hierarchy? [8:15]
- Should we be respectful to evil entities and not use harsh terms against them? [13:30]
- Did Jesus have siblings? [15:55]
- Are inspiration and canonicity equivalent, or are there some inspired works that did not make it into the canon? [19:55]
- Should Jude verse 14 be “the Lord is coming” or “the Lord has come?” [22:25]
- How was Moses at the transfiguration with Jesus if he was in Sheol before the resurrection? [26:50]
- Is there a connection between Moses dying in the Transjordan and Elijah being taken up in the same region? [31:50]
- Did the false teachers know they were false teachers? Is it possible for me to be a false teacher and not know it because I’m trying to teach something different than my church leadership teaches? [33:15]
- Which Targum bundle do you recommend for Logos? [38:50]
- How is Enoch reckoned to be the seventh from Adam? [39:55]

Transcript

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 442, Jude Q&A Part 1. I’m the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he’s the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey, Mike, how are you doing?

MH: I’m doing well, doing well.

TS: Yeah.

MH: I can’t complain.

TS: Yeah, yeah, are you happy with your Fantasy team?

MH: I'm mostly happy. [Trey laughs] I usually end up drafting pretty well, but then it's like you just hold your breath the rest of the way.

TS: Yeah, I hear you. I hear you. I'm excited. I love this time of the year for sure, as I'm sure our audience does, too. It's the best time.

MH: Yeah, they've been waiting for it.

TS: I mean, it's basically Jesus' birthday and football, right?

5:00 **MH:** Right. [laughs]

TS: So.

MH: Right, I didn't align those two things before.

TS: I know. I didn't either.

MH: But now I'll never be able to keep them apart.

TS: Exactly. They're now forever entwined. We should've thought of this earlier, but it's "Jesus and football" time. It's perfect.

MH: Yeah.

TS: It couldn't be better.

MH: Alright. Well, I'll go with that.

TS: Yeah, absolutely.

MH: Why not?

TS: Well, Mike, we did a book study over the Epistle of Jude. So now it's time to take some questions from our audience about the book of Jude. And we've got a handful here. I'm ready if you are to tackle these.

MH: Sure.

TS: Alright.

MH: Sure, let's go.

TS: Alright. Our first one is from Matt from Belgium. I don't know how you say "hi" in...What's the language they speak in Belgium, Mike? What is it?

MH: I think French.

TS: Is it French?

MH: Yeah, I would think so. I don't know.

TS: I don't know either. Alright, Matt, well, we appreciate it. All the way from...

MH: I've tried to unlearn French since grad school and I guess I'm doing a good job of it.

TS: Yeah, I hear you. I only had to learn Spanish. So I've basically forgotten everything. So don't ask me. And I'm in Texas so you'd think I'd speak it better, but I don't. I used to, but not anymore. Alright. Here we go. Matt from Belgium:

6:15

How can we see the Epistle of Jude from a practical point of view?

MH: Well, I mean, the book is geared to warning about false teachers. So I mean that's eminently practical—being warned about false teaching, and that's the thrust of the book. So it's pretty transparent. I mean, throughout the whole book this is what Jude is hammering away at. So that's its thrust. It's eminently practical to be warned not to swallow false teaching. But on the flip side of that, discerning false teaching requires a clear-headed view of what is normative or orthodox theology. So I guess in practical terms, the epistle ought to motivate us to learn doctrine—to learn sound doctrine so that we can detect false doctrine. The other major thrust of the book is living for personal gain. Again, this is viewed negatively, obviously. That is, false teaching often goes hand-in-hand with worldliness. Hence, the second major practical thrust would be an emphasis on not being worldly (defined as having the desires of the flesh and the goals of this world operating pre-eminently inside of us). So worldliness is really about (when we talk about this) the concerns of this world and getting ahead in those concerns in those areas to the detriment (and in some cases really the absence) of any sort of spiritually-minded goal. And that shouldn't be what defines or motivates us. So I think Jude lends itself to a lot of practical application and it would be a good series—a good book—for preaching.

TS: Alright. Our next question is from Mike and bear with me while I distill his plethora of questions here. Mike has a question about the 'Chief Prince' Michael disputing with the devil over the body of Moses in Jude 9 with the Gabriel messenger angel in Daniel 9:21, who was actually named warring with the Prince of Greece and Persia" alongside Michael in Daniel 10:20-21.

8:15

It would appear that Gabriel is more than a messenger and that he would be a creation or son of God also, correct? Cannot Gabriel be a son of God also, like Michael, as the chief angel over the cosmic geographical area of Israel? I'm conflicted with the tiered authority or ranks of angels where it appears one angel is higher than the other, seeing they are both sons of God and direct creations of God. And if this was the case, why is Michael only considered a prince when Gabriel is not a prince also, but only a messenger? Were they created at the same time or one before the other? Does that determine their hierarchy? I mean, what actually determines their hierarchy? Does the hierarchy derive from Second Temple Jewish Literature?

MH: Well, the short answer is we are never told. The only sense of hierarchy you get is the term "archangel," which is not used very often in scripture. So "archangel" means ruler of angels. So the notions of that are more present in Second Temple Jewish literature than they are in the Bible. So we don't have anything in terms of inspired literature that spells this out for us. So again, when that happens to me, I just don't speculate on it and call it teaching. So I'm not going to speculate here. If the hierarchy frustrates you, probably you're just going to have to get used to disappointment because it just doesn't go into it.

10:00

Even on the other side, the principalities, rulers, powers, authorities, thrones, dominions, all that stuff... You know, the assumption is that those terms form some sort of hierarchy as well, but they're never listed the same way. So no hierarchy is ever spelled out specifically—some place that you could actually land and say, oh, there's the hierarchy and here's why. So we're simply just not told.

I mean, Mike in his question points out a few obvious things. They're all sons of God, so there's equality in terminology there. We're not told when or what order (if there is an order) they were created in. We're just told that they're created beings. It's kind of like humans. I mean, humans can be ontologically equal but still have hierarchy. I mean, there's lots of hierarchy in the Bible when it comes to this or that office or this or that role in human affairs. So it doesn't say anything about their ontology. Just because there's hierarchy doesn't mean one is ontologically superior to the others. Again, to say that would be guessing because we're not specifically told that. All we're told is that there is this rank "archangel" or "ruler of angels" and that's pretty much it.

Then you get in the Second Temple period and you get lots more thought put into this with the number of archangels and who is an archangel and so on and so forth that we don't get in scripture. Mike pointed out that Gabriel is never called a prince. I don't see in Daniel 9:21, though, Gabriel assisting Michael. Gabriel

comes to Daniel in that verse. He doesn't come to Michael in that verse; he comes to Daniel. So I'm not quite sure about the wording of the question there.

There is a question as to the identity of the "man clothed in linen" in Daniel 10. It's not at all clear that it's Gabriel. We can't assume that the Gabriel of 9:21 is this other figure because nothing specifically says that. It could be (and I think it is)... I think the "man clothed in linen" is a higher authority than Gabriel. I discussed this a little bit in *Unseen Realm*. The man of chapter 10 seems to transcend Gabriel both in terms of being helped by Michael, which suggests he is of a higher rank than Michael, but Michael is helping him and he would be at the higher rank. And also the way Jesus is described in Revelation 1, which is in terms very similar to the "man clothed in linen" here... So again, my view is that the "man clothed in linen" is a higher being and outranks Michael, outranks Gabriel, so on and so forth. If you're interested in this topic, I've put an article in the protected folder where I put podcast articles in. The author's first name is just abbreviated to the letter G and then the last name is... I don't know how to pronounce this, but Bampfylde, and the article is called "Prince of the Host in Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls." It is really a good article, I think one of the more helpful things I've read on Daniel. So that's in the protected folder. If you're interested in this topic, you can go up and read that.

TS: Barry from the Republic of Ireland has our next question.

13:30

In episode 436, Michael the archangel asked God to rebuke Satan, as Michael would not personally rebuke him because of Satan's status as a son of God. How then as believers loyal to God are we to think of how to address the Satanic? That is, should we be respectful to the enemy and not use harsh terms against them?

15:00

MH: Yeah, I think that's actually the point in Jude—that we shouldn't presume an authority that allows us to talk down or presume equality with the supernatural. It should be sufficient to speak of ourselves the way scripture speaks of us (as children of God) and leave it there, and in no way should we be soliciting a conversation or conflict with Satan or any other divine being. Again, I don't think (and I'm not saying Barry is doing this), but I've seen it happen enough that I feel a sense of responsibility to say this. But this isn't *Ghostbusters*. When we do Biblical angelology or demonology, we're not looking for grounds to treat these subjects as though we're ghostbusters. "Now we're going to go out and look for the Satanic, look for the demonic, just so that we can do battle with them." Again, there's a lot of presumption there. And, again, I think it's sufficient if we just remind ourselves (and whatever entity that we might be engaged with, should that ever happen to us) of who we are in Christ. Christ becomes the authority and becomes the locus of any authority we might have. I think that's really the point in Jude—that we keep these things in perspective as to who the higher authority really is, and it is not us. It is not us. We don't outrank them in terms of their

abilities and so on and so forth. And even in chronology we don't. So I think Jude's point is that there's some caution to be taken here by people who would want to responsibly be engaged in this sort of thing, should it ever come up, but this isn't something that we're turning into *Ghostbusters*, where we go out and solicit these sorts of things.

TS: Alright. Roland has a question about the opening verse of Jude 1.

15:55

The opening verse of Jude 1 got me thinking about the controversy of Jesus having siblings. I would like to know Dr. Heiser's opinion on whether Jesus had siblings.

MH: Yeah, I think he did. I think the scriptures are adequately clear that Jesus had brothers and sisters. Let's look up a few of these. This is Matthew 12:46-50 in the ESV:

⁴⁶ While he was still speaking to the people, behold, his mother and his brothers stood outside, asking to speak to him. ⁴⁸ But he replied to the man who told him, "Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?" ⁴⁹ And stretching out his hand toward his disciples, he said, "Here are my mother and my brothers! ⁵⁰ For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother."

So some take this as a denial that Jesus actually has literal brothers, but the first part of the passage, I think, is pretty clear that he does. And his brothers and sisters are alluded to along with disciples elsewhere. I mean, those two categories are distinguished and not conflated together. Let's look up Mark 3. Mark 3:31 is basically the same as the one I just read, but there's another one that I want to get into here. John 2:12.

¹² After this [Jesus] went down to Capernaum, with his mother and his brothers and his disciples, and they stayed there for a few days.

So this passage would suggest to me (and it's not the only one; there are others like it) that the disciples (those who are following Jesus) are not the same as his brothers. That first passage in Matthew, again, some people read it...Roman Catholicism reads it, for instance, to say that Jesus didn't have any real brothers, but they were just the people who followed him. They were his spiritual brothers. Well, here they are both mentioned in the same verse, and they are clearly distinguished, "his brothers and his disciples." Again, they're two different things here along with his mother. So I think scripture is sufficiently clear that Jesus had siblings. You have to look at what's going on, too. I mean, if you follow all the references through where Jesus has brothers and sisters, we don't even know

when Jesus' siblings even became believers. Let's go to John 7:3-5 we get a little hint of this.

³ So his brothers said to him,

Now again, the Roman Catholic view would have us believe that the brothers here are just people who follow Jesus, but they're obviously not here.

³ So his brothers said to him, "Leave here and go to Judea, that your disciples also may see the works you are doing.

Again, they're distinguished. Brothers and the disciples are distinguished.

⁴ For no one works in secret if he seeks to be known openly. If you do these things, show yourself to the world." ⁵ For not even his brothers believed in him.

So here the brothers *can't* be disciples because they don't even believe in him yet. Again, I think if you put these passages together, it's quite clear that Jesus had siblings—brothers and sisters. Now the real debate is... I mean, if you get into the weeds here with Roman Catholic doctrine, they'll concede some of this, or some of the writers will concede some of this and then they'll say that the brothers and sisters were Joseph's children by a different marriage so that they can maintain Mary's perpetual virginity. Again, there is nothing in scripture that says that. That is just a place you have to go to maintain a doctrine you *want* to retain, and that is what they're doing there. But we don't actually have anything like that stated in scripture.

TS: Colin from Georgia asked:

19:55

Do you believe that a book such as 1 Enoch might have been inspired by God, but at the same time not providentially chosen to be canonical? In other words, that all canonical books are inspired, but not all inspired books are canonical? Or do you believe instead that inspiration and canonicity are equivalent?

MH: Yeah, I do. I don't believe we have inspired books that are not canonical. Why wouldn't the Spirit of God lead the masses of believers to recognize the canonicity of an inspired book? In other words, why would the Holy Spirit let that book be an outlier? It doesn't make any sense to me. If one believed the book was inspired but not recognized as canonical, one **MUST** believe that the Spirit was either unable to move the masses toward the truth of its inspiration or unwilling. You have to wonder what else did the Spirit fail at? What else did the Spirit not want to do? Why only this book? Why only Enoch? Why not have 100

of them? Again, the thinking is not coherent. Again, why would the Spirit of God do this? I can't think of a good reason for that.

I think what is needed here more than anything else is a close reading of 1 Enoch, to be honest with you. It is not always internally consistent. 1 Enoch can be internally contradictory. It also teaches salvation of the righteous by works in at least one passage in 1 Enoch. In 1 Enoch, the messiah comes not as savior... I hope we realize that. The messiah in 1 Enoch is not a savior that is going to die for the sins of the world. The messiah in Enoch is a judge. Enoch is an apocalypse. It is an apocalyptic book. It is about the coming of the messiah to destroy the wicked. It's about the day of the Lord, okay? It's not about the messiah showing up to give himself as a sacrifice for sin. That whole message is not in 1 Enoch. There is no saving act in the cross in the message of Enoch. So do we really want this to be inspired? Again, it would be quite contradictory with a number of things you get in the New Testament. But again, a book doesn't have to be canonical. It doesn't have to be inspired to be useful. Lots of books would fall into that and 1 Enoch is one of them, in my view.

TS: Alan has our next question.

22:25

Can Dr. Heiser comment on [Jude] verse 14, where it says, "The Lord is coming?" The NET note indicates the translation note in Greek as "has come," a proleptic aorist. The NSAB also translates it as "has come."

MH: Yeah, so is the Lord coming or has he come? Yeah. The verb tense is aorist, as Alan points out, which most people mistakenly assume must mean past tense. Since it refers to the second coming of the Lord, the event is still future to Jude. I mean, it obviously refers to the second coming because we've had one coming and we've had a resurrection. We have also had an ascension. So the Lord coming in Jude is referring to something still yet future: the Lord is coming. But you'll get these translations (like the NASB is one of them: "has come"), and the translation is based purely on the fact that this is an aorist tense in Greek. By the way, for those who don't know what "proleptic" means (which is what the NET Bible has), if you look it up in Webster, "prolepsis" is sort of the representation or assumption of a future act or future development as if it were presently existing already or accomplished. So this proleptic terminology gets us into the already-but-not-yet thing again.

Illustration: the transfiguration is proleptic. Remember the transfiguration? It views Jesus in his risen, exalted, Lordly state—something not yet accomplished. So they get a glimpse of what is going to happen in the future even though it hasn't happened yet. So that event is proleptic. Again, I'm just using the event to try to illustrate what "prolepsis" or "proleptic" means—again, the assumption of a

future act or a future something in development as though it were presently existing or presently had already happened.

25:00

The question gets us into not only that, but there is actually a debate in Greek grammar as to whether Greek tenses are time-focused (past, present, future) or whether they are aspect-focused. Aspect is *kind* of action, not *time* of action. Approaching the aorist aspectually... Again, assuming that... Well let's just put on our aspectual hats. Let's pretend we're on the Greek grammarian side—the grammarians who think that the Greek New Testament tense system is not primarily about time, but is primarily about aspect. We approach the aorist aspectually. That means taking it not primarily about time, but about the presentation of an action or event as a completed whole; that is, the verb action is like a snapshot. It's like taking a polaroid, a glimpse of a completed event that is no longer in process. The aorist is a tense you would use to talk about actions not in process, but as completed. And that is really why most of the time an aorist is going to be past, because completed actions are now in the past to us, to our perspective. So this is where the two things get mixed in Greek. Is it about time or is it about aspect? We tend to think the aorist is about time, but again, I am probably in the camp that thinks that the tense, the time orientation to tense, is not primary, but aspect is more primary and tense would be secondary. So here you have an aorist used to describe a future event (the Lord's coming), not because the author is time confused or in a time warp. Rather, it is because the author wants his statement about the second coming to be viewed as if it was presently accomplished. So it's almost like the second coming is so guaranteed that the writer uses the aorist. He uses this tense to convey the idea of this as an already completed act even though it's not.

TS: Maria has a question.

26:50

When listening to the discussion of Jude 9, I found it interesting that given cosmic geography, God would choose to bury Moses in unholy ground to begin with. I am re-reading the *Unseen Realm* and am a bit confused with Moses' death, Sheol, and the transfiguration in Matthew. On page 246 of the *Unseen Realm*, Dr. Heiser explains that Moses lives on with God. If I'm not mistaken, Dr. Heiser has stated that in the Old Testament everyone who died went to Sheol. That would include Moses. So if Moses is in Sheol and resurrection has not taken place yet prior to transfiguration verses in Matthew, at what point does Moses live or go from Sheol to be with God prior to resurrection?

MH: Yeah, the great, final resurrection. You get into Revelation 21, Daniel 12... That has not yet occurred because it's the resurrection of everyone to eternal reward, to eternal damnation or annihilation, depending on your view. So that hasn't occurred yet. Well, many scholars see the first resurrection of Christ as

emptying Sheol. It's a deliverance from that part of the Underworld into God's presence. That's often argued on the basis of Ephesians 4:8, which I think is not a good way to argue it. I don't think Ephesians 4:8 is about the emptying of Sheol. I think it's about the conquest of the enemies of God and Bashan and others because it harkens back to Psalm 68. It is about reclaiming the Gentile. But anyway, you'll get many theologians that argue that the first resurrection is sort of an already-but-not-yet kind of thing. That when Christ leaves the grave—when Christ is risen—then you have a resurrective act that applies to the Underworld. In other words, if you're in the Underworld at that point and you're righteous, then you're going to be removed with the Lord when he vacates the grave. And that's all Sheol, in one sense, is. It's the grave and everybody goes there because everybody dies. But of course, we know there are a couple exceptions to that, but that's why it becomes sort of a rule of thumb.

30:00

Now I'm not opposed to the idea that the first resurrection leads to the emptying of Sheol. I'm not opposed to that, but I'm also not opposed to something more immediate. What I mean by that is there are certain Psalms and other passages that express the Old Testament hope of life after death, and I don't see anything in those passages that require that hope to be held back until the resurrection of the Messiah—until Jesus, the Messiah, rises from the dead. In other words, I'm in the minority here and I'll confess to being in the minority. I think it's quite arguable from the Old Testament that you would get people who, if they are righteous when they die, they are with the Lord. But at some point they are removed from Sheol; they're rescued from the grave. We're not told a whole lot about that, but in my mind there are enough passages in the Old Testament that express this hope that on the one hand, while the hope could be yet future tied into the first resurrection of Jesus... Like I think it's fair to say like most scholars would see this. I don't really see that as a necessity. I think it could've happened earlier and could have happened individually, but again, I don't have a whole lot of scripture for that. It's just that it's not denied in the Old Testament when you get the talk of this hope. There's no timetable given, in other words.

As to Moses' death and burial, it was due to Moses' anger and rebellion that he was prevented from seeing the Promised Land. So the burial becomes kind of academic in the wake of Moses' transgression, at least in that regard. Given later revelation, though, like the transfiguration, it's evident Moses did not die needing forgiveness for salvation or anything like that. God was gracious to him. But Moses' action had this one consequence: "You're not going to see the Promised Land." So one could ask, I think, in conjunction with that, why God didn't permit the Israelites to remove his bones and move him after death. I think that's a good question, too, but to offer an answer is to offer only speculation. It's a good question for which we have no given answer.

TS: Our next question is from Joseph.

31:50

Since it was brought up that Moses died in Oboth or the Transjordan, is there a correlation with Elijah being taken up in the same-ish area? If so, is there a connection then with these two men departing in this area to the transfiguration event?

MH: Yeah, it certainly could be the case. I mean, there is more than this particular aspect of their lives, in this case Moses' death and Elijah's translation. There are more similarities between these two characters than just that. So you could add this one to the list. It's hard to know if this is the reason they are mentioned together in the transfiguration, though. Again, it's obvious they're there. We don't know why it's these two and so we have to guess. Is it these two because of some other factor or whatever? Is it the miracles? I mean, you can't say Moses didn't die because God does bury him. So that can't be it. We're never really told exactly why they're paired, but there are a lot of similarities between the two. And I think this is a legitimate observation by Joseph that this could be another one of these things where their lives intersect or overlap.

TS: Andy's question about Jude is:

33:15

Did the false teachers know they were false teachers? I'm guessing yes, based on the examples that Jude used. For example, Balaam knew he was leading the Israelites to sin, but did Korah know he was opposing God? Could he have been doing what he thought was best? Could he have had good intentions? I ask because of pastoral reasons. I've been a part of my current congregation for 35 years since I made a decision to be a Christian at 18 years old. The current leadership does such a poor job in understanding and teaching the Bible that I hold discussion groups with the intent to help, especially younger Christians, get an understanding of their Bibles. I'm wondering if I'm actually a false teacher, potentially causing division in my congregation, because despite my best intentions, I'm leading others away from the standard dogma.

35:00

MH: Well, I would say if your dogma—what you're teaching—does not violate scripture, then by definition it is not false teaching. The litmus test is pretty broad and secure when it comes to Jude and, really, the other books in the New Testament. And that is false teaching typically gets categorized that way when there is something being taught that is against the nature of the gospel itself and Christology—the person and work of Jesus. False teaching isn't associated with things like disagreements over some issue where scripture is less clear, like a creation view or eschatology views or the gifts or something like that. It's typically the nature of the gospel and, again, Christology. Is Christ the Messiah? Did God come in the flesh? The incarnation, the virgin birth (these major things that are associated with the person and work of Jesus) are typically where false teaching is oriented or how it's oriented in the New Testament. The faith once delivered in

Jude 3 isn't everything that ever popped into a pastor's head. The faith once delivered is very specific. It's the gospel. It's Christology. And, again, not only in Jude, but in other books as well. Jude also focuses on bad conduct, so if you're not encouraging immoral conduct, according to the standards of the New Testament, then you're not going to be a false teacher.

As far as Korah and the others, they are certainly not cast as being sincere, with the possible exception of Balaam early on when he refuses to curse Israel. But Balaam does cave for personal gain in suggesting how to get the Israelites to sin, and I would agree that he knows he is doing it, too. Korah and the others... Korah might have thought that he was doing the right thing (and, of course, was not) by opposing Moses and Aaron and Miriam and so on and so forth, but I mean, just put yourself in the situation. I mean, we've had the crossing of the Red Sea. We've had demonstrations of God's power through Moses. You would think that Korah would think twice—two, three, maybe 100 times—about opposing Moses, just in view of the fact of the way that God has used him up until that point. So I guess it is *possible* he could have been thinking and could have been sincere, but I would still consider it unlikely. It's hard for me to see Korah (Cain was another one, and Balaam) as ignorant and innocent of what they were doing.

TS: Yeah, I often wonder about that, Mike. You know, you see all these people, and *everybody* has their different interpretation about what the verse means. They all have YouTube videos. They all have a podcast. They all have something, teaching in the congregation. Everybody is saying 10,000 different things.

MH: Yeah, YouTube videos.

TS: Conflicting opinions and stuff like that, and it's just like, how do you run the risk of being a false prophet? I mean, you're just doing the best you can and your intention is not to mislead. People understand different things at different times.

MH: Yeah.

TS: That's the sticky thorn for me.

MH: Yeah, it's at least a possibility. But again, I think the false teaching zeros in on those things that are pretty clear and get a lot of emphasis in scripture (again, Christology and the nature of the gospel) that I think you would pretty much know if you're violating these things or not. But again, that's not to say that there aren't hard questions when it comes to Christology or maybe the nature of faith and works together and stuff like that. So there's a little room in there to make a sincere mistake. I don't want to shut that door entirely, but there's so much

emphasis in scripture on these things that it is a little hard for me to believe that someone could be that ignorant and claim innocence over them.

TS: Yeah, so it's okay. You're not going to run the risk of being a false teacher if you start a study group, right Mike?

MH: Yeah, yeah, yeah. I think that's an overreaction just out of the gate.

TS: So don't be scared to do it.

MH: Do the best you can.

TS: Sounds good.

MH: Be teachable and to the best you can.

TS: Jimmy has our next question.

38:50

Dr. Heiser mentioned in one episode of Jude about the Targums. I've been reading them myself and it's clear they make a great defense for the Visible Yahweh. I just got the Logos starter and I'm wondering which Targum bundle Mike might recommend for the Logos system for my study.

MH: Yeah, I mean, it's been several years since I was at Logos so I'm no longer familiar with how Logos packages their products. In other words, I couldn't tell you what the contents of the Targum bundle are without going to the website just like a regular customer would. But generally, I'll say this: when it comes to the Targums, I recommend the volumes edited by Martin McNamara. It's called the *Aramaic Bible*. It's a multi-volume set, and you have the Targums in English with some notes and commentary. So I would recommend that.

TS: I hope Jimmy got the Naked Bible special.

MH: Yeah, hopefully.

TS: Alright, Gregg wants to know:

39:55

If "from" means "from," then Seth is first from Adam and Enoch is sixth from Adam, unless we count Eve as first from Adam, then Enoch is seventh from Adam, correct?

MH: Yeah, this question is about the phrase in the book referring to Enoch as the seventh from Adam. What Gregg describes is one way to get to seven including Eve, because Eve came from Adam in the original creation story. In

regard to Genesis 5:1-24, though (the genealogies), another way is to include Abel. You could include Abel. Just throw him in there. Even though he is not listed, he is still from Adam, but you'd also have to exclude Cain. So there's another strategy for getting Enoch to be number 7. Bauckham, in his commentary on Jude that we used throughout the series, he and others (Bauckham's not the only one) call this numbering "inclusive generations," counting Adam as the first. So even though you think "from" means we start our count after Adam, in antiquity they didn't count that way. They included the name of the person whose generation it was, so counting Adam as the first in the list. So you would have something... Really what you're saying is that Enoch was the seventh from Adam including Adam. That's typically how the counting is done, but for us, we don't count that way.

So, again, what Gregg suggests here about Eve, or maybe throwing Abel in as a way to get to seven, again, that's just a strategy for us. That's not how they would have done it in antiquity. The inclusive method was normative in ancient Judaism. You get the same... The book of Enoch is the one who specifically has the designation, "the seventh from Adam," and of course, Jude picks up on that in 1 Enoch 60:8, 93:3. Jubilees also refers to Enoch as the "seventh in his generation." That is Jubilees 7:39 and 1 Enoch 37:1. I mean, it comes from different sources, but the inclusive reckoning where Adam is actually included in his own count is typically the way it was done, even though we don't count that way. So it is odd to us because the way we count, he would be sixth, as Gregg says.

TS: Alright, Mike. Well, we appreciate everybody who sent in their Jude questions. That's all that we have for now. Mike, we're probably going to do a couple Q&As over the next couple of weeks so please continue to send in your questions at treysticklin@gmail.com, and I always appreciate the folks who do that. Don't forget to visit our sponsor, logos.com/nakedbible. We would appreciate it. And with that, I want to thank everybody for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God bless.