

## Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 444

Q&A 56

September 25, 2022

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)

Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)

### Episode Summary

Dr. Heiser answers your questions:

- Since God is referred to by Abraham as Jehovah in Genesis 22, why does he tell Moses in Exodus 3 that his name was not made known to the patriarchs? [6:00]
- Was the Edenic fall a desire for wisdom? [23:40]
- Do we have to keep asking for forgiveness, or is it once-and-for-all? [27:35]
- Why did God designate someone like Samson to lead the nation? [29:35]
- If we're all going to end up on a New Earth, why did Jesus say he was going somewhere else to prepare a place for us? [34:15]
- Could "earth" be translated "underworld" in Genesis 1:1, as suggested in an article by Scott Noegel? [39:45]
- What does Mike like about Handel's Messiah? [41:40]

### Transcript

**TS:** Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 444, our 56<sup>th</sup> Q&A. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he is the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey, Mike. How are you doing?

**MH:** Oh, pretty good. Just trying to hold up through radiation and chemo.

**TS:** Yeah, yeah. We pray that that's good. At the time of this recording, you're almost about to start. You're a few days away. So not quite there so nothing new to report quite yet.

**MH:** Yeah.

**TS:** So we continue prayers during that journey.

**MH:** And if we have news everybody will hear about it.

**TS:** Yeah, other than that, how are things going?

**MH:** Other than that, things are going on as normal.

**TS:** Yeah.

**MH:** I'm staying busy.

**TS:** Yeah, yeah, you like your Fantasy team?

5:00 **MH:** Generally, I do. I mean, I don't think my Naked Bible team was my best draft, but I can't complain too much.

**TS:** Yeah, same here. I'm competitive, so it's all about making the moves during the year.

**MH:** It's all about your guys not getting injured.

**TS:** Yeah, that too. That too, and COVID. My son has COVID right now so it's just a reminder that that has not gone away. It is still here.

**MH:** It's still part of life, yeah.

**TS:** Yeah, yeah, it's not going away anytime soon. Alright, Mike, well we're doing a Q&A. We had a couple good Jude Q&As and now we're just doing a regular Q&A. So don't forget you can send me your questions at [treystrickin@gmail.com](mailto:treystrickin@gmail.com) and Mike, we've got a handful here today. If you don't mind, I'm ready to tackle them if you are.

**MH:** Sure, let's go.

**TS:** Alright. Our first one is from Scott in Cincinnati.

6:00

**In Genesis 22, Abraham calls the place of the sacrifice "Jehovah-Jireh." Yet, in Exodus 3, God tells Moses that by His name, Jehovah, was He not made known under Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Is Genesis showing evidence of an anachronism, or is God's point something else in Exodus 3?**

**MH:** Yeah, I think the actual reference here is Exodus 6:3. I'm just going to read it for everybody. Well, going back to verse 2. So this is Exodus 6.

**<sup>2</sup> God spoke to Moses and said to him, "I am the LORD. <sup>3</sup> I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, as God Almighty, but by my name the LORD [YAHWEH] I did not make myself known to them.**

So that's Exodus 6:2-3. Now if you go back to Exodus 3, obviously that is the revelation of the divine name in that passage in the burning bush, but I think this is actually the verse that Scott in Cincinnati is thinking of. He asked if this is evidence of an anachronism, or is God doing something else in Exodus 3. This passage, Exodus 6:2-3, is Ground Zero for the JEDP theory—that is, the theory that would deny Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. And this is one of the main go-to passages to justify a source-critical approach where the Torah (the Pentateuch) was not written by Moses, but is actually the result of the weaving together of at least four (and JEDP theorists would say more, but at least four) sources by an unknown editor or a team of editors at some point in Israel's history—that they either simultaneously composed these sources and then somebody later put them together or they were sources that had been in existence for a while through oral tradition and then got put together into a coherent document that we know as the Torah or the Pentateuch—the first five books of the Old Testament.

So there's really no way to answer this question without getting into the whole JEDP theory. This is not just a simple anachronism. This is coupled with a lot of other things. Because if we take Exodus 6:2-3 at face value where God tells Moses, "Hey, I didn't appear to the patriarchs through my divine name; I didn't use my divine name with the patriarchs." Well, then how do you get it back in [Genesis] 22? Well, the answer is an editor put it there to make all of the sources—these disparate sources that are named J, E, D, and P, the four main ones... Again, there were more than four, actually, if you get into the whole system. Some editor somewhere, to make these documents sort of appear as one cohesive story, would use the divine name in different places to sort of unite the sources and make the narrative come out as a cohesive whole.

10:00

One of the criteria for the JEDP approach to scripture (or at least approach to the Torah) is what is called the "divine name criterion," and that is, which divine name are we talking about? So the way the standard theory goes, the J source would be a document that is readable on its own. These are various strands of the Pentateuch—various sections of the Pentateuch—that if you took them out, if you pulled them out and put them together, they could be read as one coherent document. And that source is labeled J after the divine name, Yahweh. The Germans were doing this, so the Y sound is actually the letter J. So the Jahwist is referred to as one of these sources. So we've got sources divided up on the basis of which divine name was used. So one source uses Yahweh.

Another source will use all of the L names, and this is where you get the patriarchs—El Shaddai, something like that; Elohim. The divine name changes or at least this is the theory. So the E document is this hypothetical document where... Again, you can read about the stories of the patriarchs in Israel's history—parts of the content of the Torah. I have to assume that my listeners know what is in the Pentateuch to some extent here. So you could pull out all of

the verses, all of the sections that use one of the E words (El Shadai, Elohim, El—these kinds of names for God), and if you put all those together, the theory goes that the E document could be read as a standalone document all by itself.

Then there's the P document. The P document also uses Elohim as a divine name.

There's the D document, which is for Deuteronomy, that is going to use both. I mean, it gets very confusing very quickly to somebody who isn't reading the Hebrew text. It's very hard to teach people what the JEDP theory says, especially in a format like this—like just an oral podcast. But even if we had a classroom with a blackboard and Power Point slides, it's difficult to conceive how scholars are conceiving this. They would run across passages like Exodus 6:2-3 and say, "Ah, here we go, here we go! I mean, Moses himself—the Torah itself—says that God didn't use the divine name (the Yahweh name) up until the encounter with Moses (we'll just put it that way—up until God has encountered Moses at Sinai); before that, it was some other name. So this invites the Torah (the Pentateuch) being divided up by the divine name used."

Now there are other elements of JEDP. It's not just the divine name. Sometimes the Pentateuch has two or three versions of the same story or the same event. The most obvious example of this is in Genesis 1 and 2 where, ostensibly, one account of the creation ends with Genesis 1:26-27—the creation of Adam, the creation of humankind, male and female; whereas, if you go into chapter 2, you have a separate creation story for Adam and Eve as you keep reading. They are created separately. So which is it? Which is the story of creation, the one in Genesis 1 or the one in Genesis 2? And again, source critics would say, well, this is proof that you have two separate stories that an editor has put together, and so they are what are called doublets. What I just explained to you in Genesis 1 and 2 would be an example of a doublet—a story that occurs more than once.

15:00 There is the divine name criteria. Again, we are not going to get into JEDP class here. It's just impossible. You could spend whole semesters on this. In graduate school, we spent a whole seminar—a whole semester—on JEDP because this is standard Biblical criticism nowadays. This is standard Biblical studies nowadays. So that is what you are seeing. That's what Scott in Cincinnati is seeing. He is seeing this verse tell him something that apparently ought to be pretty obvious, but when you go back into the text, it's not obvious because you have both divine names appear in one verse or you have Jehovah appear earlier. Jehovah's a false name anyway, but you have Yahweh appear earlier than the encounter. At the burning bush, you have the divine name used.

So what's going on? Well, what I just explained to you, that is one view of what is going on. That you've got multiple sources of the Pentateuch, and these are things you can detect in the text that lend legitimacy to the idea. You say, well,

what about if we don't believe in JEDP? Well, then you believe in something else, okay? You can be someone who insists on Mosaic authorship for every word of the Torah, which I don't. Again, I'm not JEDP, but I don't hold to the traditional view, either, because I just don't think it's defensible in a number of respects. Again, this isn't a class on JEDP so we're not going to get into all the details.

But this whole question depends entirely on your view of the authorship of the Pentateuch. I'm what used to be called a Supplementarian. I think there's a Mosaic core to the Pentateuch and I don't see any reason why Moses couldn't have written whatever this core was (a substantial amount of the Pentateuch), but then I also think that there is editorial work going on in the Pentateuch as well. So I'm something in between. People used to believe in a Mosaic core that was added to as time went on. Like Genesis 1 to 11 would've been a separate authorship event. From the patriarchal stories forward you have oral tradition that the people, the Israelites in Egypt, would have been preserving and then they get codified and they get written down, ostensibly by Moses or somebody else. You have events of the Exodus and the wilderness wanderings that lent themselves much more to an eyewitness account. So you'd have Mosaic authorship there, but not other places. So that's what I am.

Now I say all of that to say this: You can translate Exodus 6:2-3 differently so that it doesn't say that this is the first time that Moses encountered the divine name or the divine name was held back until later. Now, I only know of one scholar who has argued for this alternate translation, and the alternate translation is legitimate. It is found in a book by Sir Francis Anderson. I think he was "Sir." Anyway, Francis Anderson. Maybe he is not Sir, but Frank, as we knew him in the office [laughs]. Francis Anderson wrote a book called *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*. And in that book, he argues for a different way of understanding Hebrew sentences in different places, and Exodus 6:2-3 is one of those places for him. So he has it come out as just sort of a statement about... (Again, we really started off with a winning question here. "Stuff that you cannot illustrate in a podcast," we might as well call this question.) He just translates it in a different way, but you don't get sources out of it. It's about the only thing I can say here without the audience not knowing some Hebrew to be able to unravel and explain this.

So my advice to Scott in Cincinnati is take your pick. You could do some learning about JEDP. Evangelicals are typically horrified at JEDP (not evangelical scholars, but evangelicals—the average person in the pew) because they think that later references like in the New Testament where Jesus and others refer to the Pentateuch as the Law of Moses, that that must require that Moses wrote all of it. I don't believe that for a minute. The Law of Moses is just a way of referring the Pentateuch. Moses is the main character. What else would you call it? The Law of Joshua? The Law of Levi? No, you would call it the Law of Moses because Moses is the lawgiver in Israel's story. That's the role he played, and so

---

20:00

the law is mostly about what happens... The Torah is mostly about what happens in and around his life. Obviously, in the first 11 chapters and the patriarchal stories, that isn't true, but once you get past the book of Genesis, the whole thing is Moses—Exodus through Deuteronomy. So really it is only the book of Genesis that does not concern Moses. Everything else does. So, again, it would be very natural to refer to it this way, but you have people push back that say, "Well, Jesus took it as the law of Moses. He quotes stuff in Genesis like Adam and Eve getting married when Jesus discusses marriage. The male and female become one flesh and so on and so forth and he calls it the Law of Moses." Well, again, that's what it is. If he was quoting Daniel, you would call it the book of Daniel, even though the book of Daniel never claims Daniel wrote it. You would call it Daniel. That's because it's all Daniel. All Daniel all the time in the book. What else would you call it? I'm not a believer that the phrase "Law of Moses" requires Mosaic authorship, but I'm also not of the disposition to think that JEDP is a sound way to approach things. I think ultimately the JEDP theory is based on circular reasoning. But anyway, that's just my take. So I'm what used to be called a Supplementarian.

And I think I'm going to draw this question to a close at this point and basically say that's the best I can do in a podcast on this. We can't have a full class on JEDP or what it is, why there might be something to it, why it might be based on circular reasoning, alternate ways to understand a Hebrew sentence... You just can't do that in a podcast format like this.

**TS:** Mike, can you real briefly remind everybody out there why Jehovah is a false name?

**MH:** Because the four consonants of the Tetragrammaton (the four consonants of the divine name) are not spelled that way. I mean, there's no vocalization given for the divine name. The vowels from Adonai are taken and applied to YHWH to create this name, but the name isn't the real name. The name is the contrived result of taking four consonants of one word and the vowels of another word and putting them together. And this was done because the name of God was not something to be... It wasn't used in regular discourse. Scribes would write it, obviously. We've got it a few thousand times in the Torah and thousands of other times in the Hebrew Bible. So they would write it, but they wouldn't say it. And so this became the convention in writing to use the consonants, but then once the vowels were invented in the Middle Ages, to use the vowels of the word Adonai as the vowels for YHWH even though everybody knew that they weren't the real vowels.

**TS:** Perfect. Alright. Scott in Cincinnati, I am a Cincinnati fan for the next few months because I have Joe Mixon as my running back.

**MH:** What loyalty!

**TS:** Yeah, yeah, exactly. Alright. Our next question is from Randy.

23:40

**Luke 2:52 says Jesus increased in wisdom, stature, and favor with God and man. I was listening to episode 138 and you mentioned an ancient Israelite would say three things caused the depravity in the world: The fall in Garden of Eden, the sons of God and daughters of Eve, and the Tower of Babel. Am I reading into scripture my own interpretation when I see the Edenic fall was for a desire for wisdom? The hybrid spawn of terrestrial and celestial gave humans stature while the Tower of Babel incident was intended to give them favor and a name. Am I out in left field on this?**

25:00

**MH:** Right. So the question refers to the threefold cause of depravity. Like Trey just said, the fall in the Garden of Eden, the sons of God episode in Genesis 6 (and by the way, the women there are never called the daughters of Eve; that's a little C.S. Lewis there), and the Tower of Babel is the third one. I would not say you're out in left field here. I would say you're out beyond shortstop [laughs]. What you're doing is you're noticing possible literary connections. That's what you're doing, which is always an interesting and, in many cases, fruitful exercise. Jesus is the Second Adam. According to Romans 5, that is how he is referred to, which can suggest things like he was the antithesis of what happened to humanity in the early parts of the Biblical story. So once you have Jesus cast as the Second Adam, then that creates the impetus to start thinking about him as the New Adam and ways that Adam and Jesus contrast or might relate to each other—you know, compare and contrast. That's all really that is happening here. And Randy is postulating a few possible literary connections between the material in Genesis 1-11 and material outside Genesis 1-11.

Having said that, again, I don't think you're in left field. I think you're out beyond shortstop. I would want to see something more textually rooted, like specific vocabulary of the Septuagint being used in the way that his question described. I would need to see it specifically used in Luke 2:52—in Luke's description of Jesus, so that that would sort of telegraph to me that Luke wants us to see something in the Septuagint of either Genesis 3 or Genesis 6 or Genesis 11 (or Deuteronomy 32, for that matter). But beyond that, that is the only way you can really prove a literary argument—to show literary connections. In this case, in the Greek in the New Testament and the Greek of the Septuagint for these passages (and to my knowledge, as far as the vocabulary), you don't have these meaningful overlaps.

So I would be predisposed to not buy what Randy is selling here, but I don't think it should be characterized as being out in left field. I mean, this is just having a good eye for things that might have some relationship to each other. So to me, I would put this in my "needs to be thought about more" file and needs more

investigation. There is a possibility that it might be something intentional, but I don't think Luke does a very good job of telegraphing it if it is. I would need more than what is there in Luke 2:52.

**TS:** Matt wants to know:

27:35

**Is forgiveness once and for all? After a person has repented and asked for forgiveness for their sins and accepted Jesus Christ as their personal Lord and Savior, do they have to keep asking for forgiveness every day for the rest of their life? Or is forgiveness once and for all?**

**MH:** Well, when you confess your sin, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness. I mean, this is 1 John 1:8-9 and, again, for those who don't necessarily have that memorized, let's just go there real quickly. Let's go back to verse 8 here. This is John writing to believers.

**<sup>8</sup> If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.**

So we're going to sin. We're going to sin as believers.

**<sup>9</sup> If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.**

When you confess your sins, they're forgiven and that doesn't mean that you never need to confess another sin. That's not what the passage says. I mean, the answer to this question is 1 John 1:8-9. Again, we're going to sin as believers. We confess our sins, and we believe that God forgives us of our sins. We don't have to confess the same sins the next day. You confess the sins you commit. Again, you don't keep cataloging them and having to rehearse them every day, or else you'd end up with quite a grocery list in a day or two. God will forgive you if you confess. It doesn't mean that you accept the gospel and then you never have to confess another sin, either. It doesn't mean that, either. Again, 1 John 1:8-9, I would say, means what it says on both sides of that coin.

**TS:** Keith has our next question, and he is trying to make sense of Samson's behavior.

29:35

**Samson seems to be a real jerk; not a role model that you'd want your kids to admire. Is this the kind of person that God designates to be the leader of a nation?**

30:00

**MH:** Well, sometimes [laughs]. I mean, Samson was never the leader of a nation. Let's just start there. He was a judge, and the judges are localized



leaders. You actually have judges functioning as a judge and doing their judging at the same time. Some of them are concurrent. It's the only way the Old Testament chronology works out for the book of Judges. But again, without getting into all that, Samson is a judge. He is appointed at some point to get rid of a problem. That's typically what a judge was appointed for, to directly confront an oppressor or an aggressor against the people of God at any given particular time or place. So in Samson's case, the problem is the Philistines. He is also a jerk. I mean, I think it is an appropriate characterization. So he is not the best character choice, but the problem was God had come to Samson's parents before he was born and told them that he was going to use the child. He told them the child was supposed to be a Nazarite, and so on and so forth. God was preparing to use him. So in one sense, God obligates himself to using Samson because this was his intention. Samson does the job, but he also does a lot of stupid things—a lot of “jerkified” things, if we want to put it that way. He is not a good example to really anybody, except maybe at the end of his life. It's about the only selfless thing he ever does. It's also the only time he ever prays in the book of Judges—when he is about to die. Again, there are all sorts of things that would make Samson a less than admirable person, but he is the person God chooses to get rid of the Philistines.

Now listen to how I say this. Sometimes God chooses imperfect people to do something. Well, newsflash: we're all imperfect! Samson was a jerk. We're not minimizing that. But if God was waiting for a perfect person to use, he'd be waiting a long time. Now there are instances that get close to this language, where at least the person in question is notably righteous. Let's just take Noah. He's the one who is righteous in his generation. So you do have instances like this, but we can't say Noah was sinlessly perfect, either. We all know the full Noah story. We're not going to conclude that. So this is a little bit like asking, “Why would God choose David?” Samson's easy to pick on, but what about a guy like David? I mean, David does some of the worst things imaginable, but he is still God's choice of King over Saul. God does forgive him, and so on and so forth. So the quandary here is, why does God use anybody? That's the larger issue, because everybody is going to be a disappointment. Everybody is going to do something. Everybody is going to misbehave at some point. So I think we have to remember that and look at Samson's birth and his life that show that God had a plan for him and God persists in the plan. Despite Samson's flaws, God continues with the program. He knows what he wants to do through Samson and he is going to get it done. Samson is going to suffer for his behavior. He is going to suffer for his mistake and so will other people, too. So it is an imperfect situation, but God makes the most of it in the period of the Judges where everybody is doing what is right in his own eyes anyway. So he doesn't have a whole lot to choose from. I also think maybe the way we teach Samson to little kids is a problem here, too. Sometimes we exclude things in the Bible and make these characters out to be the heroes that they aren't, or more of a hero than they are. I think that is certainly true with Samson.

**TS:** Christine from Southern California:

34:15

**I often hear Dr. Heiser refer to Jesus Christ inheriting a New Eden here on earth, which makes sense considering the reversal of events that took place in the original Garden of Eden. However, I am confused about how John 14:2 states Jesus' words when he says he GOES to prepare a place for us (in His Father's mansion). Jesus says that if he goes to prepare a place for us, he will come again and receive us unto himself so where he is, we may go also. If this is a place he has been preparing for us on earth, wouldn't he phrase this differently? Is there something in the text that clarifies this passage that I'm missing?**

35:00

**MH:** Yeah, I think what is missing here is the New Jerusalem to the New Earth at the end of the book of Revelation. So I think these statements about Jesus... Where does he go? Well, he goes to the spiritual world at the ascension. He goes back to be with the Father. That's where he goes. He's not somewhere on Earth. He's not somewhere on the planet that we could go to with latitude and longitude and fix a GPS location to. I think what's in view here, is there is something that needs to be worked on on the spiritual side of things in the spiritual world, but that world is going to descend to earth at the end of days. Again, I think that is the missing element here—the way to combine both these thoughts anyway. So the New Jerusalem descends to the earth as Eden being remade.

Again, having said all of that, we can't be so literal with these passages and concepts. In the end, we're not restricted to living only in the New Jerusalem, either, even when that descends to the New Earth. It is not like we have a need for housing at all. We don't need housing in the New Eden and the New Earth in the circumstance of everlasting life. We're not going to suffer the effects of bad weather or other undesirable conditions. Given the nature of our spiritual resurrection bodies, we don't need individual domiciles. We don't need that. We don't need lots of things that we are probably going to experience in the New Earth. Just even the whole concept of embodiment... It's hard to think differently about these things when the only life we know right now means we do need these things. How can we imagine ourselves to be of such of a nature where we don't need this? We don't need protection from weather. There's not ever going to be anything that we would need protection from in terms of the environment because it will be a perfect environment. It will be what Eden was originally intended to be perfectly.

Again, we tend to overly literalize this language and then sometimes we realize we're doing that and then questions like this come up. And it's a good question because it helps to see that, well maybe we're overreading this a little bit. And

again, I think the solution is to see that there is something being prepared in the spiritual world which we cannot fathom because we're not part of it, but that world is going to descend to Earth as part of the process of Earth being remade. That's the picture of what is going on in the everlasting condition that we are going to find ourselves in and what we think of as heaven. Even the designation heaven... We're not going to live in the sky. We're going to live in the New Earth. Well, heaven... Why do we even use that vocabulary? Why does scripture use that vocabulary? Because it's a word you would use to denote where God is. God is in the heavenly places—up there, way up there, up there beyond what we can see. Again, we are forced by being embodied spatial beings... Because we are embodied spatial beings, we are forced to talk about the existence of eternal life with words like “housing.” We're just forced to do it because there is no other way to conceive it. So that what the Lord is promising in John 14 is a future eternal home, using domicile language (“the multi-roomed tent,” as I've heard it explained so many times, and there's something to that). We have domicile language, which is appropriate for an audience that would know only that sort of existence, which would be us. What our eternal home will really be like extends far beyond John 14 and really far beyond our ability to even conceive of it because we don't need embodiment anymore and we're in a perfect environment. Again, how we talk about that is difficult. So what Christine is detecting here is one of these inherent difficulties with it.

**TS:** Kevin wants to know:

39:45

**Has Dr. Heiser read Scott B. Noegel's article “God of Heaven and Sheol: The ‘Unearthing’ of Creation?” In it, Noegel argues that “earth” in Genesis 1:1 should be translated as “the underworld.” What are Dr. Heiser's thoughts on this?**

**MH:** Yeah, I haven't read it. The idea is appealing. That doesn't mean it's right [laughs]. I mean, Noegel does good work, but this sounds a little unconvincing. I'd have to read the article to buy it. Here's why. I like the implications of it, especially for reading Genesis 3 as being cast down to the underworld, which is how I think Genesis 3 should be taken. But I suppose Noegel is arguing that “heaven and underworld” makes for a better merism. A merism is a statement that is all-inclusive. So Noegel is probably saying because of Israel's three-tiered cosmology (heaven, earth, and what's under the earth), that if we would translate Genesis 1:1 as God creating the heavens and the underworld, it encompasses the entirety of the three-tiered cosmology. So it's a better merism. A merism is a statement, again, that is designed to express totality. That would be my guess as to what his argument is. So I kind of like that, but then what do you do with the rest of Genesis 1 where we get a day-by-day accounting of the earth being filled and no specific mention of the underworld? I don't know. I would need some persuading on this, even though I like the implications of it. But I haven't read it.

**TS:** Our last question is from Peggy.

41:40

**I remember someone once asking Mike what music he listens to. One thing on his list is *Handel's Messiah*. I would love to know more of what Mike likes about it.**

**MS:** I'm not sure I can quantify it. In general, I like big choirs. I like large choirs. There's something appealing, as well, about taking large sections of scripture and putting them to music, which is what *Handel's Messiah* does. I like the themes of it. I think the way it is done is really smart. People tend to equate *Handel's Messiah* with the "Hallelujah Chorus." The "Hallelujah Chorus" is about 1% of *Handel's Messiah*. So if you like large choirs and you like classical music, it's kind of hard to beat. I basically had the whole thing memorized in college. I listened to it so often. I can't claim that now, but most of it is still instantly recognizable when I hear it. But yeah, I don't know why I like it. I just do. I guess that is the best reasoning I can give to it.

**TS:** Alright, Mike. Good enough. Is there any other type of music? I mean, rock. You have to like rock, right—rock & roll? I can just see you now rocking out.

**MS:** I don't like much of anything. I'm just not a music person.

**TS:** Yeah.

**MS:** I'm very eclectic. For instance, I like small group harmonies, so I like a song like "California Dreaming."

**TS:** Mm-hmm.

**MS:** It doesn't mean I'll like anything else by that group.

**TS:** AC/DC.

**MS:** No, no. To me, that's a waste of time.

**TS:** I'm just trying to get you to admit that you rock out while you read the Bible. Like that image in my head needs to happen.

**MS:** No.

**TS:** That needs to be true.

**MS:** Movie themes I tend to like, because I like the Star Wars movie theme.

**TS:** Yeah, John Williams.

**MS:** I think John Williams was a genius.

**TS:** Yeah, absolutely.

**MS:** He did all the music for that. I mean, I like Weird Al, too. I'm all over the place. Weird Al was a genius, too, or is a genius.

**TS:** Yeah.

**MS:** I shouldn't use the past tense of it, but yeah, very eclectic, very spotty. I never really listened to much of anything.

**TS:** Yeah. Yeah, well at the time of this recording, too, I wanted to ask you, any thoughts on the queen passing today?

**MS:** Oh.

**TS:** I know you're a history buff.

**MS:** Yeah.

**TS:** I mean, are you...

**MS:** Well, my wife and I, we watch *The Crown*, if they ever bother to make another episode of it, but I don't know why you need two or three years in between episodes. That's what it feels like. We're kind of into the subject matter. If you watch that, it's hard not to be. So it was sad, but I mean, she was 96 so she led a full life for sure.

**TS:** Yeah.

**MS:** But still I was surprised. You just get used to her being there [laughs].

**TS:** Yeah.

**MS:** Yeah, the older somebody is...

**TS:** I saw a stat that she was on the throne for a third of American history. That's crazy.

**MS:** Can that be true?

45:00

**TS:** Yeah, yeah, 14 U.S. Presidents. I mean, she was on the throne for over 70 years. That's a third of American History.

**MS:** That's astonishing.

**TS:** It is. It really is.

**MS:** Yeah, you need to hit at least 70 to be talking about thirds.

**TS:** Yeah.

**MS:** Yeah, I guess she would've been close to it. Yeah. Wow.

**TS:** Alright, Mike, well that's all that we have for this week. We'll be looking forward to another Q&A next week, I believe. Don't forget to visit our sponsor, [logos.com/nakedbible](https://logos.com/nakedbible). We appreciate them sponsoring our show. If you have not gotten that software yet, you gotta do it. Go get it. [Logos.com/nakedbible](https://Logos.com/nakedbible). We appreciate everybody that sent in their questions, we appreciate Dr. Heiser for answering those questions, and I want to thank everybody else for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God bless.