

The Bible (Unmuted) Transcript**Episode 8****The Resurrection of Jesus – An Interview with Gary Habermas****April 4, 2023****Teacher: Matthew Halsted****Episode Summary:**

Is it reasonable to believe Jesus rose from the dead? Do the historical facts support the conclusion that Jesus resurrected? During this holy week (2023), I chat with Dr. Gary Habermas about these and other related questions. Gary is a well-known scholar of resurrection studies, and in this conversation he shares about his lifelong investigation into what really happened on that first Easter morning.

A Link to Gary's Book:

<https://a.co/d/1pPgHAq>

Gary's website:

<http://garyhabermas.com>

+ + +

If you like this podcast, consider subscribing and sharing with your friends.

+ + +

If you like this podcast, consider becoming a Patreon supporter. You can do so by visiting: <https://www.patreon.com/TheBibleUnmuted>

Don't forget to subscribe to the podcast and share it with others!

www.matthewhalsted.com**Transcript:**

0:00 **GH** I'll hold up a New Testament that I brought to the school, and I'll say, if this book inerrant, Jesus is raised from the dead. If this book is not inerrant, it's reliable to some level; a lower or higher mid-range level. I would argue that Jesus still raised from the dead. But for you here tonight, who are skeptics and atheists, if the Bible is unreliable, if there's almost nothing we can know from the Bible, I'm here to tell you tonight that Jesus is raised from the dead.

INTRO:

0:30 Hey everybody! Welcome to the podcast! My name is Matthew Halsted. Thank you for tuning in. This podcast is all about engaging the Bible. While every episode is different, the goal is always the same. Learn more about scripture and how to interpret it. So sit back, grab your favorite beverage and enjoy the show.

1:05 **MH** Hey everyone. I'm super excited to share this conversation that I had with Dr Gary Habermas. Dr Habermas is a leading researcher in the field of resurrection studies. And as we come across Easter this week, or as we come upon Easter this week, I thought it would be so much fun to sit down with a scholar of Gary Habermas's repute and talk with him about whether or not it's reasonable to actually believe Jesus rose bodily from the dead. Dr Habermas is completing his magnum opus, a multi volume set on the resurrection due out starting next year. And so we talked a little bit about that. And I look forward to reading it. It's going to be a lot of fun

once it comes out. At any rate, I pray that this conversation encourages you and put some muscle on your faith. Gary, it's nice to see you again and get to chat. How are you doing, man?

GH I am doing splendidly. Except for my having so many requests for this and that, that I cannot get to my publishing deadlines. So in a way that's a super blessing. On the other hand, I can't get to my publishing deadlines so it's a pressure.

MH I'm honored that you're here. You told me off air a moment ago that these past three weeks, you've gotten 60 requests for either interviews, emails, whatever. So, yeah, we're honored here. So, thanks for hanging out with us.

GH I'm honored to be on. I took it. I took it! I must've thought it was a good one.

MH So Gary, we've known each other for several years, and we've talked a lot about the resurrection, and the resurrection of Jesus, and just resurrection period. And you are the guy on the resurrection. There's several of you guys. You Tom Wright, Michael Licona, William Lane Craig; you guys talk a lot about the resurrection and so I'd like to focus our talk today on that topic. This, episode will be released Easter week, or the week leading up to Easter. And so I thought, let's have Gary on. Let's chat about the resurrection. But before we get into that, tell the audience a little bit about you, your educational background, particularly your PhD topic and how that is just opened up a huge ministry for you.

GH Wow, well that's a huge topic because it lasts. I mean, it literally...Mike Licona asked me about this the other day for something he's doing. And we stopped and counted and I have been doing this, this is going to sound crazy, I've been doing it for almost 60 years.

I went into some well, I had a lot, long period of doubt. Ten straight years and ten on and off years for total of twenty. And as I've been telling people, I only realized this maybe a year ago; my doubt was book ended by the two most important people in my life dying. The first person who died, my great grandmother. And you say, well, how could your great grandmother be the most important person in your life? She was, and everybody my family knew it. My parents knew it, they were (inaudible) too happy that we were that close. Well, she died, and I started going through all kinds of doubts, and it settled on my religious faith. And I was a teenager when I started doubting. And I started reading everything. I mean everything. I was reading (inaudible) when I was seventeen and it scared me to death. And so people ask me in talk shows. They'll say, "hey, I'll bet you you're doing this for altruistic reasons, because you know it's going to help people doubt." And my answer is, well, I knew that would happen later and at that time, I didn't know it would happen later. But, but it has happened later. But no, I'm not that altruistic. I was doing it because I couldn't stand the doubt. I couldn't stand not knowing.

And one day I was reading a book that had a very simple paragraph that said if Jesus was raised from the dead Christianity would be true. Because otherwise, why would God raise him? And I thought, wow. Well, my friends were sending me to, I won't say silly things, but for my questions they didn't come up very high on the chart. And they were saying, read this, read that. How about this topic? How about that? And I thought those are good, but they don't answer my questions. And then when I read that paragraph, that did it. And I realized that if Christ had been raised from the dead, everything else is anchored to it. And my doubt ended just a handful of years before my wife and mother of my four children died of stomach cancer. So that's the other bookend. So I got in it for my own doubts. And now it's helping people. I'm overjoyed, but I can't say that's why I started.

6:05 **MH** Yeah, and then tell us a little bit about your doctoral work and the project. That you focused on up that eventually led to your PhD.

GH OK, well, I get my PHD in the Middle Ages. In 1975. And in those days, at least at my school, Michigan State, they weren't like the schools today that generally have three men doctoral committees. I had six people on my committee, and as far as I can tell, you didn't ask people direct questions. But as far as I could tell, three of them believed in the resurrection and three of them did not. And it was very balanced up. I had a Jewish historian on my committee. He was most complimentary guy of my dissertation. And when it was over, you'll get kick out of this, and your folks will; he handed me the dissertation back and said, "I like it." He goes, "but I think you left out the chief evidence for the resurrection." And I'm thinking two things shot in my mind immediately: what have I left in my whole life studied? And number two, why are you, a Jewish non-Christian historian suggesting this? And I said, "so what did I leave out?" And he said, "You said nothing about the Shroud of Turin."

MH Ohh, that's interesting.

GM It is interesting. On a bunch of grounds that he would even care about it. And, you know, but the committee was good. They are very complementary. They did not have me add a sentence to my dissertation. And I didn't think I was going to get through. I thought they're going to be really super, super tough, but they had me leave the room, and they discussed it, invited me back in. I was all nerved up, and the director said, "thank you for stepping back in Doctor Habermas." And I thought, ohh my. I can't believe it.

MH And now your project specifically you're your dissertation, which essentially became your life's work that's culminating in a magnum opus that you're currently working on. We'll talk about that in a few as well. But the essential thrust of your work is that, if the Bible is true, if it's inerrant, let's just take the top notch here - if it's inerrant, then you need to believe in the resurrection. If the Bible, if the New Testament is not inerrant, but it's still historically reliable, you should still believe in the resurrection. And so kind of work with... take us through those steps? I mean, it seems obvious that if the Bible is inerrant, if it's, you know, completely inerrant, then you would have to believe in the resurrection because the Bible speaks of it. But how could it be the case that if the Bible's not inerrant? If it's just a historical document, if the New Testament writings particularly, why should a person still believe that Jesus rose from the dead?

GH I'll add one more step to your two steps, I'll add a third one. OK, and I frequently do this when I'm in lectures, especially state universities and I hold up a New Testament that I brought to the school. And I'll say "if this book inerrant, Jesus is raised from the dead. If this book is not inerrant, it's reliable to some level; a lower or higher mid-range level. I would argue that Jesus still raised from the dead. But for you here tonight, who are skeptics and atheists, if the Bible is unreliable, if there's almost nothing we can know from the Bible, I'm here to tell you tonight that Jesus is raised from the dead." And so I think that kind of is an attention grabber.

And so what I've been doing for these four volumes that you're calling my magnum opus: volume one is a volume on evidence. I just turned it in and the printed pages are just short of 1100 pages. And It took that long to spread the evidence. And here's the key; I use evidence the way critics use evidence. At no point did I ever argue the Bible is true because the Bible says so. That's ridiculous. Not ridiculous as a statement, but ridiculous that I would try to convince anybody by arguing that way. It doesn't work. So I'm using the slowest common denominator argument that I can just use a dozen facts, which I cut down to 6. And those 6 are what I call the minimal facts. And I think you can show that without any question that the resurrection is the best possibility for those six facts than any other solution.

11:07 **MH** And these six minimal facts are facts that every historian, whether confessional or a non-Christian historian would assent to, right? This is what you are calling the minimal facts. The facts that all would agree to?

GH Yeah. Yeah.

MH When I say these guys accept it, I don't mean, "oh, you gotta be wrong, because if almost everybody accepts these guys, how about the dozens of people I've read who don't even believe Jesus existed?" And I'll go, "time out, time out. You're talking about people who may live in their parent's house. They call themselves Bible scholars. They haven't been to school. Now they are just picking this up on their own and they don't believe Jesus exists. But the real scholars, the New Testament atheist, don't give those guys a time of day."

In fact, Bart Ehrman, the well-known New Testament atheist; he said those people, the *mythers*; he said, they're mad that we don't give them attention and praise for their little books, their e-books, or whatever they are. We don't praise them. And they're ticked at that. He said, I want to tell you something. We don't read them because they're not scholars. And they say a bunch of things, which I think he calls laughers, a lot of laugh comments. And he says, they think they have scholarship on their side. He says they don't have scholarship on their side. He said, they don't have a foothold. They don't even have a toehold on the data.

I talk about guys who have to be scholars in a in a related field. They'd be like yourself. I mean, New Testament theology, history, classics, philosophy, archeology. There are some people PhD's in archeology. Those would all be relevant fields from this time. And then they have to be specialist with that background working in this area. They're the people I've surveyed, and they're the ones who read to the historicity of the six facts. Almost without exception.

MH Right. So the question becomes, what do you do with the six facts? Like, what's the interpretation of the six data points? And that's where the differences will be, of course, between say, an atheist, New Testament scholar, an agnostic, and a confessional scholar like yourself. But what is not in dispute? The facts are not in dispute, the six minimal facts. So can you kind of give us a run down? What are those six facts that every scholar or the vast majority of scholars will believe in? Can you give us a rundown of this?

GH Sure. I can do it really quickly. Jesus died by crucifixion? And this one is just as well accepted as crucifixion. I mean, there are two that I'd say along with preaching the Kingdom of God. These are the three best things we know about Jesus.

The second one is the disciples had experiences that *they* believed were appearances of the risen Jesus. They had a real experience, which, in their interpretation, was Jesus risen.

Thirdly, these data were preached very, very early. How early? Well, Gerd Ludemann passed away not too long ago; an atheist New Testament scholar. Gerd Ludemann said this message was preached, and his word is *immediately*. In fact, one scholar wrote an article a few years ago and said, this idea that whatever their experiences were, they started being preached immediately. He said it is a baseline given from critical theologians today. That was published in a major New Testament journal. In fact, I think it was *The Journal of New Testament Studies*. But OK, that's three.

Crucifixion experiences early, Four: they turned the world upside down. Their lives were transformed. Sometimes to the point of dying, sometimes just to the point of being beaten. Sometimes just to the point of leaving their families and businesses and trapesing around the world because they were so committed, that they were called to preach the gospel. A few did die

as martyrs. We have a first century statements for the martyrdoms of three of the four best known ones: James, a brother of Jesus. Peter and Paul. And John's the other one. And so we have martyrdom comments for three. They were three of the four. They were sold out.

And four and five were two individuals: James the brother of Jesus and Paul the skeptic who was going across the countryside bringing in men and women. He never said he killed them, but he said I testified against them to their deaths. So I guess that means he gave that one of the major testimonies that got them killed. Those six, you will have to look hard to find anybody in disagree with that deal.

16:17 **MH** What basis do these people have for believing these six minimal facts if they don't believe the Bible is say inerrant. Tell the audience how they are getting their data? Yeah. So I guess what I'm getting at is so let's just assume that the Bible is not inspired by any means, and it's still reliable it seems for as a historical document of what was going on in the first century, right? That these even secular scholars; atheistic, agnostic scholars still look to the New Testament as historical artifacts that we can use to discover something about the early Christian movement. That's correct, right?

GH They do. Yeah, what they do is... here's a good example. Bart Ehrman says the Gospels are not reliable. And then he turns around for his whole book, *Did Jesus Live* and he tells you a whole bunch of things in Jesus' life that are reliable, and either they happened or something very like them happened. For example, he says, one of the best-known rules that New Testament scholars are wearing, as well as historians use: multiple facts, independent, multiple facts, is a great measure of whether something happened. And Bart Ehrman lists 15 sources within a 100 years of use of depth, which is his period of historicity which is a 100 years in the ancient times. He says he's got 15 sources of Christian and non-Christian, of the death of Jesus by crucifixion. He says it's not questioned at all.

By the way, that earlier fact I mentioned, the (inaudible) being transformed. It was Bart Ehrman, who said, after they had these real experiences, and after they began preaching them, his phrase was, "they turned the world on its ear." And that's pretty cool. I mean, that's a pretty good phrase for what transformation is.

So what these guys do is they'll start with Paul, and they think Paul is the number one New Testament scholar. It's a real easy reason for that. They don't think any apostles wrote the four gospels. I'm talking about the real skeptical guys. The middle of the road moderates will give you, (I understand from New Testament scholars) Mark on Mark; maybe even Mark from Peter on Mark, and Luke; are pretty much givens. But Luke and John are more questioned. But they don't know that about the gospels. So they go to Paul because they know they can trust Paul.

And what they'll do is of the thirteen books that bear Paul's name, they will grant the historicity of seven of those books. And I tell my PhD students, it's interesting because the seven books they grant are the seven you would use if you're giving a series on who is the Apostle Paul. And those seven are: Romans, 1 & 2 Corinthians. Galatians, Philipians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon.

Now, so there's, there's the start to your question. We'll give you those seven epistles. And if you pull something from those seven epistles, if we don't believe it, at least we say you're within your rights to use it because it's from a really good source. So they'll give you seven by Paul. That's a good start.

Then you got Ehrman, who pulls all kinds of facts out of the gospels, which he says are unreliable, but he says that you still know all these things. And so when you start doing this; how many are

multiple attested? and how many of them have likely authors? When you start doing this, you get a long list of facts and those six are among the ones they grant.

So even if it's not reliable, as Ehrman says, even if it's not reliable, you have enough data to stand on. And a lot of these guys will tell me I accept all Habermas' six facts, but it's what you do with them that's important. And I'll say, "Well, great. Now, what do you do? What do you do with them?" And they'll go, "Well, I don't know. What do you want me to do?" I'll say, "Whoa. Pick a naturalistic theory. If you don't think it happened, pick it a naturalistic theory." And they will almost never pick a naturalistic theory.

And this is changing significantly. This is one of the things I found out. They will seldom pick the naturalistic theory, but they will even more seldom pick one theory and only one theory and stick to it, so that if they're disproven, they're wrong. That's why they won't do it. Because they know you are armed. It's like you're covered with twenty weapons on your body and you're going to use whatever one you need if they come at you, and you're going to use them against their one. And if they lose that one, the world will know they don't have a basis for what they're saying. So they generally, I mean some of the main guys who only chose one theory, two of them just died. Gerd Ludemann and John Shelby Spong just died in the last couple of years. So they're not around anymore. And one of the other guys who just died E.P. Sanders of Oxford and Duke Universities; Sander says in one of his books that the naturalistic theories are no good. They've been refuted. He called himself a liberal. And then he says, however, these theories just don't work. They're baloney. So...

21:40 **MH** And as every Pauline Scholar will tell you, E.P. Sanders is a pretty important scholar. Every New Testament scholar will tell you that E.P. Sanders is a very important scholar this past century.

GH Oh yeah! He and his co-author changed the whole world from Bultmann over to the Third Quest. He's the bridge between Bultmann's dominance for fifty...well, Bart is in there too. So Bultmann, let's say, Bultmann in charge for twenty years. Pretty much. Sanders changed Bart's (*Ehrman*) Hellenistic take on the New Testament to the Third Quest Jewish take on the New Testament. That was Sanders.

MH So essentially This is why you call it the minimal facts, is because we're going to use minimal sources. You're saying to yourself, okay, I'm going to look at only the sources that say the skeptics are going to use. I'll play that game, play by those rules, and then let's see where we get. And you're saying that those sources will give you the minimal facts that everybody can attest to, and you just named them, and the only reasonable explanation, the best explanation, you might say, is of those minimal facts, is that Jesus rose from the dead.

GH That's right. That's my point. Yeah.

MH So let's just say... well we've played this game. A lot of times we've done it, even in public settings and things like that.

GH Even at your house one night.

MH Yeah, we were right. Yeah, that's right.

GH Where are your elders and a couple other people firing all kinds of doubts.

MH Yep. So for the listeners, Gary was over at my house several years ago. And we were with a group of guys and we were just hanging out and chatting. And we kind of play this game. Matt gets to be the skeptic and Gary gets to win him to Christ, kind of thing. So it was a good night.

GH Yeah, we did that.

MH We did that at the conference and at the lecture you gave at church.

GH I remember that too.

MH So this is, you know, every time we get together, we sort of play this game. So we're going to play the game now.

GH Okay, let's do it.

MH So I'm going to push back. Let me, let me play skeptic here. I'm going to push back and say, OK, maybe Jesus only seemed to die, right? What's wrong with that? Maybe he just got knocked out. And then his appearances later, you know, weren't all that extraordinary because he never died in the first place. What's wrong with that argument?

24:05 **GH** OK, this is called and variously used as the *swoon* or the *apparent death theory* for the listeners. And first of all, I'll tell you of the critics out there you can't name of the sharpest guys who work in this narrow area; The Ludemanns and the Ehrmans. And you probably can't name five published scholars. I can only go by the published scholars. I can't tell who does it in private. But you probably can't name five of them who will hold that theory. And well, let me for just start with a comment. That will give them some reputations. John Dominic Crossan, who is as well-known as a skeptic as anybody. And then Marcus Borg, who passed away a few years ago are co-founders of the Jesus seminar who reject up to ninety-one percent of Jesus' so-called red-letter sayings. John Dominic Crossan says and it's pretty close to quote. He says. "I take it absolutely for granted that Jesus died by Roman crucifixion." And Borg's comment - you would think they wrote the two together, because it's almost a twin. So here you have two of the best skeptics in the world. Bart Ehrman would say the same thing - absolutely for granted. So here's what you got to ask, why do they think *swoon* does not have a chance? If they think *swoon* doesn't have a chance, and many, many others don't, it must not. Because these guys are very, very skeptical.

Here's some of the things I would say. First of all, myself and two friends, one of them a medical student, finishing his MD and he's got a PhD from medical school, because we need him in this group. We published an article about a year or so ago in a medical journal on the cause of Jesus' death. Now we didn't argue that a certain cause had to be it, but all we gave was a head count of medical people. And asphyxiation was chosen about two-to-one over all the other theories combined. Take all the other theories and double it and that's asphyxiation. Now the key to asphyxiation is you don't have to have a medical degree. You don't have to have an E. K. G. You're an E. E. G. The Centurion doesn't have to know anything. He just has to let the guy hang on the cross. And the asphyxiation theory, if it's true, not everybody says it is, is that when you slump down low in the cross, you asphyxiate. So you can't do it. You start losing your consciousness and you can't breathe. You push up. When you push up, you take these big gulps of air. And that's when you cuss people out. You know the two guys on each side of Jesus. They were saying all kinds of things to the people. That's when you do it. You push up and you let them have it and you slump back down. So it hurts to stand up like that. And you start asphyxiating again. All the Centurion has to know... and you go, well how come he (the Centurion) broke the ankles of the two guys, and he decided Jesus... and he left Jesus alone. Did the disciples pay him off? No, because he'd have to deal with Pilot. So first of all, the disciples weren't around.

They ran away. But if Pilot sees you hanging in the low position for a long time, let's say half hour, and not pushing up, you're dead. You can't fake it. From the asphyxiation view, you cannot fake death by asphyxiation.

So they came to him and then it says to make sure they did not break his ankles, but he instructed one of his legionnaires to stab him in the chest with a spear. You go, but that's only in John. Okay, cool. Why is it that Raymond Brown, James DG Dunn, and CH Dodd, three of them the very sharpest New Testament guys, in the last generation. All three of them take a stand for the spear wound. Why? Well, one reason is we have a Roman source, Quintilian, who tells us that the Centurion when they take the crucifixion, the dead body of the crucifixion victim; they take him down and a family comes to... before they throw him in a pit, if a family wants the body, he has one of his men strike the body one last time. Now the word for strike in Latin is a military term and it means to hit with an ax, a spear or a sword; to strike the body. So the dead bodies land on the ground, the family wants it, and they've got a strike - where they know they won't strike the knee, they're going to be soldiers. They are going to put their weapon somewhere that they know will kill the guy. So what I'm what I'm saying here is that what the Centurion did to Jesus is precisely what Quintilian said the Centurion would do after they got him down. But the Centurion did it when he was still hanging there at the end.

Alright, so we've got two things going here. Death by asphyxiation, you don't fake it. Alright so you do fake it. You *barely* make it. Nobody knows you're... and we only have a couple cases of people who got down off the cross out of thousands of people. If I'm not mistaken, Josephus said they crucified 500 a day. So thousands of people died. So they take him down. Let's say he's breathing very shallowly and they don't know he's alive. So he has this man, in Quintilian, strike, the guy on the cross, and they stab him in the chest. Ohh. OK, if you happen to make it breathing very shallowly in your coma, I think that spear wound to the chest will break you out of your reverie. You know, it would, it would end it.

But here's the third and major problem. There are many others. But here's the three - three major ones. Third, is to critique by the German skeptic. David Strauss in 1864 when he wrote his *Life Of Jesus* for the German people. He said, the problem with the swoon theory, which is probably the most popular theory at that time and up till maybe 1850. He said, the problem with the theory is, if Jesus struggled out of the tomb on Sunday morning, here's his problems: One, he didn't die. Two, he's got to move the stone. Three, if you believe in the guard, (skeptics don't), if you believe in the guard, he's got to get past them. Four, he's got to limp to where the disciples are. How far away would they be? I don't know. Quarter mile?

MH It'd be a distance for a beat-up man.

30:43 **GH** For a for a basically dead man. He'd have to walk there. And Strauss said, what does he say when he gets to the door? He's holding his side. He hasn't washed his hair. He is soaked with sweat and blood in his clothes, and he puts up his hand, and he says, "I told you I would rise again from the dead."

And to make a long story short, I don't doubt that the disciple would say God healed him, God did it. We believe medicine. They would say, God healed him. But I'll tell you what; he's alive but he isn't risen. This is not a definition of risen. And then Andrew, over in the corner, says, (sarcastically) "Ohh boy. Someday I'm going to have a resurrection body just like his." It doesn't work. So they would have to nurse him back to health. Who knows where he died, what he did, but they'd have to nurse him back. One thing they would know is that he wasn't raised.

And this is called the Strauss critique. And today, when skeptics are telling you why they don't believe in the swoon theory, I'm Dominic Crossan talks about asphyxiation. That's about as far as

he goes. Association is enough for him. But you got a spear wound and a guy who could not possibly be risen, alive. Those three things, pardon the pun, but those three things kill the swoon theory. I got a bunch of other reasons too, but those three are the knockout punches. And virtually nobody takes it for...well like Crossan. Just Asphyxiation. One of it, one of them does it for most people. You get all three, they seem almost closed case with many of them.

MH I'm reminded of something that N.T. Wright mentioned one time in addressing this question. He said, the Romans knew how to kill people, right? And I think, that's a pretty good response. I mean, the Romans were professional killers. They knew what they were doing. And the other thing too, is what's the evidence in the first century? You know, with respect to Jesus' death. I mean, it seemed overwhelming that everybody thought he died, right? So, the idea that he could have swooned out of the tomb, or, only looked dead or was only partially dead, or something like that. That just seems to kind of to fly in the face of what we know from the first century. Namely, that people thought he died, right? So if that, if that's something of an objection, just moving on, suppose we could entertain another objection.

OK, he died. We'll grant that. We'll go with all this with what everybody's saying, even the most skeptical people are saying that, yeah, he died. We'll concede that fact. But let's suppose that the disciples made it all up, right? Let's suppose that they had something to gain from the idea, the belief that Jesus rose from the dead. What's wrong with that argument? With that critique?

GH Your start almost anywhere, but it's probably... now, are you going to say they stole the body too, or you're not going to put that in there?

MH Yeah, I mean, yeah, they made it up. Let's say they stole the body as well, just to kind of, yeah, and they lied.

34:00 **GH** Yeah, okay, where are you going to start? First of all, there's virtually nobody today who will take that theory. No skeptic. And it has, it's been held by virtually nobody since a German named, Hermann Samuel Reimarus at 1765. Nobody's held it, and every once in a while, somebody plays with it. Richard Carrier has a little essay where he goes, "well, why not? You can play with this", but it's not his theory. He doesn't like it. So, the fact that nobody takes it, if no skeptic takes it, none; there's reasons why nobody takes it. The main one is still; the main comeback is the famous phrase we use: liars don't make martyrs.

The guys who stole the body, and you can leave that out... no, no, no, let's not say they stole the body. Let's just say they just lied. But the guys who stole the body cannot be the guys that give their life for this. And go in the same town over and over again. And someone says, "Well, you can't read their minds. You don't know if they thought they were going to be beat up when they went in there." And I go, "I'm not reading their minds. I'm reading their feet." If they go in the same geographical region or into the same town where they were already beaten up once, probably you don't go there again unless you're really revved up to be really thinking that you're preaching for the Lord. How does that belief come when you've stolen the body? Now what did you do with it? 'Liars don't make martyrs' is a huge problem for that view.

In fact, it is one of the theories that has a one punch knockout. And the one punch knockout is that a lot of these theories you have to you have a lot of punches and you knock the theory down. Hallucinations are an example. But a one punch knockout is that the guys who take the body could not be the guys who are transformed, who and some among them we know they died. Bart will say, "well we only know a few of them died." Great! Let's talk about the ones we know died. Peter, James, Paul; the most influential guys of all time.

Okay, a couple other problems. If they stole the body and lied, what brings James to the faith? Jesus' brother.

Third problem. What brings Paul to the faith years later? He's walking to Damascus and all of a sudden it hits him, "Wow, those guys could have stolen the body and Jesus is alive. And I'm going to live the rest of my life for him, and then I'll die as a martyr for him." Those things are just highly anti... each one is the opposite of the other one. And you got to pull off about four of those to account for Paul's conversion.

So you got the 'liars don't make martyrs'. You got James and Paul. There's three right there. So if we had three for (inaudible) there, there's three I would use for stolen body. And there are many others for stolen body.

MH Yeah. 'Liars don't make martyrs,' So, is it fair to say that a lot of people die for a lie, but nobody knowingly dies for their lie, right? Is that a fair statement?

GH You could say a lot of people die for a lie, and they know it's a lie. But nobody is... if I get this right, (there's guys who would say this very eloquently), there's a sentence that said about this. that said about this: nobody dies or something that is a lie, but they totally believe it can be true. Did I say that right? Did that make sense?

MH I think so. Yeah. They don't die for a lie that they know is (a lie). Yeah, yeah. I hear what you're saying.

GH But how could they be mistaken if they're the ones who stole the body?

MH Correct, yeah. It's a contradiction. There is a number of psychological defenses here. But one piece here, and I know this is something that many people talk about, but it's important for the audience to hear this part too, is that there's a theological objection here. It's that early Jews weren't necessarily anticipating an individual resurrection. They were anticipating a general resurrection at the end of time. But as NT Wright says, not the resurrection of one person in the middle of time.

GH And not the Messiah.

MH Not the Messiah.

GH Right? That's two. That's two points.

MH And if they were going to make something up, this probably wouldn't be it. This is not how they would've thought.

GH That's good stuff. There are all kinds of things. OK, when I went through these six minimal facts, the second volume, which has been turned in, (it was turned in about 2 ½ weeks ago), the second volume is all naturalistic theories. To my knowledge, nobody spends as much time on naturalistic theories of print as Mike Licona, who spends just short of 250 pages. The next book is Mike's and my co-authored book, *The Case for the Resurrection of Jesus*. If you count the endnotes, it's almost 100 pages again in naturalistic theories The book I just turned in is all naturalistic theories and it's over 1000 pages. It's probably the longest treatment.

Oh, here's the point I'm trying to make, of the six facts, every time you want it to list evidences for six facts that go against naturalistic theories, (keep in mind, I'm not using reasons that evangelicals cite because they cite an inherent or almost inherent book, and they get these facts),

I argue the way critics argue. And each one of the facts I have an average. I just did this the other day. I have an average of 14 reputations of each thing that can be brought up. It's like 13.9 of each one that can be brought up. And you got to keep in mind they don't come from people who hold the Bible and say therefore it's true. They come from the John Dominic Crossan, Marcus Borg, EP Sanders, (well, Sanders isn't even that strong. Not like these guys), Bart Ehrman and Gerd Ludemann. I prefer to use those guys. They're easier to use those guys because people realize, if you're using them; well, if they say you can get by with this, I guess you can get by with it. You know, that kind of thing. But fourteen evidences a piece.

So when I give you three for swooning, three for stolen body, that's three out of an average of fourteen. You know, some of them are major, and some of them are minor, but you got a bunch more awaiting the wings for each one of these refutations.

40:50 Become a Patreon member! <https://www.patreon.com/TheBibleUnmuted>

Let's pause our conversation for just a moment so I can share with you about some new features I'm offering. And if you find this podcast encouraging, if you find it to be a good resource for your study of Scripture, consider becoming a Patreon member. This will give you access to some cool stuff, and it will help support the podcast.

There are various tiers of support, starting at just \$5 a month. Every Patreon supporter gets access to a monthly bonus episode, as well as an invitation to be part of the launch team for my latest book. Other levels of support will get you access to early drafts of my books, articles, and research that I'm doing. You also have the option to join monthly zoom meetings, where we will take deep dives into all sorts of biblical and theological subjects. You can even sign up to be a voting member of episode topics, as well as enter into cool monthly book giveaways.

Visit [patreon.com/TheBibleUnmuted](https://www.patreon.com/TheBibleUnmuted) or follow the Patreon link in the description for this episode. A Patreon membership supports my ministry and it really helps me do what I do. I cherish your support. So, if you would, consider becoming part of The Bible (Unmuted) community.

42:00 **MH** Somebody might push back, I can envision perhaps a very conservative Christian pushing back and say, "Well, you don't need to give up the inerrancy of the Bible to make this case for the resurrection." It's interesting. Tell me what you think about this. I mean, the resurrection was a story that was told, a message that was proclaimed before the New Testament was canonized. So your method of kind of bypassing the whole inherency question or even inspiration question right is pretty much at home in the first century because they didn't have the New Testament Canon at all to yet. They were still proclaiming the resurrection. And why do you think that it's even an important point to make? I've heard Dan Wallace talk a little bit about the question of inherency and basically saying, look I'm not going to lose my faith if the Bible turns out not to be inherent. Which I think it would be shocking to many evangelical Christians, but essentially, your method would definitely allow for that.

GH Yeah I think your point is brilliant, Matt, your point that the way I'm arguing right now is the way the Apostles would have to argue before the Gospel of Mark was written. So if Mark is 60, which is pretty early, I think (inaudible) is 60-65. Let's say 60-70. Let's say 60 that kind of inherency inspiration; how good is the text argument, you don't get all these facts from Paul's epistle. So you kind of have to start with the gospels because they told the story of the crucifixion and the initial appearances. And by the way the strongest single appearance is the appearance to the 12. It is the one that everybody agrees on that it is the one that is singly attested by the most reasons and the most sources. So, but you have to get to Mark, who doesn't even have appearances. So now you got to get to Matthew. That's going to bother some people. I'll let you tell the people who are nervous that I said you don't have... most scholars think that Mark's gospel

end in chapter 16, verse 8. So, the appearances: now we're going to go to Matthew, which critics usually date about 80-85. So, 30 till 85 is 50 to 55 years. That's a long time to wait. So with all that time, what you're saying is, they have to argue the way I'm arguing.

MH That's what I find fascinating about your argument. I've always loved your argument. But I, I find that really fascinating. For that reason. I don't get into apologetics that much anymore. Partly, I think, because sometimes apologetics come across a little cheap. You know what I mean? A lot of Christian apologetic approaches to defending the faith. In other words, what I'm saying is that there's a lot of apologetic arguments out there that just don't do the job, at least even to my dissatisfaction as a Christian. And I think that's why I love your argument, is because you're getting back down to the bare bones of what that ancient or first century proclamation was all about.

And that's why it's important to bring in those perhaps psychological explanations that we were talking about, you know? That get into the psyche of the of the first Christians. Like, why were they willing to die for things like this? Tell me your comment on this, when I read 1 Corinthians 15, you know, there's a little creed there in 1 Corinthians 15 that's very important. Paul makes a statement in that chapter though, where he says, look, our faith is in vain if Jesus didn't rise from the dead. And I think it's a very important statement. Because if I were making up a "new religion", "a new movement", and I based that entire movement upon the veracity of the physical resurrection of a person, that wouldn't make sense. If I was if I was going to do that, I would base it on maybe a feeling or flutter in my heart, not something that's in the real world. You know what I mean? I would do something like, hey, I had this vision one night and God told me that we're all wrong, so follow me. Because that's a subjective experience that can be put to test. But a physical resurrection implies the empty tomb, implies appearances perhaps, right? And that's why I find Paul's statement there so fascinating. What would you have to say about that? Like the central point of the of the Christian faith being the resurrection? How important is that in this?

46:37 **GH** How about this? I'm glad this point came out of our earlier one. I said the critics will almost never seldom enough, but almost never pick a theory. Never will they pick only one theory and stick with it. And some of the main ones died in the last couple years. There's almost no real well-known guy who takes one (inaudible) because they're afraid if you get after them and disprove it, they can't then say, "ohh no, no, no. Let me check this other one." Because they'll look really, really bad in a debate and everybody will start saying *that* Christian looks like the right one here.

Paul is doing what the skeptics won't do. Paul is picking a theory. Paul is saying, yeah, this guy truly, truly died. Chapter 15, verse 3; he truly died. And let me tell you what happened afterwards. He was raised from the dead. Now, what Paul's saying is it's not swoon, it's not hallucinations, not stolen body. He did what Bart Ehrman won't do. Bart Ehrman said in a recent book, I won't pick a naturalistic theory anymore. Paul picked a supernatural theory. And was willing to stand on it. And darn you know, Paul, good job. All the evidence stands with you. You couldn't have known that in those days. You knew some evidence. But look at all we're finding out now with multiple attestation and the criteria in the New Testament. What points of this, and this, and enemy attestation, and embarrassment, all this kind of stuff, Paul didn't work with that stuff, but he boldly said, I'll pick one theory. He was raised from the dead and we will be raised too.

MH Interesting. Yeah, and you know, I've studied a lot of Paul's interpretations of the Old Testament. And there's a hermeneutic that I've detected in my... I put this in my book, and especially in Romans 4. Paul interprets the Abraham story with a resurrection hermeneutic. And that's important, I think, because it shows just how important the resurrection was to him. It not only changed his life, but it changed his hermeneutic, right?

GH Good point. In 4:25, right?

MH Yeah, he essentially retells the Abraham story christologically, right? And I'm trying to think Paul's thoughts after him here. And, yeah, that's not the only place. The resurrection was ground breaking, I think, as an event for him. And which when you consider his not only skeptical previous life, and he wasn't just a skeptic; I mean, he was an enemy, right? I mean, he was someone who saw the Christian movement as a heresy, that he wanted to squelch out. So something had to change his mind and that the Christophany that he experienced in Damascus was very important. Very important. Obviously.

I've just got two more questions, and then I'll let you go. Let's get really practical, maybe perhaps pastoral here. This Easter, what can, what should Christians take away from the resurrection story? In other words, how does it help us today? I mean, we know it's, you know, it paves the way for our resurrection at the end of time and so forth. But what about today? Like, how does it help us navigate the craziness of our strange world?

49:48 **GH** Yeah, I think it's especially good at this. First of all, intro comment; the resurrection is related to almost every major area theology to New Testament, 300 versus on the resurrection in the New Testament. And those 300 verses are related to almost every major doctrine, most of all, the gospel doctrine of the deity, death, and resurrection of Jesus. Totally. But a lot of other stuff too; First Thessalonians and the stuff about Jesus return. *And So therefore comfort one another with these words.* Talk about practical. I'll start right there.

Or I'll go backwards; what about when a loved one dies? Believers and unbelievers are sad. Paul says, we grieve too. But here's the difference. We are not like those who don't grieve, that don't have hope. Now, you and I both done a number of funerals. I was a pastor for years. An unbeliever's funeral is a lot different than a believer's funeral. Now, critics can say all the believers are just, they're just hoodwinked. Okay... Great. Well, now we're back to you can fight yourself through this maze and why couldn't have happened.

But Paul says the resurrection gives us a hope that even when we bury our mother, our father, our child, our brother, our sister, our spouse. When we bury that kind of person knowing they're going to live forever, gives us an incredible peace. So I'll go back to that one at the beginning. The one that said to be true, the teaching for today, and is said to be true more than any other teaching in the New Testament; almost 20 times in the New Testament, *we will be raised like him.* Jesus said it. Paul said it. John said it. But John says, and I like his words: *We shall see him as he is, and we shall be like him.*

The New Testament hope is that we will be raised like Jesus and the reason the resurrections worth it if you want to get right down to it, and be a selfish as we want to; but the reason it is so important is because we will be raised together. And that's an important point. Paul says, actually tells us, that we will be raised corporately and we will all be together. He tells us that, he says, *we will be raised together with you.* Now that's interesting because the Jewish deal was the resurrection would happen as a unit. The whole nation would be raised together. Paul kind of incorporates that with Christians a little bit. He knows they're they die at different times. But he said we will be raised together and share with you and heaven. So what you got right there is life after death. Eternal life after death and sharing the part of our existence that we probably value the most; the sharing. That's all guaranteed by the resurrection.

That's just two right there that will be raised and will be able to fellowship together. You got the third one that I already gave; we have hope at funerals. We have hope. But if you line up all things that are true, it all ties the meaning of the cross to the resurrection. Justification in Romans 4:25 is tied to the resurrection. In 1 Corinthians 8 it seems like he's recast a creed. He's repeated a creed that brings Jesus into the Shama, and the God of the Shama is the Father, and the Lord of

the Shema is Jesus. That's in 8:6. Well, that's only seven chapters before the resurrection of Jesus. Paul knows about the resurrection in his mind when he copies that creed. Almost like, you know, two members of the Trinity.

And Oscar Cullmann, the famous credal author who talks about the early creeds and how early they are. He says, there are no Trinitarian creeds, but there are a bunch of creeds that prefigure the Trinitarian.

Like baptizing them in the name (singular) of the Father, the son and the Holy Spirit. At the end of 2 Corinthians, where he uses all three members again. To me, that's kind of Trinitarian, but all but Cullmann says it's the beginning of the Trinity. So now you got some of our most important doctrines....

You could go down the line, and you could get a list of, say, a dozen... I've got a little book I wrote years ago that lists about a dozen doctrines that follow from the resurrection. I would tell people. Here's the biggest thing the resurrection gives us: a yellow brick road. It tells us what we should be doing now, and where we'll end up. IE in the Emerald City. So I used to say it a lot more than I say it now, but I'll say it, "therefore, follow the Yellow Brick Road. Follow the Yellow Brick Road."

And on the way through that tale in *Wizard of Oz*, the theme goes something like this: Don't throw those apples back at those mean apple trees that are throwing at us. We got a job to do, keep going. Well, look at that big guy on the right with the ax. He looks like a he could cut us to pieces. No, you work and go over and help him. He's going to be a friend of ours. Let's keep moving. Uh oh, here's the darkest part of the woods. And of course, we have the darkest parts of life. And this is the area where there are lions and tigers and bears! And I'm preaching - I do this in a church and the little kids in the church go, "Oh my!" And here comes this lion and... We get through that because we have to follow the Yellow Brick Road. Then the hardest thing is when we come out see the Emerald City and there's poppies in between and everybody's going to sleep. Well, now you learn another theme. When someone falls down and goes to sleep, the others have to come over and help them up. So now you got this corporate body that we call the church that has to help people that are in pain. And you all get everybody through it and you get safely to the Emerald City. It's such a great picture, but it's that road that you have to stay on. And the resurrection says, don't wander off of it. Stay on it. But along the way, you've got all these other doctrines fleshing in. So it's, it's a key to everything in New Testament.

56:35 **MH** I feel like as I said a moment ago, I said that Paul's hermeneutic was changed by the resurrection of Jesus and I think that our hermeneutic needs to be changed by the resurrection of Jesus. And when I say hermeneutic, I don't merely mean how we read the Bible, although that's important. But I also mean how we interpret life. When we face life's challenges, like you were saying, that we approached that and interpret that with a fresh christological, resurrection-focused understanding. Where we can look at even death and say, where is your sting? And so I think there's a lot of pastoral perspective here.

GH Yeah, that's biblical too. Where is your sting? And I tell people that's not poetry: *Oh death! Where's your sting? Where is your victory?* As Tom Wright said, He says Paul is trash talking death there, he's trash talking the devil. And the resurrection made Paul so bold and so firm. He didn't mind getting in death's face. Didn't mind getting in the devil's face. He would get nose to nose with them and say I know you can hurt me. Go ahead, give me a swat. I know you're you can hurt me, but you can't keep me from going to the Emerald City. I'm going, so try to shut me up. You won't do it until the Lord sees fit to bring me home. That was this whole message.

MH That's so good. And one more quick question. This is more of a teaser for the audience to go and maybe do some research. And I know you've done a lot of research on this, but tell us

really quickly the role, or the potential role that near death experiences have for resurrection studies. Are near death experiences a legitimate topic of interest with respect to this topic itself.

GH Yeah. In one book of medical doctors who write on the subject; they start the book by estimating that 9 to 20 million people have had near death experiences in the world today. How about the history? The point is, critics like to say to us, one of the most potent objections is, here's why my theory is better than yours. I only have this walk a day, live a day world, a real world of sticks and stones and trees. You have to have another world with God. And you've got no evidence for it. You just got this other world to stick in there. And if you don't have evidence for the... time out. I don't want to talk about the resurrection... Okay time out. Let's talk about near death experiences. Because those people, you take the simplest ones that there's hundreds of them that are evidenced. A few dozen of them, their evidences, as far as we know, the person has no brain or heartbeat or waves. And they report things that are true.

Now, if you take a simple one. There's a person on the operating table, they come back on top and they're screaming at the doctor wat the top of their lungs, their spirit, I guess. "Quit beating on my chest. I don't want to come back. Let me go. If you just let me go, I could go. I've seen enough to know I want to go out from here. I don't want to come back anymore!" And they're shouting. And finally, the doctor does his job and he's pounding and pushing. And the person comes back. And aghh, they're in a body full of cancer and then they have to go through the process of death. Where were they that they were shouting at him?

And I saw a cartoon. One frame of a cartoon with the doctor who stops and says to the person up above, "are you going to come back down in the body or am I going to pronounce you dead?" You know, like as if he could hear NDE-er. But they don't hear the NDE-er. Now, I don't know what you call it. But the NDE-er is in another realm. And that's what critics say we don't have. They say we don't have another world that's attached to this one. But what NDEs say is that there's an afterlife somewhere. We don't know where, but there's an afterlife.

And so I say to critics, if I know there's an afterlife. That's the same realm that resurrection happens. It there's a straight line from follow the Yellow Brick Road to an afterlife. And probably the best indication of the afterlife, not counting the resurrection, is near death experiences. And so if in if the NDEs open the back of the path to the Emerald City, resurrection opens the front of the path and they meet in the middle. Resurrection says there's afterlife. I'm sorry... Resurrection says there's an afterlife. NDEs say there's and afterlife. They meet together. And that's the benefit of NDEs. They tell you there is another world, or at least another dimension, say whatever you want. There's another dimension, and it's called the afterlife. The resurrection ties in with this, and we not only have the NDE evidence, we have the resurrection evidence. So the path...that's for me, I tell people, yeah, I do resurrection and NDEs. But that's not two topics. That's one topic. It's resurrection to the to the Emerald City. That's the two combined. And that's why I think they are related because they both tie together in the idea of the afterlife.

1:01:48 **MH** Yeah, they both announce that physical death is not the final say. Essentially.

GH Exactly. And why does that person up above their body very frequently say to the doctor when beating on them, "Stop it. I want to move on. Let me go." Why do they do that? Because where they can see they're heading is far better to them than the cancer racked body that, "I know I'm going to die from in six months anyway. I'd rather just go right now. Just let me go." Okay, that sounds good. Now, how does that tie in?

In Philippians chapter one, are two of my favorite five versus in the New Testament. Paul says, *for me to live as Christ and to die as gain*, (21). I tell people I've heard a lot of sermons on *to live as Christ*. I've heard virtually no sermons on, *to die is gain*. We don't talk about it. But Paul says

it's a gain. Then two verses later, which I like even better, he says, *I prefer to die and be with Christ, which is better by far*. And you know Greek way, way, way more than I do. But I understand that *better by far*, what we translate *by far*, is an emphatic *I really mean it*. It's *really* a lot better there. In fact, I read a translation once where the translation was, *I prefer to die and be with Christ, which is better, far better*. That's how they translate that emphatic thing.

And doesn't it seem like Paul is saying similarly to what the NDE-ers are saying? Leave me alone. I want to go home. I already see what I'm going to have. I want to go there. Hey, listen. I love you guys, but I know you're going to be with me too. So just let me go. Besides, who wants to go through what I have to go through if I go back in the body? Woops, I'm back in the body.

You know, so it's a similar message. I'm not trying to say NDE-ers are (inaudible). I'm not trying to do that stuff. Because NDEs don't tell us which religion is true. It's like intelligent design or (inaudible) for God's existence. It just says some religion is true. But there is an afterlife and the person wants to stay there. And Paul wants to stay there. And Paul seems to have had a near death experience in 2 Corinthians 12. Bible scholars, before NDEs became popular, I've got a couple of them where they said, the time element; where he said, *I knew a man 12 years ago*; they said, the time element works out pretty closely when he was in Lystra, stoned and left for dead. In fact, if that's true, that would all the more makes 12 look like an NDE.

MH Yeah, I've heard that too. Yeah, for sure. And you know. it's really important that the listeners understand that these near-death experiences, you're not making these up as like thought experiments. These are actually, what you were talking about, were based on actual reports that people have given and are later verified by a third party. They see something that there's no way that a body on a gurney should have been able to see, right?

GH It's in the medical literature. There's a major guy a good friend of mine, Bruce Greyson. He has published, I understand, 100; he's done way more than 100 articles, but he's done 100 essays in medical and psych journals. So if there's 100 articles from one guy in the journals, it's being taken pretty seriously.

Hey, Matt, here's something for you. I just read this recently from an atheist. You probably know Michael Shermer, he's is a really well-known atheist. He's the editor of the journal *Skeptic* and he's in a survey, and here's how he starts. I don't know who did the survey, but he said in a recent survey...they only surveyed atheist and agnostics. Atheist and agnostics. Someone asked the question: do you believe in an afterlife? Now really quickly, I mean, philosophically, we would say, "hey, y'all, if you believe in an afterlife, that doesn't come from your philosophy." But there's a surprising thing. 32% of them believed in an afterlife.

MH I remember you telling me that the other day.

GH It's inconsistent with their theory, but they want to go there.

MH It just goes to show that that topic is hot for not just believers, right, but for a lot of people.

GH But it doesn't follow from their worldview. It's a contradiction. Yeah, I think for believers that put us back to Philippians 1:21, 23. It's a fantastic message.

MH It would present a challenge for philosophical naturalism. At least the sort that I know, that I'm aware of. Maybe they come up with a different...

GH No, I think you're right. I mean, here's the funny thing, a Buddhist, a Hindu, a Muslim, a Jew, and a Christian, can stand shoulder to shoulder and affirm NDEs and an afterlife, and not

know which one is true from NDEs, because the NDE doesn't prove any of them. But here's what they all agree on. Naturalism is false. And with it, of course, that it is a subcategory.

MH Well, tell us when your book's going to be out. Is it next year? Is it this year?

GH The first Volume is due out. If there's no delays (right now we're on target), it's due out this coming January. Well, this coming, that's a long way. It's due this next January (2024).

MH And do you have, do you have a working title? Is that something you can share?

GH You know what? I'd share in a heartbeat if I knew it. I don't know, they call the set *The Resurrection* and they call the first book, *The Evidence*. They called the second book, *Alternative Theories*. Because not all of them are naturalistic. And so they're doing it like that. Real simple titles, like Resurrection, Resurrection Evidence, Resurrection Alternative Theories. And we're moving on to the last two volumes.

MH Oh, very good. Gary is always a pleasure to talk with you. And today is no exception. I just really enjoyed this conversation. Thank you so much for hanging out with us.

GH Matt, your knowledge is great. I love talking to you for that reason. In fact, your people don't know this, but Matt is one of the three New Testament scholars who reviewed two of my chapters. I can't take that stuff on my own. I mean, I have a Greek minor; which I tell people that doesn't make me good, that makes me dangerous. I can't do Greek like that.

Oh, by the way, the fellow who's editing my book, what they told me, I got to check this out; the guy has got a PhD in Semitics. And when he goes through, he changes all my titles like *Josephus, the Life*, or you know, *War*. He changes all the titles to the Latin exact titles that are called in scholarly work. So he put together my scholarly index at the beginning where all the sources I use and put the (inaudible). But he did it. He did the index with all the good titles instead of Habermas saying (inaudible) Antonius, Julius Caesar 14. He does the Latin. He does the abbreviation that are used in classical literature.

MH That's his home territory. It's second nature...

GH But I mean between you and the other two New Testament guys who did two chapters each; and now this guy, who I've never met, but he's my editor of the whole thing, he's doing all four volumes, editing them. The Lord has just given me a great team and you're one of them. You're one of the guys to go through this and I'm eternally grateful for what y'all have done.

MH It's a pleasure. I enjoyed those two chapters and I can't wait for the whole set. I'll be the first one to be there. You need to go on vacation once that thing hits the shelves.

GH I do. But my wife and I can't figure out where we want to go because all our grandkids, 16 of them, live in this town. And you know what my wife would say: Well, there's a solution. Take them all with us!

MH Oh, there you go. Yeah. Go to the beach. Have some fun. Well, Gary, blessings to you and your ministry. Thanks for hanging out.

GH Thank you very much. I enjoyed it.

1:10:05 That's the end of today's episode. And thanks again for listening to The Bible Unmuted. If you like this podcast, consider rating it on your podcast platform, subscribing to it, and sharing with your

friends. You can also support the podcast by becoming a patreon member. Go to: <https://www.patreon.com/TheBibleUnmuted> - or simply find the link in the description of this episode. Thanks for listening. Until next time, friends.