

"From the cowardice that shrinks from new truth, from the laziness that is content with half-truths, from the arrogance that thinks it knows all truth, O, God of Truth, deliver us."



## A Controversial Newsletter "The Printed Voice of Summit Theological Seminary"

~ All articles are written by George L. Faull, Rel. D. unless otherwise stated ~

Vol. 28 No. 1

January 2015

George L. Faull, Editor



### Was Jesus a Rebel?

-- By Terry Carter

It seems that the world has decided that Jesus was a rebel. Some preachers have been saying this for years and I've read it in a number of books written by preachers. What I don't hear or read is anybody challenging this assertion.

Lately, even the pop singer, Madonna, has jumped on that bandwagon. Her new album is titled "Rebel Heart". The cover pictures her face bound with straps. As part of the publicity for it, she posted similar images of Nelson Mandela, Martin Luther King, and many others including Jesus to represent the "rebel hearts" in history.

She came under fire for this for two reasons:

**First** - Some saw it as racist to have images of black leaders bound by straps. Those making this complaint apparently didn't mind others being pictured as bound by straps.

**Second** - Some objected to her comparing herself to Jesus. They saw this as blasphemous.

What I didn't hear is anyone complaining about Jesus being characterized as "a rebel". It seems that we have simply come to accept this as a truism. But I think a fair look at the Scriptures indicates otherwise.

First of all, we need to establish what it means to be a "rebel". Too many see it as simply going against the norms of society. There are times when this might be done out of rebellion, but it is not in and of itself rebellion.

My dictionary gives two definitions for the noun "rebel":

1. A person who rises in opposition or armed resistance against an established government or ruler.
2. A person who resists authority, control, or convention, disobedient.

It is clear that Jesus was never involved in armed resistance against any established government or ruler. Not only did He tell Peter to put his sword away, He refused to use the power that He had to resist those who

came to arrest Him. Instead, He submitted to Scriptures and the Will of the Father.

"51 And suddenly, one of those [who] [were] with Jesus stretched out [his] hand and drew his sword, struck the servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear. 52 But Jesus said to him, "**Put your sword in its place, for all who take the sword will perish by the sword.** 53 "Or do you think that I cannot now pray to My Father, and He will provide Me with more than twelve legions of angels? 54 "**How then could the Scriptures be fulfilled**, that it must happen thus?" **Matthew 26:51-54**

He told Pilate that His servants would not take up swords and fight because His Kingdom was not of this world.

"Jesus answered, "My kingdom is not of this world. **If My kingdom were of this world, My servants would fight**, so that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now My kingdom is not from here." **John 18:36**

In fact, Jesus never arose in opposition of any kind to an established government or ruler. He said we ought to render unto Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's.

"They said to Him, "Caesar's." And He said to them, "**Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's.**" **Matthew 22:21**

He told the multitudes and His disciples to obey the religious leaders. Even though the leaders themselves were wicked, they were in a position of authority.

"1 Then Jesus spoke to the multitudes and to His disciples, 2 saying: "**The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat.** 3 "**Therefore whatever they tell you to observe, [that] observe and do**, but do not do according to their works; for they say, and do not do." **Matthew 23:1-3**

When Jesus was left at the temple at age twelve, He was not rebelling against the authority of Joseph and Mary. He was submitting to the authority of the Father.

In fact, He was subject to Mary and Joseph.

"48 So when they saw Him, they were amazed; and His mother said to Him, "Son, why have You done this to us?"

Look, Your father and I have sought You anxiously." 49 And He said to them, "Why did you seek Me? **Did you not know that I must be about My Father's business?**" 50 But they did not understand the statement which He spoke to them. 51 **Then He went down with them and came to Nazareth, and was subject to them,** but His mother kept all these things in her heart." **Luke 2:48-51**

I believe that when people characterize Jesus as a rebel it is the second definition above that they have in mind, i.e. one who resists authority, control, or convention - disobedient. The question is, "Does this description fit Jesus"?

Certainly there were times when Jesus found Himself in opposition to the religious leaders of His day. But the crucial question is whether this was a result of a rebellious and disobedient attitude on His part. Clearly this is not the case.

At times Jesus went out of His way not to cause offence. He had the right not to pay the temple tax. Still, He paid it so that He would not offend anyone. This is not the action of a rebel.

"24 After Jesus and his disciples arrived in Capernaum, the collectors of the two-drachma tax came to Peter and asked, **"Doesn't your teacher pay the temple tax?"** 25 "Yes, he does," he replied. When Peter came into the house, Jesus was the first to speak. "What do you think, Simon?" he asked. "From whom do the kings of the earth collect duty and taxes--from their own sons or from others?" 26 "From others," Peter answered. **"Then the sons are exempt,"** Jesus said to him. 27 **"But so that we may not offend them,** go to the lake and throw out your line. Take the first fish you catch; open its mouth and you will find a four-drachma coin. Take it and **give it to them for my tax and yours."** **Matthew 17:24-27**

Matthew says Jesus fulfilled the prophecy from Isaiah that says He would not quarrel or cry out. Jesus was a religious reformer, not a political one. He never joined any protest march or political movement. Rebels are always quarreling or crying out. They might even join a protest just to oppose authority whether they care about the issue or not.

"17 This was to fulfill what was spoken through the prophet Isaiah: 18 "Here is my servant whom I have chosen, the one I love, in whom I delight; I will put my Spirit on him, and he will proclaim justice to the nations. 19 **He will not quarrel or cry out; no one will hear his voice in the streets.** 20 A bruised reed he will not break, and a smoldering wick he will not snuff out, till he leads justice to victory. 21 In his name the nations will put their hope." **Matthew 12:17-21**

The Scriptures make it clear that Jesus was our model for obedience, humility, and submission.

He submitted to the baptism of John despite the fact that He had no sin.

"13 Then Jesus came from Galilee to John at the Jordan to be baptized by him. 14 And John [tried] [to] prevent Him, saying, **"I need to be baptized by You, and are You coming to me?"** 15 But Jesus answered and said to him, **"Permit [it] [to] [be] [so] now, for thus it is fitting for us to fulfill all righteousness."** Then he allowed Him." **Matthew 3:13-15**

When Jesus washed the disciples' feet, He plainly said He was giving them an example to follow.

"For **I have given you an example** that you should do as I have done to you." **John 13:15**

Paul plainly said that we should imitate him as he imitated Christ.

**"Imitate me, just as I also [imitate] Christ"**  
**I Corinthians 11:1**

His apostles taught submission to authority. Peter said to submit to every ordinance of man.

"13 Therefore **submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether to the king as supreme, 14 or to governors,** as to those who are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers and [for] [the] praise of those who do good. 15 **For this is the will of God,** that by doing good you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men" **I Peter 2:13-15**

Paul said to be subject to the governing authorities.

"1 **Let every soul be subject to the governing authorities.** For there is no authority except from God, and the authorities that exist are appointed by God. 2 Therefore **whoever resists the authority resists the ordinance of God,** and those who resist will bring judgment on themselves." **Romans 13:1-2**

Paul even commanded that we pray for all who are in authority.

"1 Therefore I exhort first of all that supplications, prayers, intercessions, [and] giving of thanks be made for all men, 2 **for kings and all who are in authority,** that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and reverence. 3 For this [is] good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior" **I Timothy 2:1-3**

Why then, did Jesus so often find Himself in opposition to the religious leaders?

The answer is simple. He was in full submission to the ultimate authority of God the Father, but they were not. When Jesus did the Will of the Father, it put Him in direct conflict with those whose will was out of line with the

Father's. Certainly this is a result of rebellion and disobedience, but not on the part of Jesus.

The rebellion was on the part of the religious leaders who opposed Jesus. Had they been in submission to the Father and willing to obey His ultimate authority, there would have been no conflict between them and Jesus.

Jesus never resisted the authority or control of the Father, but his enemies did. Jesus was never disobedient to the Father, but the religious leaders were. When He said, "Let him who is without sin among you cast the first stone," they all left. But when He asked, "Which of you can convince me of sin," they could not meet the challenge.

"So when they continued asking Him, He raised Himself up and said to them, **"He who is without sin among you, let him throw a stone at her first."** John 8:7

**"Which of you convicts Me of sin? And if I tell the truth, why do you not believe Me?"** John 8:46

What about resisting convention? That depends on whose convention you are talking about. He never resisted the convention of the Father. At times He did resist the convention of the Jewish leaders, but it is important to note that this was only when they were in conflict with the Will of the Father. He never resisted their conventions just to be contrary or difficult. He did heal on the Sabbath, but this was to teach them about mercy and justice.

Someone may claim that Jesus turning over the tables of the moneychangers in the temple is a clear example of His rebellious nature. I would disagree for a number of reasons.

**First** - Jesus acted alone. He did not get others to join Him in some kind of an organized movement.

**Secondly** - This was not a political issue, it was a religious issue. That is, He was not rebelling against or resisting any government or authority.

**Thirdly** - Jesus was not rebelling against authority, He was submitting to the ultimate authority of the Father. It was the moneychangers that were the rebels. They were in rebellion towards God Himself. I know this is true because Jesus quoted Scripture as the basis and authority for what He did. He quoted from **Isaiah** and **Jeremiah** and the disciples realized He fulfilled a prophecy from the **Psalms**.

"12 Then Jesus went into the temple of God and drove out all those who bought and sold in the temple, and overturned the tables of the money changers and the seats of those who sold doves. 13 **And He said to them, "It is written, `My house shall be called a house of**

**prayer,' but you have made it a `den of thieves.' "** Matthew 21:12-13

"14 And He found in the temple those who sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the moneychangers doing business. 15 When He had made a whip of cords, He drove them all out of the temple, with the sheep and the oxen, and poured out the changers' money and overturned the tables. 16 And He said to those who sold doves, "Take these things away! Do not make My Father's house a house of merchandise!" 17 **Then His disciples remembered that it was written, "Zeal for Your house has eaten Me up."** John 2:14-17

It must also be noted that Jesus was a greater authority than any of those that He opposed. This is true of the Pharisees, Sadducees, scribes, lawyers, Herodians, and moneychangers. You can't be rebelling against authority by simply exercising your own greater authority. Those who opposed Jesus were the rebels resisting His authority which was much higher than their own.

He was Lord of the Sabbath and greater than the Temple. You can't rebel against something over which you are Lord. It is subject to you, not vice-versa.

"5 "Or have you not read in the law that on the Sabbath the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless? 6 "Yet I say to you that **in this place there is [One] greater than the temple.** 7 "But if you had known what [this] means, `I desire mercy and not sacrifice,' you would not have condemned the guiltless. 8 **"For the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath."** Matthew 12:5-8

When the Jews asked Him what sign He gave to prove His authority for driving out the moneychangers, He pointed to His resurrection. This demonstrated that He was Lord of the temple and all creation.

"18 Then the Jews demanded of him, **"What miraculous sign can you show us to prove your authority to do all this?"** 19 Jesus answered them, **"Destroy this temple, and I will raise it again in three days."** 20 The Jews replied, "It has taken forty-six years to build this temple, and you are going to raise it in three days?" 21 **But the temple he had spoken of was his body.** 22 After he was raised from the dead, his disciples recalled what he had said. Then they believed the Scripture and the words that Jesus had spoken." John 2:18-22 (NIV)

We ought to consider carefully the implications of calling Jesus a rebel. Samuel told King Saul that obedience was better than sacrifice and rebellion was as the sin of witchcraft. He also said, "Stubbornness (which is a kissing cousin to rebellion) is like iniquity and idolatry". Calling Jesus a rebel is akin to accusing Him of witchcraft. Saul could not be king over God's people as a result of his rebellion. How could Jesus be King over God's people if He was a rebel?



"22 Then Samuel said: "Has the Lord [as] [great] delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, As in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, **to obey is better than sacrifice**, [And] to heed than the fat of rams. 23 For **rebellion [is] [as] the sin of witchcraft**, And **stubbornness [is] [as] iniquity and idolatry**. Because you have rejected the word of the Lord, He also has rejected you from [being] king." **I Samuel 15:22-23**

Moses was not able to enter the Promised Land after calling God's people "rebels". How can we expect to enter the promised land of Heaven if we call God's Son a rebel?

"And Moses and Aaron gathered the assembly together before the rock; and he said to them, "**Hear now, you rebels!** Must we bring water for you out of this rock?" **Numbers 20:10**

Sometimes Jesus is portrayed as someone who just enjoyed upsetting people in positions of authority. He is presented as someone who woke up each morning and asked Himself, "What can I do to make them angry today?" He is seen as someone who constantly went out of His way to offend and resist authority. This is simply not true.

Jesus lived every day in total submission to the ultimate authority of the Father. If this put Him in conflict with lesser authorities, He still obeyed the Father. He often did what was unpopular, but it was always because it was right in the sight of God. This is not what a rebel does. This is the opposite of rebellion. This is what is required of us as Christians.

Perhaps the clearest passage in this regard is what Paul said in **Philippians**:

"3 **[Let] nothing [be] [done] through selfish ambition or conceit, but in lowliness of mind let each esteem others better than himself.** 4 Let each of you look out not only for his own interests, but also for the interests of others. 5 **Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus,** 6 who, being in the form of God, did not consider it robbery to be equal with God, 7 but made Himself of no reputation, **taking the form of a bondservant**, [and] coming in the likeness of men. 8 And being found in appearance as a man, **He humbled Himself and became obedient to [the] [point] [of] death, even the death of the cross."** **Philippians 2:3-8**

Imitating Christ means that we throw out selfish ambition and conceit and embrace humility. It means that we esteem others above ourselves. It means that we are willing to be a bondservant. But most importantly, it means that we humbly obey the Father even to the point of death. This is not rebellion. It is submission and obedience to the ultimate authority.

Madonna and others like her who are claiming that Jesus was a rebel may understand rebellion, but they don't understand Jesus. He is the antithesis of rebellion. He is the ultimate example of humility, submission to authority,

and obedience. I have yet to see a rebel who imitates Jesus in these things. Those who insist that Jesus was a rebel are really no different than the animal rights activists who claim that Jesus was a vegetarian, the drinkers who claim He was a party animal, or the homosexuals who claim He was gay. They are trying to justify themselves by forcing Jesus into their mold. It is not only dishonest and inaccurate, it is blasphemous.

Instead of trying to remake Jesus into our image we need to transform ourselves to His. Instead of being conformed to this world, we need to be transformed.

"But we all, with unveiled face, **beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image** from glory to glory, just as by the Spirit of the Lord." **II Corinthians 3:18**

"**And do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed** by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what [is] that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." **Romans 12:2**

### Please Contact Us If You Desire Any of the Following:

- ➔ **Summit Theological Seminary Catalog (Free)**
- ➔ **Voices of Victory Tape, CD, DVD, and Article Catalog (Free)**
- ➔ **Sermon Subscription**  
Listen to 4 sermons in a month by Receiving 24 of George L. Faul's sermons on CD twice a year (48 for the whole year) at only \$2.00 per CD. (These will be mailed out and billed \$48.00 twice a year - a total of \$96.00. Also saves you on postage costs.)  
Or - Audio Tapes
- ➔ **One Year's Subscription of the Gospel Unashamed**  
\$5.00 a year, which is mailed out quarterly. You will receive 4 issues a year. Or, GOSPEL UNASHAMED on the Internet for **FREE**. (Please send your name, contact number, and email address.)
- ➔ **Information on Annuities and Retirement**

#### SUMMIT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

2766 Airport Road - Peru, IN 46970

(765) 472-4111

summit1@myvine.com

www.summit1.org

**Summit's Gospel Unashamed Newsletter** is also available on our Website in PDF format, for Free. If you wish to receive this subscription from the Website please contact us and let us know. An email notice of when the new subscription has been added can be sent to you, as well. Please increase our reading audience by emailing a trial subscription your friends and family. Please notify us with your name and email address if you wish to be notified of new Gospel Unashamed subscriptions.

## LILITH AND EVE

*“Heresies About Adam Having More than One Wife”*

Several people have notified us asking, “Who is Lilith? Was she the first woman created and not Eve?”



According to Rabbinic Talmud, Adam had a wife before Eve, whose name was “Lilith”.

Her story seems to have been invented to reconcile the different creation myths of **Genesis Chapters 1 and 2**. In **Chapter 1**, man and woman are created out of the earth; but in **Chapter 2**, Adam is alone, and so God makes Eve from Adam’s rib.

The Rabbi’s began with the Biblical reference to man’s first creation as a bi-sexual being; male and female He (God) created them (the first humans).

Some of the Rabbi’s found in this image something similar to what Aristophanes proposed in the Symposium: a dual bodied being later divided into two who must thereafter seek each other out. But others tried to take into account the later creation of Eve detailed further on in the text. If woman was created from Adam, after his initial creation, then what happened to the female created at first?

The answer, according to the Midrash, was that she was Lilith; created WITH Adam, she refused to comply with Adam’s demands that she submit herself to him, and in the end, fled from him by using the ineffable Name of God.

Adam then complained to God about his loneliness and the creation of Eve followed, together with the fall and the expulsion from Eden. Adam, blaming this on Eve, separated from her, and for a time reunited with Lilith, before finally returning to Eve.

Another legend has it that Lilith was Adam’s first wife, created together with him on the sixth day and from the same materials. Some say that Lilith was created a little later after Adam complained to God that he alone of the creatures of the earth, had no partner. Either way, Lilith was created independently from and equal to Adam, and this led to problems.

Not least of them arose because Adam always liked to be the dominate one in intimacy. No doubt this was merely a symptom of deeper differences, but it was the issue that caused the rift in the end. After a particularly fierce

argument, which Adam attempted to win by force, Lilith, in fury, uttered the mystical, ineffable Name of the Almighty, clapped her hands and flew away.

Adam complained to Jehovah that he had been abandoned, so God sent 3 angels to persuade Lilith to return home. They found her on the shores of the Red Sea in a place populated by a particularly lascivious breed of demons, from whose attentions she had been giving birth to a hundred more little demons every day. At least, that is how the angels reported it in Adam’s version of events.

The 3 angels tried to coax Lilith to return to Adam but she only laughed: “How could I go back to Adam after the entertainment I have enjoyed here?”

The angels threatened to kill her but she only dared them to try. Which they did, and failed because she had learned some magical tricks in her exile. But after a great battle they managed to bundle her into the outer darkness and slaughtered her offspring.

Adam, meanwhile, had been provided with a new mate in the form of Eve, who was fashioned from his rib in the hope that this would bind her more dutifully to him. And the rest of their tale is famous enough not to need repeating here.

In the outer darkness, Lilith, whose most common form was of a woman from the waist up and a serpent below, became the consort of Samael and other fallen angels. Fury with Adam, and grief for her slaughtered children, led Lilith to plot revenge. By mating with the rebel angels, she gave birth to many of the greatest demons to plague the world. Chief among them were the “lilin” or “lamiae” of the ancient world, vampires, also known as “succubi”, who were fatal ravishers of men and devourers of newborn babes.

Lilith was banished from the world of Adam and Eve but she occasionally managed to sneak back. It’s often said that the serpent that tempted Eve in the Garden of Eden was none other than Lilith and many Medieval scenes of the temptation show the serpent as a woman from the waist up, handing over the fatal fruit to bring about the fall.

Lilith’s offspring also continued to plague Adam’s descendants whenever possible as “succubi” or vampires. The screech owl is Lilith’s token bird and the form in which she often prowls the night. It is also reported that Lilith dwells in the dessert whispering to traveling men in the wind to entice them. Some ancient statues show her as a voluptuous young woman with owl’s wings and feet, but she can adopt any guise to human eyes.

The legend of Lilith is a dark and grim one, but it gives a glimpse into a long buried strata of the feminine in Jewish legend. This filtered into Christian mythology, too, in the form of Gnostic legends which tell of God, Himself, having

a Heavenly consort, and daughters such as Sophia, the Wisdom of God, to whom countless Eastern churches are dedicated.

The first two chapters of Genesis were written differently. **Chapter 1** is an overview of God's creation while **Chapter 2** is the detailing of God's creation. They are one and the same events yet some wished to separate them.

In the beginning God created all things in 6 days then rested on the 7<sup>th</sup>. Sin came into the world when Eve disobeyed the command of God and Adam followed suit, which was why they were then banned from the Garden of Eden.

How could Lilith have gone to the Red Sea when man had not been removed from the Garden of Eden and the Red Sea may not have been formed at that time? How could she have children by angels and been pursued by the three angels of God then Eve be created all on the 6<sup>th</sup> day when that was when God created humans?

They have used the word "Lilith" from the Isaiah passage. **Isaiah 34:14**, "The wild beasts of the desert shall also meet with the wild beasts of the island, and the satyr shall cry to his fellow; the screech owl also shall rest there, and find for herself a place of rest."

The Hebrew word for "screech owl" is #03917. לילית *liylyth*, lee-leeth' - from 3915; a night spectre.

This passage is the reason they used the "owl" as her token bird and being present at night; they try to prove her existence because of this Hebrew word. Yet this is the only place in the Bible that mentions it and is taken totally out of context.

God's Word gives the names of Adam and Eve, so why didn't He have Lilith's name mentioned in the Genesis account or other passages? God named others in Scripture who had done sinful deeds, why not hers and the account of her existence?

Scriptures state that the man is to be the head of the woman and women are to submit to their husbands. **Colossians 3:18**, "**Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands**, as it is fit in the Lord."

The account of this woman they call "Lilith" was created for the sole purpose to have women in a superior role and to try to prove that women can have authority over man and be independent without the covering of her husband.

**I Corinthians 11:3**, "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; **and the head of the woman is the man**; and the head of Christ is God."

No wonder Paul cautions believers not to give heed to Jewish fables. **Titus 1:14**, "Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth.

## Dear Brother Faull,



It has come to my attention that the story of the woman caught in adultery, recorded in **John 8** is said not to be authentic but has been added to the Bible text. It is not in many of the older manuscripts and furthermore differs in

John's regular vocabulary. Your opinion please.

### ANSWER:

I am especially interested in this as we just had a visiting professor, James Snapp Jr., come and give us a great seminar on "Biblical Criticism". He discussed this particular verse with great expertise. He pointed out that it is true that some of the manuscripts do not have it, but many do.

He also pointed out that the event is referred to by persons in writings that are older than the manuscripts that do not contain the history of the woman. He is very gifted in the science of Biblical criticism and I suggest you contact James by visiting his website at <http://www.curtisvillechristianchurch.org/BasicTC.htm>.

My answer to this will be simpler as I am very simple.

**First** - Let's look at the context and leave out **John 7:53 - 8:11**, which is the alleged interpolation that has been added to John's writing.

In the preceding verses there is an argument among the Pharisees about Jesus. He is not there for they are angry that He was not brought to them. Since the interpolation would not be there, the next verses have Jesus speaking in another building, namely the temple, but the text reads that Jesus spoke unto them again, "I am the light of the world!!!" Wait, he was not speaking to them in **Chapter 7:26-52**; He was not even there where they were arguing among themselves.

However, with the supposed addition left in, **John 7:53's** text tells us that they went home and **John 8:1-2** says Jesus went into the Mount of Olives and the next morning He was teaching in the temple. It is then that they brought unto Him the woman who had been caught in the very act of adultery.

Without the alleged interpolation the context of the narrative is without any continuity. (I have noticed this is true of many of the narratives which supposedly are not in the text. For example, **John 5** allegedly does not have the last part of verse 3 and verse 4 about the moving of the water by an angel. However, **John 5:7** is without explainable meaning without the explanation given in verses 3, and 4.



Again, **Mark 16:9-20** is allegedly unreliable and so the Gospel of Mark would end with the women trembling, amazed and afraid, and disobedient to Jesus who told them to go tell what they had seen. What a way to end a book!!!!

But this supposed addition is a perfect and sensible way to end the Gospel. In it you have how the apostle found out that Jesus was alive, their response, and the disbelief of some of the disciples. You have Jesus' rebuke of their unbelief and His command and promise, ending with Mark's divine commentary of the results of their obedience in obeying His command and the fulfillment of His promise in confirming His Word.

**Second** - The method that uses statistic to determine authorship is relatively new and should be very suspect. It is based upon the number of times a vocabulary word or phrase is used by the writer. It should be rejected as a valid method because of the following simple reasons:

- a. Scholars say to have any scientific reliability at all would require a minimum of ten thousand words; not the 174 of the text we are concerned with here.
- b. When this method is tested on manuscripts which we are definite of the authorship, it fails to be a reliable test.
- c. When done on other ancient manuscripts, we find that authors such as Cicero also must have had additions to their text and one wonders why anyone would bother to fool with Cicero's writings. It is only the Bible, or books such as Josephus, which mention Jesus or confirm Bible narratives that skeptics want to make suspect as they wish to shake people's faith in the Word of God.

**Thirdly** – Still stranger are those who argue that the words in this passage do not contain some of the words that John ordinarily used as proof that he was not the author of the passage of the adulterous woman. Is this scholarship? Is this science? Is it even rational? Should we question these 74 words because John never used some words he uses elsewhere? Whatever happened to the concept that the author may differ in vocabulary in a paragraph due to the subject on which he is writing?

John is recording an event in history. He did not choose the words of the participants of this historical event. In this narrative, the accusers spoke, the woman spoke, and the Lord spoke. He recorded those words and their actions. To require him to not write their words and use only his own words would require that he not be an accurate recorder of an historical event. Me thinks, this speaks more of the intellect of the skeptic than the integrity of the text.

One thing is interesting to note - John often adds comments on the events he is recording more than the other authors of the other three Gospels. (Watch for my

article on the nature of John's personal comments in his Gospel)

In this narrative he explains in **verse 6** why they brought the woman to Jesus. He wrote, "This, they said, tempting Him that they might accuse Him." Now those are John's own words in this narrative and the only words by which he should be judged. I kind of doubt from these ten words that statistics are going to be very helpful in deciding the recorder of an event that is in hundreds of manuscripts, though missing in some, but also recorded in the writings of some non-Biblical texts written before the manuscripts that does not contain the wonderful event.

One other thought. Jesus said to the woman, "Where are your accusers? Hath no man condemned you?" To which she replied, "No man, Lord". Why did He say, "Neither do I condemn you."? He could not condemn her!!! He could not cast a stone even though He was without sin. Why? Because the Law required that the witnesses cast the first stone, and they were gone. **Deuteronomy 17:6-7**

I also note that He never forgave her, as she never expressed any remorse. He merely said all He could say. He said, "Go and sin no more". He could not judge her legally but only pronounced what she did as sin and instructed her not to do it again. Many of the ancients believed that Jesus was too easy on her and therefore left this event out of the manuscripts as they felt it would promote infidelity. If so, **Revelation 22:18-19** was violated.

However, this event neither excuses adultery, nor sanctions it. It rebukes it and teaches those who have committed it, not to repeat it.

As to what He wrote in the sand that convicted the accusers, I can only conjecture that from the oldest to the youngest He wrote the names of the women with whom they had been immoral. He said, "Let him without sin cast the first stone" and they dropped the stones. They would have known that He knew they were without moral purity themselves. He who reads the hearts of men and women must never be accused of sanctioning sin without some kind of rebuke. The men were rebuked for their hypocrisy and she for her adultery.

Only the man with whom she committed adultery got away without a rebuke due to the prejudice of those who sought to tempt Him because they never brought him to Jesus with the woman.

If they could get Him to forbid stoning her, He would have been untrue to Moses. If He told them to stone her they would have accused him of breaking the Roman Law which forbade the Jews to practice capital punishment, as they were under Roman jurisdiction.

They here, foiled again. They had been outwitted by Him who knew their hypocrisy and treachery.

## Musical Instruments Allowed by Scripture

--Article Compiled by Terry Carter and George L. Faulk



Both the meaning of the Greek words and the history of worship in the synagogues support the use of musical instruments

in worship. Consider the following:

“Speaking to yourselves in psalms (ψαλμός) and hymns (ᾠμος) and spiritual songs (ᾠδή), singing (ἀδῶ) and making melody (ψάλλω) in your heart to the Lord” **Ephesians 5:19 (KJV)**

### Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament

ᾠμος, -ουό in Grk. writ. fr. Hom. down a *song of praise of gods, heroes, conquerors*, [cf. Trench as below, p. 297], but in the scriptures of God; a *sacred song, hymn*; plur. Eph. v.19; Col. iii,16...[Syn. ᾠμος, ψαλμός, ᾠδή: ᾠδή is the generic term; ψαλμ and ᾠμ are specific, the former designating a song which took its general character from the O.T. Psalms (although not restricted to them, see I Cor. 14:15, 26), the latter is a song of praise. “While the **leading idea ψαλμ is a musical accompaniment**, and that of ᾠμ praise to God, ᾠδή is the general word for a song, whether accompanied or unaccompanied, whether of praise or on any other subject. Thus it was quite possible for the same song to be at once ψαλμός, ᾠμος, and ᾠδή” (Bp. Lightfoot on Col. 3:16). The words occur together in Col. 3:16 and Eph. 5:19. See Trench Syn. LXXVIII

### Synonyms of the New Testament –Trench LXXVIII

Ψαλμός, from ψάω, properly a touching, and then a touching of the harp of other stringed instruments with the finger or plectrum (ψαλμοὶ τόξων, Euripides, Ion, 174; cf. Bach. 740, are the twanging of the bowstrings), was next the instrument itself, and **last of all the song sung with this musical accompaniment. It is in this last stage of its meaning that we find the word adopted in the Septuagint**; and to this agree the ecclesiastical definitions of it;

### Vine’s Expository Dictionary of the New Testament

#### Psalm

PSALMOS (ψαλμός) primarily denoted a striking or twitching with the fingers (on musical strings); then, a **sacred song, sung to musical accompaniment**, a psalm...**Ephesians 5:19; Colossians 3:16**

#### Melody - (Verb)

PSALLO (ψάλλω) primarily to twitch, twang, then, **to play a stringed instrument with the fingers, and thence, in the Sept., to sing with a harp**, sing psalms, denotes in the N.T., to sing a hymn, sing praise; in **Ephesians 5:19**, “making melody”

#### Hymn - (Noun)

HUMNOS (ᾠμος) denotes a song of praise addressed to God (Eng. Hymn), Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16...**Note: the psalmos denoted that which had a musical accompaniment**; the ode (Eng. Ode) was the generic term for a song; hence the accompanying adjective “spiritual.”

### Liddell and Scott Greek-English Lexicon

ψαλ-μός, ὁ, *twitching* or *twanging* with the fingers, ψαλμοὶ τόξων E. *Ion* 173 (lyr.); τοξήρει ψαλμῶ [τοξεύσας] Id. *HF* 1064 (lyr.).

1. mostly of musical strings, πηκτιδων ψαλμοῖς κρέον ᾠνον *Telest.* 5, cf. *Diog. Trag.* 1.9, *Aret.* CA1.1.
2. the sound of the cithara or harp, *Pi.* Fr. 125, cf. *Phryn.* Trag. 11; ψαλμός δ’ ἀλαλάζει *A.* Fr. 57.7 (anap.); there were contests in τὸ ψάλλειν, *Michel* 898.10 (Chios, ii B. C.), 913.6 (Teos, ii B. C.).
3. later, **song sung to the harp, psalm**, *LXX* 2 *Ki.* 23.1, al., *Ep.* Eph. 5.19; βίβλος ψαλμῶν *Ev.* *Luc.* 20.42.

It is plain that the meaning of *psalmos* and *psallo* included musical accompaniment in the Septuagint. That was the Bible that Jesus and the apostles used. It is what the New Testament authors quoted frequently when referring to Old Testament passages. What the word meant in the Septuagint, is what the word meant when the New Testament was written. Thus, we are commanded to sing with musical accompaniment.

### The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Edited by Isaac Landman Vol. VIII.

“With the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. and the subsequent misfortunes that befell the Jews, the use of the musical instruments in worship almost completely disappeared. The playing of the organ was forbidden in the synagogue as a sign of mourning. No Talmudic rabbi is mentioned as a musician, but musical instruments were still in use; the tractate Kelim makes mention of metal double flutes, pipes, and horns (11:5-6) harps and drums (15:6) and the like.”

When the Israelites were taken captive to Babylon, they refused to sing because they were mourning for their nation.

“1 **By the rivers of Babylon, There we sat down, yea, we wept** When we remembered Zion. 2 **We hung our harps Upon the willows** in the midst of it. 3 For there those who carried us away captive asked of us a song, And those who plundered us [requested] mirth, [Saying], “Sing us [one] of the songs of Zion!” 4 **How shall we sing the Lord’s song in a foreign land?” Psalms 137:1-4**

A similar thing happened after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 A.D. As a sign of mourning for their nation, they stopped using instruments in the synagogue. However, when Paul wrote **Ephesians** and **Colossians** between 61 and 63 A.D., instruments were being used in the synagogues. It is simply not accurate to say that the apostolic church did not use musical instruments in their worship.