

The Discerner

the voice of... **Religion Analysis Service**

A QUARTERLY EXPOSING
UNBIBLICAL TEACHING & MOVEMENTS

Volume 38, Number 3

July • August • September 2018

Eckankar
Confucianism
Hare Krishna
Freemasons
Jehovah's Witnesses
Humanism
Jainism
Judaism
Neopaganism
MOONIES
Universalism
Wicca
Islam
~~Hinduism~~
Exposed!
MORMONS
BAHA'I FAITH
Buddhism
Scientology
Satanism

In This Edition:

With This Issue 3

Homosexuality, The Bible, Politics, and Business
by Dennis Ingolfsland 4

Michael Hudson: An Economic Distortion of the
New Testament, Part 1
by Steve Lagoon 14

QUIZ: 28



*"Hereby know we the spirit of truth
and the spirit of error" 1 John 4:6*

The Discerner

A Christian Apologetics & Counter-cult
Ministry

Volume 38, Number 3

July • August • September 2018

Religion Analysis Service Board Members

Rev. Steve Lagoon, President

Rick Dack, Vice President

Steve Devore, Treasurer, Office Manager

Dave Brittain

Scott Harvath

Cindy Marty

Doug Steiner

The Discerner editorial team is
Steve Lagoon, Steve Devore, and Doug
Steiner

PO Box 206

Chaska, MN 55318

612-331-3342 / 1-800-562-9153

FAX 612-331-3342

info@ras.org <http://www.ras.org>

Published Quarterly

Price \$10.00 for 4 issues

Foreign subscriptions \$14.00

Religion Analysis Service Board of Reference

Dr. Norman Geisler

Dr. James Walker

Don Veinot

Dr. Ron Rhodes

Robert Bowman

M. Kurt Goedelman



WITH THIS ISSUE

We have two articles in this issue of *The Discerner*. The first is by Dennis Ingolfsland, a professor of New Testament at Crown College in Saint Bonifacius, Minnesota, on the controversial subject of homosexuality. He addresses the implications of this topic for the Church and the culture in which we live.

The second article is about the impact that the world-famous economist, Michael Hudson, is having on the public's perception regarding the ministry of Jesus.

As always, check out our quiz, this time on food in the Bible.

We love to hear your feedback!

Blessings,

Steve Lagoon

President, Religion Analysis Service

HOMOSEXUALITY, THE BIBLE, POLITICS, AND BUSINESS

by Dennis Ingolfsland

Homosexuality is one of the hottest political and social issues of our times. Since it is discussed several times in the New Testament and since I teach New Testament, I wanted to produce a clear, concise statement of my position on this issue.

First, a genuine Christian position on homosexuality must never be about hate. The New Testament is very clear that we are to love our neighbor as ourselves. I do not consider gay people to be my enemies, but for those who do, I would remind them that Jesus commanded his followers to love even their enemies. All Christians should love gay people. Gay people should never be mocked, ridiculed, threatened, or abused. Gay people will never be won to Christ out of hostility. They should be treated with love and compassion.

Second, gay people should not be refused service simply because they are gay. Christian business owners do not refuse service to adulterers, or to unmarried people who are living together. Why should gay people be singled out?¹

Third, the issue is not, or should not be, about orientation, but about behavior. The Bible simply does not address the issue of sexual orientation. It addresses behavior. In the story of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19), the men of the city gather at Lot's house and demand, "Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us so that we can have sex with them." That is about behavior, not orientation.² Leviticus 18:22 says, "Do not lie with a man as one

1 (Author's Note) It may be argued that exceptions should be made in the case in which such business relationships violate deeply held religious convictions such as providing support to same-sex weddings i.e. wedding photographer, musician, officiant, or baker to provide a wedding cake, as the recent United States Supreme Court held in *MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP, LTD., ET AL. v. COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION ET AL. CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF COLORADO* No. 16-111. Argued December 5, 2017—Decided June 4, 2018.

2 Some argue that the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah (Genesis 19:1-8) was lack of hospitality and concern for the poor. They base this on Ezekiel 16:49 which says, "Behold this was the guilt of your sister Sodom: she and her daughter had pride, excess of food, and prosperous ease, but did not aid the poor and needy." That's true, but it is only part of the story. The next verse, Ezekiel 16:50 says, "They were haughty and did an abomination before me. So I removed them when I saw it." The "abomination" for which they were removed is described in Genesis 19:4-5 when the men of the city came to Lot's house demanding to have sex with the two male visitors he had taken in. In response, Lot's visitors told Lot and his family to leave because God was going to destroy the city. The same behavior in a similar story described in Judges 19 is described as wicked and vile (Judges 19:23). Second Peter 2:6-7 refers to the "sensual conduct of the wicked" in the context of Sodom and Gomorrah. Likewise, Jude 7 says, "just as Sodom and Gomorrah and

lies with a woman.” That’s about behavior, not orientation. Leviticus 20:13 says, “If a man lies with a man as one lies with a woman... [it] is detestable.” That’s about behavior. Romans 1:27 speaks of how “Men committed indecent acts with other men.” That’s about behavior. Finally, the *English Standard Version* translates ἀρσενικοῦται in First Corinthians 6:9 and First Timothy 1:10 accurately as “men who practice homosexuality.” That too, is about behavior. The same is true of the condemnation found in Jude 7.³ In every case, the Bible is discussing behavior, not orientation.

Orientation is about attraction and temptation, neither of which by itself is sin.⁴ Personally, I am attracted to women and have sometimes

the surrounding cities, which likewise indulged in sexual immorality and pursued unnatural desire, serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire.” Any attempts to limit the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah simply to lack of hospitality or unconcern for the poor are a result of a very selective reading of Scripture.

- 3 Some might want to interpret Romans 1:27-28 as being about orientation: “In the same way men...were inflamed with lust for one another...God...gave them over to a depraved mind.” I would argue that there is a difference between 1) sexual attraction, 2) temptation 3) lust and 4) a depraved mind. Virtually everyone is subject to sexual attraction, but just being sexually attracted by someone is not necessarily temptation. Granted, the line between attraction and temptation can be pretty fuzzy but I think there can be a distinction between the two. Neither attraction nor temptation are sin. Lust goes beyond attraction and temptation to mentally dwelling on, strongly desiring and perhaps fanaticizing about the object of one’s lust. Jesus equates sexual lust with adultery (Matthew 5:28). The “depraved mind” to which Paul refers in Romans 1:27-28 goes beyond someone who may be struggling with the sin of lust to someone who is “inflamed with lust” (Romans 1:27, NIV). I would interpret this as someone who has totally abandoned himself and given himself over to sexual lust. Paul is speaking here specifically of same-sex lust but the depravity could apply equally to those who have totally abandoned themselves to opposite sex lust as well—e.g. those who have given themselves over to pornography or “one-night-stands.” Of these four categories, sexually orientation falls into the first category of sexual attraction. Just because someone is attracted to someone else does not mean they are “inflamed with lust” toward that person. By itself, same sex attraction is no more sin than opposite sex attraction. **Editor’s note** (While same-sex attraction need not be considered sinful per se, it could be considered an indication of confusion in one’s sexuality).
- 4 In his article, “Is Homosexual Orientation Sinful?” (JETS 58:1; March 2015, 95–115) Denny Burk argues that same-sex orientation alone is sinful. Burk seems to equate lust with any kind of desire for anything outside of God’s will. If Burk’s argument were taken to its logical conclusion it would seem that Jesus’ desire for food in the wilderness (hunger, Lk 4:2), constituted sin since he was desiring something outside of God’s will (i.e. to eat, thereby prematurely ending the ordeal in the wilderness to which the Spirit had driven him). Apparently Jesus sinned again in the garden of Gethsemane when he strongly desired to avoid the cross (sweating drops of blood!), praying, “...let this cup pass from me.” By Burk’s definition it would appear that for a young man to recognize that his fiancé is beautiful is not sin—but if he is attracted to her, it is sin because attraction equals desire and the couple is not yet married! Burk’s Jesus was apparently born without testosterone! This leads to my second observation which is that Burk also seems to have a very docetic view of Jesus. Burk’s Jesus is one who could only be tested externally but never felt temptation the same way every other human being does—not even in his human nature! If Burk’s view was accurate, it would seem to undermine the whole point of Hebrews 4:15 “For we do not have a high priest who is unable to empathize with our weaknesses, but we have one who has been tempted in every way, just as we are—yet he did not sin.” How could Jesus possibly “empathize with our weakness” if he never experienced such human weakness? Admittedly there is a fine line between normal desire and lust but to erase the line completely would seem to make Jesus a sinner! I’ve heard that Martin Luther once said, “You can’t keep the birds from flying over your head, but you can prevent them from building a nest in your hair.” For Burk, it would appear that if the “birds” fly over your head, you have sinned!

been tempted by women, but that fact alone does not make it sin. Even Jesus was tempted in all points as we are—yet without sin. So when a man is attracted to or tempted by another man, or when a woman is attracted to or tempted by another woman, that by itself is not sin.

There is a difference between attraction and lust. Lust has to do with strong desire that one chooses to focus and dwell upon. Both gay and straight people can choose what they focus on and lust after. They do not always choose to whom they are attracted. There is nothing, therefore, inherently sinful about a celibate homosexual.⁵ In fact, a Christian who is attracted to people of the same sex, but who refrains from having sex with people of the same sex out of a deep love for Christ should be commended for his or her dedication to Christ!

In addition, there is also nothing inherently sinful about same-sex love that is non-sexual. The love David and Jonathan had for each other is said to have surpassed even their love for women (2 Samuel 1:26), which is saying a lot considering David's attraction to women!

Finally, while there is nothing inherently sinful about same-sex attraction or same-sex love that is non-sexual, the Bible is very clear that having sex with someone of the same sex is not only sinful, it is particularly detestable to God. Leviticus 18 and 20 are clear that God even expects pagan nations to know better, and that he will destroy nations over the practices listed in those chapters. Those practices include sex with close relatives, sex with animals and sex with people of the same sex.

The condemnation of the behavior of sex with people of the same sex is not just in the Old Testament, it is repeated several times in the New Testament. The Bible is very clear—sex with people of the same sex is sin, just like sex with close relatives is sin or sex with people outside of marriage is sin. Those who want to twist Scripture into saying something else would do well to heed Paul's warning about immorality in general, "For God has not called us for impurity, but in holiness. Therefore, whoever disregards this, disregards not man but God, who gives his Holy Spirit to you" (1 Thess. 4:7-8).

5 (Authors's Note) Same-sex attraction, although not sinful in itself, is yet unnatural, and can be distinguished from having an opposite-sex attraction (outside of marriage). Neither is sinful per se, but the same-sex attraction shows confusion concerning God's created heterosexual order.

Objections

People have, of course, raised all kinds of objections to this position. **First**, *some will question why Christians make homosexuality such a battleground issue.* The answer is that we Christians did not choose the battleground. Christians are not the ones seeking to make the changes. These changes are being imposed on our society by judges, politicians, Hollywood, the news media, public schools and gay rights advocate organizations. Christians are simply responding. If our society, for example, wanted to legalize sex and marriage between close relatives, Christians would be forced to make our voice heard on that too. It is part of living in a free democracy, but infinitely more important, it is part of Jesus' command to be salt and light in this world.

Second, *some will admit that the Old Testament condemns sex between people of the same sex, but the Old Testament also says we should stone murderers and we don't do that anymore either.* That's true, but the fact that we don't stone murderers doesn't make murder any less of a sin. Besides, no one is advocating the execution of gay people (except in some Muslim countries).

Third, *some will argue that the passages prohibiting homosexual behavior in Leviticus were simply part of a ritual purity code designed to distinguish Israel from her neighbors.* The implication is apparently that these practices are not valid for today. If that is true, then prohibitions against incest and child sacrifice would not be valid either since they are part of the same contexts.

Fourth, *some will acknowledge that the Old Testament condemns sex between people of the same sex, but will argue that the Old Testament also says we shouldn't eat pork, etc.* The implication is that the prohibition against sex with people of the same sex, like the prohibition against eating pork, should be ignored. It is certainly true that the New Testament teaches that the New Covenant has fulfilled the Old Covenant in some respects (for example, regarding sacrifices, food laws, priesthood and ceremonial purity), but that does not mean that we can just throw our Old Testament out. We know that New Testament writers continued to believe that the Old Testament was valid because they extensively allude to and quote from the Old Testament as their Bible and authority. Unlike the sacrifices or dietary laws, the fact that the prohibition against sex with people of the same sex is repeated several times in the New Testament makes it clear that this prohibition was not annulled.

We should also note that the context of Leviticus 18 and 20 is not about sacrifices, ceremonies or dietary laws. As mentioned above, it contains numerous sexual prohibitions including sex with close relatives and sex with animals as well as sex between people of the same sex.

Fifth, some people object by pointing out that Jesus never condemned homosexuality. It is true that there is nothing recorded in the Gospels about Jesus specifically condemning sex between people of the same sex, but Jesus didn't specifically condemn sex between children and parents, or sex with animals either.⁶ On the other hand Jesus was not entirely silent on the topic. According to Matthew's Gospel, Jesus says,

"Haven't you read," he replied, "that at the beginning the Creator made them male and female," and said, "For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh" (Matthew 19:4–5).

In this passage, Jesus is quoting from Genesis 1:27 and 2:24 affirming the sacredness of marriage between one man and one woman. Jesus never even hints that God would approve of same-sex marriage. On the contrary, Jesus specifically condemned sexual immorality (e.g. Mark 7:21). In Jesus' culture all Jews, including Jesus, agreed that the Torah was their Bible. In fact, Jesus strongly affirmed and upheld the Torah (Matthew 5:17–18)—and the Torah specifically condemned sex between people of the same sex (it also condemned cross-dressing as an abomination; Deuteronomy 22:5).⁷

6 One reason Jesus didn't specifically single out homosexuality may have been because although homosexuality was widely practiced in pagan Roman culture, it was not so prevalent among the Jews of Judea and Galilee, to whom Jesus usually confined his ministry (cf. Matthew 15:24).

7 This does not mean women can't wear pants or that men can't wear kilts! It is a prohibition against members of one sex deliberately dressing up to portray themselves as members of the opposite sex. How this actually works out may vary from one culture to another. This paper will not address transgender issues except to say this: Biology places human beings in a box from which they cannot escape. People may change their sexual appearance through surgical procedures but they cannot change their chromosomes! Modern sociologists, therefore, make a distinction between sex and gender, saying that gender is a social construct that can be fluid. The Bible knows no such distinction between one's sex and one's gender. The Bible knows only of male and female—determined by biology not by social constructs of so-called male and female characteristics. There is nothing inherently sinful for a man to have what a culture might consider to be feminine traits—for example, to be nurturing or to love beauty, style or shoes. There is nothing inherently sinful for a woman to have what society considers to be masculine traits—for example, to love hunting, or mixed martial arts, or to dislike makeup or frilly clothing. Just because a man has what a culture might consider to be feminine characteristics, does not make him female. Just because a woman has what a culture might consider to be masculine characteristics does not make her male. People need to stop letting society pigeonhole them into its alphabet boxes! Be who you are and accept people for who they are within biblical boundaries which include prohibitions against 1) pre-marital sex, 2), sex with people of the same sex, 3) lust after people of either sex, 4) sex with close relatives or animals or 5) dressing in such a way as to pass oneself off as the opposite sex (Deuteronomy

Sixth, some people object saying that *Romans 1* is discussing idolatry. They argue that Paul is, therefore, discussing the kind of orgies that took place in the context of pagan worship but that he was not condemning loving same-sex relationships. That the apostle Paul was not condemning loving same-sex relationships, however, is usually just asserted by the critics, not demonstrated. There is absolutely nothing in the Bible that would lead us to believe that Paul would have approved of sex between people of the same sex in *any* context. The fact that he specifically condemns the practice three times without qualification is evidence that the critics' objection is false.

While it is true that Paul is discussing idolatry in *Romans 1*, that is only a partial truth. In *Romans 1* Paul is condemning the willful rejection of what may be known of God, leading to idolatry. Paul says that as a result of this willful rejection, "God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity" and to "shameful lusts" as well as to wickedness, evil greed malice, etc. The fact that Paul is discussing idolatry in *Romans 1* does not excuse any of the sins he lists in that chapter, whether murder, deceit, slander or sex with people of the same sex. Nowhere in the Bible is there any hint that sex between people of the same sex is acceptable to God.

Seventh, another objection is that *Romans 1* is about the behavior of the Caesars or about oppressive relationships between rich and powerful Roman citizens and the lower classes but not about loving same-sex relationships. Some of my arguments on *Romans 1* above also answer this objection, but the argument about the Caesars ignores the fact that some relationships between an emperor and another man or a boy *were* probably loving same-sex behaviors! Paul still condemns the behavior, whether loving or not. Besides, there is nothing in *Romans 1* about the Caesars anyway. That is something read into the text, not from it.

Rev. Canon Steve Chalke, argues that our understanding of ancient culture shows that upper-class Roman citizens regularly sexually abused lower class non-Roman citizens. He believes that this is what the Bible is referring to when it condemns homosexual behavior. For example, Chalke says, "When 1 Timothy and 1 Corinthians make references to men who have sex with other men, it's part of a much longer list of people who are exploitative—murderers, slave traders, liars, perjurers, thieves, the greedy, slanderers, swindlers."

The passages Chalke cites, however, also contain references to lying, greed, slander, lawlessness, adultery, drunkenness and other sins. One has to ask, therefore, whether Chalke thinks these sins are also acceptable unless perpetrated by rich and powerful exploiters. After all, it would be ridiculous to imagine that sexual immorality, adultery or homosexual behavior were practiced only by rich and powerful Roman citizens who exploited the lower classes, so we have to ask how Chalke can be so sure Paul's condemnation is only directed toward the upper classes.

I suspect that we find the answer to this when Chalke goes on to address what I think is the real issue. Chalke says, "Whoever Paul is talking about, it cannot be the wonderful same-sex couples that are in our church, or the gay man or the transgender woman I know. It just can't be them." The issue is really not about biblical interpretation at all. It is about emotion. Some people just can't imagine that God would condemn the actions of such nice people.

There almost seems to be a new gospel in the air—a gospel of niceness, in which all warm, friendly, nice people are accepted by God. It is only the terribly abusive, oppressive, and mean people whom God condemns. One problem with this assumption is that some of the friendliest and nicest people you'd ever want to meet are among those whom Paul says will not inherit the kingdom of God (1 Corinthians 6:9–10; Galatians 5:19–21; Ephesians 5:3–6). The kingdom of God is not for those who deny, excuse or explain away their sin—regardless of how nice they are—but for those who sincerely repent of their sin and turn to Christ in faith.⁸

Eighth, *one's sexual orientation is genetic—gay people are born that way*. But the disputed question of whether people are genetically predisposed to being gay is entirely irrelevant to this discussion. From a biblical perspective, the issue is about behavior, not about sexual orientation or genetics. For example, a genetic predisposition to alcoholism is not sinful nor is it necessarily sin for someone to be tempted by drinking too much. Getting drunk, however, is a behavior condemned in the Bible as sin. Similarly, a genetic predisposition to same sex attraction is not sinful, nor is it necessarily sin for someone to be tempted by someone of the same sex. But the Bible teaches that it *is* sin to lust after someone of *either* sex, and it is sin to have sex with people of the same sex just as it is sin for opposite sex couples to have sex outside of marriage.

8 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/steve-chalke-pompeii-ancient-roman-porn_us_596fb1fee4b0110cb3cb542a

Ninth, some people object saying that we don't make other sins illegal, like adultery, for example. That is true, but it is also irrelevant since no one is trying to make sex with people of the same sex in civil law illegal either.

Tenth, some will argue that even scholars can't agree on the interpretation of the homosexuality passages in the Bible, so we should avoid being dogmatic and judgmental on this issue. Actually, you would be hard pressed to find *any* subject on which all scholars agree. You could undoubtedly even find some perverted scholars who would say that having sex with children was OK! The fact, however, is that for more than 2,000 years virtually all scholars did agree that the Bible teaches that sex between people of the same sex is sin. It has only been very recently, when western society began to push same-sex marriage, that so-called scholars have come out of the woodwork to re-interpret these passages to support their cause. Many people begin by assuming that what their culture teaches is true and they desperately try to re-interpret the Bible to support their culture. Others so desperately want to fit in to their culture that they twist the Bible to support their views. Make no mistake about it—The Bible itself is very clear: Sex between people of the same sex is sin.

Eleventh, Christians are inconsistent because they tolerate other sins like pride, greed, envy, or gluttony, but they do not tolerate homosexuality. Unfortunately, there is some truth to this objection. The biblical answer, however, is not the complete toleration of all sin, but that churches should be more consistent!

Twelfth, some argue that people should be able to marry whomever they love. Really? Should the government also support or promote polygamy, polyamory, incestuous marriage, the marriage between adults and children or the marriage between adults and their pets? If the only issue is love, then the answer would have to be yes—In fact, some would say the answer should be yes. Others would say that this begins to make marriage, as the union of two people for the purpose of raising and supporting children, meaningless. At least one gay rights activist was honest enough to admit that making marriage meaningless was the whole point of the same sex marriage debate. This argument, however, really obscures the real issue which, as will be seen below, has to do with freedom of religion and speech.

Thirteenth, people should not be refused service simply because they are gay. As I mentioned at the beginning of this position paper, I agree. Unfortunately, many of these cases have been misrepresented in the media. For example, both Barronell Studzman, owner of Arlene's flowers in Washington State, and Jack Phillips, owner of

Masterpiece Cakeshop in Colorado were happy to serve gay people. Barronell Studzman had served gay clients for years and Jack Phillips told the gay clients he would be happy to provide baked goods for them, but they just could not support same-sex marriage.⁹

I would not want government to force a gay baker to make a cake saying that homosexuality was sin, would you? I would not want the government to force a member of PETA who owned a sign company to make a sign advertising cheeseburgers. I would not want government to force a Jewish deli owner to cater an anti-Semitic conference. I would not want a Muslim store owner to be forced to sell supplies to churches. I would not want the government to force an African-American restaurant owner to cater a meeting of the KKK. No one should be forced to support causes with which they disagree. When government can tell individuals or businesses what issues they must support or cannot support, we no longer have freedom.

Fourteenth, the precedent for including practicing homosexuals in church membership is the inclusion of uncircumcised believers in the early church. Circumcision was required in the Old Testament, and yet that requirement was overturned to allow uncircumcised believers into the church. Similarly, practicing homosexuals should also be included in church membership. This argument, however, is comparing apples to oranges. Unlike homosexual practice, circumcision was never regarded as sinful. The comparison is like suggesting that since the uncircumcised were welcome into the church, child molesters or those living in adultery should also be welcome! Modern churches that openly bless behaviors that are called sin in both testaments have departed from the clear teachings of the Bible.

The real issue, politically speaking, is whether the government should be able to force people to do (or refrain from doing) something that they sincerely believe would constitute sin against God. That is what the first amendment was designed to protect. There are always exceptions to any rule of course, (e.g. freedom of speech does not allow you to yell fire in a crowded theater), but generally speaking, a government is tyrannical that attempts to force people to do things they sincerely believe are sinful. This is just as true, whether we are talking (hypothetically) about a government that would force a Muslim grocer to sell alcohol or a Jewish deli owner to sell ham, as it is about a government that would force Christians to promote homosexual behavior through the support of gay marriage.

9 (Author's Note) In other words, the Christian baker was willing to serve openly gay customers (not discriminating), but would not provide a wedding-cake which violated his religious beliefs and rights.

Summary

First, gay people are people for whom Jesus died—every bit as much as he died for me or you. Those who call themselves Christians but physically or verbally abuse gay people are like Pharisees, demonstrating that they really have no concept of God's grace or the magnitude of their own sin.

Second, the Bible says nothing about sexual orientation. It is not necessarily sin to love, be attracted to, or tempted by someone of the same sex. Third, the Bible is very clear that sex between two people of the same sex is serious sin—so serious that the Torah said God would destroy nations over it. Finally, the real issue, politically speaking, is about freedom of speech and freedom of religion.

Dennis Ingolfsland, D.Phil

Professor of New Testament, Crown College

Pastor: Randolph Baptist Church

MICHAEL HUDSON: AN ECONOMIC DISTORTION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, PART 1

by Steve Lagoon

I was recently asked what I thought of the claims of the economist Michael Hudson and his views concerning the Bible and the alleged real reason Jesus died.

A search quickly brought me to an article in which Hudson boldly asserted that Jesus didn't die for our sins, but rather for our debts, hence the name of an on-line article about him by Renegade Inc. entitled: "He died for our debt, not for our sins."

When one first encounters new ideas like those of Hudson, it is tempting to quickly dismiss them as the ravings of a crackpot or of one wholly unqualified to make such fantastic speculations. And often such an assessment is justified.

Nevertheless, a scholar of the caliber of Michael Hudson, a widely respected economist, should not be so quickly dismissed. And so, I have given Hudson a fair hearing, the results of which form the basis of the present article.

Michael Hudson's Background

Before delving into Hudson's arguments and how they impact biblical scholarship and interpretation, let us briefly be introduced to his background. His website provides his biography which I quote in part:

Michael Hudson is President of *The Institute for the Study of Long-Term Economic Trends* (ISLET), a Wall Street Financial Analyst, Distinguished Research Professor of Economics at the University of Missouri, Kansas City and author of *J is Junk Economics* (2017), *Killing the Host* (2015), *The Bubble and Beyond* (2012), *Super-Imperialism: The Economic Strategy of American Empire* (1968 & 2003), *Trade, Development and Foreign Debt* (1992 & 2009) and of *The Myth of Aid* (1971) . . . ISLET engages in research regarding domestic and international finance, national income and balance-sheet accounting with regard to real estate, and the economic history

of the ancient Near East. Michael acts as an economic advisor to governments worldwide . . . on finance and tax law.¹

Wikipedia provides further biographical information on Dr. Michael Hudson:

Michael Hudson, born March 14, 1939, is an American economist, professor of economics at the University of Missouri in Kansas City and a researcher at the Levy Economics Institute at Bard College, former Wall Street analyst, political consultant, commentator and journalist. Hudson graduated from the University of Chicago (B.A., 1959) and New York University (MA, 1965, PhD, 1968) and worked as a balance of payment economist in Chase Manhattan Bank (1964-1968). He was assistant professor of economics at the New School for Social Research 1969–1972, and 1980–90s worked for various governmental and non-governmental organizations as an economic consultant. Hudson devoted his entire scientific career to the study of debt: both domestic (loans, mortgages, interest payments) and external.²

The foregoing makes clear that Hudson is a highly accomplished world-renowned economist and scholar.

Hudson's Positive Contributions to Biblical Studies

What makes his work of interest to Biblical students are his arguments about debt and the central importance debt played in the Ancient Near East, and particularly to the biblical story. Hudson, although largely accepting the outlines of liberal Bible scholarship, has consistently defended the reality of the Biblical Jubilee legislation of the Mosaic Law:

Recent discoveries of Bronze Age Near Eastern royal proclamations extending from 2400 to 1600 BC throw a radically new light on these laws. Like their Biblical counterparts, Mesopotamian royal edicts cancelled debts, freed debt-servants and restored land to cultivators who had lost it under economic duress. There can be no doubt that these edicts were implemented, for during the Babylonian period they grew into quite elaborate promulgations, capped by Ammisaduqa's Edict of 1646 B.C. Now that these edicts have been translated and their consequences understood, the Biblical laws no longer stand alone as utopian or otherworldly ideals; they take their

1 <http://michael-hudson.com/about>

2 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Hudson_\(economist\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Hudson_(economist))

place in a two-thousand year continuum of periodic and regular economic renewal.³

Hudson expanded upon this theme:

Until fairly recently most Biblical historians doubted that these policies really were applied in practice. Advocacy of such laws seemed to be just one more way in which the Israelites emphasized their differences from surrounding societies and gods. However, during the past half-century similar economic reorderings have been found to have been traditional in Sumer, Babylonia and their commercial periphery from about 2400 to 1600 BC. It has become clear that the freedom advocated by the Covenant Code of Exodus, the septennial year of release in Deuteronomy and the Jubilee Year of Leviticus's Holiness Code were not just abstract literary ideas, but concrete legal practices freeing rural populations from debt servitude and the land from appropriation by absentee foreclosers. What made the revival of these releases revolutionary in Israel was their removal from the hands of rulers to become a sacred popular commandment.⁴

Interestingly, Hudson finds himself defending the reliability of the Old Testament record:

Indeed, what turns out to be ironic in studying the history of Near Eastern legal practices is that precisely those parts of the Biblical narratives that hitherto have been most in doubt—the laws cancelling debts, freeing debt servants and redistributing the land to its traditional users—turn out to be the most clearly documented Bronze Age legacy.⁵

Wikipedia quotes Hudson's explanation of his work in this area:

In the early 1990s I had tried to write my own summary, but was unable to convince publishers that the Near Eastern tradition of Biblical debt cancellations was firmly grounded. Two decades ago economic historians and even many Biblical scholars thought that the Jubilee Year was merely a literary creation, an utopian escape from practical reality. I encountered a wall of cognitive dissonance at the thought that the

3 Michael Hudson, *The Lost Tradition of Biblical Debt Cancellation*, 1993, p. 6, at web address: <http://michael-hudson.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/HudsonLostTradition.pdf>

4 Hudson, *Lost Tradition*, p. 7.

5 Hudson, *Lost Tradition*, p. 13.

practice was attested to in increasingly detailed Clean Slate proclamations.⁶

So, as an economist studying the history of debt, Hudson took seriously what the Old Testament had to say. Amazingly, he encountered liberal Bible scholars that refused to take the Jubilee system of debt removal described in the Scriptures seriously despite the wealth of historical evidence Hudson provided.

Michael Hudson's Support of Jewish Jubilees

We have briefly touched upon Hudson's arguments concerning the Old Testament. He takes seriously the Mosaic Law's jubilee institution. Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary defines the jubilee:

The 50th year after seven cycles of seven years, when specific instructions about property and slavery took effect . . . The Jubilee was launched with a blast from a ram's horn on the Day of Atonement . . . The 50th year was a special year in which to 'proclaim liberty throughout the land' (Lev. 25:10). Specifically, individuals who had incurred debts and had sold themselves as slaves or servants to others were released from their debts and were set at liberty. Since all land belonged to God (Lev. 25:23), land could not be sold; but land could be lost to another for reasons of debt. In the Year of Jubilee such land was returned to the families to whom it was originally given.⁷

Hudson further describes the Old Testament Jubilee:

The Liberty Bell is inscribed with a quotation from Leviticus 25:10: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, and to all the inhabitants thereof." Over the years these words have suggested to visitors such diverse ideas as our democratic freedom to vote and the American Revolution's slogan of no taxation without representation. But the full verse in Leviticus speaks of freeing debt bondsmen. It exhorts the Israelites to "hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land and to all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a Jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his family." (And also every woman, child and servant, it may be added.) Lands were restored to their traditional holders or cleared of all debt encumbrances. With the symbolic sounding of the ram's horn on the Day of Atonement of this fiftieth year, the Jubilee renewed an equitable

6 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Hudson_\(economist\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Hudson_(economist))

7 *Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, Herbert Lockyer, Sr, General Editor, Nashville TN (Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1986), p. 600.

economic balance by undoing the adverse cumulative effects of indebtedness.⁸

With the backdrop of this concern about the poor and oppressed in the Jewish Old Testament tradition, Hudson is impressed with the Jubilee system. This is all a positive contribution toward Biblical scholarship on Hudson's part.

Troubling Aspects of Hudson's Work

However, it is Hudson's arguments and theories about the New Testament and how economics impacted Jesus' life, teachings, and ministry that are controversial to conservative Bible-believing Christians.

For instance, in the Renegade article, Hudson stated: "The Christianity we know today is not the Christianity of Jesus."⁹

Hudson believes that historic Christianity is a distortion of the original message of Jesus. In line with this claim, he rejects the Christianity of the Bible, believing that Jesus' message has been co-opted by his followers.

The Lord's Prayer

Hudson points to the Lord's Prayer as an example of how Jesus' message has been misinterpreted. The Renegade article stated:

The economist told Renegade Inc. the Lord's Prayer, "forgive us our sins even as we forgive all who are indebted to us," refers specifically to debt.¹⁰

Hudson's interpretation, then, is that in the context of the Lord's Prayer (Matthew 6:9–13) Jesus is specifically concerned about the problem of personal financial debt. He wishes to teach his followers the importance of debt forgiveness.

But strictly speaking, that interpretation cannot be maintained since "forgive us our debts" (Matthew 6:12) would suggest that men owe literal financial debts to God. That is, Hudson's interpretation is guilty of a wooden literalism as though people have gone to the Bank of God and taken out loans of money.

8 Michael Hudson, *The Lost Tradition of Biblical Debt Cancellation*, <http://michael-hudson.com/1992/03/the-lost-tradition-of-biblical-debt-cancellations>, p. 14.

9 Hudson, Renegade, *Debts*, <http://michael-hudson.com/2017/12/he-died-for-our-debt-not-our-sins>

10 Hudson, Renegade, *Debts*, <http://michael-hudson.com/2017/12/he-died-for-our-debt-not-our-sins>

It is simply inconsistent to interpret the debt we owe to each other literally while taking the debt we owe to God metaphorically. There can be little doubt that Jesus' intended meaning was of debt metaphorically for our sin(s). That is, Christians should be willing to forgive others who sin against them as God as forgiven their sins.

It is not unreasonable to suggest that forgiving needy people of their debts would be a good application of the principle that Jesus was teaching, but nevertheless, it is not the primary meaning of the verse.

Why Did Jesus Die?

The Renegade article summarizes Hudson's view concerning the reason for Jesus' death:

The economist [Michael Hudson] says Jesus was crucified for his views on debt. Crucifixion being a punishment reserved especially for political dissidents. "To understand the crucifixion of Jesus is to understand it was his punishment for his economic views," says Professor Hudson. "He was a threat to the creditors." Jesus Christ was a socialist activist for the continuity of regular debt jubilees that were considered essential to the wellbeing of ancient economies.¹¹

Factors That Motivated Christ's Enemies

Hudson's above analysis does contain an element of truth, that Jesus was crucified. But his interpretation of events confuses and simplifies very complicated issues. Hudson stated that the "crucifixion" was a punishment "reserved especially for political dissidents." The New Testament record, however, expressly states that the powers that be were concerned about Jesus as a king rather than an economic reformer.

Jesus As King

Well-known biblical scholar and skeptic Bart Ehrman make this point clear:

Romans had to have a reason to crucify a person. There had to be a criminal charge. There could be lots of charges—runaway slaves, brigands, insurrectionists, all could be crucified. So why was Jesus crucified? The Gospels tell us, and in this particular case, there are very good reasons for thinking what they say is right. Jesus was crucified for calling himself King of the Jews. There are several points to make that, taken altogether,

¹¹ Renegade, *Debts*, <http://michael-hudson.com/2017/12/he-died-for-our-debt-not-our-sins>

suggest this is historically what actually happened. First, all the Gospels agree that at Jesus' trial this is what Pontius Pilate accused Jesus of, based on what the governor had learned from the Jewish authorities. Second, this is the charge that is written against Jesus on the placard over his head on the cross—again, in all our accounts.¹²

While Jesus did offer the nation of Israel the kingdom, and Himself as the King, nonetheless, Israel had rejected the offer in keeping with God's sovereign plan. As Jesus stood before Pilate, He was all about the coming cross and atonement for sins; for bringing sons into His spiritual kingdom. And so Jesus, in answer to Pilate's question, "Are you the king of the Jews?" responded, "My kingdom is not of this world" (John 18:36).

So Hudson's analysis is too simplistic. Yes, Christ was concerned about economic reform and the needs of the poor. But the apex of Christ's ministry was bringing spiritual salvation to the world.

Jesus' Challenge to Corruption

For the moment, let us dig a little deeper into Hudson's claim that Christ died for debts (efforts at economic reform) rather than for sin (and spiritual salvation).

It is true that Jesus was perceived as a threat to the powers that be and indeed to their positions of wealth and prestige. After Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead, and acclaim for Him was intensifying, the Jewish Sanhedrin met in what you might call an emergency session to deal with the perceived threat Jesus posed to their power. They cried, "If we let him go on like this, everyone will believe in him, and then the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation" (John 11:48). Their self-centered motives are easily seen through the veil of ostensible concern for the nation.

Again, the Jewish leadership was incensed that Jesus struck at the corruption involved in their money-changing schemes at the temple, and for His cleansing of it from God's house (Matthew 21:12–13; John 2:12–25). Mark tells us that "The chief priests and the teachers of the law heard this and began looking for a way to kill him" (Mark 11:18).

Hudson explains:

¹² Bart Ehrman, *Jesus' Crucifixion as the King of the Jews*, The Bart Ehrman Blog at web address: <https://ehrmanblog.org/jesus-crucifixion-as-king-of-the-jews>

Jesus drove home the conflict he felt to exist between Jewish religious values and the selfish worldliness of creditors in his famous act of overturning the banking tables in Jerusalem's temple. The story is told in all four gospels (Luke 19, Matthew 21, Mark 11 and John 2). Upon entering Jerusalem, Jesus went directly to its temple, where he overturned the benches of the moneychangers and emptied out their moneybags on the floor. He also overturned the tables of merchants selling animals, and made a scourge of cords and "drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep, and the oxen" (John 2:15). Echoing the words of Jeremiah (7:11) some four centuries earlier, he announced that "My house will be a house of prayer, but you have made it `a den of thieves.'" This is the only report in the Scriptures of his using violence, and it inspired the city's leaders to plot his death.¹³

The Renegade article amplifies Hudson's idea here:

Professor Hudson says Jesus Christ paid the ultimate price for his activism. The Pharisees, Hillel (the founder of Rabbinical Judaism) and the creditors who backed them decided that Jesus' growing popularity was a threat to their authority and wealth. "They said 'we've got to get rid of this guy.'" ¹⁴

The foregoing makes it clear that Jesus was certainly an advocate for the poor and oppressed, an enemy of corruption, and thereby a threat to the Jewish leadership. As such, they certainly formed as motivation for the plots to kill Jesus.

Jesus as the Son of God

There were also other factors that motivated the enmity of the Jewish leadership toward Jesus. A prominent example is the hostility of the Jews in response to Jesus' claims to be the Son of God:

For this reason the Jews tried all the harder to kill him; not only was he breaking the Sabbath, but he was even calling God his own Father, making himself equal with God (John 5:18).

His enemies were incensed at what they felt were blasphemous claims to divinity by Jesus (compare with John 8:58-59). This same reaction occurred when Jesus was questioned before the Sanhedrin:

¹³ Hudson, *Lost Tradition*, 42. (Editor's Note) Many New Testament Scholars and chronologists believe that Jesus cleansed the temple twice, one at the beginning of his public ministry, and a second time just before his crucifixion.

¹⁴ Renegade, *Debts*, <http://michael-hudson.com/2017/12/he-died-for-our-debt-not-our-sins>

The high priest said to him, "I charge you under oath by the living God: Tell us if you are the Messiah, the Son of God." "You have said so," Jesus replied. "But I say to all of you: From now on you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Mighty One and coming on the clouds of heaven." Then the high priest tore his clothes and said, "He has spoken blasphemy! Why do we need any more witnesses? Look, now you have heard the blasphemy. What do you think?" He is worthy of death," they answered (Matthew 26:63–66).

Sadly, it never seemed to occur to most of the Jewish leadership that Jesus was in fact the Son of God. The foregoing shows, therefore, that there were multiple and complicated causes that motivated those who wished to see Jesus Christ dead. There was the threat that Jesus posed to the political and economic interests of those in power. He spoke of a kingdom and struck at corruption and in behalf of the oppressed. Further, most of the Jewish leadership felt that Jesus' claims to be God were a blasphemous affront the word of God and required His death.

The Divine Side of the Equation

These are all human factors that show the motivation of those who sought Jesus' death. But these facts alone do not display the divine side of the equation. In other words, what did Jesus think was the purpose or point of His own crucifixion or death?

In other words, a distinction can be (and should be) drawn between what motivated those who crucified Jesus and what motivated Jesus Himself; the divine versus the human sides in the equation. Did Jesus think of Himself as just an economic reformer trying to help the poor and uphold the law, and unfortunately pushed a little too hard and became a martyr for the cause of economic reform?

This simply cannot be maintained with anything approaching faithfulness to history or the Scriptural record. It was Jesus' plan and mission to die on the cross:

"We are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man will be delivered over to the chief priests and the teachers of the law. They will condemn him to death and will hand him over to the Gentiles to be mocked and flogged and crucified. On the third day he will be raised to life!" (Matthew 20:18–19).

He was in no way a victim of circumstances swept up by events out of His control. He voluntarily laid down his life for the sins of the world:

“I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep . . . The reason my Father loves me is that I lay down my life—only to take it up again. No one takes it from me, but I lay it down of my own accord. I have authority to lay it down and authority to take it up again. (John 10:11, 17–18).

Hudson ignores Jesus’ own explanation of his mission: “For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many” (Mark 10:45).

We must maintain this distinction between the human motives of those who wanted Christ crucified and the divine motives and purposes in allowing Christ to be crucified. Those who wanted Christ dead were certainly motivated by the perceived threat He posed to their positions. But in the big picture, their actions were in fulfillment of God’s larger purpose and plan:

This man was handed over to you by God’s deliberate plan and foreknowledge; and you, with the help of wicked men, put him to death by nailing him to the cross (Acts 2:23).

Speaking about the Jewish leaders, Peter preached to the Jewish audience:

You handed him over to be killed, and you disowned him before Pilate . . . You killed the author of life, but God raised him from the dead . . . Now, brothers, I know that you acted in ignorance, as did your leaders. But this is how God fulfilled what he had foretold through all the prophets, saying that his Christ would suffer (Acts 3:13, 15, 17–18).

So Hudson’s claim that Jesus died for debts and not for sins is at best misleading. Certainly, we have shown that from a human perspective, there were economic and political concerns involved in Jesus’ crucifixion (one need only think of the 30 silver coins Judas received for betraying Jesus (i.e. Matthew 26:15)). But Christians are quite justified in accepting the explanation for the crucifixion that Jesus and His disciples offered (rather than the reason offered by the economist Michael Hudson):

Now, brother and sisters, I want to remind you of the gospel I preached to you, which you received and on which you have taken your stand. By this gospel you are saved, if you hold firmly to the word I preached to you. Otherwise, you have believed in vain. For what I received I passed on to you as of first importance: that Christ died for our sins according to the

Scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures (1 Corinthians 15:1–4).

The Example of the Reformation

Examining multiple causes for an event is not unusual. For example, many scholars have studied the political and economic factors that were in play during the Protestant Reformation.

Historian Lewis Spitz describes some of the economic causes of the Reformation:

Still another and more prosaic explanation of the Reformation looks at its sociological roots . . . New social forces such as capitalism and the bourgeois classes that rose with it, the new technology in printing, mining, shipping, and other enterprises and the new working classes that maintained it, and the further growth of cities were changing the real lines of power and dependency.¹⁵

To this, E. Harris Harbison shows how the Reformation offered German princes an opportunity to free themselves from the control of Holy Roman Empire:

To the German governing classes, the prospects of curbing the independent power of the supranational church in their particular dominions . . . had particular appeal.¹⁶

No doubt, chief among local German ruler's concerns was the economic drain of the church in their domains:

It has been asserted that one-third of the landed wealth of Europe was held by the church . . . It was widely believed that two-fifths of the German income was siphoned off to Rome through ecclesiastical channels.¹⁷

Nevertheless, Spitz affirms the primary cause of the Reformation:

Though the Reformation brought about social, political, and economic change, the reformers themselves concentrated predominantly on theological and religious matters.¹⁸

15 Lewis W. Spitz, *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements, Vol. 2 The Reformation*, Chicago IL (Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1971) 309.

16 E. Harris Harbison, *The Age of Reformation*, Ithaca NY (Cornell University Press, 1955) 56.

17 Lewis W. Spitz, *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements, Vol. 2 The Reformation*, Chicago IL (Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1971) 313.

18 Lewis W. Spitz, *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements, Vol. 2 The Reformation*, Chicago IL (Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1971) 304.

There can be little doubt that political and economic issues were involved and intertwined in the development of the Reformation, but such causes are secondary to the spiritual principles and causes that drove the major leaders of the Reformation (i.e. Martin Luther and John Calvin).

The point of this brief excursus concerning the Reformation is to show that historical events may have many and varied causes, and therefore, great care must be made to avoid simplistic explanations of them.

We have already shown the many causes that led to Christ's crucifixion. Michael Hudson has no justification, beyond his own preferences, for his claim that Christ died for debts rather than for sins. It is a false dichotomy for Hudson to say that Christ died for debt rather than sin. Economic issues were certainly one many reasons for the cause of Christ crucifixion, but there can be no doubt that Christ understood the purpose of his death in terms of spiritual redemption.

The Apostolic Witness Concerning the Meaning of Christ's Eath

Nor should there be doubt concerning the purpose Christ came to earth according to the apostles and their message contained in the New Testament. We need only begin with John 3:16: "For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life."

Let us consider several other New Testament passages that affirm the Christian gospel message that Christ died on the cross as an atonement for our sins:

"He is the atoning sacrifice for our sins, and not only for ours but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 John 2:2).

"You see, at just the right time, when we were still powerless, Christ died for the ungodly. Very rarely will anyone die for a righteous person, though for a good person someone might possibly dare to die. But God demonstrates his own love for us in this: While we were still sinners, Christ died for us. Since we have now been justified by his blood, how much more shall we be saved from God's wrath through him! For if, while we were God's enemies, we were reconciled to him through the death of his Son, how much more, having been reconciled, shall we be saved through his life! Not only is this so, but we also boast in

God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received reconciliation” (Romans 5:6–11).

“But he has appeared once for all at the culmination of the ages to do away with sin by the sacrifice of himself. Just as people are destined to die once, and after that to face judgment, so Christ was sacrificed once to take away the sins of many” (Hebrews 9:26b–28a).

Such examples can easily be multiplied; the Bible powerfully conveys the Christian gospel that Jesus’ death was an atonement for the sins of man, and that by trusting in this finished work of Christ, mankind can find eternal life.

The New Testament or Michael Hudson?

What Michael Hudson is asking is that we should ignore this clear message of the Bible and rather accept his own interpretation two thousand years after the fact. Hudson argues that the New Testament has essentially distorted Jesus message, with Paul being the chief culprit:

The economist [Michael Hudson] says that Christianity was reshaped by Saint Paul, followed by the “African” school of Cyril of Alexandria and St Augustine.¹⁹

It is simply remarkable that we are asked to set aside the testimony of the men that were Jesus’ own disciples (who were taught by Him, devoted their lives to His gospel, and who ultimately paid the price of martyrdom for that commitment) - and instead listen to Michael Hudson. Wow!

Jesus’ Own Testimony

As we have seen, Jesus’ self-understanding of His mission was far different from that which Hudson suggests. The red-lettered words of the gospels are clear testimony of the atoning power of the red-blood Christ shed for our sins. Let us consider Jesus’ own testimony!

He often used the metaphor of bread for His body, signifying the life-giving nature of his death as atonement for sins:

“Do not work for food that spoils, but for food that endures to eternal life, which the Son of Man will give you . . . For the

19 Renegade, *Debts*, <http://michael-hudson.com/2017/12/he-died-for-our-debt-not-our-sins/>

bread of God is he who comes down from heaven and gives his life to the world . . . I am the living bread that came down from heaven. If anyone eats this bread, he will live forever. This bread is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world” (John 6:27, 33, 51).

Jesus continued this same metaphor at the Last Supper:

And he took bread, gave thanks and broke it, and gave it to them, saying, “This is my body given for you; do this in remembrance of me.” In the same way, after the supper he took the cup, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is poured out for you” (Luke 22:19–20).

So the choice is clear. We can accept what Jesus Christ Himself claimed was the purpose for His death or we can believe what Michael Hudson thinks.

The article will be continued next quarter

QUIZ: THE BIBLE AND FOOD

1. What was the fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil that Adam and Eve were forbidden to eat, but did eat bringing sin and death?
 - a. Apple
 - b. Orange
 - c. Peach
 - d. Bible doesn't say
2. What is the name of the substance that fell from the sky six days a week providing sustenance for the Israelites during the period of their wanderings in the Sinai Desert?
 - a. Heaven's Dew
 - b. Angel's Food Cake
 - c. Manna
 - d. Vanilla Ice Cream
3. During his forty days of fasting in the desert, what did the Devil tempt Jesus to eat?
 - a. Ham
 - b. Turn water into soup
 - c. Turn stones into bread
 - d. Bible doesn't say
4. When Jesus fed the five thousand (John 6:1-15), he multiplied a boys meal of:
 - a. Five small barley loaves and two small fish
 - b. Two small stones and five sticks
 - c. Five pigeons and a badger
 - d. Two turtle doves and a partridge in a pear tree

5. Which food were Jews forbidden to eat under the Mosaic Law?
- a. Steak
 - b. Pheasant
 - c. Gazelle
 - d. Pork
6. At the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15, Gentile Christians were asked to refrain from eating what for the peace and unity of the Church?
- a. Pork and pasta
 - b. Green eggs and ham
 - c. Food polluted by idols, the meat of things strangled, and blood
 - d. All kinds of four-footed animals, as well as reptiles of the earth, and birds of the air
7. What did Jesus eat (Luke 24:41-41) with the disciples when He appeared to them after the resurrection?
- a. Lamb
 - b. Broiled fish
 - c. Bread and wine
 - d. Bethany Buffet
8. Palestine was the Jewish Promised Land and was often called:
- a. A place of faith and fortune
 - b. A land flowing with milk and honey
 - c. The Big Apple
 - d. Heaven on earth
9. What food does the Bible describe in the heavenly New Jerusalem (Revelations 22:2)?
- a. Lamb
 - b. Honey
 - c. Apples and Oranges
 - d. The Tree of Life bearing twelve crops of fruit every month

10. What type of food restored Elijah in the wilderness (1 Kings 19:6)

- a. Raisins
- b. Carrots
- c. Bread
- d. Big Mac

Answers:

1, d, 2, c, 3, c, 4, a, 5, d, 6, c, 7, b, 8, b, 9, d, 10, c

Personal Notes on the Articles:

Please feel free to email us at info@ras.org if you have any questions or comments.

SUBSCRIBERS

If your mailing label reads September 2018,
your subscription expires with this issue. Please renew your
subscription soon. Renewals cost \$10.00 per year in the U.S.
Foreign subscriptions cost extra to cover the additional postage.

Come visit Religion Analysis Service on the World Wide Web!
Our URL is: <http://www.ras.org> • Our e-mail address is: info@ras.org

RELIGION ANALYSIS SERVICE, INC.
PO BOX 206
CHASKA, MN 55318-0206
ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

NON-PROFIT ORG
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
CHASKA, MN
PERMIT NO. 171

Important—If your mailing label
reads September 2018, your sub-
scription has expired with this issue.
Please renew now!