



## **“THOUGHTS ON *THE DAVINCI CODE*” BY NOEL HEIKKINEN**

This paper was originally given as a message at Riverview. We asked the church what they wanted to hear taught on and one of the most common answers was *The Da Vinci Code*. Teaching through this topic was weird for me because of two camps in the Christian community right now. The first camp says *The Da Vinci Code* is a huge threat, the second says it's an amazing opportunity. I'm right about in the middle: I think it's a little bit of both and a little bit of neither.

I read this guy Glenn Lucke's blog<sup>i</sup> and he summed up my feelings:

*“Regarding the Da Vinci Code, I'm an apathist. I feel no outrage at the novelist for writing fiction about Mary Magdalene and the church. I feel no urgency that Brown's fiction might prevail against the church. Call me crazy, call me complacent, but I tend to think the church is slightly more durable than the Da Vinci Code.” – Glenn Lucke*

*The Da Vinci Code* is a novel - it's fiction. The reason I don't see it as a threat is simple: it's only a threat if the allegations in it are true and they simply aren't. Author Sandra Miesel<sup>ii</sup> writes:

*“So error-laden is The Da Vinci Code that the educated reader actually applauds those rare occasions where Brown stumbles (despite himself) into the truth.”*

Roger Ebert<sup>iii</sup> agrees...

*“Dan Brown's novel is utterly preposterous; Ron Howard's movie is preposterously entertaining. Both contain accusations against the Catholic Church and its order of Opus Dei that would be scandalous if anyone of sound mind could possibly entertain them. I know there are people who believe Brown's fantasies about the Holy Grail, the descendants of Jesus, the Knights Templar, Opus Dei and the true story of Mary Magdalene. This has the advantage of distracting them from the theory that the Pentagon was not hit by an airplane. Let us begin, then, by agreeing that The Da Vinci Code is a work of fiction.”*

Despite all of this, so many people are still making a big deal about this book. Why? Because of the first page that reads:

*“Fact: All descriptions of artwork, architecture, documents, and secret rituals in this novel are accurate.”*

That sentence has art historians, Christian historians, and non-Christian historians laughing. This book is a work of fiction with a whole bunch of conspiracy theories woven in. Last month, I was in Dallas and I had the opportunity to stand in the place where JFK was shot. Yes, Noel stood on the Grassy Knoll.

The conspiracy theories about JFK's death abound. Around the site, there were people selling books and CDs. Others were proposing their theories on what happened. It was fun! Conspiracy theories are a blast...until you start taking them seriously.

That's what *The Da Vinci Code* is like. I enjoyed both the book and the movie. They are great fun, just like reading the Harry Potter books or watching a TV special on Roswell.

If you don't know what all the hubbub is about, this is the basic premise of *The Da Vinci Code*: Jesus was married to Mary Magdalene and had a kid. This is a fact that the church has been hiding because if it was true Jesus couldn't be divine. Instead, he would be just a normal shmuck like the rest of us.

Most people I have talked with don't care at all about *The Da Vinci Code* but at the same time, the book brings up some questions that many Christians can't answer. It has become a sort of 1 Peter 3:15 deal:

*1 Peter 3:15 - You must worship Christ as Lord of your life. And if someone asks about your Christian hope, always be ready to explain it.*

This is part of our lives as Christ-followers: being ready. Tragically, many Christians are not versed enough in the Bible and Church History to answer a lot of the questions *The Da Vinci Code* raises. Now obviously, in this short paper, we can't hit everything in this book. If you would like a more definitive treatment, you can download a list of articles, papers, and teachings here: \*\*\*\*\*.

In this paper, I'm gonna hit three of the more pointed issues in the *Da Vinci Code*:

*Is the Bible reliable (especially the four Gospel accounts)?*

*Was Jesus married to Mary Magdalene?*

*Is Jesus divine?*

### **Is the Bible reliable (especially the four Gospel accounts)?**

---

*"The Bible is a product of man, my dear. Not of God. The Bible did not fall magically from the clouds. Man created it as a historical record of tumultuous times, and it has evolved through countless translations, additions, and revisions. History has never had a definitive version of the book."*

*"More than eighty gospels were considered for the New Testament, and yet only a relatively few were chosen for inclusion—Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John among them."*

*"Who chose which gospels to include?" Sophie asked.*

*"Aha!" Teabing burst in with enthusiasm. "The fundamental irony of Christianity! The Bible, as we know it today, was collated by the pagan Roman emperor Constantine the Great."*

*"I thought Constantine was a Christian," Sophie said.*

*"Hardly," Teabing scoffed. "He was a lifelong pagan who was baptized on his deathbed, too weak to protest."*

*"Constantine commissioned and financed a new Bible, which omitted those gospels that spoke of Christ's human traits and embellished those gospels that made him godlike. The earlier gospels were outlawed, gathered up, and burned."<sup>iv</sup>*

Of all of *The Da Vinci Code*'s allegations, this one has tripped up more people I have talked with. Is it true that Constantine (a pagan) compiled the Bible?

One of the worse thing Dan Brown did in this book is this portrayal of Constantine. Now the dude was not an angel, by any stretch. It is well known and documented that he was ruthless with his political enemies. On top of that, he wrote some pretty brutal laws with some cruel and unusual punishments. But the statement that he was a pagan that only converted to Christianity on his deathbed when he was “too weak to protest” is ridiculous. It flies in the face of historical record and fact. Any historian (Christian or not) will tell you that.

Dr. Paul Maier, who is Professor of Ancient History at Western Michigan University writes:<sup>v</sup>

*“Constantine was a true convert to Christianity. He built cathedrals as if there were no tomorrow. All the main identification spots associated with Jesus in Palestine are Constantinian construction: the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem and the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem. He couldn’t do enough for the church. He reimbursed the church for all the damage it had suffered in the persecutions. He invited the clergy regularly for dinner. He called himself a bishop of those outside the church in order to bring them into the church. He felt that God had appointed him to convert the Roman Empire to Christianity. He was active in church affairs. He exempted the church from taxation. It’s ridiculous to say he was a lifelong pagan. It’s simply a bald lie.”*

Was Constantine baptized on his deathbed? Yes.

Was it because he was “too weak to protest”? No, he was just a bad theologian.

Constantine believed that baptism cleansed you from your sins from that point in your life backward. Any other sins you committed during your lifetime had to be confessed. Because of this belief, he was baptized just before dying to make sure he had covered all his sins. This was common practice throughout the 4th and 5th centuries.

As stupid as this reason to wait on baptism was, that was Constantine’s reasoning. It wasn’t because he was a pagan who had to be forced under the water.

Now, what about the allegation that he compiled the Bible? There are two specific allegations the Da Vinci Code makes: First, that gospels that showed Jesus’ human side were eliminated; Second, that the ones that were eliminated were the “earliest gospels.” Let’s tackle these one at a time.

First, anyone who reads the Gospels that we have will see a very human Jesus. We see him exhausted<sup>vi</sup>, starving<sup>vii</sup>, sad<sup>viii</sup> ticked off<sup>x</sup> and lonely<sup>x</sup>, just to mention a few human emotions. In the Bible, Jesus is portrayed as very, very human. Interestingly enough, the gospels Dan Brown refers to portray Jesus as less human: he’s more of a mystical figure.

Secondly, there never were 80+ gospels vying to be put into the Bible. No one can figure out where Dan Brown got that number, even those that agree with him! It is part of historical record that there were other so-called gospels. Roughly 52 of them, if you are very loose on your definition of “gospel.” Most of the 52 hit on one or two stories from Jesus’ life with specific intent to show that Jesus was passing on some “secret and mystical knowledge.” These books include The Gospel of Judas, The Gospel of Phillip, and The Gospel of Mary. There’s also The Gospel of Truth which is, interestingly enough, not even about Jesus! It’s the creation story told from the perspective of the Serpent.

Now, what about these books? Why aren’t they in the Bible? (Besides the fact that one of them was supposedly written by Satan.) Let’s start by looking at a few key dates which are agreed upon by historians. Hopefully, they will clarify things a bit.

*30-33 AD – Jesus was crucified*

Whether or not historians believe he was resurrected, they agree with the date of his death.

*33-68 AD – Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were written*

The reason we have these dates is that Jerusalem was under siege by the Roman Empire in 68 AD and it was burned to the ground in 70 AD. Every detail in the Gospels is set in the social, cultural, and economic background of the period of history before Jerusalem was destroyed. By the time Jerusalem had burned, these Gospels had been copied again and again and were widespread enough that they were not destroyed with Jerusalem. In fact, in museums all around the world today there are fragments that match up word for word with each other as well as complete manuscripts of these Gospels.

*130 AD - Papias, a student of Jesus' disciple John wrote:*

*Matthew compiled the logia in the Aramaic speech, and everyone translated them as best he could. Mark, the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately whatsoever Peter remembered.*

*140 – 180 AD - Two prolific Christian writers (Justin Martyr and Tertullian) repeatedly reference the four Gospels as the Word of God*

*Late 2nd Century - Gnosticism gains steam*

Gnosticism has as its root the Greek word “Gnosis,” which means “knowledge.” The Gnostics believed that all matter is evil: the human body, the physical world, the computer I typed this on. All of this, to a Gnostic, is a prison for who we truly are: our mind. They teach that we all come from a mystical place sort of like heaven and we need to get back there. The only way of escape from this prison is by accepting some secret knowledge that shows you the path. Ronald Nash<sup>xi</sup> described Gnosticism this way:

*“Something happened in that heavenly world of light that caused each human soul to fall from its heavenly home and resulted in the soul’s being imprisoned in its body. But the good god, taking pity on these poor souls, sent to earth a Gnostic Redeemer who imparted a secret knowledge about their former state—a state that people had forgotten—and about how they might return to it.”*

Sound familiar? It should. Go back and watch *The Matrix* again: it’s like a primer on Gnosticism.

From the late 2nd Century through the 3rd Century, the Gnostics began to write their own Gospels and they used the names of the original followers of Jesus to give them credibility. Remember the Gospel of Truth? That was the book that was the creation account – written from the perspective of Satan? It actually refers to Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, Paul’s Letters, and The Book of Revelations. In other words, it references the New Testament that we have today!

*180 AD – Irenaeus (who was a student of Polycarp, who was a student of Jesus’ friend John) refutes the Gnostics as heretics*

Irenaeus wrote definitively that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were eye-witness accounts that were authoritative and inspired by God. He added that the Gnostic writers were not to add to scripture.

*Early 200s - the theologian Origen wrote:*

*“I know a certain gospel which is called ‘The Gospel according to Thomas’ and a ‘Gospel according to Matthias,’ and many others have we read—lest we should in any way be considered ignorant because of those who imagine they possess some knowledge if they are acquainted with these. Nevertheless, among all these we have approved solely what the church has recognized, which is that only the four gospels should be accepted.”*

Long before Constantine came along in the 300s, the Bible was already becoming widely accepted as we have it. There never were never 80 Gospels vying to be in the Bible and the Gnostic Gospels we have were never even considered for inclusion in the Bible.

*The Da Vinci Code* quotes authoritatively from the Gospel of Phillip and the Gospel of Mary, which are both Gnostic Gospels. Neither were written by Phillip or Mary; they were written by other people 100 to 150 years after the events they describe.

## **Was Jesus Married?**

---

In the trailer to the movie *The Da Vinci Code*, they talk about a “Secret so powerful that if revealed it would devastate the very foundations of mankind?”<sup>xii</sup> What is that secret?

*“The early Church needed to convince the world that the mortal prophet Jesus was a divine being. Therefore, any gospels that described earthly aspects of Jesus’ life had to be omitted from the Bible. Unfortunately for the early editors, one particularly troubling earthly theme kept recurring in the gospels. Mary Magdalene.” He paused. “More specifically, her marriage to Jesus Christ.”*

*“I beg your pardon?” Sophie’s eyes moved to Langdon and then back to Teabing.*

*“It’s a matter of historical record,” Teabing said.*

“A matter of historical record.” That, my friends, is a bold statement! Surely if it is a matter of historical record, there is tons of evidence for this allegation, right? Brown points to two.<sup>xiii</sup>

*“These are photocopies of the Nag Hammadi and Dead Sea Scrolls, which I mentioned earlier,” Teabing said. “The earliest Christian records. Troubling, they do not match up with the gospels in the Bible.”*

What’s the Nag Hammadi? That’s the Gnostic Gospels. They are called that because they were found in Egypt at a place called Nag Hammadi.

Now what are the Dead Sea Scrolls?<sup>xiv</sup>

This is where it gets fun! There was a cave that some shepherds went into in 1947 near the Dead Sea. They found some jars filled with scrolls that were perfectly preserved. As archaeologists dug around, they found eleven caves with all sorts of stuff: some linen cloth, coins, scroll tabs, combs, a bowl, some sandals, and something archaeologists call “thongs.” Maybe they were remnants from MTV’s “Spring Break at the Dead Sea.”

The thongs were indeed marvelous, but the greatest discovery was the scrolls. Here’s a description from Grant Jeffrey in the book *Jesus: The Great Debate*<sup>xv</sup>:

*“The most incredible find was discovered in Cave Four at Qumran—an immense library of biblical manuscripts that contained almost all of the books of the Old Testament (with the exception of the book of Esther). In fact, multiple copies of several biblical texts that had lain undisturbed in the desert caves for almost two thousand years...After carefully comparing the biblical manuscripts, they discovered that, aside from a tiny number of spelling variations, there were no significant differences between the original scrolls in the caves and the Hebrew texts used to produce the Authorized King James Version of 1611.”*

Wait? Did you catch it? There’s a lot of good stuff in there, but the part that’s important to this discussion is that the scrolls were of the Old Testament! They were from before the time of Jesus. They don’t detail any of the life of Jesus, let alone his relationship with Mary. Remember what Teabing said?

*“These are photocopies of the Nag Hammadi and Dead Sea Scrolls, which I mentioned earlier,” Teabing said. “The earliest Christian records. Troubling, they do not match up with the gospels in the Bible.”*

That is a bait and switch! The Nag Hammadi texts were written 100-150 years after the other gospels and the Dead Sea Scrolls predate the New Testament.

Teabing goes on and quotes the Gospel of Philip (from the Gnostic Gospels)<sup>xvi</sup>:

*“The Gospel of Philip is always a good place to start.”*

*And the companion of the Saviour is Mary Magdalene. Christ loved her more than all the disciples and used to kiss her often on her mouth. The rest of the disciples were offended by it and expressed disapproval. They said to him, ‘Why do you love her more than all of us?’*

*Teabing smiled, pointing to the first line. “As any Aramaic scholar will tell you, the word companion in those days literally meant spouse.”*

There’s one tiny, tiny little problem here: the only known copy of the Gospel of Philip isn’t written in Aramaic<sup>xvii</sup>, but Coptic. And the word “companion” in Coptic means “companion.” It does not mean “spouse.”

This is the strongest piece of evidence for Jesus and Mary being married, so let’s read it again.

*And the companion of the Saviour is Mary Magdalene. Christ loved her more than all the disciples and used to kiss her often on her mouth. The rest of the disciples were offended by it and expressed disapproval. They said to him, ‘Why do you love her more than all of us?’*

By the way, here’s the rest of that section...(which he doesn’t quote)<sup>xviii</sup>

*The Savior answered and said to them, ‘Why do I not love you like her?’ When a blind man and one who sees are both together in darkness, they are no different from one another. Then the light comes, then he who sees will see the light, and he who is blind will remain in darkness”*

If you asked me why I love my wife more than you, there would be an obvious answer. “Because she’s my wife!” But Jesus (reportedly) didn’t answer that way. Why does he love her more? Because she sees the light; she has “special knowledge.” This is Gnosticism at its finest.

Oh...there's something else you need to know. The only copy of *The Gospel of Philip* we have is pretty worn out. Because of this, a lot of words have to be assumed. It's like a big game of Mad Libs. Remember that game? You list out various parts of speech and enter them into a pre-determined story. The results are usually pretty funny.

When I gave this message at Riverview, we played Mad Libs with this section of *The Gospel of Philip* with some pretty hilarious results.

Here's is the original version of *The Gospel of Philip* in the only copy that exists:

*The companion of the [ ] Mary Magdalene. [ ] her more than [ ] the disciples, and used to kiss her [ ] on her [ ]. The rest of [ ] ... They said to him, "Why do you love her more than all of us?"*

Here are the different variations we got at our three services:

*The companion of the [Bottle Washer] Mary Magdalene. [He ran] her more than [an ounce of] the disciples, and used to kiss her [everyday] on her [elbow]. The rest of [the Gypsies] ... They said to him, "Why do you love her more than all of us?"*

*The companion of the [Electrician] Mary Magdalene. [He jumped] her more than [eleventy billion of] the disciples, and used to kiss her [weekly] on her [head]. The rest of [the Riverview attenders] ... They said to him, "Why do you love her more than all of us?"*

*The companion of the [Sanitation Consultant] Mary Magdalene. [He fished] her more than [thirty of] the disciples, and used to kiss her [17 times a day] on her [pinky toe]. The rest of [the nuns] ... They said to him, "Why do you love her more than all of us?"*

Now, obviously translators are a little more scientific than Mad Libs, but you get the point. This is supposed to be the strongest evidence for Jesus' marriage! And after presenting this, Teabing makes the sweeping statement<sup>xix</sup>:

*"I shan't bore you with the countless references to Jesus and Magdalene's union."*

I wish he would, but he can't.

The bottom line is summed up beautifully by historian Bart Ehrman<sup>xx</sup> from the University of North Carolina:

*"...the historical evidence against it is overwhelming. For one thing, not one of the early sources on the historical Jesus—not even the Gnostic gospels Dan Brown cites—ever mention a wife. But the sources do mention other members of Jesus's family surrounding him, and they mention the spouses of Jesus's followers. So if Jesus had been married, it's logical to assume that at least one mention of her would have survived. But none exist."*

So, who was Mary Magdalene? Well, according to the Bible she was a follower and friend of Jesus as were many women. One of the most telling verses was at the tomb:

*John 20:14-18*

*She turned to leave and saw someone standing there. It was Jesus, but she didn't recognize him. "Dear woman, why are you crying?" Jesus asked her. "Who are you looking for?" She thought he was the gardener.*

*"Sir," she said, "if you have taken him away, tell me where you have put him, and I will go and get him."*

*"Mary!" Jesus said. She turned to him and cried out, "Rabboni!" (which is Hebrew for "Husband?" No. "Lover?" No. "Pookie?" No. It's Hebrew for "Teacher").*

*"Don't cling to me," Jesus said, "for I haven't yet ascended to the Father. But go find my brothers and tell them that I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God."*

*Mary Magdalene found the disciples and told them, "I have seen (who?) the Lord!" Then she gave them his message.*

We know a few things about Mary Magdalene, but nothing points to her being married to Jesus.

But let's take another giant leap: let's say Jesus was married. Would that be a secret that is so powerful that it would devastate the very foundations of mankind?<sup>xxi</sup>

No.

This is such a big deal for *The Da Vinci Code*:

*"...you must understand the Church's powerful motivations to conduct such a cover-up. They could never have survived public knowledge of a bloodline. A child of Jesus would undermine the critical notion of Christ's divinity and therefore the Christian Church..."*

Not really. I can't think of a single reason why it would have been a big deal if Jesus was married. The Bible has a high view of marriage; sex within the context of marriage is a holy thing; to have kids is a blessing. All of these things would just have shown that Jesus was fully human. Which is exactly what he is: fully God and fully human both.

I think it would have been kinda cool if Jesus was married and had a kid, especially in light of a new ABCnews report<sup>xxii</sup> that came out this week that shows how probability theory proves that if Jesus had any children his lineage would have died out quickly or millions of people alive today would be his direct descendants!

Some of you reading this would be his kin. But you aren't and it doesn't even matter one little bit. Because Jesus is fully human.

## **Is Jesus Divine?**

---

The Da Vinci Code asserts that Jesus was not divine, rather Constantine made him divine in the 300s<sup>xxiii</sup>:

*"At this gathering," Teabing said, "many aspects of Christianity were debated and voted upon—the date of Easter, the role of the bishops, the administration of the sacraments, and of course, the divinity of Jesus...until that moment in history, Jesus was viewed by His followers as a mortal prophet...a great and powerful man, but a man nonetheless. A mortal."*

*“Not the son of God?”*

*“Right,” Teabing said. “Jesus’ establishment as ‘the Son of God’ was officially proposed and voted on by the Council of Niceae.”*

*“Hold on. You’re saying Jesus’ divinity was the result of a vote?”*

*“A relatively close vote at that.”*

That’s what historians call “silly.” But let’s look at the evidence. The first person to claim Jesus was God was Jesus:

*John 10:24*

*The people surrounded him and asked, “How long are you going to keep us in suspense? If you are the Messiah, tell us plainly.”*

So he does. He says:

*John 10: 30-33*

*The Father and I are one.”*

*Once again the people picked up stones to kill him. Jesus said, “At my Father’s direction I have done many good works. For which one are you going to stone me?”*

*They replied, “We’re stoning you not for any good work, but for blasphemy! You, a mere man, claim to be God.”*

Then there was Peter who said:

*“You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.” – Matthew 16:16*

And Paul, who said:

*“For in Christ all the fullness of Deity lives in bodily form.” – Colossians 2:9*

And John, who said:

*I John 5:20 We live in fellowship with the true God because we live in fellowship with his Son, Jesus Christ. He is the only true God, and he is eternal life.*

Jesus said he was God, his closest friends said he was God, and so did the early church.

*100 AD - Pliny the Younger (the Roman Governor) wrote to Emperor Trajan<sup>xxiv</sup>*

That the Christians would not worship a statue of the Emperor but rather would sing a song to Jesus, “as to a God.”

*115 AD - A Guy Named Ignatius*

Would not recant his assertion that Jesus had risen from the dead. His dying declaration was that he wanted to imitate “our God Jesus in death.”<sup>xxv</sup> So he was torn apart by wild animals in the arena.

By the time we hit Constantine in the 300s, thousands of references of Jesus as God were part of the biblical and historical records.

So what was the Council of Nicea and did they have a close vote on the divinity of Jesus?

Well here’s the deal. Back in this time of history, church councils were convened to deal with theological rifts that were happening in the church. The first we know of was in Acts 15 over the circumcision issue. In the 300s, there were some pressing issues. One was a guy named Arius who was wandering around saying Jesus is God, but he is a created God. Here are his own words:<sup>xxvi</sup>

*But what do we say and think? What have we taught and what do we teach? “The Son has a beginning, but God is without beginning.” We are persecuted because we say, “He is from nothing.” But we speak thus inasmuch as he is neither part of God nor from any substratum.*

This guy was a marketing genius. He wrote these little jingles about his philosophies and soon everyone in the empire was singing them. You know how you get a song stuck in your head? That’s what Arius was doing with his heresy: he made these catchy little jingles that would get stuck in your head.

So the Council of Nicea was convened to settle this issue among other things. Not one of the 300 plus delegates doubted that Jesus was God, not one! And when they were faced with the overwhelming evidence in Scripture that Jesus had always been divine, they voted.

Was it close?<sup>xxvii</sup>

If you call 300 to 2 close.

They published the famous Nicene Creed<sup>xxviii</sup> that reads:

*Nicine Creed of 325*

*We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty Maker of all that is seen and unseen.*

*And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten from the father, only-begotten, that is, from the substance of the father.*

*God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten not made, one in Being with the Father.*

*Through whom all things came into being, things in heaven and things on earth.*

*Who because of us men and because of our salvation came down and became incarnate, becoming man, suffered.*

*On the third day he rose again and ascended to heaven.*

*He will come again to judge the living and the dead.*

*And in the Holy Spirit.*

*But as for those who say, there was when He was not, and before being born He was not, and that He came into existence out of nothing or who assert that the Son of God is of a different hypostasis or substance, or is subject to alteration or change - those the Catholic and apostolic Church anathematizes.*

You can see they are dealing with Arius with this last line, which was removed from later versions. They also made rulings on 20 different items which were mostly regarding church discipline issues. In fact, we have a historical record of all of the 20 rulings the Council of Nicea<sup>xxix</sup> made.

My favorite is this one: If a pastor castrates himself, he shouldn't be a pastor anymore. But if a doctor or barbarian does it to him, it's OK, he can stay in the ministry.

What is notably missing is that the Council did not vote on the divinity of Jesus, period. Now when this council was all said and done did Constantine order certain Gospels to be burned? No...but he did order something to be burned: all the writings by Arius.

Oh...and he did call for fifty additional copies of the Bible to be made so that new churches that were being built could have a copy. He didn't publish a new version of the Bible, he had copies made of the existing Bible.

So, what can we learn from all of this?

Regarding *The Da Vinci Code*

Tom Hanks said it best<sup>xxx</sup>

*Interviewed for London's Evening Standard, the star of the upcoming blockbuster insists the furor over the film is misplaced. "It's a damn good story and a lot of fun," he asserted, adding that no one should take the film too seriously. It's loaded, he said, "with all sorts of hooley."*

Regarding this type of thing in general?

Paul said it best. He said we should be equipped so...

*Ephesians 4:14*

*Then we will no longer be immature like children. We won't be tossed and blown about by every wind of new teaching. We will not be influenced when people try to trick us with lies so clever they sound like the truth.*



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons License](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/2.0/) (for more information, please see <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/2.0/>)

- 
- <sup>i</sup> [http://commongroundsonline.typepad.com/common\\_grounds\\_online/2006/05/must\\_i\\_care\\_abo.html](http://commongroundsonline.typepad.com/common_grounds_online/2006/05/must_i_care_abo.html)
- <sup>ii</sup> <http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/persecution/pch0058.html>
- <sup>iii</sup> <http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20060518/REVIEWS/60419009/1001>
- <sup>iv</sup> The Da Vinci Code, p 250-251,254
- <sup>v</sup> Lee Strobel; "Discussing the Da Vinci Code."
- <sup>vi</sup> John 4:6
- <sup>vii</sup> Matthew 4:2
- <sup>viii</sup> Mark 3:5
- <sup>ix</sup> Mark 3:5
- <sup>x</sup> Matthew 26:38
- <sup>xi</sup> Ronald Nash, "The Gospel and the Greeks," p 205
- <sup>xii</sup> The Da Vinci Code, p 264
- <sup>xiii</sup> The Da Vinci Code, p 266
- <sup>xiv</sup> <http://www.ibiblio.org/expo/deadsea.scrolls.exhibit/intro.html>
- <sup>xv</sup> Grant Jeffrey, Jesus: The Great Debate, p 59-60
- <sup>xvi</sup> The Da Vinci Code, p 266
- <sup>xvii</sup> <http://christopherbutler.wordpress.com/tag/gospel-of-philip/>
- <sup>xviii</sup> The Gospel of Philip, Section 63
- <sup>xix</sup> The Da Vinci Code, p 267
- <sup>xx</sup> <http://hnn.us/articles/25706.html>
- <sup>xxi</sup> The Da Vinci Code, p 264
- <sup>xxii</sup> <http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/story?id=2019650&page=1&CMP=OTC-RSSFeeds0312>
- <sup>xxiii</sup> The Da Vinci Code, p 253
- <sup>xxiv</sup> <http://www.jesus.com.au/html/page/pliny>
- <sup>xxv</sup> <http://www.christianitytoday.com/history/special/131christians/ignatiusantioch.html>
- <sup>xxvi</sup> (Quoted in William G. Rausch, The Trinitarian Controversy [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980] 29-30).
- <sup>xxvii</sup> <http://blog.seacoastgrace.org/2006/05/24/was-the-divinity-of-jesus-a-fourth-century-political-invention/>
- <sup>xxviii</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nicene\\_Creed](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nicene_Creed)
- <sup>xxix</sup> <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3801.htm>
- <sup>xxx</sup> <http://hnn.us/articles/25706.html>