



# The Da Vinci Code

## Personal Unedited Research

By: Josh McDowell © 2006

## Overview

Josh McDowell's personal research on *The Da Vinci Code* was collected in preparation for the development of several equipping resources released in March 2006.

This research is available as part of Josh McDowell's Da Vinci Pastor Resource Kit. The full kit provides you with tools to equip your people to answer the questions raised by *The Da Vinci Code* book and movie. We trust that these resources will help you prepare your people with a positive readiness so that they might seize this as an opportunity to open up compelling dialogue about the real and relevant Christ.

---

### *Da Vinci Pastor Resource Kit*



This kit includes:

- 3-Part Sermon Series & Notes
- Multi-media Presentation
- Video of Josh's 3-Session Seminar on DVD
- Sound-bites & Video Clip Library
- Josh McDowell's Personal Research & Notes

FREE Gift  
Josh's  
Research



Retail Price: \$49.95

---

The 3-part sermon series includes a sermon outline, discussion points and sample illustrations. Each session includes references to the slide presentation should you choose to include audio-visuals with your sermon series. A library of additional sound-bites and video clips is also included.

Josh McDowell's delivery of a 3-session seminar was captured on video and is included in the kit. Josh's personal research and notes are also included. This extensive research is categorized by topic with side-by-side comparison to Da Vinci claims versus historical evidence.

For more information and to order Da Vinci resources by Josh McDowell, visit [josh.davinciquest.org](http://josh.davinciquest.org).

## Table of Contents

Introduction: The Search for Truth.....	4
Historical Chart: Claims vs. Fact .....	7
Christianity borrowed from pagan mythology .....	7
The Sacred Feminine .....	10
Priory of Sion.....	14
Knights Templar .....	18
The Bible is man-made .....	23
The Council of Nicaea Concerning the books to include in the New Testament canon .....	25
What were the early Christians like? .....	70
Was the early church anti-feminine? .....	76
Constantine and The Council of Nicaea Concerning Jesus' deity .....	81
Did Christ command that Mary Magdalene should lead the Church?.....	95
Did Mary Magdalene bear Christ's child?.....	97
Christ's royal bloodline .....	99
The Holy Grail .....	102
The Last Supper Painting.....	103
Other pieces of artwork .....	106
Da Vinci Code & Jesus Christ .....	108
Leonardo da Vinci Unplugged .....	145
General.....	145
Leonardo's use of iconography indicating the Passion of the Christ .....	145
Views on death, his Catholic funeral, his will, and the soul .....	146
Regarding the Catholic Church and his belief in the crucifixion .....	149
Leonardo's personal beliefs regarding God, the Soul .....	149
The Last Supper .....	152
The need for restoration.....	155
Leonardo's asceticism, views on humanity modesty, propriety, intimacy, vegetarianism, care for animals, love of pranks.....	157
Inquisitive and Scientific approach.....	160
Virgin Of the Rocks, the Lourve and London versions .....	160
Mona Lisa .....	161
Madonna, Child, St. Anne and a Lamb .....	162
Bibliography .....	162
Leonardo's Manuscripts.....	163
Paris Manuscripts: .....	163
Other notebooks and manuscripts and cited sources: .....	163
Closing Notes on Leonardo Research .....	164

## Introduction: The Search for Truth

There is no question or doubt that Dan Brown has written a spell-binding novel. We all love a good story, but even more, we love “a good conspiracy.”

As we indulge in the “conspiracy,” we also need to begin the “quest” and “search for the truth.” Dan Brown needs to be congratulated on his great writing and the ability to produce a thriller that is so hard to put down. Multitudes of authors envy his writing ability.

Over the years while lecturing in more than 1000 universities in 107 different countries, I have had the opportunity to participate in more than 250 debates with scholars, historians, and philosophers.

I never enter the research phase to “win the debate,” but rather to find the truth. As I examine the material relevant to the theme of the debate, I have to ask myself several questions:

- 1) Is this the truth or is it someone's personal opinion, bias, or prejudice?
- 2) Is there sufficient credible evidence to support the truth claim?
- 3) Is it relevant to the argument?

For me to be energetic in a debate and to speak with authority, I must be convinced in my own mind that my position is valid and intellectually defensible. If I have developed the arguments skewed by my own personal bias or prejudice, or twisted the facts to support my position, then it shouldn't take a worthy opponent long to expose me and win the debate.

As a believer in Christ, I am committed to the Truth. Jesus said in John 8:32, “You shall **know** the truth.” He did not say you should ignore the truth or distort the truth. If anyone should be committed to knowing and following the truth, it is a Christian.

As a university student, I was an obnoxious, antagonistic agnostic. During my pursuit to expose the Christian faith as an “historic construct” by his followers, I was confronted with historical evidence about Jesus being the Son of God and the Bible being reliable and accurate. This evidence not only appeared to be “credible” but it also ran contrary to my position and to what I was so passionately wanting to prove.

Finally, the evidence compelled me to change my attitude and my viewpoint. I no longer pursued the “truth” to refute Christianity, but rather to simply ask the question, “Is it true?” and then let the evidence speak for itself. It was through this process that I came to Christ.

It was imperative that we approach the historic claims of *The Da Vinci Code* in the same way. People perceive the book as a fictional novel based upon “fact.”

\*\*\*\*\*

**DAN BROWN MAKES CLAIMS THAT THE NOVEL IS HISTORIC FACT.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**NBC Today - October 10, 2005**

Dan Brown was asked by host Matt Lauer, "How much of this [book] is based on reality in terms of things that actually happened?" Brown emphatically replied, **"Absolutely all of it... is historical fact."**

\*\*\*\*\*

**ABC Good Morning America - November 3, 2003**

Host Charlie Gibson said to Dan Brown, "This is a novel. If you were writing it as a non-fiction book, how would it have been different?" Brown responded, **"I don't think it would have."**

\*\*\*\*\*

**USA Today**

*The Da Vinci Code is*

**"Historic fact with a contemporary storyline."**

(Bob Minzesheimer, "Code Deciphers Interest in Religious History,"  
December 11, 2003, pD1)

\*\*\*\*\*

Another comment refers to the work as

**"A good yarn within a richly factual context."**

("The Da Vinci Code: Book Review,"

[www.counterculture.co.uk/book-review/the-da-vinci-code.html](http://www.counterculture.co.uk/book-review/the-da-vinci-code.html))

\*\*\*\*\*

**"The most amazing thing about this novel [*The Da Vinci Code*]  
is that it's based on fact."**

(Taylor, [www.archive.salon.com/books/review/2003/03/27da\\_vinci](http://www.archive.salon.com/books/review/2003/03/27da_vinci))

\*\*\*\*\*

**It is "A fact-based thriller."**

(Valerie MacEwen, "Try Pulling This Book Down,"

[www.popmatters.com/books/reviews/d/da-vinc-code.shtml](http://www.popmatters.com/books/reviews/d/da-vinc-code.shtml))

Dan Brown set the stage for you and me to enter The Da Vinci Quest and evaluate the "facts." Brown says, "each individual reader must explore these characters' viewpoints and come to his or her own interpretations." (Dan Brown, "The Da Vinci Code," Doubleday: New York, NY, 2003)

It is my hope that as you analyze the “facts” Dan Brown sets forth in *The Da Vinci Code* that this research will provide the reliable and credible evidences you need to “know the truth.” I also pray that, like me, you will come to appreciate and love God’s Word more and more every day.

That people might know Him,



Josh D. McDowell

## Historical Chart: Claims vs. Fact

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<b>CHRISTIANITY BORROWED FROM PAGAN MYTHOLOGY</b>		
<b>Bruce Metzger</b>	<p>“Nothing in Christianity is original. The pre-Christian God Mithras—called <i>the Son of God</i> and <i>the Light of the World</i> was born on December 25, died, was buried in a rock tomb, and then resurrected in three days. By the way, December 25 is also the birthday of Osiris, Adonis, and Dionysus. The newborn Krishna was presented with gold, frankincense, and myrrh. Even Christianity’s weekly holy day was stolen from the pagans.” (p232)</p>	<p>Specific myths about Mithras’ miraculous birth and becoming a ‘savior god’ were modeled after the stories of Jesus and developed after Christianity came to Rome in the first century.</p> <p>It is not until at least the second century, if not the third century A.D., that there is sufficient source materials to reconstruct a reliable semblance of the pagan mystery religions.</p> <p>“Far too many writers use this late source material (after A.D. 200) to form reconstructions of the third century mystery experience and then uncritically reason back to what they think must have been the earlier nature of the cults”, writes Ronald Nash. (Ronald Nash, “Was the New Testament Influenced by Pagan Religions?” <i>Christian Research Journal</i>, Winter 1994. Accessed online at <a href="http://www.equip.org">www.equip.org</a>)</p>
	<p>“By fusing pagan symbols, dates, and rituals into the growing Christian tradition, he [Constantine] created a kind of hybrid religion that was acceptable to both parties.” (p232)</p>	<p>Indeed, it is a question of who influenced who. With Christianity exploding onto the scene of the Roman Empire, it is evident that other religions adopted certain teachings or practices from Christianity in order to stem the tide of departing adherents and/or to attract Christians to their side.</p> <p>Dr. Bruce Metzger, Professor Emeritus of Princeton Theological Seminary, gives an accurate assessment in his article on this subject, “Mystery Religions and Early Christianity”:          “In what T. R. Glover aptly called the “conflict of</p>

“Unlike the deities of the Mysteries, who were

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
Sabbath	<p>“Christianity honored the Jewish Sabbath of Saturday, but Constantine shifted it to coincide with the pagan’s veneration day of the sun. To this day, most churchgoers attend services on Sunday morning</p>	<p>nebulous figures of an imaginary past, the Divine Being, whom the Christian worshipped as Lord was known as a real Person on earth only a short time before the earliest documents of the New Testament were written. From the earliest times, the Christian creed included the affirmation that Jesus “was crucified under Pontius Pilate.” On the other hand, Plutarch thinks it necessary to warn the priestess Clea against believing that “any of these tales [concerning Isis and Osiris] actually happened in the manner in which they are related.” (Metzger, <i>Historical and Literary Studies</i>, 13.)</p> <p>Certainly no early texts refer to any resurrection of Attis or link the worship of Adonis to a resurrection</p> <p>Nor is the case for a resurrection of Osiris any stronger</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After Isis gathered together the pieces of Osiris’s dismembered body, he became “Lord of the Underworld.”</li> <li>• According to Plutarch, it was the pious desire of devotees to be buried in the same ground where, according to local tradition, the body of Osiris was still lying.</li> </ul> <p>French scholar Andre Boulanger concludes: “The conception that the god dies and is resurrected in order to lead his faithful to eternal life is represented in no Hellenistic mystery religion.” (Nash, CHW, 172-173)</p> <p>Here Johnson refers in part to the fact that the Christians have been celebrating their weekly liturgy on Sunday, the first day of the week, since the time of Paul and the other apostles. Sunday was also the feast day of the <i>Sol Invictus</i> (Invisible) cult, whose worship of the pagan sun god had appeared in the Roman world, around the middle of the second century, and had been strongly supported by Emperor Aurelian. (A.D.270 - 275). (Chas S. Clifton, <i>Encyclopedia of Heresies and Heretics</i>, New York: Barnes &amp; Noble, 1992, 121)</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
	with no idea that they are there on account of the pagan sun god's weekly tribute— <i>Sunday</i> .” (pp232-233)	
<b>THE SACRED FEMININE</b>		
<b>The Pentacle</b>	<p>“The ancients envisioned their world in two halves—masculine and feminine. Their Gods and Goddesses worked to keep a balance of power. Yin and yang.” (p36)</p> <p>“This pentacle is the representative of the <i>female</i> half of all things – a concept religious historians call the ‘sacred feminine’ or the ‘divine goddess’.” (p36)</p>	<p>The beliefs about the early Church, gnosticism, and Mary Magdalene set forth in Brown's novel date back to the 19th century and the advent of modern feminism. Philip Jenkins, points out, in <i>Hidden Gospels: How The Search For Jesus Lost Its Way</i>, that</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"late nineteenth-century activists saw Jesus and his first followers as protofeminists, whose radical ideas were swamped by patriarchal orthodoxy."</p> <p>In addition to feminists, this</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"idea that the Gnostics retained the core truths of a lost Christianity was commonplace among occult and esoteric writers, many of whom shared the contemporary excitement over women's suffrage and other progressive causes."</p> <p>These writers looked to heretical, gnostic forms of early Christianity for material to bolster their belief that Jesus was really a radical feminist, that the church was initially founded as an egalitarian and non-dogmatic body, and that women were among the first apostles -- or, as in the case of Mary Magdalene, the <i>primary</i> apostles. (Philip Jenkins, <i>Hidden Gospels: How the Search for Jesus Lost It's Way</i>, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, 125).</p> <p>First, from authoritative sources we know that there is no single interpretation of the pentacle. Even within Wicca “there seems to have been no single tradition concerning their meaning and use...In many contexts they seem simply to have been decorative...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Another Wiccan, Doreen Valiente says, “The origin of the magical five-pointed star is lost in the mists of time.” (Valiente, AWPP, 306).</li> </ul>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<b>Olympics as a tribute to Venus</b>	<p>“In its most specific interpretation, the pentacle symbolizes Venus-the goddess of female sexual love and beauty.” (p36)</p> <p>“As a tribute to Venus, the Greeks used her eight-year cycle to organize their Olympic games. . . the four-year schedule of modern Olympics still followed the half-cycles of Venus. . . the five-pointed star had almost become the official Olympic seal but was modified at the last moment-its five points exchanged for five intersecting rings.” (pp36-37)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pythagoras, the Greek mathematician (570-495 B.C, interpreted it to mean “health.”</li> <li>Empedocles (490-430 B.C) used it to mean spirit, earth, air, fire, and water. (Grimassi, EWW, 285)</li> <li>Even modern neopagans use it to represent spirituality over materialism. (Cuhulian, FCM, 103)</li> </ul> <p>Needless to say, we have no evidence whatsoever to believe that the pentacle represents the sacred feminine.</p> <p>Concerning the Olympics, its historical sources make clear they were a tribute to Zeus, not Venus.<sup>1</sup> (M.I. Finley and H.W. Pleket, <i>The Olympic Games: The First Thousand Years</i>, New York: Viking, 1976; J. Kieran and A. Dailey, <i>The Story of the Olympic Games</i>, Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1977; B. Henry and R. Yeoman, <i>An Approved History of the Olympic Games</i>, (Sherman Oaks, CA: Alfred, 1984; and Allen Guttmann, <i>The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games</i>, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1992).</p> <p>The Olympic seal (the five rings) has nothing to do with the pentacle. It is a modern symbol, designed by Baron Pierre de Coubertin in 1913. It was made to represent the five continents. This logo was finally accepted in 1920. (TRORNSA)</p>
<b>Shekinah goddess</b>	<p>“Early Jews believed that the Holy of Holies in Solomon’s Temple housed not only God but also his powerful female equal, Shekinah. Men seeking spiritual wholeness</p>	<p>Again, there is no evidence whatsoever that the ancient pagans worshipped goddesses. But Brown’s premise that the world was like this all the way until Constantine decided to change what everybody believed is just not true. It was not a part of Jewish tradition.</p> <p>Yes there was a problem in Jewish history with temple prostitution, but this was clearly against the Law of Moses, the prophets, and Jewish tradition. It</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Tetragrammaton</b></p>	<p>came to the Temple to visit priestesses- or <i>hierodules</i> with whom they made love and experienced the divine through physical union.</p> <p>The Jewish tetragrammaton YHWH-the sacred name of God-in fact derived from Jehovah, an androgynous physical union between the masculine <i>Jah</i> and the pre-Hebraic name for Eve-<i>Havah</i>" (p309)</p>	<p>was actually the adoption of Canaanite rituals, which Moses sternly warned them against (Deut. 23:17-18). Jewish tradition represented by Kings like David, Asa, and Josiah supported the worship of and allegiance to one God, Jehovah.</p> <p>Speaking of Jehovah, Brown says that YHWH came from the word Jehovah. This is exactly backwards. Ancient written Hebrew had no vowels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• So the "original" covenant name of God was YHWH.</li> <li>• ...Inserting the vowels from "Adonai" (my Lord). Yahowah. When that word was Latinized, around 1270 A.D., the Y changed to a J and the W to a V. Thus, we now have Jehovah.</li> </ul> <p>Again, it is apparent that Dan Brown's facts behind his fiction are in many cases exactly opposite of the truth. We'll see more of it ahead. The big picture here, that Dan Brown is trying to present, despite the facts, is one of pagan goddess worship which would have called the ancient Hebrew prophets to scoff in disgust. He writes:</p> <p>"The goddess Venus and the planet Venus were one and the same. The goddess had a place in the nighttime sky and was known by many names—Venus, the Eastern Star, Ishtar, Astarte—all of them powerful female concepts with ties to Nature and Mother Earth." (p36)</p> <p>Some 1400 years before Jesus was born, Moses sternly warned the Jewish people and set a precedent for all time for the worshippers of the living God:</p> <p>"So watch yourselves carefully, since you did not see any form on the day the Lord spoke to you at Horeb from the midst of the fire, so that you do not act corruptly and make a graven image for yourselves in the form of any figure, the likeness of male or female,.... And beware not to lift up your</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>The Hebrew word: "Shekinah"</b></p>		<p>eyes to heaven and see the sun and the moon and the stars, all the host of heaven, and be drawn away and worship them and serve them...." (Deuteronomy 4:15, 16, 19)</p> <p>In attempting to bolster his case for the sacred feminine, Brown retranslates the Hebrew word <i>Shekinah</i> to mean another deity, a female one, matched with and counter-balancing the male deity, Yahweh (p446). But if Yahweh was the male deity, why did Brown previously assert that Yahweh (YHWH) was itself "an androgynous physical union between the masculine Jah and the pre-Hebraic name for Eve, Havah"? (p309)</p> <p>This whole effort to make God feminine betrays a human-centered way of thinking about God. God's gender was never an issue; in fact it is a total non-issue, which was meant to carry over into human relationships in Christ. The apostle Paul warned against thinking in gender terms with respect to spirituality when he wrote in or about A.D. 48, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus. (Galatians 3:28)</p> <p>Returning to Brown's claim that <i>Shekinah</i> was a female deity worshiped alongside of Yahweh, this translation is gaining popularity without any grounds for its truth. One website (accessed 9/16/05) <a href="http://shekinah.elysiumgates.com/">http://shekinah.elysiumgates.com/</a> yielded the following reinterpretation of the Hebrew "Shekinah":  Among the Hebrews one of the traditional names of God is the <i>Shekinah</i>, and, interestingly, it is a feminine gender noun. Many Hebrews saw her as the mother or feminine aspect of God. ... Lamentations 1:5, "Her children are gone into captivity," and immediately after 1:6, "From Zion her splendour is departed." (Note the use of "her" for God and "splendour" is also one of the ways to describe the <i>Shekinah</i>).</p> <p><b>Nothing could be further from the truth!</b></p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
		<p>Anyone reading Lamentations, chapter one, can immediately tell from the very first verse on that “her” refers to the city of Zion as representative of the nation of Judah. <i>Shekinah</i> appears nowhere in the passage.</p> <p><i>Shekinah</i> is “A term referring to the ‘glory of God.’ The idea that this term is paired with the name of God, Yahweh, so that a male (Yahweh) and female (Shekinah) counterpart exists with God, is simple fabrication.</p>
<b>PRIORY OF SION</b>		
<b>Formed in 1956</b>	<p>“<b>FACT:</b> The Priory of Sion - a European secret society founded in 1099 - is a real organization. In 1975 Paris’s Bibliotheque Nationale discovered parchments known as <i>Les Dossiers Secrets</i>, identifying numerous members of the Priory of Sion, including Sir Isaac Newton, Botticelli, Victor Hugo, and Leonardo da Vinci.”</p> <p>“The Priory of Sion... was founded in Jerusalem in 1099 by a French king named Godefroi de Bouillon, immediately after he had conquered the city... King Godefroi was allegedly the possessor of a powerful secret [Christ’ marriage to Mary Magdalene] - a</p>	<p>King Godefroi did start an organization after conquering Jerusalem. It was a group of monks known as the <i>Ordre de Notre Dame de Sion</i> which means, Order of Our Lady of Zion, but it ceased in 1617. (The Truth Behind The Da Vinci Code - Richard Abanes)</p> <p>A Father Vincent wrote of this group in 1698. He wrote,          “There were in Jerusalem during the Crusades . . . knights attached to the Abbey of Notre Dame de Sion who took the name of Chevaliers de l’Ordre de Notre Dame de Sion(Knights of the Order of Our Lady of Zion).” (Laura Knight-Jadczyk, “The Grail Quest and The Destiny of Man-Part V-g: The Priory of Sion,” <a href="http://www.cassiopaea.org/cass/grail_5g.htm">www.cassiopaea.org/cass/grail_5g.htm</a>)</p> <p>The actual name the “Priory of Sion” is not mentioned until 1956 when Pierre Plantard started a social club “devoted to the cause of Low-Cost Housing”. (Paul Smith, “Priory of Sion Debunked,” <a href="http://www.answers.org/free/pos/debunking/">www.answers.org/free/pos/debunking/</a> )</p> <p>After that Priory ended, Plantard started another one in the early 1960’s. The intent of this Priory was to bring back the French monarchy. They tried to build off the rumor that there was a hidden royal bloodline in France, by planting forged papers in libraries. (Paul Smith, “Priory Documents and Articles linked with Pierre Plantard, Thomas Plantard and Pillipe de Cherisey,” <a href="http://www.priory-of-sion.com/psp/id24.html">www.priory-of-sion.com/psp/id24.html</a>)</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
	<p>secret that had been in his family since the time of Christ. Fearing his secret might be lost when he died, he founded a secret brotherhood-the Priory of Sion - and charged them with protecting his secret by quietly passing it on from generation to generation... The Legend is complicated, but the important thing to remember is that the Priory guards the proof, and is purportedly awaiting the right moment in history to reveal the truth." (pp157-161)</p> <p>"The Priory's membership has included some of history's most cultured individuals: men like Botticelli, Sir Isaac Newton, Victor Hugo . . . And, Leonardo da Vinci... Da Vinci presided over the Priory between 1510 and 1519 as the brotherhood's Grand Master," (p113).</p> <p>"Proof of that fact had been uncovered years ago in Paris's Bibliotheque</p>	<p>Plantard appeared on BBC television as a Templar expert in 1979. He came to the attention of Michael Baigent and his partners, resulting in the publication of <i>Holy Blood, Holy Grail</i> (1982) and <i>The Messianic Legacy</i> (1986).</p> <p>The authors believed Plantard's pretensions that the Priory was a marvelously astute society numbering thousands of important people, while guarding a secret that would topple the Catholic Church.</p> <p>How did they maintain such strict secrecy that academic historians of occult movements such as the magisterial Frances Yates failed to hear of them? Why did they leave no record before the twentieth century? Is this another case of the clichéd claim: "The secret society was said to exist, but it was also said to be too secret to be proved to exist?" (W.L. Warren, <i>Henry II</i>, 1973; Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1977, 174.)</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Historian Paul Maier</b></p> <p><b>Fabrications</b></p>	<p>Nationale in papers that became known as <i>Les Dossiers Secrets</i>.” (p206)</p> <p>“They’re based here in France and attract powerful members from all over Europe. In fact, they are one of the oldest surviving secret societies on earth.” (p113)</p>	<p>Ancient Historian Paul Maier has used his skills to track down a little modern history. Reflecting Brown’s claims about the secret documents, <i>Les Dossiers Secrets</i>, being found in a prestigious Paris library, Maier reveals,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The priory’s role in this novel is supposedly “proven by a cache of documents that were discovered...at Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris.</p> <p>These documents really do exist, but they were planted there by a person named Pierre Plantard.</p> <p>One of Plantard’s henchmen admitted to assisting him in the fabrication of these materials, including the genealogical tables and lists of the Priory’s grand masters.</p> <p>Dan Brown’s other major source of esoteric ideas, <i>The Templar Revelation</i>, dismisses the <i>Dossiers</i> as fabrications.</p> <p>(Lynn Picknett and Clive Prince, <i>The Templar Revelation: Secret Guardians of the True Identity of Christ</i> (1997; New York: Simon and Schuster, 1998), 39-57.)</p> <p>Plantard began to plant forged documents throughout France. (<a href="http://www.priory-of-sion.com/psp/id22.html">www.priory-of-sion.com/psp/id22.html</a>)</p> <p>One of these papers was titled <i>Genealogie des rois merovingians</i> (“a genealogy of the Merovingian kings”). It dates back to January 18, 1964. This text was signed by “Henri Lobineau” a “genealogist”. The date was “1954” and it was the document that said that the Priory of Sion was founded by Godfrey of Bouillion and that the Merovingian line survived via King Dagobert. (<a href="http://www.priory-of-sion.com/psp/id22.html">www.priory-of-sion.com/psp/id22.html</a>)</p> <p>Another paper that was forged said that Berenger</p>

When Plantard was brought before the authorities he “admitted that **he made it all up**”. (Paul Smith,

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
		<p><i>Priory of Sion Legal Battles</i>,  <a href="http://www.answers.org/free/posbattles/">www.answers.org/free/posbattles/</a>.</p> <p>His house was searched and 'Priory Documents', that said that Plantard was the 'true King of France', were found. Plantard was charged with being a "harmless crank" and he was issued a severe warning for "playing games". (Paul Smith, <i>Pierre Plantard and The Priory of Sion Chronology</i>,  <a href="http://www.priory-of-sion.com/psp/id22.html">www.priory-of-sion.com/psp/id22.html</a></p> <p>Plantard turned out to be an anti-Semite with a criminal record for fraud, while the real Priory of Sion is a little splinter social group founded half a century ago.<sup>2</sup> The most important strand in the central plot of <i>The Da Vinci Code</i>, then, is a total hoax. So much for the "Fact" Brown claims on his first page!</p>
<b>KNIGHTS TEMPLAR</b>		
	<p>"During their years in Jerusalem, the Priory learned of a stash of hidden documents [Sangreal Documents] buried beneath the ruins of Herod's temple, which had been built atop the earlier ruins of Herod's temple... The Priory vowed that no matter how long it took, these documents must be recovered from the rubble beneath the temple and protected forever, so the truth would never die. In order to retrieve the</p>	<p>We know first of all that Brown's "Priory of Sion" was really a creation of forged documents. Therefore, the actual Priory could have had nothing to do with the Knights Templar.</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>A real organization</b></p>	<p>documents from the ruins, the Priory created a military arm - a group of nine knights called the Order of the Poor Knights of Christ and the Temple of Solomon . . . More commonly known as the Knights Templar.” (p158)</p> <p>“The Knights were in the Holy Land during the Second Crusade and told King Baldwin II that they were there to protect Christian pilgrims on the roadways... the Knights told the king they required basic shelter and requested his permission to take up residence in the stables under the ruins of the temple... For almost a decade, the nine Knights lived in the ruins, excavating in total secrecy through the solid rock... the Knights had finally found what they had been searching for.” (pp158-159)</p>	<p>What we do know is that the Knights Templar was a real organization. It was founded in about A.D. 1118 by Hugh des Payens. (Clouse, T, 956) However, there is no evidence to support the claim that the Knights had any other mission than the historical explanation of protecting pilgrims to the Holy Land. (Abanes, TBDVC, 57)</p>
<p><b>Where did they live?</b></p>		<p>The first Templars were not housed in a “meager residence” under the old Temple called Solomon’s stables. They lived in a wing of the royal palace on</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<b>Their wealth</b>	<p>“Nobody knows for certain whether the Knights had blackmailed the Vatican or whether the Church simply tried to buy the Knights’ silence, but Pope Innocent II immediately issued an unprecedented papal bull that afforded the Knights Templar limitless power... With their new carte blanche from the Vatican, the Knights Templar expanded at a staggering rate... They began extending credit... thereby establishing modern banking and broadening their wealth and influence.” (p159)</p>	<p>Temple Mount, next to the Al-Aqsa Mosque (which still exists). (Olson, <i>Da Vinci Hoax</i>, p206)</p> <p>The Knights did become wealthy, but it was through the gifts of pilgrims, not blackmailing the church. And this wealth did not come to them in a short time, but they actually acquired it throughout their whole time in Jerusalem, from 1118-1290, a period of over 170 years.</p> <p>Their initial wealth did not come in Europe, but in Jerusalem. And they did continue to acquire wealth when they came to Europe by starting a medieval banking institution cum travel agency.</p> <p>The Knights actually came to Europe not because they had found some treasure, but because in the year 1291 all Christians were expelled from Jerusalem when the last Crusader fortress, which was located at Acre, fell to the Muslims.</p>
<b>Their history</b>	<p>“By the 1300’s... Pope Clement V decided that something had to be done. Working in concert with France’s King Phillippe IV, the Pope devised an ingeniously planned sting operation to quash the Templars and seize their</p>	<p>Brown does distort the truth concerning the demise of the Knights Templar. Karen Ralls - a medieval historian from Oxford, and Celtic scholar - quotes from “The Trials of the Templars Revisited”, which was written by Malcolm Barber, a professor of Medieval European History at the University of Reading, by saying,</p> <p>“the king did not proceed in the arrests of the Templars ‘through letters of the Pope’”. (Ralls, TG, 78; and Barber, TTR, 49)</p> <p>It was actually King Phillip IV who was responsible for the trial and deaths of the Knights, not Pope</p>

Then Philip ordered *his* soldiers – not the Pope’s – to make a mass arrest on October 13, 1307. This is the date on which the Knights were taken into custody, not executed, as the *Code* states.

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<b>Their deaths</b>		<p>Historians agree that Clement was a terribly weak pope and was almost subservient to Philip. And yet, when he heard about what the French king had done, he not only annulled the entire trial, but also suspended the powers of the bishops involved and their inquisitors. Unfortunately, Philip had already released to the public his list of the crimes to which so many of the Knights had confessed, and the outrage of the masses now became a factor.</p> <p>Then, in June 1308, Philip forced 72 Knights to publicly admit their crimes before the Pope himself. The testimony was so convincing that Clement himself began to wonder about the Knights. So he opened a new commission to make an investigation of the charges. ...to be done on a local level throughout Europe.</p> <p>The <i>Code</i> conveniently fails to mention that at the trials in Portugal, Spain, Germany, Cyprus, and most of Italy, the Templars were found innocent and released. (Abanes, TBDVC, 60-61)</p> <p>King Philip maneuvered to have 54 Templars burned. The date was May 12, 1310, not 1307 as Brown has it. Almost another 70 of the knights were later executed on March 16, 1314.</p> <p>All of this history is important for our purposes here to show that Pope Clement seems to be bending over backward for the Knights Templar, which makes Brown's story of a Vatican quest for Sangreal documents quite implausible.</p> <p>All of this conspiracy theory rests on thin ice, actually it has broken through and sunk, when one considers that the key group behind all the alleged events is "The Priory of Sion", a fictitious society invented in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and foisted on the public through forged documents planted in libraries.</p> <p>So what really happened back there with Jesus and Mary Magdalene?</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<b>THE BIBLE IS MAN-MADE</b>		
<b>Biblical Unity</b>	<p>“The Bible did not arrive by fax from heaven... The Bible is a product of <i>man</i>, 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.” (p231)</p>	<p>The Bible is not just one book. It is composed of 66 separate books. Yet the Bible is not just an anthology, a collection of literary pieces without regard of their agreement with each other. Historically, the Bible is unique; it is different from any other book. Just imagine, it is the only book:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Written over about a fifteen-hundred-year span;</li> <li>2) Written by more than forty authors from every walk of life, including Moses, a political leader and judge, trained in the universities of Egypt; David, a king, poet, musician, shepherd, and warrior; Amos, a herdsman; Joshua, a military general; Nehemiah, a cupbearer to a pagan king; Daniel, a prime minister; Solomon, a king and philosopher; Luke, a physician and historian; Peter, a fisherman; Matthew, a tax collector; Paul, a rabbi; and Mark, Peter’s secretary;</li> <li>3) Written in different places: by Moses in the wilderness, Jeremiah in a dungeon, Daniel on a hillside and in a palace, Paul inside prison walls, Luke while traveling, John while in exile on the isle of Patmos;</li> <li>4) Written at different times: for example, David in times of war and sacrifice, Solomon in times of peace and prosperity;</li> <li>5) Written during different moods: Some writing from the heights of joy; others writing from the depths of sorrow and despair; some during times of certainty and conviction; others during days of confusion and doubt;</li> <li>6) Written on three continents: Asia, Africa, and Europe;</li> <li>7) Written in three languages: <i>Hebrew</i>, the language of the Israelites used for practically all of the Old Testament; <i>Aramaic</i>, the “common language” of the Near East until the time of Alexander the Great (sixth century B.C. through the fourth century B.C.)</li> </ol>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>F.F. Bruce on the Bible</b></p>		<p>(Albright, AP, 218), used for Daniel 2 through 7 and most of Ezra 4 through 7; and <i>Greek</i>, the language comprising almost all of the New Testament, and which in its common form had become the international trading language throughout the whole Roman Empire and beyond;</p> <p><b>8)</b> Written in a wide variety of literary styles, including: poetry, historical narrative, song, romance, didactic treatise, personal correspondence, memoirs, satire, biography, autobiography, law, prophecy, parable, and allegory.</p> <p>In addition to all of the diversity above, the Bible addresses hundreds of controversial subjects, hot topics that create opposing opinions when mentioned or discussed (e.g., marriage, divorce and remarriage, homosexuality, adultery, obedience to authority, truth-telling and lying, character development, parenting, the nature and revelation of God). Yet from Genesis through Revelation these many writers addressed them with an amazing degree of harmony.</p> <p>In spite of its diversity, the Bible presents a single unfolding story: God’s redemption of human beings. Among all the people described in the Bible, the leading character throughout is the one, true, living God made known through Jesus Christ. In the Old Testament, the Law provides the “<i>foundation</i> for Christ,” the historical books show “the <i>preparation</i>” for Christ, the poetical works “<i>aspire</i>” to Christ, and the prophecies display an “<i>expectation</i>” of Christ. In the New Testament, the “Gospels . . . record the historical <i>manifestation</i> of Christ, the Acts relate the <i>propagation</i> of Christ, the Epistles give the <i>interpretation</i> of Him, and in Revelation is found the <i>consummation</i> of all things in Christ” (Geisler/Nix, GIB’86, 29).</p> <p>From cover to cover, the Bible is Christocentric.</p> <p>Therefore, although the Bible contains many books by many authors, it shows in its continuity that it is also one book. As the eminent Manchester scholar, F. F. Bruce, observes:</p> <p>“The Bible, at first sight, appears to be a collection</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
		<p>of literature – mainly Jewish. If we enquire into the circumstances under which the various Biblical documents were written, we find that they were written at intervals over a space of nearly 1400 years. The writers wrote in various lands, from Italy in the west to Mesopotamia and possibly Persia in the east. The writers themselves were a heterogeneous number of people, not only separated from each other by hundreds of years and hundreds of miles, but belonging to the most diverse walks of life. In their ranks we have kings, herdsmen, soldiers, legislators, fishermen, statesmen, courtiers, priests and prophets, a tent-making Rabbi and a Gentile physician, not to speak of others of whom we know nothing apart from the writings they have left us. The writings themselves belong to a great variety of literary types. They include history, law (civil, criminal, ethical, ritual, sanitary), religious poetry, didactic treatises, lyric poetry, parable and allegory, biography, personal correspondence, personal memoirs and diaries, in addition to the distinctively Biblical types of prophecy and apocalyptic.”</p>
<b>THE COUNCIL OF NICAEA CONCERNING THE BOOKS TO INCLUDE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON</b>		
	<p>“The Bible, as we know it today, was collated by the pagan Roman emperor Constantine the Great.” (p231)</p> <p>“More than <i>eighty</i> gospels were considered for the New Testament, and yet only a relative few were chosen for inclusion-Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John among them.” (p231)</p>	<p>According to Harvard Professor Helmut Koester’s <i>Introduction to the New Testament</i>, there are only sixty extra biblical documents written, and you need to realize the majority of those were not gospels. (Bock, BDVC, 62)</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
	<p>“Constantine commissioned and financed a new Bible, which omitted those gospels that spoke of Christ’s <i>human</i> traits and embellished those gospels that made Him godlike. The earlier gospels were outlawed, gathered up, and burned.” (p234)</p> <p>“Some of the gospels that Constantine attempted to eradicate managed to survive. The Dead Sea Scrolls were found in the 1950s hidden in a cave near Qumran in the Judean desert. And, of course, the Coptic Scrolls in 1945 at Nag Hammadi.”</p> <p>“The scrolls highlight glaring discrepancies and fabrications, clearly confirming that the modern Bible was compiled and edited by men who possessed a political agenda – to promote the divinity of the man Jesus Christ and use His influence to solidify their own power</p>	<p>As with all other ancient literature, the original documents of the various books of the Bible have perished through time. But unlike most other ancient literature, there are so many manuscript copies of New Testament books available to us that Biblical scholars have been able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) date when the original was probably written, and</li> <li>2) eliminate almost all copying errors to verify almost exactly what the original documents said.</li> </ol> <p>What minor differences still remain in question have no effect on any major doctrine or teaching of the Christian faith.</p> <p>When it comes to dating the New Testament books (our primary source of information about Christ), there are differences between conservative and liberal scholars, but only in terms of decades, not centuries, as one might glean from <i>The Da Vinci Code</i>.</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Dates of Biblical books</b></p> <p><b>Irenaeus</b></p>	<p>base.” (p234)</p>	<p>With the rise of archaeological discoveries and scholarly study in the twentieth century, the evidence confirmed that the New Testament documents were of a very early date and not composed years after the time of Christ.</p> <p>The John Rylands manuscript copy of a fragment of the Gospel of John was discovered and dated at A.D. 130. Professor Norman Geisler states,  “Because of its early date and location (Egypt), some distance from the traditional place of composition (Asia Minor), this portion of the Gospel of John tends to confirm the traditional date of the composition of the Gospel about the end of the 1st century.” (Geisler, GIB, 268)</p> <p>New Testament literary scholar Bruce Metzger speaks of the impact of this discovery:  “Had this little fragment been known during the middle of the past century, that school of New Testament criticism which was inspired by the brilliant Tubingen professor, Ferdinand Christian Baur, could not have argued that the Fourth Gospel was not composed until about the year 160.” (Metzger, TNT, 39)</p> <p>The chart below gives conservative and liberal dating of the original writing of the books of the New Testament. As you can see, these dates completely overthrow Dan Brown’s allegations that the Bible as we know it today was a product of Constantine and the Nicaean Council meeting in A.D. 325</p> <p>In some cases, even the “conservative” dates below are probably not conservative enough. For example, Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons (A.D. 180) a disciple of Polycarp, a disciple of John the Apostle, wrote in his <i>Against Heresies</i> 3:  “Matthew published his Gospel among the Hebrews (i.e., Jews) in their own tongue, when Peter and Paul were preaching the gospel in Rome and founding the church there.”</p> <p>Since Paul was in Rome from A.D. 60 to 64, Matthew probably finished his gospel at this time using notes</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact																																				
<p><b>William Foxwell Albright</b></p> <p><b>John A.T. Robinson's shocking revelation</b></p>		<p>and information he had collected over the years while and since walking with Jesus. As a tax collector, used to documenting data accurately, he was well fit for the task.</p> <p>William Foxwell Albright, one of the world's foremost biblical archaeologists, said:          "We can already say emphatically that there is no longer any solid basis for dating any book of the New Testament after about A.D. 80, two full generations before the date between 130 and 150 given by the more radical New Testament critics of today." (Albright, RDBL, 136)</p> <p>Many liberal scholars are being forced to reconsider earlier dates for the New Testament. The late Dr. John A. T. Robinson, no conservative himself, shocked the scholarly world when he came to some startling conclusions revealed in his ground-breaking book <i>Redating the New Testament</i>. His research led to his strong conviction that the whole of the New Testament was written before the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. (Robinson, RNT)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>CONSERVATIVE DATING</u></b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Paul's Letters</td><td>A.D. 50-66</td><td>(Hiebert)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Matthew</td><td>A.D. 70-8</td><td>(Harrison)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Mark</td><td>A.D. 50-60</td><td>(Harnak)</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>A.D. 58-65</td><td>(T.W. Manson)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Luke</td><td>A.D. early 60s</td><td>(Harrison)</td></tr> <tr> <td>John</td><td>A.D. 80-100</td><td>(Harrison)</td></tr> </table> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>LIBERAL DATING</u></b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Paul's Letters</td><td>A.D. 50-100</td><td>(Kümmel)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Matthew</td><td>A.D. 80-100</td><td>(Kümmel)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Mark</td><td>A.D. 70</td><td>(Kümmel)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Luke</td><td>A.D. 70-90</td><td>(Kümmel)</td></tr> <tr> <td>John</td><td>A.D. 17</td><td>(Baur)</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>A.D. 90-100</td><td>(Kümmel)</td></tr> </table> <p>Confirmation of the first century composition of the New Testament portion of the Bible comes from many of the early church fathers and evangelists.</p>	Paul's Letters	A.D. 50-66	(Hiebert)	Matthew	A.D. 70-8	(Harrison)	Mark	A.D. 50-60	(Harnak)		A.D. 58-65	(T.W. Manson)	Luke	A.D. early 60s	(Harrison)	John	A.D. 80-100	(Harrison)	Paul's Letters	A.D. 50-100	(Kümmel)	Matthew	A.D. 80-100	(Kümmel)	Mark	A.D. 70	(Kümmel)	Luke	A.D. 70-90	(Kümmel)	John	A.D. 17	(Baur)		A.D. 90-100	(Kümmel)
Paul's Letters	A.D. 50-66	(Hiebert)																																				
Matthew	A.D. 70-8	(Harrison)																																				
Mark	A.D. 50-60	(Harnak)																																				
	A.D. 58-65	(T.W. Manson)																																				
Luke	A.D. early 60s	(Harrison)																																				
John	A.D. 80-100	(Harrison)																																				
Paul's Letters	A.D. 50-100	(Kümmel)																																				
Matthew	A.D. 80-100	(Kümmel)																																				
Mark	A.D. 70	(Kümmel)																																				
Luke	A.D. 70-90	(Kümmel)																																				
John	A.D. 17	(Baur)																																				
	A.D. 90-100	(Kümmel)																																				

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
Justin Martyr	<p>"Christianity honored the Jewish Sabbath of Saturday, but Constantine shifted it to coincide with the pagan's veneration day of the sun...<i>Sunday</i>."</p>	<p>Justin Martyr, who lived from A.D. 100–165, writes in his <i>First Apology</i> [or Defense of the Christian faith] 1.67:</p> <p>"And on the day called <b>Sunday</b> there is a gathering together to one place of all those who live in cities or in the country, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits. Then when the reader has ceased the president presents admonition and invitation to the imitation of these good things..."</p> <p>Notice that this statement completely refutes Brown's assertion that Sunday worship came in under Constantine.</p>
Sabbath Sunday		<p><i>**There are many devoted followers of Jesus who still observe the Sabbath on Saturday.</i></p> <p>It's a little obvious that Constantine, who reigned from A.D. 306 to 337, could not begin a practice that had begun at least two centuries earlier. Further, the New Testament, in 1 Corinthians 16:2, Acts 20:7, and Revelation 1:10 alludes to Sunday worship already being established among the believers shortly after Jesus' death, probably in honor of his resurrection on the first day of the week, Sunday.</p>
Four Gospels		<p>Justin Martyr also adds in his <i>Dialogue</i> with Trypho (pp. 49, 103, 105, 107) the formula "It is written" when he quotes from the Gospels. Both he and Trypho must have known to what "It is written" referred, and that this introduction designated that the Scripture is inspired.</p>
Irenaeus		<p>Irenaeus, only about a century removed from when the gospels were written, referred to them in his book <i>Against Heresies</i>, saying that it was fitting that she (the Church) should have four pillars. Later on he speaks of them as "the Gospel in quadriform". (Ch. 3.11.8)</p> <p>Irenaeus specifically refers to the four Gospels and their authors implies that they are granted a unique status with in the Church:</p>

“Gnosticism was (and still is) a theosophy with many ingredients. Occultism and oriental

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>New Testament scholar Norman Geisler</b></p> <p><b>Irenaeus</b></p> <p><b>Origen</b></p>		<p>mysticism became fused with astrology, magic...They collected sayings of Jesus shaped to fit their own interpretation (as in the Gospel of Thomas), and offered their adherents an alternative or rival form of Christianity.” (John McManners, ed., <i>The Oxford History of Christianity</i> (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002, p28)</p> <p>“It was not Constantine who branded the Gnostic beliefs as heretical; it was the apostles themselves.”</p> <p>“The apostles, in their teaching and writings, went to great lengths to condemn these beliefs as being opposed to the truth of Jesus, to whom they were eyewitnesses.”</p> <p>“Check out, for example, what the apostle John wrote near the end of the first century: ‘Who is the great liar? The one who says that Jesus is not the Christ. Such people are antichrists, for they have denied the Father and the Son.’” (I John 2:22)</p> <p>New Testament scholar Norman Geisler commented on two Gnostic writings, the Gospel of Peter and the Acts of John. (These Gnostic writings are not to be confused with the New Testament books written by John and Peter.)</p> <p>“The Gnostic writings were not written by the apostles, but by men in the second century (and later) pretending to use apostolic authority to advance their own teachings. Today we call this fraud and forgery.” (Norman Geisler and Ron Brooks, <i>When Skeptics Ask</i>, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1998, p156)</p> <p>“The early church leaders unanimously condemned the Gnostics as a cult. Church father Irenaeus, writing 140 years before the Council of Nicaea...rejected their ‘gospels.’ However, referring to the four New Testament Gospels, he said, ‘It is not possible that the Gospels can be either more or fewer in number than they are.’” (Darrell L. Bock, <i>Breaking the Da Vinci Code</i>, Nashville: Nelson, 2004, p114)</p> <p>Let’s look at a fuller text of the comment Origen</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
	<p>According to the Da Vinci Code: "The Bible, as we know it today, was collated by the pagan Roman emperor Constantine the Great."</p>	<p>(above) made in the first half of the 200's A.D. which shows that the church had long since (by his day, not years later by Constantine) dealt with the problem of false gospels:</p> <p>"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 <i>solely what the church has recognized</i>, which is that only the four gospels should be accepted." [Emphasis mine] (Bock, BDVC, 119,120)</p> <p>There we have it in the words of a highly regarded early church leader. The Gnostics were recognized as a non-Christian cult well before the Council of Nicaea.</p> <p>In these early days, "the church" was not an ivory tower fortress with huge cathedrals and a well-established hierarchy.</p> <p>Origen's own father and many of his friends were put to death as martyrs refusing to recant their faith in Christ</p> <p>By the church, Origen is referring to that growing body of believers who <b>passed on the apostle's witness of all they had seen and heard concerning Jesus</b>. It was the early believers who protected and passed on those writing which were genuinely from the apostles, and they also warned against Johnny-come-lately writings which deceptively sought authenticity under an earlier disciple's name.</p> <p>But what about the councils that supposedly voted on which books to include? Or put another way, who decided what to include in the "canon" of Scripture? Brown would have us believe that it was Constantine who determined what books that would be canonized.</p>

According to this premise, the hierarchical and male-dominated Church came much later, in the second and third centuries, and Jesus was not deified as the God-man until the time of Constantine. This is essentially the scenario depicted in *The Da Vinci Code* (230-62).

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
The canon		<p>However, if the gnostic books were not written until several decades, or even centuries, after the New Testament books, a different picture emerges. In it, the gnostic writings are the result of the intense struggle of heretical sects against the established teachings of the Church and the apostles. In fact, precisely such struggles did erupt in the second century, were especially noticeable around A.D. 135 to 165, and continued for quite some time. The nature of this struggle can be seen in the writings of orthodox apologists Irenaeus, who wrote his great polemic, refuting gnosticism (especially the Valentinian's), <i>Against Heresies</i>, around A.D. 180. (Olson, <i>The Da Vinci Hoax</i>, pp61-62)</p> <p>The word <i>canon</i> comes from the root word <i>reed</i> (English word <i>cane</i>, Hebrew form <i>ganeh</i>, and Greek form <i>kanon</i>). The reed was used as a measuring rod, and came to mean "standard."</p> <p>Long before Constantine or any council considered this issue, Origen (in the early third century) used the word "canon to denote what we call the 'rule of faith,' the standard by which we are to measure and evaluate." Later, the term meant a "list" or "index." (Bruce, BP, 95)</p> <p>As applied to Scripture, <i>canon</i> means "an officially accepted list of books." (Earle, HWGOB, 31)</p> <p>It is important to note that the church did not create the canon; it did not determine or select which books would be called Scripture, the inspired Word of God. Instead, the church recognized, or discovered, which books had been inspired from their inception.</p> <p>Stated another way,          "A book is not the Word of God because it is accepted by the people of God. Rather, it was accepted by the people of God because it is the Word of God. That is, God gives the book its divine authority, not the people of God. They merely recognize the divine authority which God gives to it." (Geisler, GIB, 210)</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Who created the "canon"?</b></p> <p><b>The Old Testament</b></p> <p><b>F.F. Bruce</b></p> <p><b>Council of Nicaea</b></p>		<p>With regard to the Old Testament, the evidence clearly supports the position that the Hebrew canon was established well before the late first century A.D., more than likely as early as the fourth century B.C. and certainly no later than 150 B.C. A major reason for this conclusion comes from the Jews themselves, who from the fourth century B.C. onward were convinced that "the voice of God had ceased to speak directly." (Ewert, ATMT, 69)</p> <p>In other words, the prophetic voices had been stilled. No word from God meant no <i>new</i> Word of God. Without prophets, there can be no scriptural revelation.</p> <p>The last Old Testament books written and recognized as canonical were Malachi (written around 450 to 430 B.C.) and Chronicles (written no later than 400 B.C.) (Walvoord, BKCOT, 589, 1573). These books appear with the rest of the Hebrew canonical books in the Greek translation of the Hebrew canon (or Old Testament) called the Septuagint (LXX), which was composed around 250 to 150 B.C. (Geisler, GIB, 24; see also Ewert, ATMT, 104-108 and Würthwein, TOT, 49-53)</p> <p>Dr. F. F. Bruce affirms that,          "The books of the Hebrew Bible are traditionally twenty-four in number, arranged in three divisions." (Bruce, CS, 29)</p> <p>The three divisions are the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings. Although the Christian church has the same Old Testament canon, the number of books differs because we divide Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and Ezra-Nehemiah into two books each, and we make separate books out of the Minor Prophets rather than combining them into one as the Jews do under the heading "The Twelve." The church also rearranged the order of books to have a topical arrangement instead of an official order. (Geisler, GIB, 23)</p> <p>We can confidently conclude that neither Constantine nor even the Council of Nicaea had any</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>The New Testament Canon</b></p> <p><b>II Peter 3:15-16</b></p> <p><b>Polycarp</b></p> <p><b>Ireneaus</b></p>		<p>influence whatsoever over what books were included in the Old Testament canon.</p> <p>That had been decided probably 400 years before Christ and definitely by the time the Septuagint was written between 250 and 150 B.C.</p> <p>Turning again to the New Testament canon, it as well had been largely settled upon (especially concerning the four gospels) well before the first Council of Nicaea in A.D. 325.</p> <p>The debate at this council concerned not what books to include or even whether or not Christ was divine, but how to interpret the books already accepted in regard to what Christ's deity really meant.</p> <p>Christians, even in the first century, the evidence shows, recognized certain Biblical books as Scripture. Peter, who had been soundly rebuked by Paul (see Galatians 2:11ff, written in A.D. 49 or 55) wrote of Paul's letters just before Peter's death in A.D. 67</p> <p>"...just as also our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given him, wrote to you, as also in all his letters, speaking in them of these things, in which are some things hard to understand, which the untaught and unstable distort, as they do also the rest of the Scriptures, to their own destruction." (2 Peter 3:15,16)</p> <p>By "the rest of the Scriptures", Peter means the Old Testament. It's clear that believers in Christ had very early recognized certain New Testament books such as the letters of Paul and the Gospels as Scripture that was just as authoritative as the Old Testament.</p> <p>After the apostles, other church leaders recognized the same. For example, Polycarp (A.D. 115), and Clement of Alexandria (both before and after A.D. 200) refer to the Old and New Testament books with the phrase "as it is said in these scriptures."</p> <p>Dr. F. F. Bruce explains that Irenaeus (A.D. 180) was,</p> <p>Brought up in Asia Minor at the feet of Polycarp,</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p>Why need for canon?</p>		<p>the disciple of John, he became Bishop of Lyons in Gaul, A.D. 180. His writings attest the canonical recognition of the fourfold Gospel and Acts, of Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy., and Titus, of 1 Peter and 1 John and of the Revelation. In his treatise, <i>Against Heresies</i>, III, ii, 8, it is evident that by A.D. 180 the idea of the fourfold Gospel had become so axiomatic throughout Christendom that it could be referred to as an established fact as obvious and inevitable and natural as the four cardinal points of the compass (as we call them) or the four winds. (Bruce, BP, 109)</p> <p>There were good reasons why the church needed to recognize certain writings as authentically inspired and others as spurious:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Since they were written by an apostle or prophet of God, they must be valuable, and if valuable, they should be preserved. This reasoning is apparent in apostolic times, by the collection and circulation of Paul's epistles (cf. 2 Peter 3:15–16; Colossians. 4:16)." (Geisler, GIB, 277)</li> <li>2. The rise of heretics motivated Christian believers to clearly define what had been recognized as inspired. One early departure from the faith that had been received was Marcion. As early as A.D. 140, he developed his own incomplete canon (ignoring every book of the Old Testament and accepting only his revised version of the Gospel of Luke and eleven of Paul's letters) and began to propagate it.</li> </ol> <p>The church needed to counter his influence by collecting all the books of New Testament Scripture. In addition, many Eastern churches began to use books they did not realize were counterfeit.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Motivation for defining the New Testament canon early was missions. "Christianity had spread rapidly to other countries, and there was the</li> </ol>

"Tertullian (c.155 or 160 -- after 228. A.D.), a church father, remarked that there were two ways to butcher Scripture.

He concludes,

Since this time there has been no serious questioning of the twenty-seven accepted books of the New Testament by Roman Catholics, Protestants, or the Eastern Orthodox Church. So why were some books canonized and some not.

## How accurate is the New Testament?

1) The number of manuscripts existing today,

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p data-bbox="201 1058 396 1150"><b>The Bibliographical Test</b></p> <p data-bbox="201 1829 363 1892"><b>Number of manuscripts</b></p>		<p data-bbox="747 394 1430 590"><b>2)</b> The time period between the original document and the earliest manuscripts still in existence today. The more manuscripts we have and the closer the manuscripts are to the original, the more we are able to determine where copyist errors happened and which copies reflect the original.</p> <p data-bbox="747 630 1430 1020">If I had ten copies of Lincoln's Gettysburg address, and one contained a word, say "hundred" rather than "score" in the first sentence ("Four score and seven years ago...") that was different from the other nine, I can determine from the nine that a copyist introduced an error in the one different copy. Further, if most of my nine copies were dated closer to the original writing than the one using the word "hundred", there is even clearer confirmation as to what the original actually said. This process is called textual criticism or the bibliographical test for the authenticity of any document.</p> <p data-bbox="747 1058 1403 1150">The bibliographical test is given to all historical documents in order to determine their closeness to the original. For example:</p> <ul data-bbox="747 1190 1430 1696" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The book <i>Natural History</i>, written by Pliny Secundus has 7 manuscript copies with a 750 yr. gap between the earliest copy and the original text.</li> <li>• <i>Annals</i>, written by Tacitus, has 20 copies with a 1,000 yr. gap.</li> <li>• <i>Gallic Wars</i>, written by Caesar, has 10 copies with a 1,000 yr. gap.</li> <li>• <i>History</i>, written by Thucydides, has 8 copies with a 1,300 yr. gap. The number two book in all of history in manuscript authority is</li> <li>• <i>The Iliad</i>, written by Homer, which has 643 copies with a 400 yr. gap, as compared to 250 years maximum with the New Testament. (McDowell, NETDV, 38)</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="747 1730 1338 1793">All of these books are taught and accepted as accurate to their originals.</p> <p data-bbox="747 1829 1403 1892">Let's compare the above with the numbers for the New Testament. The New Testament has currently</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>"To be skeptical..."</b></p> <p><b>Sir Frederic G. Kenyon</b></p>		<p>24,970 manuscript copies, completely towering over all other works of antiquity. For detailed sources on this manuscript evidence, I recommend my book, <i>The New Evidence That Demands A Verdict</i> (see Bibliography). In addition, we have one fragment of the New Testament with only a 50 year gap from the original, whole books with only a 100 year gap, and the whole NT with only a 225-250 year gap.</p> <p>These numbers completely blow away those for any other historical document from antiquity! We don't have to blindly trust that the NT today is the exact same one that was originally written. We can compare it with almost 25,000 manuscripts that go back to within 50-250 years from the original copy! Brown says that the Bible has "evolved". Well, if it has, then it completed its whole evolutionary process before the end of the first century!</p> <p>Dr. John Warwick Montgomery observes that          "...to be skeptical of the resultant text of the New Testament books is to allow all of classical antiquity to slip into obscurity, for no documents of the ancient period are as well attested bibliographically as the New Testament."          (Montgomery, HC'71, 29)</p> <p>Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, who was the director and principal librarian of the British Museum and second to none in authority for issuing statements about MSS, states that          "...besides number, the manuscripts of the New Testament differ from those of the classical authors. . . . In no other case is the interval of time between the composition of the book and the date of the earliest extant manuscripts so short as in that of the New Testament." (Kenyon, HTCNT, 4)</p> <p>Kenyon continues in <i>The Bible and Archaeology</i>:          "The interval then between the dates of original composition and the earliest extant evidence becomes so small as to be in fact negligible, and the last foundation for any doubt that the Scriptures have come down to us substantially as they were written has now been removed. Both the authenticity and the general integrity of</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>F.J.H. Hort</b></p> <p><b>F.F. Bruce</b></p> <p><b>The New Testament is the best attested writing</b></p> <p><b>The Internal</b></p>		<p>the books of the New Testament may be regarded as finally established.” (Kenyon, BA, 288)</p> <p>F. J. A. Hort rightfully adds that  “...in the variety and fullness of the evidence on which it rests the text of the New Testament stands absolutely and unapproachably alone among ancient prose writings.” (Hort, NTOG, 561)</p> <p>F. F. Bruce writes:  “There is no body of ancient literature in the world which enjoys such a wealth of good textual attestation as the New Testament.” (Bruce, BP, 178)</p> <p>No wonder Dr. Ravi Zacharias concludes:  “In real terms, the New Testament is easily the best attested ancient writing in terms of the sheer number of documents, the time span between the events and the document, and the variety of documents available to sustain or contradict it. There is nothing in ancient manuscript evidence to match such textual availability and integrity.” (Zacharias, CMLWG, 162)</p> <p>Dr. Dan Wallace, Greek scholar and New Testament tested critic admonishes that:  “New Testament scholars normally defer to <i>The Greek New Testament</i>, edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren as a faithful rendering of the first century New Testament. All translations into other languages are based on the Koine (common) Greek language used to write the original books of the New Testament. For the Old Testament, scholars defer to <i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> as the standard text.”</p> <p>Most English and other language translations are based on this text.</p> <p><b>Internal Evidence Test</b></p>

“As an undergraduate at Harvard, I was fascinated by apologetics and biblical evidences; so I labored to obtain a knowledge of the languages and cultures that have any bearing on biblical scholarship. As a classics major in college, I received training in Latin and Greek, also in French and German. At seminary I majored in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic; and in post-graduate years I became involved in Syriac and Akkadian, to the extent of teaching elective courses in each of these subjects. Earlier, during my final two years of high school, I had acquired a special interest in Middle Kingdom Egyptian studies, which was furthered as I later taught courses in this field. At the Oriental Institute in Chicago, I did specialized study in Eighteenth Dynasty historical records and also studied Coptic and Sumerian. Combined with this work

Students of the Bible are often troubled to find statements in the Bible that appear to contradict other statements in the Bible. For example, one of my associates had always wondered why the books of Matthew and Acts gave conflicting versions of the death of Judas Iscariot. Matthew relates that Judas died by hanging himself. But Acts says that Judas fell headlong in a field, “his body burst open and all his intestines spilled out.” My friend was perplexed as to how both accounts could be true. He theorized that Judas must have hanged himself off the side of a cliff, the rope gave way, and he fell headlong into the field below. It would be the only way a fall into a field could burst open a body. Sure enough, several years later on a trip to the Holy Land, my friend was shown the traditional site of Judas’s death: a field at

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
Eyewitness accounts		<p>the bottom of a cliff outside Jerusalem.</p> <p>Of primary concern, when investigating the accuracy and authenticity of a document, the Internal Evidence test asks how close the writers or their sources are to the events they describe, i.e., eyewitnesses or first-hand listening.</p> <p>The writers of the New Testament wrote as eyewitnesses or from firsthand information. The books of the New Testament make claims such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Luke 1:1-3:</b> “Inasmuch as many have undertaken to set in order a narrative of those things which have been fulfilled among us, just as those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word delivered them to us, it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write to you an orderly account, most excellent Theophilus.”</li> <li>• <b>2 Peter 1:16:</b> “For we did not follow cunningly devised fables when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of His majesty.”</li> <li>• <b>1 John 1:3:</b> “That which we have seen and heard we declare to you, that you also may have fellowship with us, and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.”</li> <li>• <b>Acts 2:22:</b> “ ‘Men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a Man attested by God to you by miracles, wonders, and signs which God did through Him in your midst, as you yourselves also know....’ ”</li> <li>• <b>John 19:35:</b> “And he who has seen has testified, and his testimony is true; and he knows that he is telling the truth, so that you may believe.”</li> <li>• <b>Luke 3:1:</b> “Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, his brother Phillip tetrarch of Iturea and the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene....”</li> <li>• <b>Acts 26:24-26:</b> “Now as he thus made his defense, Festus said with a loud voice, ‘Paul, you are beside yourself! Much learning is driving</li> </ul>
Appealed to knowledge of skeptics		

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>F.F. Bruce on eyewitness</b></p>		<p>you mad!' But he said, 'I am not mad, most noble Festus, but speak the words of truth and reason. For the king, before whom I also speak freely, knows these things; for I am convinced that none of these things escapes his attention, since this thing was not done in a corner.' ”</p> <p>F.F. Bruce, the former Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis at the University of Manchester, says, concerning the primary-source value of the New Testament records:</p> <p>The earliest preachers of the gospel knew the value of ... first-hand testimony, and appealed to it time and again. “We are witnesses of these things,” was their constant and confident assertion. And it can have been by no means so easy as some writers seem to think to invent words and deeds of Jesus in those early years, when so many of His disciples were about, who could remember what had and had not happened.</p> <p>And it was not only friendly eyewitnesses that the early preachers had to reckon with; there were others less well disposed who were also conversant with the main facts of the ministry and death of Jesus. The disciples could not afford to risk inaccuracies (not to speak of willful manipulation of the facts), which would at once be exposed by those who would be only too glad to do so. On the contrary, one of the strong points in the original apostolic preaching is the confident appeal to the knowledge of the hearers; they not only said, “We are witnesses of these things,” but also, “As you yourselves also know” (Acts 2:22). Had there been any tendency to depart from the facts in any material respect, the possible presence of hostile witnesses in the audience would have served as a further corrective. (Bruce, NTD, 33, 44-46)</p> <p>The fact is, however, that the books of the New Testament were not written down a century or more after the events they described. As we saw earlier, the accounts were prepared during the lifetimes of those involved in the events they describe.</p>

F. F. Bruce wrote,

“When we are asked what “collateral proof” exists of the life of Jesus Christ, would it be unfair to begin by asking another question? In which contemporary writers — in which writers who flourished, say, during the first fifty years after the death of Christ — would you expect to find collateral evidence you are looking for? Well, perhaps it would be rather unfair, as the man in the street can hardly be expected to know who was writing in the Graeco-Roman world during those fifty years; the classical student himself has to scratch his head in an attempt to remember who they were. For it is surprising how few writings, comparatively speaking, have survived from those years of a kind which might be even remotely expected to mention Christ.” (Bruce, JCOONT, 17)

This reference provides solid evidence that Jesus Christ was worshipped as God from an early date by Christians who continued to follow the practice of breaking bread together, as reported in Acts 2:42 and 46. This secular reference alone disproves Dan Brown's theory that the deity of Christ was accepted only lately around the time of Constantine, over two hundred years after this letter was written!

Josephus (c. A.D. 37-C. A.D. 100) a Jewish historian working under Roman authority, makes many statements that verify, either generally or in specific detail, the historical nature of both the Old and New Testaments of the Bible. He supports the Protestant view of the canon of the Old Testament against the Roman Catholic view, which venerates the Old Testament Apocrypha. He even lists the names of the books, which are identical with the thirty-nine books of the Protestant Old Testament, grouping the thirty-nine into twenty-two volumes, to correspond with the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet:

In a disputed text, not on textual grounds but

“On the whole world there pressed a most fearful darkness, and the rocks were rent by an earthquake, and many places in Judea and other districts were thrown down. This darkness Thallus, in the third book of his *History*, calls, as appears to me without reason, an eclipse of the sun.” (Julius Africanus, *Chronography*, 18.1 in Roberts, ANF) His reason for disagreeing with Thallus is that a solar eclipse can not take place

Whole books have been written on another huge area of external evidence which gives extra-biblical support to the reliability of both the Old and New

"I may fairly claim to have entered on this

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Luke's accuracy</b></p> <p><b>Lystra/Derbe</b></p> <p><b>Lysanias</b></p>		<p>investigation without prejudice in favour of the conclusion which I shall now seek to justify to the reader. On the contrary, I began with a mind unfavourable to it, for the ingenuity and apparent completeness of the Tübingen theory had at one time quite convinced me. It did not then lie in my line of life to investigate the subject minutely; but more recently I found myself brought into contact with the Book of Acts as an authority for the topography, antiquities and society of Asia Minor. It was gradually borne upon me that in various details the narrative showed marvelous truth.” (Blaklock, LAENT, 36 - quoted from Ramsay's book: <i>St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen</i>)</p> <p>Concerning Luke's ability as a historian, Sir William Ramsay concluded after thirty years of study that “Luke is a historian of the first rank; not merely are his statements of fact trustworthy... this author should be placed along with the very greatest of historians.” (Ramsay, BRDNT, 222)</p> <p>Ramsay adds: “Luke's history is unsurpassed in respect of its trustworthiness.” (Ramsay, SPTRC, 81)</p> <p>Archaeologists at first believed Luke's implication wrong that Lystra and Derbe were in Lycaonia, and that Iconium was not (Acts 14:6). They based their belief on the writings of Romans such as Cicero, who indicated that Iconium was in Lycaonia. Thus, archaeologists said the Book of Acts was unreliable. However, in 1910 Sir William Ramsay found a monument that showed that Iconium was a Phrygian city, thus not a part of Lycaonia. Later discoveries confirm this fact. (Free, ABH, 317)</p> <p>Among other historical references of Luke is that of Lysanias, the Tetrarch of Abilene who ruled in Syria and Palestine (Luke 3:1) at the beginning of John the Baptist's ministry in A.D. 27. The only Lysanias known to ancient historians was one who was killed in 36 <u>B.C.</u> However, an inscription found at Abila near Damascus speaks of “Freedman of Lysanias the Tetrarch,” and is dated between <u>A.D.</u> 14 and 29.</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<b>Synagogue of the Hebrews</b>  <b>Meat market</b>  <b>Geography details</b>  <b>Riot of Ephesus</b>  <b>Riot in Jerusalem</b>  <b>Part of Macedonia</b>		<p>(Bruce, "ACNT," as cited in Henry, RB, 321)</p> <p>In Corinth, a fragmentary inscription was found which was believed to have borne the words "Synagogue of the Hebrews." Conceivably it stood over the doorway of the synagogue where Paul debated (Acts 18:4-7).</p> <p>Another Corinthian inscription mentions the city "meat market" to which Paul refers in 1 Corinthians 10:25.</p> <p>In many similar ways, thanks to the archaeological finds, most of the ancient cities mentioned in the Book of Acts have been identified. The journeys of Paul can now be accurately traced as a result of these finds. (Bruce, NTD, 95; Albright, RDBL, 118)</p> <p>Geisler reveals,          "In all, Luke names thirty-two countries, fifty-four cities and nine islands without an error."          (Geisler, BECA, 47)</p> <p>Luke writes of the riot of Ephesus, and represents a civic assembly (Ecclesia) taking place in a theater (Acts 19:23-29). The facts are that it did meet there, as borne out by an inscription that speaks of silver statues of Artemis ("Diana" in the KJV) to be placed in the "theater during a full session of the <i>Ecclesia</i>." The theater, when excavated, proved to have room for twenty-five thousand people. (Bruce, "ACNT," as cited in Henry, RB, 326)</p> <p>Luke also relates that a riot broke out in Jerusalem because Paul took a Gentile into the temple (Acts 21:28). Inscriptions have been found that read, in Greek and Latin,</p> <p>"No foreigner may enter within the barrier which surrounds the temple and enclosure. Anyone who is caught doing so will be personally responsible for his ensuing death." Luke is proved right again! (Bruce, "ACNT," as cited in Henry, RB, 326)</p> <p>Also in doubt were Luke's usages of certain words. Luke refers to Philippi as a "part" or "district" of Macedonia. He uses the Greek word <i>meris</i>, which is translated "part" or "district." F. J. A. Hort believed</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>"Praetors"</b></p> <p><b>Gallio as proconsul</b></p> <p><b>The Delphi Inscription</b></p> <p><b>Publius</b></p> <p><b>Politarchs</b></p>		<p>Luke erred in this usage. He said that <i>meris</i> referred to a "portion," not a "district," thus, his grounds for disagreement. Archaeological excavations, however, have shown that this very word, <i>meris</i>, was used to describe the divisions of the district.</p> <p>Thus, archaeology has again shown the accuracy of Luke. (Free, ABH, 320)</p> <p>Other poor word usages were attached to Luke. He was not considered technically correct for referring to the Philippian rulers as <i>praetors</i>. According to the "scholars" two <i>duumvirs</i> would have ruled the town. However, as usual, Luke was right. Findings have shown that the title of <i>praetor</i> was employed by the magistrates of a Roman colony. (Free, ABH, 321) His choice of the word <i>proconsul</i> as the title for Gallio (Acts 18:12) is correct, as evidenced by the Delphi inscription that states in part: "As Lucius Junius Gallio, my friend, and the Proconsul of Achaia. . . ." (Vos, CITB, 180)</p> <p>The Delphi inscription (A.D. 52) gives us a fixed time period for establishing Paul's ministry of one and a half years in Corinth. We know this by the fact, from other sources, that Gallio took office on July 1, that his proconsulship lasted only one year, and that this year overlapped Paul's work in Corinth. (Bruce, "ACNT," as cited in Henry, RB, 324)</p> <p>Luke gives to Publius, the chief man in Malta, the title "first man of the island" (Acts 28: 7). Inscriptions have been unearthed that do give him the title of "first man." (Bruce, "ACNT," as cited in Henry, RB, 325)</p> <p>Still another case is his usage of <i>politarchs</i> to denote the civil authorities of Thessalonica (Acts 17: 6). Since <i>politarch</i> is not found in the classical literature, Luke was again assumed to be wrong. However, some nineteen inscriptions that make use of the title have been found. Interestingly enough, five of these are in reference to Thessalonica. (Bruce, "ACNT," as cited in Henry, RB, 325)</p> <p>One of the inscriptions was discovered in a Roman arch at Thessalonica and in it are found the names</p>

The whole Old Testament part of the Bible (approximately the first three fourths of the Bible) was completed hundreds of years before Christ. Dan Brown does not distinguish between the Bible and the New Testament, so when he claims that the Bible was rewritten by Constantine, I need to put in a word of correction regarding the accurate transmission of the Old Testament, even as I did for

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>The Dead Sea Scrolls and Reliability of the Old Testament.</b></p>	<p>“The Bible, as we know it today, was collated by the pagan Roman emperor Constantine the Great.” (p231)</p> <p>“More than <i>eighty</i> gospels were considered for the New Testament, and yet only a relative few were chosen for inclusion-Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John among them.” (p231)</p> <p>“Constantine commissioned and financed a new Bible, which omitted those gospels that spoke of Christ’s <i>human</i> traits and embellished those gospels that made Him godlike. The</p>	<p>the New Testament above. Though we don’t have as many surviving manuscripts for the Old Testament as we do with the New, there is no reason to have any less confidence in the Old Testament’s faithfulness to its originals. It has been preserved by the Jews as no book in history. It would have been impossible for the church to have suppressed or changed any of its material. Here’s an example:  <b>The Dead Sea Scrolls and Reliability of the Old Testament.</b></p> <p>Though Brown tries to use the Dead Sea Scrolls as a source indicating the corruption of the Bible, <b>just the opposite is true.</b></p> <p>Before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the question was, “How accurate are the copies we have today compared to the copies of the first century and earlier?” Our earliest complete copy of the Old Testament dates from the tenth century <u>A.D.</u> Thus the big question: “Because the text has been copied over many times, can we trust it?” The Dead Sea Scrolls provided an astounding answer.</p> <p>The scrolls, discovered in 1947 and the following years, are made up of some forty thousand inscribed fragments. From these fragments more than five hundred books have been reconstructed. Many extra-biblical books and fragments were discovered that shed light on the second century B.C. to first century A.D. religious community of Qumran on the shores of the Dead Sea. Such writings as the “Zadokite documents,” a “Rule of the Community,” and the “Manual of Discipline” help us to understand the purpose of daily Qumran life. In the various caves are some very helpful commentaries on the Scriptures. But the most important documents of the Dead Sea Scrolls are copies of the Old Testament text dating from more than a century <i>before</i> the birth of Christ.</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Text of Isaiah</b></p>	<p>earlier gospels were outlawed, gathered up, and burned.” (p234)</p> <p>“Some of the gospels that Constantine attempted to eradicate managed to survive. The Dead Sea Scrolls were found in the 1950s hidden in a cave near Qumran in the Judean desert. And, of course, the Coptic Scrolls in 1945 at Nag Hammadi.”</p> <p>“The scrolls highlight glaring discrepancies and fabrications, clearly confirming that the modern Bible was compiled and edited by men who possessed a political agenda – to promote the divinity of the man Jesus Christ and use His influence to solidify their own power base.” (p234)</p>	<p>Since the oldest complete Hebrew Old Testament manuscripts we possessed before the Dead Sea Scrolls were from A.D. 900 on, how could we be sure of their accurate transmission since before the time of Christ? Thanks to archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls, we now know. One of the scrolls in the Dead Sea caves was a complete MS of the Hebrew text of Isaiah. It is dated by paleographers at around 125</p>

The reason for such accuracy can be accredited to original Judaic scholars: the *Sopherim*, the *Zugoth*, the *Tannaim*, and the *Talmudists*. Their accuracy derived from their

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Dr. Bernard Ramm</b></p>		<p>extremely strict disciplines in copying manuscripts. In his 1856 book <i>The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament</i>, Samuel Davidson explains the excruciating 17 step process that the <i>Talmudists</i> went through in copying a manuscript. (Davidson, HTOT)</p> <p>The Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah verified their success long after Davidson had written of their discipline.</p> <p>One of the facts Dan Brown leaves out in his attempt to recast the Bible as a late written collection of alleged co-conspirators with Constantine is the unity of material which begins in the Old Testament. That body of writing was completed centuries before Jesus walked on earth, was more than 1000 years before anyone had ever heard of Constantine, and it was zealously guarded by the Jews. It could not and would not be changed by any possible tampering of a fourth century (A.D.) politician and his cohorts. As Dr. Bernard Ramm put it:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Jews preserved it as no other manuscript has ever been preserved. With their <i>massora</i> (<i>parva</i>, <i>magna</i>, and <i>finalis</i>) they kept tabs on every letter, syllable, word and paragraph. They had special classes of men within their culture whose sole duty was to preserve and transmit these documents with practically perfect fidelity—scribes, lawyers, massoretes. Who ever counted the letters and syllables and words of Plato or Aristotle? Cicero or Seneca?” (Ramm, PCE '53, 230–231)</p>
<p><b>Dead Sea Scrolls contain no New Testament documents...not one</b></p>	<p>“Some of the gospels that Constantine attempted to eradicate managed to survive. The Dead Sea Scrolls were found in the 1950s hidden in a cave near Qumran in the Judean desert. And, of course, the Coptic Scrolls in 1945 at Nag Hammadi.”</p>	<p>Brown tells us that some of the gospels that Constantine tried to eradicate were the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Coptic Scrolls. But the Dead Sea Scrolls do not even contain <u>any</u> Gospels, and since these scrolls were stashed away in jars in the dry dessert above the Dead Sea and not discovered until 1947, it is doubtful that Constantine had any access to copies of them. The Coptic Scrolls contain the Gnostic Gospels which are dated from the mid 100's all the way to 350 A.D. (Hembold, NH, v. 3, 473; Robinson, NGL, 38, 124, 141, 524. Their late dates and geographic locations of writing far from the events that took place rather conclusively disqualify them as being historically accurate when compared to earlier Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. They are also disqualified by the fact that they hardly mention any historical data which can be checked against</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>The One True Living God Message of the Old Testament</b></p> <p><b>Monotheistic</b></p>	<p>“The scrolls highlight glaring discrepancies and fabrications, clearly confirming that the modern Bible was compiled and edited by men who possessed a political agenda – to promote the divinity of the man Jesus Christ and use His influence to solidify their own power base.” (p234)</p>	<p>archaeological, inscriptional, or manuscript discoveries, and that they are primarily Platonic philosophical speculations about the nature of Christ which has only speculative, not historical, appeal.</p> <p><b>The One True Living God Message of the Old Testament</b></p> <p>One of the great values of the Old Testament is to show that the whole history of the Jews was concerned with the worship of the one true, living, creator God. Though their history was strewn with times of straying to other gods, from Moses through to the prophets, the Old Testament record is one of God’s constant, sometimes extreme, measures to bring his people back to following Him and Him alone. Hundreds of Old Testament verses warn the people not to follow any other so-called god than the one true living LORD God. For example:  In the beginning of Israel’s history (c. 2,000-1860 B.C.),  “...Jacob said to his household and to all who were with him, ‘Put away the foreign gods which are among you, and purify yourselves and change your garments;’” (Genesis 35:2).</p> <p>Around 1400 B.C., God gave Moses the Ten Commandments. They are stated in both Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5. Number one on the list is, “You shall have no other gods before Me.” In Deuteronomy, in the very next chapter, God gives the nation of Israel the great Shema (meaning “hear”). This verse is without a doubt the most quoted verse in Judaism: “Hear, O Israel! The LORD is our God, the LORD is one!” (Deuteronomy 6:4) According to Rabbinic law it was to be recited both morning and night. The verse is often translated into</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Bible condemns polytheism</b></p>		<p>English as “The LORD is our God, the LORD alone.”</p> <p>For the Christian and the Jew, the meaning is clear: There is only one God. For Christians, that one God manifests himself in three Persons: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, even as the word “one” in the Shema suggests. That word comes from the plural form of a Hebrew word also used in Genesis 2:24, “the two shall become <i>one</i> flesh”, describing the union of two persons in <i>one</i> flesh.</p> <p>Shortly after Moses, Joshua commanded the Israelites, “...you will not associate with these nations, these which remain among you, or mention the name of their gods, or make anyone swear by them, or serve them, or bow down to them.” (Joshua 23:7)</p> <p>During the period of the Judges (1300-1065 B.C.), the Bible clearly condemns the worship of all other gods (including goddesses worshipped by the other nations, e.g., the Sidonians) in Judges 10:6:</p> <p>“Then the sons of Israel again did evil in the sight of the LORD, served the Baals and the Ashtarothe, the gods of Aram, the gods of Sidon, the gods of Moab, the gods of the sons of Ammon, and the gods of the Philistines; thus they forsook the LORD and did not serve Him.”</p> <p>Toward the end of Solomon’s reign (c. 930 B.C.), 1 Kings 11:5,6 reports,</p> <p>“...Solomon went after Ashtoreth the goddess of the Sidonians and after Milcom the detestable idol of the Ammonites. Solomon did what was evil in the sight of the Lord, and did not follow the Lord fully, as David his father had done.”</p> <p>As a result, God tore the kingdom in two, and only two out of the twelve tribes continued to follow the kings of his lineage.</p> <p>In the time of the prophets (8<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C.), God constantly rebukes his people for going after other gods, false gods. Jeremiah speaks these words from God:</p> <p>"Why should I pardon you? Your sons have forsaken Me and sworn by those who are not gods when I had fed them to the full, they</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Messianic Prophecy Fulfilled in Christ</b></p>		<p>committed adultery and trooped to the harlot's house." (Jeremiah 5:7)</p> <p>The prophet Hosea brings God's condemnation to Israel as he reveals the same kind of worship advocated by Brown for his sacred feminine:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"...I will punish them for their ways and repay them for their deeds...a spirit of harlotry has led them astray, and they have played the harlot, departing from their God. ...For the men themselves go apart with harlots and offer sacrifices with temple prostitutes; so the people without understanding are ruined." (Hosea 4:9,12,14)</p> <p>God speaks through Micah saying,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"I will cut off sorceries from your hand, and you will have fortune-tellers no more. ... I will root out your Asherim from among you and destroy your cities." (Micah 5:12,14)</p> <p>Asherah poles represented the female consort of the false god, Baal, and worship of her included male and female prostitution.</p> <p>Given all the references from beginning to end of the Old Testament books which condemn the worship of false gods, and given the reliability of the faithful transmission of those books down through history, there is absolutely no way Israel could have evolved from the worship of many gods and goddesses to the worship of one true God. The same is true of the New Testament.</p> <p><b>Messianic Prophecy Fulfilled in Christ</b></p> <p>One other important role the Old Testament played was to predict and prepare for the coming of the Messiah, God's Son, to earth. These prophecies show, in a powerful way, the unity of the whole Bible declaring the worship of the one true living Father God, made know through His uniquely begotten Son, Jesus, experienced through the power and indwelling presence of His Holy Spirit.</p> <p>Throughout the New Testament the apostles appealed to two areas of the life of Jesus of Nazareth to establish His messiahship. One was the</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Messianic prophecies</b></p>		<p>resurrection and the other was fulfilled messianic prophecy. The Old Testament, written over a one-thousand-year period, contains over three hundred references to the coming Messiah. All of these were fulfilled in Jesus Christ, and they establish a solid confirmation of His credentials as the Messiah.</p> <p>Because there are so many and such telling prophecies about Christ in the Old Testament, some have tried to late date those portions of the Old Testament which speak of the future coming Messiah. But these attempts are in vain because of the existence of the Septuagint. The Septuagint—the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures—was initiated in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-246 B.C.). It is rather obvious that if you have a Greek translation initiated in 250 B.C., then you had to have the Hebrew text from which it was written. This will suffice to indicate that there was <i>at least</i> a 250-year gap between the prophecies being written down and their fulfillment in the person of Christ.</p> <p>Floyd Hamilton, in <i>The Basis of Christian Faith</i> (a modern defense of the Christian religion), writes:  “Canon Liddon is authority for the statement that there are in the Old Testament 332 distinct predictions which were literally fulfilled in Christ” (Hamilton, BCF, 160).</p> <p>Payne lists 191 in his <i>Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy</i>. (Payne, EBP, 665-670)</p> <p>The following prophecies predicted various aspects of Christ’s first coming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The fact:</b> Genesis 3:15; Deuteronomy 18:15; Psalm 89:20; Isaiah 9:6; 28:16; 32:1; 35:4; 42:6; 49:1; 55:4; Ezekiel 34:24; Daniel 2:44; Micah 4:1; Zechariah 3:8.</li> <li>• <b>The time:</b> Genesis 49:10; Numbers 24:17; Daniel 9:24-26; Malachi 3:1.</li> <li>• <b>His divinity:</b> Psalms 2:7, 11; 45:6, 7, 11; 72:8; 89:26, 27; 102:24-27; 110:1; Isaiah 9:6; 25:9; 40:10; Jeremiah 23:6; Micah 5:2; Malachi 3:1.</li> <li>• <b>Human generation:</b> Genesis 12:3; 18:18; 21:12; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14; 49:10; 2 Samuel 7:14;</li> </ul>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
		<p>Psalms 18:4-6, 50; 22:22, 23; 29:36; 89:4; 132:11; Isaiah 11:1; Jeremiah 23:5; 33:15.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>His Forerunner:</b> Isaiah 40:3; Malachi 3:1; 4:5.</li> </ul> <p>About His birth and early years the Old Testament includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The fact:</b> Genesis 3:15; Isaiah 7:14; Jeremiah 31:22.</li> <li>• <b>The place:</b> Numbers 24:17, 19; Micah 5:2.</li> <li>• <b>Adoration by Magi:</b> Psalm 72:10,15; Isaiah 60:3, 6.</li> <li>• <b>Descent into Egypt:</b> Hosea 11:1.</li> <li>• <b>Massacre of innocents:</b> Jeremiah 31:15.</li> </ul> <p>Prophecies about His mission and office include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mission:</b> Genesis 12:3; 49:10; Numbers 24:19; Deuteronomy 18:18, 19; Psalm 21:1; Isaiah 59:20; Jeremiah 33:16.</li> <li>• <b>Priest like Melchizedek:</b> Psalm 110:4.</li> <li>• <b>Prophet like Moses:</b> Deuteronomy 18:15.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Conversion of Gentiles:</b> Isaiah 11:10; Deuteronomy 32:43; Psalms 18:49; 19:4; 117:1; Isaiah 42:1; 45:23; 49:6; Hosea 1:10; 2:23; Joel 2:32.</li> <li>• <b>Ministry in Galilee:</b> Isaiah 9:1, 2.</li> <li>• <b>Miracles:</b> Isaiah 35:5, 6; 42:7; 53:4.</li> <li>• <b>Spiritual graces:</b> Psalm 45:7; Isaiah 11:2; 42:1; 53:9; 61:1, 2.</li> <li>• <b>Preaching:</b> Psalms 2:7; 78:2; Isaiah 2:3; 61:1; Micah 4:2.</li> <li>• <b>Purification of the temple:</b> Psalm 69:9.</li> </ul> <p>Regarding His passion are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Rejection by Jews and Gentiles:</b> Psalms 2:1; 22:12, 41:5; 56:5; 69:8; 118:22, 23; Isaiah 6:9, 10; 8:14; 29:13; 53:1; 65:2.</li> <li>• <b>Persecution:</b> Psalms 22:6; 35:7, 12; 56:5; 71:10; 109:2; Isaiah 49:7; 53:3.</li> <li>• <b>Triumphal entry into Jerusalem:</b> Psalms 8:2; 118:25, 26; Zechariah 9:9.</li> <li>• <b>Betrayal by own friend:</b> Psalms 41:9; 55:13; Zechariah 13:6.</li> <li>• <b>Betrayal for thirty pieces of silver:</b> Zechariah 11:12.</li> </ul>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Betrayer's death:</b> Psalms 55:15, 23; 109:17.</li> <li>• <b>Purchase of potter's Field:</b> Zechariah 11:13.</li> <li>• <b>Desertion by disciples:</b> Zechariah 13:7.</li> <li>• <b>False accusation:</b> Psalms 2:1, 2; 27:12; 35:11; 109:2.</li> <li>• <b>Silence under accusation:</b> Psalm 38:13; Isaiah 53:7.</li> <li>• <b>Mocking:</b> Psalms 22:7, 8, 16; 109:25.</li> <li>• <b>Insults, buffeting, spitting, scourging:</b> Psalm 35:15, 21; Isaiah 50:6.</li> <li>• <b>Patience under suffering:</b> Isaiah 53:7-9.</li> <li>• <b>Crucifixion:</b> Psalm 22:14, 17.</li> <li>• <b>Offer of gall and vinegar:</b> Psalm 69:21.</li> <li>• <b>Prayer for enemies:</b> Psalm 109:4.</li> <li>• <b>Cries upon the Cross:</b> Psalms 22:1; 31:5.</li> <li>• <b>Death in prime of life:</b> Psalms 89:45; 102:24.</li> <li>• <b>Death with malefactors:</b> Isaiah 53:9, 12.</li> <li>• <b>Death attested by convulsions of nature:</b> Amos 5:20; Zechariah 14:4-6.</li> <li>• <b>Casting lots for garments:</b> Psalm 22:18.</li> <li>• <b>Bones not to be broken:</b> Psalm 34:20.</li> <li>• <b>Piercing:</b> Psalm 22:16; Zechariah 12:10; 13:6.</li> <li>• <b>Voluntary death:</b> Psalm 40:6-8.</li> <li>• <b>Vicarious suffering:</b> Isaiah 53:4-6, 12; Daniel 9:26.</li> <li>• <b>Burial with the rich:</b> Isaiah 53:9.</li> <li>• <b>His resurrection predicted:</b> in Psalms 2:7; 16:8-10; 30:3; 41:10; 118:17.</li> <li>• <b>His ascension:</b> Psalms 16:11; 24:7; 68:18; 110:1; 118:19.</li> <li>• <b>His Second coming:</b> Psalm 50:3-6; Isaiah 9:6, 7; 66:18; Daniel 7:13, 14; Zechariah 12:10; 14:4-8.</li> <li>• <b>His dominion universal and everlasting:</b> 1 Chronicles 17:11-14; Psalms 2:6-8; 8:6; 45:6-7; 72:8; 110:1-3; Isaiah 9:7; Daniel 7:14.</li> </ul>
<b>WHAT WERE THE EARLY CHRISTIANS LIKE?</b>		
	<p>"Christians and pagans began warring, and the conflict grew to such proportions that it</p>	<p>The book of Acts written by Luke, as we have seen, is an extremely reliable source of history concerning what was happening within the early church. As world renowned Archaeologist, Sir William Ramsay stated,</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>The church was growing</b></p>	<p>threatened to rend Rome in two.” (p232)</p>	<p>“Luke’s history is unsurpassed in respect of its trustworthiness.” (Ramsay, SPTRC, 81)</p> <p>One thing we learn from Luke in this book is how fast the early church grew, and what characterized it. In Acts 1:14-15, the church in Jerusalem is composed of about 120 persons,</p> <p>“all with one mind ... devoting themselves to prayer, along with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with His brothers.”</p> <p>Not many days later, Peter has an opportunity to speak to a large crowd, and 3,000 new people became a part of the church. (Acts 2:41)</p> <p>For most churches, that would be a logistical nightmare. Where would they put all the people? The Jerusalem Christian’s solution?</p> <p>“Day by day continuing with one mind in the temple and breaking bread from house to house, they were taking their meals together with gladness and sincerity of heart, praising God and having favor with all the people. And the Lord was adding to their number day by day those who were being saved.” (Acts 2:46,47)</p> <p>Every day new people were being added, and they just kept opening up more homes in which to meet. No waiting around for church buildings to be built. By Acts 4:4 the church totaled 5,000 men alone, not counting women and children. In Acts 21:20, Luke reports the words of James and the elders to Paul,</p> <p>“You see, brother, how many thousands there are among the Jews of those who have believed....”</p> <p>The word Greek word Luke used here for <i>thousands</i> literally means tens of thousands. In other words many tens of thousands in Jerusalem, perhaps as many as 100,000 out of a total population of 200,000 had become “followers of the way” within 20-25 years after Jesus’ resurrection.</p> <p>The richness of relationships and worship together in the hospitality of the homes added to the spread of the church. Throughout the rest of the New</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
Sought peace		<p>Testament, you see groups of believers referred to as “the church in so-and-so’s home”. (Acts 20:20; Romans 16:5; 1 Corinthians 16:19; Colossians 4:15; Philemon 1:2) A huge part of the experience of those early followers of the risen Jesus was an emphasis on loving one another as well as those outside the church. It wasn’t just talk. They loved in sacrificial ways, selling their own possessions to give to other believers in need (Acts 2:45), and maintaining their testimony of what they experienced in Christ even when threatened with persecution or death (e.g., Stephen’s martyrdom in Acts 7).</p> <p>Neither in the teaching of Jesus or the apostles or the early church leaders of those first three centuries before Constantine can you find any kind of Christian “Holy Jihad” doctrine. On the contrary, followers of Jesus seemed to take Jesus’ words literally:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“...do not resist an evil person; but whoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn the other to him also.” (Matthew 5:39)</p> <p>Referring to Roman soldiers in their midst who could make anyone in this conquered land carry their pack for one mile, Jesus told his followers,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Whoever forces you to go one mile, go with him two....” (Matthew 5:41)</p> <p>Jesus had also taught,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“You have heard that it was said, ‘You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.’ But I say to you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you.... For if you love those who love you, what reward do you have? Do not even the tax collectors do the same? If you greet only your brothers, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the Gentiles do the same?” (Matthew 4:43-44, 46-47)</p> <p>The word <i>Gentile</i> was another way of referring to a pagan.</p> <p>One of Jesus’ most powerful teachings came at the point of his arrest. Peter had drawn a sword and cut off the ear of the High Priest’s slave, and Jesus commanded Peter,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Put your sword back into its place; for all those</p>

## Ignatius

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
Justin Martyr		<p>when ye assemble frequently in the same place, the powers of Satan are destroyed, and the destruction at which he aims is prevented by the unity of your faith. Nothing is more precious than peace, by which all war, both in heaven and earth, is brought to an end.” (110 A.D., <i>The Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians</i>, Chapter XIII)</p> <p>Justin Martyr, a Palestinian philosopher who converted to Christ and was eventually martyred, wrote in about A.D. 160,</p> <p>“We who formerly murdered one another now refrain from making war even upon our enemies.” (Roberts, ANF, 1.176)</p> <p>and,</p> <p>“We used to be filled with war, mutual slaughter, and every kind of wickedness. However, now all of us have, throughout the whole earth, changed our warlike weapons. We have changed our swords into plowshares, and our spears into farming implements.” (Roberts, ANF 1.254)</p> <p>I could go on quoting other “church fathers” like Athenagorus, Irenaeus, Origen, and others right up until the time of Constantine who taught their flocks, as Clement of Alexandria put it,</p> <p>“It is not in war, but in peace, that we are trained.” (Roberts, ANF 2.234)</p> <p>What this teaching from the apostles and early church fathers demonstrates is that far from being a group of people hung-up over a patriarchal or matriarchal notion of God, the early Christians focused on following Christ and the teaching He had given them. That teaching continued to be passed on through the church leaders who laid down their lives for the truth of the gospel.</p> <p>The martyrdoms experienced by the church fathers all help to confirm the martyrdoms reported of Jesus’ original disciples, because they were following in their footsteps. From various sources, we are reasonably sure that almost all of Jesus’ apostles and New Testament writers were martyred for their faith. They chose death at the hands of persecutors</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Eusebius on the martyrs</b></p>		<p>rather than deny the facts of the life of Jesus which they were passing on to a new generation of Christians.</p> <p>Eusebius, considered to be generally accurate in what he reports, records the martyrdoms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peter (crucified upside down),</li> <li>• Paul (beheaded), James the brother of Jesus (stoned and clubbed), and</li> <li>• James the brother of John (killed by the sword). Acts 12:2 is a much earlier source for the death of James the brother of John, and Josephus is a much earlier source for the death of James the brother of Jesus.</li> </ul> <p>Tradition holds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thomas was killed by a spear,</li> <li>• Thaddaeus was put to death by arrows,</li> <li>• Bartholomew is reported to have been flayed alive and crucified upside down,</li> <li>• Tradition from the fourth century holds Luke to be a martyr,</li> <li>• Other tradition has Mark dying a martyr's death in the eighth year of Nero,</li> <li>• John is reported to have been boiled in oil but miraculously survived.</li> </ul> <p>It is important to note that these people were not just dying for a philosophy, but for their willingness to simply tell of what they had seen and heard and experienced. The deaths of the apostles and New Testament writers sealed the things they reported as true. Why? Because no one willingly dies for something they know is a lie. And if the reports they made about what Jesus said and did were false, then they knew they were false, and wouldn't sacrifice themselves for something they knew to be a lie.</p> <p>Some people react, "But, the 9/11 terrorists died believing they would go to heaven and receive 70 virgins, and that was a lie. So therefore, they died for a lie." Yes, they died for a lie, but the key is that they didn't know it was a lie. They thought it was the truth. Lots of people die for philosophies or religions they</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
		<p>think are true. The difference with the disciples is that they died for their knowledge of historical facts they knew they could not deny. Jesus had really risen from the dead and appeared to them and changed them. They could not deny the facts. And the testimony of their deaths is provides additional evidence that the New Testament records are reliable. They are not just religious stories, they are historical facts.</p> <p>This is puzzling, since his novel also states that all of the pagans of the time were sun-worshippers, or worshippers of a male deity, <i>Sol Invictus</i>. (Dan Brown, <i>The Da Vinci Code</i>, pp124,232)</p>
<b>WAS THE EARLY CHURCH ANTI-FEMININE?</b>		
<b>Paganism and matriarchal</b>	<p>“The Priory believes that Constantine and his male successors successfully converted the world from matriarchal paganism to patriarchal Christianity.” (p124)</p> <p>“Powerful men in the early Christian church ‘conned’ the world by propagating lies that devalued the female and tipped the scales in favor of the masculine.” (p124)</p>	<p>Abanes gives us the benefit of his research: “Ancient paganism was neither matriarchal nor patriarchal. It was not even close to a unified belief system. Those adhering to various <i>forms</i> of paganism often revered “dozens or hundreds of gods, goddesses, spirits, and less easily defined supernatural entities.”</p> <p>Instead of there being any single “matriarchal paganism,” there actually existed <i>many different paganisms</i>. Some did not even involve a goddess. (Abanes, TBDVC, 33)</p> <p>For Brown to project that this new organization was capable of rewriting over 1700 years of previous written history is known by scholars to be preposterous. We are able today, through archaeology and manuscript evidence, to prove what writings existed long before the church became institutionalized. These writings formed both our Old Testament and New Testament scriptures and guided the early Christians as well as sincere Christians down through history up to our day, to live in Christ.</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
Did Eve eat the fruit?	<p>“The power of the female and her ability to produce life was once very sacred, but it posed a threat to the rise of the predominantly male Church, and so the sacred feminine was demonized and called unclean” (p238)</p>	<p>Take the book of beginnings, Genesis. Here is a book, as we have seen, that is among those protected by the Jewish scribes in such a way that scholars are confident of its integrity. What we have now is not a product of Constantine’s era. It goes back, in written form to around 1400 B.C., the time of Moses. As we saw earlier, we just have too much evidence available today to be able to accept that any part of the Old Testament could have been rewritten in the fourth century A.D. Even the Greek translation of the Old Testament (the Septuagint) was completed and in circulation more than five centuries prior to Constantine.</p>
	<p>“It was <i>man</i>, not God, who created the concept of ‘original sin,’ whereby Eve tasted of the apple and caused the downfall of the human race. Woman, once the sacred giver of life was now the enemy.” (p238)</p>	<p>On a minor point by the way, the Bible never says, as Brown does, that Eve ate an “apple”; it just says “fruit” (Genesis 3:1-6). “Apple” has just become a popular myth, not a fact.</p>
	<p>“This concept of woman as lifebringer was the foundation of ancient religion. Childbirth was mystical and powerful. Sadly, Christian philosophy decided to embezzle the female’s creative power by ignoring biological truth and making <i>man</i> the Creator. Genesis tells us that Eve was created from</p>	<p>The Bible does not blame Eve for original sin. At best it blames both equally, but it really seems to point the finger at Adam. In Genesis 3:9-13, God questions Adam first. Romans 5:12 says that through one <u>man</u> sin entered the world, (not one woman). Verse 14 names that man as Adam and labels that sin as “the offense of Adam” (NAS). 1 Corinthians. 15:22 says, “in Adam all die”. It is clear that the Bible definitely does not pin the blame solely on Eve.</p>

The 15<sup>th</sup> century publication of *Malleus Maleficarum*, it is an admittedly mean-spirited book that led to the persecution of both women *and* men. (CSEWH) It was an attack on any possible witches and definitely

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p>Witch hunts # of deaths</p>	<p>“During three hundred years of witch hunts, the Church burned at the stake an astounding five <i>million</i> women.” (p125)</p>	<p>showed an anti-female bias. But Brown goes beyond the facts when he says that all kinds of women were picked out, among them midwives because they gave medication to women during pregnancy. (p125) His charge is largely untrue. Women all over Europe were mid-wives, and some were even Roman Catholic. Researcher and writer Richard Abanes states,</p> <p>“Countless women in the groupings listed in the <i>Code</i> were never targets of persecution by the Church. The comment about midwives also is untrue. Women practiced midwifery and herbal medicine all over medieval Europe without fear. In fact, many midwives and healer (for example, the well known Hildegard von Binges, born 1098) were Roman Catholic.” (Abanes, TBDVC, 35)</p> <p>Between the years of 1400-1800 which is four hundred years, there were less than 100,000 maximum people killed. And at least 20% of these were men. I am not trying to justify a wrong the church has perpetrated during a failed period of her history, only seeking to convey the data accurately which Brown misrepresents. On this point, Abanes corrects the record:</p> <p>In fact, historical documents show that most of the victims “were not killed by Catholics or officials of the Church,” but were executed by the state. “The vast majority of witches were condemned by secular courts, with local courts especially noted for their persecutory zeal.”</p> <p>Scholarly estimates put the number of “witch hunt” victims in Europe from 1400 to 1800 (a period 100 years longer than the 300 years the <i>Code</i> mentions) at 30,000 to 80,000. At most, there were probably no more than 100,000 victims. Even some neopagans and witches cite figures as low as 50,000. Moreover, 20-25 percent of Europeans executed for witchcraft between the 14<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries were male. (Abanes, TBDVC, 35,36)</p> <p>In answer to Brown’s charges, I do not at all justify the medieval church’s actions which clearly are at odds with what should have been the church’s foundation, the life of Christ exhibited in the New</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Constantine and the Gnostic writings</b></p> <p><b>Gnosticism and women</b></p> <p><b>Jesus included women</b></p> <p><b>A woman's testimony</b></p>		<p>Testament. It is sad that in the course of many centuries, the persecuted church was so changed and institutionalized that it became an influence, if not vehicle, for persecuting others.</p> <p>"Brown suggests that one of the motives for Constantine's alleged banning of the Gnostic writings was a desire to suppress women in the church. Ironically, it is the Gnostic Gospel of Thomas that demeans women. It concludes (supposedly quoting Peter) with this eye-popping statement: "Let Mary go away from us, because women are not worthy of life.' Then Jesus allegedly tells Peter that he will make Mary into a male so that she may enter the kingdom of heaven. Read: women are inferior. With sentiments like that on display, it's difficult to conceive of the Gnostic writings as being a battle cry for women's liberation." Pagels notes that the gnostics did not affirm women in a unanimous way, "nor were the orthodox unanimous in denigrating them". Many gnostic texts, in fact, clearly refer to the feminine with great contempt. (Elaine Pagels, <i>The Gnostic Gospels</i>, 1979; New York: Vintage Books, 1989, p66).</p> <p>Let's return now to the first century when the example was set and the teaching laid down as to what the church's attitude toward women should be. It is notable that Jesus' band of disciples did include women, yes, Mary Magdalene among them. His three closest disciples and likely the three primary leaders among the early Jewish Christians were Peter, James and John. They were with Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration and appear in various places with Jesus when only three of the twelve were singled out. Nowhere in the gospels written earliest and which first became the fourfold witness to the life of Jesus is Mary Magdalene identified in leadership of the community, though she appears to be a prominent figure among the women.</p> <p>It was to Mary that Jesus first appeared, and the gospel writers honor her by placing her testimony as the first appearance of the risen Christ. In the Jewish culture, a woman's testimony was not regarded highly. Buy what else could the disciples do? That's how it happened. They told the story as it was.</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<b>Galatians 3:28</b>		<p>Shortly after the Jewish church had begun, the resurrected Jesus appeared to another Jew, Saul of Tarsus, a leading rabbi among the party of the Pharisees. He sent him to the Gentiles, and in probably his earliest letter, written in A.D. 49, he speaks of his attitude toward women. In so doing he lays down a genderless doctrine of what it means to be "in Christ":</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus." (Galatians 3:28)</p> <p>In a few other places he speaks of how the genders interact and what roles they play in different spheres of influence, but foundational to all relationships in the church is that we are all one in Christ. It is for the world to fight over which gender is superior. In the church we are all equal at the foot of the cross.</p>
<b>CONSTANTINE AND THE COUNCIL OF NICAEA CONCERNING JESUS' DEITY</b>		
<b>Constantine's vision</b>	<p>"Constantine commissioned and financed a new Bible, which omitted those gospels that spoke of Christ's <i>human</i> traits and embellished those gospels that made Him godlike. The earlier gospels were outlawed, gathered up, and burned." (p234)</p> <p>"Many scholars claim that the early Church literally <i>stole</i> Jesus from His original followers, hijacking His human message, shrouding it in an impenetrable cloak of divinity, and</p>	<p>In the words of Eusebius of Caesarea, who was both a historian and a confidant of Constantine, the emperor was praying to a pagan god when "he saw with his own eyes the trophy of a cross in the light of the heavens, above the sun and an inscription, <i>Conquer By This</i>, attached to it.... Then in his sleep the Christ of God appeared to him with the sign which he had seen in the heavens, and commanded him to make a likeness of the sign which he had seen in the heavens, and to use it as a safeguard in all engagements with this enemies.</p> <p>To make a long story short, Constantine crossed over the bridge and won the battle, fighting under the banner of the Christian cross. Later he issued the Edict of Milan, decreeing that Christians were no longer to be persecuted." (Lutzer, DVD, 3,4)</p> <p>For Christians who had seen so many friends and family members die at the hands of Roman persecutors, it was one of the highest points of the church's history. Credible historians don't doubt the sincerity of Constantine's conversion. They recognize, however, that you don't get to be emperor</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Role of the Council of Nicaea</b></p> <p><b>300 - 2 (now that</b></p>	<p>using it to expand their own power.” (p233)</p> <p>“Jesus’ establishment as the ‘Son of God’ was officially proposed and voted on by the Council of Nicaea...A relatively close vote at that.” (p233)</p>	<p>of the Roman empire by being a Sunday School teacher. Emperors were always concerned about the unity of their empire. That’s why so many Christians were killed. They wouldn’t bow down to the empire’s gods (including the Caesars) so they were viewed as threats within the empire to be eliminated.</p> <p>Constantine now recognized another source of disunity in his empire. A forceful speaker named Arius had attracted a large following of people who were persuaded that Christ was something less than eternal God, something like a lesser God, created by the Father and sent to earth to enter humanity through his birth from Mary of Nazareth. Constantine felt both a political and religious desire to end this controversy, and called together over 300 Bishops from all over the empire. Lutzer describes,</p> <p>“He gave the opening speech himself, telling the delegates that doctrinal disunity was worse than war.</p> <p>This intrusion of a politician into the doctrines and procedures of the church was resented by some of the delegates, but welcomed by others. For those who had gone through a period of bitter persecution, this conference, carried on under the imperial banner, was heaven on earth.” (Lutzer, DVD, 5)</p> <p>Something else Brown doesn’t mention is that Arius believed that Jesus was sinless, created the universe, and was a unique and special created being - not a mere man. Arius simply was reluctant to take the next step and classify Jesus as God in the full sense.</p> <p>“Athanasius and most church leaders, on the other hand, were convinced that Jesus was God in the flesh. Constantine wanted to settle the dispute, hoping to bring peace to his empire, uniting the east and west divisions. Thus, in 325 a.d., he convened more than 300 bishops at Nicaea (now part of Turkey) from throughout the Christian world.”</p> <p>So just how close was the vote for Jesus’ co-</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
was a close one)		<p>eternality with the Father? "In fact," says historian and researcher Dr. Paul Maier at Western Michigan University, "the vote was 300 to 2." (Hanegraaff, DVCFF, 15) That's quite a stretch: from "a relatively close vote" to 300 to 2. (Some sources say that the vote was 218-2)</p> <p>How does it feel to be lied to so convincingly? In actuality, it was a landslide in favor of the position we have in the Nicæan creed today, Christ being "Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made."</p>
Claims to deity	<p>"Until <i>that</i> moment in history, Jesus was viewed by His followers as a mortal prophet... a great and powerful <i>man</i>, but a man nonetheless. A mortal." (p233)</p>	<p>What is important for people to know in the face of <i>The Da Vinci Code</i> claims, is that this vote <b>only affirmed what Christians had believed all along</b>.</p>
Matthew 16:16		<p>Matthew was there when Peter made his famous confession in Matthew 16:13-16, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God".</p>
John 1:1-3		<p>The disciple, John wrote of Jesus, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things came into being through Him, and apart from Him nothing came into being.... And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we saw His glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth." (John 1:1-3,14)</p>
John 20:28		<p>John was there when Thomas made the declaration he never thought he would when he called Jesus "My Lord and my God". (John 20:28)</p>
Philippians 2:6-7		<p>These followers of Christ definitely regarded Christ as deity, and, as we saw earlier wrote down the only eye-witness gospel accounts of the life of Jesus preserved for posterity. Literally hundreds of verses could be quoted from the gospels and other books.</p> <p>Jesus has publicly condoned the worship he received from his disciples.</p> <p>"In the letter to the church at Philippi, the apostle</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Justin Martyr</b></p> <p><b>Irenaeus</b></p> <p><b>Clement of Alexandria</b></p> <p><b>Ignatius of Antioch</b></p>		<p>Paul clearly affirms Jesus' status as deity - as the very Creator of the universe."          "Though he was God, he did not demand and cling to his rights as God. He made himself nothing; he took the humble position of a slave and appeared in human form. And in human form obediently humbled himself even further by dying a criminal's death on a cross." (Philippians 2:6-7)</p> <p>"These words from Paul were written well over 200 years before the council of Nicaea. But is this view that Jesus was already widely regarded as God reflected in <i>The Da Vinci Code</i>?"</p> <p>Not only the disciples, but also some of the most famous 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> century followers of Christ had the same belief.</p> <p>Justin Martyr wrote of Christ, "being the first-begotten Word of God, is even God"; "both God and Lord of hosts". (<i>First Apology</i>, Ch. 63 in Roberts, <i>ANF</i>, v. 1, 184)</p> <p>Irenaeus wrote, "our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King". (Irenaeus, <i>Against Heresies</i>, bk. 1, ch. 10 in Roberts, <i>ANF</i>, v. 1, 330 )</p> <p>Clement of Alexandria wrote, "truly most manifest Deity, He that is made equal to the Lord of the universe; because he was His Son". (Clement of Alexandria, <i>Exhortation to the Heathen</i>, ch.10 in Roberts, <i>ANF</i>, v. 2, 202)</p> <p>"There is one Physician who is possessed both of flesh and spirit; both made and not made; God existing in flesh; true life in death; both of Mary and of God; first possible and then in possible, even Jesus Christ our Lord." (Ignatius of Antioch, <i>Letter to the Ephesians</i>, chap. 7)</p> <p>"For our God, Jesus Christ, was, according to the appointment of God, conceived in the womb by Mary, of the seed of David, but by the Holy Ghost." (Ignatius of Antioch, <i>Letter to the Smyrneans</i>, 10)</p>

Irenaeus, between 182 and 188 wrote his great work, *Against Heresies*. “In reality,” as Richard Abanes points out, “the word appears much earlier—in the New Testament book of Titus, which was written by the apostle Paul about A.D. 63 to 64. Paul’s admonition was to reject anyone who was heretical (*hairetikos*, Titus 3:10). The Greek word for

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<b>Tertullian</b>		<p>heresy (<i>hairesis</i>) shows up even earlier, in 1 Corinthians 11:19..." in about A.D. 54. (See <i>Introductory Note To Irenaeus Against Heresies</i> in the collection <i>The Ante-Nicene Fathers</i>.)</p> <p>It also appears in the second epistle of Peter:          "But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in destructive heresies, even denying the Master who brought them, bringing upon themselves with destruction." (2 Peter 2:1)</p> <p>Ignatius of Antioch, writing around A.D. 110, also refers to heretics: "Keep off foreign fare", he writes to the Trallians, "by which I mean heresy." (Ignatius of Antioch, <i>Letter to the Trallians</i>, 6)</p> <p>Finally, Tertullian wrote <i>De praescriptione haereticorum</i> ("The Prescription against Heretics"):          "We ought not to be astonished at the heresies (which abound). Neither ought their existence to surprise us, for it was foretold that they should come to pass." (Tertullian, <i>De praescriptione haereticorum</i>, 1)</p>
<b>Constantine's alleged deception of Jesus</b>	"The early Church needed to convince the world that the mortal prophet Jesus was a <i>divine</i> being. Therefore, any gospels that described <i>earthly</i> aspects of Jesus' life had to be omitted from the Bible." (p244)	<p>As for Constantine omitting the Gospels that spoke of Christ's human traits and embellishing the Gospels that spoke of his Godlike traits, we might ask, "Why, then, do the early and authentic Gospels included in the Bible speak of Christ's human traits?" They speak of his hunger in Matthew 4:2, his amazement of the faith of the centurion in Matthew 8:5-10, his anger with the moneychangers in Mark 11:15-17, his fatigue in Luke 8:22-23, and his sorrow in John 11:33-36. In Hebrews 4:15-16 we are told that not only did Christ suffer temptation but he can completely understand when we are tempted because he was "in all points tempted <i>like as we are</i>". The Bible mentions very clearly the human traits of Christ.</p>
<b>Paul Maier</b>	"He [Constantine] was a lifelong pagan who was baptized	In taking this position, Brown ignores the many historians who have studied Constantine's life. Professor of Ancient History, Paul L. Maier at

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Will Durant</b></p>	<p>on his deathbed, too weak to protest.” (p232)</p>	<p>Western Michigan University, for example, summarizes what almost all historians believe about Constantine:</p> <p>“While Constantine was undeniably a flawed individual, historians agree that he certainly abjured paganism, became a genuine Christian convert, repaid the church for it’s terrible losses during the persecutions, favored the clergy, built many churches throughout his empire, convened the first ecumenical council at Nicaea- underwriting the expenses of clergy to attend it- and <i>desired</i> baptism near death. As for the last, he was merely following the custom at the time (innocent though mistaken) of delaying baptism until the end of life because it wiped your slate clean of preceding sins.” (Hanegraaff, DVCFF, 14)</p> <p>Will Durant, hardly partial to the Catholic Church, writes,</p> <p>“His Christianity, beginning as policy, appears to have graduated into sincere conviction. He became the most persistent preacher in his realm, persecuted heretics faithfully, and took God into partnership at every step. Wiser than Diocletian, he gave new life to an aging Empire by associating it with a young religion, a vigorous organization, a fresh morality.” (Will Durant, <i>Caesar and Christ: The Story of Civilization</i>, pt.3, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1944, p664).</p> <p>Perhaps the worst thing about Constantine’s favoring of the church is that he brought political values into a church that had been purified by persecution.</p> <p>With the state now favoring the church, she was tempted to benefit from all the help she could get from it. Making Christianity the state religion was actually one of the worst things that could happen to the church. Now there would be multitudes of professing Christians within the church who in reality did not believe in Christ alone for salvation and continued to practice their old religions, baptizing those practices into the church.</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p>Nicaean Council and Christ's deity</p> <p>Arius</p>	<p>"The modern Bible was compiled and edited by men who possessed a political agenda—to promote the divinity of the man Jesus Christ and use His influence to solidify their own power base." (p234)</p>	<p>Christianity would have been far more benefited by a policy which allowed all people everywhere the freedom to choose the religion of their conscience. State power behind Christianity became a curse which led to the persecution of non-Christians in the same way the state had formerly persecuted Christians. The light and life of Jesus in the church began to flicker.</p> <p>As mentioned above, the Council of Nicaea was initiated by Constantine in order to settle a developing schism in the church. Over 300 bishops were present. <i>The Da Vinci Code</i> seems to tie this council to one main issue (deciding on Jesus' deity), and then seems to add a second: deciding what books to include in the canon.</p> <p>The average reader with little background in ancient history is left helpless against such a claim. Let's get the perspective of a real historian who has studied the sources regarding the Nicaean Council in A.D. 325:  Professor Paul Maier states,  "Jesus' deity was attested by many New Testament passages, as well as by the earliest Christians and all the church fathers, even if there was some disagreement as to the precise nature of that deity. The Council of Nicaea did not debate over whether Jesus was divine or only mortal, but whether he was coeternal with the Father."  (Hanegraaff, DVCFF, 15)</p> <p>Since the source of the conflict was a certain bishop named Arius, who was forcefully spreading a doctrine different from that seen in the accepted New Testament books, the vote regarding Jesus' deity was in reality a vote regarding Arius' faithfulness to Scripture. Lutzer gives the verdict:</p> <p>"Overwhelmingly, the council declared Arius a heretic. Though Arius was given an opportunity to defend his views, the delegates recognized that if</p>

“...the compiler adds details not found in the

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
Constantine's tampering with Scripture?		<p>writings of historians. As for his account of Nicaea, he writes that the council dealt with matters of the divinity of Jesus, the Trinity, and the canon. He writes, "The canonical and apocryphal books it distinguished in the following manner: in the house of God the books were placed down by the holy altar; then the council asked the Lord in prayer that the inspired words be found on top and—as in fact happened...." That, quite obviously, is the stuff of legend. No primary documents pertaining to Nicaea make reference to such a procedure." (Lutzer, DVD, 14,15)</p> <p>It's no secret that Constantine did arrange for the copying (not collating) of fifty Bibles for the churches of Constantinople. "But," concludes Lutzer, "<i>The Da Vinci Code's</i> assertion that Constantine tampered with the Scriptures or excluded certain books is bogus. This is a reminder that legends are often confused with facts in such a way that the legends appear to replace the facts. When one presents history without consulting the sources, anything the mind can imagine can be written. As fabrications go, <i>The Da Vinci Code</i> is right up there with Elvis sightings." (Lutzer, DVD, 16)</p>
<b>THE DAVINCI CODE AND MARY MAGDALENE</b>		
The Gospel of Phillip	<p><i>The Gospel of Phillip</i>: "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</p>	<p>At first sight, something sounds a little fishy to me in this paragraph. I mean, if Jesus were married to Mary Magdalene, wouldn't he normally kiss her on her mouth? Why should the disciples be offended by that? In fact, the very asking of the question of why Jesus would show more love to Mary than the disciples is a proof against their having been married. Otherwise, the answer would have been self-evident and the question unasked.</p>

"A *Newsweek* magazine article concluded that the theory that Jesus and Mary Magdalene were secretly married has no historical basis." (Barbara Kantrowitz and Anne Underwood, "Decoding the Da Vinci Code," *Nesweek*, December 8, 2003, p54)

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Kiss one another</b></p>		<p>"The proposal set forth in <i>The Da Vinci Code</i> is built upon one obscure verse in the Gospel of Philip. And its account, saying that Jesus 'kissed Mary Magdalene,' is subject to interpretation and isn't corroborated by any shred of reliable evidence."</p> <p>Second, another passage in <i>The Gospel of Phillip</i> (58:34-59:4) says          "For it is by a kiss that the perfect conceive and give birth. <i>For this reason we all kiss one another.</i> We receive conception from the grace which is in one another."</p> <p>Harvard Professor Karen King parallels that passage to the passage used by Brown above (Phillip 63:32-64:10) and she says that it is speaking of the kiss of fellowship between believers. She says it refers to "the intimate reception of spiritual teaching." (King, GMM, 204, n. 50)</p> <p>One more huge problem for anything at all reliable coming out of <i>The Gospel of Phillip</i> is that it is a part of the Gnostic Gospels which were written later than the four Biblical Gospels. The earliest the Gnostic Gospels, that Brown appeals to, could have been written was the mid 100's to early 200's, and the <i>Gospel of Phillip</i> itself was dated in the late 200's. (Helmbold, NH, v.3, 473 and Robinson, NHL, 38, 124, 141, 524)</p> <p>Anyone writing at this late date and claiming to be Phillip is obviously deceiving his readers right from the start. Erudite scholars try to dismiss this practice as an accepted commonality among the Gnostic Gospel writers. Precisely why none of them were accepted as canonical Scripture or even reliable historical reports regarding Jesus! A sensible person ought to be asking at this point, "Why are we even looking at these writings?"</p>
<p><b>Was Jesus required to be married?</b></p>	<p>"The social decorum during that time virtually forbid a Jewish man to be unmarried. According to Jewish</p>	<p>The other major evidence for Jesus' alleged marriage is the conclusion that          "the social decorum during that time virtually forbid a Jewish man to be unmarried. According to Jewish custom, celibacy was condemned...." (p. 245)</p>

**D:** In 1 Corinthians 9:5, Paul defends the right to be married. In his defense he says, “Do we not have the right to be accompanied by a wife, as do the other apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Cephas?” He mentions the apostles, Peter, and even the brothers of Christ as being married, but he doesn’t mention Christ himself. The crowning piece of evidence for his argument would have been to say,

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Jesus married?</b></p>	<p>"It's a matter of historical record... and Da Vinci was certainly aware of that fact. <i>The Last Supper</i> practically shouts at the viewer that Jesus and Magdalene were a pair." (p244)</p>	<p>"just as the Lord Himself was married." But he could not because, obviously Jesus was not married.</p> <p><b>E:</b> When Jesus was crucified, John 19:25 says that Jesus mother, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene were all standing by the cross. Why at this crucial point was he concerned enough to have John care for his mother, but does not express any concern at all toward or for Mary Magdalene, his alleged wife? (John 19:25-27)</p> <p><b>E:</b> In John 20:14-17, when Jesus appears to Mary after his resurrection, she at first does not recognize him, probably due to the absence of much light in the early morning hour or because of tears obscuring her vision. When Jesus calls her name, though, she turns to him and recognizes him, apparently grasping him or clinging to him. But her statement is a strange one if she were his wife. She exclaims, "Rabboni", which means "my teacher". She does not say "my dear" or "my husband", but "my teacher"! Probably the best conclusion to all the evidence is that Jesus was not married because his marriage is yet to come.</p> <p>Revelation 19:7-9 speaks of his bride, the church:        "Let us rejoice and be glad and give the glory to Him, for the marriage of the Lamb has come and His bride has made herself ready." It was given to her to clothe herself in fine linen, bright and clean; for the fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints. Then he said to me, "Write, 'Blessed are those who are invited to the marriage supper of the Lamb.'" And he said to me, "These are true words of God."</p> <p>Dr. Paul Maier, who has spent his whole academic career researching historical facts of ancient history, states concerning the evidence of Jesus being married,        "In sober fact, Jesus never wed anyone, but for years sensationalizing scholars and their novelistic popularizers have played the role of doting mothers trying to marry off an eligible son. Now, if there were even one <i>spark</i> of evidence from antiquity that Jesus even <i>may</i> have gotten</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
	<p>"I shan't bore you with the countless references to Jesus and Magdalene's union. That has been explored ad nauseam by modern historians." (p247)</p> <p>"As I said earlier, the marriage of Jesus and Mary Magdalene is part of the historical record." (p245)</p>	<p>married, then as a historian, I would have to weigh this evidence against the <i>total</i> absence of such information in either Scripture or the early church traditions. But there is no such spark—<i>not a scintilla of evidence</i> (emphasized by the author) – anywhere in historical sources. Even where one might expect to find such claims in the bizarre, second-century, apocryphal gospels—which the Jesus Seminar and other radical voices are trying so desperately to rehabilitate—there is no reference that Jesus ever got married." (Hanegraaff, DVDF, 16)</p>
<b>DID CHRIST COMMAND THAT MARY MAGDALENE SHOULD LEAD THE CHURCH?</b>		
<b>The Gospel of Mary Magdalene</b>	<p>"So He [Jesus] gives Mary Magdalene instructions on how to carry on His church after He is gone." (pp247-248)</p> <p>"Jesus was the original feminist. He intended for the future of His Church to be in the hands of Mary Magdalene." (p248)</p> <p>"This is from the Gospel of Mary Magdalene..."</p> <p>'And Peter said, 'Did the Saviour really speak with a woman without our knowledge? Are we to turn about and all listen to her? Did he prefer her to us?'</p>	<p>The <i>Gospel of Mary Magdalene</i> is <u>not</u> part of the Nag Hammadi manuscripts or Dead Sea Scrolls as seems to be inferred from <i>The Da Vinci Code</i>. There are three fragments that exist. Two fragments are from the third century and are written in Greek, and the other is from the fifth century and is written in Coptic. This passage is a portion of the Greek and a portion of the Coptic fragments. (King, GMM, 16-17)</p> <p>Brown only gave us a portion of the passage of the <i>Gospel of Mary Magdalene</i>. The context of the passage clarifies what is being discussed. The text is <i>Gospel of Mary</i> 17:10-18:21. It reads,</p> <p>"But Andrew answered and said to the brethren, 'Say what you (wish to) say about what she has said. I at least do not believe that the Savior said this. For certainly the teachings are strange ideas.' Peter answered and spoke concerning these same things. He questioned them about the Savior: "Did He really speak with a woman without our knowledge and not openly? Are we to turn</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
Mary, not Peter	<p>‘And Levi answered, “Peter, you have always been hot-tempered. Now I see you contending against the woman like an adversary. If the Saviour made her worthy, who are you indeed to reject her? Surely the Saviour knows her very well. That is why he loved her more than us.’</p>	<p>about and all listen to her? Did He prefer her to us?’ Then Mary wept and said to Peter, ‘My brother Peter, what do you think? Do you think that I have thought this up myself in my heart, or that I am lying about the Savior?’ Levi answered and said to Peter, ‘Peter, you have always been hot tempered. Now I see you contending against the woman like the adversaries. But if the Savior made her worthy, who are you indeed to reject her? Surely the Savior knows her very well. That is why He loved her more than us. Rather let us be ashamed and put on the perfect Man, and separate as He commanded us and preach the gospel, not laying down any other rule or law beyond what the Savior said.’” (Bock, BDVC, pp.25-26)</p>
	<p>The woman they are speaking of is Mary Magdalene.” (p247)</p> <p>“According to these unaltered gospels, it was not <i>Peter</i> to whom Christ gave directions with which to establish the Christian Church. It was <i>Mary Magdalene</i>.” (p248)</p>	<p>The first thing to remember when evaluating whether or not this incident really happened is that this writing was another Gnostic Gospel, written perhaps somewhere in the second century or into the third, using the name Mary (though it did not have “Magdalene” attached to it). Its late date disqualifies it from being considered as an eye witness account of an actual historical event.</p>
	<p>“And Peter is jealous of her... Peter expresses his discontent over playing second fiddle to a woman. I daresay Peter was something of a sexist.” (pp247-248)</p>	<p>The text shows that Peter isn’t the only one who contends with Mary’s ideas, but also Andrew, and it is because they thought her teachings were “strange ideas”. There is no reference whatsoever that Jesus gave Mary instructions to start the church or that Mary claimed to be given them. Peter and Andrew are not contending against Mary being commissioned to lead the church, they are contending against “strange ideas”. And Mary is not contending that Jesus commissioned her to lead the church.</p> <p>The text is not talking about church leadership, it is talking about metaphysical “powers”. (<i>Gospel of Mary</i>, pp17-19, reprinted in James M. Robinson, ed., <i>The Nag Hammadi Library</i>, San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1978; 1990 ed., pp526-527)</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
		<p>Further, Peter is not jealous about Mary being chosen to start the Church, just contesting whether or not Mary had been given special revelation from Christ apart from the rest of the disciples. This makes sense because <i>The Gospel of Mary Magdalene</i> is a Gnostic Gospel, and “special revelation” is a controversial element of Gnosticism. (Bock, BDVC 24-25) Like all the Gnostic Gospels, the difference between this one and the Biblical gospels is one of esoteric knowledge versus historical description.</p>
<b>DID MARY MAGDALENE BEAR CHRIST’S CHILD?</b>		
<b>Tribe of Benjamin</b>	<p>“Not only was Jesus Christ married, but He was a father. My dear, Mary Magdalene was the Holy Vessel. She was the chalice that bore the royal bloodline of Jesus Christ. She was the womb that bore the lineage, and the vine from which the sacred fruit sprang forth!” (p249)</p> <p>“Mary Magdalene...was of the House of Benjamin...Mary Magdalene was of royal descent...the Book of Matthew tells us that Jesus was of the House of David. A descendant of King Solomon-King of the Jews. By marrying into the powerful House of Benjamin,</p>	<p>At this point in Brown’s novel, we reach the height of fiction. The series of claims laid down in the preceding paragraph are claims which have no evidence behind them at all. There is no evidence for the “Sangreal Documents”.</p> <p>Concerning Mary’s supposed lineage as that of the tribe of Benjamin, Professor Maier states, “there is no record whatsoever of Mary’s tribal affiliation, nor of a member in the tribe of Benjamin thereby having royal blood.” (Hanegraaff, DVCFF, 18)</p> <p>At best, perhaps Brown may be conjecturing that Mary Magdalene could be of the tribe of Benjamin and that if so she and Jesus together could bring the royal lines of King David and King Saul together again. But that would be pure speculation as no genealogy of Mary Magdalene is given or exists.</p>

Fortunately, Brown provides four book titles, presumably the best historians among the “scores of historians” we could consult. Richard Abanes explains:

“Dan Brown clearly hopes to add scholarly weight and an air of credibility to his assertion about Jesus’ bloodline by using the word “historians.” Following this, four books are listed: *Holy Blood*,

## CHRIST'S ROYAL BLOODLINE

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
	<p>safe refuge in the Jewish community. It was here in France that she gave birth to a daughter. Her name was Sarah.” (p255)</p> <p>“Magdalene’s and Sarah’s lives were scrutinously chronicled by their Jewish protectors... Countless scholars of that era chronicled Mary Magdalene’s days in France, including the birth of Sarah and the subsequent family tree.” (p255)</p>	<p>All we have to go on is tradition, and there are several of those. Some traditions may report history, but many are legends, sometimes only myths. One tradition says Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Jesus finished their lives in Ephesus, although another later tradition holds that Mary, Lazarus, and another disciple named Maximinus escaped persecution by sailing across the Mediterranean Sea to a place near Arles in present day France. Mary Magdalene is credited, in this tradition, with converting the city of Provence on the Mediterranean Sea to Christ. No mention is made of any daughter in any of these traditions. One says she spent the last thirty years of her life in a hillside cave given to a life of penance.</p> <p>We have a host of historical fallacies presented as facts within this piece of fiction. As mentioned above, there is no evidence for the “Sangreal Documents” (Hanegraaff, DVCFF, 32), and Brown provides no documentation for this claim. Outside of their alleged existence, there is no evidence for Mary Magdalene and a daughter living in Gaul/France. That’s the short answer.</p>
<p><b>Who founded Paris?</b></p>	<p>“Christ’s line grew quietly under cover in France until making a bold move in the fifth century, when it intermarried with French royal blood and created a lineage known as the Merovingian bloodline.” (p257)</p> <p>“The Merovingians</p>	<p>The Merovingians did not found Paris. Abanes reviews the history of Paris which can be verified in any encyclopedia:</p> <p>“Paris was founded by a Celtic people, the Gauls, and specifically the tribe of the Parisii, who “settled there between 250-200 B.C. The city became part of the Roman Empire after being conquered in 52 B.C. by Julius Caesar. The Merovingians did not even exist at this time. They showed up hundreds of years later, when the area was taken over by the Franks, a union of western <i>Germanic</i> tribes. These tribes migrated to Belgic Gaul about A.D. 200 to 250, and under King Clovis</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
	<p>founded Paris.” (p257)</p> <p>“Kind Dagobert...a Merovingian king...assassinated by the Vatican” (pp257-258)</p> <p>“Fortunately, Dagobert’s son, Sigisbert, secretly escaped the attack and carried on the lineage, which later included Godefroi de Bouillon-founder of the Priory of Sion.” (p258)</p> <p>“Few members of the royal Merovingian</p>	<p>I (481-511), they seized control of the area now called France in about 486.</p> <p>The beginnings of the Merovingian lineage can be traced to King Merovech, who ruled from about 447 to 457—long before the Franks entered the Paris region. It was his grandson, Clovis I, who chose the <i>already existing</i> city of Paris for his capital.” (Abanes, TBDVC, 42)</p> <p>There is no evidence that King Dagobert was assassinated by the church. Most histories speak of his love for the church and the church’s respect for his good leadership. The church had every reason to appreciate him for his founding of the first great abbey of Saint-Denis, where he is buried. He is remembered in a children’s song as “Good King Dagobert”. The song likely has no historical merit as it was created during the French Revolution centuries later.</p> <p>Dagobert did have a reputation for his wise and just rulings. He apparently listened as intently to the cases of the poor as he did to those of the rich.</p> <p>King Dagobert was killed while hunting in a forest, by one of his companions. This companion had been suborned by Ebroin, mayor of the palace of Neustria. (Eddius Stephanus, <i>Via Wilfridi</i>. See Bertram Colgrave, <i>The Life of Bishop Wilfrid</i>, 1927; repr., New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985, pp66-69)</p> <p>The theory of the Merovingian bloodline being carried on through Dagobert II “relies on a very dubious event - the alleged marriage between Dagobert II and a Giselle de Razes.” (Abanes, TBDVC, 57)</p> <p>But Giselle de Razes never really existed. She was another of Pierre Plantard’s fabrications in a genealogy document he forged and placed in the Bibliothèque Nationale on 1 October 1985. (Richardson, PSH, 54 and <a href="http://www.priory-of-sion.com/psp/id84.html">www.priory-of-sion.com/psp/id84.html</a>)</p> <p>Abanes continues, “Medievalist D.L. d’Avery</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
	<p>bloodline...have survived into modern times." (p258)</p>	<p>(University College London, History Department) called this Merovingian-Godefroi theory 'amiable lunacy.' He added, 'I have consulted a good specialist in the Merovingian and Carolingian periods. She told me that she could find no evidence of the survival of the Merovingian line.... [Y]ou would be on safe ground in assuming that the Merovingian line is of no historical importance after the eighth century.'" (Abanes, TBDVC, 56, 57)</p>
<b>THE HOLY GRAIL</b>		
	<p>"The Holy Grail is not a thing. It is, in fact . . . a <i>person</i>." (p236).</p> <p>"Sophie, legend tells us the Holy Grail is a chalice - a cup. But the Grail's description as a chalice is actually an allegory to protect the true nature of the Holy Grail. That is to say, the legend uses the chalice as a <i>metaphor</i> for something far more important. 'A woman'." (pp237-238)</p> <p>"When Grail legend speaks of 'the chalice that held the blood of Christ'...it speaks, in fact, of Mary Magdalene - the female womb that carried Jesus' royal bloodline." (p249)</p>	<p>Walter Scott gave us the great line, "Oh what a tangled web we weave, when first we practice to deceive". Brown's story continues to dive deeper and deeper into a sea of conjecture to find some kind of evidence to support his position. But the more "evidence" he supplies, the more evidence the reader has, if he or she is willing to check it out, that Brown plays so fast and loose with the facts that it becomes evident he's making up much of what he calls "fact".</p> <p>1) First, and foremost, as discussed above, there is no historical evidence supporting the marriage of Christ and Mary Magdalene, or that they had a child. If they were not married and did not have a child, all speculation that the womb of Mary Magdalene is the Holy Grail is ended. It is futile speculation.</p> <p>2) All of Brown's symbology is conjecture. Many different symbols have been used for male and female as may be seen at <a href="http://www.symbols.com">www.symbols.com</a> - "the world's largest online encyclopedia of graphic symbols."</p> <p>In fact, very few of the symbols Brown gives are verified as common. That's why authors such as Abanes can confidently disclaim Brown's assertions by saying, for example, "There was no "original"</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
		<p>female sign.” (Abanes, TBDVC, 47)</p> <p>If you want to see how far from objective fact Brown is on his symbology, visit <a href="http://www.symbols.com">www.symbols.com</a>, go to their word index, and explore what symbols have been used at various times in history.</p> <p>3) As discussed earlier, there is no evidence whatsoever for the “Sangreal Documents.” (Hanegraaff, DVCFF, 32)</p>
<b>THE LAST SUPPER PAINTING</b>		
Portrayal of Judas	<p>“<i>The Last Supper</i> practically shouts at the viewer that Jesus and Magdalene were a pair.” (p243)</p>	<p>Let’s get the big picture first before we dive into some details. Remember that if Da Vinci were trying to tell us that Mary Magdalene was the Holy Grail, his belief doesn’t mean it’s true. Just because somebody believes something, doesn’t mean they got their facts right in the first place. Leonardo (1452-1519) lived almost 15 centuries removed from the life of Jesus, and was dependent upon plenty of flawed myths and legends outside the Gospel accounts concerning His life.</p> <p>Leonardo was masterful at portraying inner emotions and psychological states, and his masterpiece is a brilliant and multi-layered portrayal of the reactions of the apostles following Jesus’ prediction of betrayal.</p> <p>But rather than show the moment when Jesus directly confronts Judas (see John 13:26-27), Leonardo depicts the very moment following Jesus’ statement, “Truly, truly, I say to you, one of you will betray me” (John 13:21). But the traditional gesture of Christ offering the bread to Judas, a gesture of denunciation and accusation, has been omitted by Leonardo; and the meaning and resonance of Christ’s words are grasped only in the reactions of the apostles, which spread like a chain from one end of the table to the other.”          (Anna Maria Brizzio, Maria Vittoria Brugnoli, and Andre Chastel, <i>Leonardo the Artist</i>, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980, p49)</p>
Where is John?	<p>“How about the one seated in the place</p>	<p>Is the figure to the right of Jesus really the figure of Mary instead of John? <i>Slate</i> magazine said “a</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>The knife</b></p>	<p>of honor, at the right hand of the Lord...The individual had flowing red hair, delicate folded hands, and the hint of a bosom. It was without a doubt...female" (p243)</p>	<p>girlish-looking figure in a painting isn't proof that Mary was present at the Last Supper, let alone that Jesus and Mary were married. At best, it only reflects what Leonardo wanted to put in the painting!</p> <p>The fact that John does look admittedly feminine is easily explained. Bruce Boucher, Curator of European Decorative Arts and Sculpture at the Art Institute of Chicago answers that "St. John was invariably represented as a beautiful young man". According to Boucher, the femininity is the way Florentine artists traditionally depicted John. (Boucher, DDVCCL)</p> <p>This approach can be seen in other paintings of the period, including Leonardo's own <i>Saint John the Baptist</i> (ca. 1413–1416), which depicts a young man who is quite effeminate in appearance and also has flowing hair and delicate hands.</p> <p>Further, if the person to Jesus' right is indeed Mary Magdalene, then where is John in the painting? There are thirteen figures in the painting. We know that the Last Supper included Jesus and his twelve disciples. So, if Mary was also in the painting then there would have to be fourteen people at the table, which there are not. (Hanegraaff, DVCFF, 26)</p> <p>And before you think that maybe Judas is not in the painting, look for the guy clutching the money bag just in front of Peter.</p> <p>In <i>The Last Supper</i>, Steinberg writes, St. Andrew (from left to right)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"is followed by Peter, Judas, and John, the three whose identity in the mural was never doubted." (Steinberg, <i>Leonardo's Incessant Last Supper</i>, 76)</p> <p>These three have distinctive qualities: Peter's intense movement forward and wielding of the knife</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<b>Same color clothes</b>	<p>"Notice that Jesus and Magdalene are clothed as mere images of one another." (p243)</p>	<p>(prefiguring his use of a sword in the Garden), Judas recoiling and grasping the bag of money (he was the treasurer for the group - see John 13:29), and John's youthful appearance and contemplative pose.</p> <p>The fact that Christ and this person to his right have on clothes that were inverse colors can also be used as an argument for this person being John, considering the fact that John was the "disciple whom Jesus loved".</p> <p>Da Vinci may just as easily have been trying to show this special relationship by painting their clothes with inverse colors. In fact, if Brown is correct in identifying Leonardo as "a flamboyant homosexual" (a debated point), he may have wanted to picture John in this way to suggest a homosexual nuance of "the disciple whom Jesus loved".</p> <p>Too, the colors worn by Jesus and John are not exactly the inverse of each other. In truth, depending on the quality of the print you are viewing, the Pantone RGB values and their shadings are going to be markedly different for the supposed inverse colors.</p>
<b>Peter</b>	<p>"That's Peter there. You can see that Da Vinci was well aware of how Peter felt about Mary Magdalene...Peter was leaning menacingly toward Mary Magdalene and slicing his blade-like hand across her neck." (p248)</p>	<p>What about Peter's menacingly look at "Mary"(John)? Actually, it looks more like he is leaning in to talk to John. That is why John's head is tilted towards Peter as if Peter is whispering into his ear. Peter does have an angry look on his face, but that is probably because Jesus has just announced his betrayal, and Peter is trying to question John about it, just as depicted in the Gospel of John (13:21-26).</p>
<b>The "dagger" in Peter's hand</b>	<p>"And here too', Langdon said, pointing now to the crowd of disciples near Peter. 'A bit</p>	<p>The blade-like hand is actually Peter putting his hand on John's shoulder to talk to him. The disembodied hand holding a dagger is also Peter's. "Anyone can replicate his position by copying his movements. First, he rises from being seated, and</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
	ominous, no?' Sophie squinted and saw a hand emerging from the crowd of disciples. 'Is that hand wielding a <i>dagger</i> ?' (p248)	then turns left to speak with John. While doing so, he moves the knife he is holding downward, turning his arm counterclockwise, <i>away</i> from the direction he is moving, keeping his elbow flexed and wrist bent upside down." It is probable that this part of the painting is foreshadowing Peter using the dagger in the Garden of Gethsemane. (Abanes, TBDVC, 75) There is a "Last Supper" study sketch that Leonardo made for Peter's right arm that supports that explanation. (Marani, LVCP, 231)
<b>OTHER PIECES OF ARTWORK</b>		
<b>Madonna of the Rocks error</b>	<p>"All descriptions of artwork, architecture, documents, and secret rituals in this novel are accurate" (p2)</p> <p>"A five-foot-tall canvas [The Madonna of the Rocks]" (pp131-133)</p> <p>"The painting [Madonna on the rocks] showed a blue-robed Virgin Mary sitting with her arm around an infant child, presumably Baby Jesus. Opposite Mary sat Uriel, also with an infant, presumably baby John the Baptist. Oddly, though, rather than the usual Jesus-blessing-John scenario, it was baby <i>John</i> who was</p>	<p>Brown twice describes the first painting [The Madonna of the Rocks] as a "a five-foot-tall canvas" (pp131-133), whereas it is actually about 6.5 feet tall. In reality, Sophie's action would be a remarkable feat, for the painting, at six and a half feet in height, and in a wooden frame, is undoubtedly very heavy and awkward.</p> <p>Art historians and scholars have always understood that the infant on the left, under the right arm of the Virgin Mary, is John the Baptist; the infant on the right common next to the angel Uriel, is Jesus. The angel supports the Christ Child, "emphasizing his divinity." (Field, <i>Leonardo Da Vinci</i>, 153)</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>The secret of Mona Lisa</b></p>	<p>blessing Jesus...and Jesus was submitting to his authority!" (p138)</p>	<p><i>The Dictionary of Art</i> states that :          "Mona Lisa" comes from <i>Mona</i>, or "M'lady" - a common title respect in Florence in the 16th century - and "Lisa", possibly the wife of Francisco del Giocondo, a local merchant. <i>The Dictionary of Art</i> claims that the sitter was "M [ad] o [n] na Lisa", the wife of Francesco del Giocondo (hence the painting's alternate name, <i>La Gioconda</i>) was confirmed in 1991 "with the publications of the 1525 death inventory of Leonardo's assistant of thirty years, Gian Giaconno Caprotti, who seems to have been in possession of a number of his master's works, including this portrait." (Jane Turner, ed., <i>The Dictionary of Art</i>, vol. 19, New York: Macmillan, 1996, p185)</p> <p>Vezzosi writes that it is "absurd" to think that the <i>Mona Lisa</i> depicts Leonardo as a woman.</p> <p><i>The Encyclopedia World Art</i> states,          "Questions concerning the sitter's personality are of doubtful value. The <i>Mona Lisa</i> represents the ideal female portrait, the type continued from Raphael to Corot." (<i>Encyclopedia of World Art</i>, p216)</p> <p>I emphasize, however, that even if Leonardo did believe and paint with the motives Dan Brown alleges, that in itself does not provide an iota of evidence that this 15<sup>th</sup> century painter and inventor knew anything more accurately about the 1<sup>st</sup> century than what has come down to us in the historical record. Not unless he really possessed "four trunks" full of authentic documents concerning "the Holy</p>
	<p>"Her [Mona Lisa] name is an anagram of the divine union of male and female." (p121)</p> <p>"Computerized analysis of the Mona Lisa and Da Vinci's self-portraits confirm some startling points of congruency in their faces. Whatever Da Vinci was up to...his Mona Lisa is neither male nor female. It carries a subtle message of androgyny. It is a fusing of both." (p120)</p>	

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
		Grail” along with the bones of Mary Magdalene. It makes one wonder, has the Catholic Church really been all that powerful, and the keepers of this secret so weak and uninventive, that in almost 2,000 years they could not figure out a way to make their secrets a matter of public historical record anywhere in the world?
<b>DA VINCI CODE &amp; JESUS CHRIST</b>		
<p><b>The Resurrection</b></p>	<p>“Jesus was viewed by His followers as a mortal prophet . . . a great and powerful man, but a <i>man</i> nonetheless. A mortal.” (p233)</p> <p>“Many scholars claim that the early Church literally <i>stole</i> Jesus from his original followers, hijacking His human message, shrouding it in an impenetrable cloak of divinity, and using it to expand their own power.” (p233)</p>	<p>Sometimes tantalizing bits of information can get you off track in discovering reality. Throughout the course of Dan Brown’s novel approach to seeing Jesus through the eyes of contrived symbols, he has forgotten a central truth: When the first disciples began to spread the message about Jesus, they appealed primarily to two amazing realities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) That Jesus had been literally raised from the dead bodily,</li> <li>2) That Jesus had fulfilled Old Testament prophecies predicting the identity of the Messiah.</li> </ol> <p>We’ll go back to Brown’s assertions about Jesus not being God in this chapter, but it is important first that we take a brief look at Jesus’ resurrection and the claim that He fulfilled Messianic prophecy.</p>
<p><b>Was the Resurrection of Christ fact or fallacy?</b></p>		<p><b>Was the Resurrection of Christ fact or fallacy?</b>  After more than seven hundred hours of studying this subject and thoroughly investigating its foundation, I have come to the conclusion that the resurrection of Jesus Christ is one of the <i>most wicked, vicious, heartless hoaxes ever foisted upon the minds of men</i>, OR it is the most fantastic fact of history.</p>
<p><b>The centrality of the Resurrection</b></p>		<p>Dr. William Lane Craig writes:  “Without the belief in the resurrection the Christian</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
		<p>faith could not have come into being. The disciples would have remained crushed and defeated men. Even had they continued to remember Jesus as their beloved teacher, his crucifixion would have forever silenced any hopes of his being the Messiah. The cross would have remained the sad and shameful end of his career. The origin of Christianity therefore hinges on the belief of the early disciples that God had raised Jesus from the dead.” (Craig, KTR, 116-17)</p> <p>The Apostle Paul recognized how central the truth of Christ’s resurrection was to the Christian faith. He put it very simply:</p> <p>“...if Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is vain, your faith also is vain. ... and if Christ has not been raised, your faith is worthless; you are still in your sins.” (1 Corinthians 15:14,17)</p> <p>H. P. Liddon says:</p> <p>“Faith in the resurrection is the very keystone of the arch of Christian faith, and, when it is removed, all must inevitably crumble into ruin.” (Liddon, as cited in Smith, TS, 577)</p> <p>Christ predicted His resurrection in an unmistakable and straightforward manner. While His disciples simply couldn’t understand it, the Jews took His assertions quite seriously.</p> <p>Dr. Bernard Ramm remarks:</p> <p>“Taking the Gospel record as faithful history there can be no doubt that Christ Himself anticipated His death and resurrection, and plainly declared it to His disciples. . . . The gospel writers are quite frank to admit that such predictions really did not penetrate their minds till the resurrection was a fact (John 20:9). But the evidence is there from the mouth of our Lord that He would come back from the dead after three days. He told them that He would be put to death violently, through the cause of hatred, and would rise the third day. All this came to pass.” (Ramm, PCE, 191)</p>

“We are told on eyewitness authority that “blood and water” came out of the pierced side of Jesus

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p data-bbox="201 1087 407 1184"><b>Everyone knew the location of the tomb.</b></p> <p data-bbox="201 1619 386 1682"><b>The body was encased.</b></p>		<p data-bbox="781 365 1435 827">(John 19:34,35). The eyewitness clearly attached great importance to this. Had Jesus been alive when the spear pierced His side, strong spouts of blood would have emerged with every heart beat. Instead, the observer noticed semi-solid dark red clot seeping out, distinct and separate from the accompanying watery serum. This is evidence of massive clotting of the blood in the main arteries, and is exceptionally strong medical proof of death. It is all the more impressive because the evangelist could not possibly have realized its significance to a pathologist. The “blood and water” from the spear-thrust is proof positive that Jesus was already dead.” (Green, MA, 33)</p> <p data-bbox="748 858 1414 1058">Every few years someone new comes along to propose some way, as the Muslims believe, that Jesus really did not die on the cross. Given the above representation of a large amount of historical data, the burden of proof continues to be on those who say Jesus was not really dead.</p> <p data-bbox="748 1089 1268 1121"><b>Everyone knew the location of the tomb.</b></p> <p data-bbox="781 1125 1419 1587">“On the next day, which followed the Day of Preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees gathered together to Pilate, saying, ‘Sir, we remember, while He was still alive, how that deceiver said, “After three days I will rise.” Therefore command that the tomb be made secure until the third day, lest His disciples come by night and steal Him away, and say to the people, “He has risen from the dead.” So the last deception will be worse than the first.’ Pilate said to them, ‘You have a guard; go your way, make it as secure as you know how.’ So they went and made the tomb secure, sealing the stone and setting the guard” (Matthew 27:62-66).</p> <p data-bbox="748 1619 1057 1650"><b>The body was encased.</b></p> <p data-bbox="781 1654 1435 1854">“He [Joseph of Arimathea] came . . . and Nicodemus . . . also came . . . bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pounds. Then they took the body of Jesus, and bound it in strips of linen with the spices, as the custom of the Jews is to bury” (John 19:38-40).</p>

"The opening to the central chamber was guarded by a large and heavy disc of rock which

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p>The tomb was sealed with a guard stationed at the tomb.</p>		<p>could roll along a groove slightly depressed at the centre, in front of the tomb entrance.” (Holloman, EPR, 38)</p> <p>T. J. Thorburn mentions that this stone was used “as a protection against both men and beasts.”</p> <p>He further observes:          “This stone is often mentioned by the Talmudists. According to Maimonides, a structure <i>ex linga, alia Materia</i> was also used.”</p> <p>Of the enormous size of such a stone Dr. Thorburn comments:          “It usually required several men to remove it.”          Since the one rolled to the entrance of Jesus’ tomb was intended to prevent an expected theft, it was probably even larger than what would normally have been used! (Thorburn, RNMC, 97-98)</p> <p>Alfred Edersheim, the Hebrew-Christian who is an exceptionally good source for the historical background of the New Testament times, relates the following concerning Jesus’ burial:          “And so they laid Him to rest in the niche of the rock-hewn new tomb. And as they went out, they rolled, as was the custom, a ‘great stone’—the <i>Golel</i>—to close the entrance to the tomb, probably leaning against it for support, as was the practice, a smaller stone—the so-called <i>Dopheg</i>. It would be where the one stone was laid against the other, that on the next day, the Sabbath though it was, the Jewish authorities would have affixed the seal, so that the slightest disturbance might become apparent.” (Edersheim, LTJM, 618)</p> <p><b>The tomb was sealed with a guard stationed at the tomb.</b>          “So they went and made the tomb secure, sealing the stone and setting the guard.” (Matthew 27:66)</p> <p>A. T. Robertson says that the method of sealing the stone at Jesus’ tomb was          “...probably by a cord stretched across the stone and sealed at each end as in Daniel 6:17 [“And a</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
A Roman guard		<p>stone was brought and laid over the mouth of the den; and the king sealed it with his own signet ring and with the signets of his nobles, so that nothing might be changed in regard to Daniel"]. The sealing was done in the presence of the Roman guards who were left in charge to protect this stamp of Roman authority and power. They did their best to prevent theft and the resurrection (Bruce), but they overreached themselves and provided additional witness to the fact of the empty tomb and the resurrection of Jesus (Plummer)." (Robertson, WPNT, 239)</p> <p>D. D. Whedon says:        "The door could not be opened, therefore, without breaking the seal; which was a crime against the authority of the proprietor of the seal. The guard was to prevent the duplicity of the disciples; the seal was to secure against the collusion of the guard." (Whedon, CGM, 343)</p> <p>Arndt and Gingrich (<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament</i>, University of Chicago Press, 1952) cite the following sources wherein the word for guard, <i>koustodia</i>, is found:        "POxy. 294,20 [22 ad]; PRyl. 189,2; BGU 341,3; cf. Hahn 233,6; 234,7 w. lit. Lat. loanw., custodia, also in rabb.)." (Arndt, GEL, 448)</p> <p>They define it as being        "a guard composed of soldiers" (Matthew 27:66; 28:11), . . . "take a guard." (Matthew 27:65) (Arndt, GEL, 448)</p> <p>Harold Smith, in <i>A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels</i>, gives the following information on the Roman guard:        "GUARD.—1. RV rendering of [koustodia] (Lat. <i>custodia</i>), Matthew. 27:65, 66; 28:11, AV 'watch'; obtained by the chief priests and Pharisees from Pilate to guard the sepulchre. The need of Pilate's authorization and the risk of punishment from him (Matthew. 28:14) show that this guard must have consisted, not of the Jewish Temple police, but of soldiers from the Roman cohort at Jerusalem; possibly, though not probably, the same as had</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Punishment for failure</b></p> <p><b>Vegetius</b></p>		<p>guarded the cross. . . . [You have] is probably imperative, 'have (take) a guard.' " (Smith, as cited in Hastings, DCG, 694)</p> <p>Matthew 28:14 confirms the view that they were a Roman guard and directly responsible to Pilate:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"And if this should come to the governor's ears, we will win him over and keep you out of trouble."</p> <p>If they were the "temple police," why worry about Pilate hearing about it? The temple police were only responsible to the Sanhedrin.</p> <p>When it comes to the topic of the Roman guard, William Smith, in the <i>Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities</i>, gives us some information about the number of men in a Roman "guard." According to Dr. Smith, the maniple (a subdivision of the Roman legion) consisting of either 120 or 60 men:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"furnished . . . for the tribune to whom it was specially attached . . . two guards . . . of four men each, who kept watch, some in front of the tent and some behind, among the horses. We may remark in passing, that four was the regular number for a Roman guard . . . of these one always acted as a sentinel, while the others enjoyed a certain degree of repose, ready, however, to start up at the first alarm." (Smith, William, DGRA, 250-51)</p> <p>George Currie says,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"The punishment for quitting post was death, according to the laws (Dion. Hal, <i>Antiq. Rom.</i> VIII.79). The most famous discourse on the strictness of camp discipline is that of Polybius VI. 37, 38, which indicates that the fear of punishments produced faultless attention to duty, especially in the night watches. It carries weight from the prestige of the author, who was describing what he had an opportunity to see with his own eyes. His statements are duplicated in a general way by others." (Currie, MDR, 41-43)</p> <p>Currie continues,</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>The disciples went their own way.</b></p>		<p>“Vegetius speaks of daily attention to strictness of discipline by the prefect of the legion (<i>Military Institutes</i> 11.9). And Vegetius certainly maintains (<i>Military Institutes</i> 1.21) that the earlier Romans [at the time of Christ] disciplined more strictly than those of his day.” (Currie, MDR, 43-44)</p> <p>Currie, in speaking of Vegetius’s comments on the Roman army, says:</p> <p>“The system he described provided for the severest punishment. The classicum was the signal blown on the trumpet to announce an execution (11.22). Daily attention to strictness of discipline was the duty of the prefect of the legion (11.9).” (Currie, MDR, 49-50)</p> <p>If by chance the guard was not a Roman guard, but the Temple police, the discipline was still strict. Alfred Edersheim gives us this description of the tight discipline under which the temple guard worked:</p> <p>“During the night the ‘captain of the Temple’ made his rounds. On his approach the guards had to rise and salute him in a particular manner. Any guard found asleep when on duty was beaten, or his garments were set on fire—a punishment, as we know, actually awarded. Hence the admonition to us who, as it were, are here on Temple guard, ‘Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments’ [Revelation 16:15].” (Edersheim, TMS, 147-49)</p> <p><b>The disciples went their own way.</b></p> <p>In his Gospel, Matthew shows us the cowardice of the disciples (26:56). Jesus had been arrested in the garden of Gethsemane and</p> <p>“then all the disciples forsook Him and fled.”</p> <p>Mark writes in his Gospel (14:50):</p> <p>“Then they all forsook Him and fled.”</p> <p>George Hanson remarks:</p> <p>“They were not naturally either very brave or large-minded. In the most cowardly fashion, when their Master was arrested, they ‘all forsook Him’ and fled, leaving Him to face His fate alone.” (Hanson, RL, 24-26)</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p>The tomb was empty.</p>		<p>Albert Roper speaks of Simon Peter's "cringing under the taunt of a maid in the court of the high priests and denying with a curse that he knew 'this man of whom ye speak.'" (Roper, JRD, 50)</p> <p>He asserts that "fear, abject fear for his own personal safety, brought Peter to reject the Man he truly loved. Fear, craven fear, made him recreant to the One who had called him from his nets to become a fisher of men." (Roper, DJRD, 52)</p> <p><b>The tomb was empty.</b>        Professor William Lane Craig, one of the preeminent researchers on Christ's resurrection today, says of the empty tomb that it        "...is a <i>sine qua non</i> of the resurrection. The notion that Jesus rose from the dead with a new body while his old body still lay in the grave is a modern conception. Jewish mentality would never have accepted a division of two bodies. Even if the disciples failed to check the empty tomb, the Jewish authorities could have been guilty of no such oversight. When therefore the disciples began to preach the resurrection in Jerusalem and people responded, and when religious authorities stood helplessly by, the tomb must have been empty. The simple fact that the Christian fellowship, founded on belief in Jesus' resurrection, came into existence and flourished in the very city where he was executed and buried is powerful evidence for the historicity of the empty tomb." (Craig, "DJRD," as cited in Wilkins, JUF, 151-52)</p> <p>W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, citing Julius Wellhausen, the famous German scholar noted for his higher criticism of the Old Testament, gives Wellhausen's testimony concerning the resurrection of Christ:        "It is admitted that with the Resurrection the body of Jesus also had vanished from the grave, and it will be impossible to account for this on natural grounds." (Sparrow-Simpson, as cited in Hastings, DCG, 508)</p>

“‘rolled up’ is ambiguous, the twisted napkin I suppose formed a ring like the roll of a turban loosened, without the central part.” (Latham, RM, 36)

“Here the soldiers would have practically no other alternative than to trust to the good offices of the priests. The body (we will suppose) was *gone*, and their negligence in *any* case would (under ordinary circumstances) be punishable by death (cp. Acts xii. 19).” (Thorburn, RNMC, 179-82)

"The most drastic way of dismissing the evidence would be to say that these stories were mere fabrications, that they were pure lies. But, so far as I know, not a single critic today would take such an attitude. In fact, it would really be an

Paul Little asks:

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Acts 2</b></p>		<p>“Are these men, who helped transform the moral structure of society, consummate liars or deluded madmen? These alternatives are harder to believe than the fact of the Resurrection, and there is no shred of evidence to support them.” (Little, KWhyB, 63)</p> <p>Look at the changed life of James, the brother of Jesus.</p> <p>Before the resurrection he despised all that his brother stood for. He thought Christ’s claims were blatant pretension and served only to ruin the family name.</p> <p>After the resurrection, though, James is found with the other disciples preaching the gospel of their Lord. His epistle describes well the new relationship that he had with Christ. He describes himself as “a bondservant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ” (James 1:1). The only explanation for this change in his life is that which Paul gives: “After that He [Jesus] was seen by James” (1 Corinthians 15:7).</p> <p>J. N. D. Anderson comments:</p> <p>“Think of the character of the witnesses, men and women who gave the world the highest ethical teaching it has ever known, and who even on the testimony of their enemies lived it out in their lives. Think of the psychological absurdity of picturing a little band of defeated cowards cowering in an upper room one day and a few days later transformed into a company that no persecution could silence—and then attempting to attribute this dramatic change to nothing more convincing than a miserable fabrication they were trying to foist upon the world. That simply wouldn’t make sense.” (Anderson, “RJC,” 5–6)</p> <p>To the above may be added the fact that the resurrected Jesus, still alive today, is still changing lives. I know this fact from personal experience, for He transformed my life because He is alive. I share that story in the last chapter of this book.</p> <p><b>Acts 2:</b> Luke records Peter’s sermon on the day of Pentecost. There was no refutation given by the</p>

Thomas Arnold was for fourteen years the famous headmaster of Rugby, author of the famous three-volume *History of Rome*, appointed to the chair of modern history at Oxford, and certainly a man well

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Could the church have rigged the fulfilled Messianic prophecies in Jesus?</b></p>		<p>acquainted with the value of evidence in determining historical facts. Speaking of the evidence for Christ's resurrection, this great scholar remarked:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"Thousands and tens of thousands of persons have gone through it piece by piece, as carefully as every judge summing up on a most important cause. I have myself done it many times over, not to persuade others but to satisfy myself. I have been used for many years to study the histories of other times, and to examine and weigh the evidence of those who have written about them, and I know of no one fact in the history of mankind which is proved by better and fuller evidence of every sort, to the understanding of a fair inquirer, than the great sign which God hath given us that Christ died and rose again from the dead."(Arnold, as cited in Smith, TS, 425-26)</p> <p><b>Could the church have rigged the fulfilled Messianic prophecies in Jesus?</b></p> <p>In his first letter to those at Corinth, the Apostle Paul sets forth in clear terms the mission of his life:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"For I delivered to you first of all that which I also received: that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures" (1 Corinthians 15:3,4)</p> <p>He had been the recipient of historical reports about Jesus and their significance as given hundreds of years earlier in the Old Testament. Jesus had appeared to him, and Paul, a leading Pharisee and student of the Hebrew scriptures was able to see that the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ were all "according to the Scriptures", a phrase he emphasizes by stating it twice in one sentence.</p> <p>What becomes clear is that Jesus' disciples were not the first to write about Him? No, they weren't. And it certainly wasn't the Gnostics or pseudepigraphal writers; they tried to add to and reinterpret the eyewitness accounts of the New Testament writers. No, the first to write about Christ actually wrote hundreds of years, in some cases more than a thousand years before His incarnation, His birth. These were the prophets of old.</p>

PROPHECY	FULFILLMENT
<p>"But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, Though you are little among the thousands of Judah, Yet out of you shall come forth to Me The One to be Ruler in Israel, whose goings forth are from of old, From everlasting." —Micah 5:2</p>	<p>"Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea." —Matthew 2:1 (See also Matt. 2:4; Luke 2:4-7, John 7:42.)</p> <p>"And He is before [or, has existed prior to] all things, and in Him all things consist." —Colossians 1:17 (See also John 17:5, 24; Rev. 1:1, 2; 1:17; 2:8; 8:58; 22:13.)</p>

“My God, my God, why have You forsaken me?... All who see me sneer at me; they separate with the lip, they wag the head, saying, “Commit yourself to the Lord; let Him deliver him; Let Him rescue him, because He delights in him.” ... I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint; my heart is like wax; it is melted within me. My strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue cleaves to my jaws; and You lay me in the dust of death. For dogs have surrounded me; A band of evildoers has encompassed me; they pierced my hands and my feet. I can count all my bones. They look, they stare at me; they divide my garments among them, and for my clothing they cast lots.” (Vs. 1,7,8,14-18)

1) First of all, this was contrary to Jesus' honest character as noted above. It assumes He was one of the greatest deceivers of all time. It presupposes that He was not even a good person, to say nothing of

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Objection Two: Fulfilled Prophecy in Jesus Was Coincidental—an Accident.</b></p>		<p>the perfect man the Gospels affirm Him to be. There are several lines of evidence that combine to demonstrate that this is a completely implausible thesis.</p> <p><b>2)</b> Second, there is no way Jesus could have controlled many events necessary for the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies about the Messiah. For example, He had no control over where He would be born (Micah 5:2), how He would be born of a virgin (Isaiah 7:14), when He would die (Daniel 9:25), what tribe (Genesis. 49:10) and lineage He would be from (2 Samuel 7:12), or other facts about His life that have corresponded to prophecy.</p> <p><b>3)</b> Third, there is no way short of being supernatural that Jesus could have manipulated the events and people in His life to respond in exactly the way necessary for it to appear that He was fulfilling all these prophecies, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John’s heralding Him (Matthew 3),</li> <li>• His accuser’s reactions (Matthew 27:12),</li> <li>• How the soldiers cast lots for His garments (John 19:23, 24), and</li> <li>• How they would pierce His side with a spear (John 19:34).</li> </ul> <p>Indeed even Schonfield admits that the plot failed when the Romans actually pierced Christ. The fact is that anyone with all this power would have to be divine—the very thing the Passover hypothesis attempts to avoid. In short, it takes a bigger miracle to believe the <i>Passover Plot</i> than to accept these prophecies as supernatural. (Geisler, BECA, 585)</p> <p><b>Objection Two: Fulfilled Prophecy in Jesus Was Coincidental—an Accident.</b></p> <p>“Why, you could find some of these prophecies fulfilled in the deaths of Kennedy, King, Nasser, and other great figures,” replies the critic.</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> Yes, one could possibly find one or two prophecies fulfilled in the lives of other men, but not</p>

"We find that the chance that any man might have lived down to the present time and fulfilled all eight prophecies is 1 in  $10^{17}$  (10 to the 17<sup>th</sup> power). That would be 1 in 100,000,000,000,000,000 (17 zeros

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Probability of 48 prophecies being fulfilled</b></p>		<p>after the one). In order to help us comprehend this staggering probability, Stoner illustrates it by supposing that “we take <math>10^{17}</math> silver dollars and lay them on the face of Texas. They will cover all of the state two feet deep. Now mark one of these silver dollars and stir the whole mass thoroughly, all over the state. Blindfold a man and tell him that he can travel as far as he wishes, but he must pick up one silver dollar and say that this is the right one. What chance would he have of getting the right one? Just the same chance that the prophets would have had of writing these eight prophecies and having them all come true in any one man, from their day to the present time, providing they wrote them according to their own wisdom.</p> <p>Now these prophecies were either given by inspiration of God or the prophets just wrote them as they thought they should be. In such a case the prophets had just one chance in <math>10^{17}</math> of having them come true in any man, but they all came true in Christ. This means that the fulfillment of these eight prophecies alone proves that God inspired the writing of those prophecies to a definiteness which lacks only one chance in <math>10^{17}</math> of being absolute.” (Stoner, SS, 100-107)</p> <p>Stoner considers forty-eight prophecies and reports, “We find the chance that any one man fulfilled all 48 prophecies to be 1 in <math>10^{157}</math>. This is really a large number and it represents an extremely small chance. Let us try to visualize it. The silver dollar, which we have been using, is entirely too large. We must select a smaller object. The electron is about as small an object as we know of. It is so small that it will take 2.5 times <math>10^{15}</math> of them laid side by side to make a line, single file, one inch long. If we were going to count the electrons in this line one inch long, and counted 250 each minute, and if we counted day and night, it would take us 19,000,000 years to count just the one-inch line of electrons. If we had a cubic inch of these electrons and we tried to count them it would take us, counting steadily 250 each minute, 19,000,000 times 19,000,000 times 19,000,000 years or <math>6.9 \times 10^{21}</math> years.” (Stoner, SS, 109, 110)</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Did Jesus and/or His followers claim that He was God?</b></p>		<p>Such is the chance of any individual fulfilling forty-eight prophecies. The only way it could happen is if there were a supernatural and all-knowing God who:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) works within history,</li> <li>2) knows the beginning from the end, and</li> <li>3) reveals what is going to take place to certain individuals who will proclaim the message ahead of the time of its fulfillment.</li> </ol> <p>The study of fulfilled Messianic prophecy is a fascinating subject. Some prophecies, such as Daniel 9:24-27 which I believe predicts to the day the time of Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem, are utterly amazing. See my book, <i>The New Evidence That Demands A Verdict</i> for more detail and to help you get started in this study.</p> <p><b>Did Jesus and/or His followers claim that He was God?</b></p> <p>The question, then, is "Did Jesus and those who immediately followed after Him actually claim that He was God?" I believe in hundreds of different statements and actions He and they most definitely did proclaim His deity.</p> <p>Earlier I documented evidence which I believe incontrovertibly shows that the New Testament documents are historically accurate. These documents also originated shortly after the events they discuss, in the first century, and are the primary documents the followers of Christ have viewed as authentic and even inspired. Now I want to reproduce some of the things said or done by or around Jesus that proclaimed His deity.</p> <p>My argument right up front is this: If Christ claimed to be God, performed works that only God could do, was raised bodily from the dead so that He appeared alive to His disciples, and His followers continued to spread that message even at the loss of their own lives when proclaiming it, then Jesus had to be who He claimed to be.</p> <p>More on that later. For now, is it true that Jesus and/or His followers affirmed that He was God?</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Statements by Jesus</b></p>		<p>The importance of this question is all the more highlighted by the fact that Jesus and His disciples were all Jews. They were not from the kind of culture or religious background that lent itself to calling any great individual a god. No. These were Jews who had been impressed upon for over 2,000 years that there is only one God, the creator, and it is an abomination to make any one other than God, God! One devastation after another, repeated conquests by other nations of them, and their exportation as slaves into other nations had taught them well, there is only one God—do not turn from Him to any other. I believe there are statements or actions by Jesus and His disciples declaring His deity on just about every page of the New Testament, so I can only reproduce a representative few here:</p> <p><b>Statements by Jesus:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Matthew 28:18-20:</b> “All authority has been given to Me in heaven and on earth. Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age.” (Only God has all authority.)</li> <li>• <b>Luke 23: 42, 43:</b> A thief on the cross next to Jesus asked Him to remember him when He comes into His kingdom. Jesus responds by saying, “Truly I say to you, today you shall be with Me in Paradise.” Jesus took it upon himself to grant the thief paradise. (Only God can permit entrance to paradise.)</li> <li>• <b>John 5:23, 24:</b> “He who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent him. Most assuredly, I say unto you, he who hears My word and believes in Him who sent Me has everlasting life, and shall not come into judgment, but has passed on from death to life.”</li> <li>• <b>John 8:19:</b> “You know neither Me nor My Father. If you had known Me, you would have known My Father also.”</li> <li>• <b>John 14:1:</b> “You believe in God, believe also in Me.” Notice he did not say “believe me”. All of us say that. He said “believe in Me”... in the same</li> </ul>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
		<p>way he said to believe in God, as deity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>John 14:6-7, 9-11:</b> “I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father but through Me. If you had known Me, you would have known My Father also; from now on you know Him, and have seen Him. ... He who has seen Me has seen the Father; ... Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me? The words that I say to you I do not speak on My own initiative, but the Father abiding in Me does His works. Believe Me that I am in the Father and the Father is in Me; otherwise believe because of the works themselves.”</li> <li>• <b>Mark 14: 61-62:</b> “Again the high priest was questioning Him, and saying to Him, ‘Are You the Christ the Son of the Blessed One?’ And Jesus said, ‘I am; and you shall see the son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.’” Right here the high priest asks Christ of His deity and Jesus responded with an emphatic yes, quoting the Old Testament announcement of the coming of the Messiah!</li> <li>• <b>Mark 2: 5:</b> “Seeing their faith, Jesus said to the paralyzed man, ‘Son, your sins are forgiven.’” Once again Jesus takes it upon himself to do something that no man has the authority to do, forgive sin. Some people might say that Jesus was just simply stating the fact that his sins would be forgiven and not actually granting it. Or some may say that Jesus was personally forgiving this man, and not actually clearing his debt to God. These assumptions sound good but are actually disproved in the next two verses. That is where we see the people’s response to Jesus. If Jesus was simply stating a fact or personally forgiving this man then it wouldn’t have been a big deal and there would not have been a negative reaction. But there was. Verses 6 and 7 tell us that after Jesus forgave the paralytic, the scribes reasoned in their hearts, “Why does this Man speak blasphemies like this? Who can forgive sins but God alone?” You see, it is by the scribes’ response that we see what it was that Christ was actually doing. He was granting forgiveness of sins, something that</li> </ul>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p>Who do you say HE is?</p>		<p>only God could do.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>John 19:</b> When Jesus was put on trial we are told one of the reasons he was on trial. Pilate was going to release him, but the Jews responded, "We have a law, and by that law He ought to die because He made himself out <i>to be</i> the Son of God."(vs. 7). Some may say, "Well we are all sons and daughters of God." Obviously Jesus was not considering himself in the same son status as everyone else, or he wouldn't have been put on trial for his claim. He was making a claim worthy of death. And that claim was not that he was a son of God, but the Son of God.</li> <li>• <b>John 10:</b> After claiming in vs. 28, "I give eternal life to them", he states in vs. 30, "I and the Father are one." The Jewish leaders understood what He was claiming and tried to stone him. Jesus questioned them as to why they wanted to stone him and they responded, "For a good work we do not stone You, but for blasphemy; and because You, being a man, make Yourself out <i>to be</i> God."(vs. 34) If Jesus was not claiming to be deity then why were the Jews consistently responding to him as though He were.</li> </ul> <p>Jesus thought it was fundamentally important what others believed about Him. It was not a subject that allowed for neutrality or a less than honest appraisal of the evidence. C. S. Lewis, the great professor of English literature at Cambridge University and a former agnostic, captured this truth in his book <i>Mere Christianity</i>. After surveying some of the evidence regarding Jesus' identity, Lewis writes:</p> <p>"I am trying here to prevent anyone saying the really foolish thing that people often say about Him: 'I'm ready to accept Jesus as a great moral teacher, but I don't accept His claim to be God.' That is the one thing we must not say. A man who was merely a man and said the sort of things Jesus said would not be a great moral teacher. He would either be a lunatic—on a level with the man who says he is a poached egg—or else he would be the Devil of Hell. You must make your choice. Either this man was, and is, the Son of God: or else a mad man or something worse. You can shut Him up for a fool, you can spit at Him and kill Him as a demon; or you can fall at His feet and call</p>

We have already seen that the New Testament books are historically accurate and reliable; so reliable, in fact, that Jesus cannot be dismissed as a

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>What options exist concerning the deity of Christ?</b></p> <p><b>The Trilemma</b></p> <p><b>Was He a Liar?</b></p>		<p>mere legend. The Gospel accounts preserve an accurate record of the things He did, the places He visited, and the words He spoke. And Jesus definitely claimed to be God (see above). So every person must answer the question: Is His claim to deity true or false?</p> <p>This question deserves a most serious consideration.</p> <p>In the first century, when people were giving a number of answers about Jesus' identity, Jesus asked His disciples, "But who do you say that I am?" to which Peter responded, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matthew 16:15, 16 NIV). Not everyone accepts Peter's answer, but no one should avoid Jesus' question.</p> <p><b>What options exist concerning the deity of Christ?</b></p> <p>Jesus' claim to be God must be either true or false. If Jesus' claims are true, then He is the Lord, and we must either accept or reject His lordship.</p> <p>If Jesus' claims to be God were false, then there are just two options:</p> <p>He either knew His claims were false, in which case He would be a deceiver—a liar, or He did not know they were false, in which case He would be deceived—a lunatic. Let's consider the evidence for each alternative.</p> <p><b>Was He a Liar?</b></p> <p>If, when Jesus made His claims, He knew He was not God, then He was lying. But if He was a liar, then He was also a hypocrite, because He told others to be honest, whatever the cost, while He, at the same time, was teaching and living a colossal lie.</p> <p>More than that, He was a demon, because He deliberately told others to trust Him for their eternal destiny. If He could not back up His claims and knew they were false, then He was unspeakably evil in deliberately misleading so many followers down through the centuries.</p>

“It was reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character which through all the changes of eighteen centuries has inspired the hearts of men

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<b>Philip Schaff</b>		<p>with an impassioned love; has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments and conditions; has been not only the highest pattern of virtue, but the strongest incentive to its practice...The simple record of [Jesus'] these three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists." (Lecky, HEMAC, 8; Grounds, RFOH, 34)</p> <p>When the church historian Philip Schaff considered the evidence for Jesus' deity, especially in light of what Jesus taught and the kind of life He led, Schaff was struck by the absurdity of the explanations designed to escape the logical implications of this evidence. Stated Schaff:</p> <p>"This testimony, if not true, must be down right blasphemy or madness. The former hypothesis cannot stand a moment before the moral purity and dignity of Jesus, revealed in His every word and work, and acknowledged by universal consent. Self-deception in a matter so momentous, and with an intellect in all respects so clear and so sound, is equally out of the question. How could He be an enthusiast or a madman who never lost the even balance of His mind, who sailed serenely over all the troubles and persecutions, as the sun above the clouds, who always returned the wisest answer to tempting questions, who calmly and deliberately predicted His death on the cross, His resurrection on the third day, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the founding of His Church, the destruction of Jerusalem – predictions which have been literally fulfilled? A character so original, so complete, so uniformly consistent, so perfect, so human and yet so high above all human greatness, can be neither a fraud nor a fiction. The poet, as has been well said, would in this case be greater than the hero. It would take more than a Jesus to invent a Jesus." (Schaff, HCC, 109)</p> <p>If it is inconceivable for Jesus to have been a liar, then could He have thought He was God but have been mistaken? After all, it is possible to be both</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>Was He a Lunatic?</b></p> <p><b>Peter Kreeft</b></p>		<p>sincere and wrong.</p> <p><b>Was He a Lunatic?</b>  But we must remember that for someone to think he was God, especially in a culture that was fiercely monotheistic, and then to tell others that their eternal destiny depends on believing in him, was no slight flight of fantasy but the thoughts of a lunatic in the fullest sense. Was Jesus Christ such a person?</p> <p>Christian philosopher Peter Kreeft presents this option, then shows why we must reject it:  “A measure of your insanity is the size of the gap between what you think you are and what you really are. If I think I am the greatest philosopher in America, I am only an arrogant fool; if I think I am Napoleon, I am probably over the edge; if I think I am a butterfly, I am fully embarked from the sunny shores of sanity. But if I think I am God, I am even more insane because the gap between anything finite and the infinite God is even greater than the gap between any two finite things, even a man and a butterfly.</p> <p>...Well, then, why [was not Jesus a] liar or lunatic? ...[A]lmost no one who has read the Gospels can honestly and seriously consider that option. The savviness, the canniness, the human wisdom, the attractiveness of Jesus emerge from the Gospels with unavoidable force to any but the most hardened and prejudiced reader... Compare Jesus with liars...or lunatics like the dying Nietzsche. Jesus has in abundance precisely those three qualities that liars and lunatics most conspicuously lack:</p> <p>1) His practical wisdom, his ability to read human hearts;  2) His deep and winning love, his passionate compassion, his ability to attract people and make them feel at home and forgiven, his authority, “not as the scribes”;  3) His ability to astonish, his unpredictability, his creativity. Liars and lunatics are all so dull and predictable! No one who knows both the Gospels and human beings can seriously entertain the possibility that Jesus was a liar or a lunatic, a bad</p>

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
Napoleon Bonaparte		<p>man.” (Kreeft, FFECA, 60, 61)</p> <p>Even Napoleon Bonaparte went on record as saying: “I know men; and I tell you that Jesus Christ is not a man. Superficial minds see a resemblance between Christ and the founders of empires, and the gods of other religions. That resemblance does not exist. There is between Christianity and whatever other religions the distance of infinity...Everything in Christ astonishes me. His spirit overawes me, and His will confounds me. Between Him and whoever else in the world, there is no possible term of comparison. He is truly a being by Himself. His ideas and sentiments, the truth which He announces, His manner of convincing, are not explained either by human organization or by the nature of things...The nearer I approach, the more carefully I examine, everything is above me -everything remains grand, of a grandeur which overpowers. His religion is a revelation from an intelligence which certainly is not that of man...One can absolutely find nowhere, but in Him alone, the imitation or the example of His life...I search in vain in history to find the similar to Jesus Christ, or anything which can approach the gospel. Neither history, nor humanity, nor the ages, nor nature, offer me anything with which I am able to compare it or to explain it. Here everything is extraordinary.” (Grounds, ROH, 37)</p>
William Channing		<p>William Channing, although a nineteenth-century Unitarian and humanist, rejected the lunatic theory as a completely unsatisfactory explanation of Jesus’ identity:</p> <p>“The charge of an extravagant, self-deluding enthusiasm is the last to be fastened on Jesus. Where can we find the traces of it in His history? Do we detect them in the calm authority of His precepts? in the mild, practical and beneficent spirit of His religion; in the unlabored simplicity of the language with which He unfolds His high powers and the sublime truths of religion; or in the good sense, the knowledge of human nature, which He always discovers in His estimate and treatment of the different classes of men with</p>

The truth is, Jesus was not only sane, but the counsel He provided gives us the most concise and accurate formula for peace of mind and heart. I like the way psychiatrist J. T. Fisher brings this out:

“If you were to take the sum total of all authoritative articles ever written by the most qualified of psychologists and psychiatrists on the subject of mental hygiene - if you were to combine them and refine them and cleave out the excess verbiage - if you were to take the whole of the meat and none of the parsley, and if you were to have these unadulterated bits of pure scientific knowledge concisely expressed by the most

- “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,” Peter proclaimed (Matthew 16:18).
- “Yes, Lord, I believe that You are the Christ, the Son of God, who is to come into the world,” confessed Martha of Bethany, Lazarus’ sister (John 11:27 NKJV).
- “My Lord and my God!” Thomas exclaimed after seeing the resurrected Jesus standing before him (John 20:28 NKJV).
- “The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God,” Mark wrote as the opening line of the New Testament book bearing his name (Mark 1:1 NKJV).
- “He [Jesus] is the radiance of His [God’s] glory and the exact representation of His nature, and

Who you decide Jesus Christ is must not be an idle intellectual exercise. You cannot put Him on the shelf as a great moral teacher. That is not a valid option. He is either a liar, a lunatic, or the Lord. You

Subject	Da Vinci Code Claim	Historical Fact
<p><b>"My Lord and my God."</b></p>		<p>must make a choice. "But," as the apostle John wrote,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"these have been written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God"; and more important, "that believing you may have life in His name" (John 20:31).</p> <p>The evidence is clearly in favor of Jesus as Lord. However, some people reject the clear evidence because of the moral implications involved. There needs to be a moral honesty in the above consideration of Jesus as either liar, lunatic, or Lord and God.</p>

## Leonardo da Vinci Unplugged

### General

1. "In more than 5,000 pages of Leonardo's notes and drawings that survive there are no personal comments about his youth, and exceedingly few personal comments on any subject whatever." (Wallace, 10)
2. "Although Leonardo's undying reputation is rooted in other things as well as his art, it is nonetheless surprising that in his 67 years, he produced so few paintings - little more than a dozen. And only in the past half century, because of advances in scientific techniques and historical analysis, have critics been able to reach some agreement as to what paintings are genuine Leonardos and to disqualify others, long attributed to him, that are merely Leonardesque." (Wallace, p. 27)
3. Vasari writes, "One day Ser Piero took some of Leonardo's drawings along to Andrea del Verrocchio, who was a good friend of his, and asked if he thought it would be profitable for the boy to study drawing. Andrea was amazed to see that extraordinary beginnings Leonardo had made, and urged Piero to make him study the subject. So Piero arranged for Leonardo to enter Andrea's workshop. The boy was delighted with this decision." (Nicholl, p. 61)
4. "He [Leonardo] had as good a master as he could get: Verrocchio was probably the finest draughtsman of his generation in Florence." (Nicholl, p. 78)
5. Regarding the artist and historian Vasari: ". . . Vasari was a tireless researcher who sought out men who had been Leonardo's pupils and acquaintances, and came as close to the truth as he could." (Wallace, p. 12)
6. "The Anonimo Gaddiano has a marvelous verbal snapshot of him: 'He was very attractive, well-proportioned, graceful and good-looking. He wore a short, rose-pink tunic, knee-length at a time when most people wore long gowns. He had beautiful curling hair, carefully styled, which came down to the middle of his chest.'" (Nicholl, p. 11 and Bramly, pp. 5-6 citing Antonio Gaddiano, in *Codice Magliabecchiano*, ed. Carl Frey, Berlin, 1892)

### Leonardo's use of iconography indicating the Passion of the Christ

1. "The iconography of the Yarnwinder [The Madonna of the Yarnwinder Redford version, by Leonardo and assistants, c. 1501-40] seems to be original to Leonardo, though it is part of a convention of the Christ-child contemplating symbols for his future Passion, as in Leonardo's early Florentine panels where the symbols are flowers-the blood-red carnation of the Munich Madonna and Child, the cruciform bitter cress for the

Benois Madonna. Leonardo imbues the note of prophecy with his characteristic drama, the momentum of the moment - the flowing motion of the child towards the miniature cross, towards, the picture edge, towards the future; the protective motion of the mother's hand, seemingly arrested in a trance-like instant of tragic premonition." (Nicholl, p. 339)

2. Regarding the Madonna of the Yarnwinder: "The modeling of the figures is faultless: this is the first figurative painting that we know of since the completion of the Last Supper, four years previously, and it continues that painting's precise and learned depiction of significant gesture: the *moti mentali*. ( Nicholl, p. 339)

3. "Leonardo was probably the first painter to omit haloes from the heads of figures from the Scriptures . . . Haloes appear in the works he executed in Verrocchio's studio . . . the haloes in the Benois Madonna were most likely added by another hand. (Bramly, p. 439)

### Views on death, his Catholic funeral, his will, and the soul

1. Four years before his death, "On 8 October 1515, Leonardo enrolled in the Confraternity of St. John of the Florentines, which had its headquarters across the Tiber from the Vatican. He may have done so for a number of reasons: a resurgence of his sense of himself as a Florentine; a late touch of religiosity; a desire to ensure a decent burial." ( Nicholl, p 483). Leonard failed to pay his dues, most likely 'for this month of October 1515 he left Rome as a member of the papal entourage, bound for Florence and Bologna, where a historic meeting was scheduled between the Pope and the new French king, Francois I . . .'" (Nicholl, p. 483 citing: C Frommel, 'Leonardo fratello della Confraternita della Pietà dei Fiorentini a Roma', RV 20 {1964}, 369-73)

2. "Leonardo's decision to leave for France must surely have been made by the summer of 1516 . . . Leonardo's last address was the handsome manor-house of Cloux (now Clos Luce) half a mile south of the great chateau of Amboise [provided by King Francois I]." (Nicholl, pp. 486-487)

3. "When the sculptor Benvenuto Cellini was in France he reported that 'King Francis, being enamored to such an extraordinary degree of Leonardo's great talents, took such pleasure in hearing him talk that he would only on a few days deprive himself of his company . . . I cannot resist repeating the words I heard the King say about him, in the presence of the Cardinal of Lorraine and the King of Navarre; he said that he did not believe that a man had ever been born who knew as much as Leonardo, not only in the spheres of painting, sculpture, and architecture, but in that he was a very great philosopher.'" (Kemp, p.44)

4. In his final will he gave "to Messer Francisco da Melzi . . . each and all of the books the Testator is at present possessed of; and the instruments and portraits . . . and the remainder of his pension, and all sums of money which are owing to him . . . and each and all of his clothes which now possesses . . . to Battista de Vilanis his servant, one

half of his garden outside the walls of Milan . . . To Salai [Giacomo Caprotti] his servant, the other half of the same garden, in which garden the same Salai has built and constructed a house which shall be and remain henceforth the property of Salai. . .to Maturina his serving woman, a cloak . . . cloth, and a single payment . . . To his brothers now living in Florence, the sum of four hundred scudi . . . "(Nicholl, pp. 498-99)

5. "And then there was the saga of the house outside of the Porta Vercellina, given to Leonardo by the Moor in about 1497, leased to Salai's father after Leonardo's departure from Milan, and by degrees seeming to become Salai's own property . . . " (Nicholl, p. 276 citing: Sell and Simon 1992, doc. 26. He leased it to one Antonio Meda in September 1513 {ibid dl, doc. 27})

6. "Francesco Melzi was never to leave Leonardo's side, nursing him when he was ill, handling studio affairs . . . taking all sorts of notes from his dictation. Later he would attempt to put Leonardo's writings into some kind of order. Nor was he without talent as a painter . . ." (Bramly, p. 370)

7. "Francesco Melzi did not return immediately to Italy. One document tells us that on 20 August 1519, he was still at Amboise, receiving a pension from the king . . . It seems likely he now handed over to Francois I the paintings Leonardo had brought to France. Then, having conscientiously executed the last wishes of his master and friend, Melzi set off for Milan in 1520 or 1521, taking with him the vital inheritance: thousands of pages of notes and all the drawings, objects, and instruments of which Leonardo had made him sole legatee. By 1523, he was back in Lombardy-as was Salai, who seems to have been killed the following year by a bolt from a crossbow . . . Melzi was trying to classify the notes . . . To this end, Melzi hired two scribes; under his guidance, they put together he work know today as the Trattato della pittura. But for some unknown reason, they, like Leonardo before them, never finished the compilation . . . Melzi died in 1570. He had married, but his son Orazio [one of his eight children], having different tastes . . . consigned all the manuscripts randomly into chests . . . And the dispersal went on down to the nineteenth century." (Bramly, p. 418)

8. "After his [Melzi's] death, his pious stewardship was ill rewarded by the piecemeal dispersal of the notebooks and drawings. They suffered various fates, with probably more than four-fifths of them disappearing without trace. Those that remain today have passed through various collections across Europe . . ." (Kemp. p. 48)

9. "He died on 2 May, 1519, at the age of sixty-seven. According to Vasari, our only source, King Francois was present, and cradled him in his arms. As the final seizure came - 'a paroxysm, messenger of death' the King 'held his head up, to help him and bring him comfort.'" (Nicholl, p. 500)

10. "Vasari says that the king, 'who was in the habit of making frequent affectionate visits to him,' entered his chamber just as the priest who gave him extreme unction was leaving. Leonardo then summoned up the strength to raise himself up on his be 'with deference,' to explain to Francois what his sickness was and what the symptoms were,

before recognizing 'how much he had offended God by not working on his art as much as he should have.' Then he fell silent and had a last spasm, upon which the king came near, held up his head, spoke tenderly to him, and tried to relieve his suffering. So Leonardo had the honor of dying a few moments later in the arms of the king of France. In 1850 Leon de Laborde cast doubt on this story by reproducing an act of Francois I dated 3 May 1519 and written at Saint-Germain-en-Laye. Since it took two good days on horse back to reach Saint-Germain from Amboise, the king could not have been at the painter's death bed the day before. Most modern historians have accepted this argument. However, as Aime Champollion pointed out in 1856, the act of 3 May 1519 is not signed by the king himself but by his chancellor, in the king's absence: it bears the inscription 'Par le Roy.' So it is possible that Francois I did assist Leonardo in his last moments." (Bramly, pp. 407-408 citing: Historians have not as a rule noted Champollion's comment, but it was taken up by Jean Adhemar in an article in *Le Monde*, 25 July 1952)

11. "Vasari concludes, 'All those who knew him grieved without measure the loss of Leonardo,' at which point I forget about the King altogether, and see Francesco Melzi by the bedside in tears. It was not until 1 June that Melzi wrote to the half-brothers in Florence with news of the death. 'He was like the best of fathers to me,' he wrote. 'As long as I have breath in my body I shall feel the sadness, for all time. He gave me every day the proofs of his most passionate and ardent affection.'" (Nicholl, p. 500 citing: Uzielli 1872, no. 26. Like the will, the original of Melzi's letter was seen and transcribed at Vinci in the eighteenth century, but has since disappeared.)

12. "But it is more revealing to observe that in his will Leonardo made elaborate stipulations concerning his Christian funeral. There were to be three high Masses and 30 low at four separate churches a procession of monks and mourner, bearing torches . . . was to light him on his way ' (Forty pounds of wax for the candles ordered the meticulous artist) . . . (It was 1517, while Leonardo was in residence at Amboise, that Martin Luther nailed his 95 theses to the door of the church at Wittenberg, although it is unlikely that Leonardo ever learned of them.)" (Wallace, p. 167)

13. "Vasari says that toward the end of his life, having been ill for many months, Leonardo 'desired scrupulously to be informed of the Catholic practice and the good and holy Christian religion, then, after many tears, he repented and confessed. Since he could no longer stand upright, he had himself supported by his friends and servants in order to receive the holy sacrament in piety outside his bed.' . . . Leonardo commends his soul to Almighty God, to the Blessed Virgin Mary, to Saint Michael and all angels and saints in paradise. He asks to be interred at the church of Saint-Florentin in Amboise; that his coffin be carried by the chaplains of this church and followed by the prior, the curates, and minor friars of the church; that three high masses be celebrated by the deacon and subdeacon, and thirty low Gregorian masses at Saint-Florentin and Saint-Denis; that sixty poor men, to whom alms will be given, should carry sixty tapers at his funeral; that ten great candles be lit while prayers are said for his soul; that seventy sous tournois be distributed to the poor at the Hotel-Dieu and at Saint-Lazare in Ambiose." (Bramly, p. 406)

## Regarding the Catholic Church and his belief in the crucifixion

1. "Leonardo despised the antics of priests, who 'produce many words, receive much wealth, and promise paradise.' 'Many are those,' he wrote, 'who trade in tricks and simulated miracles, duping the foolish multitude; and if nobody unmasked their subterfuges, they would impose them on everyone.'" (Bramly 274, citing: Notebook F 5v from the Institut de France, Paris)
2. "He seems to have thought that dead saints were incapable of hearing the prayers addressed to them." (Durant, p. 225 citing: Codice Atlantico, B 70 r.a.; Notebooks, II, 504)
3. "Of the commercial exploitation of pious objects, he wrote, 'I see Christ once more being sold and crucified and his saints martyred.'" (Bramly, p.275, citing: Notebook I 66 (18) v. The pious Michelangelo also wrote of the Christ of crucifixes. "In Rome, they even sell his skin" (Sonnet V). And Dante had written: "In Rome, Christ is bought and sold everyday." (Bramly, p. 275)
4. "He protested against the sale of indulgences, criticized the exaggerated pomp of churches, obligatory confession, and the cult of the saints. He mocked those redundant prelates who claimed 'to be pleasing God' by lounging all year round in sumptuous residences." (Bramly, p. 275 citing: C 19v.)
5. "On one Good Friday he wrote: 'Today all the world is in mourning because one man died in the Orient.'" (Durant, p. 225 citing: Jean Paul Richter, II, p. 369)

## Leonardo's personal beliefs regarding God, the Soul

1. "He had no taste for the abstractions of pure philosophy, which he scathingly characterized as a kind of pseudo-knowledge 'that begins and ends in the mind'. He showed little patience with theology and religious dogma or with mystical bodies of knowledge such as astrology. He accepted that there was a supreme, ineffable power behind the design of nature, identifiable as God, but he was convinced that concrete knowledge could not reveal the nature of divinity itself." (Kemp. p.49)
2. "Leonardo's flagrant anticlericalism certainly did not lead him toward an atheistic position. He believed in God - though not perhaps a very Christian God; rather, one closer to the ideas of Aristotle or the German theologian Nicholas of Cusa, and prefiguring the God of Spinoza . . . He was almost jealous of the Creator, whom he called the primo motore: the inventor of everything was a better architect and engineer than he himself would ever be." (Bramly, p. 275)
3. Leonardo wrote: "Now do you not see that the eye embraces the beauty of the world?"

. . . Oh excellent above all other things created by God . . . And it triumphs over nature .  
. . ." (Kemp. p. 52)

4. "Oh, that it may please God to let me also expound the psychology of the habits of man in such fashion as I am describing his body!" (Durant, p. 225 citing: F 5r and 4v; Notebooks, I, 295)

5. The following quote from the book published in 1550, by Torrentino written by Giorgio Vasari, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects*. (Vite de' piu eccellenti architettori, pittori e scultori italiani, containing one hundred twenty biographies. {the 1550 edition has been reissued in one volume} (Turin: Einaudi, 1986) "The quote was later removed from Vasari's second version which was printed in 1568: "Leonardo was of such a heretical frame of mind that he did not adhere to any kind of religion, believing that it is perhaps better to be a philosopher than a Christian." (Wallace p. 167) This quote also noted by Bramly, p. 274) "The sentence was doubtless stricken because Vasari was anxious to project what he thought was a better image of Leonardo. In the second edition (1568) he omitted the sentence, leaving the reader with this picture of the old man on his deathbed: 'He desired to occupy himself with the truths of the Catholic faith and the holy Christian religion. Then, having confessed and shown his penitence with much lamentation, he devoutly took the Sacrament.'" (Wallace, p. 167)

6. "However, this is by no means to suggest that Leonardo was an atheist. The name of the Creator appears often enough in his writings to indicate that he had some undefined but still enduring conception of a divine power." (Wallace, p 167)

7. "Nor was he adverse to invoking the name of God: "May it please the Lord, light of all things, to show me the way, so that I shall paint light worthily.'" (Kemp, p. 68 citing: Codex Trivulzianus, 84v. {Hereafter Cod. Triv.})

8. "In a letter to Sultan Bajazet July 3 [1503], 'I your servant . . . will build a mill . . . but powered by wind alone' and 'God, may He be praised, has granted me a way of extracting water . . . May God make you believe these words, and consider this servant of yours always at your service.'" (Nicholl, pp. 353-354 citing: Topkapi Museum, Istanbul, E 6184; first published by E. Babinger, *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Gotingen* 52 {1952})

9. "A solitary fragment of discourse between them [Leonardo and his father Ser Piero] survives: The opening sentence of a letter from Leonard - undated, . . . 'Dearest father,' it reads: 'On the last day of this month I received the letter you wrote to me, which caused me a brief space of time both pleasure and sadness: pleasure in that I learned from it you are well, for which I thank God, and displeasure to hear of your troubles.'" (Nicholl p. 384 citing: CA 178/62v-a, R 1372A.)

10. From Leonard's extensive anatomy studies Bramly notes, "He had proposed to 'write down what the soul is'; now he left the question to be answered by the 'clerics, the

fathers of the people, those who discover all secrets through divine inspiration." (Bramly, p. 376 citing: Windsor, 19115r)

11. "It is in the body's extremities that grace is revealed." (Bramly, in bibliographic citations, p. 436)

12. According to Bramly, no where in Da Vinci's writings do we see him mention life after death. (Bramly, p. 406). Leonardo wrote, "All evil leaves sadness in one's memory, except the supreme evil'-sommio male- which destroys memory along with life." (Bramly, p. 468 citing: H 33v.)

13. "And of the soul he wrote simply: 'It is with the greatest reluctance that it leaves the body, and I think that its sorrow and lamentations are not without cause.'" (Bramly, p.406 citing: A 2r)

14. Leonardo noted: "The common sense is what judges the things given to it by the other senses. The ancient speculators concluded that man's capacity to interpret is caused by an organ to which the other five senses refer everything . . . They say that this common sense is situated in the centre of the head between the zones of impression and memory . . . It seems that the soul resides in this organ . . . The Common Sense is the seat of the soul." (Nicholl. pp. 242-243 citing: RL 12603. The basic theory, which Leonardo modifies, is found in Aristotle's De anima.)

15. "Leonardo writes that the foetus is a 'creature' wholly dependent on its mother's soul, as on her body: 'The same soul governs these two bodies . . . ' In the Rome of 1515 this smacked of the heretical Aristotelian position that the soul was materially composed, and died with the body.'" (Nicholl, p. 481 citing: RL 1912r, df. 19101V, 19128r)

16. " . . . he was not a materialist. On the contrary he defined force as 'spiritual capacity . . . spiritual because the life in it is invisible and without body . . . impalpable because the body in which it is produced is increased neither in size nor in weight.'" Durant, p. 223 citing: Codice Atlantico, 244. r.a; Notebooks, I, 248)

17. "Sleeping, forgetting, feeling nothing: these are images of death consonant with the essentially Aristotelian materialism of the Renaissance scientists. Of the resurrection and the life to come we hear nothing." (Nicholl 499)

18. "Whatever it is, the soul is a divine thing, therefore leave it to dwell in its works, and be at ease there . . . for it takes its leave of the body very unwillingly, and indeed I believe that its grief and pain are not without cause.'" (Nicholl, p. 499 citing anatomical folio of C. 1510)

19. " . . . [Leonardo] had written thirty years earlier in Milan : 'Just as a well-filled day brings blessed sleep, so a well-employed life brings a blessed death.'" (Bramly, p. 407 citing Tr Tav., 28a)

20. "I could wish that I had such power of language as should avail me to censure those who would extol of the worship of men above that of the sun . . . Those who have wished to worship men as gods have made a very grave error." (Durant, p. 226 citing: F 5r and 4v; Notebooks, I, 295)

21. "He addressed Deity with humility and fervor in some passages; (Durant p. 226 citing: A 24r; Notebooks, I, 538; Richter, II, p. 285) ) but at other times he identified God with Nature, Natural Law, and 'Necessity.'" ( Durant, p. 226 citing: Taylor, 7)

## The Last Supper

"But this is to fulfill the scripture,: 'He who shares my bread has lifted up his heel against me.' "I am telling you now before it happens . . . After he had said this, Jesus was deeply troubled and testified," I tell you the truth, one of you is going to betray me." His disciples stared at one another, at a loss to know which of them he meant. One of them, the disciple whom Jesus loved, was reclining next to him. Simon Peter motioned to this disciple and said, "Ask him which one he means." Leaning back against Jesus, he asked him, "Lord who is it?" Jesus answered, "It is the one to whom I will give this piece of bread when I have dipped it in the dish." Then dipping the piece of bread, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, son of Simon." (John, 13:18-16)

1. "In planning the composition as a whole, Leonardo undoubtedly made numerous studies, about only two of them remain to us today." (Wallace, pp. 86-87)

2. "There are two separate drawings on the sheet. The left-hand sketch has ten figures: the sheet has probably been trimmed, losing the remaining three . . . The right-hand sketch shows four figures, but is essentially a study of Christ and Judas. Here Leonardo is focussing on the dramatic moment of identification: 'he that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me' (Matthew 26:23). Judas has climbed off his stool and is reaching forward with his hand to the dish. Christ's hand is tried out in two positions." (Nicholl, p. 295)

3. "From the [two] compositional studies in Windsor and Venice, the focus moves in to the features of the individual figures, and so we come to the famous series of heads in Windsor, mostly in red chalk, some highly finished . . . We see the characters emerging from a mist: Judas, Peter, St James the Elder, St Philip . . . There is the beautiful study for the hands of St John and for the sleeve of St Peter." (Nicholl, p. 296 citing: Judas: RL 12547r (illustrated). Peter: Alberina, Vienna, inv. no. 17614. St James: RL 12552r (illustrated). St Philip: RL 12551r. Hands: RL 12543r. Sleeve: RL 12546r.)

4. Referring to Judas as he reaches for the bread, "Dark, staring, he leans away from Christ, forever sealed in his guilt and solitude. The other disciples, questioning, remonstrating, denying, have as yet no knowledge of who the betrayer is; the spectator sees at once." (Wallace, 82)

5. "Only John, the disciple whom Jesus loved sitting beside him like a mirror image of his master, eyes closed and face tilted, seems to understand that the son of Man must go to meet his fate - 'as it was written,' Saint Luke says." (Bramly, p. 278).
6. "Goethe noted that Leonardo took as his model the monks' actual trestle table, 'even their tablecloth with its regular folds, its embroidered border, and its fringe,' as well as the plates, dishes, and glasses that they daily used." (Bramly, p. 277 from reference Goethe, *Schriften und Aufsätze zur Kunst*, essay on Joseph Bossi and Leonardo (Abandmahl, 1817)
7. "He organized their [apostles] 'action' like a theater director. He noted the apostles' names and distributed roles: 'One who has just been drinking,' he writes in his notebook, 'has put down his glass and turned his head toward another, who is speaking. Another, entwining his fingers together, is turning with a frown toward his neighbor. Another displays the palms of his hands and shrugs his shoulders up toward his ears, struck dumb with amazement. Another whispers in the ear of his neighbor, who turns toward him and inclines his ear, while holding in one hand a knife and in the other a bread roll partly cut.' and so on." (Bramly, p. 27 citing: Forster II, 62v; 63r)
8. "In his notes for the painting Leonardo enumerated several gestures he thought suitable-some he retained, others were dropped . . . 'and in turning round, another, who holds a knife, upsets with his hand a glass on the table.' The last gesture was retained, but changed and assigned to Judas, who clutches not a knife but a moneybag and instead of a glass upsets the salt, in the traditional, superstitious symbolism of impending evil." (Wallace, p. 81)
9. "Some of these find their place in the finished painting - white-bearded St Andrew (third from left) shows his palms and shrugs up his shoulders. Others are transmuted, so that the man who turns with a knife in his hand (St Peter) is detached from the man who knocks over a glass, and the latter becomes a man (Judas) spilling a salt-cellar." (Nicholl, p. 296)
10. "Of the face of Judas in Leonardo's Last supper there is a well-known anecdote in Vasari: how the prior of the Grazie constantly badgered Leonardo 'to hurry up and finish the work', and complained of the artist's dilatoriness to the Duke. In response Leonardo to Ludovico he was still searching for a face evil enough to represent Judas, but that if he did not succeed 'he could always use the head of that tactless and impatient prior' as a model. At this the Duke roared with laughter, and 'the unfortunate prior retired in confusion . . .'" (Nicholl, p. 297-298)
11. "The Giraldis version of the story purports to be a record of Leonardo's own words: 'It remains for me to do the head of Judas, who was the great betrayer, as you all know, and so deserves to be painted with a face that expresses all his wickedness . . . And so for a year now, perhaps more, I have been going every day, morning and evening, down to the Borghetto, where all the base and ignoble characters live, most of them evil and wicked, in the hope that I will see a face which would be fit for this evil man. And to this

day I have not found one . . . and if it turns out I cannot find one I will have to use the face of this revered father, the prior." (Nicholl 298 citing: Giambattista Giralaldi Cinzio, Dicorsi (Venice, 1554), 193-6, citing the reminiscence of his father, Cristoforo Giralaldi, a Ferrarese diplomat in Milan)

12. "According to Lomazzo (writing in 1557), Leonardo's old friend Zenale advised him to leave the face of Christ unfinished, saying: 'Of a truth it would be impossible to imagine faces lovelier or gentler than those of James the Greater or James the Less. Accept your misfortune, then, and leave your Christ incomplete; for otherwise, when compared with the Apostles, He would not be their Savior or their Master,'" (Durant, p. 205 citing: Matteo Bandelli in Muntz, Leonardo, I, 184)

13. ". . . so we come to the famous series of heads in Windsor, mostly in red chalk, some highly finished. We see the characters emerging from a mist . . . There is a beautiful study for the hands of St John, and for the sleeve of St Peter. (Nicholl, p. 296 citing Hands: RL 23543r. Sleeve: RL 12546r) These studies are complemented by brief comments in the Forster notebooks - that a certain Alessandro from Parma provided the model for Christ's hand; that 'Cristofano da Castiglione, who lives at the Pieta, has a good head. . . There is a note headed simply 'crissto', under which Leonard writes, 'Giovanni Conte, the one with the Cardinal of Mortaro'; this may tell us of the name of the model for Christ." (Nicholl, p 296 citing Fors2 1 6r, Fors3 IV: Fors 2 1 er,v.)

14. Author Johann Wolfgang Goethe's "subject of attention in 1817 was the Last Supper, damaged, faded, and crudely restored though it was. The ghosts and shards on the refectory wall were supplemented by his comprehensive study of copies and prints - he especially recommended his readers to look at the engraving by Raphael Morghen . . . Gieuseppe Bossi, which had in turn provided the basis for an enduring version in mosaic. Bossi did more than copy the mural; he undertook extensive scholarly research into the origins and history of the mural . . . which he published in his pioneering study, *Del cenacolo di Leonardo da Vinci* in 1810. . . . (The quotations are from Noehden's 1821 translation, approved by Goethe himself.) 'For this reason it was consonant with the judgment of the painter to take the tables and the monks as models; and there is no doubt, that the table-cloth, with its pleated folds, its stripes and figures, and even the knots, at the corners were borrowed from the laundry of the convent . . . The means of excitement, which he employed to agitate the holy and tranquil company, at table, are the words of the Master: There is one among you that betrays me. The words are uttered, and the whole company is thrown into consternation.'" ( Kemp, pp. 235-236)

15. "One of the discoveries to emerge from the latest restoration is the vestige of a sinopia, or outline drawing, done directly on to the plaster - 'extremely concise red lines, executed freehand and with a fluid brush-stroke . . . to define the masses for his composition'. After this the gesso or ground was applied: modern analysis shows this to be 'a slightly granular mixture, 100-200 microns thick, composed of calcium carbonate and magnesium with a proteinaceous binding agent', and top of that came a thin imprimatura of lead white." (Nicholl , p. 298 citing: Technical data in Barcelon and Marani 2001, 408ff., on which this paragraph is abased.)

16. "At this stage a number of incisions were made on the surface, mainly defining the form and perspective of the architectural setting, and - an eerie moment of precision - a small hole was punched in the center of the pictorial area: the vanishing point. This hole can be seen in a magnified photograph: it is the point on the right temple of Christ." (Nicholl, pp. 298-299 citing: Technical data in Barcelon and Marani 2001, 408ff., on which this paragraph is based.)

17. "In one of his novellas (Lucca, 1554), [Mateeo Bandello, nephew of the prior of the convent] tells how as a boy he would see the painter arrive in the refectory early in the morning, climb up onto the scaffolding (The Last Supper is a good two meters above the ground), and immediately start work. 'He sometimes stayed there from dawn to sundown, never putting down his brush, forgetting to eat and drink, painting without pause. He would also sometimes remain two, three, or four days without touching his brush, although he spent several hours a day standing in front of the work, arms folded, examining and criticizing the figures to himself. I also saw him one day, driven by some sudden urge, at midday, when the sun was at its height, leaving the Corte Vecchia, where he was working on his marvelous clay horse, to come straight to Santa Maria delle Grazie, without seeking shade, and clamber up onto the scaffolding, pick up a brush, put in one or two strokes, and then go away again.'" (Bramly, p. 281).

18. "Each figure and each object of the table shows minor or significant revisions of outlines, which stray into the adjacent colours, testifying to the fact that Leonardo allowed himself great freedom in returning more than once to a given motif." (Nicholl, p. 300 citing: Technical data in Barcelon and Marani 2001, 413-14)

19. "In the summer of 1496, while he was at work on the Last Supper, Leonardo was also decorating certain rooms (camerini) - probably the apartments of Duchess Beatrice - in the Castello Sforzesco. 'Remember the commission to paint the rooms' he writes. In a fragmentary letter to the Duke he writes, 'It vexes me greatly that you should have found me in need, and . . . that my having to earn my living has forced me to interrupt the work and attend to lesser matters instead of following up the work which your Lordship entrusted to me.'" (Nicholl, p. 300 citing: CA 866r/315v-a, R1344)

20. "The mathematician Luca Pacioli, Leonardo's friend who watched the execution of the painting, wrote of it as 'a symbol of man's burning desire for salvation.'" (Wallace., 82)

## The need for restoration

1. "During the 17th and 18th centuries the Last Supper was restored many times by inept artists. (Wallace, p. 83)

2. "He used a mix of oil and tempera for painting, instead of the traditional Buon Fresco of painting on fresh plaster. This enabled him to work more slowly, and to repaint, but its disadvantages soon became apparent as the paint began to flake off. An inherent

problem with damp exacerbate the situation. The deterioration of the paint surface was already visible during his lifetime. In 1517 the diarist Antonio de Beatis noted that the mural was 'beginning to spoil', and by the time Vasari saw it in the 1550's there was 'nothing visible except a muddle of blots'." (Nicholl, p. 302, citing: Beatis, 1979, 182; Vasari 1878-85, 5.424; Barcelon and Marani 2001, 21-350)

3. "At the end of World War II, the Last Supper was in such a perilous state of disintegration that both paint and plaster seemed about to turn to dust. With nothing to lose and everything to gain, Italy's Ministry of Fine Arts made a final attempt to save the painting. A master of restoration, Mauro Pellicoli, set out on an eight-year adventure of exquisitely delicate intellectual and physical work." (Wallace, p. 83)

4. "In 1556, when Vasari observed it [the Last Supper], he noted that 'there is nothing visible except a muddle of blots.' A century later it was written that one could scarcely distinguish the subject, let alone the details, of the painting." (Wallace, p. 83)

5. "In 1517 the diarist Antonio De Beatis noted that the mural was 'beginning to spoil', and by the time Vasari saw it in the 1550's there was 'nothing visible except a muddle of blots'. (Nicholl, p. 302 citing: Beatis 1979, 182; Vasari 1878-85, 5. 424; Barcelon and Marani 2002, 23-35.) This is doubtless the reason for the many early copies made of it, two of them - Marco d'Oggiono's and Giampietrino's - by painters who were probably involved in the creation of the original. It is all the reason for the extensive restoration projects; the earliest which is documented was done in the early eighteenth century was probably not the first . . . Kenneth Clark lamented the loss of subtle nuances of expression beneath the deadening hand of the restorer . . ." (Nicholl 302 citing: Clark, 1988, 147. There were a dozen copies done within Leonardo's lifetime; Giampietrino's superb copy, c. 1515-20 . . . Now in the Royal Academy collection, is held at Magdalen College, Oxford. (Nicholl, p. 302 citing footnote 105, p. 538)

6. "Between 1946 and 1954 they were again restored by Mauro Pellicoli, a master of the art . . . bears some resemblance to Leonardo's original painting." (Wallace p. 83)

7. "The Painting's inherent, self-inflicted fragility seems now part of its magic. Reduced with a few decades to a 'muddle of blots', vandalized by Napoleonic soldiers in the early nineteenth century [the soldiers threw bricks at it], and narrowly missed by Allied bombs in the summer of 1943, it is a miracle that it has survived at all . . . The latest and most ambitious restoration, under Pinin Brambilla Barcilon, was unveiled in 1999, after more than twenty years' work [begun in 1977] at an estimated cost of 20 billion lire (approximately L6 million). Much of it was targeted at removing the superimpositions of previous restoration: an encrustation of varnishes and over-paintings which were teased away, scab by microscopic scab, in the hope that some original pigment remained beneath . . . The restoration had its critics as always - it had 'lost the soul' of the original - but what we now see is much closer to what Leonardo and his assistants painted on that wall . . . Closer, but of course partial - only about 20 percent of the original picture surface survives. The painting hovers like a ghost on the wall, vestigial yet ravishing restocked with expressions and gestures, and with the simple yet compelling details of

that last meal: the half-filled beakers of wine, the filigree weave on the tablecloth, the knife which in the emotion of the moment St. Peter grips like a murder-weapon."  
(Nicholl, p.302)

Leonardo's asceticism, views on humanity modesty, propriety, intimacy, vegetarianism, care for animals, love of pranks

1. "It seems to me that unlike Socrates, Leonardo did not believe that men were fundamentally good. Some individuals did not even seem to him to deserve the bodies the Creator had given them. He says, speaking of bone structure, muscles, and organs: 'I do not think that rough men, of bad habits and little intelligence, deserve such a fine instrument and such a variety of mechanism.'"(Bramly, p. 280 citing: Windsor, 19060r.)
2. "'How many people there are,' Leonardo writes, 'who could be described as mere channels for food, producers of excrement, fillers of latrines, for they have no other purpose in this world; they practice no virtue whatsoever; all that remains after them is a full latrine.'" (Bramly, p., 66 citing: Forster III, 74v.)
3. "He warns against abuse of food and drink; 'Wine is good,' he says, 'but at table, water is preferable.'" (Bramly p. 68 citing: Cod. Atl., 200r.)
4. ". . . he disapproves of the 'excessive ornament' worn by young people." (Bramly, p. 114 citing Ludwig, Buch der Malerei, paragraph 404.)
5. "Thus according to him, humanity was rushing unwittingly to destruction. At about the same time that he painted The Last Supper, Leonardo composed this prophecy (in the form of a riddle); 'there will be seen on earth creatures fighting each other without pause and with very heavy losses and frequent deaths on both sides. Their malice will know no bounds; in the immense forests of the world, their savage members will cut down an immense number of trees. Once sated with food, they will want to assuage their desire to inflict death, affliction, torment, terror, and exile on every living thing . . . O Earth! Why do you hesitate to swallow them up into the deep crevasses of your great abysses and caverns and never show again to the face of heaven a monster so cruel and horrible!'" (Bramly, p 28 citing: Forster III, 74v.)
6. "Leonardo's asceticism is well known; his writings are full of observations such as 'Intellectual passion drives out sensuality . . . Small rooms or dwellings set the mind in the right path, large ones cause it to go astray . . . Whoso curbs not lustful desires puts himself on a level with the beasts . . . If you want money in abundance, you will end by not enjoying it.'" (Wallace, p. 168)
7. "In his studies for an Adoration, Leonardo's drawing precisely follows his instructions: 'Women should be represented in modest attitudes, with legs close together, arms folded, and with their heads low and bending sideways . . . Little children should be

represented when sitting as twisting themselves about with quick movements, and in shy, timid attitudes when standing up." (Wallace p. 130)

8. "In one of his comparisons between the painter and the sculptor he pictures the latter sweating and dirty with labour, 'his face smeared with marble dust so he looks like a baker'. The painter, by contrast, works 'at ease'; he is 'well dressed'; he 'moves a light brush dipped in delicate colours' and 'adorns himself with the clothes he fancies'." (Nicholl, p. 126 citing: CU 20v, McM51.)

9. "Leonardo put his work away every night to protect it - from dust and accidents as much as from inquisitive eyes." (Bramly, in bibliographical footnotes, p. 448)

10. "According to Paolo Giovio, 'Leonardo would not permit youngsters under the age twenty to touch brushes and colours, and would only let them practice with a lead stylus, diligently following the best examples of the ancients, and imitating the force of nature and lineaments of the body with the simplest lines.' " (Nicholl, p. 78 citing: PCI.II {part of the fragmentary supplement to Giovio's Leonardi Vincii vita})

11. "The man who has intercourse aggressively and uneasily will produce children who are irritable and untrustworthy; but if the intercourse is done with great love and desire on both sides, then the child will be of great intellect, and witty, lively and lovable." (Nicholl, p. 27 citing Schlossmuseum, Weimar;PC 2. 110: a double-sided sheet of anatomical studies originally joined to RL. 19052)

12. "On an anatomical sheet of c. 1510 is another interesting comment: 'The act of coition and the parts of the body involved in it are of such ugliness that if it were not for the beauty of the faces and the adornments of the lovers, and the reined-in desire, nature would lose the human species.' (Nicholl, p. 442 quoting RL 19009r.) Again the language is revealing: between them beauty and desire - especially a desire that has been repressed and reined in (frenata) - override the inherent 'bruttura' of heterosexual love." (Nicholl, p. 442)

13. Even Freud did not view Leonardo as highly sexual. He wrote regarding Leonardo's illegitimacy and his parents' separation and his ambivalent feelings he had toward his mother. "Freud then went on to show that this [his mother's abandonment] contributed to the development of Leonardo's sexual inhibitions, to his homosexuality, and eventually to his refusal of all sexual activity." (Bramly, p. 49)

14. "On a folio dated 23 April 1490 . . . he says, 'If you want to see how a person's soul inhabits his body, look at how his body treats its daily abode; if the latter is disordered, so the body will be kept in a disordered and confused way by the soul.' In another text around this time he envisages the painter at work in 'his dwelling full of charming pictures, and well-kept, and often accompanied by music or readings of various fine works.' " (Nicholl, p. 252 citing: CA 297r/76r-a, R II43; CU 20v, McM 51)

15. "He was the least occult of the thinkers of his age. He rejected alchemy and astrology, and hoped for a time when 'all astrologers will be castrated.'" (Durant, p. 222 citing: Codice Atlantico, 318 v.a.; Notebooks, I, 513)

16. Around 1493 Leonardo was enjoying life. "Although without fortune, 'Vasari tells us, 'he always had many servants and horses, which he loved dearly, as well as all sorts of animals, which he tended with extreme patience and care. 'Leonardo loved animals so much, it seems, that he had turned vegetarian . . . he would not let his body become a 'tomb for other animals, an inn of the dead . . . a container of corruption'" (Bramly, p. 240 citing: Cod. Atl., 76v a. Leonardo believed that all creatures capable of movement could feel pain - that they had been granted movement precisely because of, or together with, that faculty. So he wanted to eat only what could neither move nor suffer: vegetables.{H 60-12r})

17. "Vasari says, 'He took and especial delight in animals of all sorts, which he treated with wonderful love and patience. For instance, when he was passing the places where they sold birds, he would often take them out of their cages with his hand, and having paid whatever price was asked by the vendor, he would let them fly away into the air, giving them back their lost liberty.'" (Nicholl, p. 43)

18. According to Vasari, Piero, Leonardo's father asked Leonardo to paint something on a circular shield (rotello) that he had, ". . . he [Leonardo] began to consider what he could paint on it, so as to terrify anyone who encountered it, like the head of the Medusa once did. To this purpose Leonardo collected lizards, geckos, crickets, butterflies, locusts, and bats and other strange creatures . . . and taking and adapting different parts of these creatures, he made a most fearsome and horrible monster . . . belching forth venom from its mouth and fire from its eyes and smoke from its nostrils.' He took so long over his work that the stench of dead animals in his room was unbearable, but 'Leonardo did not notice this . . . ' Leonardo arranged the buckler on an easel . . . and then invited him in to see it. On first sight of it . . . Ser Piero gave a sudden start . . . He began to back away, but Leonardo stopped him, and said, 'The work has served the purpose it was made for . . . because it has done what was expected of it.' And Ser Piero thought the whole thing quite marvelous, and loudly praised Leonardo's capricious imagination.'" ( Nicholl, pp. 105-106)

19. "According to Vasari, Leonardo obtained a large lizard and fixed on its back wings made of scales from other reptiles and painted with quicksilver. He also attached to this creature big eyes, horns, and a beard, then tamed it and carried it about with him in a box. People ran away screaming when he loosed his 'dragon' on them. . . . Another time, he cleaned and scraped the intestines of a bullock so carefully that they could be held in the palm of a hand. Fitting the extremities of these tubes to a blacksmith's bellows concealed in the next room, he activated the bellows when visitors arrived, and the intestines were inflated to such a monstrous size that they filled the room, 'which was, moreover, a very big one,' forcing the people into the corners.'" (Bramly, p.388)

20. "Jokes appear scattered throughout Leonard's notebooks and manuscripts . . . ' A painter was asked by he produced such beautiful figures, though they were dead things, and yet produced such ugly children. To which he replied that he made his paintings by day and his children by night.'" (Nicholl, p. 222)

### Inquisitive and Scientific approach

1. "The manuscripts are a map of Leonardo's mind. They contain everything from the briefest half-sentence of squiggled calculation to fully worked-out scientific treatises and literary exercises. Their subject-matter ranges from anatomy to zoology by way of aerodynamics, architecture, botany, costume-design, civil and military engineering, fossil studies, hydrography, mathematics, mechanics, music, optics, philosophy, robotics, star-gazing, stage-design and viticulture . . . Leonard was, as Kenneth Clark put it, 'the most relentlessly curious man in history' . . . he habitually doodled the word *dimmi* - 'Tell me'. . . Tell me what, tell me how, tell me why . . . " (Nicholl, p. 7)

2. "Side by side with his drawings, sometimes on the same page, sometimes scrawled across a sketch of a man or a woman, and landscape or a machine, are the notes in which this insatiable mind puzzled over the laws and operations of nature." (Durant, p. 221)

3. "He tried his hand at almost every science. He took enthusiastically to mathematics as the purest form of reasoning; he felt a certain beauty in geometrical figures, and drew some on the same page with a study for The Last Supper." (Durant, p. 222 citing: Popham, plate 161)

### Virgin Of the Rocks, the Louve and London versions

1. "This then, the meeting of the infant Jesus with the infant John the Baptist, was virtually confined to Florence before Leonardo's Virgin of the Rocks, and then only to a few paintings (notably Nativities by Filippo Lippi)." (Bramly, p. 439)

2. "The painting was commissioned by a contract dated 25 April 1483, drawn up by a notary named Antonio de' Capitani." (Nicholl, p. 197 citing: Beltrami 1919, docs. 23-4. On the complex history of this painting see Davies 1947, Sironi 1981; Marani 2003; Sollner, Burlington Magazine 143 (2001), 35-7; Zollner 2003, 223-4)

3. "All commentators agree that the version in the Louvre stylistically predates the other [London] . . . Some have suggested that Leonardo painted a third version . . . " (Bramly, p. 439-440)

4. ". . . Leonardo and Ambrogio . . . began work on a substitute copy for the Confraternity . . . The case wallowed in the bog of Italian litigation for three years . . . The central panel of the altarpiece was adjudged to be 'unfinished' . . . and the court

orders him [Leonardo] . . .to complete the painting within two years." (Nicholl, pp. 403-04 citing (Supplica of 1503: Beltrami 1919, doc. 120)

5. [Regarding the Virgin of the Rocks in London's National Gallery, c. 1495-1508]  
"Although there may be studio intervention in subsidiary parts of the picture, the figures are entirely consistent with Leonardo's style in the mid-1490's in Milan, when he presumably began the 'replacement' version. Areas of the flesh show the finger-print technique that is widely apparent in his works before 1500." ( Kemp. p. 251)

6. "As for the 1506 agreement with the Confraternity, delivery of the reworked Virgin of the Rocks was due by [1508] and perhaps some final touches were applied by the maestro before the painting was handed over . . . in the Confraternity's possession sometime before mid-August . . ." ( Nicholl, p. 423)

7. "There is no Biblical evidence of any encounter between Christ and St. John as children." (Wallace, p. 31) "Forewarned by the angel Gabriel, Mary, Joseph, and the Child left at night to take refuge in Egypt, where they lived in the desert until the tyrant had died. An apocryphal legend, based on Saint Luke and divulged in the fourteenth century by the Dominican Fra Pietro Cavalca, says that in their exile, they met the infant Saint John with his mother, Saint Elizabeth, under the protection of the angel Uriel . . ." (Bramly, pp. 185-186)

## Mona Lisa

1. "Mona Lisa was not Leonardo's ideal of beauty . . . Yet he must have seen in Mona Lisa another sort of ideal that so impressed him that he rejected other valuable commissions in order to work for perhaps three years on her portrait." (Wallace, pp. 126-127)

2."The first known mention of the painting is by Antonio de Beatis, secretary to Cardinal Luigi of Aragon, whose diary records their visit to Leonardo's studio in France in 1517. (Nicholl, p. 365 citing: Beatis 1979 132.)

3. "Vasari's 'Mona Lisa' certainly existed. She was Lisa di Antonmaria Gherardini, born on 15 June 1479. Her father was a respectable but not spectacularly wealthy Florentine; the family had a town-house near Santa Trinita and a small estate . . . near Greve . . . She married Francesco di Bartolomeo del Giocondo in March 1495, at the age of fifteen; he was a well-to-do businessman with interests in the silk and cloth trades, thirty-five years old, already twice widowed, and with an infant son . . ." (Nicholl, p. p. 363-364)

4. "Beatis's brief but vividly specific account of their visit to Clos Luce is our last snapshot of Leonardo . . . 'He showed His Lordship [Cardinal Luigi of Aragon] three pictures, one of a certain Florentine lady, done from life at the instigation of the late Magnifico Giuliano de' Medici, another of the young St John the Baptist, and another of

the Madonna and Child placed on the lap of St Anne: All quite perfect . . ." (Nicholl, ,p. 490)

5. "When he [Salai] died from an arrow wound in 1424, the inventory of his property for division between his two sisters contained the Leda and Swan (now lost), the Madonna, child, St Anne, and a Lamb, the Mona Lisa, and the portrait of a woman, the St John the Baptist, the St Jerome, together with five or six smaller works, including 'One Madonna with a son in her arms', which may be one of the two variants of the Madonna of the Yarnwinder." (Kemp, p. 12 referencing:

6. "What immediately happened to the top paintings in the late Salai's possession is unclear . . . Since we know that the Leda and the Mona Lisa were housed in Francis I's Appartement des Bains at Fontainebleau during the 1540's, it is reasonable to suppose that he obtained them directly from Salai's heirs. It may seem surprising that Francis ever allowed the pictures to leave France after the artist's death in his service, but we know that he granted Leonardo special permission to make a will bequeathing his estate to whomsoever he chose. . . The King thus found himself in the odd position of having to buy back pictures by his court 'familiar', presumably at a high price. A seventeenth century source says the Mona Lisa cost him the huge sum of 12,000 francs." ( Kemp. pp. 224-225)

## Madonna, Child, St. Anne and a Lamb

1. "Prints show that Leonardo made several variations of the Madonna and Christ child with various objects including fruit, cats, and lamb." (Wallace, pp. 158-159)

2. "There is an eyewitness account . . . written in April 1501 by Fra Pietro Novellara, vicar-general of the Carmelites . . . Writing to Isabella d'Este about Leonardo's activities, Novellara says: 'Since he has been in Florence he has only done one drawing, in a cartoon. It shows the infant Christ, of about one year old, almost escaping from the arms of his mother. He has got hold of a lamb and seems to be squeezing it. The mother . . . holds on to the child in order to draw him away from the lamb, which signifies the Passion. Saint Anne is rising somewhat . . . seems that she wants to restrain her daughter . . .'" (Nicholl, p. 333 citing: Novellara to Isabella, 3 April: Archivio di Stato, Mantua, Gonzaga E XXVIII e, busta 1103)

## Bibliography

Bramly, Serge. Translated by Sian Reynolds. Leonardo The Artist and the Man. London: Penguin Books, 1988.

Durant, Will. The Story of Civilization: Part V The Renaissance. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1953.

Kemp, Martin. Leonardo. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Nicholl, Charles. Leonardo Da Vinci Flights Of The Mind. New York: Penguin Group Inc., 2004.

Popham, A. E. Drawings of Leonardo da Vinci. London, 1947.  
Richter, Jean Paul. Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci. London, 1883, 2v.  
Wallace, Robert and editors of Time-Life Books. The World of Leonardo. New York: Time Incorporated, 1966.  
Vasari, Giorgio. 1987. Lives of the Artists. Trans. George Bull. 2 vols. Harmondsworth (from: Vasari, Giorgio. Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects. 1550)  
Vasari, Giorgio. Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects, Everyman's Library, 4v.  
Same, ed. E. H. & E. W. Blashfield, and A. A. Hopkins. New York, 1907, references to Vol. IV

## Leonardo's Manuscripts

Ar Codex Arundel. British Library, London (Arundel MS 263). 283 folios, with a typical format of 210 x 150 mm.  
CA Codex Atlantics. Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan. Miscellaneous collection of drawings and writings, formerly of 401 folios in large format, 645 x 435 mm, compiled by Pompeo Leoni in the sixteenth century, recently reorganized [1962-1970] into 12 volumes with a total of 1,119 folios.  
RL Royal Library, Windsor. A collection of 655 drawings and manuscripts, catalogued as folios 12275-12727 (general) and 19000-19152 (anatomical).

## Paris Manuscripts:

A (MS 21272), B (MS 21273), C (MS 21274), D (MS 21275), E (MS 21276), F (MS 21277) G (MS 21278), H (MS 21279), I (MS 21280), K (MS 21281), L (MS 21282), M (21283), and BN 2037, BN 2038 are part of Paris MS at the Institut de France, Paris.

## Other notebooks and manuscripts and cited sources:

Gaddiano, Anonimo, in Codice Magliabecchiano, ed. Carl Frey. Berlin, 1892.  
Fors: Forster Codices, Victoria & Albert Museum, London. Three volumes containing five notebooks.  
Leonardo da Vinci. Notebooks, arranged, rendered into English, and introduced by Edward MacCurdy. New York, 1938, 2v.  
Ma: Madrid Condices, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid (MSS 8936, 8937).  
Triv: Trivulzian Codex. Castello Sforzesco, Milan, Biblioteca Trivulziana MS N2362. 55 folios, 195x 135 mm.  
CU: Vatican Library, Codex Urbinus Latinus 1270. Selections from various notebooks and manuscripts made c. 1530 by Francesco Melzi; abbreviated edition published as Trattato della pittura (Paris 1651).  
R: Jean-Paul Richter, The Literary works of Leonardo da Vinci (2 vols., London, 1st ed. 1883, 2nd ed. 1939, repr. 1970).  
BM: British Museum.

## Closing Notes on Leonardo Research

I've included many quotes from various sources. I tried to find the most primary sources provided by the various authors and researchers. I have not included their exhaustive primary source resources, page upon page. I'd be glad to send them if you desire. I hope these quotes might be useful.

Also, Dr. Martin Kemp is one of the top experts regarding Leonardo, (currently a Professor of the History of Art at the University of Oxford). He has taken an exhibit of the universal Leonardo to highlight Leonardo's art and accomplishments and has been part of specials and created a CD-rom for Bill Gates who owns one of Leonardo's notebooks. In his book, *Leonardo*, he notes:

"Almost inevitably, Leonardo has been signed up for secret societies, such the Knights Templar, the Priory of Zion, and the Rosicrucians, the kinds of mysterious, closed, or underground organizations beloved of historical conspiracy theorists. The more 'secret' the conspiracy, the more latitude is afforded to the historical fantasist. If the Holy Grail is involved, so much the better. For the writer of fiction, the license is almost unlimited. Dan Brown's phenomenally successful *The Da Vinci Code*, published in 2003, lists 'Leonardo da Vinci 1510-1519' as one of the 'Grand Masters' of the 'Priore de Sion' in 'Les Dossiers Secrets - Number 4\* Un 249' in the Bibliotheque National in Paris. Amongst his companions in the strange list of 26 Grand masters are Botticelli, Newton, and Debussy! An opportunity has been missed; 27 is traditionally a much more mysterious number. The Last Supper contains the hidden clues, the most significant of which is that St John, portrayed in stock mode as tradition required - youthful and somnambulant - is actually Mary Magdalene, who is pregnant with Jesus' child. The murderous mysteries that ensue depend upon the suppression and intended annexation of this awesome truth by St Peter and his papal successors. In the service of fiction, such unfounded 'fact' are fine; as history they perpetrate nonsense. The problem with Brown's Code is not in its invention of 'truth'; but that it has been taken seriously by those who cannot recognize fiction as fiction."

PS. The following 3 videos show the people behind the da Vinci code hoax. They do make one feel very uncomfortable, but when viewed as a whole, they seem so bizarre in the way they talk about their many assumptions and conclusions.

- 1) *Origins of the Da Vinci Code* features Henry Lincoln
- 2) *Da Vinci Code Decoded* covers all the major players of the code and Lynn Picknett's description of Jesus as an Egyptian magician
- 3) *Cracking the Da Vinci code*, especially section 4 also shows Picknett's view of the famous artwork and that she disagrees with Dan Brown that Jesus was married and even admits maybe they just had spiritual sex and not actual sex, according to "the numerous documents."