

## JESUS TWISTED SCRIPTURE

Jesus said that the Old Testament was the word of God. His emphasis on mysteries of religion, like his eccentric miracles, which should have been done for the world and not just a few, is proof enough that he wanted people to believe that it is all inspired for mysteries would have been the excuse for its shortcomings. If only bits of it are and God's ways are an enigma even to the genius then it cannot be a real message from God when you cannot sort out the wheat from the chaff. At the same time, Jesus perverted his scriptures for his own ends, for his own selfish glorification.

Jesus quoted God's saying to Moses to defend belief in the resurrection of the dead, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Mark 12:26). This was supposed to prove by its present tense that the men named were alive having being raised from the dead (Luke 20:37,38). This shows he knew little of the Old Testament. The text proves no such thing for God saying he is the God of Abraham and co is not the same as saying he is not the God of the dead for he was their God when they were alive. There was no hint of an afterlife in the Law which recorded the story. And if Luke's detail about Jesus' reasoning is right then Jesus was a liar for he knew better.

Malachi 3:1, "Behold I send My messenger and he shall prepare the way before Me. And the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to His temple".

Concerning his so-called precursor, John the Baptist, Jesus said that when God said in the Book of Malachi that a messenger from God would come that, John had this position (Matthew 11:10). Malachi says that the messenger would be sent before God while Jesus changed the text to make it say that he would pave the way for him instead. The Old Testament God abhorred anyone who changed his text. Only Matthew and Luke contain Jesus' lie.

Malachi predicted that the messenger would come first for God and get the way prepared for the Lord who would suddenly come to the Temple. God says I first and then Lord when he says I will send my messenger and the Lord will come to the Temple. The style of Malachi has God saying I and then talking about himself in the first person (1:7,8) so the Lord God mentioned is not a different person from God who speaks. Jesus did not come suddenly to the Temple. Malachi probably has the notion of God becoming present in some special way in the Temple, like he did in the past. Mount Sinai was made special by God when he expressed his presence there by clouds and thunder. Perhaps the Lord, if he is not God, is a special dwelling for God and not God. Perhaps it means, "My messenger will prepare the way before me and I will come to the Temple suddenly in the body of the Lord you are waiting for." Jesus used a text that has lots of interpretations and he forced one on it which gave the two fingers to honesty and fairness.

Jesus told the Jews that when they agree with circumcision being done on the Sabbath to avoid violating the Law they thought to agree with curing people on that day (John 7:23,24). The Law of Moses commanded circumcision but it did not command miracle cures therefore the two situations are different. The man would not have died if he had been left for a day. Jesus could have cured him long before on an ordinary day had he wished. Circumcision dedicates one to God and was urgent unlike the miracles. Had the miracles been urgent they would have been done long before.

Jesus thought that when David ate the bread that only priests were allowed to eat that this proved that his disciples did not do wrong by picking food on the Sabbath. The Old Testament never said that David was right so Jesus had no business using this example.

Jesus might have claimed to be without sin. Yet he said that Psalm 118 was about him. In it, the author asks God to make him righteous and then says that the rejected stone has become the most important part of the foundation. The latter bit Jesus took to be about himself. If it was then he was not sinless. Jesus lied if he claimed to be totally immaculate.

Jesus said that God would strike him and scatter his sheep, the disciples in fulfilment of Zechariah 13:7. But the prophecy says that a sword will do this but no sword touched Jesus. Jesus was a liar. Don't make the sword out to be a symbol for execution because that logic can be used to turn any prophecy that does not fit what you want it to fit into one that fits. That would be a dishonest approach.

Jesus claimed that Isaiah prophesied about the Jews, that Jesus contended with, that they would all be religious hypocrites (Mark 7). This was dishonest for nobody can prove that they were. Isaiah said that he meant people who did not know the truth (Isaiah 29). Jesus meant people who did know the truth. He even said that they had the key of knowledge and had blinded themselves to the truth. Isaiah had the people of his own day in mind.

Jesus claimed that Isaiah 61:1-3 was about him although it could have been about anybody. The prophet meant himself which Jesus conveniently ignored. The most likely interpretation should not be repudiated. A text should only be taken to

say what it is most likely to mean.

Jesus quoted King David's line, "The Lord (God) says to my Lord (the Messiah), Sit at My right hand" (Psalm 110:1) to argue that he, the Messiah, could not be David's son when David calls him Lord (Matthew 12:37). Christians say this means, "The Messiah cannot be a mere descendant – a descendant only – when he is Lord. Jesus is hinting that the Messiah is not a mere human being or ordinary son". This is nonsense. Jesus knew that a person can have offspring better than himself or herself so if he meant this he was telling lies. Didn't he call himself the Son of Man despite claiming to be better than man? Jesus said "son of David" not "a mere son of David". Jesus is saying that he was not a descendant of David even though he claimed to be Christ at times. Mary was a descendant so he was denying that she was truly his mother. He claimed to have come down from Heaven without parents contradicting the Bible. He was telling a boastful lie. The Gospellers did not fully understand what the episode meant.

Jesus said that the Law decreed that two witnesses were enough. He said that he was one witness for himself and his Father was the other (John 8:12,18). That was a stupid lie. Any false prophet could say the same and indeed often does. The Law meant two independent witnesses apart from yourself. He would not have tolerated anybody else saying that God is his witness and he is his own witness and so he has two witnesses. This argument was the basis of all that Jesus claimed to be – the entire house of cards falls when it is on a shaking foundation. Jesus was the one that stated that if he bears witness to himself his witness is false and he is a liar (John 5:31). Isaiah 44:8-11 stated that idolaters witness to themselves that idols are gods and that is why they are fools and false witnesses. And if Jesus was God his claim that God backed him up as a witness is worse for if Jesus cannot testify to himself then neither can God and so then you would have God incarnate testifying to himself which is worse than having the Son of God who is not God testifying to himself and having God who is independent of him and a separate being testifying to him. Jesus is hinting that he is not God incarnate but that does not help matters much.

Jesus accused the Jews of not believing in Moses, who was the author of the Law. He said that he was the prophet Moses said would come so if they believed Moses they would believe in him (John 5:46,47). But all Moses said was that a prophet greater than himself would come who could be anybody like all the prophecies that were allegedly about Jesus. Jesus was trying to blackmail the Jews with a text that could refer to anybody.

The wrong teaching that Jesus gave is so inexcusable that it is plain that Jesus was lying. Even if they were errors they were lies in the sense that he should have checked things out right first. It is lying to present as truth what may not be truth unless you have done your best. He did not correct himself for the corrections would be what we are reading about.

Christians do not condemn Jesus' lies but try to ignore them or confuse them who notice them. They condone the lies.

When Critics Ask, Norman Geisler and Thomas Howe, Victor Books, Illinois ,1992