

The Virgin Birth Defended & the Gospel Vindicated

2. *The Son of God, the second person in the Holy Trinity, being very and eternal God, the brightness of the Father's glory, of one substance and equal with him who made the world, who upholdeth and governeth all things he hath made, did, when the fullness of time was come, take upon him man's nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin; being conceived by the Holy Spirit in the womb of the Virgin Mary, the Holy Spirit coming down upon her: and the power of the Most High overshadowing her; and so was made of a woman of the tribe of Judah, of the seed of Abraham and David according to the Scriptures; so that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion; which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only mediator between God and man. (John 1:14; Gal. 4:4; Rom. 8:3; Heb. 2:14, 16, 17, 4:15; Matt. 1:22, 23; Luke 1:27, 31, 35; Rom. 9:5; 1 Tim. 2:5) Philadelphia Confession Chapter 8, OF CHRIST THE MEDIATOR*

Q. 30. How did Christ, the Lord of life and glory, become man? A. Christ, the Lord of life and glory, became man by taking upon Him the nature of His people, being conceived in the womb of the Virgin Mary (by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost) and born of her, yet without sin (Isa 7:14; Mat 1:20, 23; Luk 1:31-35; Joh 1:14; Gal 4:4; Phi 2:6-8; Heb 2:14-18). William Gadsby's Catechism

Q. 26: How did Christ, being the Son of God, become man? Answer: Christ, the Son of God became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul; being conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit in the womb of the Virgin Mary and born of her, yet without sin. Heb. 2:14; Matt. 26:38; Lk. 2:52; Jn. 12:27; Lk. 1:31, 35; Heb. 4:15; 7:26 1693 Baptist Catechism

Ample are the sly, silly, stupid sophistries whereby the irreligious, modernists and other sophists malign the virgin birth of the blessed Jesus as pagan folklore; the scoffers, some of no little learning, merely demonstrate their own ignorance of the sacred scriptures. It might be

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

expected for a Unitarian to question the virgin birth from within the last two centuries, but bold idolater and modernist John Spong, a retired bishop in the Episcopal Church, opined in 1991, *“Am I suggesting that these stories of the virgin birth are not literally true? The answer is a simple and direct ‘Yes.’ Of course these narratives are not literally true. Stars do not wander, angels do not sing, virgins do not give birth, magi do not travel to a distant land to present gifts to a baby, and shepherds do not go in search of a newborn savior. ...“To talk of a Father God who has a divine-human son by a virgin woman is a mythology that our generation would never have created, and obviously, could not use. To speak of a Father God so enraged by human evil that he requires propitiation for our sins that we cannot pay and thus demands the death of the divine-human son as a guilt offering is a ludicrous idea to our century. The sacrificial concept that focuses on the saving blood of Jesus that somehow washes me clean, so popular in Evangelical and Fundamentalist circles, is by and large repugnant to us today”* (John Spong, *Rescuing the Bible from Fundamentalism: A Bishop Rethinks the Meaning of Scripture*, Harper & Row, 1991, pp. 215, 234) according to Dr Cloud’s book, *New Evangelicalism: Its History, Characteristics and Fruit*, page 16. Likewise, Jesus Seminar premier Marcus Borg (perhaps their Jesus was of the Gnostics, the original textual critics, or Richard Simon, the first Counter Reformation papist critic) stated the year afterward, *I would argue that the truth of Easter does not depend on whether there was an empty tomb, or whether anything happened to the body of Jesus. ... I do not see Christian tradition as exclusively true, or the Bible as the unique and infallible revelation of God. ... It makes no historical sense to say, ‘Jesus was killed for the sins of the world.’ ... I am one of those Christians who does not believe in the virgin birth, nor in the star of Bethlehem, nor in the journeys of the wisemen, nor in the shepherds coming to the manger, as facts of history”* in the Bible Review of December 1992. Of important note is that the Jesus Seminar, again notes Dr Cloud on page 17 to page 19, published the color-coded Scholar’s Translation; Dr Cloud notes their method of drawing lots. *In the 1980s, the Jesus Seminar scholars cast ballots on the authenticity of Christ’s sayings in the four Gospels using pegs or balls. After discussing a passage, the presumptuous “scholars” would cast their votes. Red indicated a strong probability of authenticity; pink indicated a good probability; gray*

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

indicated a weak probability; and black indicated little or no probability. The colors therefore indicated various degrees of doubt in God's Word. The Seminar, continues the good doctor, concluded that Jesus spoke only 18 percent of the sayings attributed to Him in the Bible. According to this group of modernistic scholars, Christ did not speak most of the beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount; He did not say anything about turning the other cheek; He did not speak the parable of the sower, the parable of the ten virgins, the parable of the ten pieces of money, or the parable of the talents; He did not say, "I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." He did not say, "Take eat, this is my body," and the other sayings associated with the Lord's Supper. He did not pray in the garden of Gethsemane. He did not say, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do," or, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me," when He was on the cross. The Seminar determined that Jesus did not walk on the water, did not feed the thousands with only a few loaves and fishes, did not prophesy of His death or resurrection or second coming, did not appear before the Jewish high priest or before Pilate, did not rise again bodily on the third day, and did not ascend to Heaven. According to the Jesus Seminar, "THE STORY OF THE HISTORICAL JESUS ENDED WITH HIS DEATH ON THE CROSS AND THE DECAY OF HIS BODY" (Religious News Service, March 6, 1995). These modernistic scholars announced to the world that Jesus Christ was a mere man who was plagued with delusions and was caught up in some sort of political intrigue and events beyond His control [Dr Cloud's much-needed capitalization is original to his book]. Again, the Talmud paints a similar picture of Emmanuel as these rationalist, hyper-liberal scholars.

The Jewish rulers attacked the virgin birth, according to their exceedingly blasphemous traditions of the elders, when they said to Jesus' statement *Ye do the deeds of your father, We be not born of fornication* (Jn. 8.41), that father being the devil identified four verses later. What a parallel between the Pharisees and the Edenic serpent! The God of heaven and earth, wearied at Israel's doubt, suffered a sign from the mouth of Isaiah, *Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel*. There are those who speculate the translation should read *a young woman* as the modernist RSV or *damsel*, for they speculate this to be the proper meaning of the word H5959

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

עלמה *'almâh* happening only seven instances in the Hebrew Scriptures. Yet, none of the seven mentions of עלמה refer to any other than a pure young woman of marital age. The Authorized Version translators have not followed the Great Second Rabbinic Bible closely in this passage, but rather the third-century BC Septuagint (LXX), *διὰ τοῦτο δώσει κύριος αὐτὸς ὑμῖν σημεῖον ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουηλ*; Brenton's English LXX translation is identical to the Old Version in Isaiah 7.14. Yet, the Hebrew עלמה is *the virgin* as properly stated in the Breeches and Parker's versions, referring only to the righteous virgin named Mary.

The LXX used the word G3933 παρθενος *parthenos*, a word the liberal Mr Strong states means, *Of unknown origin; a maiden; by implication an unmarried daughter: - virgin*. While of dubious origin, and subject to criticism both for the Old Covenant was written in Hebrew and by authorities present or past of no little moment, the LXX choice of παρθενος reflects its translators, who are disputed, believed this coming virginal miracle must come from an unmarried, pure woman. Would not these Hebrew rabbis know more of ancient Hebrew than the modern scholar, yet the New English Bible and Revised Standard Version lay an ax to the root of our Messiah? What is more, the origin of the term arises from H5956 עלם; the Brown-Driver-Briggs Lexicon defines it following— *1) to conceal, hide, be hidden, be concealed, be secret 1a) (Qal) secret (participle) 1b) (Niphal) 1b1) to be concealed 1b2) concealed, dissembler (participle) 1c) (Hiphil) to conceal, hide 1d) (Hithpael) to hide oneself*. In the Hebrew, the definite article precedes *'almâh*; Fausset's *Bible Dictionary* offers, *Designated Septuagint. The Greek version of Old Testament, made for the Greek speaking (Hellenistic) Jews at Alexandria. The oldest manuscripts in capitals ("uncials") are the Cottonian ("fragments") in British Museum; Vatican (representing especially the oldest text [the fourth century is not the oldest text when Bibles following the TR reading dating between AD 0 through AD 299 predate it]) at Rome; Alexandrian in British Museum, of which Baber in 1816 published a facsimile; Sinaitic at Petersburg. Alexandrian is of the fifth century, the others are of the fourth. The ancient text current before Origen was called "the common one"; he compared this with the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, and marked the Septuagint with an obelos mark where he*

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

found superfluous words, and supplied deficiencies of Septuagint from those three, prefixing an asterisk. Its wide circulation among Hellenistic Jews before Christ providentially prepared the way for the gospel. Its completion was commemorated by a yearly feast at Alexandria (Philo, Vit. Mos. 2). Its general use is proved by the manner of its quotation in New Testament. The Jews in Justin Martyr's Apology questioned its accuracy. A letter of Aristeas to his brother Philocrates (Hody, Bibl. Text. Orig., 1705) describes the origin of Septuagint; King Ptolemy (Philadelphus), by the advice of his librarian Demetrius Phalereus, obtained from the high priest at Jerusalem 72 interpreters, six from each tribe; by conference and comparison in 72 days they completed the work. Aristobulus (second century B.C., in Clemens Alex. Strom.) says that, before Demetrius, others had made a translation of the Pentateuch and Joshua (the history of the going forth from Egypt, etc.). Aristeas' letter is probably a forgery of an Alexandrian Jew; nevertheless the story gave its title to the Septuagint (70, the round number for 72). The composition at Alexandria begun under the earlier Ptolemies, 280 B.C.; the Pentateuch alone at first; these are the main facts well established. The Alexandrian Macedonic Greek forms in the Septuagint disprove the coming of 72 interpreters from Jerusalem, and show that the translators were Alexandrian Jews. The Pentateuch is the best part of the version, being the first translated; the other books betray increasing degeneracy of the Hebrew manuscripts, with decay of Hebrew learning. The Septuagint translators did not have Hebrew manuscripts pointed as ours; nor were their words divided as ours. Different persons translated different books, and no general revision harmonized the whole. Names are differently rendered in different books. The poetical parts (except Psalms and Proverbs) are inferior to the historical. In the greater prophets important passages are misunderstood, as Isa 9:1; Isa 9:6; Jer 23:6; Ezekiel and the lesser prophets are better. Theodotion's version of Daniel was substituted for Septuagint, which was not used. The delicate details of the Hebrew are sacrificed in Septuagint, the same word in the same chapter being often rendered by differing words, and differing words by the same word, the names of God (Yahweh, Kurios, and 'Elohim, Theos) being confounded; and proper names at times being translated, and Hebrew words mistaken for words like in form but altogether different in sense (sh being mistaken for s, Shin (ש) (pronounced "sheen") for Sin (ש*

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

) (pronounced "seen") [the same letter (with a different "point") pronounced different], r for d, Resh (ר) for Daleth (ד). Some of the changes are designed; Gen 2:2, "sixth" for "seventh." Strong Hebrew expressions are softened, "God's power" for "hand," "word" for "mouth"; so no stress can be laid on the Septuagint words to prove a point. (See OLD TESTAMENT.) Use of Septuagint. Being made from manuscripts older far than our Masoretic text (from 280 to 180 B.C.), it helps towards arriving at the true text in doubtful passages; so Psa 22:16, where Septuagint "they pierced" gives the true reading instead of "as a lion," Aquila a Jew (A.D. 133) so translated "they disfigured"; (Psa 16:10) "Thy Holy One" singular, instead of our Masoretic "Thy holy ones." The Septuagint is an impartial witness, being ages before the controversy between Jews and Christians. In Gen 4:8 Septuagint has "and Cain said to Abel his brother, Let us go into the plain" or "field" (so Samaritan Pentateuch); but Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the Targum of Onkelos agree with our Hebrew. Of 350 quotations of the Old Testament in the New Testament only 50 differ materially from Septuagint Its language molded the conceptions of the New Testament writers and preachers. The Hebrew ideas and modes of thought are transfused into its Greek, which is wholly distinct from classic Greek in this. Expressions unknown to the latter are intelligible from Septuagint, as "believe in God," "faith toward God," "flesh," "spirit," "justify," "fleshly mindedness." "The Passover" includes the after feast and sacrifices (Deu 16:2), illustrating the question on what day Christ kept it (Joh 18:28).

Smith's Bible Dictionary gives the sense of the character of this ancient Greek version, The Septuagint version was highly esteemed by the Hellenistic Jews, before the coming of Christ. Wherever, by the conquests of Alexander or by colonization, the Greek language prevailed; wherever Jews were settled and the attention of the neighboring Gentiles was drawn to their wondrous history and law, there was found the Septuagint, which, thus, became, by divine Providence, the means of spreading widely, the knowledge of the one true God, and his promises of it's Saviour to come, throughout the nations. To the wide dispersion of this version, we may ascribe, in great measure, that general persuasion which prevailed over the whole East of the near approach of the Redeemer, and led the Magi to recognize the star which, reclaimed the birth of the King of the Jews. Not less wide was the influence of the Septuagint in the spread

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

of the gospel. For a long period, the Septuagint was the Old Testament of the far larger part of the Christian Church. Character of the Septuagint. The Septuagint is faithful in substance, but not minutely accurate in details. It has been clearly shown by Hody, Frankel and others, that the several books were translated by different persons, without any comprehensive revision to harmonize the several parts. Names and words are rendered differently in different books. Thus, the character of the version varies much in the several books, those of the Pentateuch are the best. The poetical parts are, generally speaking, inferior to the historical, the original abounding with rarer words and expressions. In the major prophets, (probably translated nearly 100 years after the Pentateuch), some of the most important prophecies are sadly obscured. Ezekiel and the minor prophets, (generally speaking), seem to be better rendered. Supposing the numerous glosses and duplicate renderings, which have evidently crept from the margin into the text, to be removed and forming a rough estimate of what the Septuagint was in its earliest state, we may, perhaps, say of it that it is the image of the original seen through a glass, not adjusted to the proper focus; the larger features are shown, but the sharpness of definition is lost. The close connection between the Old and the New Testament makes the study of the Septuagint most valuable, and indeed indispensable, to the theological student. It was manifestly the chief storehouse, from which the apostles drew their proofs and precepts.

It would be dishonest not to note the heretic Origen was its author, as Hasting's *Bible Dictionary* describes, and therefore originated in Alexandria, yet this does not cast doubt on his choice of *parthenos* in the Isaiah text, a word which cannot translate apart from *virgin*. The LXX is as well the father of the two main Critical manuscripts, the Sinaitic and Vatican (discussed in *Which Version? Authorized or Revised* by Philip Mauro to a great extent) notes Hasting's dictionary, but it as well offers the following of the LXX— *Such was the state of things when Origen (A.D. 185–253), the greatest scholar produced by the early Church, entered the field of textual criticism. His labours therein had the most far-reaching effect on the fortunes of the LXX, and are the cause of a large part of our difficulties in respect of its text to-day. Struck by the discrepancies between the LXX and the Heb., he conceived the idea of a vast work which should set the facts plainly before the student. This was the Hexapla, or sixfold version of the*

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

OT, in which six versions were set forth in six parallel columns. The six versions were as follows —(1) the Hebrew text; (2) the same transliterated in Greek characters; (3) the version of Aquila, which of all the versions was the nearest to the Hebrew; (4) the version of Symmachus; (5) his own edition of the LXX; (6) the version of Theodotion. In the case of the Psalms, no less than three additional Greek versions were included, of which very little is known; they are called simply Quinta, Sexta, and Septima. Elsewhere also there is occasional evidence of an additional version having been included; but these are unimportant. A separate copy of the four main Greek versions was also made, and was known as the Tetrapla. The principal extant fragment of a MS of the Hexapla (a 10th cent. palimpsest at Milan, containing about 11 Psalms) omits the Hebrew column, but makes up the total of six by a column containing various isolated readings. The only other fragment is a 7th cent. leaf discovered at Cairo in a genizah (or receptacle for damaged and disused synagogue MSS), and now at Cambridge. It contains Psa 22:15-18; Psa 22:20-28, and has been edited by Dr. C. Taylor (Cairo Genizah Palimpsests, 1900). Origen's Hebrew text was substantially identical with the Massoretic; and Aq., Symm., and Theod., as has been stated above, were translations from it; but the LXX, in view of its wide and frequent discrepancies, received special treatment. Passages present in the LXX, but wanting in the Heb., were marked with an obelus (—or); Passages Wanting In The LXX, But Present In The Heb., Were Supplied From Aq. Or Theod., And Marked With An Asterisk (); The Close Of The Passage To Which The Signs Applied Being Marked By A Metobelus (: Or %. Or x). In Cases Of Divergences In Arrangement, The Order Of The Heb. Was Followed (Except In Prov.), And The Text Of The LXX Was Considerably Corrected So As To Bring It Into Better Conformity With The Heb. The Establishment Of Such A Conformity Was In Fact Origen's Main Object, Though His Conscience As A Scholar And His Reverence For The LXX Did Not Allow Him Altogether To Cast Out Passages Which Occurred In It, Even Though They Had No Sanction In The Hebrew Text As He Knew It. Hastings in addition offers, Its character cannot be described in a word. It is written in Greek, which in vocabulary and accent is substantially that koinē dialektos, or Hellenistic Greek, which was in common use throughout the empire of Alexander, and of which our knowledge, in its non-literary form, has been greatly extended by the recent discoveries of*

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

Greek papyri in Egypt. In its syntax, however, it is strongly tinged with Hebraisms, which give it a distinct character of its own. The general tendency of the LXX translators was to be very literal, and they have repeatedly followed Hebrew usage (notably in the use of pronouns, prepositions, and participial constructions) to an extent which runs entirely counter to the genius of the Greek language. [For examples, and for the grammar of the LXX generally, see the Introduction to Selections from the Septuagint, by F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock (1905).] The quality of the translation differs in different books. It is at its best in the Pentateuch, which was probably both the first and the most deliberately prepared portion of the translation. It is at its worst in the Prophets, which presented the greatest difficulties in the way of interpretation. Neither the Greek nor the Hebrew scholarship of the translators was of a high order, and they not infrequently wrote down words which convey no rational meaning whatever. Something has been done of late to distinguish the work of different translators. [See the articles of H. St. J. Thackeray in JThSt iv. 245, 398, 578, viii. 262, the results of which are here summarized.] It has been shown that Jer. is probably the work of two translators, who respectively translated chs. 1–28 and 29–51 (in the Greek order of the chapters), the latter, who was an inferior scholar, being responsible also for Baruch. Ezek. likewise shows traces of two translators, one taking chs. 1–27 and 40–48, the other 28–39. The Minor Prophets form a single group, which has considerable affinities with the first translators of both Jer. and Ezekiel. Isaiah stands markedly apart from all these, exhibiting a more classical style, but less fidelity to the Hebrew. 1Kings (= 1Samam.) similarly stands apart from 2–4 Kings, the latter having features in common with Judges. It is also worthy of note the 100 BC Dead Sea Scrolls discovered in 1967, while chiefly secular literature contain manifold copies of Isaiah, substantially older than the AD 1000 Masorete text in unbroken use among the Orthodox and Torah-believing rabbis, agree with the latter in the Isaiah verse. The doubtful hate of Mr Spong could not stand in most any reputable court of law; the onus is on the doubters to present reliable evidence, not postulations, speculations or sophistries. It is also of no little estimation the Greek Vamvas Bible reads, Διά τούτο ο Κύριος αυτός θέλει σας δώσει σημεῖον ἰδοῦ, ἡ παρθένος θέλει συλλάβει και γεννήσει υιόν, και θέλει καλεσθῆ το ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Εμμανουήλ.

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

Furthermore, what is the witness of other Reformation-descended texts using the Masoretic and Byzantine texts as their basis? The Czech Kralice version offers, *Protož sám Pán dá vám znamení: Aj, panna počne, a porodí syna, a nazúve jméno jeho Immanuel*. Reads the passage in Luther's German version, based in part on the Vaudois Teple version, *Darum so wird euch der HERR selbst ein Zeichen geben: Siehe, eine Jungfrau ist schwanger und wird einen Sohn gebären, den wird sie heißen Immanuel*. Perciò, il Signore stesso vi darà un segno: *Ecco, la Vergine concepirà, e partorirà un Figliuolo; e tu chiamerai il suo nome Emmanuele* reads the Diodati version. *Ezért át jelt néktek az Úr maga: Ímé, a szűz fogan méhében, és szül fiat, s nevezi azt Immánuelnek*, reads the Karoli Bible. The Swedish Carl XII version reads, *Så skall då Herren själv giva eder ett tecken: Se, den unga kvinnan skall varda havande och föda en son, och hon skall giva honom namnet Immanuel*. The Finnish version of 1776 reads, *Sentähden antaa itse Herra teille merkin: katso, neitsy siittää ja synnyttää pojan, sen nimi pitää kutsuttaman Immanuel*. The Arabic Smyth Van Dyke praised even by Islamic clerics for its accuracy reads, "«وَلَكِنْ يُعْطِيكُمْ السَّيِّدُ نَفْسَهُ آيَةً: هَا الْعَذْرَاءُ تُحْبَلُ وَتَلِدُ ابْنًا وَتَدْعُو اسْمَهُ «عِمَّا نُؤْيِلَ»". The Gdanska version renders the passage, *Przetoż wam sam Pan znak da. Oto panna pocznie i porodzi syna, a nazwie imię jego Immanuel*. *Итак Сам Господь даст вам знамение: се, Дева во чреве приимет и родит Сына, и нарекут имя Ему: Еммануил* offers the Russian Synodal Version. The Revised and Corrected version of Alemida's Portugese text, differing not at all from the original except to correct it to the original tongue, states, *Portanto, o mesmo Senhor vos dará um sinal: eis que uma virgem conceberá, e dará à luz um filho, e será o seu nome Emanuel*. The Albanian version reads, *Prandaj vet Zoti do t'ju japë një shenjë: Ja, e virgjëra do të mbetet me barrë dhe do të lindë një fëmijë të cilin do ta quajë Emanuel*. The Bulgarian version reads, *Затова сам Господ ще ви даде знамение: Ето, девица ще зачне и ще роди син, И ще го нарече Емануил*. The Gdanska version in Polish offers, *Boter en honig zal Hij eten, totdat Hij wete te verwerpen het kwade, en te verkiezen het goede*. The Ukrainian version reads, *Тому Господь Сам дасть вам знака: Ось Діва в утробі зачне, і Сина породить, і назвеш ім'я Йому: Еммануїл*. The Dutch *Statenvertaling*, product of the legendary scholars at the Dordrecht Synod, reads *Daarom zal de Heere Zelf ulieden een teken geven; ziet, een maagd zal*

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

zwanger worden, en zij zal een Zoon baren, en Zijn naam IMMANUEL heten. Derfor vil Herren selv give eder et Tegn: Se, Jomfruen bliver frugtsommelig og føder en Søn, og hun kalder ham Immanuel" reads the Danish version. The Norwegian version reads, *Derfor skal Herren selv gi eder et tegn: Se, en jomfru blir fruktsommelig og føder en sønn, og hun gir ham navnet Immanuel [Gud med oss.]*. Finally, even the wild-eyed Vulgate agrees with the Second Rabbinic Bible's reading, establishing no Christian authority before the wave of satanic higher criticism, Unitarianism, Arminianism and modernism among other schisms accepted the *damsel or young woman* reading, for it states, *propter hoc dabit Dominus ipse vobis signum ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium et vocabitis nomen eius Emmanuhel*. The Minority text versions, following for the better part the Critical school of dynamic equivalence as well as the false Majority Text used in the NKJV (one that departs from the Received Text 1900 times) are varied. Interestingly, the English Revised, American Standard, World English, Young's Literal, Tree of Life, The Scriptures 2009, Lexingham English, Modern King James, Literal Translation of the Holy Bible, Jewish Publication Society, KJV-BRG, Jubilee 2000, GOD'S WORD, Darby, ESV and Contemporary English versions agree with the Traditional Text reading.

Some unbelievers attempt to state Jesus could not be virgin born by attacking his lineage listed in Matthew, the King's gospel where Joseph was charged with rearing the holy child, and Luke, the historian's most accurate record of the Saviour, and the gospel of the Word's eternal deity (not that of the eternal Son, for that is a pagan error; see Heb. 1.8) in John; Mark's record is the Servant's gospel. Let us consider first the record of John Mark. Mark, so say the modernists, knows nothing of the virgin birth, and neither did the apostle Paul. The absurdity is obvious in the first example where the text reads, *The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God; As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee; The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight*. The ludicrousness of the second claim in two places of Paul's epistles shows forth, first Romans' 8.3, second in Philippians' second chapter, where the holy verses read—

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:

If there is therefore any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies, Fulfill ye my joy, that ye be like-minded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind. Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

John Trapp remarks on the ninth verse, *Ver. 9. Wherefore God also, &c.] "Wherefore" denoteth not the cause, but the order of Christ's exaltation, as a consequent of his sufferings, as some conceive. Bengel's Gnomon remarks, Php 2:9. Διὸ καὶ, wherefore also) The most appropriate reward of emptying is exaltation; Luk 24:26; Joh 10:17. That result could not but follow it; Joh 16:15. Whatever belongs to the Father belongs to the Son. Those things could not so belong to the Father, as that they should not belong to the Son; Joh 17:5. Paul elegantly leaves the fact to be supplied, that they also will be exalted who humble themselves according to the example of Christ; nay, he expresses it, ch. Php 3:21.—ὁ Θεός, God) Christ emptied Christ; God exalted Christ, comp. 1Pe 5:6, and made Him to be equal with God.—ὑπερύψωσε, highly exalted) It was thus the humiliation was compensated. A lofty compound.—καὶ ἐχαρίσατο, and hath given) It was thus the emptying was compensated, to which also the fulness is more expressly opposed, Eph 1:23; Eph 4:10. By the verb χαρίζεσθαι, to give, is denoted, how acceptable the emptying of Christ was to God, and with how lowly a mind Christ, after He had gone through all that state of servitude, received this gift.—ὄνομα) a name along*

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

with the thing, i.e. dignity and praise.—ὕπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα, above every name) Eph 1:21, not merely above every name among mankind. The Genevan version's notation on the verse is, (3) He shows the most glorious even of Christ's submission, to teach us that modesty is the true way to true praise and glory. (i) Dignity and high distinction, and that which accompanies it.

The gospel according to Matthew is under attack in the passage, 1.18 to 25, where the Isaiah passage satisfies. A gamut of versions omits the word *firstborn* because Gnostic the corrupt Wescott-Hort text regards it as loquacious. *Και ουκ εγινωσκεν αυτην εως ουετεκεν υιον και εκαλεσεν το ονομα αυτου ιησουν* reads this ghastly text. Compared to the Byzantine text, it misses a word, a word omitted by both the heresiarch unbelievers Bishop BH Wescott and Professor FJA Hort, and by the Gnostics who made their corruptions in the text to suit it to their extreme schisms. *και ουκ εγινωσκεν αυτην εως ου ετεκεν τον υιον αυτης τον πρωτοτοκον και εκαλεσεν το ονομα αυτου ιησουν. Parthenos* appears again in this text in verse 23, *Now the birth of Jesus Christ was in this manner: When his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child by the Holy Spirit. Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, purposed to put her away privately. But while he thought on these things, the angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take to thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is by the Holy Spirit. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken from the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. Then Joseph, being raised from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took to him his wife: And knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son: and he called his name JESUS. ιδου η παρθενος εν γαστρι εξει και τεξεται υιον και καλεσουσιν το ονομα αυτου εμμανουηλ ο εστιν μεθερμηνευομενον μεθ ημων ο θεος* reads the Traditional text; interestingly, the Wescott-Hort text also contains *παρθενος* while quoting the Isaiah text.

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

No commentator, not even those of a dispensationalist sort like JN Darby or EW Bullinger, doubts the authenticity of the passage or of the word *firstborn* in the verse, especially those from the time of the Reformation to the twentieth century. The modernist will attempt to say the genealogy of Jesus is that of Joseph, not Mary. Again, the scoffer demonstrates an abject apathy of the Bible. Sarah, whose womb was as good as dead, brought forth a son in her old age in a picturesque promise resembling the woman who Satan tried to flood out (Apoc. 12). The centrality of this attack originates in the vain attempt to snuff the Light of the world, who has saved his people from their sins. *What saith the scripture?* asks the messenger Paul.

The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.

Abraham begat Isaac; and Isaac begat Jacob; and Jacob begat Judah and his brethren; And Judah begat Phares and Zara of Thamar; and Phares begat Esrom; and Esrom begat Aram; And Aram begat Aminadab; and Aminadab begat Naasson; and Naasson begat Salmon; And Salmon begat Booz of Rachab; and Booz begat Obed of Ruth; and Obed begat Jesse; And Jesse begat David the king; and David the king begat Solomon of her that had been the wife of Uriah; And Solomon begat Roboam; and Roboam begat Abia; and Abia begat Asa; And Asa begat Josaphat; and Josaphat begat Joram; and Joram begat Ozias; And Ozias begat Joatham; and Joatham begat Achaz; and Achaz begat Ezekias; And Ezekias begat Manasses; and Manasses begat Amon; and Amon begat Josias; And Josias begat Jechonias and his brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon: And after they were brought to Babylon, Jechonias begat Salathiel; and Salathiel begat Zorobabel; And Zorobabel begat Abiud; and Abiud begat Eliakim; and Eliakim begat Azor; And Azor begat Sadoc; and Sadoc begat Achim; and Achim begat Eliud; And Eliud begat Eleazar; and Eleazar begat Matthan; and Matthan begat Jacob; And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ. So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon to Christ are fourteen generations.

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

Hebraic law gave no standing to the wife saving in inheritance, but to the husband; the husband took on the genealogy of his beloved wife. Yet, the text of Matthew is to establish the covenant of salt (II Chron. 13.5) given to David, to establish a greater, that is Emmanuel, than the king pulled from the sheep coat. A monarch must know his generations if he has a right to rule, but in this case to ascend to the (Lu. 24.25. 3.13; 6.62; 7.33; 14.28; 16.5; 20.17; Acts 1.9; Ro. 8.34; Eph. 4.7-8; I Pe. 3.22) right hand of power after the prophecies of the Psalmist, *Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in also Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yes, for the rebellious also, that the LORD God might dwell among them. Blessed be the Lord, who daily loadeth us with benefits, even the God of our salvation. Selah.* Matthew verifies that right, so that God might be overmuch glorified.

The modernist might bark, as do all dumb dogs; yet there is a gospel that makes the dumb sing (Isa. 35.6; 56.10) that Luke's record makes Jesus the son of Joseph. Yet, quoted by Joseph Benson, Macknight refutes the abysmal research abilities of the scoffers. *Being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli — That is, the son-in-law: for Eli was the father of Mary. So Matthew writes the genealogy of Joseph, descended from David by Solomon; Luke that of Mary, descended from David by Nathan. In the genealogy of Joseph (recited by Matthew) that of Mary is implied, the Jews being accustomed to marry into their own families. The genealogy inserted here by Luke will appear with a beautiful propriety, if the place which it holds in his history be attended to. "It stands immediately after Jesus is said to have received the testimony of the Spirit, declaring him the Son of God, that is to say, Messiah; and before he entered on his ministry, the first act of which was, his encountering with and vanquishing the strongest temptation of the arch enemy of mankind. Christ's genealogy by his mother, who conceived him miraculously, placed in this order, seems to insinuate that he was the seed of the woman, which, in the first intimation of mercy vouchsafed to mankind after the fall, was predicted to break the head of the serpent. Accordingly Luke, as became the historian who related Christ's miraculous conception, carries his genealogy to Adam, who, together with Eve, received the fore-mentioned promise concerning the restitution of mankind by the seed of*

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

the woman.” Joseph and Mary were but the custodial, legal guardians of him that was, and was dead, but evermore lives, the resurrection and the life (Apoc. 4.8; Jn. 11.25) notes Bishop Ryle's *Expository Thoughts*. His virgin birth announced the one mediator between God and man. His virgin birth offers an infallible proof, not the postulations or probabilities or theorizing of the mockers, of the fullness of the Trinity bodily, that silences all their mocking as Belshazzar's mystic hand (Pro. 1.26; 14.9).

This bold-faced attack on the virgin birth of the Amen in his first advent is a dry tree. Why? *And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli*, first because the Holy Spirit does not assign the Sonship of Jesus to Joseph. Second, the words *the son of* being italicized represent words added by the translators for linguistic comprehension are not in the original, but are supported by the original language into the receptor. Some might ask, *That is all very fine, but what of the virgin birth in John the revelator's account?* The first chapter refutes their error, in addition to the witness of the last and greatest prophet, John Baptist.

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light. That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth. John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I

Ryan La Fleur Psalm 60.4, 61.5, 100.5, 115.1, 130.5 AV & WEB

spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me: for he was before me. And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou? And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No. Then said they unto him, Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself? He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias. And they which were sent were of the Pharisees. And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet? John answered them, saying, I baptize with water: but there standeth one among you, whom ye know not; He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose. These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing. Behold, the Lamb of God! The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me: for he was before me. And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God. Again the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples; And looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God! And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus.

Dear friend, has the only Prophet, Priest and King, the Lamb of God born of a virgin, of the Church given you power to believe on His blessed name today?