

Chapter 2: This Doctrine Matters

Many non-virgin birth proponents make the claim that the teaching of the virgin birth is a mute teaching. They say it really makes no difference if you are *against* the doctrine. In other words, it really doesn't matter when it comes to one's salvation. One such proponent stated the following:

Let me be clear in stating that one of my primary objectives is to show that the "virgin" birth is NOT a redemptive issue, that it does NOT decide the eternal fate of an individual. The New Testament very clearly does not present, as necessary for salvation, that one must accept (or deny) the virgin birth. Even the most forceful proponents of the literal virgin birth must admit, unless they are dishonest, that the virgin birth issue is not an issue that determines one's eternal destiny. In other words, study the issue and believe as you wish, knowing your sincere opinion will not influence your eternal life.¹

I disagree with the authors above statement. Call me dishonest with the Scriptures if you wish, but I stand firm on my belief. Why do I make such a claim? After all, there is no verse (to my knowledge) in all of Scripture stating something like "Thou shalt believe in the virgin birth to be saved." But, although the Scriptures do not state this verbatim, they do state something else we must accept and believe in as essential doctrine. A non-virgin birth makes it *impossible* to accept and believe this very doctrine.

Yeshua, the Son of Yahweh

The Scriptures unequivocally state that in order for one to have salvation, he or she must believe that Yeshua is the son of Yahweh.² What makes Yeshua's son-ship different from our son-ship? The *primary* difference is found in the doctrine of the virgin birth. You see, if the Messiah was born exactly as you and I, and committed sin (as some teach) as you and I, he was merely *a* son of Yahweh - just as you and I can be. Someone who obtained son-ship as you and I can obtain son-ship does not meet the qualifications shown in many passages in the New Covenant Holy Scriptures. For instance, recall the account of the question asked to Peter concerning who the son of man really was.

When Yeshua came into the coasts of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Elijah; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living Almighty. ¹⁷And Yeshua answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. [Matthew 16:13-17]

Please note that Yeshua's question acknowledged that the apostles knew him as the Son of man. Yeshua called himself the Son of man when asking the question. The answer Yeshua was looking for was something other than his Son of man status. Peter's revelation must have consisted of more than just acknowledging Yeshua as a son of

¹ *How the "virgin birth" doctrine weakens Yahshua's claim to being Messiah*, p1, TorahofMessiah.com.

² Here's just a few verses from the writings of John. *John 3:16-18; 1 John 4:15; 5:10-13*

Yahweh, as Peter could be (as a believing Israelite; Hosea 1:10). Peter received the revelation that Yeshua was the Son of Yahweh - that he had a heavenly origin, coming from the bosom of the Father. Yeshua did not have a revelation that Peter was the son of Yahweh, or any other of his disciples for that matter. No, the revelation consisted of believing that Yeshua was the Son of Yahweh, and the context of this passage alone shows that this is Son of Yahweh *differently* than you or I can be. But there is much more.

Consider Matthew 14:22-33. Yeshua had compelled the apostles to go ahead of him in their boat. As they were out at sea, the winds prevailed and they eventually saw the Lord walking towards them on top of the water. Peter wanted to do the same, and could, as long as his eyes stayed upon Yeshua. Upon Peter taking his eyes off of the Lord, he was held up by the Master's hand, and both came to the boat and got on board. Upon the Messiah's entry, those who were in the boat made an extraordinary claim.

Then they that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of [the] Almighty. [Mark 14:33]

Do you really think those in the boat that fell down upon their faces in worship thought that they were the Son of Yahweh in the same way that He was? Some would have us to believe so.

Now, some will say that the Scripture says that Yahoshua is the "Son of Yahweh." Therefore, one must look at what it takes to be a "son" ... Yahoshua is referred to as "the son of Yahweh" approximately 100 times (many of these are implied, not specific) in the new testament. In very, very few of these instance is Yahoshua the speaker. Rather he referred to himself as the "son of man," to which he referred himself approximately eighty-five times!³

I find it odd that one cannot accept 100 passages, whether implied or specific, that refer to Yeshua as the son of Yahweh. All I would need was one Scripture, and that would settle it for me. Both passages I have already shown from Matthew's epistle show that Yeshua's son-ship is different from our own. I can see no way in getting around the truth of these passages. We can become sons of Yahweh, but the Messiah is and was always the Son of Yahweh, only begotten.

Let us also consider two passages in the epistle of I John which indicate a different son-ship for the Messiah.

In this was manifested the love of [the] Almighty toward us, because that [the] Almighty sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved [the] Almighty, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. [I John 4:9-10]

And we know that the Son of [the] Almighty is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Yeshua the Messiah. This is the true Almighty, and eternal life. [I John 5:20]

³ *What Think Ye of Messiah? Whose Son is He?* p8, by Raymond Yakley, 10-3-89.

These verse make no sense if the Messiah is only *a* son of Yahweh as we can become. Yahweh sent His Son for the propitiation of our sins. We are to confess that Yeshua is the Son of Yahweh.⁴ Why would we have to confess something of someone else, that we are ourselves? When the Scripture states words like “These things saith the Son of [the] Almighty”⁵ they are speaking of a being different than us, as we will see, a being who came into the earth through the womb of a virgin woman. When Paul preached in the synagogues that the Messiah was the Son of Yahweh,⁶ it was something extraordinary. Paul was not preaching something about Yeshua that was also true of him-self.

A Son by Resurrection

Many, who believe in a non-virgin birth, state the claim that the Messiah became the Son of Yahweh, *only* at his resurrection. Note the statements by one author:

Beyond a shadow of a doubt, Saul believed that Yahoshua was born of the flesh, a man, from the seed of David. That He BECAME the Son of Yahweh, born of the Spirit at His resurrection from the dead. Notice how he confirmed this belief in his letter to the Romans: “Concerning His Son Yahoshua the Messiah our Master, Which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh. And declared to be the Son of the Almighty with Power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead” (Romans 1:3-4).⁷

I cannot argue with this passage in Romans, neither its parallel passage in the book of Psalm 2:7 stating the same. However, Yeshua addresses himself as Yahweh’s only begotten Son *before* His resurrection in John 3:16-18.⁸

For [the] Almighty so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For [the] Almighty sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of [the] Almighty.

Obviously, if Yahweh gave his only begotten Son (meaning giving him up to die, in the context before of John 3:14-15) he had to be Yahweh’s only begotten Son *before* the resurrection. Therefore another understanding must be sought for the passages in Psalms and Romans, a spiritual understanding perhaps, or an additional reason for Yeshua's unique son-ship; that he was the first man to ever be resurrected to immortality.

If you do an examination of the references to the Messiah before his resurrection, as the Son of Yahweh, you will find that he is referred to by this title many, many times.⁹

⁴ I John 4:15

⁵ Revelation 2:18

⁶ Acts 9:20

⁷ *Do You Believe Moses?* The Liberty Newsletter, No. 11, November 1981, p5, by Richard H. Francis Jr.

⁸ We also saw this in an aforementioned verse, 1 John 4:9-10, where John speaks of Yahweh sending His only begotten Son *into* the world. To send your only begotten Son *into* the world, means He has to be only begotten *before* He is sent into the world.

⁹ Mt. 4:3, 6; 8:29; 14:33; 26:63; 27:40, 43, 54; Mk. 1:1; 3:11; 15:39; Lk. 1:35; 4:3; 4:9, 41; 8:28; 22:70; Jn. 1:34, 49; Jn. 3:18; 5:25; 9:35; 10:36; 11:4, 27; 19:7; 20:31.

This thoroughly disproves the belief that the Messiah became the Son of Yahweh only at or after his resurrection.

Adam: a Son of the Almighty

An excellent example showing the difference between Yeshua's son-ship and ours is by realizing the difference between Adam's son-ship and ours. Yes, Adam was without a doubt a son of Yahweh differently than you and I. Notice a portion of the genealogy of the Messiah in the book of Luke.

Which was the son of Mathusala, which was the son of Enoch, which was the son of Jared, which was the son of Maleleel, which was the son of Cainan, Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of [the] Almighty. [Luke 3:37-38]

This passage singles out Adam as the son of Yahweh. Notice how every other man in this passage has an earthly origin (like Seth - the son of Adam), but Adam is referred to as being "of Yahweh" because he had a heavenly origin. This shows that the phrase "son of the Almighty" or "son of Yahweh" is not always a phrase that can be used of all believers. There are certain unique connotations to the phrase "son of Yahweh."

A Parable to Consider

If Yeshua was a son of Yahweh just as you and I, this would imply that he was also a son of Yahweh just as the prophets. Yet consider a parable Yeshua told in the book of Matthew 21:33-41.

Hear another parable: There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country: And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits of it. And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. Again, he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them likewise. But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him. When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons.

One author, in an article entitled *A Defense of the Virgin Birth Doctrine*, gives some excellent statements concerning this parable and the son-ship of Yeshua.

This parable refers to the nation of Israel killing the son (Yeshua). Prior to that, Yahweh (the householder) sent many servants (prophets included) who they also killed. Yet, those servants are not referred to as sons. There was only one son sent. Why? Because the householder (Yahweh) only has one true son (Yeshua).

In reading this parable we should be able to see that the son-ship of Yeshua is distinctly different than the son-ship we as believers have.

Yahweh's Own Blood

In the book of Acts, during the Apostle Paul's great speech to the assembly at Ephesus, he made a statement that unambiguously shows Yeshua's unique son-ship.

Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of [the] Almighty. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers, to feed the assembly of [the] Almighty, which he hath purchased with his own blood. [Acts 20:26-28]

I am a Father. I can rightfully refer to my son as my own blood. Without me, my son would not exist. Your son (if you have one) could not be referred to, by me, as my own blood. In like manner, Yeshua is Yahweh's own blood (His kin, progeny) because Yahweh is His Father. There is never a time in Scripture when we as believers are referred to in the way Paul speaks here.

Association with the Father and the Holy Spirit

A final way I will use to prove the incomparable son-ship of Yeshua the Messiah, is to show his relationship with the Father in salvation. A certain passage in Scripture does this emphatically.

And Yeshua came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son... [Matthew 28:18-19]

Here we see the close relationship of the Son to the Father. Is anyone really going to try to explain how the one mentioned here as the Son, is a son just as you and I as believers are? This is also the case with an Old Covenant Scripture verse in the book of Proverbs. A special Son is mentioned in connection with the Father.

Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended? who hath gathered the wind in his fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his name, and what is his son's name, if thou canst tell? [Proverbs 30:4]

Conclusion

We have seen that throughout the gospels, that Yeshua is known as Yahweh's own Son, His only begotten Son. Yeshua is a Son of Yahweh similarly (yet not the same) to Adam¹⁰ who was a son of Yahweh differently than you and I. The passages which speak of Yeshua's son-ship can only be understood as meaning that he was from the being of Yahweh. To demand a simplistic understanding of the passages I have cited, as if there

¹⁰ Though Adam and Yeshua are both referred to as a Son of the Almighty, Adam is never referred to as the only begotten Son of Yahweh, nor Adam associated with Yahweh the Father in the eternal salvation of His people. Therefore Yeshua's son-ship is very superior to Adam's. For instance, we are not required to place our faith and trust in Adam to inherit eternal life, but we do have to place faith and trust in Yeshua to inherit eternal life. (1 John 2:23; 4:15)

were no difference in son-ship between Yeshua and ourselves, is to wholly disregard the framework of the passages.

Therefore, what is the ingredient that distinguishes Yeshua from us? It is none other than the doctrine of the virgin birth. Yeshua was born differently, miraculously, in comparison to my birth and yours. This is seen most readily from the Gospel of Luke.

According to Luke's Gospel, the angel Gabriel explained to the young woman Miriam that she would conceive and give birth to a son. Gabriel said this son would be great and be called the Son of the Most High (Luke 1:30-33) Miriam knew what she was saying when she questioned the angel with the words, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? (Luke 1:34)"

Let's think this through for a moment. If the angel came to Miriam the virgin (Luke 1:27) and told her she would conceive a son, it would be quite logical for Miriam to think, "Well, I am a virgin now, but I am betrothed to Joseph so I'll be getting married soon, Joseph and I will be intimate and we will have a special child." So, why does Miriam respond to the angel with wonder and amazement if she was already betrothed and would soon be married and able to be intimate with Joseph?

The best way to understand this is that Miriam took Gabriel's words with immediacy. In other words, as Gabriel talked to her (Luke 1:30-33) Miriam realized that the word Gabriel gave to her about conceiving a son would happen soon after he said it. This makes sense. It explains why she asked the question, "How is this possible seeing I've never had sex with a man?" Miriam realized that Gabriel was telling her she would conceive while only being betrothed to Joseph, before she had sex with him.

The literal rendering of Miriam's question at this point is "seeing I *know not* a man," but if we are familiar with Scripture we should realize that this is a common euphemism for sexual relations. We see it as early as Genesis 4:1 where Adam "knew" Eve and she conceived." Does this mean Adam "met" Eve in the English sense of the word "met?" Does it just mean that Adam knew who she was, like I know who women in my family are? Of course not, it means that Adam had sex with Eve, i.e. he knew her intimately. So Miriam was saying "I've never had sex with a man before." Miriam knew even as a young virgin woman how children were produced. She realized that she had never laid with a man sexually. "I have never been intimate with man" is a translation that accurately portrays the meaning of the original sentence Miriam spoke.

After Miriam asks the angel "How is this going to happen?" Gabriel responds by explaining it (to some degree) to her. Notice Gabriel's response is right in line with Miriam understanding the immediacy of her pregnancy. Gabriel does not correct her and say, "No Miriam, you will marry Joseph and have a child after having sex with him." Gabriel tells her that a miracle will take place in her womb; the Spirit of the Holy One will come upon her. Gabriel continues by saying:

The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of [the] Almighty. [Luke 1:35]

Therefore basically means "On the basis of what I've just told you." The NASB renders it nicely in saying "For that reason." So what Gabriel is saying is this, "There will be a miracle performed upon you Miriam. The Most High's power will overshadow you and *because of this* the holy child born within you will be called Yahweh's Son." There

is no reason for us to doubt Luke's account here concerning a virgin conceiving and bringing forth a son, and according to Luke the virgin conception is directly linked with Yeshua being the Son of Yahweh.

There also is no reason to disbelieve Matthew's account in the first two chapters of his evangel. However, non-virgin birth proponents claim the first two chapters of Matthew are spurious and thus useless. Could they be correct? Maybe the non-virgin birth proponents can support a claim after all?