

The Wayback Machine - <https://web.archive.org/web/20170228101633/http://hope-of-israel.org/virginm.html>

Hope of Israel Ministries (Ecclesia of YEHOVAH):

The *Virgin Birth* and the Messiah

The apostle Paul does not mention the virgin birth anywhere in his writings. It would seem reasonable to assume that if Paul had known of the alleged special conditions of the Messiah's birth that he would have mentioned them in one of his epistles. However, the opposite appears to be true! He considers Yeshua's birth to have been natural and conventional -- with no sign of a virgin birth! The bottom line is: The "virgin birth" story found in mainstream Christianity is derived from the many fables found in the religions of pagan peoples that shared the world of early Christianity!

by HOIM Staff

This article delves into an issue of immeasurable importance. In our opinion it is a "show stopper" with regard to the issue of whether or not Yeshua (Jesus) is the BIBLICAL Messiah. It also represents one of the clearest examples of ignorance and/or deception that exists in traditional Christianity and counterfeit Messianism.

Mainstream Christians enjoy the thought of "baby Jesus" in the context of the "virgin birth". It appeals to the "mother" in all of us. Christians want to believe the "virgin birth" account because it seems such a beautiful story! The desire to believe something is a powerful emotion to overcome, and this desire is a primary reason why many refuse to consider that the alleged birth accounts of the Messiah may be corrupted.

"Sugar and spice and everything nice" dances in the minds of most Christians during Christmas time (an undeniably pagan holiday). They enjoy thinking about the sweet and emotional scenario of the "virgin Mary" with the cute little baby "Jesus" in her arms -- or asleep in the manger. Most Christians don't consider the fact they are actually promoting "baby God" in the arms of Mary -- a thought that is repulsive to those of us that truly revere the Almighty, infinite Creator YEHOVAH God, or that have knowledge of the foundational Hebraic truths of Scripture. Anyone that doubts the extreme emotionalism inherent in the "virgin birth" story need only view the horrendous idolatry of "the blessed virgin" that exist within the Roman Catholic church, which has created an entire set of "Marian dogmas" surrounding the "virgin birth" story. Most mainstream Christians consider the virgin birth to be heartwarming, sweet and beautiful.

Error -- particularly error that blasphemously lowers the Creator into being a helpless little baby (or even an adult human being) at the mercy of all around him and that defines a replacement, false Messiah -- is NOT the least bit "sweet," "beautiful," or "heartwarming".

There is an "all or nothing" mind set within traditional Christianity. It seems that traditional Christianity is a "binary" religion -- a religion that is 1 or 0, "yes" or "no", "grace" or "works", "saved" or "damned", etc. Most Christians will only accept "all" of the birth story and refuse to consider that, perhaps, it may not be totally accurate. Most of it may be true, but the "virgin" aspect is definitely false and is most certainly NOT supported by the Tanakh (Old Testament) -- a fact we will prove in this article.

We realize most will angrily condemn us and reject this article, as well as most other facts we present, without even studying or looking at the evidence shown. So be it. The majority love not the truth and prefer to believe the lie (2 Thes. 2:10,11).

10 He will enable him to deceive, in all kinds of wicked ways, those who are headed for destruction because they would not receive the love of the truth that could have saved them.

11 This is why God is causing them to go astray, so that they will believe the Lie (2 Thessalonians 2:10,11 ***Jewish New Testament***).

Most traditional Christians and Messianics flee those truths they wish not to accept and will usually not even devote time to study them. We are warned that such widespread devotion to the Beast religious system is exactly what will be found by Yeshua and the Father when they return to finally destroy the false teachers, Torah violators, and all others that struggle to perpetuate the age-old lies of the mystery Babylon religion.

We invite you to read on if you are sincerely searching for truth, because what we will prove is basic to whether or not you worship the TRUE Messiah that was promised through the prophets of the Hebrew Scriptures -- the Old Testament -- or the false Messiah of the antichrist promoting great harlot.

What we will prove is that IF Yeshua was born of a "virgin" mother then he is NOT the Messiah of Scripture. Note that we said Messiah "of Scripture". We will show that the "Christ" of traditional Christianity and counterfeit Messianism is actually derived from pagan mystery sun-god religions from which most traditional Christian teachings originate.

The following issues constitute our argument that the virgin birth is a fraudulent manipulation of New Testament writings:

1. The prophecy cited (Isaiah 7:14) to support the "virgin birth" is misinterpreted by mainstream Christian and Messianic apologists as they shred the context to "prove" their point. The context of Isaiah's prophecy prevents it from being divorced from the time frame in which it was given.

We will address the arguments regarding the proper translation of the word often rendered as "virgin" in Isaiah 7:14.

We will also address the common use of the Septuagint Greek translation by those promoting the Babylonish mystery religion "virgin birth".

2. The belief among mainstream Christians and counterfeit Messianics that the New Testament writings are "perfectly" accurate will be discussed. The incorrect belief that the New Testament is "infallible" is a primary reason why so many accept the virgin birth scenario.

3. We will discuss the absolute necessity for the Messiah to be a LITERAL descendant of King David through his human father and how this fact of Scripture is discarded by mainstream Christian/Messianic apologists as they promote a false Messiah (antichrist) -- a REPLACEMENT Messiah that usurps and replaces the TRUE Hebraic Messiah of Scripture.

4. Finally, we will reveal a rarely discussed argument; an argument that is devastating to whatever is left of the virgin birth argument once the other issues have been covered. This may be the first exposure you've ever had to this argument since we've never seen it discussed elsewhere.

The simple fact is that the "virgin birth" is NEVER even mentioned in the New Testament writings except for the alleged birth accounts in a handful of passages in Matthew's and Luke's gospels. This undeniable fact provides strong evidence that the "virgin birth" never happened. As part of this point is the clear and irrefutable fact that acceptance of the virgin birth is NOWHERE stated as a necessary belief within the pages of the New Testament writings!

This begs the question -- if the New Testament writings NEVER state it is necessary to accept the virgin birth, why do traditional Christians and Christianized Messianics teach one MUST accept it? Exactly what are they really promoting since they present demands regarding what one must believe that are nowhere found in the Biblical writings? The demand that one MUST accept that the Messiah is "God in the flesh" is also NOWHERE found in ANY examples of conversion recorded in the Apostolic writings (New Testament).

Just so no misunderstanding will occur, allow us to define what we mean when we say "virgin birth". In this article "virgin birth" is defined as becoming pregnant -- conceiving a child -- without the normal sexual union between man and woman. It is the act of conceiving without losing one's virginity. We define a "virgin birth" as human conception without the normal fertilization of the female egg with the male sperm -- male sperm which is deposited by and/or originates from a normal human male. In that light, our use of the term "virgin" is to denote the one to whom the virgin birth, as just defined, applies. It is our firm conviction -- a conviction fully supported from the TRUE Holy Scriptures -- that Mary, the mother of Yeshua, did NOT conceive as a virgin, in the sense of not having relations with Joseph. We will specify when and where our use of the term "virgin" differs from the definition just mentioned.

As a side note: It is also the conviction of many leaders within Christianity that Mary was not a virgin. There are many other leaders that actually realize the virgin birth is not supported from Scripture and that also realize the New Testament accounts are likely fraudulent. However, they never express this "on the record". Instead, they admit their true belief "off the record". We consider it insincere and deceptive for them to continue to promote what they actually do not even believe. For them -- and for many others -- peer pressure, pride, and the fear of losing their profitable positions take precedence over serving YEHOVAH God with a whole and TRUE heart. By teaching what they do not even themselves believe, they prove themselves to be practicing willful deception and prove that TRUTH (and thus serving YEHOVAH God) is NOT their highest priority.

Let us also clarify that we DO consider Yeshua (falsely called by the name "Jesus") to be the promised Messiah. Most traditional Christians and counterfeit Messianics are so confused about what the Scripture says about Messiah that they consider many doctrines, such as the "virgin birth", crucial to proving "Jesus" is the "Christ". Such beliefs illuminate how successful Satan has been in persuading many that their beliefs are Biblical, while they are actually very UNbiblical. Tragically, since the Scriptural study habits of Christians are so woefully poor, they are easily victimized by the Beastly system that deceives the entire world (Rev. 12:9).

So, if you assume that the objective of this article is to oppose the Messiah, you are mistaken. Our objective is to exalt the TRUE Messiah Yeshua and to hopefully begin to shake mainstream Christians and counterfeit Messianics from their stupor of spiritual drunkenness and victimization caused by the ignorance or intentional lies of their spiritual leaders -- some of whom may actually be among Satan's servants "disguised as angels of light" (2 Cor. 11:13-15).

Satan hopes to continue to present a "Christ" that knowledgeable Jews can NEVER accept, because he knows if they finally do accept Yeshua, he is doomed! A major obstacle to the acceptance of Yeshua

as the Messiah by the Jews is the pagan doctrine of godly procreation promoted by the virgin birth teaching.

We will prove that IF Yeshua did not have an earthly father, he is NOT the Scriptural Messiah (anointed one) of the one and only Eternal YEHOUVAH God. This is a fundamental fact of Scripture that followers of, and promoters of, the spirit of antichrist (replacement Messiah) hope you never discover.

The New Testament teaches we should always test what is taught us by referencing the Tanakh (Old Testament). In the book of Acts we read of a group of people the author describes as "more noble" than others.

Now the people here were of nobler character than the ones in Thessalonika; they eagerly welcomed the message, checking the Tanakh every day to see if the things Sha'ul [Paul] was saying were true (Acts 17:11 **Jewish New Testament**).

Note the reason they were considered noble is because they were OPEN-MINDED and they searched the Scriptures DAILY to prove if what they were being taught was true. The "Scripture" they searched was the **Old Testament**. The New Testament did not even exist at that time! Despite this, most Christians NEVER test what they are taught, or interpret from their readings of the New Testament, by seeing if it can be verified in the Old. Instead, most Christians blasphemously conclude the Old Testament is largely irrelevant.

Traditional Christians and counterfeit Messianics (versus true monotheistic Messianics that refuse to honor the replacement mystery Babylon God-man Messiah) the world over do not follow the clear teaching of the New Testament -- which DEMANDS all things must be verified from the Old! Christians and counterfeit Messianics violate the very New Testament they cling to and shun and/or despise those that can prove their unscriptural understanding that the New Testament is superior to -- or even equal to -- the Old Testament to be incorrect. The New Testament writings are not, never have been, and never will be, superior to or equal to the Old! The New Testament, itself, CLEARLY testifies to this fact.

There is no better example of the need to test what is taught from the New Testament by verifying it against the ultimate truths in the Old Testament than the issue of the virgin birth. Ultimately, as we will show, the issue becomes one of glaring contradiction between the Old Testament and the alleged birth accounts in the New Testament.

Sadly, virtually all traditional Christians and counterfeit Messianics do the exact opposite of what the noble Bereans did. Most reverse the test by elevating the New Testament as the ultimate authority, despite the fact the Apostolic writings (New Testament) teach against it. When the TRUE test -- the same test those "more noble" utilize -- is applied, the virgin birth is proven to be a fabrication by those seeking to proliferate the ancient and continuing mystery Babylon sun-god false religion that has always stood against the Hebraic truths.

Now to the study.

Contrary to what most mainstream Christians and counterfeit Messianics think, if it was somehow proven to them that Yeshua was actually not born of a virgin but was the literal son of Joseph, it would not negatively affect Yeshua's prophetic hold on his being the Messiah at all! However, because of their incorrect understanding of what the "Messiah" is, it probably would unnecessarily damage their faith.

ONLY if Joseph was clearly Yeshua's father would Yeshua meet the primary necessity of literally being of the seed of David -- a CRUCIAL fact that the virgin birth destroys! So, if Joseph is proven to be his father, such news would positively impact Yeshua's prophetic hold to being the Messiah. Such news would also not negatively affect his being the SCRIPTURAL "Son of God".

The Prophecy of Isaiah

A traditional Christian misunderstanding of Scripture is shown by the common belief that the virgin birth is an essential part of Yeshua's Messianic requirements. Prophetically speaking, as proof of his Messiahship, the claim that he was born of a "virgin" is indeed an issue, but in a way most Christians and Christianized Messianics fail to grasp! There is absolutely NOTHING in the Hebrew Scriptures that REQUIRES the Messiah to be born to a virgin. The passage many messianically apply to this claim (Isaiah 7:14) does NOT necessarily refer to a "virgin" woman, despite the deceitful claims by preachers and ministers. Furthermore, a fact those promoting the virgin birth hate to have attention focused upon, is that when the context of Isaiah 7:14 is considered, the verse is easily proven to NOT even be a Messianic passage!

Typically, the "virgin birth" debate focuses on the Hebrew word *almah*, which is found in Isaiah 7:14 and translated as "virgin" in some Bible translations. The New Revised Standard Version more accurately translates it as "young woman", and the New American Standard Version has an alternate rendering note, which shows "maiden" as the translation. The primary tactic used by those promoting the mystery Babylon godly procreation teaching of the "virgin birth," is to confuse the issue by rarely mentioning the clear context of the Scripture. It is for this reason they promote the intentionally deceptive idea that the entire debate hinges on the proper translation of the word they choose as "virgin".

The translation issue is a distant second to the far more revealing issue of Scriptural context, but since virgin birth proponents know the context offers them ZERO support, they endeavor to cunningly steer the debate clear of a consideration of the context by focusing on the less crucial and more confusing word game surrounding the "virgin" translation of *almah*.

In order for Isaiah 7:14 to be Messianic, it must be completely separated from ALL the surrounding passages. However, as with many other passages of Scripture, traditional Christians and counterfeit Messianics show no hesitation to shred the context as a means to "prove" their false teachings -- especially their promotion of a "God in the flesh" Messiah!

Although the word-game regarding the translation of the word as "virgin" is a distant second in order of importance, we will nevertheless address the issue, since it is so often raised. The facts we will present should settle the issue for anyone that is truly sincere in their search for truth.

Those wishing to consider "virgin" as the proper rendering discard the clear Hebrew meaning of *almah* in order to claim proof for their argument. Actually, their "proof" is a zealous promotion of falsehood since they intentionally stretch the Hebrew word's true meaning to the breaking point in their search for straws of nonexistent support for the pagan doctrine of godly procreation.

The sure meaning of the Hebrew word, *almah*, (**Strong's #5959**) is a young woman of the age to be married. Whether it refers to a literal virgin or not has no affect on its being fulfilled in Yeshua except in a negative sense, since if Mary was a "virgin", Yeshua is NOT the Messiah!

The New Strong's Guide to Bible Words shows that the word *almah* can mean "a lass" or "young woman".

The Enhanced Strong's Lexicon presents the word as meaning a "virgin or young woman of marriageable age, a maid or newly married".

The Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Hebrew (Old Testament) shows the proper rendering of *almah* to be "a young woman, i.e., sexually mature female of marriageable age, which may or may not be sexually active".

That the word *almah* does not imply virginity is conceded by E. W. Hengstenberg, author of the popular book ***The Christology of the Old Testament***. In his commentary on Isaiah 7:14, he writes,

"Here, as well as throughout this whole inquiry, the notion of a pure virgin, and that of an unmarried woman, are blended together. The former is not indeed required by the etymology of the word, but the latter certainly is" (page 169).

On the same page, he writes,

"...we do not claim for the word the sense of unspotted purity, but only that of the unmarried state".

There is a separate Hebrew word, *betulah*, (***Strong's* #1330**) that is used far more often to represent a true virgin (sexually pure) female. It is used 50 or so times in the Tanakh (Old Testament), compared to 9 or so for *almah*. ***Strong's Exhaustive Concordance*** shows ONLY one clear translation for the Hebrew term, *betulah*. That translation is VIRGIN! Contrast this with the various alternate possible renderings for the word, *almah*, which traditional Christians and counterfeit Messianics *demand* must be translated as "virgin".

So, *betulah*, NOT *almah*, is clearly THE Hebrew word for "virgin". Isaiah was well aware of this and would have used *betulah* if he meant to imply a pure virgin was going to miraculously conceive! Constantinian Christian and Messianic theologians are also well aware of this but, as usual, twist the truth to fit their objectives.

Later we will address the weak argument made using the Septuagint Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. The use of such weak arguments is common within traditional Christian and counterfeit Messianic groups.

It is true that in rare situations the Hebrew word *almah* may possibly be used to refer to a virgin; HOWEVER, even if it was indisputably the word for virgin it still proves nothing. As already mentioned, the word games played by desperate and deceitful Trinitarians and others seeking to promote the lie of pagan godly procreation is nothing more than chaff thrown up to confuse and deceive. THE issue is NOT the translation of the Hebrew Word, *almah*. THE issue is the context of the passages in which Isaiah 7:14 is firmly and irrefutably placed!

For proof, we will do what few Christian or Messianic leaders do, we will present the actual context of the verse and highlight crucial areas. This will prove that the use of Isaiah 7:14 as a Messianic passage is a prime example of distortion and context shredding of Scripture. We will even use the King James Version, the favorite of those opposing us within traditional Christianity. Our proof is even more pronounced if other versions are used; however, to preclude the accusation of using a biased version, we will use the translation most adored by those believing Yeshua to be God. As you will see, even the KJV proves the traditional interpretation of Isaiah 7:14 wrong to all that are sincere and open minded to YEHOVAH God's Truth instead of in bondage to tradition.

1 And it came to pass in the days of Ahaz the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, king of Judah, that Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, went up toward Jerusalem to war against it, but could not prevail against it.

2 And it was told the house of David (king Ahaz), saying, Syria is confederate with Ephraim. And his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind. **(Ahaz and the people of Judah were terrified of the defeat they expected from the united efforts of Syria and the northern Kingdom, Israel)**

3 Then said the LORD unto Isaiah, Go forth now to meet Ahaz, (**Isaiah sent to talk to Ahaz**) thou, and Shearjashub (**lit. "a remnant shall return"**) thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field;

4 And say unto him, Take heed, and be quiet; fear not, (**Isaiah sent to calm the fears of the king of Judah**) neither be fainthearted for the two tails of these smoking firebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah.

5 Because Syria, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah, have taken evil counsel against thee, saying,

6 Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein for us, and set a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeal:

7 Thus saith the Lord GOD, It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass (**the defeat of Judah by Rezin of Syria and Pekah of the northern Kingdom of Israel**).

8 For the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin; and within threescore and five years (**NOTE! a clear time frame was given from THAT time**) shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people.

9 And the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is Remaliah's son. If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established.

10 Moreover the LORD spake again unto Ahaz, saying,

11 Ask thee a sign of the LORD thy God; (**Ahaz is asked to ask for a sign**) ask it either in the depth, or in the height above.

12 But Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the LORD.

13 And he said, Hear ye now, O house of David; (**Ahaz is of the house of David**) Is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also?

14 Therefore the Lord himself shall give you (**Ahaz**) a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.

(The birth -- or the name -- was to be a sign to Ahaz. This couldn't possibly be the birth of Messiah, since it was hundreds of years later, long after Ahaz had died! A "sign" to a dead man is useless!)

15 Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good.

16 For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. (**those united against Judah**)

17 The LORD shall bring upon thee (**Ahaz**), and upon thy people (**Judah**), and upon thy father's house, days that have not come, from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah; even the king of Assyria. (**Judah would be chastised severely through Assyria because of the wicked rule of Ahaz and other kings that forsook YEHOVAH God's torah; however, Assyria would not be the end for Judah.**)

18 And it shall come to pass in that day, that the LORD shall hiss for the fly that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria.

19 And they shall come, and shall rest all of them in the desolate valleys, and in the holes of the rocks, and upon all thorns, and upon all bushes.

20 In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired, namely, by them beyond the river, by the king of Assyria, the head, and the hair of the feet: and it shall also consume the beard.

21 And it shall come to pass in that day, that a man shall nourish a young cow, and two sheep;

22 And it shall come to pass, for the abundance of milk that they shall give he shall eat butter: for butter and honey shall every one eat that is left in the land.

23 And it shall come to pass in that day, that every place shall be, where there were a thousand vines at a thousand silverlings, it shall even be for briers and thorns.

24 With arrows and with bows shall men come thither; because all the land shall become briers and thorns.

25 And on all hills that shall be digged with the mattock, there shall not come thither the fear of briers and thorns: but it shall be for the sending forth of oxen, and for the treading of lesser cattle.

8:1 Moreover the LORD said unto me, Take thee a great roll, and write in it with a man's pen concerning Mahershalalhashbaz.

2 And I took unto me faithful witnesses to record, Uriah the priest, and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah.

3 And I went unto the prophetess; and she conceived, and bare a son. Then said the LORD to me, Call his name Mahershalalhashbaz. **(THIS IS THE FULFILLMENT OF 7:14!)**

4 For before the child shall have knowledge to cry, My father, and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria. **(repeat of 7:16, further proving the birth of Isaiah's son to be the fulfillment of Is. 7:14!)**

5 The LORD spake also unto me again, saying,

6 Forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Shiloah that go softly, and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah's son;

7 Now therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory: and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks:

8 And he shall pass through Judah; he shall overflow and go over, he shall reach even to the neck; and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel. (Isaiah 7:1-8:8 (KJV))

(The use of this term (Immanuel) in 7:14 was part of the sign which was "God with us" during the time to soon come when Judah feels threatened from Assyria. Here the name is applied to Judah to insure that divine protection will be extended to it, which of course, it was at that time.)

There are several unambiguous facts seen in the context of these verses.

1. First, Isaiah is talking to King Ahaz of Judah and tells HIM (Ahaz) that the sign of a birth will be for HIM. This fact alone makes application of Isaiah 7:14 to the birth of Yeshua impossible, since Ahaz was long dead by the time Yeshua was born; thus proving it is not a Messianic prophesy.
2. The ENTIRE context of these verses refer to the specific issue of the prophecy regarding what will happen to those that were plotting to destroy Judah, of which Ahaz was King. Even the term Immanuel, "god with us", was to assure Judah, as shown in 8:8, that YEHOVAH God would be "with them" during the time of trial that was to come when Syria and Israel strove against Judah and Assyria invaded.
3. Only a few verses after Isaiah 7:14, in verse 8:3, we probably see the birth he was speaking of in Is. 7:14. It was a birth of a son to Isaiah and his young wife. Furthermore, even the term "virgin" would apply to the prophetess if the information shown earlier regarding the use of *almah* to mean "a young woman" (i.e., "sexually mature female of marriageable age, which may or may not be sexually active") is considered. We will comment more on this a little later.
4. Thus, the context is clear that the "virgin" (young woman) was probably Isaiah's wife, the "prophetess", mentioned in Is. 8:3. This is crystal clear when bias is removed and the Scripture is actually allowed to speak for itself. Some Judaic commentators believe it applies to Hezekiah, the son of Ahaz, who proved to be one of Judah's greatest Kings; however, we feel the context more correctly points to Isaiah's son as the fulfillment. Either way, the newborn child being prophesied was for THAT PARTICULAR TIME FRAME as a sign to Ahaz. The prophecy was NOT for a time frame 700 years after Ahaz was dead (Yeshua was born about 700 years after this prophecy)!
5. Additionally, Isaiah 7:16 and 8:4 are almost identical, proving them to reference the same event, which was that while the newborn son of Isaiah was yet young, the prophecy would be accomplished, which was that YEHOVAH God would eliminate the threat posed to Ahaz by the combined efforts of Ephraim and Damascus. This provides further evidence that the birth foretold as a sign TO AHAZ was fulfilled by the birth of Isaiah's newborn son with the prophetess (Isaiah's wife) as the mother.
6. The common sense context is clear. The ONLY way Isaiah 7:14 can be a Messianic verse referring to Yeshua the Messiah is to completely rip it free of the clear context in which it resides. The ONLY evidence that this is a Messianic prophecy is the evidence supplied by Constantinian Christian tradition and probable scribal manipulation of the Gospels.

We challenge anyone to show us, FROM THE CONTEXT OF ISAIAH, that this verse applies to the Messiah! And don't throw Matthew and Luke at us, writings for which evidence exists of scribal manipulation -- an issue we will briefly address later. Prove it from Isaiah. Also, recall that even in the New Testament we find that truth MUST be proven from the OLD TESTAMENT, just as was done by the "noble" Bereans. Almost all Christians seem to forget or ignore this clear teaching from the pages of the New Testament.

A typical argument presented by Constantinian Christians/Messianics is that Isaiah 7:14 has a "dual" meaning. Those promoting this will agree that the context does NOT suggest some sort of future Messianic prophecy. However, instead of allowing Scripture to speak for itself, they utilize the common "ejection button" of "mystery" or "hidden meaning."

If a prophecy cannot be shown in the Old Testament, it is not a prophecy, and the use of Isaiah 7:14 as Messianic prophecy cannot be legitimately shown from its context; therefore, its "fulfillment" in the birth of Messiah cannot be substantiated. Unlike other verses that leave room for various opinions regarding their application to Messiah, Isaiah 7:14 is too clear to allow it to be so brutally divorced from its context. Unfortunately, since traditional Christians doggedly claim the New Testament to be equal or even superior to the Old, they allow the few verses in Matthew and Luke -- or the notion of a "dual" meaning -- to overrule the clarity shown from the context of Isaiah 7 and 8.

Regardless of the specifics of the prophecy, one thing is clear -- it was DEFINITELY a prophecy for Ahaz and the days of Ahaz! There is absolutely NO HINT that this is referring to the Messiah. The common Christian interpretation that Isaiah 7:14 applies to Messiah (despite the contextual evidence proving otherwise) was possibly accomplished when scribes took it upon themselves to edit the Gospel accounts of Yeshua's birth so that the alleged birth account would better line up with the standard Babylonian sun-god mystery religion god-man of pagan thought. The typical, almost universal argument we receive from those that disagree with us comes from the alleged Gospel accounts. Thus, the ONLY proof available for the virgin birth comes from writings scholars have proven are corrupt copies of original manuscripts that themselves are not "originals."

New Testament Problems?

The fact that tens of thousands of undeniable differences exist between the available New Testament manuscripts is all one need point to for proof that the New Testament has scribal corruption. If I recall correctly, Bart Ehrman says in his book, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, that there are over 100,000 variations among the 5366 extant manuscripts and no two manuscripts are in agreement. Even the most conservative estimate among scholars is that there are "over 10,000 variations" in the available texts. These facts ALONE prove, beyond doubt, that the New Testament is NOT the "perfect Word of God".

Only the most obstinate and insincere individual would dare deny the clear fact of manuscript differences. Of course, the textual variants just mentioned apply only to the Greek manuscripts and ignore the added error introduced by incorrect translation from those manuscripts. If translator mistakes (or bias) are considered, the potential for error is dramatically multiplied since even a perfectly authentic Greek text, assuming one even exist, can be corrupted by biased translation into a different language -- English for instance. Nevertheless, few Christians or counterfeit Messianics wish to accept the facts, which prove the New Testament to be imperfect. Most Constantinian Christians and Messianics absolutely refuse to accept this undeniable fact and in so doing PROVE themselves to be insincere!

Unfortunately, because of an unrealistic traditional insistence on the infallibility of the New Testament -- despite mountains of scholarship that proves otherwise -- insincerity rules supreme in traditional Christianity regarding Isaiah 7:14 and the probably fabricated "virgin birth" accounts in the early chapters of Matthew and Luke. In those accounts Isaiah 7:14 is stripped from the context in which it resides and wrongly applied, probably by biased scribes reaching for nonexistent "proof" of prophecy for a "virgin birth" that is more closely aligned with their mystery Babylon-based religions beliefs. So, one must be insincere and biased to apply Isaiah 7:14 to the Messiah when reading Isaiah free from the bias of Matthew's and Luke's birth accounts -- particularly since Matthew's and Luke's accounts can NOT be proven to be free of scribal corruption.

Those that doggedly maintain "perfection" for the New Testament will utilize all manner of arguments from it to "prove" the virgin birth. Of course, ALL such arguments are necessarily limited to ONLY a few passages from Matthew and Luke -- passages that would tell a completely different story if only a handful of words were different. Scribal corruption would not have had to be extensive to totally change the birth accounts of Messiah so as to align them with the virgin birth Roman doctrines of the Babylonian mystery religion sun-god worship that was common during the times the gospels were

canonized. Virgin birth proponents are forced to rely upon the small fragments of verses they cling to from Matthew and Luke since the Tanakh (Old Testament) is void of any proof of the virgin birth. There are NO Messianic prophecies that even hint at a "virgin birth"! In fact, with the exception of Matthew's and Luke's alleged accounts, virgin birth promoters cannot even find proof anywhere else in the New Testament for their belief! It is nowhere else mentioned or even hinted at!

One "proof" argument uses the alleged fact that Joseph was going to put away (cancel plans to marry) Mary when he found out she was pregnant. Those using this argument will say this proves it was not his child and was therefore a "virgin birth".

The common characteristic of ALL such arguments is the ASSUMPTION that what is recorded in a few specific verses is actually the truth and/or was in the original autographed copy of the text. Ultimately, those presenting such "proofs" simply refuse to consider that the gospel accounts of the birth of Messiah may have been corrupted by changing just a few crucial words. They utterly refuse to consider that their belief in the infallibility of the New Testament writings may be unwise. They elevate the New Testament above the Old Testament -- despite the fact that the New Testament itself warns them to ALWAYS base truth on the Old! Later we will present one case of SURE corruption, that being the discrepancy between the recorded genealogies of Messiah shown in Matthew and Luke.

Many that disagree with us vehemently present another argument similar to the following:

"The New Testament has been proven 99 percent accurate."

Ninety-nine percent may be a bit of wishful thinking, but let's assume that we accept their statement. In fact, we do believe that the New Testament is highly reliable. The question is, do THEY actually accept their own accuracy estimate? Are they willing to stand by their statement? Since they so forcefully promote the idea that the New Testament is 99 percent accurate, then they must also accept what is implied by their statement, which is that the New Testament is 1 percent corrupt! Are they willing to admit that ONE OUT OF EVERY 100 WORDS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT IS INCORRECT, based on their own vigorously stated position of 99 percent New Testament accuracy? Obviously, if they admit 1% error they will have to admit it is quite possible a few of those 1 out of 100 incorrect words (or added words) may lie within the alleged birth accounts of the Messiah! There are 7957 verses in the New Testament. Are those promoting 99 percent accuracy willing to admit that by their own estimation roughly 80 New Testament passages present false information? Depending on where those 80 (as a minimum) are located, they may GREATLY affect one's understanding of "Scripture".

In truth, even those that assume 99 percent accuracy for the New Testament still refuse to admit there may be 1 percent error. Even if they do, they ALWAYS subjectively select those passages they consider to be within the list of erroneous verses based upon their own personal bias. In other words, those that accuse us of discarding passages we choose not to accept do precisely the same thing when shown the numerous New Testament passages that conflict with their own beliefs! They are proven to be hypocritical regarding the accusations they hurl against those like ourselves!

The difference between Hope of Israel Ministries and those that hypocritically accuse us of selective New Testament acceptance is that we, unlike our accusers, use the same approach as the "noble" Bereans (Acts 17:11). We TEST the verses of the New Testament by comparing them to what is written in the Old Testament, just as the New Testament authors command. This test is virtually never used by Christians or counterfeit Messianics. Therefore, our use of discernment to determine what may be incorrect within the New Testament is not only Scriptural, but is also commanded from within the very pages of the New Testament. Since we follow the command to test the apostolic writings using the Old Testament, we are more of "New Testament believers" than our Constantinian Christian opponents! WE ACTUALLY FOLLOW THE NEW TESTAMENT MORE CLOSELY THAN OUR OPPONENTS DO!

Christians and counterfeit Messianics need to realize that their faith in the infallibility of the New Testament writings is actually faith in the infallibility of the men who collected, copied (edited), and canonized the New Testament manuscripts! When a Christian states a belief that the New Testament is the "Word of God", what they are actually naively accepting as perfect are imperfect men that history proves were VERY anti-Hebraic, anti-Semitic, steeped in the mystery sun-god religions -- and politically motivated! Christians are not even aware of what their faith ACTUALLY involves or in whom their faith is ACTUALLY placed! They never stop to consider what they are ACTUALLY basing their "faith" upon! And of course, very few Christians have the slightest idea of what REALLY happened during those crucial first 4 centuries following the death of Yeshua. Worst still, most Christians don't care!

We am NOT saying the New Testament is bogus. Many falsely accuse us of that since they cannot refute our arguments using the Old Testament or scholarship! All we are saying is that even if the corruption exists in a small percentage of the overall number of passages it is unwise to ultimately base one's faith on a collection of writings PROVEN to be corrupt or questionable in various areas, which were collected by men that are also proven to be corrupt. We are also not implying widespread corruption. It doesn't take much cyanide or cobra venom to kill. One drop is all that is needed. Likewise, a scribal "edit" of just a few carefully placed words can totally poison truth, particularly when those words are contained in a handful of crucial verses. As stated previously, this problem is multiplied when otherwise correct texts within the Greek manuscripts are mistranslated! It is for this reason one should follow the New Testament authors' pleas to ALWAYS base one's faith ULTIMATELY on what is written in the Old Testament, and by verifying that their interpretation of New Testament passages has Old Testament support.

When the advice of the New Testament authors to verify the New Testament by using the Old is followed, the virgin birth is proven to be false (as are many other teachings within Christianity, particularly the "God in the flesh" Messiah and anti-Torah doctrines).

It is also unwise to assume English versions of the Bible to be the "Word of God", which are based upon biased renderings from the available Hebrew and Greek manuscripts. Bias does not necessarily imply intent to corrupt. It is simply a fact of human nature that bias will inevitably enter into a translation when the translator must choose between various legitimate renderings of a Hebrew or Greek word. Of course, virtually all Bibles used by Christians were translated by individuals that were biased against the Hebraic world view.

One book which discusses the issue of scribal manipulation of the New Testament writings is ***The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture***, by Bart D. Ehrman, which we briefly mentioned earlier. There are LOTS of other books which prove that the New Testament is most certainly NOT infallible. We will not spend time proving what many scholarly publications already do. If others wish to believe the New Testament is the "perfect and infallible Word of God," and refuse to verify their stated belief, so be it. There are many that prefer ignorance over truth because truth is too much for them to accept. Such is the case of those that wish to believe the New Testament writings are free from error.

The Septuagint

Now we will address the common argument regarding the Greek word found in the Septuagint, which is properly rendered as "virgin"; however, the Greek word, *parthenos*, is not limited to always meaning "virgin". The Septuagint was for the most part a notoriously sloppy translation, and its version of Isaiah was generally more error-ridden than the rest. By the Middle Ages, the Jews had abandoned the Septuagint, and later Greek translations, by Aquila, Theodotion, Lucien and others, did not use the word *parthenos*. (The Septuagint, commonly known as the LXX, is still favored by Eastern Orthodox churches.) Briefly, there are a few points one must consider:

1. First, it is a fact that the Septuagint is a translation. The situation is no different than an English translation from the Hebrew that all in the English speaking world carry. Only the most grotesquely deceived will dare claim the English Bible is "perfect". Most serious students of Scripture reference Hebrew Lexicons to verify and clarify their English translations of the Hebrew Scriptures. So, like your English version of the Tanakh (Old Testament), the Septuagint is a translation from the original Hebrew, and like your English version, it is NOT perfect. The Septuagint is NOT an original version of Scripture! The original language of the Old Testament is Hebrew; therefore, common sense and honesty demands that the Hebrew be given precedence over the Greek -- just as common sense and honesty demands the Hebrew be given precedence over an English translation. However, when this is done a primary argument of those promoting a "virgin birth" is severely weakened; thus, they selectively choose the Septuagint for their final argument.

2. The Septuagint was completed in the Hellenistic hotbed of Alexandria Egypt. Though traditionally said to have been translated by 70 or 72 Jewish scholars at the request of Ptolemy II, most scholars believe that only the Pentateuch (Torah, or Genesis -- Deuteronomy) was completed in the early part of the 3rd century BCE and that the remaining books were translated in the next two centuries. Of course, since the Prophetic writings were not part of the original and no one really knows who added them (Prophetic writings) to the Septuagint, it is not wise to consider them infallible. Obviously, Isaiah is part of this later addition to the Septuagint. I do feel the Septuagint is an excellent source for study and even quoting; however, when conflicts arise between the Greek of the Septuagint and the Hebrew of the more widely accepted Hebrew Scriptures, precedence should always be given to the Hebrew.

Because of the questions surrounding the origins of the Septuagint, it is NOT universally accepted. There were significant doctrinal and lifestyle differences between Hellenistic Jews and the more traditional Jews within the land of Israel. Hellenists were heavily influenced by Greek culture; thus, it makes sense that this same pagan influence may have contributed somewhat to some of the nuances of the Septuagint translation.

Christianity, as is often the case, promotes an assumption as fact by stating that Paul and other writers of the New Testament -- as well as Yeshua -- utilized the Septuagint as their primary Scripture. Such an assumption is not provable, is unlikely, and also has as a foundation the assumption that what we now have is EXACTLY what Paul and the other New Testament writers actually wrote. As a Pharisee, it is highly unlikely Paul would have used as his primary Scripture a translation composed by Hellenistic Jews -- with whom the Pharisees differed greatly. It is likewise unlikely that Yeshua, or the other writers of the New Testament, used the Septuagint as the final Word.

3. Even if the proper translation of the Hebrew word is "virgin", it still does not prove that a literal virgin was intended. If one marries a virgin and she conceives after the first act of sexual union, it can legitimately be stated that a virgin conceived. Of course, AFTER the union she would no longer be a virgin. The term is interpreted in the strictest possible sense by Constantinian Christians when, in fact, it should be interpreted based upon how the original writer intended -- which of course we cannot possibly know. It could very well have been a young maiden, which is the rendering from the Hebrew.

4. Finally, regardless of whether or not it is rendered as virgin or maiden, it still is firmly lodged in the same context of Scripture; therefore, the context still demands the prophecy be applied as shown, which was as a sign to AHAZ. Ahaz was long dead (about 700 years) before Yeshua was born. As stated earlier, as sign to a dead man will not do much good.

Most will immediately think of the passages in the New Testament that refer to the child (Yeshua) being conceived "of the Holy Ghost"; we will briefly address that issue. First, as already mentioned, there is legitimate debate regarding the authenticity of the accounts recorded in the early chapters of Matthew and Luke; so, the alleged fulfillment of Isaiah 7:14 in those Gospels may be an invention of the early Constantinian minded Greek and Roman scribes. The clear context of Isaiah 7:14, as just discussed,

does not even hint at any sort of Messianic fulfillment. Also, the Word (Scriptures) is Spirit; therefore, being conceived of the holy spirit could just as well mean being conceived, as prophesied or planned, by YEHOVAH God through His Word. The plan of YEHOVAH always involved the birth of THE Messiah; therefore, being conceived (planned) by the holy spirit could just as easily mean being planned by the Creator and manifested at that time.

Next we wish to address a common argument put forth by those promoting the virgin birth as they attempt to wiggle free from the CLEAR contextual facts previously presented. This argument is among one of the clearest examples of panicked desperation that one can find within traditional Christian Biblical interpretations.

A Literal Descendant

You know that feeling you get when a friend makes a fool of themselves in public? You know that feeling of embarrassment for them? Well, the typical traditional Christian argument we're about to discuss is like that. It is such an obvious act of desperation that it actually makes us feel embarrassed for the Christian and Messianic leaders that are forced to utilize it as they find themselves with no place to hide from the UNAMBIGUOUS PROOFS found within the context of Isaiah 7 and 8. The argument to which we refer is that used by those promoting the virgin birth of the verse Genesis 3:15, which refers to the "seed" of woman. They frantically attempt to promote the teaching that within this verse there is a mysterious code, which differentiates between the "seed" of man and the "seed" of woman, that lay dormant for 4000 years then reappeared to apply to Mary, the mother of Yeshua. Below we show four separate translations of the verse --

15 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. (Genesis 3:15 (*Tanakh*))

15 I will put enmity between you and the woman, And between your offspring and hers; They shall strike at your head, and you shall strike at their heel. (Genesis 3:15 (*NRSV*))

15 I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will strike your head, and you will strike his heel. (Genesis 3:15 (*NASB95*))

15 And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; he shall bruise you on the head, and you shall bruise him on the heel. (Genesis 3:15 (*KJV*))

Primarily, as a result of the KJV translation, traditional Christians stretch, twist, and bend the words "seed" and "woman" into being some sort of mysterious code-match of words to imply the Messiah is here shown to be of the "seed" of Mary instead of the "seed" of Joseph. Therefore, they attempt to force the argument that the CLEAR and OFTEN STATED crucial requirement that the Messiah be LITERALLY of the offspring of King David THROUGH HIS FATHER, which we will discuss shortly, is somehow overruled by this verse. This is one of the best examples of shameless context shredding and false doctrine that one can point to within traditional Christianity and is, indeed, an embarrassingly desperate teaching. In this case, the context being shredded is the entire Bible, which shows the Messiah to be the LITERAL offspring of King David! Let's examine these verses.

First, the word rendered as "seed" or "offspring" is the Hebrew word *zera*. **The Enhanced Strong's Lexicon** shows the word (**Strong's #2233**) occurs 229 times in the Hebrew Scriptures. Note that it is shown to be a MASCULINE noun. The Authorized Version (KJV) translates it as seed 221 times, child twice, and also other times as carnally, fruitful, seedtime, and sowing time. **Strong's** also shows the meaning as:

* seed * sowing * offspring * semen virile * descendants * posterity * children

The Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament presents the following information regarding the Hebrew word, *zera*. As you read this note how the primary meaning most definitely implies it is the MALE reproductive function that dominates the definition, NOT the female.

zera: Sowing, seed, offspring. This noun is used 224 times. Its usages fall into four basic semantic categories: 1. The time of sowing, seedtime; 2. the seed as that which is scattered or as the product of what is sown; 3. the seed as semen and 4. the Seed as the offspring in the promised line of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob or in other groups separate from this people of promise. (Harris, R. L. (1999, c1980). **Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament** (pages 252-253), Chicago: Moody Press.

Finally, within the definition found in the **Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains : Hebrew (Old Testament)** we find the following:

(zera): n.masc.; = Str 2233; TWOT 582a - 1. LN 3.35 seed, i.e., a kernel part of a plant that propagates the species (Ge 1:11); 2. LN 8.70-8.77 **semen**, i.e., **the product of the male genitals** (Lev 15:16); 3. LN 9.41-9.45 child, i.e., one that is the direct offspring (Ge 15:3); 4. LN 10.14-10.48 **offspring, descendant, posterity**, i.e., one that is related more than one generation removed (Ge 3:15); 5. LN 11.90-11.95 family, clan, i.e., an extended family group based on a common ancestor (Ge 19:32, 34); 6. LN 11.12-11.54 race, i.e., a very extended family line based on many different criteria, with a focus on religious ties (Ezr 9:2) Swanson, J. (1997). **Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains : Hebrew (Old Testament)** (HGK2446). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

We realize the information just presented may seem like overkill; however, the main point shown is that the term simply means offspring. Also, since the term is masculine, **distorting it to refer to the "seed" (egg) of Mary instead of the "seed" (sperm) of Joseph is proven to be nothing more than hopeless, intentional falsehood by those unwilling to release their embrace of error.** There are numerous clear references to specific applications of the term to male seminal emission. However, there are no references to it, that we found, where it refers specifically to the female egg; yet, this is precisely what panicky traditional Christian and counterfeit Messianic promoters of error implicitly and/or explicitly imply as the meaning in Genesis 3:15. However, the dominant meaning is simply offspring; thus, seed means offspring and is correctly translated as such in many versions of Scripture.

Genesis 3:15 is simply saying that from **Eve's** offspring (the **HUMAN** race, NOT some code word for Mary's egg) would arise one or possibly many (Messiah or the "Israel" of YEHOVAH God) that will crush the head of Satan. There is nothing mysterious or mystical at all about the clear and simple meaning of the verse. All mankind were offspring of Adam and Eve. The idea promoted by the virgin birth adherents, which is that Genesis 3:15 represents some mysterious "code" that negates ALL the subsequent prophecies showing that Messiah would be a descendant of King David **through his father**, is an outlandish assumption and is shown to be an unparalleled attempt at deception by traditional Christian leaders. **Also, since Eve's offspring are HUMAN BEINGS, the "God in the flesh" teaching is further weakened since IF the Messiah is "God", he is NOT human, despite the blasphemous verbal gymnastics conducted by those that promote one can be both human and God.** This particular misrepresentation of Scripture (Gen. 3:15) is one of those false doctrines for which we show little patience towards its promoters due to their intent to demolish the clear Scriptural context just so they can salvage a primary lie the great harlot hopes to promote.

The Scriptures VERY CLEARLY prove, in case after case after case, that one's genealogy is traced THROUGH THE FATHER. It is for this reason, for instance, that we read in Kings and Chronicles instances of where the sons of Kings were killed by wicked rulers in an attempt to prevent the seed of David from continuing on as kings of Judah, and where YEHOVAH God allowed the sons of various wicked men to be killed in order to destroy their seed (eliminate their future offspring). Obed, the Israeli

grandfather of King David, had Ruth, a Moabite, as his mother. Similarly Rahab, the non-Israelite harlot, is an ancestor of the Messiah. However, since it is ALWAYS the father that determines one's Biblical heritage, the non-Israelite status of these women is meaningless.

Note also that the ancestry of Yeshua shown in Matthew and Luke is dominated by men with only a few passing references to women. Some attempt to promote the totally false teaching that the Luke genealogy was for Mary, despite the fact the verses in Luke's gospel very clearly carry them through to Joseph. Frankly, the insistence that the Luke genealogy applies to Mary is one of the more obvious examples of outright deception by Christians and counterfeit Messianics as they attempt to "prove" their false godly procreation teaching, and should be noted as clear evidence of how far some will go in their attempts to promote blatant falsehood.

So, why do Constantinian Christians and counterfeit Messianics attempt to misrepresent the clear reading of the genealogy accounts of Matthew and Luke? Answer: Because of the obvious error presented in New Testament writings regarding the ancestry of Messiah Yeshua. The deceivers frantically attempt to side-step the VERY CLEAR fact that the differing genealogies shown in the Matthew and Luke gospel accounts PROVE the gospels to be corrupt!

There is no way around the fact that Matthew and Luke cannot both be correct in their presentation of different records of Yeshua's ancestry. However, instead of admitting the obvious truth that these verses prove the New Testament writings are NOT infallible, Christians and Messianics engage in hopeless verbal gymnastics in an attempt to cover up the fact that the differences provide strong evidence of scribal manipulation. They, of course, wish to cover up the genealogical discrepancy and hope their followers will not notice the glaring contradiction. Their primary strategy used to explain away the obvious error is shameless deception. They promote the devious and totally baseless concept that one account is for Joseph and the other for Mary -- despite the fact both accounts list Joseph as the focus of the genealogical record. Sadly, the majority of Christians and Messianics swallow the lie hook, line, and sinker as they do numerous other obvious false teachings.

Some will argue that since Judaism teaches one's ethnic heritage is derived from the mother, this proves the Messiah did not have to have an earthly father. So, despite the anti-Judaic stance of Christianity, Rabbinic traditions are sometimes used in a twisted attempt to support Yeshua's presumed deity. However, it should be noted how odd it is that Christianity adopts "Judaic" principles when those principles support them and condemns them as "works of the law" when they do not!

The Rabbinic tradition that one's Jewishness is transferred through the mother actually originated as a ruling of Judaic authorities in the early centuries. It was created in reaction to the large numbers of Jewish women that produced offspring resulting from rape by Romans and other non-Jews. Of course, abortion was not an issue as it is today; therefore, the mother would be shouldered with the responsibility of raising and training the child. Such a task would have been extremely difficult had she and/or the child been ostracized by the Jewish community. The Orthodox Jewish community can be EXTREMELY harsh towards those that dare break from tradition. The Jewish authorities (Sanhedrin) sympathetically recognized the tremendous burden of both mother and child and thus ruled that the child was fully Jewish despite the fact the father was not. It was intended to be an inclusive and well-meaning opinion of the Sages that allowed the children of such brutality to be counted as fully Jewish -- with all rights and privileges -- and thus accepted and supported by the community. The matriarchal (vs. patriarchal) Jewish pedigree is NOT based upon Scripture, though the Rabbis prospect for Scriptural support for it. Unfortunately, what was intended as an INCLUSIVE ruling has become EXCLUSIVE; thus, even to this day, one is "Jewish" only if his/her mother is Jewish despite the fact Scripture presents an opposite "ruling". Bottom line: THE MATRIARCHAL PEDIGREE CONCEPT IS RABBINIC. IT IS NOT SCRIPTURAL and represents one of many Rabbinic rulings ("traditions of men") that have become "Torah" for Judaism as Rabbinic law supercedes and/or appends YEHOVAH's laws.

The examples are numerous that prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that one's ancestry is determined by who fathered them. The pedigree is determined by the father -- NOT the mother. Therefore, with this in mind, the virgin birth becomes a **SERIOUS** issue because if Yeshua the Messiah did NOT have an earthly father, he is NOT the Messiah! Thus the Beastly religious system, represented by the great harlot of Rome, has shown her antichrist (usurper of Messiah, replacement Messiah) foundations again by removing from the Messianic resume of Yeshua **THE** primary demand for being the Messiah, which is that he be **LITERALLY** an offspring of King David through his father. And note this, if the virgin birth is true, Yeshua cannot possibly be the Messiah!

This is a **MAJOR** point! **IF YESHUA DID NOT HAVE AN EARTHLY FATHER WITH DAVID AS AN ANCESTOR, YESHUA IS NOT THE MESSIAH!** Why Christian and counterfeit Messianic leaders dismiss this important point is a cause for deep concern and wonder to us, because what they are actually dismissing is **THE** primary test used for determining if one is -- or is not -- the Messiah!

Another relevant issue of importance is the "timing" of Yeshua's birth, which relates to the clear 70 weeks prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27 and the absolute necessity of the Messiah arriving at that precise time in history. Mark alludes to this "timing" in Mark 1:15:

15 And saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel (Mark 1:15). The **King James Version**, (Cambridge: Cambridge) 1769.

In terms of Yeshua being the Messiah, Mary's virginity -- indeed the entire birth episode -- should not be an issue judged as redemptive. However, it **DOES** impact whether or not Yeshua is the Messiah. The **ONLY** crucial issue regarding his birth is whether or not he was a literal descendant of King David, which the genealogies from Matthew and Luke indicate as being the case **IF** -- and **ONLY** if -- Joseph was his father. The fact is, there is **NOTHING** in Scripture that **REQUIRES** a miraculous birth of Messiah -- but there is a **LOT** of evidence that requires he be **LITERALLY** of the seed of David through his father.

As a final argument, ask yourself the following question:

IF the Messiah was born of a "virgin" with no earthly father, why is it so rarely mentioned in the New Testament?

IF such an event occurred, it would have been an unprecedented miracle! Yet, the New Testament authors virtually never even mention it! This fact alone makes its actual occurrence extremely unlikely.

We cannot accept something that is hardly even mentioned, except for a few questionable verses, in the early chapters of Matthew and Luke. It would have been a **VERY** big deal and would have been often mentioned within the pages of the New Testament. The fact that it was **NOT** discussed in **ANY** of the examples in Acts, for example, where we read of the preaching and/or acceptance of the Gospel, proves to us that it did not happen. Of course, there is also no mention of it in any of the epistles.

Imagine if this happened today. Wouldn't such an event be on the front page of every newspaper in the world -- and the major topic of most news broadcasts? Such was also the case then.

The silence regarding the virgin birth of Yeshua within the pages of the New Testament strongly suggest it never occurred and that Yeshua was born just as all other human beings are born -- **AND THIS IN NO WAY DIMINISHES HIS BEING THE MESSIAH!** Since his being the Messiah is not dependant upon a "virgin birth", he is still very clearly the Messiah.

The Influence of the Mystery Religions

The unusual importance Christian leaders place on Yeshua's birth may be due to the importance that was placed on the birth of Tammuz, Mithra, and other "god in the flesh" saviors in the pagan religions from which the Constantinian religion of Christianity derived many of its doctrines. These same pagan religions ALL had godly procreation as a major theme; thus, Constantinian Christianity and counterfeit Messianism, which is actually repackaged Constantinian Christianity, exalts the alleged godly procreation in the birth of Messiah -- even though it is irrelevant to Messianic prophecy! **The ONLY "demand" imposed upon Yeshua being a LITERAL "son" of YEHOVAH God is the demand created from the pagan origins of the majority of Christian theology -- the same origins from which the doctrine of the Trinity arose!**

The virgin birth was probably copied from other pagan religions.

It is a matter of historical fact that there were MANY pagan, mystery religions that flourished during the time the "church fathers" canonized their "New" Testament "scripture". Mithraism was but one of those religions. Of course many of these were based in worship of a sun god. Guess where the church gets the idea for the halo or sun that surrounds the head of "Jesus" and/or Mary in many artists renderings?

The pagan foundation of MANY aspects of Christianity is obvious; however, most Christians prefer to ignore it. Truth is too difficult or embarrassing for most Christians and counterfeit Messianics to accept.

History records that:

- * Buddha was born of the virgin Maya after the Holy Ghost descended upon her.
- * The Egyptian God Horus was born of the virgin Isis; as an infant, he was visited by three kings
- * In Phrygia, Attis was born of the virgin Nama.
- * A Roman savior Quirinus was born of a virgin.
- * In Tibet, Indra was born of a virgin. He ascended into heaven after death.
- * The Greek deity Adonis was born of the virgin Myrrha, many centuries before the birth of Jesus. He was born at Bethlehem, in the same sacred cave that Christians later claimed as the birthplace of "Jesus".
- * In Persia, the god Mithra was born of a virgin on DECEMBER 25. An alternate myth is that he emerged from a rock.
- * Also in Persia, Zoroaster was also born of a virgin. * In India, the god Krishna was born of the virgin Devaki.
- * Virgin births were claimed for many Egyptian pharaohs, Greek emperors and for Alexander the Great of Greece.

One source is quoted as saying that there were many mythological figures: Hercules, Osiris, Bacchus, Mithra, Hermes, Prometheus, Perseus and Horus who share a number of factors. All were believed to have:

- * been male.

- * lived in pre-Christian times.
- * had a god for a father.
- * human virgin for a mother.
- * had their birth announced by a heavenly display.
- * had their birth announced by celestial music.
- * been born around December 25th.
- * had an attempt on their life by a tyrant while they were still an infant.
- * met with a violent death.
- * rose again from the dead.

Oddly, the concept of godly procreation is hinted at within Scripture; however, neither the "gods" nor the concept are presented in a positive light. We read in Genesis chapter 6 how the "sons of God" lusted for the "daughters of men" and cohabited with them. Though there is debate as to what the record truly signifies, many feel the relevant passages suggest angelic beings left their heavenly abode because of their lustful desires for earthly women. There are other apocryphal writings that support this -- Enoch for instance. When one reads the passages in Genesis chapter 6 without allegorical interpretation, they seem to very directly refer to such mingling of angelic beings with humankind.

If one considers the fact that Adam and Eve were absolutely perfect in all physical respects, and that these earthly women were only a few generations from this perfection, it is conceivable that the appearances of the women of that time surpassed that of today's sexiest, most stunningly attractive women. They were probably unimaginably beautiful. Of course the men were probably also amazingly strong and handsome, and all lived astoundingly long lives. It is probable that the new body those that merit eternal life will be given after the resurrection will be of the same state of perfection that the Creator originally intended for his most exalted creation -- mankind.

It was these "earth babes" that the angelic beings lusted for and with whom they possibly had sexual relations. Again, debate rages on this issue; however, the verses seem relatively straight forward. It is also from these unions that mighty men (superhuman offspring) were possibly born. These were, in a sense, sons of the "gods". Our point is that the godly procreation of mythology is not as far-out and unscriptural as most may think. There may be some aspects of truth to the mythological stories of old, though the stories are distorted.

So, IF such was the case, then we can indeed point to a form of godly procreation. The "gods" were the heavenly beings, and the "virgins" were the stunningly attractive women of the earth. But, does Scripture record this as being a good thing? NO! In fact, it was largely as a result of these abominable unions that YEHOVAH God ultimately destroyed the earth with a great flood! Thus, what Scripture implies to be a grotesque abomination -- cohabitation between heavenly and earthly beings -- Christianity teaches as a major doctrine and exalts! Worse still, Christianity, following its pagan Babylonish origins, has the very Creator, Himself, partaking in this sexual union with woman!

It is notable that two of the only religions that do not have a virgin birth account is the true Monotheistic Messianic faith (not to be confused with counterfeit Messianism) and Judaism of which the true Monotheistic Messianic faith was a sect.

For centuries, since the dawn of time, Satan worked tirelessly to promote his false, Babylonish religion. He finally succeeded with his final work -- the Beastly religious system or great harlot that seduces and spiritually fornicates with much of the world's population -- Constantinian Christianity. It is with this grand achievement -- the spiritual great harlot -- that Satan may finally obtain the worship he has always desired. Using Constantinian Christianity, Satan has pulled many people away from worship of the TRUE God and the man chosen by YEHOVAH God -- the Messiah Yeshua.

It dismays us when we consider the way Traditional Christians focus so much on the "virgin birth" of Yeshua, even to the point of making it a foundational and often redemptive teaching. Of course, this is done despite the fact there is hardly a mention of it in the entire New Testament and absolutely ZERO indication that it was considered a necessary belief! Christianity even "christianized" an unscriptural holiday to commemorate it (Christmas), which is undoubtedly a celebration of entirely pagan origins.

Scripturally speaking, the birth of Yeshua -- at best -- ranks a distant third among miraculous births! Adam was fashioned from dirt, and Eve from Adam's rib! Neither of them even had a mother! If a miraculous birth is a primary ingredient in determining who is the "son of God", the female, Eve, is more of a "son" than Yeshua! Indeed, if miraculous birth is a primary ingredient for determining one's "deity", then Adam and Eve have a stronger claim to being "God" than does Yeshua!

Our eternal life is not determined by Yeshua's birth. It is determined by his selfless death as payment for the lawful penalty of eternal death we deserve because of our sins. It is his death and subsequent resurrection by His God and ours that gives us hope for a future resurrection to eternal life in the Kingdom to come.

Hope of Israel Ministries -- Taking the Lead in the Search for Truth!

Hope of Israel Ministries
P.O. Box 853
Azusa, CA 91702, U.S.A.
www.hope-of-israel.org



Scan with your
Smartphone for
more information