

A Discussion on the Virgin Birth:

A question was asked on a Facebook forum about the phrase 'only begotten'. I replied and this started a discussion with another member of this FB forum. To protect his identity I will use the name Robert (not his real name). While I believe that Robert is a Pastor of long standing, who also does acknowledge the need to approach the Bible from an Hebraic and not Hellenistic mindset, you may well notice that he really struggles to do so.

The discussion was disjointed in places (at it may be as much as 24 hours between responses and a response may be to an earlier post), and this may make it a little hard to follow. Also, many of Robert's responses had nothing to do with this phrase and his argument that it was referring to the virgin birth.

However, many of these divergent and seemingly irrelevant responses often lead to some interesting exchanges. At least, I thought so, so I have tried to compile the thread that took place over several weeks here:

My Response:

I explain the 'only begotten' phrase and how it is mis-used in this article
<http://circumcisedheart.info/TheGenealogyOfYeshua.pdf> - see page 10.

Re-posted here for the sake of clarity and convenience:

Our English translations have the phrase 'only begotten son' in reference to Yeshua. 'Only begotten son entails an adjective (only) followed by a verb (begotten), followed by the noun (son) it applies to. 'Begotten' comes from the root word 'begat' which means to create a child (and there is only one way to do that – with the seed of a man impregnating or fertilising the egg of a woman).

*This phrase in such verses as Yochanan (John) 3:16 "For God so loved the world, that He gave His **only begotten Son**, that whoever believes in Him shall not perish, but have eternal life." (NASB), and may seem to imply that this son has been created by God, especially when we first read similar passages such as Hebrews 11:17 "By faith Abraham, when he was tested, offered up Isaac, and he who had received the promises was offering up his **only begotten son**."*

But with respect to Hebrews 11:17 we know that Isaac was not Abraham's 'only created son', as he had many more, including Ishmael who was born before Isaac.

The problem here is that the single Greek word 'μονογενῆ' is deceptively translated as 'only begotten' when it is better translated as 'unique', which most significantly is an adjective which describes the son's role.

As I stated, when 'only begotten' is used it implies an action (as it is a verb) by the father, rather than its proper role as an adjective which describes the unique role of the son, whether Isaac or Yeshua in these two examples.

This is the reality in all 6 cases where this word, and its derivatives are used, namely John 1:14 & Jn 3:18, where it is a genitive adjective (and 'son' is implied); Jn 1:18 where it is a nominative adjective; and Jn 3:16, Heb 11:17 and 1 John 4:9, where it is a masculine accusative adjective. To repeat, in all these uses of this Greek word 'μονογενῆ' it is an adjective and not a verb, and therefore it describes the noun, that is, the son and his uniqueness, not some action of the father or Father.

This deceptive translation of 'only begotten' clearly leads to the incorrect pre-suppositions and inferences about the birth of Yeshua.

Robert :

Isaiah 7-11 with Luke 1:30-35 and Matthew 1 "of the Holy Spirit"

Psalm 110 with Matthew 22 and Acts 2 "the Christ whose son is he?"

John 10:36, "I said I am the son of God"

Mathew 16:16 "you are the Christ the son of the living God"

Acts 9:20-22 "And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God.

....

But Saul increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is very Christ."

My Response

"The clear and undeniable fact is that the term "son of God" is always used in an anthropomorphic

sense to refer to God's representative(s) or devotees. Of course, as the greatest, most obedient, and most exalted of all of The Eternal God's representatives, Yeshua is indeed a unique "son of God".
<https://www.torahofmessiah.org/son-of-god>

Robert:

John 3:16 Jesus is God's only son conceived and born by God's holy power on Mary. Jesus is soul (Acts 2) who died and was made alive, God having His son life without end.

Does that make Jesus an anthropomorphism?

My Response

Yochanan 3:16 "For God so loved the world that he gave his unique son, so that everyone who trusts in him may have eternal life, instead of being utterly destroyed."

Do you trust in Yeshua and his message? As Yochanan goes on to state, the light (of Torah) has come into the world and many reject the light and Torah.

As I discuss at length in my two articles on Yochanan 1:1 (- see 'The Torah Dressed itself in Flesh' - <http://circumcisedheart.info/Torah%20dressed%20in%20Flesh.pdf>), Yeshua was a real man, not some hybrid god/spirit/man, who was sent, just as Yochanan himself was sent, to bring the message of Torah and the hope of the Coming Age.

So as a man, he is clearly not "an anthropomorphism" as Bruce Barham (see the TorahOfMessiah link above) explains in his brilliant article, but his title of 'son' is in a sense an anthropomorphism, as is this title when given to every righteous person trusting in Yeshua's message and hence in Yehovah and His Instructions (Torah).

Robert

"Son of God" is a real son, never used as a title (though capitalized according to rules of English). Jesus many times demonstrated by saying, "I am God's son" just after he said, "my father" (John 10). Jesus knew this when he was 12, "I must be about my father's work."

My Response

Robert, 'son of God' is indeed a title, even being the firstborn son of god is still a title though it sounds real enough if you are not familiar with Hebraisms and anthropomorphisms.

Exodus 4:22 (KJV) And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the LORD, Israel is my son, even my firstborn.

And all righteous are children of God, and thus God is their father. God even declared Himself to be the father of King Solomon, so he is just as real a son of God as anyone of the millions who are.

But Yeshua actually declared himself to be a 'son of man' more than a or the 'son of God'. Geza Vermes makes a great argument that 'son of man' in the Gospels should be translated as 'I', that is, Yeshua was primarily referring just to himself, although when quoting Daniel and using this term, he was clearly referring to a divine, Messianic figure.

Please read Bruce Barham's article I linked above which clarifies this.

Robert :

What you call >a title< is in the context explained as relationship. YHVH described His relationship to Israel as a father/son because He brought them out of Egypt. God did the same to David and his descendants, except for one. That "son / descendant of David" was named "Jesus".

Every prophecy about Jesus is he is YHVH's son. How? In Isaiah 7 through 12 YHVH said He would a young woman would have a son- not a young woman and a man (like Mahershallalhashbaz), but Pelejoezelgibborabiadsarshalom, a literal son by only a young woman. YHVH spoke the same to a young woman, "you will conceive" (not you and Joseph) "and bear a son and call his name Jesus". God added that Mary's son is both the "son of the Highest" by "the power of the Highest". Mary confirmed this by her question and later comments. A literal "son of God" as well as a son of "his father David (ancestor / descendant by Mary, not by Mary and Joseph).

The Hebrew word "ben" is flexible and is defined by each context. Calling "son of God" for Jesus in a real sense accounts for the multitude of times Jesus said, "my Father". John's use of "monogenes of the Father" meant that "son of God is better translated, "God's son".

My Response

Of course, a title involves a relationship. But it is the nature of the relationship that is in question here. You are clutching at straws to try to make out that the relationship with respect to Yeshua is fundamentally different in a way that invalidates his qualifications to be the Messiah as well!

First of all though, you use of Isaiah 7 is seriously in error. As Bruce Barham points out:

"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. ..." - see my blog post here for details - <https://luke443.blogspot.com/2013/08/the-ancient-mediterraneans-virgin-birth.html>

And in my article on the Genealogy of Yeshua I explain how 'monogenes' is mis-understood wrt Yeshua:

"Also Luke 1:35 does not inform us of when the Ruach HaKodesh (the Spirit of God) will 'overshadow' Miriam (implying instead perhaps a sense of 'surrounding' or 'protecting the conception' so that a special child is conceived). This could be before she had sexual relations with Yosef, when she did, or after the event. But what it does tell us is that the power and purpose of HaShem is involved in this conception so that the child born will be a very unique 'son' of God.

And Yeshua's use of 'my father' was nothing new. You seem to try to imply that this proves he was somehow different and didn't have an earthly, physical father, yet such an implication is not only clutching at straws but the reality is that his use of the phrase was quite common:

<http://circumcisedheart.info/Christian%20site/Abba%20and%20Father.pdf>

Robert:

That Jesus was God's son (not Joseph's biological son) is exactly what the Jews thought Jesus taught in

John 5:18

Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because ... he said also that God was his Father..."

In John 8 the Jews knew the difference between the three uses of the word "father" and what Jesus was saying.

In John 10:30 and 36, Jesus said, "I am God's son".

My Response

I would have thought that as a Unitarian and not being into Oneness or the Trinity you would recognize that "I and the Father are one." - Jn 10:30 is a oneness of unity and purpose, especially when his prayer is also that we be one as he is (and we can't go back into the womb and be re-born).

It is the same with the statement in Jn 10:36. When you look at the context (esp. using the CJB) you should see that the issue was not Yeshua being some form of God-man, but rather his accusers misunderstanding him:

"34 Yeshua answered them, "Isn't it written in your Torah, 'I have said, "You people are Elohim' "?"

35 If he called 'elohim' the people to whom the word of Elohim was addressed (and the Tanakh cannot be broken),

36 then are you telling the one whom the Father set apart as holy and sent into the world, 'You are committing blasphemy,' just because I said, 'I am a son of Elohim'?"- CJB

Again, this is not evidence that Yeshua rejected Yosef as his father at all, it is simply evidence of his great intimacy with Yehovah. As I have already indicated, many Jews in his day and before used 'father', especially in their prayers, but perhaps they were not as overt with this intimate reference to Yehovah in a public arena.

Robert:

God and God's are one in "work" (5:18). So, we agree that "I and my Father are one" in work - unity of purpose.

Notice in John 5 I only made the connection the Jews made: "my father" = "said God is your father".

If it were, as you described, common, the Jew would have agreed. Later in John 10:17 and 29-36, the Jews thought Jesus blasphemed and had a demon when he again said "my father". Jesus' reply stated their concern, "Do you say of him ..., 'You blaspheme? because I say I am God's son?'"

The Jews recognized Jesus was saying something not common and making a claim that to them meant "he a man make yourself God" (in Hebrew, YHVH ELOHIM).

Jesus made a distinction between "The Father" and "my Father" then equated "my father / Father" with "I am God's son" (in Hebrew, ben-ELOHIM).

BTW, Jews whom YHVH directed to lead Israel were "mighty ones" - never called gods. Jesus was never a god, never called god, never called god or God. He is called the "mighty one" - king of the Jews.

My Response

I'm afraid that your understanding of the text (which I don't share) only implicates the translators of some bias and possible redactions, because the evidence no longer supports this.

To quote from my article on the use of father or 'my father': "Texts have been found from Qumran which demonstrate that the Jews of and before Yeshua's time could and did address God as "my father."
These texts show that this term was particularly important in prayers that sought God as the refuge of the afflicted and persecuted.

For example in 1QHODAYOTH (composed late in the Second Century BCE) reads in part:

"You have made me a father for the sons of kindness, like a wet--nurse to the men of portent; they open their mouth like a chi[ld on the breast of its mother,] like a suckling child in the lap of its wet--nurse"

... Because you are a father to all the [son]s of your truth.

And while all this happened, Joseph [was delivered] into the hand of foreigners who consumed his strength and broke all his bones up by the time of his end. And he became wear[y] and he summoned the powerful God to save him from their hands.

And he said, "My father and my God, do not abandon me to the hands of the Gentiles [] do me justice, so that the poor and afflicted do not perish. You have no need of any people or nation for any help. [Your] fing[er] is bigger and stronger than any there are in the world. For you choose truth and in your hand there is no violence at all. And your mercies are great and great is your compassion for all who seek you; [...] they are greater than me and my brothers who are associated with me. An enemy people lives in it [...] and opens its mouth against all the sons of your beloved Jacob with in- sults for [...] the moment of their annihilation from the whole world and they shall be delivered [...] I shall arise to do right and just[ice...] the will of my creator, to offer sacrifices [of thanksgiving...] to my God." (translated by García Martínez and Tigchelaar) – text in square brackets was missing from the fragment found.

The evidence then seems quite strong that in calling HaShem his Father or 'Abba', Yeshua was not doing a new thing; he was not giving a new revelation, but speaking with the same desire for intimacy for the King of the Universe that all his fellow righteous Jews shared." - end quote

Robert:

We really don't need extra biblical evidence to describe the father / son relationships you mention. They were already found in the Hebrew Scriptures. Scripture also included the literal "son of David" would be God's son.

Acts 3:24-25-26

"Yees, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days.

You all are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in your seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.

Unto you first God, having raised up His son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities."

My Response

The extra-Biblical material is establishing that calling Yehovah. 'my father' was not unique to Yeshua and thus you can not use his references to Yehovah as father and 'my father' as in anyway implying his birth was different and a man was not his natural father.

I have tried to show you that the Tanakh makes it very clear that 'son of God' and 'son of man' can refer to many people (including women) as it is a relational title as you mentioned and can describe anyone who is righteous and part of Avraham and Yehovah's family.

Certainly, both these terms also have Messianic implications in certain passages, but they never argue for a virgin birth, only for a uniqueness in the role that the messianic 'son of God' and/or 'son of man' will play.

To qualify as a literal 'son' (meaning descendant) of King David, a male must have a father who is of the tribe of Judah (not just a mother) and such a genealogy was apparently verifiable until the destruction of the Temple.

Robert

The apostle Paul was expert in the Hebrew language of Scripture. Paul of Tarsus was also expert in the Aramaic and Greek culture. He, being a Pharisee, was expert in Judaism and the Jew's language and culture. He was also expert in words.

Paul wrote 4 letters to churches all over from Rome to Greece and regions throughout now Turkey. Paul referred to God the Father and to Jesus as God's son, specially "tou huiou autou" / "His son" then added which son, "the one having been born out of a seed of David" (Romans 1:3). Paul was even more specific to the churches in the region of Galatia, "But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth >His son< (literally, "the son of Himself"), having been born out of a woman, having been born under the Law. that we might receive the adoption of sons; and because you are sons, He sent forth the spirit of His son into your hearts, crying ABBA! Father! so that you are no longer a servant, but a son; and if a son, also an heir of God".

Nine (9) times Paul said of YHVH his God about Jesus, "His son" in a more distinct way than commonly thought. Had Paul thought **#it** commonplace or >natural<, he had no reason go to the synagogue and "preach Christ [the son of David's line] that he [Jesus] was God's son" (Acts 9:20-22). There would have been no reason for the Jews to try to kill Paul for saying Christ was the son of God.

My Response

Robert, I have to give you credit for coming up with some novel approaches to this issue, but you are so totally stretching the point here. If the Apostle Paul had believed in the Virgin Birth, but further, believed it was a significant issue, he would most surely have spoken explicitly about it. He never did. In fact, his silence on this issue coupled with the likelihood of his letters having been written before the gospels of Luke and Matthew (and with much evidence that the virgin birth narratives in Matthew being a late - after 70 CE - addition as well), is actually strong evidence against the doctrine.

Use of 'seed of David' offers no support to your position at all and given all that has already been demonstrated with respect to the title 'son of God', these other passages don't imply anything different either.

In fact, as a great Torah scholar which you acknowledge, and as a Torah observant Jew as well, the Apostle Paul would have recognized that this doctrine invalidates Yeshua's claims to be the eschatological Messiah.

Robert:

Seems a closer read of Paul is needed. Paul wrote: "out of a seed of David" "out of a woman" Paul was more specific, more specific than "son of / descendant of David". Jesus came "out of" only one woman, that is Mary. Paul was aware of the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, the same prophecies Matthew referred to below.

Matthew confirms Joseph had no part; he found out after Mary was pregnant. But more important is what God spoke of Joseph's ancestor, "Jechonias": "write this man childless... for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah." To suggest Jesus is Joseph's biological son, denies Jesus the right to sit on the throne of his father David.

Rather, being the "son" /descendant of David by Nathan gives Jesus the birthright to sit on the throne of his father David.

Yes Paul was a Torah scholar; he learned from the most respected rabbi Gamaliel. Paul was a Pharisee of Pharisees. Concerning the Law, blameless. But after being taught by Rabbi Jesus, he was no longer a Torah observant Jew, both explained in Galatians.

In Galatians 3-4, Paul declared that Jesus was born "out of a woman" and was God's son - no mention of Joseph. In fact the disciples of Jesus mention 20 times, "His son" referring to God.

My Response

I'm sorry but you are seriously mixed up and mistaken in all of this! Firstly, the two main quotes you use from Rav Sha'ul:

Romans 1: 1-3 Sha'ul - servant of Mashiach Yeshua; summoned as a founding advocate, set apart for the benefit of a good-news message of G-d, which He promised beforehand through His Prophets, amidst holy writings, in connection with His champion follower, born out from the seed of David according to lineage,...

And

Galatians: 4:4 -7

4 And so in due course, when the time was ripe, G-d sent His son, born out from a woman, to become responsible to Torah-law,...

5 ...so as to buy time for those responsible to Torah-law, in order for them to acquire the status of being adopted.

6 And that, because when you are becoming sons, G-d sends His Spirit into our hearts, which calls out "Abba," the Father,.

7 ..so that no longer are you existing as a servant, but rather as a son, and if as a son, also as an heir through G-d. - from Uriel ben Mordechai's translations of the earliest extant mss's (P46).

The first quote from Romans, requires a descendant via his father - this is and always had been the biblical requirement for any one to be able to sit on King David's throne. And the second quote only emphasises his shared humanity and that all can be sons and heirs.

Secondly, the whole 'Jechonias' issue is irrelevant (as I explain in my article on the genealogy of Yeshua if you took the time to read it) - Yeshua's father Yosef was not descended via this line.

But even worse, you could not be more wrong than with this statement: "... But after being taught by Rabbi Jesus, he was no longer a Torah observant Jew, both explained in Galatians ..."

I have written a whole book [Defending The Apostle Paul: Weighing the Evidence'](https://www.amazon.com/Defending-Apostle-Paul-Weighing-Evidence-ebook/dp/B009TLLK0U/) showing how false this Hellenistic understanding is.

<https://www.amazon.com/Defending-Apostle-Paul-Weighing-Evidence-ebook/dp/B009TLLK0U/>

This is the whole problem when people approach the Bible from a Hellenistic perspective without understanding the Hebraic Mindset it is written with, and Galatians is more susceptible and more miss-used than almost every other book of the NT.

In fact, the very theme and purpose of Galatians is totally missed by most of Hellenistic Christianity.

If you really want to understand the Apostle Paul beyond my short introduction and in serious depth, then you need to start studying the work of Prof. Mark Nanos, who is to Paul what Flusser was to Yeshua.

Robert

Matthew: Solomon —> Jechonias —> Jacob begat Joseph who was committed to Mary whom Joseph knew he was not the father of her child.

Luke:

Jesus "son of —> Eli —> Nathan

All males.

Jesus, as Matthew 5 recounts, rejected Hellenic Judaism that developed after Malachi. Jesus' "but I say unto you" established what God's prophets said, including Moses and an accurate understanding of the prophets. The writing of Hebrews captures Jesus' connection time the prophets. That connection was that God spoke through His prophets until John (the immerser). Then God spoke by >"His son"<. Jesus fulfilled all that "the law and the "prophets" wrote by God's Holy Spirit in them said. Jesus taught Saul (Paul). Both observed Moses until the prophet like him came and made firm God's word concerning a "new covenant" according to Jeremiah 31 and Daniel 9. Hebrews 9:15 explained that "new

covenant” became effective by the death of Jesus (Yeshua in Aramaic). After his death and resurrection, Jesus asked all Jews including Paul to become new covenant observant according to the Tanach rather than just the Torah. Please read Galatians, Romans, and all of Paul’s letters in light of the New Covenant”.

One example is

Romans 7:4 “Wherefore, my brethren, you all also are become dead to the Law [Torah] by the body of Christ; that you all should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.”

I’ve read your article. I note one assumption not found anywhere in Scripture, that is, a descendant is counted only if it has a physical male father to procreate it. Rather, the Scripture said of David,

2 Samuel 7:12

“And when your days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with your fathers, I will set up your seed after you, >who shall proceed out of your bowels<, and I will establish his kingdom.”

God said the same to Abraham about Isaac, “in Isaac shall your seed be called” and “in you seed shall all nations be blessed.” Paul explained that “one” seed is “Christ” - “the one born of a woman”.

My Response

Again sorry Robert, but you have so many mis-understandings here. Yes Yeshua rejected Hellenism but you haven't, as you are using Hellenistic mis-interpretations.

When Yeshua stated that he fulfilled or completed the Torah he was not for a second stating that he had done away with it.

Jeremiah 31 has not yet been fulfilled - perhaps you could read it again - we wouldn't be having this debate if it were.

Hebrews does not say in 8:13, 9:15, etc. that the new covenant is now in effect - this is an interpolation made obvious in the KLV where it was added in italics - Hebrews speaks of a new Priesthood not covenant (and one that will only really be implemented in the Coming Age (ben Mordechai's translation of Hebrews from P46 illustrates this very well.

Romans 7:4: By similar principle, you as well my brothers, are going to experience death, wherein the Torah, through the effort of Mashiach, leads to unveiling that different you, raised out from amongst the dead in order that we might yield fruit to G-d. - from P46 by Uriel ben Mordechai

The need for a physical male father IS in the Tanakh - ask any of the great Jewish scholars from Rashi to the RAMBAM.

As for what Yeshua meant when stating that he had 'fulfilled Torah please see this short article:
<http://circumcisedheart.info/Fulfill.pdf>

Robert

Luke 1:1-2-3-4

“Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us,

Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word;

It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus,

That you might know the certainty of those things, wherein you have been instructed.”

Luke wrote before Paul wrote 1 Corinthians 15. Luke knew Paul and Peter and many other witnesses and wrote before they died. To dispute Luke’s account is to discredit the Acts of the apostles also written by Luke. Dispute Luke’s account is to discredit Jesus’ close disciple Matthew and his account.

Dispute Luke’s account is to question the Prophets:

Genesis 3:15

Genesis 12:3

Genesis 49:10

2 Samuel 7:12ff

Psalms 2

Psalms 89

Hosea 12

Isaiah 7-12
Jeremiah 22-23
Ezekiel
Daniel 9

Tanach and Rabbinic interpretation:

Jesus used the Tanach but cautioned rabbinic interpretation. It's good to use linguistic sources from all, Jewish and Christian but with the caution of bias that fails Jesus' teaching from the Hebrew Scriptures. I don't find in the Hebrew or Greek Scriptures any lessening of women in the lineage of any person, from "seed of the woman" to "you will conceive". However, Luke's account stated, "Jesus the son of Eli"....

Matthew 5:17-18 is a reference to the Tanach, not just the Torah. Fulfill refers to the entire work of Messiah, from Moses to Malachi.

Luke 24:44-45-46-47-48

"And he said unto them, These are the words which I spoke unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.

Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures,

And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day:

And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.

And ye are witnesses of these things."

Acts 3:18

"But those things, which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he has so fulfilled.

New Covenant

Matthew 26:28 For this is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

Hebrews 9:15 agrees with Jesus' comment the night before his blood was shed.

See also Hebrews 10:12-22, Isaiah 53, Daniel 9:24,27a

My Response

Here is a great article that explains the serious redactions in Hebrews and demonstrates it is NOT speaking of a New (or Renewed Covenant) at all:

<http://circumcisedheart.info/frank/The%20Covenant%20in%20Hebrews%208%20&%209.pdf>

The issue with Matthew 26 is also many fold, but one of the Hebraisms that is vital is that of 'prophetic perfect' tense, that is speaking of something in the future as if it is here now or even past.

"... The Hebrew language almost always presents events as past or present, even when those events are clearly still to occur and even perhaps predicted to occur a long time into the future. This is strikingly clear and unequivocal when these 'events' are divinely inspired prophetic utterances.

Add to this the fact that, as Hebrew is such an 'action language', the writer would always translate himself to the time of the event he was describing as if he were there and it was occurring as he/she witnessed it[3].

This was true for events that were long past, such as Moses descriptions of the Creation, and events that were still future.

Thus great care was sometimes needed to determine if the literal, present tense description of an event meant that it was either:

1. occurring at the time the writer spoke about it (or in the very recent past to their making a record of it); or
2. that it had occurred some day, years or generations in the past, or was to occur even some days, years or thousands of years in the future.

Part of the reason for using 'past' or 'present' tense for prophecies was the understanding of the Prophet of God, that the event was as good as accomplished, if it was a promise of the Almighty.

The writer could speak of it as past, because it's future occurrence was just as certain...."

- from my article <https://luke443.blogspot.com/2013/10/the-prophetic-perfect.html>

Robert

Hebrew 8 and 10 quote Jeremiah 31. "In that he [God] said, 'a new' [600 years before, he [God] has made the first old"...

My Response

I am not disputing Luke, but rather your flawed interpretation of it.

BTW, Luke's account does not state that "Jesus the son of Eli"....! as you wrote but rather that Heli/Eli was the father of Yosef. Matthew's genealogy is through Miriam and her father who was also Yosef as I explain in the article you said you had read.

Robert

Please read Daniel 9:24 and 27 in light of Hebrews 9:28
So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin [not as a sin offering] unto salvation."

My Response

It is speaking of a Priesthood not the Mosaic Covenant. This is an important distinction.

Robert

Luke 3 "Hebrews 9:28 So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

My Response

To argue that "Matthew 5:17-18 is a reference to the Tanach, not just the Torah. Fulfill refers to the entire work of Messiah, from Moses to Malachi." (which seems to suggest or infer, based on your definition of fulfil, that everything ever mentioned is now completed somehow - i.e a total irrational impossibility), but worse it totally neglects the whole context on Yeshua's words, and all his disciples from his brother Ya'acov, to Yochanan and Sha'ul that agreed with Yeshua in the very next verse stating that: "So whoever disobeys the least of these mitzvot and teaches others to do so will be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven. "

Here is a podcast that is as good as anything I have ever read or heard on the truth of what Yeshua stated in Mathew 5:17-19:

Proof: Christianity Teaches AGAINST Following Christ - Part 1

<https://yeshuajudaism.podbean.com/e/proof-christianity-teaches-against-following-christ-part-1/>

I also find surprising that you quote so many passages that in no way say what you seem to think they say. For example you just quoted Luke 24:44-45-46-47-48 and Acts 3:18.

These verses do not in any way contradict anything I have written, so how you can see them as supporting your argument is beyond me.

Perhaps if you could drill down in much more detail to illustrate your understanding and interpretation?

And then when you do I may be better able to show how much your interpretation and understanding is based on Hellenistic thought and not consistent with the themes and Hebraic context of the Bible.

You wrote: "as was supposed" = not really true'. This could be an interpretation, but it is not the only one. Again I addressed this in the article you said you read - if you don't feel my response was valid, then please argue against that, not as if you had never read it.

I wrote in part:

Some try to make an issue of the 'supposed that he was a son of Yosef', yet Luke thought enough of this genealogy to actually list it, so he clearly did not have too much doubt. Note that this genealogical record is given in the context of the question as to whether Yeshua was the long awaited Messiah, and some had witnessed a declaration to this effect

from heaven. So to give this list of ancestors back to King David would seem in this context to clearly be intended to establish that Yeshua also qualified on the grounds of his tribal affiliation and being a 'son of David'."

That is, it had nothing to do with any pagan doctrine about a virgin birth.

My Response

You wrote "... Jesus used the Tanach but cautioned rabbinic interpretation." This is not really accurate. The NT is full of Oral Torah, especially the writings of the Apostle Paul. Yeshua also used Oral Torah and for the most part actually agreed with the 'rabbinic interpretations (the Pharisees), while not having a lot of time for the over strict interpretations of the Essenes or the Qumran Yachad.

In many ways, Yeshua was a Pharisee - of the 4 main sects of Judaism in Yeshua's day, they were the most common and middle of the road, down to earth types - Yeshua though had a major issue with the hypocrisy of some of them (and as he so closely identified with them and their vital role he was more vocal in his criticism - compared with the muted criticism of the Essenes).

Flusser is the best source of such an understanding, but one simple example is in Matthew 5:17 that you raised. The phrase ""Do not think that I came to destroy the Torah or the Prophets. I did not come to destroy but to fulfill. ..." was, as I indicate in my article on fulfil, a very common refrain in their disputes and discussions, showing that Yeshua was very much in tune with their thinking.

The fact that many Pharisees came to be disciples of Yeshua after his death is also evidence of his affinity with them and their understanding.

I have some indepth discussion of this in this book:

<https://www.amazon.com/new-testament-language-mindset-hellenistic-ebook/dp/B009XOONQU/>

Robert

Jesus used the "it is written" TaNaK. So did his disciples. Jesus said, "the writing...it testifies of me".

I'm making no effort to debate or rebut anything you have 'written'. Jesus only used God's words, "it is written" in the "Scriptures" - more literal, the "writings" that the Jews coined as "T-N-K, or TaNaK. Jesus said these "writings" which you read every Sabbath "testify of me".

The list of Scriptures in my replies are to direct us to read the Hebrew Scriptures as God used "ben" and "beniy" in its Hebrew context. Yes, that involves Biblical context, not a Hellenic Judaistic intertestament context.

The broad use of "son" in the Scriptures allows for the literal son of a father. Add Psalm 2, "I have begotten you". Add Psalm 89, "my firstborn" and "you are my father". Taken in its literal sense and compared with 2Samuel 7 and later prophecies such as Isaiah 7-12, YHVH's "son" was to be by "a young will conceive" - "a branch" of Jesse and David to rule on the "throne of David" / "his government shall have no end". Jesus and his disciples taught the same message. That is, as Nathaniel replied to Jesus, "You are God's son; you are Israel's King". Also, as Peter said, "You are the Christ, the son of the living God." This was how the Jews understood, "he said that God was his father, making himself equal with God" so blasphemed because Jesus said, "I am God's son."

If we are to accept the literal sense of Scripture, as Rashi taught against the general allegorical method of most rabbis since Philo, it is reasonable to consider Mary conceived "by the Holy Spirit" as both Matthew and Luke recounted. A young woman had no relations with a man, not even her fiancée, a man named Joseph, conceived by "the power of the Highest" and has been "the son of the Highest" since God's Holy Spirit came upon Mary.

We should not deny God's word to Solomon's descendant Jechoniah that no descendant of his will ever sit on the throne of David, a "branch of David" will because God gave the birthright to Nathan (like Jacob did to Ephraim, Joseph's second son).

Jesus used God's written word to teach these things, no other writings. No need to redact or deny any account of Jesus' life by those who knew Mary and her son, Jesus.

My Response

Robert, none of these Scriptures you quote directly indicate a virgin birth. You have replied to me here to try to establish this contention and doctrine, which I deny is at all Scriptural. Therefore you are arguing against my position and trying to rebut it.

But you have consistently failed to address the issues I have raised that show your argument to lack evidence. For example, you try to use the curse of Jeconiah - which even if relevant, that is, even if he was in the direct line to Yeshua's father Yosef, would not in and of itself prove your case, only act as an inference to the VB as one possibility (and the rejection of Yeshua's Messianic qualification as another).

I have explained what the holy Spirit 'over-shadowing' Miriam actually means as well, yet you again fail to address any of these issues and instead just argue the 'son of' means literally 'son of God' and not a human father, when it comes to Yeshua but no one else.

This is all just wishful, and emotional thinking, not a valid and reasonable interpretation of the Bible at all. But worse, if you really studied the issue you would see that your VB doctrine is not only a pagan doctrine dreamed up by Hellenists, but that it actually invalidates Yeshua's claims as well.

And when you add comments such as this: '... more literal, the "writings" that the Jews coined as "T-N-K, or TaNaK...' in replying to me, it suggests you have almost totally ignored any and everything I have written here that should demonstrate I do not need to be told such extremely basic facts. I appreciate you may be aware that other people may be reading this, but such comments are really an insult to both of us.

Given that you still appear to have failed to appreciate the degree to which Hellenism has corrupted Christianity and your thinking here, may I suggest another of my books may help you to clarify and deepen your grasp of this issue: Doctrinal Pitfalls of Hellenism (Studies in the Greek Way From God Book 1) <https://www.amazon.com/Doctrinal-Pitfalls-Hellenism-Studies-Greek-ebook/dp/B00DO17CK8>

BTW, all three books are free to download as pdfs at circumcisedheart.info

Robert

Not only am I well aware of Hellenized Christianity, but I am well aware of Hellenized Judaism and its conflict with their own holy writings and that Jesus relied only on the Hebrews Scriptures:

It a discussion of God's word rather than Hellenic Judaism or Hellenic Christianity, both of which I do not espouse.
Luke 24:27-28-30-44

"And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself."

...

"These are the words which I spoke unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me."

Jesus, as Matthew 5-7 is an example, spent a lot of time redirecting Jewish teachings to understand who he was. His disciples continued teaching the Jews for 3 1/2 years but they rejected Jesus as God's messiah and God's son.

Acts 28:23-24-25-26-27-28-29-30-31

And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him into his lodging; to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening.

And some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not.

And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word, Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers,

Saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive:

For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.

Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and that they will hear it.

And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves.

And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him,

Preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him.

My Response

And nowhere in the Tanakh is there a prophecy that the Messiah would be born of a virgin and not have a biological father.

The Torah and Tanakh does not help you here - virtually no orthodox Jew would agree that such a prophecy ever existed, rather they can show that the Tanakh teaches the exact opposite with respect to the legal/Biblical requirements for a man to be either Messiah ben Yosef or Messiah ben David or both.

Robert

I received my first TaNaK - Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia text - when I was 13 from Jewish book store. I expect Orthodox Jews read from the same Isaiah 7-11 text in the Early Prophets and the same Psalm 2 text in the Writings. They read a word form of "yalad" for the young woman (a daughter of Jesse), "bearing" her "son"; they read a form of "yalad" for YHVH's son, "begotten".

Isaiah 7:14, "ADNY himself will give you a sign".

Psalm 2:7, "the decree of YHVH, 'you are my son; today I have begotten you.'"

My Response

I suggest you look more closely at what day it was that was being referred to in Ps 2. Hint, it was not anyone's birth.

Here's Psalm 2:6-7 directly translated from the Hebrew:

6. "I pour out (as a libation) my king on Zion, my holy hill."

7. Let me tell (recount, rehearse) of a decree: The Lord says to me "My son (are) you, I today have begotten you."

And here's Bruce again on Isaiah 7:

"Isaiah 7:8-8:8

... 8 For the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin; and within threescore and five years (NOTE! a clear timeframe 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 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.

... 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."

(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.

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.

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 Is. 8:8, that God would be "with them" during the time of trial that was to come when Syria and Israel strove against Judah and Assyria invaded.

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. I will comment more on this a little later. 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, I feel the context more correctly points to Isaiah's son as the fulfillment. Either way, the newborn child being prophesied was for THAT PARTICULAR TIMEFRAME as a sign to Ahaz. The prophecy was NOT for the timeframe 700 years after Ahaz was dead (Yeshua was born about 700 years after this prophecy)!

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 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.

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. "- from [The Ancient Mediterranean's Virgin Birth Narratives: https://luke443.blogspot.com/2013/08/the-ancient-mediterraneans-virgin-birth.html](https://luke443.blogspot.com/2013/08/the-ancient-mediterraneans-virgin-birth.html)

Robert

Psalm 2:6 "I pour out" is a very literal translation; but not in the sense of liquid libations. Rather, a liquid like molten metal that is poured then solidifies, "set" on Zion is the imagery.

Psalm 2:7 is a literal translation, virtually identical to the Analytical Key to the Old Testament (John Joseph Owens). "begotten" is keyed to "yalad" in BDB, pg. 408, "to bear, bring forth, beget". YHVH's anointed has already stated as "set" on Zion, YHVH declared His anointed one to be YHVH's son, born to inherit the nations, that is God's son exalted over the entire earth. Some suggest "My son" is figurative of kingship. But from 2:7 on it's about God's son as the "heir".

Isaiah 7:14

It seems Bruce recognized the "sign" to Ahaz fulfilled in Maher-shalhash-baz. Bruce seems to have missed the "sign" to the "house of David" fulfilled in Pelejoezelgibborabiadsarshalom. But Matthew, having been taught by Jesus, recognized him on whom the "spirit of counsel" from "YHVH" came.

My Response

Regarding Ps 2 v6, it is in the sense of a liquid libation (meaning a religious offering).

While many translations use 'set' or 'installed' in verse 6, the primary meaning of the Hebrew word 'nacak' is 'to pour out' and in this context seems to be correctly rendered 'to pour out a libation'.

Given Luke's reference in Acts 13 to this Psalm and the context of his reference to it, I would suggest that Luke understood verse 6 to refer to the pouring out of Yeshua's blood on the Holy hill of Zion. (See also Leviticus 4:30).

Let us now look at the very explicit reference to Psalm 2 in Acts 13:29-33 and the context of Acts 13: When they had carried out all that was written about him, they took him down from the tree and laid him in a tomb. But God raised him from the dead, and for many days he was seen by those who had travelled with him from Galilee to Jerusalem. They are now his witnesses to our people.

"We tell you the good news: What God promised our fathers he has fulfilled for us, their children, by raising up Yeshua. As it is written in the second Psalm: "You are my Son; today I have become your Father."

This makes it very clear that Matthew, Luke and the disciples saw the crucifixion of Yeshua as the time he truly or fully became the 'son of God'. Again, to suggest this alludes to Yeshua's birth is simply flat wrong.

And Bruce didn't miss anything - Isaiah 7 is a prophecy that was fulfilled in its day and further a prophecy that have nothing to do with a virgin birth.

In fact, the verse is: "Therefore, HaShem (יהוה) will give to you a sign. (Look) here (now)! the pregnant young lady (העלמה הררה) will give birth to a son and he will call his name 'Emmanuel.' which clearly excludes a VB!

<https://www.facebook.com/notes/ben-daveed/the-pregnant-young-woman-haalmah-%D7%94%D7%A2%D7%9C%D7%9E%D7%94-will-give-birth-to-a-son-isaiah-714-in-th/3039207482778243/>

And Isaiah 9:6 is absolutely of no help to you either (especially has it has been misinterpreted by Hellenistic Christianity) - see my article here: <https://globaltruthinternational.com/2014/07/03/a-different-take-on-isaiah-96/>

Robert

Psalm 2 "set my King on Zion"

BDB with Kiel and Delitzsch explain that no kind of pour (of libation or of oil) but the King was placed on Zion.

Acts 13:33-34

V.33

"fulfilled the same to us their children, in that He raised up Jesus"

= Acts 3:26 with Deuteronomy 18:15,18

V.34

"And as concerning that He raised him >up from the dead<

= psalm 16:10

= "the sure mercies of Davi

= V.37

Agreed Hellenistic Christianity took a literal translation of Isaiah 9:6 then declared the "son" of God was God. The abused the words "Imanu El" as well. Neither call anyone YHVH God or a god.

Isaiah 7-12 explained both the 2 captivities then restoration of Israel "a second time". Therefore, Mahershallhashbaz was the son of their destruction by Assyria and Babylon. But Pelejoezelgibborabiadsarshalom was the son to sit on David's throne and his government will have no end: he will restore Israel back to the land of Imanu El". Thus YHVH will be with His people. It takes two young women to accomplish the zeal of YHVH.

My Response

Ps 2:6 <http://circumcisedheart.info/Christian%20site/Psalm%20%20verse%20%20commentary.pdf>

Regarding Ps 2 again, perhaps you have a different version on BDB. Mine has 'pour out a libation' as the primary meaning of the Hebrew word 'nacak' נָצַק (page 650 - Strongs 5258).

But even if we were to go with 'installed' or 'set' it is still not at anyone's birth.

And quoting verses (see your quotes of Acts above) without any explanation of what point in the debate you think they are addressing or rebutting and without adding how you interpret them is really of no help to anyone.

It is good that I can agree totally with you on this statement though:

"Agreed Hellenistic Christianity took a literal translation of Isaiah 9:6 then declared the "son" of God was God."

Robert

Psalm 2:6

BDB page 651, III. NaSaK ... Psalm 2:6 "I have installed my king upon Zion"

Yes, "born king of the Jews" but installed after he sat on the right hand of his Father (Psalm 110). YHVH's messiah / anointed is then identified as God's son born king of the Jews.

Psalm 2:7 "son" is also identified as heir. Not only is God's anointed the son of David will reign in Zion, but God's heir because he is God's son born to inherit the earth.

Acts 13:34

Paul stated the same as Peter. Peter quoted Deuteronomy 18, that God raised up his son "from among his brethren" to be a prophet. In 3:26 Peter used the same word that Paul "raised up his son Jesus" thus referring to the life of Jesus.

Paul quoted Psalm 2:7 to mean God raised up his son "to us" and "sent him to bless you" - like Moses.

By just citing "raised up" versus "raised up from the dead" you might see Paul made a difference between Psalm 2 and Psalm 16 - birth versus resurrection.

My Response

The BDB and other Hebrew lexicons clearly indicate that 'pour out a libation' is the first and primary meaning of *nacak* - the BDB makes this clear on page 650 and then makes the mistake of applying a secondary meaning with no justification on p651.

But either way, this still does not in any way imply that this 'son of God' is made son at his birth (or conception). As I have already pointed out the apostles clearly saw this verse as connected with Yeshua's crucifixion not his birth. And to read so much into "raised up" versus "raised up from the dead" is seriously stretching all credibility! Your arguments are unfounded inference built upon unfounded inference.

Deut 18 for example has absolutely nothing to do with a virgin birth and to imagine that it does is totally fanciful - almost as bad as the Muslims who argue that it refers to Mohammed!

Robert

Psalm 2:6

DBD gives 3 uses of the word, common to most words. No need to accuse them of a mistake. In fact the primary #1 use gives two, a libation or molten metal, both equal options depending on context. Please reread Kiel and Delitzsch as they explain why libation does not fit Psalm 2:6.

That said, a literal translation, "I have poured my king on Zion" - offers little understanding. Rather, "I have set..." or "I have appointed my king on Zion" (a little stilted) gives the sense that YHVH has chosen Zion on which to place YHVH's anointed king.

Acts 13:33-34

"I will raise up from among your brethren" = "God has raised unto us" = the life of Jesus. Peter said, "God has raised up His son".

If Jesus is "God's son" then he is more than the "son of David" (regardless of how one counts the genealogy of David).

Jesus made this his point in Matthew 22. Jesus is "conceived of the Holy Spirit" = "God's son".

Btw, Mohammed said in the Koran God could not have a son, no virgin birth.

My Response

As I have stated here already and in my commentary I posted on Ps 2v6, 'poured out a libation' is the primary meaning and primitive root of the word. The BDB does recognize this, as do other Lexicons. The argument to use a second meaning because the first does not seem to make sense would be valid if correct. The only problem is that the first meaning does make sense (at least in hindsight after the 1st century CE).

The very explicit reference to Psalm 2 in Acts 13:29-33 demonstrates this:

"When they had carried out all that was written about him, they took him down from the tree and laid him in a tomb. But God raised him from the dead, and for many days he was seen by those who had travelled with him from Galilee to Jerusalem. They are now his witnesses to our people.

"We tell you the good news: What God promised our fathers he has fulfilled for us, their children, by raising up Yeshua. As it is written in the second Psalm: "You are my Son; today I have become your Father."

It should be obvious here that Luke in quoting Ps 2 saw the crucifixion and resurrection as the event that led to this declaration and therefore as the event referred to in verse 6.

A death and resurrection is not an 'installation' (i.e. a coronation) of a King, but the blood of Yeshua being spilled on the Holy Hill (Leviticus 4:27-35) certainly merits an understanding of being a religious libation.

Robert

Peter said Psalm 2:7 is about "God's son" - God's heir who was also God's anointed to be king. If we read all that Paul said in Acts 13, we can see Paul talked about the life of David and the life of Jesus, more than just the resurrection from Psalm 16.

My Response

Of course this is all much more about Yeshua's life than his death. If he had not led a righteous life he would not have been raised from the dead. The whole book of Acts focuses on how we also should live. But none of this implies a virgin birth. It is not necessary (as Original Sin is a false doctrine) and as I have also explained in my article; worse, it invalidates his claims to Messiahship.

Yeshua himself makes it clear that his father/son relationship with Yehovah is not based on his birth but his life, a life of righteousness and doing the will of his Father "... The Father has not left me alone, for I always do those things that please Him." - John 8:29

Robert

Jesus' life began with conception - agreed? Jesus began his existence in the womb of Mary.
John 2:23

"I am from above" = 8:42, "I proceeded forth and came from God" = 8:28,54 "my Father" as well as "the son of man". It was for his claim (blasphemy) that the Jews took up stones to throw at him.

In John 8 Jesus used "father / Father" many ways. John wrote this to explain "that Jesus is the Christ and God's son. Acts 2 includes Peter identifying Jesus as "the Christ" then David's "Lord" from Psalm 110. Jesus quoted the same psalm asking the question, "whose son is he?"

Like John's gospel Acts communicates two messages: Jesus is the Christ and God's son.

They had no message if these two were simply references to common usage in the Jewish society.

You asked how this relates to Jesus' birth being by a virgin. Mary was his mother. But John, Peter and Paul continually declare Jesus' father was God (never once suggesting Joseph was the father). That God was Jesus' father makes Mary a virgin.

In Acts 3 Peter said the same as Paul in Acts 13, God having raised up his son Jesus" then "sent him to bless you". "raised up" before "sent him" - the same in John 8.

My Response

I have already addressed the points you are trying to make here Robert. For starters you say you reject Hellenism yet you don't appear to recognize all the Hebraisms you have just quoted, as you are misunderstanding them. Please see my article, 'Hebraisms in John' for some depth

- <http://www.circumcisedheart.info/Hebraisms%20in%20John's%20Gospel.pdf>

'Sent him' and 'raised up' do not mean what you seem to think they mean - they have nothing to do with anyone's birth, that is, when the Bible speaks of prophets being 'raised up' or 'sent', etc., it does not mean they were born with no human father.

And you continue to try to infer that somehow the Epistles are implying a virgin birth because in your opinion they don't mention Yosef enough, yet the opposite it really the case as Bruce Barham writes:

"IF 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 astounding miracle and a subject of frequent discussion! Yet, the New Testament authors virtually never even mention it! This fact alone makes its actual occurrence unlikely.

1. It is NEVER mentioned in ANY of the epistles.
2. It is NEVER mentioned by Yeshua (Jesus) the Messiah.
3. It is NEVER mentioned in ANY recorded presentations of the "gospel" in Acts or the epistles.
4. It is NEVER mentioned ANYWHERE as part of a necessary belief a person must accept! EVER!
5. The ONLY place it is mentioned, or even hinted at, is in the alleged (and contradictory) birth accounts of Matthew and Luke!
6. Yet Christianity, counterfeit Messianism, and many monotheistic Messianics consider it a crucial doctrine even though Scripture most certainly shows it to NOT be crucial!

- see <http://torahofmessiah.org/the-birth-of-yeshua-messiah-jesus-christ/>

And further, as I discuss in my genealogy article, there is historical evidence that some followers of Yeshua late in the 1st century CE explicitly stated that they rejected the addition of any implied VB narrative (given that the best evidence suggests Matthew was virtually the last book of the NT to be written - again see my article for details).

And those who accused Yeshua of blasphemy were not doing so because he claimed to be born of a virgin.

As for Jn 5:18, this false accusation is not implying a virgin birth either - even most Unitarians who accept the VB would not claim this. Rather, the Jews here are rejecting Yeshua's relationship (and it's inherent claim to Messiahship).

The point was not that he called God his own Father but that his Father was still working and he was working. Yeshua came in his Father's name (5:43; 10:25; 17:6); he did the works of his Father (5:20,36; 10:25,32, 37-38; 14:10-11; 17:4). Yeshua was anointed (Acts 10:38) and given the mission to carry out the Father's will and His purposes. To come in the Father's name meant that he represented the Father in all his words and deeds. There is no virgin birth here either - what it appears to be is that having first accepted the VB, you then try to read it into everything, as evidence for your accepted pre-supposition. This is really a form of circular reasoning.

BTW, Ps 110 also says nothing about a virgin birth.

And you state that "John, Peter and Paul continually declare Jesus' father was God (never once suggesting Joseph was the father)..." yet we have John 1:45 "Philip found Nathanael and said to him, "We have found the one Moses wrote about in the Law and the Prophets: Yeshua, Yosef's son, from Nazareth." as well as Jn 6:42. Note that here there is not mention of Miriam - does that imply Yeshua didn't have a mother - clearly not.

But more importantly, see Bruce's quote above.

Robert

My reply later but in the quote you gave I noticed my typo 'Jesus was God'. Rather it should be 'Jesus was God's son'. I don't argue for Incarnation it incarnation as later Christianity used Hellenic concepts. I suggest only that the Scriptures say that Jesus is God's son, conceived by the power of God.

I read your comments and some of Barham's article. It appears we have different assumptions on which to determine the meaning of "son". Jesus used the term "son" based on the Hebrew Scriptures alone. He did not used the 'oral torah' developed between Malachi and John, during which time there were no prophets. Jesus referred to this period as, you have heard it said ... but I say unto you." Jesus challenged their interpretation that "son of God" was only a title by, "I say I am God's son" and "the heir".

Jesus cited only the Hebrew Scriptures so held a that 'Hebraisms' were as described in the Hebrew Scriptures, not including the teachings of those not prophets.

To define "son of God" from oral torah is to define it by those who had not yet understood that Jesus was the Christ, the son of David, and as well God's son as he indicated the teachers of the Jews should have understood from the prophet David in Psalm 110 and supported by David's other prophecies.

Jesus' disciples followed Jesus' teaching. Luke wrote that he had "complete knowledge" of what was "held in common" by all who knew and believed Jesus.

Therefore, you and my discussion conclude differently, I that there is corruption of any disciples' writings aside from

copyists errors and difficulties by translators; I that “son of God” may be translated literally “God’s son”; and I that the Hebrew Scripture is the sole determinative guide for understanding New Testament quotes and statements. I add that there are many words and phrases the convey Jesus was conceived and born by a virgin, and God YHVH was the sole source of her conception as Luke and Matthew, as well as John wrote in his account.

If there is a text we’ve not addressed, I’m willing to consider it. Best to you.

My Response

Robert, I am sure you are correct that we have some different assumptions, but a number of your conclusions about my assumptions and starting points as well as Yeshua’s are incorrect.

Firstly, defining the term ‘son’ based on its Hebrew meaning and the Hebrew Bible is perfectly fine – that does not help your argument at all. Nowhere does the Tanakh establish your ‘special case’ argument that when son was used with respect to the eschatological Messiah it meant a literal son of God with no human father.

As for Yeshua not using the ‘Oral Torah’ (which is not Jewish writing between Malachi and John) this is simply incorrect. Please check out an introductory article such as this one: <https://www.torahofmessiah.org/oral-torah>

But also Yeshua did quote from Jewish authors of this period – please see my article on the Times of Yeshua where I show that he quoted from Yeshua Ben Sirach (Wisdom of Solomon) for example.

And it appears you do not understand what ‘Hebraisms’ are – these are phrases, terms and contextual understandings found throughout the Tanakh. NT and other Jewish writings, but it is these other writings (such as the DSS) that have helped us understand the use of these Hebraisms in both the Tanakh and NT much better. Even Greek scholar and author of The Source NT, Anne Nyland explains this very well in her introduction.

Psalm 110 has absolutely nothing to do with a virgin birth and so is simply not at all relevant to your argument. You cite it but you have not shown how you can find some mention of a virgin birth in this psalm, the most quoted psalm in the NT.

You argue that “son of God” may be translated literally “God’s son” which if my literal you mean with God as your literal father and no human father, then there are a great multitude of such ‘sons’ both male and female. This argument is so seriously flawed that it is only an emotional attachment that could keep you vested in it, as all logic and rationale should reject it. And I note how far this emotional attachment goes when I see you are unable to accept the un-refutable arguments that John Butterworth has presented on the use of ‘mongenes’ (*this was in reference to another thread on the same forum*).

You also wrote: “If there is a text we’ve not addressed, I’m willing to consider it.”- you have not addressed a great many verses or texts that I have raised – rather you have tried to circumvent them by changing tack and moving to some other verse/text.

It took me years, (because I so wanted to believe the VB), to be able to reject the VB even though I knew it had no rationale or biblical defence – so I understand your challenge as well. And I do wish the best for you as well.

My Response

I should have added to the above:

I would also argue that we don't need to go beyond the Tanakh for historical support that there was no prophecy of a virgin birth at all and no need for one either, and worse that such doctrine must only have pagan origins.

But further Yeshua did use inter-testamental writings as indicated by Prof David Flusser, who is without peer in recent times wrt the writings of Yeshua:

Flusser: “From ancient Jewish writings we could easily construct a whole Gospel without using a single word that originated with Jesus.

<http://circumcisedheart.info/The%20Times%20of%20Yeshua.pdf>

And as I mentioned Dr Ann Nyland the author of the Source NT comments that:

“For centuries, the meanings of numerous New Testament words remained unknown. Bible lexicographers, that is, people who compose dictionaries of word meaning, look at the occurrences of a particular word. Many words which

appeared in the New Testament were not found anywhere else, which made grasping their meaning difficult. However, when the papyri and inscriptions (written at the time of the New Testament) were unearthed, many of these words appeared commonly in all sorts of different contexts, and thus their meaning became apparent. Some papyri and inscriptions were discovered in the late 1880s but a huge number after the mid 1970s.

Yet nearly every New Testament translation of today follows the traditional Bible translations of the earlier versions, which were published centuries before the evidence from the papyri and inscriptions revealed to us the meanings of numerous New Testament words. ... [In 1976 alone], fifteen volumes of new papyri were published." Nyland makes a very significant point here as the great majority of New Testament translations have NOT made use of these findings and thus have a great many mistranslations as they have misunderstood and misappropriated the meanings of a great many words.

And even though many translations have been edited since 1976 there appears to be very limited changes in these versions that have taken all these new word meanings into account." - for more see <https://luke443.blogspot.com/2019/02/the-source-new-testament.html>

Also you wrote: " I suggest only that the Scriptures say that Jesus is God's son, conceived by the power of God.", but what you mean by this is very different to what is meant biblically, as all righteous are 'God's sons' (including women) and all births of all humanity and even all animals can and do only occur thanks to the power of God. If Yehovah removed His power from this Universe it would vanish into nothingness.

As I explained in my genealogy article, having the holy Spirit 'overshadow' Miriam's birth does not mean what you assume it means - what you assume it means has Hellenistic and pagan originals and is simply not a Biblical theme or understanding.

Instead, as I wrote: "... what it does tell us is that the power and purpose of HaShem is involved in this conception so that the child born will be a very unique 'son' of God."

Robert

I read Barham, Oral Torah Part 1, several times. His definition, >unwritten Torah< / "legitimate oral Torah is Divine God-given instruction, commandment, or teaching. It is very sacred since it originated from the Eternal Creator< / >midrash component of oral Torah and PaRDes... (Peshat, Remez, Derash, Sod)< / >Oral Torah simply means 'verbal teachings' that were not explicitly written down in Scripture (the Bible)<. He claims oral Torah goes back to Moses.

So I'll amend my response to include extra biblical teachings, oral or recorded as oral.

Is it God-given or from man? My point is that anything not in the Hebrew Scriptures, TaNaK, is uninspired and opinion, good or poor. The between the testaments' Wisdom of Solomon Ben Sirach never claimed nor was considered on par with the Proverbs of King Solomon, son of David.

One may find words in writings outside of Scripture (some use words taken from Scripture) similar to what Jesus said. But we find Jesus' words were the words of his Father; this was Jesus' evaluation of his ministry in John 17. Hebrews 1:1-2, God spoke by His prophets, then by His son. Jesus fulfilled Deuteronomy 18:18ff in the words he spoke - "he will speak all that I command him".

My Response

Robert, I agree with you that "... anything not in the Hebrew Scriptures, TaNaK, is uninspired ..." (or at the very least, can not possibly have the same level of authenticity and authority of the Tanakh, as practically evidenced throughout the history of the Jewish people and their writings), but much of the Apostle Paul's writing are midrashic and based on Oral Torah. So while I agree with you, it still impacts our contextual understanding.

Similarly, with the inter- testamental writings - Yeshua quoted or made reference to them a lot more than you might realise, and so again they help our contextual understanding. This does not negate that "he will speak all that I command him" which you quote - this prophecy is not exclusive - it does not imply that Yeshua will only speak what is in the Tanakh. It is even quite plausible that Yehovah might inspire him to speak from the 'Wisdom of Solomon' given how full of truth it is, especially as summarised by Yeshua.

Robert

On Psalm 110, please review Matthew 21,22. Jesus' answer to his question in context is that Christ is God's son.

Acts 2 Jesus' disciples had the spirit of YHVH, as Joel and Isaiah prophesied. Much more than midrash and personal opinion.

My Response

Ps 110 is not directly referenced in Matt 21, but in Matt 22 we have:

"41 Then, turning to the assembled P'rushim, Yeshua put a sh'eilah to them: 42 "Tell me your view concerning the Messiah: whose son is he?" They said to him, "David's." 43 "Then how is it," he asked them, "that David, inspired by the Spirit, calls him 'Lord,' when he says,
44 'Adonai said to my Lord,
"Sit here at my right hand
until I put your enemies under your feet"?"[e]
45 If David thus calls him 'Lord,' how is he his son?" 46 No one could think of anything to say in reply; and from that day on, no one dared put to him another sh'eilah."

The fact that the Pharisee's didn't know how to answer his question has nothing to do with a virgin birth. Note Ps 110:1 in stating 'my Lord' does not make him an ancestor of King David and it does not contradict that the Messiah is to be a 'son of David' (which means a descendant) either.

There is again no virgin birth here unless you come up with some very stretched imaginative interpretation.

You also reminded that that I have considered Ps 110 in other contexts before - for example, I discuss a number of issues wrt Ps 110 in my book 'The Hebrew Behind the Greek'.

Here's a little:

While Hebrews chapters 6-10 clearly focus on Yeshua as the future High Priest, Uriel ben Mordechai argues that Hebrews is primarily about the Coming Age.

He writes: "Moreover, "El Ha'Iv'rim" (Hebrews) is primarily a story about the Olam Ha'Bah [the world to come]. One read through it, will convince the one who embarks on this journey, of the original author's determination to present to his contemporaries a Torah-observant norm, from eyes fixed upon the Beit Ha'MiK'dash [the Holy Temple] in Jerusalem. The result is a message that redirects all eyes to their Olam Ha'Bah, in a manner consistent with that delivered by Torat-Moshe.

The recipients must have been a group of Jews originally belonging to the Dead Sea Sect who had welcomed Yeshua. "El Ha'Iv'rim" is thus a polemic to vindicate how Mashiach would fit into their already well-developed eschatological views that included both a Kohein Gadol, a Kohein Ha'Mashiach, and a King who would present himself to AM Israel after Moshe. The geographical destination of "El Ha'Iv'rim" seems likely to have been in Jerusalem, or at least some location within the Land of Israel."

Further support for this focus on the Olam HaBah comes from how often Psalm 110 is quoted in Hebrews. We see explicit references to it in Hebrews 1:3,13; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2.

Such regular quoting of Ps 110 certainly leads credence to the argument that it is directed to Jewish believers who were formally part of the Qumran Yachad, also saw Ps 110 as very relevant to their end-times eschatology.

But, in checking my book again, I can see where you could introduce your VB if you were only using the LXX. Here's a little more from my book:

"... As for Psalm 110:3, to argue here for the LXX over the Hebrew is clearly unwise for two main reasons. Firstly, as explained above, the Messianic context means that the distinction between the two versions (as underlined below) is really insignificant.

Ps 110:3 (LXX): "With thee is dominion in the day of thy power, in the splendours of thy saints: I have begotten thee from the womb before the morning."

Tanakh (JPS): "Thy people offer themselves willingly in the day of thy warfare; In adornments of holiness, from the womb of the dawn, Thine is the dew of thy youth."

While the LXX version above may seem to give more Messianic detail, the whole Psalm, in either reading is strongly Messianic regardless. So again, any preference for the LXX here is really superficial...."

Robert

>>all righteous are God's sons"<<

Rav Shaul / Paul clarified the difference between "heir" / God's son and "joint heirs" / God's sons (plural) as adopted sons. The latter affirms there is only one who is God's son - God's heir as Psalm 2 states.

Psalm 110

We can understand Jesus if we recognize 'continual prophetic interpretation of Scripture'. It's what I have explained as Linear Logic. Follow God's reasoning from "beginning to end" because God continually revealed in His word by His prophets, first Moses, then Samuel to Malachi. The Pharisees did reply because they knew that Jesus implied he fulfill the "son" and the owner of the vineyard was his Father.

In Matthew 21, Jesus told a parable about the "son" of the owner who was killed by those whom the Pharisees took as referring to them (Matthew 21:45). Jesus afterwards asked, "the Messiah? Whose son is he? Their response, "the son of David" did not recognize the other Scriptures which identified "David's Lord" is God's "firstborn" whom God will set over the kings of the earth in Psalm 89, and over 400 years later God by Ezekiel said David will rule as a prince under David's descendant. This descendant is called God's son in Psalms 89:26-27-28-29

"He shall cry unto me, You are my father, my God, and the rock of my salvation.

Also I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth.

My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him.

His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven."

My Response

Ps 2 does not state that there is only one son at all. It speaks of a very special son but nowhere does it exclude others from being 'sons' and daughters. You are also confused about Rav Sha'ul and in fact the whole Bible - all righteous are the sons and daughters of God - this is a fundamental theme of the entire Biblical narrative. And we are all adopted in the sense that there is no such thing as a literal, physical son of God - such a concept is totally alien to the Tanakh and to Hebraic thought - it is Gnostic at its core.

I have a number of articles on Hebraic thought that might help you - see circumcisedheart.info

You continue to confuse meanings and assume that in one part of Scripture 'firstborn' can mean Israel and not be literal and then in another that 'firstborn' must be literal, when in all cases the context is clear. These terms, sons, firstborn, heirs, etc. are all about relationship. Yeshua can be the firstborn in the sense that he represents Israel and Israel is the firstborn in the sense that it represents all peoples, yet neither was born as literal off-spring of Yehovah - such ideas of gods mating with humans is from Greek and Gnostic thought - sadly is so permeates Hellenistic Christian thought that it is very hard to shake it. Perhaps you may do so when you have had enough time to digest all this.

Perhaps you could reconsider a link to one of my blogposts that I referred to a few days ago:

"... Amongst these stories of individuals born to a divine mother and a human father, were Achilles (son of the divine Thetis and the human Peleus), and Aeneas (son of Aphrodite and the mortal Anchises).

Those believed to be the offspring of a god and a human mother included Asclepius (son of Apollo and the mortal Coronis) and Hercules (son of Zeus and the human Alcmene).

Stories of miraculous conceptions and births were also told about rulers and philosophers in historical time. Among the philosophers, Pythagoras was said to be the offspring of Apollo and the human Pythais. Plato was believed to have been the son of Apollo and Amphictione; and Apollonius of Tyana was thought to be the son of Proteus, a divinity of Egypt, or Zeus.

He writes that these traditions were still common in the 2nd century CE and gives a number of examples including the apparent miraculous conception of Alexander the Great.

He also notes a second tradition where a number of these miraculous conceptions involved some form of spiritual encounter with the virgin mother, with Aeschylus an early example. "In "Suppliants" 17-19, Io is said to be impregnated by Zeus in the form of the 'on-breathing of his love'." - <https://luke443.blogspot.com/2013/08/the-ancient-mediterraneans-virgin-birth.html>

Robert

Psalm 2 = one who is YHVH's messiah who will sit on YHVH's throne in Zion over all nations. That one messiah YHVH said, "You are My son"

Hebrews 1:1 states "His son" sits beside Him in heaven. The writer of Hebrews to second generation believers in Jesus' teaching (2:1-3) then then quoted Psalm 2:7, Psalm 89:27, Psalm 97:7, Psalm 46:6-7, Psalm 102:25, Psalm 110:1, Psalm 8:4-5. Then he wrote, "But we see Jesus, who...."

Hebrews 5:5, also quoting Psalm 2 and 110 again, "So also Christ glorified not himself... Though he were a son, yet he learned obedience by the things which he suffered..."

Only one son fulfilled Psalm 2 and all the rest of David's prophecies about YHVH's "holy one" singular in Psalm 16:10. Christian Hebrews used their own Scriptures to show the entire life of God's son from birth to God's kingdom.

Uriel noted only *olam haba* portion of Hebrews. He did not note the complete "new covenant" message of Jeremiah 33, Daniel 9 and Psalm 118:22-26, "This is the day that YHVH has made; we will be rejoice and be glad in it. Blessed be HABA in the name of YHVH." Jesus said he was HABA both when he came to suffer/die and when he comes again in his kingdom (Matthew 11 and 23).

Rather than speculate these believers had secluded themselves in Qumran, it is evident they were involved with first century Christians,

Hebrews 13:23 "You know that our brother Timothy is set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you. Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy salute you."

My Response

Before I address your latest post Robert, I had not finished addressing a couple of earlier ones. Firstly you said you were using Linear Logic (which we would expect as Westerners to make use of this approach). However, the Hebrew mindset instead uses 'Block Logic'- please see this article from my website: <http://circumcisedheart.info/Christian%20site/LivingTruthTheHebraicMindset.pdf>

Also, even if your interpretation of what the Pharisees didn't understand in terms of Ps 110 with Yeshua being the son of God, and Lord/Master of King David (as the Messiah), but also a son of David (by tribal descent), this still does not make him the result of a virgin birth.

As a counter point to elucidate this, consider this amplified translation of Hebrews (from P46 by translator Uriel ben Mordechai):

Hebrews 1

- 1 *In days gone by, G-d spoke in many and varied ways to the Fathers [of the Jewish People] through the Prophets.*
- 2 *[And] In these acharit ha'Yamim [i.e. last days], He [i.e. G-d] has spoken to us through the son, who He [i.e. G-d] appointed heir of all things, for whom [i.e. the son] indeed, He [i.e. G-d] made the worlds.*
- 3 *He [i.e. the son] is an illumination [or reflection] of His [HaShem's] glory and the picture of His [i.e. G-d's] reality. He [i.e. the son] assumes [i.e. undertakes or carries] all the things of [or relating to] authority, by virtue of Him [i.e. the Almighty]. A purification of sin he [i.e. the son] shall make; he [already] sat down at the right hand of the Greatness [of G-d], in high places,...*
- 4 *...becoming so much better than angels, inasmuch as unlike with [most of] them, he has inherited a reputation.*
- 5 *For to which of the angels did He [i.e. G-d] ever say, [quote: Mizmor 2:7] "You are my son; today I have become your Father"? Again, [quote: Divrei Ha'Yamim Alef 22:10] "I will be his Father and he will be My son."*
- 6 *In addition, when the preeminent one [i.e. he who is renowned, chosen or selected] is brought into the world, he [the Psalmist] says, [quote: Mizmor 97:7] "Let all judges [lit. "elohim", i.e. angels or others assigned a divine status], render honor [i.e. bow down only] to HaShem."*
- 7 *Indeed, when speaking of angels, it [the Mizmor, quoting from 104:4] says, "...He [i.e. G-d] commissions the winds to be His [i.e. G-d's] messengers [or angels]; the blazing fire, to be His [i.e. G-d's] servants."*
- 8 *But with regard to the son [the Mizmor at 45:7-8 clarifies], "[ONLY] Your Throne, O G-d, will last forever and ever; [but] an upright Scepter [i.e. a son of G-d, e.g. Mashiach] is a [mark of a] Scepter of Your [i.e. G-d's] Kingdom.*
- 9 *You [i.e. G-d] have [always] loved uprightness and hated wickedness. Accordingly, Elohim, [who is] your G-d has anointed you [i.e. set you apart], from amongst your own [i.e. from amongst those of the house of David], [with] Shemen Sason [i.e. the oil of gladness]."*
- 10 *And You [i.e. HaShem] [quote: Mizmor 102:25-27], "before anything else [existed], You laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Your hands.*
- 11 *[Yet] they shall [all] vanish, but You [i.e. G-d] shall remain; All of them, like a piece of clothing, shall wear out;*
- 12 *and like a garment in need of replacing, it shall be replaced. But You [i.e. G-d] are the [only] one whose years shall never end."*

Now note the implication that Yehovah could have declared an angel His son, but did not. Yet the angels are not the result of a virgin birth, again showing that sonship is relational not literal.

My Response

Sorry, could you consider rewording your last post - it's rather disjointed and not at all clear what earlier comments you are referring to.

"There is no existent ancient Hebrew manuscript or fragment of Isaiah 7.14 in which the Hebrew word בתולה (bethulah) is used in place of "the young maiden" (haalma העלמה).

In the earliest original Hebrew text for Isaiah 7.14 found in the Dead Sea Scrolls (dated between 565 and 103 BCE), we read: "Therefore, HaShem (יהוה-יה) will give to you a sign. (Look) here (now)! the pregnant young lady (העלמה הרה) will give birth to a son and he will call his name 'Emmanuel.' [לכן יתן יהוה הוא לכם אות הנה העלמה הרה וילדת בן וקרא שמו] עמנואל]

In other words, in Isaiah 7.14, the pregnant young woman who gave birth to a son called "Emmanuel" at the time of King AHaz is not considered to be a virgin when she bares her son. The Aramaic Targum (composed later near the end of the first century BCE) translates the Hebrew העלמה (haalma) as עולִימְתָא (ulaymta) which also means "the young lady."

Over eighteen hundred years later, the Aramaic Syriac Peshitta of 1852 translates haalma into Syriac as ܚܠܡܬܐ which means either "a maiden" or as some claim "a chaste maiden." However, this much later Christian Syriac translation of the Hebrew term, "alma," does not override the valid, original Hebrew and Aramaic versions, which preceded it. Note that Jews/Israelites since the time of Isaiah have always interpreted the word, alma (עלמה), as meaning "a young lady" and never as 'a virgin.' For example, in the second century, C.E., Justin Martyr, a Christian, had a dialogue with Trypho, a Jew. In the text of the debate, we find that Trypho reads עלמה (alma) in Isaiah 7.14 as meaning "a young woman" and not as "a virgin." - quoting Shmuel Playfair

And:

"The Creator expressed His desire/will regarding what He chooses, when He swore an oath to King David, promising to place one of his patrilineal biological descendants "according to the flesh" on his throne. [2 Sam. 7.11-17; cf. Acts 2.30; Rom. 1.3-4]

On the other hand, God never expressed His desire/will "to quicken or form a baby in the womb of any woman still a virgin" or "cause the woman's egg to transform" (without using a male sperm/seed) to prove that nothing is impossible for Him.

... the Creator expressed His will or desire regarding the coming of the future Messiah in 2 Shmuel 7.11-17: "HaShem (יהוה-יה) will establish a dynasty for you...

I shall raise up your offspring after you (David), who will issue from your loins (genitalia), and I shall make his kingdom firm. ...

I shall be a Father unto him, and he shall be a son unto Me.... Your throne will remain firm forever...." - Shmuel Playfair.

Note the "I will be a Father ..." - this speaks of a relationship based on a decision and a set of future events. It does not speak of a literal father-son link based on a conception, and I think the 'issue from your loins' is pretty clear.

Robert

Psalm 89:20-36, 26-27 "You are my father ... I will make him My firstborn"

The father/son relationship is the eldest son, the first one born of the "seed" of David who will sit on David's throne forever, "higher than the kings of the earth". This is not said to all or a few righteous sons of David but to one seed who is YHVH's messiah/Christ. This is in Hebrews, "His son" who is also the "son of Adam" and "the son of David" who is Jesus (Aramaic, Yeshua).

YHVH's power to "speak" and "command" a young woman out of the "loins" of David is demeaned, even discredited, when associating >gods mating with gods or mating humans< as the same as YHVH promise to David that one of David's sons would be also YHVH's son. It's a shameful argument. We who know how YHVH created Man out of dust and a Woman out of the rib of Man understand the power of YHVH over the womb of a young woman. The result is Mary had a male son and YHVH is that male was not only "His son", but "My firstborn" - even the only one conceived and born "from the Father" (John 1:24; 3:16).

I expect you know a basic principle that a figure in language is only true when it is founded in reality. Please consider this in the full meaning of "ben" used over 4800 times in the Hebrew Scriptures. I don't think you would explain that

because YHVH is call "Baali / my Lord" in Hosea that Israel's God YHVH is just another Canaanite god. The same for YHVH's son.

Please understand 'Linear Logic' as I define rather than your article defined. I just restated John 1, so could have used "linear logos" which John based on God's logos in the Hebrew Scriptures like, Isaiah 46:9-10
"Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, Declaring all from beginning to end, and from times long ago the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure:". This is my definition of Linear Logic from God's viewpoint before He made all things related in the Hebrew Scriptures.

Isaiah 7:14 - I agree "behold a young woman is pregnant" is a good translation. So is Matthew's translation, "he parthenos en gastri" because a parthenos may be a young women, especially in the context of "that being performed in her is by the Holy Spirit".

My Response

"... the pregnant young lady will give birth to a son and he will call his name 'Emmanuel.' In other words, in Isaiah 7.14, the pregnant young woman who gave birth to a son called "Emmanuel" at the time of King AHaz is not considered to be a virgin when she bares her son."
Robert, you really seem confused about this and much more.

For example, your disjointed comments wrt Qumran. I'm not sure how this is even slightly relevant, but the Quram Yachad were most likely Essenes and they were clearly not followers of Yeshua (there purity rules for example, went way beyond even the strictest of the Pharisees and Yeshua clearly disagreed with them.

Your comments that mentioning ancient pagan and Gnostic views about god mating with humans, views that existed long before the 1st Century CE, being somehow shameful only confirms you emotional attached to this pagan heresy of the virgin birth.

BTW, Yeshua is Hebrew not Aramaic. (From Yehoshua i.e. the same Hebrew translated as Joshua in most Bibles). This statement is clearly a typo: "The result is Mary had a male son and YHVH is that male was not only "His son", but "My firstborn" ", but even ignoring the typo, this is still all about a relationship, not any literal god/man conception. Israel is also God's firstborn. And contextually the word has the same relational meaning.

You continue to quote a great many verses and even facts like the number of times 'ben' (son) is used as if they support your strained but imaginative interpretations that are based on approaching the Bible from a Hellenistic perspective.

Robert

Isaiah 8, yes, only says the young woman was impregnated by the prophet Isaiah so on information on the status of the mother of Mahershallhashbaz.
However, he is not identified as "Imanu El".

My Response

BTW, you use John 1:24 here "... from the Father" (John 1:24; 3:16)." when reads something like: "And they which were sent were of the Pharisees." I'm sure you meant some other verse?

Robert

Typo for John 1:14, "from the Father" - the Father is the origin of Mary's son, as the angel said to Joseph, "that which is generated in here is out of the Holy Spirit".

My Response

Jn 1:14 in most versions has the 'only begotten' phrase that John Butterworth has so emphatically shown you is a doctrinal redaction and not a valid translation.

But it's actually much worse. This whole passage has been seriously mistreated theologically with clearly Hellenistic reasons.

I explain the verses leading to v14 here: <https://globaltruthinternational.com/2018/06/24/two-re-translations-of-john-1-a-comparison/> and you can see in v12 the relational nature of being children (sons and daughters) of God.

But the next few verses are even more revealing (when translated from P46 rather than a 15th century Greek version:

1:12 As many as did take hold of IT [i.e., this illumination from the Torah], IT gave them prerogative to emerge as children of G-d; to those who are trusting in His [i.e., Ha'Shem's] Name,
1:13 who, not out from a bloodline lineage, nor out from sexual activity, neither out from any sort of human intervention, but rather coming out from G-d, they were engendered [or furnished] with new life.
1:14 And humanity acquired [i.e., received, or experienced] the Torah [or the Torah came down to humanity], and IT resided [or settled-in] right next to us [i.e., to AHM Israel]. And we contemplated [or noted] ITS greatness [or divine character], a distinction [or grandeur] in the sense of being unprecedented [i.e., unique, or without equal] coming from a Father with generosity [or goodwill] and truthfulness [or dependability, or trustworthiness].
1:15 Yochanan was testifying concerning IT [i.e., the Torah], and even shouted out, saying, "THIS [i.e., the Torah] was the very thing to which I had referred, which will go on [long] after [or subsequent to] me, having existed [long] before me. Specifically, it has [always] been my primary authority,
1:16 seeing that extending out from ITS [i.e., the Torah's] abundance, each and everyone of us shall also express [or choose] gratitude as a response to [Ha'Shem's] generosity [or goodwill],
1:17 in view of the fact that through Moshe this precious gift — the Torah — was given, and then [the added benefit of] the age of truthfulness [or legitimacy] shall come to pass [or be realized] by way of [or as a result of] Yeshua, Mashiach."
1:18 G-d? No one yet has ever set eyes upon Him! [He is] A unique [or unprecedented] G-d [i.e., without equal]! For the one who lives surrounded by [or absorbed in] the Father's embrace — [there, in] that place He will acknowledge [or poss. passive 'He shall be explained or fully disclosed']. - translated by Uriel ben Mordechai

My Response

Quoting Shmuel Playfair:

"In Luke 1.32, the messenger, Gabriel, informs Meeryam that she will conceive and bear a son who will be given the throne of his [biological] father, David. In Jewish thought, every birth is considered to be a miraculous affair involving three parties, the mother, the father, and the power or presence of the Holy One, blessed be He.

While the mother and father give the child its physical form, God implants the soul or divine spark within this body. [cf. Talmud Bavli, Kiddushin 30b]. Thus, HaShem's messenger told Meeryam that "the spirit of the Holy One will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you." [Luke 1.35]

The participation of HaShem's spirit in the conception and birth of Yeshua supports rather than negates Meeryam getting to "know" her husband, Yoseph, a patrilineal son of King David. We know that Eleesheva conceived her son through her husband Zechariah, because an angel appeared to Zechariah and promised him a son. [cf. Luke 1.5-13] And, the sign given to Meeryam regarding her relative, Eleesheva, who was called barren, conceiving a son in her old age suggests that Meeryam's pregnancy would likewise be the miraculous outcome from "knowing" her husband, Joseph.

Meeryam was not the only woman in the Jewish Scriptures to conceive a son by the Holy One's power. After Kain was born, Eve said that she had "acquired a man from (i.e., with the help of) HaShem." [Gen. 4.1] Also, remember what God said to Avraham: "I will bless her (Sarah), and I will give you a son by her; I will bless her, and she shall be a mother of nations; kings of peoples shall come from her." [Gen. 17.16]

Do not forget Hannah's vow to HaShem of Armies: "If You will look on the misery of Your maidservant, and remember me, and not forget Your maidservant; but if You give Your maidservant a male offspring (זֶרַח אֲנִישֵׁים zerah anasheem), then I will give him to HaShem all the days of his life..." [1 Shmuel 1.11] And, we read in Ruth that "HaShem made her conceive, and she bore a son." [4.13]

Notice, finally, what Z'Haryah's wife, Eleesheva, said after she conceived a son: "HaShem has done this to me in the days when he looked on me, to take away my reproach among people." [Luke 1.25] All these extraordinary birth stories originate in a Jewish milieu where births were considered to be unusual or extraordinary without being "virginal," as we commonly find in non-Jewish pagan environments. " <<end quote>>

I think we are back to square 1, so we might as well end it here.

You are now just repeating the same errors that have been addressed (though you have not responded directly to most of my points that have addressed your errors). Even simple things like arguing that Yeshua is Aramaic. Or that the Pharisee's were lax - yes, in some ways their traditions were guided by self-interest and many were hypocritical, but overall, the Pharisees, and even more so the Essenes, were extremely strict on minor details, but rigid and lacking compassion on some more important relational aspects (so clearly elucidated by Yeshua in Matt 23:23 quoting Micah 6:8).

But regardless of this, in general Rabbinic interpretation is by scholars who understand the Hebrew as native speakers as well as understanding the Hebraisms and rejecting Hellenistic perspectives. Typical of Hellenistic Christianity, you reject their explanations, for seriously flawed pagan interpretations and doctrines. A very simple example is the misunderstanding you continue to promote regarding what was meant and understood by the holy Spirit 'casting its shadow' over the conception.

Actually, the Greek word used here in Luke 1:35 is a good example of how translations can 'cloud' (no pun intended) the meaning, as the same word is also used in Luke 9:35; Mark 9:7; Acts 5:15. This issue is even more significant in the translation of Hebrew.

We can at least agree when you speak of Miriam that it was indeed 'her firstborn son'.

So, we have some agreement on some minor aspects of this dispute, but after weeks it appears we have made next to no progress. Thanks for an interesting discussion though - you have raised a great many secondary points that I did not think relevant, but which lead to some further consideration of Scripture, which is always a blessing.

All the best and shalom.