

CHALLENGE TO THE CULTS, NO. 4.



WAS  
JESUS  
CHRIST  
VIRGIN  
BORN  
?



By Rev. Cyril Hutchinson

Principal, Berean Bible College

---

Berean Bible College

Calgary, Alberta, Canada



## CHALLENGE TO THE CULTS No. 4

### "WAS JESUS CHRIST VIRGIN BORN?"

Perhaps no greater question has ever been propounded to the mind and heart of mankind than the one we deal with in this booklet. It has been assailed by more false cults, and by the rage of more modernists than any other teaching of the Word of God. The reason is not far to seek. If Jesus Christ was virgin-born, coming into this world from a previous existence in heaven, becoming God incarnate in the flesh, then to Him every knee should bow, and every tongue confess allegiance, and every heart offer its worship. If He was not virgin born, then He is not God, and the foundation stone of Christianity is destroyed.

For this reason we again challenge every cult on earth to examine the Bible facts fairly and fully, without resorting to the subtle, underhanded trick of the modernists who are seeking to destroy the truth by changing the Bible to suit their sinister, satanic designs. "What saith the Scriptures?" should be our concern.

★ ★ ★

How have people come into the world?

Why do wicked men deny the virgin birth?

What does the Bible say about the virgin birth of Christ?

Was this event prophesied?

Were the prophecies fulfilled?

Do the Scriptures imply the virgin birth?

★ ★ ★

These are some of the questions that lie before us in these pages. We invite your honest appraisal of these Bible facts that answer the questions beyond any shadow of doubt or controversy. May God bless you as you read!

## Was Jesus Christ Virgin Born?

Startling though it may seem, the Bible declares that human beings have come into this world by four different methods or processes. We are accustomed to think of only one of these ways, the one now in full and continuous operation, the way we came into the world. Every living person we now see on earth, to the best of our knowledge, has had a natural birth, being conceived by human parents, and born of a woman through natural generation. Although we may never have actually witnessed the natural process of birth, and though we were too young to appreciate the means of our own birth, we are nevertheless convinced by the evidence about us that children come into existence through this natural process.

But let me repeat, the Bible speaks of four ways in which people have begun life on earth, and moreover hints at still another, a fifth way. The first method is described in Genesis 1:27 and Genesis 2:7. These passages of Scripture give us first the general statements of what God did, and then tell us the details of that stupendous act, the creation of the first man. The first human being came into existence by direct creation. You may believe that or not. God's Word states that it happened. This is a flat, uncompromising statement of fact. It is not allegorical folk-lore, not a subtly disguised description of some evolutionary process. God created Adam as a real, perfect, fully-developed man. True, sin has ruined mankind since then, and he is on the way DOWN, not UP. Some of these beetle-browed creatures anthropologists dig up and exhibit are not examples of whence humanity CAME, but examples of where humanity is GOING! It is evident the first human being was not born, for no parents existed for him, and thus we logically expect him to appear by another process altogether. This record is logical and scientific. Nobody was there to observe it, so nobody is able to deny it from any reasonable viewpoint. Nor can any savant on earth propose any other possible, reasonable explanation for the appearance of this first man. The illogical, unscientific and immoral theory of evolution is neither possible nor reasonable. God saw this happen. He was there, as an eye-witness. And He has revealed the truth to us. It is just as simple as that! Let every atheist on earth deny the fact of Adam's direct creation. He was not there, and his "evidence" would be laughed out of any court of justice in our land.

The second way in which a human being began life on earth is described for us in Genesis 2:21-22. From the side of anaesthetised Adam God took living flesh and bone, and made of that substance a woman,



the first woman. Why was she not created as Adam was, directly from the dust of the earth? Because God was establishing the basic principles of TRUE marriage, that a man and a woman truly wedded become ONE FLESH, living one united life. How wonderfully this is demonstrated in the fashioning of Eve from the very flesh and bones of Adam! Not taken from his head to be a ruler over him, nor from his feet to be his inferior, but from his side, to be his loving life-companion, thus she was made. And how wonderfully God tells us of that coming of the last Adam, His own beloved Son, from whose wounded side He is taking the Bride of Christ! God had a wonderful plan in mind as He formed the first woman.

The third way in which human life begins on earth is that of natural generation, a child being born of the union of a man and a woman. Thus the first child, Cain, was born, (Gen. 4:1) and through the operation of the amazing laws of procreation NEARLY all human beings have since come into the world. So marvellous is this process, so dimly understood by the most brilliant scientific investigators, so incredible in its intricacies that the birth of every child is nothing short of an act of God, as miraculous as the creation of Adam himself.

It is not our purpose to discuss at length the strange birth into the world of some who are called "giants . . . mighty men . . . men of renown" in Gen. 6:1-4. These were born of the union of the "sons of God" with the "daughters of men." Although this statement is watered down by some interpreters to mean that godly men married ungodly women, it seems abundantly evident that its prime meaning is clearly that angelic beings, fallen from their sinless state, actually cohabited with human beings, women on this earth, and produced an abnormal "super-race" that was destroyed by God in the awful judgment of the Flood. It is surely evident that it was a sin of some magnitude that called for a judgment of such magnitude. It is more than likely that Judas was thus born in the earthly days of the Saviour, for he is called the "son of perdition" and "a devil from the beginning." It is also interesting to notice that the anti-christ will carry this same title, the "son of perdition," probably being miraculously born of a woman, yet fathered by either Satan himself, or by one of his agents. (II Thess. 2:3).

Finally, we read in the Bible the marvellous story of the virgin birth of Christ, that He was born of the woman Mary, but having no earthly father, was conceived of the Holy Ghost, becoming truly man and truly God, God manifested in the flesh. Only One was thus born, to be the Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, standing on an equality with both man and God, and able to reconcile man to God.

## WICKED MEN DENY THAT JESUS WAS VIRGIN BORN.

Some of the bitterest attacks of those strange bed-fellows, the modernists and the atheists, have been directed against this teaching of the Bible concerning the virgin birth of Christ. We need not seek far for the reason. It is because this doctrine is one of the great foundation stones of Christianity. If Jesus was born of an earthly father, then he cannot be the eternal God manifested in flesh. He becomes simply another religionist, a teacher such as Confucius or Buddha, and has no particular right to our loyalty, much less to our worship. Thus an outstanding modernist of New York, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, wrote a book entitled "The Peril of Worshipping Jesus." And his treatise is perfectly logical IF Jesus is not God; and if He was not virgin born, then He cannot be God! Moreover, if Jesus was not virgin born, then Mary was certainly a sinful, fallen, deceitful woman, and Jesus was the offspring of some lustful, immoral reprobate who seduced her. Any man therefore who denies the virgin birth does so to deny that Christ was the pre-existent Son of God who willingly became incarnate in human flesh that He might redeem us from our sins by the sacrifice at Calvary. The voice of antichrist denies our Lord's virgin birth!

Have you heard their "arguments"? Some say of the virgin birth: "It is only mentioned in two or three places in the Bible." That is not true. We shall show later on how fully this truth is declared in the Bible. But if it were only stated once, would not that be sufficient? If God says it ONCE, that is enough. He never lies. Others say: "Jesus himself did not claim to be virgin born." That is also completely untrue. Jesus said that He came down from heaven. (John 6:33). That implies at once His virgin birth. He called Himself the "only begotten Son of God" (John 3:16). That word "begat" is a term used in genealogies, referring to the male part in procreating a child. Jesus said He was "begotten" of God, not Joseph. That Greek word "monogenes" is used six times in the New Testament about Jesus as the only-begotten of God, and twice Jesus used it of Himself. Nor did our Lord claim to be simply one who is begotten of God. He said he was the "ONLY-begotten" of God. Again we hear the modernist say: "Scientists have no records of any being born without an earthly father." Of course not! People are not born that way in the natural sequence of events. This proves the unique and wonderful nature of the birth of Christ. "But that would be a miracle," cries yet another unbeliever. Certainly it was a miracle. Our God is the God of miracles. If He were not, this earth would still be an empty, sterile waste as the Bible tells us it once was. How did life appear on earth at all? Let the

scientists give us a scientific answer to that poser! The only answer is that life came miraculously from the hand of God. And Jesus was virgin born by a miracle! Then we read the final sneer from some ungodly teacher, as he seeks to destroy the faith of some innocent young people in his class: "Intelligent people do not believe in the virgin birth." He could not face an intelligent and informed Christian leader with such a question. Were not Sir Isaac Newton, Sir James Simpson, Lord Kelvin, Louis Pasteur, William E. Gladstone, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, William Jennings Bryan, and innumerable men of like calibre and position possessed of high intelligence? Such men believed in the virgin birth and the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ!

Well, do not wonder that wicked men have appeared on the scene in these latter days, denying the virgin birth of Christ. The Bible said they would come. Take the Scriptures and read carefully such passages as I Timothy 4:1-2, II Peter 2:1-3, II John 7-11 and Jude 3, 4. God says in such prophecies that men will rise "denying the only Lord God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ," "even denying the Lord that bought them," "who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," "and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ." Every time a modernist or the inventor of a false cult denies the virgin birth of Christ, he is unconsciously fulfilling these exact prophecies, and proving that the Bible is true!

#### *WHAT THEN DOES THE BIBLE SAY ABOUT THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST?*

FIRST:— The Bible prophesies His virgin birth.

The first recorded prophecy is found in Genesis 3:15, where we find this expression used as God addressed the serpent, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and HER SEED." In natural procreation there is no such thing as the seed of a woman. The seed is of the man. The rest of the verse prophesies this concerning this coming SEED OF THE WOMAN: "It shall bruise thy (Satan's) head." This prophecy declared to the devil that his Conqueror was coming, and that He would be born in different manner to anyone else, being not the seed of a man, but born of a woman without natural generation. Here is the whole story of the Bible in a nutshell!

Another great prophecy is that found in Isaiah 7:14. Be sure to read this in the Authorized Version, which gives the correct translation. Some of the modern versions have come from ungodly men who have impiously tampered with the wording, seeking to destroy this clear prophecy of our

Lord's wonderful birth. Listen to the words: "Therefore the LORD himself shall give you a sign; Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." The modernists have changed the word "virgin" to "young woman," and thereby made fools of themselves and their new version! What a ridiculous statement they have fashioned! It is certainly no SIGN for a young woman to bear a son! The unmistakable SIGN is for a VIRGIN to bring forth a son. And the origin of such a child is at once indicated, for he was to be called "Immanuel" which means "God with us." God himself, said Isaiah, was to become incarnate through the womb of a virgin.

Jeremiah corroborates Isaiah with this remarkable statement found in Jer. 31:22 "The LORD hath created a new thing in the earth, a woman shall compass a man." Again we see that this is no ordinary happening; it is to be a "new thing in the earth." A woman compassing a man, carrying a man-child in her womb is neither new nor strange. Thus it is evident that this "new thing" is a new kind of birth, a woman compassing a man without receiving the seed of a man. This is the virgin birth of Christ. Jeremiah also has an indirect, but nevertheless very significant reference to the virgin birth of Christ, wrapped up in another prophecy. In Jer. 22:28-29 we read God's declaration that no man descended from Coniah (Jechoniah or Jehoiachin) would ever sit on the throne of David and rule over Judah. He was to be written childless, although he had many descendents. As far as the throne was concerned, God says he was to be as though he never had a child at all. Now add to that prophecy two remarkable facts. First, the Lord Jesus was promised the throne of David, before He was born, by the proclamation of the archangel Gabriel. This is found in Luke 1:31-33. Second, Joseph was descended from "Jechonias," the Coniah of Jeremiah's prophecy! (See Matt. 1:12-16). Mary was descended from David by another line altogether. It is thus clear that our Lord **COULD NOT HAVE DESCENDED FROM JOSEPH AT ALL!** He was virgin born of Mary, and through her He legally inherits the throne of David. How wonderful are the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning the Lord Jesus!

And while dwelling on these indisputable facts, it is well to read again the great Old Testament statements about the Son who was to be begotten of God. In Psalm 2:7 we read this decree of Jehovah, speaking to One whose wrath kings are to fear, "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." Again we find this word "begotten" used. The Son was not, and could not be begotten of Joseph, or any other man. He is named again in Psalm 2:12, as the Son, a capitalized name given to the One whose

wrath is terrible, but whose blessing rests upon all who trust in Him. Then in Proverbs 30:4, this remarkable question is asked concerning One who has created, and Who now controls all the universe: "What is his name?" That is easy to answer. He is the great Creator God. But the question continues: "And what is his son's name, if thou canst tell?" Has God a Son? This is most certainly declared by these Scriptures. And His name shall be called Immanuel, God with us! And of His many names, the one we know and perhaps love the best, is Jesus.

Nor do we exhaust the theme at this point. Would to God that all who love and believe the Old Testament, the Law and the Psalms and the Prophets, might ponder these truths! In Isaiah 9:6 the prophet cries of a coming one who was to be born into the nation of Israel: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given . . . and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Isaiah declared that one was to be BORN into the world, and yet he was to be "The Mighty God." How could such a thing take place? Only by the virgin birth of Christ. This prophecy is fulfilled in our Lord, and the record of that fulfillment is so clearly stated in John 3:16, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And let us not forget to add yet another prophecy, that found in Micah 5:2. Not only does this clearly foretell the birthplace of the Messiah, but he is declared to be the one "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Again we are told that the everlasting God was to be born into the world, as a little child. Again the only possible explanation of such a wonder is the virgin birth of Christ.

SECOND:— The Bible records His virgin birth.

Nobody can read the Bible without knowing this fact. The Gospel records teem with the clear testimonies and statements of eye-witnesses of the birth of Jesus Christ. Who is there, brazenly willing to stand up today, over 1900 years later, and deny the recorded evidence of these first-hand witnesses? Would such a one expect to have his statements believed in any court of our land? Listen to the repeated, consistent records of the Word of God!

*Matthew* 1:22-23 tells us that the birth of Jesus fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, for here he quotes the very words of Isa. 7:14, and says: "Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet."

*Matthew* 1:16 tells us that Jesus was born of Mary, not of Joseph.

*Matthew* 1:18 says "Mary . . . was found with child of the Holy Ghost," not of Joseph or of any other man.

*Matthew* 1:19 declares that Joseph was a "just man," not a lustful seducer of a trusting woman. He could not be "just" and the progenitor of Jesus. *Matthew* 1:20-21 sets before us the testimony of "angel of the Lord." Would you not rather believe such a witness from heaven than the little brain of some egotistical modernist, a mere dying man on the way to his grave? The angel said that Mary's coming child was "*conceived of the Holy Ghost.*" Weigh that statement well! It is beyond controversy. It is a voice from heaven. Let any man deny it at the infinite peril of his soul! Note too that the angel called that coming babe "a son," not, speaking to Joseph, "thy son." Joseph had nothing whatsoever to do with that conception.

*Matthew* 1:24-25 makes that fact abundantly clear. Remember, this is the word of God. God knew every minute item of Joseph's private life, and it is His testimony that this man "knew not" Mary until after the birth of Jesus.

*Matthew* 2:2 records the testimony of the wise men, that the Babe of Bethlehem was a born king, whose birth was unique, peculiar from all others, being actually heralded by the appearance of a great "Nova," a new flaming star in the constellation of Virgo, the Virgin.

*Matthew* 2:11 shows us that these men who were so wise bowed in worship before this young child, acknowledging Him to be God, and thus testifying to His virgin birth. Wise is every man or woman who worships this One who is God in the flesh! And notice in verse 12 that as they worshipped Him, they were still under the direction and blessing of God. They were in no "peril of worshipping Jesus"!

*Matthew* 2:13, 14, 20, 21 give us four repetitions of the same remarkable phrase, "The young child and his mother." Now, when we note that this expression is contained in two commands given by God to JOSEPH, and two records of his obedience to these commands, we see how significant the expression is. Any idea of Joseph's parenthood is entirely eliminated, contrary to natural usage, and only Mary acknowledged as having any possible relationship to the child.

*Luke* 1:16-17 declares that John the Baptist, forerunner of the Lord Jesus, would go before the "Lord their God." Thus Jesus was the virgin-born Lord God of Israel.

*Luke 1:30-33* records the certain declaration of the archangel Gabriel. Do you think his testimony is acceptable? Or do archangels lie? Gabriel said that Jesus is the "Son of the Highest." Yet some vile, blasphemous scoffers of our day would call Him the son of the lowest, the offspring of some lewd seducer of Mary! Which will you believe?

*Luke 1:34* gives us Mary's first testimony, that she was a pure virgin. She said "I know not a man." Either she lied, or every denier of the virgin birth is a liar!

*Luke 1:35* gives us Gabriel's second testimony, and sets forth two important facts. He said the One born of Mary would be called the "Son of God," not the son of any man. And he called that which was to be born of her "that holy THING." Why did he use such a strange, impersonal word about a baby? The Greek word used is "Haigon" which is a neuter noun! This is used to teach us that Mary did not give birth to a person at all, but to a "thing," the fleshy body that God was to inhabit for some thirty-three years. The Person was pre-existent, with His whole personality. Jesus was not part God and part Mary in His nature, character or personality. She contributed absolutely NOTHING to His sinless Godhead, or His perfect manhood. Thus the specious and subtle expression "Mary, mother of God" is wholly and utterly deceiving. It is a terrible and wicked attempt to exalt Mary beyond her human position, and lower our blessed Lord to an inferior status, as One who owed His life to that woman. What a horrible and shameful thing that is! May God deliver us forever from such blasphemy! In *John 1:3-4* we read of Christ that "Without him was not any thing made that was made . . . In him was life." The Lord Jesus was Mary's Creator. He gave her life! And of Himself we read in *John 1:14*, "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." What really happened at the birth of Christ? He was conceived in the womb of Mary. That in itself tells of an unusual birth. The Holy Ghost performed a miracle, not half a miracle. This was not partly of Mary and partly of God. Neither Mary nor any man contributed to that conception. The Holy Ghost implanted a living "THING" in the womb of Mary, and God the Son inhabited that flesh, with all the original glories of His eternal Personality, no less, and no more. This the archangel Gabriel declared! *Luke 1:38* records Mary's complete submission to the will of God, so that all these things might be done "according to thy word." That submission set her apart as the "blessed" woman (not the "blessing woman"), receiving the high honour of becoming the virgin mother of the flesh of the Son of God.

*Luke 1:43* gives us the inspired testimony of Elizabeth, the cousin of Mary. She called Mary the "mother of my Lord" (i.e. after the flesh). Already carrying the babe who was to be John the Baptist, she testified that the babe leaped in her womb at the voice of Mary, and Elizabeth herself was filled with the Holy Ghost. Did she then tell the truth when she called Mary's babe "Lord"?

*Luke 1:46-49* records what has been called "The Magnificat," the praise of Mary. By no stretch of the imagination can this be classed as the song of a fallen woman, betrayed into illegitimate childbearing. Notice, in verse 47, that she acknowledged her own need of a God who would be her "Saviour." Mary was not sinless, but she was a virgin.

*Luke 1:76-79* brings to us the testimony and praise of Zacharias upon the birth of his son, John the Baptist. He prophesied that John would be "the prophet of the Highest," and that he would "go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways." This clearly shows that the Lord Jesus was the "HIGHEST," the Lord! There is none higher than He. He was God incarnate, through the virgin birth. This is another amazing, unanswerable proof of the Deity of Christ, and thus of His virgin birth.

*Luke 2:10-11* tells us of the angel's words to the shepherds. Again he is called "the angel of the Lord." Will his testimony stand? He said that the Bethlehem Babe was "Christ the Lord," and so must have been virgin born. So when the shepherds came to the manger, we read in verse 16 that "they found Mary, and Joseph, and the babe." It was not THEIR babe, but simply THE babe, Christ the Lord, from heaven.

*Luke 1:21* tells how Jesus was named, in obedience to the word of the angel. His name means "Saviour," the prophesied One who was to be begotten of God, not of man.

*Luke 1:22* is most interesting in that it tells of the presentation of the Babe in the temple. Was He rightly born or was He a bastard child? In *Deuteronomy 23.2* we read that no bastard (or illegitimate child) could ever enter into the temple. Joseph and Mary, in bringing this Babe before God, declared He was a holy child, virgin born.

*Luke 1:28-32* gives us the wonderful testimony of aged Simeon. He declared that this child was the "salvation" for which he waited, the "light to . . . the Gentiles . . . the glory of . . . Israel." Who could He then be but God incarnate, born of the virgin, without a human father?

*Luke 2:36-38* adds the similar godly testimony of Anna, a prophetess, who spoke of the Babe as the "redemption," the price of sin that He alone was able to pay, being born sinless himself, inheriting no fallen nature of Adam.



Luke 2:49 preserves to us the first testimony, in fact the first recorded words, of the Saviour himself. Mary, in her human fallibility and her natural agitation, had spoken of Joseph and herself as "thy father and I." Instantly and emphatically our Lord corrected her! "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business." What did He mean? Certainly that God *alone* was His Father! And His Father's business was not the labour at the carpenter's bench, but the preaching of the Word of God, the Gospel of salvation. (See Luke 4:18). Notice too that Jewish boys were usually presented at the temple when 13 years of age, EXCEPT when they had no earthly father living. In this latter case they were brought to become "sons of the law" at the age of 12. In bringing Jesus at that age, Joseph was saying "He is not my son!" He was virgin born!

Luke 3:23 records the genealogy of Mary. Note that Joseph, here spoken of as the "son of Heli," is actually his son-in-law. This form of expression is often used in the Scriptures. Heli was the father of Mary. Now Jesus was "as was supposed," the son of Joseph. Legally He was recognized as his son, but it was only a supposition. He was the *only-begotten* Son of God.

Galatians 4:4 adds the testimony of the Apostle Paul, as he speaks of Christ as being "made of a woman." This is a clear declaration of His virgin birth.

What an amazing, repeated testimony there is in the Scriptures to this supremely important truth of our Lord's virgin birth. Are you convinced of its truth? Then read on, for the Bible has much more to say.

THIRD:— The Bible infers His virgin birth.

By "infer" we mean that the truth of His virgin birth is indicated in more indirect ways than the declarations we have just noted. Every phase of Bible truth implies that He was virgin born, and NOT ONE WORD casts the slightest doubt upon it. That is very strong evidence in itself. Read the following passages:—

John 1:1-2, 14 show us that the One known as the Word, who became a Babe, living in a body of flesh, was actually the Eternal God who made all things. For such a One to become flesh necessitated the virgin birth.

In this Scripture we also find the testimony of the Apostle John, declaring that the Lord Jesus was "the only BEGOTTEN of the FATHER." This implies the virgin birth by declaring that Jesus was not "begotten" of any man.

John 1:15 presents a further testimony from John the Baptist. Although born about six months before the Lord Jesus, he says of Him, "He was before me." This is a clear statement of the Lord's pre-existence, and in this way proves that He did not come into being by the union of some man and woman. He was virgin born.

Time and space forbid us examining this great Gospel of John at length. We suggest that the reader list for himself every passage that states or implies the Deity of Christ. There are scores of them in this Gospel. And remember that every one of these references implies the virgin birth, for Christ could not be God apart from such a birth. Every living thing begets "after its kind," and a sinful man could only beget a sinful man. Is Christ our Holy God, or a sinful man? Every time His Deity is taught in the Scriptures, the fact of His virgin birth is proved.

One or two matters yet remain. Another slanderous attack is being made by wicked men who have been carried away with their satanic desire to defile the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Like all such who are governed by their debased prejudices, they have made fools of themselves again. These modernists claim that the Gospel of Mark was the first of the Gospels written. This is sheer speculation, mere guesswork, paraded with all the solemnity that hypocritical scholarship can assume to promote its foul purpose. Then the statement is added that Mark gave no record of the virgin birth and so this idea must have been added later by Matthew and Luke to enhance the reputation of Jesus, and make Him appear to be a god! We are reluctant to even record such blasphemy, and we do so only to expose the evil tactics of these godless men. Here is not only a denial of the virgin birth of Christ, but a wholesale denial of the inspiration of the Scriptures, intimating that the writers added in any fable that they thought might make a better story. This is the wicked teaching of so-called modern thought. It is actually as old as the devil's first words to man, "Yea, hath God said?"

Now, all the proof given in this article, and especially all the prophecies given long before Mark wrote his Gospel, show how foolish is the "logic" of these men. Whenever Mark wrote his Gospel, it did NOT originate the truth of the virgin birth. But examine the matter further. Did Mark not know about the virgin birth, or speak of it in his Gospel? Examine the records with me:—

Mark 1:1, the very first verse of the Gospel, says "Jesus Christ, THE SON OF GOD." What more need we say? Mark at once declares that the Lord was not the son of any man, but of God.



*Mark 1:2-3* goes on to quote the prophets concerning Christ, and as proof of the statement just made that He was the Son of God. The quotation is from Isaiah 40:3, the prophecy of the coming of John the Baptist, and this tells us that he was to be the forerunner of the "Lord." In Isaiah that word is spelt "LORD," and means the great Jehovah God, the Hebrew national name for God. Thus Mark declares that Jesus Christ is the Jehovah God of the Old Testament come into human form. This means He was virgin born. Such a statement needs no "enhancing" by later writers to make Jesus "appear to be a god"! Mark says He is the virgin born God of Heaven.

*Mark 14:61-62* contains these words, first a question of the High Priest, and then the answer of the Lord Himself: "Art thou the Christ, the SON OF THE BLESSED?" And Jesus said, "I AM." Mark gives us with crystal clarity the very confession of the Lord Himself, that He was born of no human father, but that He was the Son of the Blessed, the God of heaven. *Mark 15:37-39* gives us the story of the death of Christ, the record of the rending of the veil in the temple, leaving the way open to God through the death of His Son, and then the testimony of the centurion who was in charge of the crucifixion. He said: "Truly this man was the Son of God." He weighed the evidence that he saw and heard, and gave this testimony. And Mark recorded it. Of course the Gospel of Mark teaches the Deity of Christ, and the consequent necessity of His virgin birth. Let not these subtle and specious deceivers lead you to believe otherwise. They are simply betraying their own colossal ignorance and wicked conceit.

Let me add two other statements, this time from the epistles.

*Hebrews 7:3* speaks of the great Melchisedec, who appeared to Abram long ago. He was God the Son, in one of His many Old Testament appearances. And this Scripture declares that He was "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life." No man and woman cohabited, either lawfully or unlawfully to bring Him into being. He was and is the Eternal God!

*I Timothy 3:16* is perhaps the capstone of this pyramid of truth. "Great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh." That sums it all up. No wonder the modern versions have tried to change no less than six of the most prominent Scriptures that declare the Deity and virgin birth of Christ, including this one. Here Paul declares the whole fact of the pre-existent God the Son coming, through the virgin birth, to be made flesh for our salvation. This statement cannot be denied, and so wicked men in their utter debasement have dared to lay their impious hand on the Word of God, changing it to mean nothing at all. Yet the Word re-

mains, thank God, enshrined forever in this Authorized Version still beloved of millions all over the world. It is still true that "The Ancient of Days became the Infant of Days. God Himself a baby deigned to be, and slept upon a mortal mother's breast, and steeped in baby tears His Deity."

I believe that God requires of us, each one, a personal answer to the question, "Was Jesus Christ Virgin Born?" He has not recorded this truth idly, or piled proof upon proof with no purpose in mind. The issues are so great, and the conclusions so widely separated, that eternity lies between. The question is whether Jesus Christ was the illegitimate child of sinful parents, and thus born into the world as a sinful man, or whether He is in truth the virgin born Eternal God who was manifested in human form for some thirty-three years.

What is your answer? Surely there can be only one reply, unless you are prepared to deny the whole teaching of the Word of God. Jesus Christ is God. And if He then was God in the flesh, and died for you on Calvary, then indeed here is love Divine, and a salvation that is prepared for all people. When He gave that life, the life of Deity, as a ransom for our souls, as the full payment for all our sins, the price was sufficient for all men. His life is worth more than all the Universes there could possibly be. And He laid down that life for you, because He loved you.

Have you received Him as your Saviour? Have you believed on Him, accepted His salvation by faith, and thanked Him for dying for you? If not do so at once. He is your God. And He is the One who died for you. Read *John 3:16* carefully, with a heart that is willing to yield to God, and put your own name in the place of the "whosoever," for it includes you. Let me suggest that you use the decision form at the end of this booklet, as a record of your personal acceptance of Christ. And then let me know of your decision by writing us about it. We shall try to help you further, and certainly pray for you.

And dear Christian friend, I pray that these words may have been a strength to your faith, and given you a bulwark of truth against the attacks of every evil sect abroad today. And may you be stirred in heart to serve the God who so loved us with all your strength and mind and talents and possessions. Let us be real soldiers of Christ, able to "contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."

*MY DECISION*

Knowing that I am a sinner condemned before God; and believing that Jesus Christ shed His blood and died for me, I NOW accept Him as my Saviour, and with His help I intend to live for Him and confess Him before men.

Date .....

Signed .....

**BEREAN PUBLICATIONS**

Bible Facts About the Healing of the Body .....	25c
Challenge to the Cults, No. 1, Is Jesus Christ God? .....	10c
Challenge to the Cults, No. 2, Is There a Literal Hell? .....	15c
Challenge to the Cults, No. 3, Is There a Second Chance? .....	15c
Challenge to the Cults, No. 4, Was Jesus Christ Virgin Born .....	15c
Liquor Traffic - The Reptile of Society .....	15c
The Conflict of Communism and Christianity .....	10c
The Woman and Her Adornments .....	10c
Why Christians Should Reject the New Bible .....	15c
Syllabus of Berean Bible College .....	Free

---

Published by

**Berean Bible College**

3216 - 4th St. N.W.

CALGARY - ALBERTA - CANADA