

CHURCH OF GOD
Parsonage Library

The Son of God

JESUS CHRIST

A Treatise on the Divine Sonship of Jesus,
Based Upon the Documentary, Historical,
and Biblical Evidence Relating Thereto

Paul Preached Christ in the Synagogues
That He is the Son of God. Acts 9:20

By A. H. ZILMER

Price: 30 cents in U. S.
1 shilling, 6 pence in Foreign Countries

Published by the Author
626 Eureka Street, Waterloo, Iowa, U. S. A.
1922

G. E. Marsh Memorial Library, Church of God
General Conference: McDonough, GA; <https://coggc.org/>

The Son of God—Jesus Christ

(II Cor. 1:19)

A Treatise on the Divine Sonship of Jesus,
Based Upon the Documentary, Historical,
and Biblical Evidence Relating Thereto.

Paul Preached Christ in the Synagogues—

That He is the Son of God.

(Acts 9:20)

Anyone who carefully reads the New Testament as we have it is impressed with the idea that the Jesus therein depicted was by the writers regarded as the Son of God in a sense in which no one else was such. Ten of the New Testament books speak of Him fifty times as the "Son of God," the "Son of the Highest," and fifteen refer to Him eighty-six times as "A Son," "His Son," "my Son," and "the Son," in relation to God. Thus there are in the New Testament 136 direct references to the divine sonship of Jesus. Six books refer to Him eighty-six times as the "Son of Man"; four speak of Him six times as the Son either "of Mary," "of the carpenter," or "of Joseph," and three speak of Him sixteen times as the "Son of David." 16

THE GOSPEL ACCOUNTS

That Jesus is the Son of God by divine begetting, without the intervention of man, the New Testament very clearly teaches in the Gospel accounts of the life of Jesus, especially those by Matthew and Luke. Here we read: "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as His mother was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Spirit. Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived [or begotten] in her is of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 1:18-20).

The account of Luke reads as follows: "In the sixth month [of Elizabeth] the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose

name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail! highly favored one; the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women. And when she saw him she was troubled at this saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favor with God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call His name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David; and He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that Holy Thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke 1:26-35).

These two accounts agree in attributing the begetting of the child Jesus to God through the Holy Spirit, and according to Luke's account the child so begotten was to be called the Son of God on account of such begetting.

It is at this point that we encounter a serious objection by some, namely, that these passages are spurious, the story of the divine begetting being designated as an invention of designing men, a "gross fabrication," and that the chapters in Matthew and Luke containing these accounts form no part of the divine record concerning Jesus. Rejecting these chapters, they hold, as men have held from an early date, that Jesus was a natural son of Joseph and Mary; or, believing in the human paternity, they reject the record they contain. It is taught by believers in the human paternity that Jesus became the Son of God, not by being begotten of God by the Holy Spirit, but, first, at His baptism, when the voice from heaven said, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. 3:17); and, secondly, at His resurrection from the dead; and two passages are cited as proof, viz., the words of Psalm 2:7, quoted by the apostle Paul in Acts 13:33, "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee," and that in Rom. 1:3, 4, "Concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." Thus, by one sweep of the hand, as it were, is the Gospel testimony regarding the divine sonship of Jesus disposed of, and we are given to understand that those who accept what the first two chapters of Matthew and Luke respectively set forth, are believing a pagan and papal fiction, which designing hands have fastened upon the New Testament, to the deception and lasting hurt of the simple minded. "The argument rests upon the genuineness of these chapters (1 and 2 of Matthew and

Luke respectively); for if they be genuine, their authenticity must follow, the general authenticity of these writers being fully established" (Charles Dealtry, in a letter written to Robert Roberts, December 17, 1867).

THE EVIDENCE OF THE MANUSCRIPTS AND HISTORY

What are the facts in the case? There are two sources of information from which these facts can be gathered, and these are the ancient manuscripts, and history. Let us consider these.

1. *The evidence of the manuscripts.*—Since the Authorized Version of the Bible was made in 1611, more than 1500 manuscripts of the New Testament in different languages have been discovered, of which 355 are in Greek. All these manuscripts containing the Gospels except two contain the first two chapters of Matthew and Luke substantially as we have them today. These two exceptions are the Greek Codex Ebnerianus, and the Syriac manuscript discovered in 1892 by two English ladies, Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis and Mrs. Margaret Dunlop Gibson, in the convent of St. Catherine at Mount Sinai. The Codex Ebnerianus begins with Matt. 1:18, which says, "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as Mary his mother was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child by the Holy Spirit, then Joseph her husband," etc. The Syriac manuscript contains chapter 1 of Matthew, with certain changes that will appear from Mr. H. L. Hastings' Introduction to Murdock's translation of the Peshitto Syriac, some of which we transcribe, as follows:

"In their exploration of decaying manuscripts they came upon an old Syriac manuscript of 350 pages dating back to A. D. 778, containing lives of female saints, which had been written over some earlier writing, which had faded and been partly erased. With their photographic apparatus these ladies photographed nearly all of this old palimpsest, bringing the film to England for development, and there Mr. F. C. Burkitt and Robert Bensley deciphered some of the older writing, and Mr. Bensley identified it as a manuscript of the long-sought Cureton Syriac, or some closely allied versions of the Gospels.

"Early in 1893 the same ladies, accompanied by Messrs. Burkitt and Bensley, and Prof. J. Randall Harris, revisited the convent of St. Catharine, and in February and March transcribed this ancient codex, using chemicals to restore the faded letters, which were too faint to be distinctly photographed.

"The Syriac manuscript thus recovered contained nearly the whole of the Gospels, about eight pages being defective. The Syriac Gospels have been issued from the Cambridge press, and an English translation by Mrs. Lewis also appeared.

"These Gospels are valued for their antiquity, though for practical purposes this more crude version can never compete with the more accurate Peshitto. They may, however, serve to shed some

light on perplexing critical problems. In the Gospel of Mark the last twelve verses are wanting. In Luke 2:14 the reading is, 'good will towards men.'

"In these long discarded Syriac Gospels may also be found one of the rare instances of *intentional interpolations* in the text, which this version shares with a small family of old Latin manuscripts. Thus the fact of the miraculous birth of the Savior is distinctly discredited, for this Syriac codex says, Matt. 1:16, 'Joseph, to whom the virgin Mary was betrothed, begat Jesus, who is called Christ,' and in verse 21 it reads, 'she shall bear *thee* a son,' and in verse 25 it omits the words, 'And he knew her not till,' but says, 'And he married his betrothed wife, and she bare him a son, and he called his name Jesus.' But that these changes were made to favor certain Ebionite notions is clear from the fact that the corrector *did not complete his work* or make it uniform.

"Thus Matt. 1:18 reads, 'The birth of Jesus took place as follows: As Mary his mother, to whom Joseph was betrothed, before he married her, discovered that she was with child by the Holy Spirit.' Verse 16 calls her 'Mary the virgin.' And in Luke 3:23 it reads, 'But Jesus, being about thirty years old, called, as He was, the son of Joseph.'

"Hence it appears there was good reason for discarding this version, or at least some copies of it, as intentionally though incompletely altered, and using instead thereof the version universally accepted and preserved, the Peshitto." So for Mr. Hastings.

As far as the Codex Ebnerianus is concerned, it is entirely in favor of the divine begetting of Jesus, as contained in our Matthew, and omits only the genealogy. The Syriac Lewis manuscript, whatever its age, contradicts itself. It says that "Joseph begat Jesus," and also says that Mary, "before he married her, discovered that she was with child by the Holy Spirit." If Joseph begat Jesus, then it cannot be true that Mary was with child by the Holy Spirit before Joseph married her. These statements flatly contradict one another, and are mutually destructive. Hence this manuscript is of no value as evidence upon the subject in question.

Then, too, this manuscript contains verse 16, which speaks of Mary as "the virgin." While Mr. Hastings did not say that it contains the verses preceding it, it could not very well contain verse 16 without some of the preceding context, for this verse reads, "And Jacob begat Joseph, to whom Mary the virgin was betrothed," etc. We further note that this manuscript contains verses 21 and 25, which are rejected in their entirety by most teachers of the human paternity.

Then we have not only the Peshitto, a very ancient Syriac manuscript above referred to, which has Matthew and Luke as we have them, but also the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts in Greek, whose great antiquity is conceded by all. These contain the disputed chapters in Matthew and Luke entire. The Alexandrian

manuscript, belonging to the same class as the last two mentioned, omits all of Matthew up to chapter 25:6, which renders it valueless as evidence upon the subject under consideration.

That the documentary evidence in favor of the human paternity is by no means as clear and convincing as it should be in order to produce conviction, or as even its advocates wish, is evident from a statement contained in a leaflet on *The Messiah of Prophecy*, as follows: "I expect to see the monasteries of Jerusalem and Constantinople, and also the Vatican at Rome, to be sacked, and that decisive evidence will then be produced that will prove conclusively that this miraculous begettal story is a papal and pagan fraud." Out of 1500 manuscripts of the New Testament found since the beginning of the seventeenth century, 355 of them in Greek, there is admittedly not one that contains the "decisive evidence" or "proves conclusively" that Jesus was a son of Joseph and Mary by natural begettal. Is it not, to say the least, very singular that after all the search that has been made, and all the discoveries that have been recorded, there has not been found, if it exists, a single manuscript which teaches beyond question the human paternity of Jesus? Yet in the absence of such proof we are asked to regard the existing evidence as a "papal and pagan fraud," and the fact established thereby as fiction. If the evidence in favor of the human paternity of Jesus were half as copious, and the proof half as conclusive, not to say overwhelming, as it is on the side of the divine begettal, then those who would object would be regarded by the believers in the human paternity as deniers of the word of God. Yet while confessedly the contenders for this doctrine cannot produce a single ancient manuscript which unquestionably proves their claim, they expect others to reject the existing evidence as spurious, and accept instead that for which there is no evidence.

But suppose there were a single manuscript that teaches beyond question that Jesus was begotten of Joseph. What would this prove as against 1499 others that teach the contrary? Simply that there is one manuscript that differs in this respect from the rest. Or suppose there were fifty. This would still leave 1450 that teach the divine paternity. It would then be for the scholars, critics and archeologists to determine which of them are of greater antiquity, and which are more modern. But this is mere hypothesis. The documentary evidence is wholly on the side of the divine paternity.

2. *The evidence of history.*—There is a mass of evidence in the early Christian literature which must not be overlooked. There are the writings of the "fathers" from Ignatius (A. D. 70-110) to Lactantius (A. D. 256-310), in which are found many hundreds of references to the New Testament books as we have them, as well as the Old, including the disputed chapters in Matthew and Luke. These writings are before us as we write. Those who either quote,

refer to, or make comments upon, the passages in dispute are, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and others of later date. We give extracts from their several writings dealing with the question now engaging our attention.

(a) Ignatius (A. D. 70-110), a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of the apostle John, wrote in his Epistle to the Ephesians, "For the Son of God was conceived in the womb of Mary, according to the appointment of God, of the seed of David, and by the Holy Spirit" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1, page 57). In his Epistle to the Trallians the same writer said, "Stop your ears therefore when anyone speaks to you at variance with Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was descended from David, and was also of Mary, who was truly begotten of God, and of the virgin, but not after the same manner" (Vol. 1, page 69). Both passages teach the divine begetting of Jesus in accordance with Matt. 1:20 and Luke 1:30-35, and prove that this doctrine was well established and fixed in the consciousness of the Christians at that early date.

(b) Justin Martyr (A. D. 110-165) wrote in his first Apology to Emperor Hadrian, "And the angel of God who was sent to Mary at that time brought her good news, saying, 'Behold, thou shalt conceive of the Holy Ghost, and shalt bear a son, and he shall be called the Son of the Highest, and thou shalt call His name Jesus; for He shall save His people from their sins,' as they who have recorded all things that concern our Savior have taught, whom we have believed, since by Isaiah also, whom we have now adduced, the Spirit of prophecy declared that He should be born as we intimated before. It is wrong therefore to understand the Spirit and the power of God as anything else than the word, who is also the firstborn of God, as the aforesaid prophet Moses declared; and it was this which, when it came upon the virgin and overshadowed her, caused her to conceive, not by intercourse, but by power. And the same Jesus in the Hebrew language means *Soter* (Savior) in the Greek. Wherefore too the angel said to the virgin, 'Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins'" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1, page 174). No man can quote a passage from any writing which does not exist. The fact that Matt. 1:21 and Luke 1:35 were quoted as we have them, proves that these chapters were in existence at the time when Justin wrote. He speaks of those who have "recorded all that concerns our Savior," that they had "taught" them these things, and "whom we believed." "They" who "recorded all that concerns our Savior" were more than one, and since Justin cited from Matthew and Luke, almost verbatim, it is evident that it was from these Gospels as we have them.

In his dialogue with Trypho the Jew Justin wrote, "But the virgin Mary received faith and joy, when the angel Gabriel announced the glad tidings to her that the Spirit of the Lord would

come upon her, and the power of the Highest would overshadow her; wherefore also the Holy Thing begotten of her is the Son of God; and she replied, 'Be it unto me according to thy word.' And by her has He been born to whom we have proved so many Scriptures refer" (Vol. 1, page 249). The "Scriptures" referred to are Isaiah, Matthew and Luke. This is another commentary on the position occupied by Matthew and Luke as belonging to the "Scriptures."

(c) Irenæus, a contemporary (A. D. 120-200), referred to or quoted verses 1, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20 and 23 of the first chapter of Matthew, showing that the manuscript containing this chapter was in existence, and before the eyes of Irenæus, we should say, from the middle of the second century. Coming to his own words, we read, "Matthew again relates His generation as a Man, saying, 'The Book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham'; and also, 'The birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise.' This then is the Gospel of His humanity; for which reason it is too that the character of a humble and meek man is kept up through the whole Gospel" (page 428).

Again: "And Matthew, too, recognizing one and the same Jesus Christ, exhibiting His generation as a man from the virgin, even as God did promise to David that He would raise up from the fruit of His body an eternal King, having made the same promise to Abraham a long time previously, says, 'The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of Abraham, the son of David.' Then that he might free our minds from the suspicion concerning Joseph, he says, 'But the birth of Christ was on this wise: When His mother was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.' Then when Joseph had it in contemplation to put Mary away, since she proved with child (Matthew tells us of) the angel of the Lord standing by him and saying, 'Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins'" (pages 440, 441).

(d) Clement of Alexandria, another of the "fathers" living about the same period (A. D. 160-230), quoted Matt. 1:17, concerning the generations from Abraham to Christ, and Luke 2:1, 2, 23, concerning the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, the baptism of Jesus, and His age "about thirty years." Clement's work, the *Stromata*, Book II, chapter 21, being a chronological work, he did not quote from the first chapter of Luke's Gospel. His quotation of Matt. 1:17 begins with "for" thus: "For from Abraham to David are fourteen generations," etc. This verse, beginning with the conjunction "for," proves that the copy which lay before Clement contained at least one of the preceding sixteen verses, along with the 17th as we have them now. He refers to the two Gospels by name, and says, "And in the Gospel according to

Matthew the genealogy which begins with Abraham is continued down to Mary the mother of the Lord." His quotation from Luke is introduced thus: "And to prove that this is true, it is written in the Gospel by Luke as follows, 'And in the 15th year of Tiberius Cæsar'" (Vol. II, pages 333, 334).

(e) We mention Tertullian (A. D. 160-230), a voluminous writer who also made quotations from these chapters. He quoted or referred to five passages in Matt. 1, between verses 1 and 23, and sixteen in Luke 1, between verses 1 and 79, showing that these chapters were before the eyes of Tertullian at the time when he wrote. There is one passage in his treatise "On the Flesh of Christ" which we deem especially pertinent as not only embodying reference to many passages in the Gospel according to Luke, but also revealing the nature of the objections of Marcion (who died A. D. 165). He says,

"Clearly enough is the nativity announced by Gabriel. But what has he (Marcion) to do with the Creator's angel? The conception in the virgin's womb is also plainly set before us. But what concern has he for the Creator's prophet, Isaiah? He will not brook delay, since suddenly (without prophetic announcement) did he bring down Christ from heaven. 'Away,' says he, 'with that eternal plaguey taxing of Cæsar, and the scanty inn, and the squalid swaddling clothes, and the hard stable. We do not care a jot for that multitude of the heavenly host which praised their Lord at night. Let the shepherds take better care of their flock, and let the wise men spare their legs so long a journey; let them keep their gold to themselves. Let Herod, too, mend his manners, so that Jeremy may not glory over him. Spare also the babe from circumcision, that He may escape the pain thereof; nor let Him be brought into the temple, lest He burden His parents with the expense of the offering; nor let Him be handed to Simeon, lest the old man be saddened at the point of death. Let that old woman also hold her tongue, lest she should bewitch the child.' After such a fashion as this, I suppose you have had, O Marcion, the hardihood of blotting out the original records of the history of Christ, that His flesh may lose the proofs of its reality" (Vol. III, page 522).

Not only did the early Christians quote from the disputed chapters in Matthew and Luke; so did also the enemies of Christianity. We direct special attention to the use made of certain verses in Matthew, chapters 1 and 2, by Celsus, a famous and very able opponent of Christianity in the second century. His work, *Logos Alethes*, "The True Word;" in which he attacked the Christians, has perished, but considerable portions of it are preserved in Origin's work, *Contra Celsum*, in eight books. Almost everything to which Celsus referred is to be found in the Gospels, especially of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. We mention the following circumstances referred to by Celsus, and cited by Origin in the *Ante-*

Nicene Fathers, Vol. IV: Jesus born of a virgin (pages 408, 413); an angel appearing to Joseph (page 412); the star in the East (pages 411, 413); the wise men (page 413); Joseph with Mary and the child Jesus fleeing into Egypt (pages 412, 426); the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus (page 413), and the voice from heaven, "This is my beloved Son" (page 461).

In some instances the language is cited verbatim; in others the circumstances are referred to in Celsus' own words, but in such a manner as to show that he had these disputed chapters before him. Since no one can quote from a document which does not exist, it is evident that the account of the miraculous begetting and birth of Jesus was in existence for some time before Celsus wrote his attack upon Christianity. Thus friend and foe alike bear witness to the existence and recognized authority among Christians of those portions of the Gospel of Matthew of which believers in the human paternity of Jesus would fain rid the New Testament.

When we come to the charge of fraud or forgery, we are prepared to affirm that, as far as the known New Testament documents are concerned, such corruption must be laid at the doors of those in the early centuries who, for one reason or another, rejected the doctrine of the divine paternity of Jesus as contained in the Gospels according to Matthew and Luke as we have them, and as crystallized in the consciousness of the Christians from the very beginning of post-apostolic times. That the Gospel records existed as we have them, and were accepted as authority before the middle of the second century, is abundantly established from the writings of those who were then living. They quoted from these early chapters of Matthew and Luke exactly as they quoted from any other parts of those books, or from the Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Galatians, or Hebrews.

WILLFUL ALTERATION OF TEXT

The only instance of demonstrable willful alteration of an existing document that we know of is to be found in the Syriac codex found by Mrs. Lewis at Mount Sinai, in which the author wrote that "Joseph begat Jesus," and at the same time also said that Mary "discovered, before they were married, that she was with child by the Holy Spirit." Here is a palpable contradiction, as anyone can readily see. Both statements cannot be true at the same time. Either "Joseph begat Jesus," as this manuscript says, or else Mary was with child by the Holy Spirit, as this manuscript also says, and as hundreds of other New Testament manuscripts so far discovered also say. Who made this alteration we cannot say, but it must have been done by someone who believed in the human paternity of Jesus. We shall now give our reasons for this conclusion. There were those at an early date who strenuously opposed the doctrine of the divine begetting of Jesus. There were, for instance, the Ebionites, referred to in Mr. Hastings'

Introduction to Murdock, and some of the sect of the Nazarenes, who believed that Jesus was a natural son of Joseph, and therefore rejected those portions of the Gospel narratives which deal with this subject. Concerning them Prof. Adolph Harnack says:

"The Judaizing Christians, though of many shades, were not divided into two parties, and were not originally distinguished from the 'great church' by differences of 'doctrine,' but only by the forms of their religious life, while they had the following points of controversy among themselves: (1) Whether the observance of the law was a necessary condition of the reception of the Messianic salvation; (2) Whether it was to be insisted on in the case of the Gentile converts; (3) Whether, and in how far, they ought to hold fellowship with the Gentile Christians, who did not keep the law; (4) Whether Paul had been an elect servant of God, or an intruder; (5) Whether Jesus was a son of Joseph, or miraculously conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost. Their Gospel was some form of that known as the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. In the time of Epiphanius (A. D. 310-403), who calls them 'Ebionites,' they were in large numbers in the Dead Sea district. To them Jesus was merely a prophet" (*Standard Encyclopedia*, Vol. IX, page 340).

Several persons of the early post-apostolic period mentioned by Irenæus, Justin, Tertullian, and others, are referred to as advocating, along with other doctrines not held by the generality of the Christians, the human paternity of Jesus. There were Cerdo, Cerinthus, Carpocrates, and Marcion. All of these were contemporary with Irenæus and Justin. The former says of Cerinthus,

"He represents Jesus as having not been born of a virgin, but as being a son of Joseph and Mary according to the ordinary course of generation, while He was nevertheless more righteous, prudent and wise than other men" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1, pages 350, 352). He remarks, "Those who are called Ebionites agree that the world was made by God; but their opinions with respect to the Lord are similar to those of Cerinthus and Carpocrates." He further says, "They use the Gospel according to Matthew only, and repudiate the apostle Paul, maintaining that he was an apostate from the law." This "Gospel according to Matthew" was probably the same as the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" mentioned by Prof. Harnack above.

Tertullian likewise mentions Carpocrates as maintaining "that Christ was not born of the Virgin Mary, but was generated a mere human being, of the seed of Joseph, superior above all others in the practice of righteousness and in integrity of life. . . . After him broke out the heretic Cerinthus, teaching similarly, for he too says that the world was originated by those angels; and sets forth Christ as born of the seed of Joseph, contending that He was merely human" (Vol. III, pages 350, 351). He speaks of Marcion as attempting to prove the heresy of Cerdo, and says, "Besides this

he mutilates the Gospel which is according to Luke, removing all that is written respecting the generation of the Lord, and setting aside a great deal of the teaching of the Lord, in which the Lord is recorded as most clearly confessing that the Maker of this universe is His Father. He likewise persuaded his disciples that he himself was worthy of more credit than are those apostles who handed down the Gospel to us, furnishing them not with the Gospel, but merely a fragment of it. In like manner, too, he dismembers the Epistles of Paul, removing all that is said by the apostle respecting that God who made the world, to the effect that He is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also those passages from the prophetic writings which the apostle quotes in order to teach us that they announced beforehand the coming of the Lord" (page 352).

Tertullian said of Marcion, "Now of the authors whom we possess [Matthew, Mark, Luke and John] Marcion seems to have singled out Luke for his mutilating process. . . . For if the Gospels of the apostles have come down to us in their integrity, whilst Luke's which is received among us, so far accords with their rule as to be on a par with them in permanency of reception in the churches, it clearly follows that Luke's Gospel also came down to us in like integrity until the sacrilegious treatment of Marcion. In short, when Marcion laid hands on it, it then became divers and hostile to the Gospel of the apostles. . . . He has erased everything that was contrary to his own opinion, . . . while everything which agreed with his own opinion he has retained" (Vol. III, pages 347-351). Thus, according to the testimony of men who were in a position to know, we see what influences were at work to undermine the Gospels which had "come down" from the apostles.

From these extracts we see that the Ebionites rejected all the Gospels but that of Matthew, while Marcion and others cast out all but Luke. We are told that the so-called "Gospel according to Matthew" began with chapter 3:1, and Marcion's *Evangelion* (which is Luke's Gospel "mutilated") began with Luke 3:1 thus: "In the 15th year of Tiberius Cæsar God came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee." Neither of these so-called "Gospels" is now extant. Origen (A. D. 185-253) referred to this Gospel in these words, "It is written in a certain Gospel called 'According to the Hebrews,' if anyone is pleased to receive it, not as authority, but for illustration of the present question, 'Just now my mother, the Holy Ghost, took me by one of my hairs, and carried me to the great mountain Tabor'" (Schaff-Herzog, *Religious Encyclopedia*, Vol. V, page 30).

From the foregoing history, which we have gathered almost altogether at first hand from the works referred to, we note the following facts:

1. That of 1500 New Testament manuscripts known to exist, those containing the disputed chapters in Matthew and Luke agree

in teaching the divine begetting of Jesus as we read it in our Bibles.

2. That the Lewis codex, discovered at Mount Sinai in 1892, while saying that Joseph begat Jesus, contradicts this by saying that Mary discovered that she was with child by the Holy Spirit before they were married. This proves that the text was intentionally altered, which renders it of no value as evidence upon the question of the paternity of Jesus.

3. That there is no ancient manuscript of the New Testament known to exist which unquestionably teaches the human paternity.

4. That there were some during the second century who taught the human paternity, who, in doing so, rejected all the Gospels which we have except either Matthew or Luke, and these, according to indubitable evidence, they changed to suit their notions.

5. The period during which such changes were made in the Gospel records to suit Ebionite views regarding the paternity of Jesus was about the middle of the second century, contemporary with most of the "fathers" whose testimony we have cited.

6. Those who made such changes in the Gospels, either by taking from or adding to, also rejected other portions of the New Testament Scriptures, notably the Epistles of Paul.

7. The Ebionites, and some of the so-called Nazarenes, regarded the apostle Paul as an apostate from the law of Moses.

8. As far as we can learn, all who rejected the Gospel narratives, whether Ebionites, Nazarenes, Cerdo, Cerinthus, Carpocrates, or Marcion, either believed doctrines or engaged in practices in which modern teachers of the human paternity would not follow them. Mosheim and others testify that the Ebionites and Nazarenes after the second destruction of Jerusalem by Emperor Hadrian "deserted the ordinary assemblies of the Christians, and established separate meetings for themselves" (*Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History*, page 32).

One of the practices referred to was the observance of the Mosaic law. McClintock & Strong's *Religious Encyclopedia* says, "Nazarenes is the name of a Jewish Christian sect whose members continued to observe all the obligations of the law of Moses after the mother church at Jerusalem had abandoned it." Doubtless this "mother church" was one of the churches referred to by the apostle Paul, "For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God which in Judea were in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 1:22; 1 Thess. 2:14). Holding different views from the rest of the Christians of the second century, they rejected the apostolic writings, either in whole or in part, and it is no wonder that they either produced or adopted a literature of their own, including "Gospels" which were in keeping with their beliefs.

Without burdening the reader with further quotations upon these points, we say, without fear of successful contradiction, that those manuscripts of the New Testament which contained the account of the divine begetting of Jesus as we have it today, were the

first written, and therefore the first read, received, and believed. Attacks were made by enemies either of Christianity or of certain doctrines held by the Christians, and when the Gospels containing the account of the birth of Jesus were found standing in the way, they became the objects of attack, and as a consequence the "purg-
ing" process was begun by such men as Cerinthus, Marcion and others, until we have the clumsy, mutilated Gospel found in the Lewis codex above referred to. This is what the historic method yields when applied to the documentary evidence now available.

"JUDAIZING" TENDENCIES

The "Judaizing" tendency, referred to by several writers above quoted, existed in the church in the days of the apostles, as is evident from the reference to this matter in Acts the 15th chapter, and numerous passages in the apostolic writings, especially those of Paul. Up to a certain time the word was preached "to none but Jews only" (Acts 11:19). It required a special revelation to the apostle Peter in order to overcome his Jewish prejudice against the Gentiles (Acts 10:1-18); and after Peter's visit at the house of the Gentile Cornelius (verses 19-49), those of the circumcision "contended with him" because he had "eaten with the uncircumcised" (chapter 11:1-3). It was only after Barnabas and Saul were sent by the church at Antioch on a larger mission that the narrow lines of nationalism were crossed, and the gospel proclamation was carried to the Gentiles; and even then they first visited the synagogues of the Jews (chapter 13:14; 14:1; 17:1; 18:4). When the Jews opposed themselves and blasphemed, the proclaimers turned to the Gentiles in the localities visited. In the execution of their mission the apostles encountered much opposition and bitterness from the Jews. These opposed themselves; they objected, contradicted, blasphemed, made the minds of the Gentiles evil affected toward the brethren, said it was not fit that Paul should live, stoned him, drew him before Gentile tribunals, and condemned him. They accused the apostles and other believers of speaking against the law, the temple, and the customs which Moses had delivered. Among the Jewish converts there were those who sought to win the Gentile believers over to their side by teaching, "Except ye be circumcised and keep the law of Moses, ye cannot be saved" (Acts 15:1, 2). But the apostles had "given no such commandment" to any (verse 24); and nowhere in the apostolic preaching do we find any trace of this tendency. The apostle Paul contended most earnestly against it, and many are the trenchant sayings of his opposing it. Here is a notable example:

"Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect to you whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace" (Gal. 5:1-4).

However, we may even go farther back than this. Jesus Christ, by whom God preached peace to the children of Israel (Acts 10:36), encountered the same bitter spirit of opposition, the same hostility. He came to His own, but His own received Him not. He came that they might have life, but they refused to come to Him that they might receive it. When He was on trial for His life, because the Jews had accused Him out of envy, His accusers said, "His blood be on us, and on our children" (Matt. 27:25). To these children they communicated, by parental teaching and authority, their towering prejudice against Jesus as the Son of God, which became a "tradition received from their fathers" (I Peter 1:18). Since it was "Jesus of Nazareth" who would "destroy this place, and change the customs which Moses had delivered" (Acts 6:13, 14), they associated with this Jesus the setting aside of the ancient landmarks of Judaism. Of course, they regarded His claims as God's Son and Anointed as false and unfounded, and Himself as a wicked and bold pretender. What had He to do with God? and what right had He to claim being God's Son? No wonder the apostle Paul afterward said that Jesus was "to the Jews a stumbling-block" (I Cor. 1:23).

THE EBIONITES AND THEIR DOCTRINES

It was the Ebionites and some of the Nazarenes who wished to retain the observance of the Mosaic law "after the mother church at Jerusalem had abandoned it." The council at Jerusalem, above referred to, which relieved the Gentile converts of the necessity of keeping the law (Acts 15), was held about the year A. D. 50, or seventeen years after the "beginning at Jerusalem." But these "Jewish Christians," who later developed into the sect of the Ebionites, not content therewith, retained the observance of the law; and finding the writings of the apostle Paul strongly opposed to this tendency, they repudiated Paul's authority as an apostle, and rejected his writings.

But their views on this matter were not the only line of cleavage between themselves and the generality of Christians at that time. They held, also, that Jesus was a natural son of Joseph, and not the Son of God by divine begetting. How they acquired these notions, it is not difficult to see. They saw in Jesus merely a prophet, who magnified God's law, and, like their ancestors and forebears, they failed to see in Him the Son of God. Finding in the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" (possibly by Cerinthus, a Jew) an authority to which they might appeal, they adopted this as their Gospel, and rejected all the others, as pointed out above. But with this Gospel beginning with Matt. 3:1, and containing the clumsy addition about being carried by a hair to Mount Tabor; and the further fact that they rejected all the Gospels but Matthew, no one would regard these sectaries as the exclusive possessors of God's truth, or care to follow them. In the second cen-

tury they separated themselves from the other Christians, formed a distinct and separate sect, and maintained separate assemblies.

"The more rigid Ebionites were the successors of the Judaizers of the apostle Paul's time. They were bitterly hostile to this apostle. They considered Jesus to be a prophet, the promulgator of the law in a more rigid form, and held that at His baptism, on the significance of which they laid great emphasis, He was furnished with His higher powers. They denied His miraculous birth, and passed lightly over His death. While with the Gentile believers who did not adopt the Jewish rites they would have no fellowship. The only Gospel which they used was one form or recension of Matthew" (Geo. P. Fisher's *History of the Christian Church*, pages 74, 75).

A PAPAL FRAUD

Here we have the fountain of the doctrine of the human paternity of Jesus, and the course it took, and not, as a certain writer above quoted says, that the story of the miraculous begettal is a "papal and pagan fraud." As for the word "papal," it means "of or pertaining to the papacy or the Pope," also the Roman Catholic church. There was, during the second century, neither Pope nor Roman Catholic church in the sense commonly attached to these terms. Hence neither Pope nor Roman church could perpetrate the "fraud" of corrupting the text of a manuscript containing the apostolic writings. Both the Syriac and the Greek languages, in which the ancient manuscripts were written, were eastern languages, and these Syriac and Greek documents were written and used in the East. Palestine, Sinai, Alexandria, and other places where they were either composed or found, were in the East. The papal language is the Latin, and is not an eastern but a western language. Therefore it is impossible that a "papal fraud" could be practised in the Syriac and Greek manuscripts existing in the early part of the second century, to make them teach what they did not originally contain. The only eastern manuscript known to contain "intentional interpolations" is the Syriac manuscript found by Mrs. Lewis at Mount Sinai in 1892. Mr. Hastings refers to "a small family of Latin manuscripts" with which the Lewis manuscript "shares instances of *intentional interpolations* in the text." These, being Latin, and therefore sooner "papal" than the other, even if they taught the human paternity, could not be regarded as of very high authority.

A PAGAN FRAUD

Then as to the "pagan" source of "this miraculous begettal story," there is no similarity between the mythological begettal stories as found in the pagan religions, and the pure and dignified narratives of the begettal and birth of Jesus as contained in our Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Is there anything to be found in

the pagan mythologies antedating the Gospels that in any way resembles the Gospel "story" of the begetting of Jesus? If so, let it be produced.

If that "story" is a "pagan fraud," what pagan conceived the idea of the Holy Spirit coming upon Mary, and the power of the Highest overshadowing her, acting upon her in such a manner that she became with child, and later brought forth a son? From what sources would a pagan, who knew nothing about the true God and the power and operation of His Holy Spirit, derive such an idea? Did Buddhism, Brahmanism, or the mythologies of the Greeks or Latins furnish the material for that "story"? A pagan is one who worships some other than the God of revelation; and in order that such a story might find its way from paganism into the New Testament of the Christians, some plausible way must be suggested by which this story first gained currency, and then either by stealth or force was introduced into the narratives of the birth of the world's Redeemer. Let us bear in mind that we are given to understand that this "papal and pagan fraud" did not form any part of the Gospels as written by the inspired men of God, but is said to be an addition to the original Gospels made by a later hand.

Did the "fathers" above quoted bring it with them from the "paganism" they left when they became Christians? Did Ignatius, or Justin, or Irenæus, or Clement of Alexandria, or Tertullian? Read their condemnation of the immoralities of the pagan gods they had forsaken. They charged Jupiter with going to women through lust. They condemned his uncleanness with his own children. They reprobated him and other gods who practiced sodomy and shameless intercourse with women. And these men defended what the apostles had "handed down" to them as the record of God's Son. We ask, If the ancient pagan religions contain any miraculous begetting stories that in any manner approach the dignity, the purity, and the artless straightforwardness of the story we have, and which these "fathers" also had lying before them, let them be produced. At the same time let it be shown, at least with as much reason and clearness, how that story gained entrance into the New Testament about the middle of the second century, as has been shown what changes were made, when, and by whom. Until this is done we must regard the charge of "papal and pagan fraud" as unproved assertion, as affirmation without evidence.

THE PHYSICAL ASPECT

Coming to the physical aspect of the question, we may say that the narrative we have in Matt. 1:18-20 and Luke 1:31-35 contains nothing that is impossible or unreasonable, or incompatible with other miracles recorded in the Bible. We call attention to the following facts:

1. That the Spirit of God was employed in the creation of man; that man is sustained in life by having that Spirit in his

nostrils: these are truths that are distinctly affirmed in the Bible (Job 33:4; 27:3).

2. That God in a number of instances in ancient times intervened to impart fertility to women who were barren, is abundantly attested in Scripture. There was Sarah, the wife of Abraham, who was barren (Gen. 11:30; 16:1, 2; 17:15-19; 21:1-3); Rachel, the wife of Isaac and mother of Joseph and Benjamin (Gen. 30:1), and Hannah, the mother of Samuel (1 Sam. 1:2, 5, 6, 11, 17, 19, 20).

3. Then there was an angel visit in the days of Manoah and his wife, the parents of Samson, somewhat similar to that recorded in Matthew and Luke. The angel announced to the woman, "Behold, now, thou art barren, and bearest not; but thou shalt conceive, and bear a son" (Judges 13:1-3).

While in these cases the women conceived according to the ordinary course of generation, nevertheless the power of God was employed in such a manner as to make them fruitful so that they could bear children. In the case of Mary, who was only "betrothed," but not married to Joseph, the conversation between the angel and Mary as recorded in Luke 1:30-38, explains the difference in the manner of the conception between Mary's case, and the Old Testament cases mentioned. The same God who, by His Spirit, "visited" and "blessed" the women of old to make them fruitful, caused Mary to conceive by the "power [Greek, *dunamis*, ability] of the Highest" which was communicated to her by the Holy Spirit coming upon her. Unless we are prepared to deny miracles entirely, upon the ground either of impossibility, or of none being witnessed in our day, it is no more difficult to believe in one miracle than it is to believe in another. God by His Spirit made man; by that Spirit He sustains him in life; by that Spirit He caused barren women to become fruitful and the mothers of children; and by that Spirit He could, if He willed to do so, cause a woman in Israel to conceive and bring forth a child without the intervention of a man. One miracle, so long as it is a miracle, is no more incompatible with the ways of God, and therefore no more unbelievable, than are others. Therefore, if we can accept the miracles of the Old Testament referred to, this miracle is in every way as believable as they are.

THE EBIONITES ONCE MORE

There are a few further facts in connection with the Ebionites of the second century which call for special remark. These are:

1. These Ebionites are by several of the writers above quoted styled "*Jewish Christians*." Hence they were Jews.

2. Their legalizing tendency, as shown from the writings of several contemporary witnesses; and

3. Their repudiation of the apostle Paul and rejection of his writings.

Eusebius (A. D. 264-340) says of them, "With them the observance of the law was altogether necessary, as if they could not be saved only by faith in Christ and a corresponding life." "The heresy of the Ebionites asserts that Christ was born of Joseph and Mary, and supposes Him to be a mere man, and insists upon the observance of the law too much after the manner of the Jews" (*Ecclesiastical History*, pages 101, 102, 222).

What is the historical background of this tendency? For it could not and did not appear suddenly. The answer to this question is to be found in circumstances existing in the days of the apostles, and in the writings of these men themselves. There was the desire among the Jews not only to seek God's favor through the observance of the law, but to force the law upon the Gentile converts as well. These Jews "rested in the law" and "boasted of God," being "instructed out of the law" (Rom. 2:17-20). They "desired to be under the law" (Gal. 4:21), and said to the Gentiles that it was "needful [for them] to keep the law," and, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved" (Acts 15:1, 5). These had "gone out" from the teaching of the apostles and the belief and communion of the church, and "troubled" the Gentiles with "words" of such import (verse 24). The Pauline Epistles being directed strongly against this tendency, it is easy to see why these Judaizers opposed the apostle most resolutely.

At Corinth this tendency manifested itself in personal opposition to the apostle. They were "Hebrews" who did this (II Cor. 11:21-23). They attacked his reliability (chapter 1:12, 17); accused him of corrupting the word of God (chapter 2:17; 4:2); of assuming spiritual dictatorship over their faith (chapter 1:24); of being boastful (chapter 3:1; 5:12; 10:1, 2); regarded him as an insignificant person (chapter 10:10; 11:16); charged him with being covetous (chapter 12:13-17); regarded him as being weak-minded (chapter 5:13), and refused obedience to his authority (chapter 10:6; 13:10). Whereas they should have commended him (chapter 12:11-13), they were questioning whether Christ was speaking at all through him (chapter 13:3). With them "evil communications" had "corrupted good manners" (I Cor. 15:33).

The apostle pronounced a solemn anathema upon the troublers of the church, and the perverters of the gospel which he had preached (Gal. 1:6, 7). His position in relation to the law, the same as that of the other apostles, was that the law could neither justify nor give life (Acts 13:39; Gal. 3:21); that the believers were not under the law (Rom. 6:14, 16; Gal. 3:25), the law having been done away (II Cor. 3:11); and that if any sought to be justified by the law, they had fallen from grace, and Christ would profit them nothing (Gal. 5:1-4).

Then we must also consider the fact that the apostle upon various occasions predicted a widespread departure from the faith

which had been apostolically delivered. Thus he said to the elders of the Ephesian church, "For I know this that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts 20:29, 30). There were those in Galatia (and elsewhere) who contradicted the apostle's teaching and preached "another gospel" by perverting the true gospel (Gal. 1:6-8). The falling away, which would precede the day of Christ, was already developing in its incipient stages (11 Thess. 2:1-12). The "false brethren," "false apostles," and "false teachers" were already appearing (Gal. 2:4, 5; 11 Cor. 11:13; 11 Peter 2:1-3). There were those who were "observing days and months and times and years," for whom the apostle was afraid (Gal. 4:10, 11).

WAS PAUL AN APOSTATE

Since some of these opponents of the apostle Paul and his teaching had already "gone out" from the church during the life time of the apostles, while others remained within the pale of the church, we can easily see how these Judaizing teachers, by far the greater part of them Jews, would form an opposition movement which would, within a comparatively short time, take the form of a distinct party or sect, with a distinctive faith. This movement with its tendencies above indicated would neither rise nor subside suddenly. It did not die with the apostles, but continued after their demise, and we see it in the Ebionite sect from the second century onward. It is testified by Irenæus and others that "the Ebionites agree that the world was made by God; but their opinions with respect to the Lord are similar to those of Cerinthus and Carpocrates. They use the Gospel according to Matthew only, and *repudiate the apostle Paul, maintaining that he is an apostate from the law*" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1, page 392). Again: "But again we allege the same against those who do not recognize Paul as an apostle; that they should either reject the other words of the gospel which we have come to know through Luke alone, and not make use of them; or else if they do receive all these, they must necessarily also admit that testimony concerning Paul, when he (Luke) tells us that the Lord first spoke to him from heaven, 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? I am Jesus whom thou persecutest'" (Vol. 1, page 439).

Rejecting all the Gospels but Matthew, and that one "mutilated," and setting aside the Pauline writings, there was very little testimony left to these sectaries that would lead one to believe that Jesus was God's Son. What Paul taught concerning Jesus as the Son of God had no weight with them. The divine sonship of Jesus is referred to not less than twenty times in the writings of Paul, but to the Ebionites this testimony did not exist. Why should these so-called "Jewish Christians" believe that Jesus was the Son

of God, when they recognized no valid testimony that such was the case?

Thus we see the historical background of this Judaizing doctrine of the Ebionites of the second century, who were contemporary with Justin, Irenæus, and others who speak of them. They were the post-apostolic continuation of the Judaizing party which gave the church so much trouble in the days of the apostles.

After the most painstaking search of the available sources of information we register the fact that we have not discovered a single circumstance that would lead us to the conclusion that a fraud was perpetrated in the post-apostolic church in the manipulation of the historic documents dealing with the birth and life of the Savior. The Christian writers of the second century were men of honor, and quoted from the early chapters of Matthew and Luke exactly the same as from any other parts of those documents, or any others. No pagans could have introduced into the records lying before those men, whether by strategem or by force, a begettal story that was foreign to the design of the Gospels, to which they constantly appealed with the utmost confidence.

As regards the New Testament books as we have them, we mention first their contents. We receive the same *facts* and *doctrines* upon their testimony that were received in the early post-apostolic church. Universal corruption of the originals was impossible during the life of the authors without detection. Copies of the Gospels and other New Testament books were dispersed all over the Roman empire within a quarter of a century of the ascension of Jesus. These documents were not concealed from the public except perhaps in times of severe persecution. Besides this, there was the high esteem and veneration in which they were held, containing, as they did, the authentic accounts of the life and teaching of the Savior. Copies multiplied as fast as the number of churches increased, and translations were made into the languages spoken or read by the converts. Not *all* the Christians would agree in a design to corrupt the originals. If some would attempt such a thing, the genuine, uncorrupted copies would still remain to detect and expose corruption. Then there are the many hundreds of quotations from all the books of the New Testament in the works of the Christian "fathers" living from the fourth century back to the days of the apostles, and the remarkable agreement existing between their quotations and the New Testament books as we have them.

THE APOSTOLIC RECORDS CAREFULLY PRESERVED

We have abundantly established from reliable history, by far the most of it at first hand, that such material changes as were made in the Gospel records were made by the opponents of certain doctrines held from the first in the church, or by enemies of the church itself. There were no "popes" in the sense of "papal"

in the second and third centuries, when the changes in the Gospels above noted were made.

What we have hitherto said had to do almost exclusively with the documentary and historic aspects of the question. So far we have alluded very briefly to the divine side. But "there is a God in heaven" who not only "revealeth secrets," but preserveth them. Shall we accept the unproved assertion about "papal and pagan fraud," and say that God looked on with indifference while His word was being smirched with a "divine begettal story" which is at once base and deceptive? Would He permit, not to say cause, the introduction of such a scandal into the record of His Son? Calculate, if one can, the tremendous effect such a falsehood must have upon the countless thousands who would read that story *in the Bible* during the course of twenty centuries. And that this story alone, of all stories, should in some mysterious way, no one knows how, have been insinuated into the Bible, to be accepted and venerated as a true and correct statement of the facts, when in reality it is nothing but a lie of the most despicable sort! Was there no divine Providence that could prevent a calamity of such far-reaching consequences? Was there neither sufficient divine wisdom nor power to so regulate the course of human events, both in the church and the world at large, as to preserve the Book in any manner pure? To us the preservation of the record seems "more like the care of Providence than the invention of a forger."

THE DIVINE PROVIDENCE AND THE TRUTH

It is taught in Scripture that "the truth of the Lord endureth forever" (Psalm 110:2), "to all generations" (Psalm 100:5). This "truth" must include that truth (that which is in accordance with the facts) concerning the Son of God: His begettal, His birth, His character, His life, His death, and His redemptive work for men. Here are six hundred and forty generations since the appearing of Christ among men, and it does not appeal to our judgment as believable that the divine Author of the Bible would permit a "papal and pagan fraud" of such hue and magnitude to insinuate itself into the record which He gave of His Son, and that hundreds of generations living since then have been deceived and deluded through no fault of theirs by such a fraud. We could as soon believe that the Most High had relinquished His position as "possessor of heaven and earth" and "Governor among the nations" as to accept the thought that He would allow such a falsehood to invade the record of His Son. The changes affecting the record of the birth of Jesus were made by the opposite side, but the overruling Providence of God prevented them from gaining a foothold generally, and especially finding an entrance into the Bible.

CERTAIN EXPRESSIONS PECULIAR TO MATTHEW

As we study "the book of the generation of Jesus Christ," the Gospel according to Matthew as we have it (Matt. 1:1), we are

at once struck with certain forms of expression found in it. There is, for instance, the constant reference to the fulfillment of that which had been spoken. It is a peculiarity of style with Matthew to say that certain things were "done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet," or "of the Lord by the prophet." There are not less than twelve instances of this kind in our Gospel according to Matthew. Four of these are found in the first two chapters, as follows: chapters 1:22; 2:15, 17, 23. The other eight instances, identical in style, occur in chapters 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 21:4; 26:56; 27:9, 35. The sameness of style argues identity of authorship. Upon this basis, if the last 26 chapters of Matthew may be accepted as genuine, so may the first two; and if these may not, neither can the other 26 be accepted. They stand or fall together. Would a papal or pagan forger adopt the same style as the genuine Matthew, embodying the same confident appeal to that "which was spoken," either by the Lord or the prophets, and the forgery not be discovered as soon as made?

Another matter which runs through the Gospel according to Matthew is the introduction of certain facts by the adverb "when." This is found four times in the first two chapters (chapter 1:18; 2:1, 13, 19), in chapter 4:12, and many times in the remaining chapters of the book. It does not seem probable that a forger would either unconsciously use a style like that of Matthew, or intentionally adopt a style simulating the genuine. "When His mother was espoused," etc., in chapter 1:18, is the same style as "when Jesus heard that John was cast into prison" (chapter 4:12), or "when Jesus departed," etc. (chapter 9:27). It is a style peculiar to Matthew, and the same author wrote the entire book.

If chapters 1 and 2 are spurious, we cannot account for the style of the beginning of chapter 3, which reads thus: "In those days came John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness of Judea." What "days"? There must of necessity be some historical background for this chapter; and if chapters 1 and 2 are spurious, this does not exist. "Those days" are the days of the Herod referred to in chapter 2:1, 3, 7, 12, 15, 16, 19, 22. If the preceding context is spurious, then chapter 3 begins wrong, and has no proper historical setting. Either verse 1 of chapter 3 must be changed into harmony with such omission; or leave it as it is, and it fits logically and chronologically with the narrative as given in chapters 1 and 2.

The narratives in Matt. 1:21, 25 and Luke 1:31 agree perfectly that the child to be born to Mary was called Jesus before He was born. How did the person who was to be raised up of God receive His name? We read in the account of the activities of John (whose birth and naming are also a matter of record.—Luke 1:57-63), "Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon

Him" (Luke 3:21, 22). Who was this "Jesus also" if chapter 2 is not to be accepted? If we have in mind the birth and naming of the child Jesus, as given in the first two chapters of this record, and that Jesus as a child "increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men" (chapter 2:52), we have a proper setting for the coming of "Jesus also" to the baptism of John; otherwise not. The steps in the life of Jesus as narrated in these chapters are as logical and consistent as they could possibly be, and His appearance at the Jordan for the baptism of John can only be understood when the historical background furnished by chapters 1 and 2 is known and kept before the mind.

THE NAMING OF MARY'S CHILD

The name given to this child is also a matter worthy of note. His name was to be called "Jesus." This name signifies a Savior. Why a Savior? Were any in need of salvation? And had a Savior been promised? Jehovah had promised the nation of Israel that He would become their salvation. "Behold, God is my salvation. I will trust and not be afraid; for the Lord Jehovah is my strength and my song; He also is become my salvation" (Isa. 12:2). The child to be born of Mary was the divinely appointed means through which this promise was to be fulfilled. The Hebrew name for salvation is Yeshua, which is the same as Joshua. Jesus is the Greek form of the word (See Heb. 4:8). The first part of the word is a contraction of Jahwe, and is given as "Jah" in Psalm 68:4. This word has reference to continuity of existence, and is by Leaser rendered "the Eternal." In Aramaic Jahshua, in Greek Jesus, we have the idea, "He will save." Hence the explanation in Matt. 1:21, "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins." Jesus, during His public ministry, conscious of the greatness of His mission, said that He had "come to seek and to save that which was lost." Take away the chapters which tell how He was named, and the name that was given to Him, and we have a situation which is at once disappointing and perplexing. We have in the Scriptures many instances of the naming of children whose position in the world was of vastly less importance than that of Jesus; and why the circumstances of their naming should be given, in some instances with some detail, and the naming of the world's Redeemer and Savior be passed by in complete silence, as if this were a matter of no consequence, is at least noteworthy, apart from the accounts contained in the first two chapters of Matthew and Luke as we have them.

"AS WAS SUPPOSED"

We next consider the supposition among the Jews that Jesus was the Son of Joseph (Luke 3:23). Does the Greek word *nomizo*, translated "supposed," mean that the Jews reckoned Jesus to be a Son of Joseph when in fact He was not? We believe that such is

the meaning of the word as here used, and call attention to the use of the word as to its meaning. The word is found 15 times in the New Testament, and is rendered "suppose" nine times, "think" five times, and "wont" once.

We read in the narrative of the visit of Jesus at Jerusalem at the age of twelve, "And when they had fulfilled the days [of the passover], as they returned, the child Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem, and Joseph and His mother knew not of it. But they supposing [*nomizo*] Him to have been in the company, went a day's journey," etc. (Luke 2:43, 44). It is evident from the narrative that the "kinfolk and acquaintances," referred to in verse 44, did not go in the same company with Joseph and Mary; hence the "supposition" on their part that Jesus was in the company, either preceding or following. But instead of this as they "supposed," or imagined, He had "tarried behind in Jerusalem." The fact that they supposed Jesus to be in the company did not make the supposition true; it was merely a supposition.

In Acts 7:25 we read that after Moses had killed an Egyptian, "he supposed (*nomizo*) his brethren would have understood how that God by his hand would deliver them," but in this he was mistaken. This supposition did not make a fact of that which Moses supposed to be so.

It is said that certain Jews at Lystra stoned Paul, and drew him out of the city, "supposing him to be dead" (Acts 14:19). There were several things which led those Jews to this conclusion. There was the fact that they stoned Paul, which act as we know had the death of Paul for its object. Then as the stones were thrown at him, and he fell to the ground in a swoon, they believed they had accomplished the object of their wrath. Hence they supposed, or imagined, that Paul was dead. Did this make their supposition true? Was Paul actually dead because they stoned him with this object in view, and after the stoning supposed him to be dead? It did not follow that because they supposed Paul to be dead, therefore he was dead.

Again, it is said that certain Jews at Jerusalem "supposed" that Paul had brought an Ephesian into the temple, and upon the strength of this supposition, which had some facts in its favor, they went about to kill the apostle (Acts 21:29). But it was merely a supposition, and not a fact that Paul had brought Trophymus into the temple, as we see by reference to verses 21-24.

In 1 Tim. 6:5 we are told that "men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth" were "supposing that gain is godliness," and the apostle cautioned Timothy, "From such withdraw thyself." Very likely those persons, whose minds had been corrupted from the simplicity of the truth, imagined that gain was an evidence of godliness. Are we therefore to conclude that such was really the case? Nay, but the truth in such cases must be established upon other grounds than mere gain, or worldly prosperity. There are

those who are "poor in this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which God hath promised to them that love Him" (James 2:5). The supposition that gain was godliness rested upon a false premise, viz., that all godly persons would be prosperous in this world.

Now let us apply this line of reasoning to the supposition current among the Jews in the days of Jesus that He was a Son of Joseph. Would this supposition make Him what some "supposed" Him to be? By no means! As there were certain circumstances which led the Jews at Lystra to suppose that Paul was dead, so there were certain facts in the life of Jesus which led some of His contemporaries to suppose that He was a natural son of Joseph and Mary. We know that He was subject to them (Luke 2:51), and that He was a carpenter (Mark 6:3), the same as Joseph (Matt. 13:55). What would be more natural in view of these circumstances than for His contemporaries, who were not informed of all the facts in the case, to suppose that He was, what He *appeared* to them to be, namely, a son of Joseph?

Who "supposed" Jesus to be a son of Joseph? Not Joseph and Mary, for they certainly knew the facts, which would at least in their minds put the case beyond the possibility of doubt. Not those who knew who Jesus was, and this included Luke. There was only one class who would suppose that Jesus was a son of Joseph, viz., those who were not informed of all the facts in the case. These, judging from the fact of Jesus being subject to Joseph and Mary, accompanying them to Jerusalem, etc., would infer, though this inference would not necessarily be correct, that He was a son of Joseph. The fact that He was "supposed" to be a son of Joseph implies doubt, or at least uncertainty, upon the part of those who entertained this notion. But why does Luke refer to this current supposition? If it was a fact that Jesus was a son of Joseph, why not state the fact without casting a shadow upon it by referring to this supposition? It was not supposed that Isaac was the son of Abraham, Jacob of Isaac, etc. This was simply a matter of fact which was questioned by no one; but the supposition that Jesus was a son of Joseph raises a doubt in the mind whether this is really a fact, or whether He may be the Son of someone else. It is evident that Luke, the writer of "the things most surely believed among us," had definite information concerning the paternity of Jesus, and taking into consideration the words of chapter 1:35, that the Son born of Mary was "THEREFORE" to be "called the Son of God," viz., because the Holy Spirit was to come upon her, and the power of the Highest overshadow her, we see why he referred to the supposition held by others, but which he himself did not share. The argument for the human paternity would be much stronger if the account in this place said positively, without the supposition, "And Jesus Himself began to be about thirty years of age, being the Son of Joseph, which was the son

of Heli." etc. (Luke 3:23). But when we give due weight to the record of the begetting of Jesus as contained in chapter 1, we understand why Luke thus refers to the "supposition" mentioned in this passage.

"THE SON OF JOSEPH"

Much has been made of the terms, "Son of Joseph," "the carpenter's Son," etc., and one writer said, "Philip, an inspired disciple of Jesus, testified that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah of prophecy (John 1:45)." We observe the following facts:

1. That Philip did not say, as the result of long acquaintance, that Jesus was the Son of Joseph, as he had only been with Jesus a day or so when he made this statement. Philip being a resident of Galilee (verse 43), where Jesus had been brought up, he would reflect the popular "supposition" (Luke 3:23) that Jesus was a "Son of Joseph."

2. As to Philip being "an inspired disciple," we would only say that "the Spirit had not yet been given" (John 7:39), and therefore it is impossible to say with any degree of certainty that the statement attributed to Philip was an "inspired" one.

3. The other instance in John where Jesus was called a "Son of Joseph" is in chapter 6:42. Here the Jews "murmured" at some things the Lord had said, "Is not this Jesus, the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" (verses 41, 42). Upon this Jesus said, "Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him," etc. (verses 43, 44). A parallel passage says that the Jews were "offended at Him" because He, as "the Son of Joseph," displayed such wisdom, and did such mighty works (Matt. 13:54, 55; see also Mark 6:3; Luke 4:22). It will be observed that all this was "in His own country," and it is nothing strange that public sentiment, not being advised of all the facts in the case, regarded Him as Joseph's Son.

We are asked to explain: "If Jesus was the Son of God by divine begetting, and yet His contemporaries believed Him to be a Son of Joseph, why did He not correct their notions regarding this matter?" In this, as in some other matters wherein they were wrong, He did not categorically deny that they were right. When they said He cast out demons by Beelzebub, the prince of the demons, He did not say, "You are wrong; the truth is, there are no such demons." When even the disciples had very erroneous notions regarding the man who had been born blind, whether perchance he had sinned in a pre-existent state, "that he should be born blind," Jesus did not immediately proceed to correct this wrong notion; but when the Holy Spirit came and brought to their remembrance the positive truths He had communicated to them, they understood the matter, as also appears from their own teaching later on. It simply remains to say that Jesus did not go out of His way to directly contradict every current error on doctrinal

points; but He did many times positively say that God was His Father, and He God's Son.

HIS PARENTS, THE PARENTS

Another proof of the human paternity of Jesus is supposed to be found in the words of the historian Luke when he said that "the parents" did for Him "according to the custom of the law" (Luke 2:27), and that "His parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the passover" (verse 41); and in verse 48 Mary herself called Joseph the "father" of Jesus. Bearing in mind Luke's record of the angel's words to Mary that because of the overshadowing presence of the Holy Spirit the child to be begotten in her was to be the Son of the Highest, and the Son of God (chapter 1:30-35), the terms "parent" and "father" must be construed in harmony with the facts there narrated, and not in a manner that will contradict the record. Both statements are inspired, and must be understood in harmony with each other.

RAISE UP A PROPHET, A BRANCH

We direct attention to the divine promise, several times repeated in the Old Testament, that God would "raise up" Christ. In Deut. 18:18 the Lord said to the nation of Israel, "I will raise up a Prophet from among their brethren, and will put my words in His mouth. He shall speak unto them all that I shall command Him." To David He said, "I will raise up thy seed after thee, which shall be of thy sons; and I will establish His kingdom" (1 Chron. 17:11). Again He said to the nation, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise up unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth" (Jer. 23:5). These promises, made at long intervals during the history of Israel, indicate resoluteness of purpose on the part of Him who promised. The lapse of centuries did not divert Him from the purpose which He had formed. To the nation He would raise up a Prophet, to David a King, to Israel a righteous Branch. That this purpose finds its focus in Christ is proved by numerous New Testament references thereto. In Acts 3:22-26 we find the language of Deut. 18:15-18 applied directly to God's "Son Jesus." In Acts 2:30 there is a reference to the purpose of God to raise up Christ to sit on David's throne. Later the apostle Paul said, "Of this man's seed hath God according to His promise raised up unto Israel a Savior, Jesus" (Acts 13:23).

In what way and by what means did God raise up Jesus in accordance with His promise made many centuries before? Some of those who hold to the human paternity say it was done by raising Jesus from the dead, and cite Acts 13:32, 33, which in the A. V. reads, "And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which God made unto the fathers, the same hath He fulfilled unto us their children in that He hath raised up Jesus again;

as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." But here those referred to forget themselves. If the terms "Son" and "Christ" are synonymous, and a title of honor, then Jesus was already the Christ, and therefore the Son of God, having become such at His baptism. If the anointing made Him the Christ (or Son of God), then resurrection *did not* make Him such; or if He was made such at or by His resurrection, then He was not such prior to that event. We have already called attention to the fact that God first raised up His Son, and then sent Him to Israel (Acts 3:26). The raising up antedated the sending. He was sent to the children of Israel years before His death and resurrection (Acts 10:36). Many were His appeals to the fact that His Father had sent Him. The Gospel of John alone contains sixteen references to this mission. Most cogent among these is the statement, "He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him" (John 3:34). This proves conclusively that God sent His Son before the latter's death, burial and resurrection. Therefore the resurrection of Jesus cannot be the "raising up" spoken of in Acts 3:22, 26, and 13:23.

The Greek word *anistemi* as used in Acts 13:33 does not necessarily mean that the language of Psalm 2:6, "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee," was fulfilled by raising Jesus from the dead, as the word "again" in the Authorized Version suggests; but by "having raised up Jesus" (*Diaglott*, Young, Hinds & Noble): "in that He hath raised up Jesus" (Revised Version); "by raising up Jesus" (Rotherham); "in that He raised up Jesus" (Murdock's Syriac); "raising up Jesus" (Douay). Out of 111 occurrences of this word in the New Testament it is applied to rising up or raising up seventy-four times, and to rising from the dead thirty-seven times. It is used in the LXX in Deut. 18:15, 18, where God promised to "raise up a Prophet" to Israel; in I Chron. 17:11, where He would "raise up" the seed of David, and in Jer. 23:5, where He would "raise unto David a righteous Branch." In none of these places would we be justified in reading "resurrect" instead of "raise" or "raise up" for *anistemi*. In Gen. 38:8, where Onan was commanded to "raise up seed" to his brother, we have the same word; also in Ruth 4:5, where Boaz married Ruth "to raise up the name of the dead upon his inheritance." When the word is followed by the qualification "from the dead," as in Acts 13:34, it is certain beyond question that the raising refers to what is commonly called "resurrection"; otherwise not. When a man "raised up seed to his brother" (Matt. 22:24), or when "God raised up that Prophet" (Acts 3:22, 26), it is obvious that the word does not mean "resurrect." From the foregoing facts it is clear that the passage Acts 13:33 does not necessarily mean that Jesus became the Son of God by resurrection from the dead. Since He was the Son of God by divine begetting, as set forth in the

records of Matthew and Luke, it follows of necessity that the begettal spoken of in Psalm 2:6 does not refer to resurrection. Acts 13:33 says nothing about Jesus being "raised from the dead"; but the next statement applies directly and specifically to that event: "And as concerning *that He raised Him up from the dead*, no more to return to corruption, He saith *on this wise*, I will give you the sure mercies of David."

The idea is advanced with great confidence that in order to be a Prophet like Moses, Jesus must have been begotten as Moses was, of two human parents. This does not by any means follow from that language. The promise does not say that the Prophet to be raised up should be begotten as Moses was begotten, but that He was to be "*a Prophet like unto Moses*." What kind of a prophet was Moses? He was a faithful prophet, and this Prophet, whom God would raise up, would faithfully speak the words which God would put in His mouth. This much we see from the context itself. We read, "And Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which should be spoken after; but *Christ as a Son* over His own house, whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end" (Heb. 3:5, 6). That "Moses verily was faithful" was testified of God, "My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house" (Num. 12:7). It was in respect to faithfulness that Jesus was to be "*a Prophet like unto Moses*"; but there was one particular in which he was to distinguish Himself from Moses. While the latter was a "servant," Christ Jesus was "*a Son*." This sonship is the subject of frequent mention in this Epistle, as elsewhere in the New Testament. We are assured that God "hath spoken by a Son" (chapter 1:2); that to the Son He saith, "Thy throne, O God, is forever" (verse 8); that though He were a Son, "yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered" (chapter 5:8); that Melchizedek was made "like the Son of God" (chapter 7:3), and that the Son has been "consecrated for evermore" (verse 28). This is He of whom God said, "I will be His Father, and He shall be my Son" (11 Sam. 7:14; Heb. 1:5). Whose Son? If faith and submission made Jesus a Son of God, then Moses was no less a son than Jesus, for both were approved of God on account of their faithfulness. According to this testimony Jesus was to be something more, something higher, than Moses. He was a Son, while Moses was only a servant. There is no explanation of this difference except as furnished in the histories of Matthew and Luke concerning the begettal and birth of "the Son."

THE ONLY BEGOTTEN SON

There are words and phrases in the New Testament which can only have meaning and force when we understand that Jesus was begotten of God in the manner set forth in the first chapters of

Matthew and Luke. We mention the term "only begotten" as applied to Jesus only.

"And we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth" (John 1:14).

"No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him" (verse 18).

"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" (John 3:16).

"He that believeth not is condemned already, because He hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God" (verse 19).

"In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that He sent His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him" (1 John 4:9).

What is meant by the "only begotten Son of God"? That these words apply to Jesus, and to Him only, admits of no doubt. Being the "only begotten Son," His sonship differs from that of each and every other person who is a son of God. The Greek word *monos* used in connection with "begotten" means "only," as given in our translation. It has been suggested that the word means "chief begotten." Even admitting this, in what sense was He the chief begotten? It is evident that either "only" or "chief" is a word which qualifies the word "begotten," and distinguishes the one so begotten from all others. There is not another like Him. However, the Greek word rendered "only" is *monos*, and means only. We have it in the words "monosyllable": one syllable; "monologue": one person speaking, and "monoplane": a single plane. It would not sound well, nor would it be according to fact, to say "chief syllable," "chief speaker," or "chief plane." The Greek words most often rendered "chief" are *protos* and *archon*, but *monos*, never.

Referring to the suggestion above mentioned that "only begotten" means "chief begotten," it is said that Isaac was called Abraham's "only begotten son" (Heb. 11:17), while it is a fact that Ishmael was also Abraham's son (Gen. 16:11). That "Abraham had two sons" (Gal. 4:22), is a fact which cannot be denied; but it is also a fact that Ishmael, the son of the bond woman, was cast out of Abraham's house (Gen. 21:10; Gal. 4:30), never to return. Being cast out, he ceased to be regarded as Abraham's son as well as "heir." And God approved of the casting out of Ishmael. When Abraham offered up Isaac, some years later (Gen. 22:1-13), Isaac was Abraham's only begotten son of his marriage with Sarah, the free woman. God Himself, through His angel, said to Abraham, "Thou hast not withheld thy son, *thine only son*, from me" (verse 12). These circumstances form the basis of the New Testament statement that Isaac was Abraham's "only begotten son."

Jesus was called the "only begotten Son" long after others had become sons of God by faith and submission to the gospel. The apostle John wrote to the "little children," the "young men," and the "fathers" (1 John 2:12-14), "Now are we the sons of God, and it does not yet appear what we shall be" (chapter 3:1, 2). And yet, even though there were at this time many sons of God, there was but one who was God's "only begotten Son" (chapter 4:9). And here let us note that "God sent His only begotten Son into the world." This person did not *become* the Son of God, or the only begotten Son, by being sent, but was already such when the sending took place. This is a matter of frequent testimony, of which the following are a few examples:

THE SENDING OF GOD'S SON

"For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved" (John 3:17).

"Unto you first God, having raised up His Son Jesus, sent Him to bless you in turning away everyone of you from his iniquities" (Acts 3:26).

"Herein is love, not that we have loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be a propitiation for our sins" (1 John 4:10).

"And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world" (1 John 4:14).

These passages each and all refer to the mission of Jesus, the Son of God. When did this sending take place? It is clear from the testimony of these passages,

1. That the Son of God was "raised up" before He was sent.

2. That He was God's "only begotten Son" prior to the sending.

That the sending is synonymous with the anointing appears from the language of Isaiah cited by Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath *anointed* me to preach the gospel to the poor; He hath *sent* me to heal the broken-hearted" (Luke 4:18). "I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also, for therefore am I *sent*" (verse 43). "How God *anointed* Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and power" (Acts 10:38). This anointing or sending took place at Jesus' baptism in the river Jordan, at which time God testified from heaven, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. 3:17). The anointing or sending did not *make* Him the Son of God; He was already that before the sending, and *as such* was sent.

Of this sending the apostle John and others were witnesses; that is, they were present when it took place; as he says, "We have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world" (1 John 4:14). Since this sending was at the baptism of Jesus, we see from the testimony that "the Son" came as such to the baptism of John, and neither the baptism nor the anointing

made Him the Son. In what sense was He the Son before His baptism and anointing? Let the Gospels of Matthew and Luke in their account of the begetting of Jesus give this information. Cast out their testimony, and the terms "the Son" and "only begotten Son" as found throughout the New Testament are unintelligible and meaningless; accept their testimony, and all is clear.

HIS FATHER'S BUSINESS

What did Jesus mean when He, as a boy of twelve years of age, said to His parents, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" (Luke 2:49). Again we encounter the objection raised against the first chapter of Luke, and are told, "It is spurious." Well, then, let us investigate. And here again we agree to stand by the facts as they shall appear. We read in the writings of Irenæus:

"Some passages also which occur in the Gospels receive from them (their enemies) a coloring of the same kind, such as the answer which He gave to His mother, 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' " (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I, page 345).

Besides this, Irenæus (A. D. 120-200) made ten other quotations from the second chapter of the Gospel of Luke covering almost the entire chapter. This question of Jesus was contained in one of "the Gospels" which were extant and accessible at that time. The genuineness of the passage being established, we make a few remarks thereon. When Jesus at the age of twelve years said that He must be about His Father's business, did He mean that He must be about Joseph's business? Joseph's business was at Nazareth, while Jesus remained at the temple in Jerusalem. It is evident that He meant a different "Father" than Joseph. This was He whom He addressed as "Father," and styled "the Father" and "my Father" 132 times in the four Gospels; "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." Even at the tender age of twelve He knew that God was His Father. And here we note that instead of saying, "I must be about *our* Father's business," as if God were the Father of all of them alike, He used the exclusive phrase, "*my* Father's business," showing that this was a matter which was restricted to Himself. The record of the begetting of Jesus in Matthew and Luke explains *who* His Father was, and *why* He must be about His Father's business.

When the term "Son of Joseph" occurs in the Gospels, the believers in the human paternity of Jesus construe the word "Son" in the most literal sense, i. e., that Jesus was actually begotten of Joseph; but when we read of Jesus being the "Son of God," then, strange to say, they construe it in a metaphorical sense, i. e., begotten of the word or truth coming from God; and this in the face of the fact that the term "Son of God" is nowhere in the New

Testament so used of Jesus. It is nowhere taught that He became the Son of God by submission to the word.

"SON OF GOD" A TITLE

We are told that the term "Son of God" as applied to Jesus is a lofty title, and that it is the equivalent of the term Christ, or Anointed. The apostles, through Peter, acknowledged that Jesus was "the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16:16).

During the trial of Jesus two charges were laid against Him: one, that of blasphemy, before the high priest, Caiaphas; and the other, that of sedition, before the governor, Pilate. The high priest adjured Jesus to tell him whether He were "the Christ, the Son of the Blessed" (Matt. 26:63). When Jesus gave an affirmative answer the Jews accused Him of "blasphemy," and said He was "guilty of death" (verses 64, 65).

The next morning the crowd took Jesus before the governor, and accused Him of "perverting the nation, and saying that Himself is Christ a King" (Luke 23:1, 2), whereupon the questioning ensued regarding His Jewish kingship (John 18:33-40). The charge of blasphemy, based upon His claim of being "the Son of God," was of a religious nature, over which the "council" (sanhedrin, presided over by the high priest) had jurisdiction. The charge of sedition, for claiming to be Christ a king, was of a political nature, which properly came before the governor. The Jews could not put Him to death on a charge of blasphemy, and the political charge before Pilate was not sufficiently proven to justify the government in putting Him to death. Hence the embarrassment of Pilate, "What shall I do with Jesus?"

That the terms "Christ" and "Son of God" are not of the same import must appear upon the most casual reflection. "Christ" is a Greek word meaning Anointed, the same as the Hebrew Messiah. As Andrew said to his brother Simon Peter, "We have found the Messiah, which is being interpreted, the Christ," or Anointed (John 1:41). A "son" is a male child considered with reference to either parent or to both; also a male descendant, however distant. Jesus was both the Son of God, and the Christ: the one by begetting, and the other by anointing. King Saul was "the Lord's anointed" (11 Sam. 19:21), as was also David (chapter 22:51; 23:1); but of neither can it therefore be said that he was the son of God, as was Jesus. The Scriptures abound with testimony that Jesus became Christ by the anointing with the Holy Spirit; but there is no testimony which sets forth that He became the Son of God by such anointing. It was reserved for the testimony relating to His begetting to state the *reason why* He should be "called the Son of the Highest" (Luke 1:35).

Nor was He merely one of *many* sons of God: He was "the *only* begotten Son," not only before His death and resurrection, but many years thereafter, when there were many who were "called

sons of God," and *were* such (I John 3:1-3; 4:9). If He was begotten a Son of God by faith and obedience, then in this sense, as soon as another was so begotten. He ceased to be the "only begotten," and this term should never thereafter have been applied to Him. But the fact that it was applied to Him more than fifty years after His baptism is "decisive evidence" and "conclusive proof" that the term "only begotten" means something different from the term son of God when applied to the believer.

"YET ONE SON, HIS WELL BELOVED"

Jesus spoke a parable of a man who had leased his vineyard to certain husbandmen. "And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruit of it." What took place? "And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another. Again he sent other servants more than the first; and they did unto them likewise. But last of all he sent unto them his son [his well beloved.]—Mark 12:6]. saying, They will reverence my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and killed him" (Matt. 21:33-39). That the owner of this vineyard represents God, who will question? (Read carefully Isa. 5:1-7) And who was his son? No other than Jesus, whom they "slew and hanged on a tree." Who were the servants? The prophets and other faithful servants of God, whom He had sent to the people of Israel. In the sense of rendering obedience to God many of them distinguished themselves by their faithfulness; and if obedience is the only thing that makes men sons of God, then they were such as well as Jesus. However, He was the Son, while others in comparison with Him were only servants. And we must here especially emphasize the term used in speaking of the son, namely, "yet one son, his well beloved." God had many servants, but only one well beloved Son, of whom He testified, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. 3:17). In what sense He is "the Son of God," in distinction from all others, we learn from "the record which God gave of His Son" in the accounts which detail the facts in connection with His begettall.

WAS JESUS THE SON OF GOD BY RESURRECTION?

"I hold that Jesus is the Son of Joseph by natural descent, and the Son of God by His anointing and resurrection from the dead" (Charles Dealtry, in *The Ambassador*, 1867, pages 304, 306). In proof of this contention two passages are referred to, viz., Acts 13:33, dealt with above, and Rom. 1:3, which reads, "Concerning His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection

from the dead." This passage neither says nor implies that "God made Jesus His Son by resurrection from the dead," but merely that He "declared" Him to be such. We perceive a wide difference between the two things. When Jesus as "the only begotten of the Father" "declared" the Father to men, did He thereby make God His Father? When He said He had "declared" His righteous Father's name, and would declare it (John 17:26), does this mean that He had given His Father a name, or would name Him? We trow not. The *Emphatic Diaglott* tells us that *horizo* means "distinctly set forth" or "determined." The word is translated "determine" three times in the A. V., "limit" once, and "ordain" twice. The word determine is used in the sense of demonstrate or establish. And why not? In the resurrection of God's "Son Jesus Christ our Lord" it was determined, demonstrated or established with power that He was God's Son. The proof that He thus became God's Son is nugatory so far as this passage is concerned. As to how He became God's Son, and why He was called such, consult the record of His begettal in the early chapters of Matthew and Luke as found in our Bibles.

THE HATRED OF THE JEWS

When Pilate wrote the accusation to be placed on the cross of Jesus, it read, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews" (John 19:19). "Then said the chief priests of the Jews unto Pilate, Write not, The King of the Jews; but He said, I am the King of the Jews" (verse 21). According to the Roman law there was "no cause of death in Him"; and the Jews could not put Him to death on the charge of blasphemy for claiming to be the Son of God. But they cried the more, "Away with Him! Crucify Him!"

Such was the inveterate hate of the leading Jews against Jesus. Every claim He made they denied; every truth He enunciated they challenged. When He sought out those who were outcasts of society, in order to elevate them to a higher plane of thought and action, the leaders said with contempt and disdain, "This man eateth with sinners." When He crossed the line of nationalism and narrow sectarianism, and gave to the Samaritans the glad tidings which was to be to all people, these self-appointed critics said He was a "Samaritan" and had a "devil." He Himself complained that they would not come to Him that they might have life. When the people said at His trial, "His blood be on us and on our children" (Matt. 27:25), they gave expression to their irreconcilable antagonism to Him whom God had sent to them with the message of salvation; and they instilled in their children the hate, the enmity, which they felt within themselves. Future generations received from their parents and forebears their antagonism to Jesus Christ and Him crucified. When the apostles went into all the world with their message of life in Christ, they went "to the Jew first." In almost every community visited by these emissaries

of the Son of God, they first went to the synagogues of the Jews. It was the "manner" or custom of the apostle Paul to do this (Acts 17:1-3). But in most places the Jews, especially those in high positions as leaders of the people, counted themselves unworthy of eternal life, whereupon the apostles in those localities "turned to the Gentiles" (Acts 13:46; 18:6; 28:28). Partial blindness happened to Israel, and this state of things, it was foretold, would continue "until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in" (Rom. 11:25). The apostolic preaching concerning Jesus was "to the Jews a stumbling-block" (1 Cor. 1:23). The charge of blasphemy, which the Jews so persistently laid against the Lord Jesus on account of His claim of being the Son of God, was not silenced after His resurrection and ascension to heaven; and it is neither impossible nor difficult to see how they saw in Him a daring and wicked pretender whose every claim must be overthrown.

ANCIENT AND MODERN JEWS

One writer on the human paternity said, "It is no wonder that the 'modern Jew,' who searches the Scriptures, refuses to acknowledge the 'Messiah' of 'modern Christianity.' Truly the Jewish nation never will acknowledge or believe in a Christ that does not have a clear genealogy tracing His birth through the male descent back to David and Abraham." How about the *ancient* Jews? They "supposed" Him to be the Son of Joseph (Luke 3:23), and some of them called Him "Joseph's Son, whose father and mother we know" (John 6:42). Did they accept Him because they supposed He was "Joseph's Son"? On the contrary, we read that they "murmured" on that account (verse 43), and were "offended" at Him, so that He "could not do many mighty works because of their unbelief" (Matt. 13:55-58). They would not receive Him because they supposed Him to be a Son of Joseph; and when He said that He was the Son of God, they accused Him of "blasphemy" (John 5:17; 10:36; Matt. 26:65). Such was the attitude of the *ancient* Jews. Some of their descendants in the first three centuries who professed to be "Christians" (the Ebionites) held that He was a Son of Joseph, but along with this they taught, as their ancestors had done, that it was necessary to keep the law of Moses in order to be saved, and separated themselves from the general body of Christians by establishing assemblies of their own. When the "modern Jews" accept Him as their Messiah, this will not be upon the basis of His fleshly descent from David, but because, as God's appointed Ruler, He will have assembled the outcasts of Israel, and gathered the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth (Isa. 11:12). They will recognize in Him the mighty Monarch whom God has ordained, and say, "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for Him, and He will save us; this is the Lord; we will be glad, and rejoice in His salvation" (Isa. 25:9).

As to how the "modern Jew" regards the New Testament, as well as the Jesus it depicts, the apostles it introduces, and the doctrine it teaches, is illustrated by the following extracts from the speeches of Mr. Louis Stern, a Jew, in a debate with Bro. Robert Roberts on the question, "Was Jesus of Nazareth the Messiah?"

"I hold that it is really a sin, not alone to read the New Testament, but for a Jew to have it even in his possession."

"I have said, and I maintain it, that the New Testament is a compilation of falsehoods and forgeries."

"It is your forged documents that tell you that we have crucified Christ. We have never done anything of the sort. In fact, I am prepared to prove that Jesus was not crucified at all."

"I came here as a doubter, not alone of Jesus, but of the value of the testimony of the New Testament."

To every passage which the speaker on the opposite side quoted from the New Testament Mr. Stern would say, "I do not believe it."

This is the attitude of the "modern Jew" toward the New Testament in general, and the Lord Jesus in particular. As for the Old Testament, when passages were cited that deal with certain phases of the life of Jesus, Mr. Stern applied them to persons of Old Testament times, and denied that they had anything to do with Jesus. No ancestral genealogy or pedigree of Jesus, however correct, is able to overcome this Jewish prejudice, or convince them that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah. They still say, as did their ancestors many centuries ago, "Is not this Jesus Joseph's Son, whose father and mother we know?" The only thing that will ever convince them will be the exercise of His great power in gathering them from the ends of the earth to the land of their fathers, and ruling over them on the throne of David. This He will do by the decree of Almighty God, whether the "modern Jew" recognizes Him or not.

IS JESUS NO LONGER A "MAN"?

While this writer claims that Jesus must have "a clear genealogy tracing His birth through the male descent to David and Abraham," he also says that "Jesus is no longer a Man, and that His immortal body is not flesh and bone." The Jesus of this doctrine manifestly is not "that *same Jesus*" who was crucified (Acts 2:36); not "*this Jesus*" whom God raised out of the grave (verse 32); who said assuringly to His disciples, "Behold my hands and my feet, that *it is I myself*"; handle me, and see; for a spirit [such as they supposed Him to be] hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have" (Luke 24:36-39). The Jesus of this extract, being "*no longer a man*," is "another Jesus" (11 Cor. 11:4), who is no longer human; hence He has no descent from David or Abraham in any sense, and no human genealogy that would have any weight with Jews, whether ancient or modern. Therefore, according to this

writer's logic, He has no more valid claim to the throne of David than the angels, to whom God did not say, "Thou art my Son."

As to whether or not Jesus is any "longer a Man," we will let the scriptural testimony decide. The adoptive Paul styled Him "*the second Man*," who is (*ek*) out of heaven (1 Cor. 15:47); the "one Mediator between God and men, *the Man Christ Jesus*" (1 Tim. 2:6); and when God shall "judge the world in righteousness," it will be "by *that Man* whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead" (Acts 17:31). To the apostle Paul Jesus was still a "Man," but one who has a "glorious body," and is a "firstfruit" of men, whose bodies shall be made "like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself" (Phil. 3:21). This will be effected, not by casting away the human body, and substituting another which is not human, but by having "*this* corruptible [body] *put on* incorruption, and this mortal [body] *put on* immortality" (1 Cor. 15:54). By this *clothing upon* "the mortal" (*to thneton*) is swallowed up of life" (1 Cor. 5:4).

THE LEGAL ARGUMENT

It is confidently affirmed that the birth of Jesus by divine begetting through the power of the Holy Spirit would involve a violation of God's oath to both David and Abraham; that the Christ should come from their "loins," and be their "seed" according to the flesh through Joseph, and Gen. 15:4; Psalm 89:35-37; Acts 2:30, and Rom. 1:3, are cited as proof. This is what may be styled the *legal argument*. Those who advance this argument seem to overlook, among other things, the important fact that the kingdom of Israel was primarily not man's kingdom, but God's kingdom; and it was God's sovereign prerogative to appoint as rulers whom He would. The Lord announced to the leaders of Israel in the days of Moses the conditions upon which Israel was to be *His kingdom*. "Now therefore if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then shall ye be a peculiar treasure *unto me* above all people; for all the earth is mine. And *ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation*" (Exod. 19:5, 6). The kingdom of David was "*the kingdom of the Lord over Israel*" (1 Chron. 28:5). When Solomon occupied the throne, he "*sat on the throne of the Lord* as king instead of David his father" (chapter 29:23). Even the queen of Sheba recognized this fact when she said to Solomon, "Blessed be the Lord thy God, which delighted in thee to set thee on *His throne, to be king for the Lord thy God*" (chapter 9:8). Right along it was "*the kingdom of the Lord*" (chapter 13:8). This was "the kingdom of God," of which the little Israelitish children in the days of Jesus were citizens (Mark 10:14). God's throne is for ever and ever, and the sceptre of His kingdom is a right sceptre (Psalm 45:6, 7.) This language was

applied to Jesus, the Son of God, "But unto the Son He saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom" (Heb. 1:8). So when the Lord Jesus shall sit on "the throne of the Lord" (Jer. 3:17), which is also "the throne of His father David" (Isa. 9:6, 7; Luke 1:30-33), He will be both the Son of God, and the Son of David. Let us consider a few facts:

1. When a ruler was required in the past for the kingdom of the Lord, God consulted no royal genealogy for the proper person, but in His own right chose Saul, saying to Samuel, "Tomorrow about this time I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin, and thou shalt anoint him to be captain over *my people Israel*, that he may save *my people* out of the hands of the Philistines: for I have looked upon *my people*. And when Samuel saw Saul, the Lord said unto him, Behold the man I spake to thee of! *This is the same that shall reign over my people Israel*" (1 Sam. 9:15-17). The apostle Paul, when reciting the history of Israel, said, "And afterward they desired a king; and *God gave unto them Saul, the son of Cis*" (Acts 13:21). When Saul had served the divine purpose, God "removed him" (verse 22), and without regard to genealogy or pedigree gave them David, a man after His own heart. Here again we note that the people were God's people, and God exercised His sovereign will in appointing one to occupy the position that had been held by Saul. "The Lord hath sought Him a man after His own heart, and *the Lord hath commanded him to be captain over His people*" (1 Sam. 13:14). Thus was the tribal line crossed, and the royal sceptre went from Benjamin to Judah.

2. When God wanted a priest from among men after the order of Melchizedek, He did not consult the priestly pedigree of Levi, but contrary to human reckoning, chose one of another tribe, "of which Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood" (Heb. 7:14). He made oath that David's Lord as well as Son should be such priest, and from this purpose He will never depart. As Melchizedek, so Jesus is "without [priestly] genealogy, without father, without mother, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life"; He "abideth a priest continually" (verse 3). To choose a priest where He would was the divine prerogative, which the Most High exercised without let or hindrance, without consulting anyone, and without infringement of any human rights.

3. John the Baptist said to the Jews of his day, "And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham" (Matt. 3:9). Here is an announcement of what God was "able" to do. The "stones" referred to were doubtless some of the stones lying about the banks of Jordan, where John was baptizing. How could God of (Greek, *ek*, out of) stones raise up children that would be children of Abraham? Would He

change the stones into living human beings, male and female, who by the law of generation would beget children, and these would be Abraham's children, as well as heirs? Who will question that God was "able" to do this? If not in this way, in what other way would it be done "out of these stones"? Then since God was able out of stones to raise up children to Abraham, so that these would truly be Abraham's children, with no genealogy tracing them back to Abraham, could He not, if He chose to do so, in His own way, and by such means as were at His command, raise to David a righteous Branch, and to Israel a Prophet, without having recourse to Joseph? To say nay is to "limit the Holy One of Israel" (Psalm 78:41). If God is, as the word constantly affirms, the "*Almighty God*," and His "ways are past finding out" (Rom. 11:33), was it impossible for Him, through the agency and power of His Spirit, by which He had wrought countless miracles in the past, to beget of a woman in Israel a Son to Himself, who would at the same time be a descendant of Abraham and David? From what we know of His mighty works in the past, we have no hesitancy in affirming our most implicit faith in His ability to do this.

4. But suppose Jesus can only occupy the throne of David upon the basis of His being a fleshly Son of Joseph, what right have others to the throne of David, when they have not descended from David by natural generation? The throne promised to Jesus is the throne of David, and if fleshly descent alone gives the right to occupy that throne, then there would be no hope for any save such as are literal descendants of David to sit down with Christ on His throne (Luke 1:30-33; Rev. 3:21). Upon the other hand, since spiritual and moral qualifications alone, without fleshly descent, entitle others to sit down on that throne, then, as a matter of sound thinking, it is certainly true that the right of Jesus to sit on the throne of David is not based *exclusively* upon fleshly descent. A throne of righteousness, such as Jesus is to occupy, requires a righteous occupant. "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God" (II Sam. 23:3). Had Jesus been a Son of Joseph ever so much, and been devoid of the necessary moral qualifications for the position, would His fleshly descent alone entitle Him to hold that position? There can be but one answer, and that a negative. So we see that fleshly descent is by no means the only consideration.

This is recognized by some who believe in the human paternity of Jesus. We read, "When He (Jesus) said that 'the flesh profiteth nothing,' and that the words of divine truth are spirit and life, we see that all that is of value in man is from heaven." Then since "the flesh profiteth nothing," of what profit was the flesh of Joseph as furnishing the right to the throne of David? The right of the Lord Jesus to occupy the throne of the Lord and of David rests upon the divine will, the divine begetting of Jesus of a virgin of the house of David, and the decree of God: "*Thou art my Son*;

this days have I begotten thee"; and, "Yet have I set *my King* upon my holy hill of Zion" (Psalm 2:6, 7). God's Son is also to be God's King. As King over God's kingdom He comes into this position by divine right and moral fitness; and He is the Son by divine begetting. Thus has He the right to David's throne, which is also God's throne. Others will be seated with Him upon condition of sonship by adoption (Eph. 1:5), and moral fitness. "None of the unrighteous shall inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. 6:9). Whatever their fleshly descent, their "blood," this will count for nothing, and will not entitle them to an entrance into that kingdom.

According to Jesus' own words, even His flesh was "from heaven." Said He, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" (John 6:51). Then since Jesus is the bread which came down from heaven, and the bread which He will give is His flesh, it follows that His flesh in some sense came down from heaven. In what way may we say that the flesh of Jesus was from heaven? It is not that Jesus had a personal existence in a spiritual state in heaven before His birth of Mary; nor that His flesh as such was in heaven, and came to earth. We do not understand Jesus so to teach. Had Jesus been first a spiritual being, and thereafter a natural being, this would be an inversion of the established divine order of things, which says, "That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual" (1 Cor. 15:46).

That Jesus' flesh literally came from heaven, either as a babe or a full-sized man, is nowhere taught in Scripture; nor is it a fact. The only sense therefore in which His flesh can be said to have come from heaven is that of origin. God, who would have a Son, was in heaven; the Spirit by which He begat that Son was in heaven; the will and power of God which were exerted in the bringing of Jesus into being and upon the scene, were in heaven, and all came from thence. And thus the flesh of Jesus was from heaven in a way and manner which justifies the statement above quoted. In this sense He was and is "the Lord from heaven" (1 Cor. 15:47). This being so, the flesh of Jesus, which He would "give for the life of the world," was "of value."

The apostle Paul taught, "And you that were sometime alienated and enemies by wicked works, yet now hath He *reconciled in the body of His flesh through death*, to present you holy and unblameable in His sight" (Col. 1:21, 22). And it was "*in His flesh*" that He "abolished the enmity, for to make in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace, and that He might reconcile both in one body, having slain the enmity thereby" (Eph. 2:15, 16). Moreover, we are told that "by the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all"

(Heb. 10:10). The body thus offered was the body "prepared" (verse 5). When we eat bread and drink of the fruit of the vine, we do this in remembrance of "the body and blood of the Lord." Are we to understand that there was no value in the flesh that was given, and the blood that was shed? Had they been merely from Joseph, and not, as Jesus said, "from heaven," there would have been neither value nor profit in them; but His flesh being from thence through Spirit begetting, when He gave His flesh for the life of the world, it was made possible "that the world through Him might be saved" (John 3:17).

DESCENT THROUGH THE FEMALE

We shall now take up the claim that, in order to be entitled to the throne of David, Jesus must have been begotten of a human father, as well as born of a human mother in an unbroken line from David down. We direct attention to two cases in Scripture where *the genealogical line was continued through the female*. The first case is that of Jair, styled "the son of Manasseh" (Num. 32:41; Deut. 3:14). Jair was in reality a descendant of Judah. In I Chron. 2:21, 22, it is stated that Hezron, who was the grandfather of Jair, and a son of Judah, went in unto the daughter of Machir (who was a son of Manasseh.—Num. 27:1), whom he married when he was fourscore years old; and she bare him Segub; "and Segub begat Jair," etc. Thus, while Jair was a great-grandson of Judah, yet owing to his marriage to a female descendant of Manasseh, he is styled "the son of Manasseh," and his relation to the tribe of Manasseh is based upon the fact that his wife was of the tribe of that name. The line of descent of Machir was as follows:

Joseph
Manasseh
Machir (whose daughter Hezron married)
Hepher
Zelophehad

(See I Chron. 2:21; Num. 26:33; 27:1)

The line of Hezron was on this wise:

Judah
Pharez
Hezron (who married a daughter of Machir)
Segub
Jair

(Num. 32:41; Deut. 3:14)

Thus was Hezron transferred from the tribe of Judah to that of Manasseh on account of his marriage to a woman of the tribe of Manasseh.

Another remarkable case is that of Sheshan, who had no sons, but several daughters (I Chron. 1:31, 34). Sheshan gave one of his daughters to an Egyptian servant whose name was Jarha; and

she bare him (that is, to Sheshan) Attai. We then follow the line of descent:

Sheshan
A daughter of Sheshan
Attai
Nathan
Zabad
(See verses 34, 35)

Here is a clear case of interruption in the male line of descent, where the family name was continued through a woman, who conceived and bore a son by a stranger, not of another tribe merely, but of another nation, and a slave besides. Is it any more difficult to believe that God by His Spirit begat a son in a virgin of the house of David, than that Attai, though begotten of a stranger, was counted in the line of succession as a son of Sheshan?

Suppose then that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was an only child of her father, and the appointed "time" had come for God's Son to be "born of a woman" (Rom. 5:6; Gal. 4:4): would the right of inheritance in the throne of David in that case have ended or been lost? Not at all. The case of Zelophehad's daughters proves that it would not (Num. 27:1-11). Zelophehad was the father of five daughters, but he had no sons (verses 1-3). This being the case, the father's "name" was about to disappear, and his "possession" pass to others (verse 4). In view of this the daughters presented their case to Moses and Eleazar before the princes of the congregation (verse 2), "and Moses brought their cause before the Lord" (verse 5). The Lord said, ". . . Thou shalt surely give them a possession of an inheritance among their father's brethren, and thou shalt cause the inheritance of their father to pass unto them" (verse 7). So much as far as the daughters of Zelophehad were concerned. But suppose there were other similar cases later on. What about them? A very specific law was enacted, which read, "If a man die, and have no son, then *ye shall cause his inheritance to pass unto his daughter*. And if he have no daughter, then ye shall give his inheritance unto his brethren. And if he have no brethren, then ye shall give his inheritance unto his father's brethren. And if his father have no brethren, then ye shall give his inheritance unto his kinsman that is next to him of his family; and it shall be unto the children of Israel for a statute of judgment, as the Lord commanded Moses" (verse 11). This law provided that a man's "inheritance," whatever this might be, in case he died without leaving a male heir, should "pass unto his daughter"; and this covered the inheritance of the throne of David, as well as provided that it should not pass from the royal line, even if there was no male heir. Then if Mary was an only heir of the kingly line, the "inheritance," as well as the "name," would not on that account be forfeited or lost. Her Son, though not begotten of Joseph, the same as Attai, who was begotten of an Egyptian

slave of a daughter of Sheshan, would according to this statute be counted as a direct descendant of David, and His right to David's throne could not be challenged or questioned upon legal grounds.

RAISE UP SEED TO HIS BROTHER

Another matter which illustrates the case is the law pertaining to a man who died childless. It appears from Gen. 38:8 that there was a custom among the descendants of Abraham about the time of Judah that when a man died childless, his brother was to marry his widow, the object being "to raise up seed unto his brother." Why was this? So that the dead man's name might not die out on account of having no children, but be continued through his brother. We read that Onan, one of Judah's sons, married his brother Er's widow, and he knew that the seed to be born of his brother's widow "should not be his" (Gen. 38:7-9). This was later enacted into a law in Israel. "If brethren shall dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead man shall not marry without unto a stranger; her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of an husband's brother unto her. And it shall be that *the first-born that she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not put out of Israel*" (Deut. 25:5, 6). The specific object of this legal enactment was to preserve the "name" of the dead man through his brother's child. The child so born, though in no sense the dead man's child, would continue the name of one who was only his uncle; and he was counted as the dead man's child exactly the same as if he had been begotten of him. The child so born not only continued the dead man's name, but also became his heir, and had the right of the firstborn. That is, a double portion of his property, a right which could not be alienated from him by any other children that might afterward be born. That this law became the "manner in Israel" is shown in the marriage of Boaz to Ruth the Moabitess (Ruth 4:6-8). The husband's inheritance vested by right in the widow. Ruth was a widow who had no son. Hence according to the law covering such cases, her husband Mahlon's name was about to die out unless someone would "do the part of a kinsman" by marrying her (chapter 3:13), and through an heir born of this union "raise up the name of the dead upon his inheritance" (chapter 4:5). This was done by Boaz, a relative of Naomi, Ruth's mother-in-law, and thus he "raised up seed" in the name of Mahlon, Ruth's deceased husband, and preserved it from being "cut off from among his brethren, and from the gate of his place" (verses 9, 10). Here a landed inheritance was preserved through an heir who was not the first husband's son. Now if one man could thus "raise up seed" to another, it is no less possible that Jesus, having been born of Mary, a descendant of David, though not begotten of Joseph, could inherit the right of the throne of David through Mary. The prin-

ciple involved in this Israelitish law at once and forever settles the legal question.

OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECIES

There is scarcely an Old Testament prophecy relating to Christ or His work that deals with every detail of the particular matter which it foretells. When God foretold, through the prophet Isaiah, that He would endow Jesus with the Holy Spirit (Isa. 11:1-3; 42:1; 61:1), He did not specify all the particulars that would enter into this matter. Thus, for instance, it was not stated when or under what conditions this should be done; nor does the prophecy mention the performance of miracles, which followed the bestowal of the Spirit upon Jesus. Only the outstanding facts appear in the prophecy.

When God promised that He would raise up unto Israel a Prophet of like faithfulness with Moses (Deut. 18:15-18); or that He would raise unto David a righteous Branch (Isa. 11:1), it was not specifically stated when or how this promise should be carried out. Only the fact was stated that God would at some time intervene in the affairs of the nation by bringing upon the scene one who should be such a Prophet and such a Branch. The circumstances and details may be obtained from the New Testament narratives dealing with the execution of these promises.

When God said that He would make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah (Jer. 31:31-34), only the most prominent features were given, while the details were left to be stated in the New Testament writings (Matt. 26:28; 11 Cor. 3:1-11; Heb. 8:6-13; 10:15-18, and others).

Thus also with the prophecies concerning Jesus: they were mostly of a general character. Doubtless many of them were never discovered or detected until Jesus Himself appeared, and His extraordinary personality and remarkable work drew the attention of the thoughtful to them.

Many of the prophecies concerning Jesus were, we may say, hidden away among curious local circumstances in the history of Israel, and we doubt not that it required considerable "searching," even upon the part of the prophets, to find and identify some of them (1 Peter 1:11).

There are prophecies concerning Christ in the Old Testament which are surrounded with matters that cannot possibly be applied to Him. We direct attention to Psalm 18, which was a Psalm of David spoken or sung "in the day that the Lord delivered him from the hands of all his enemies, and from the haul of Saul" (See the superscription at the head of this Psalm). At verse 49 we read, "Therefore will I give thanks unto thee, O Lord, among the heathen, and sing praises unto thy name." This language is cited by the apostle Paul in Rom. 15:9. The most that can be said is that Jesus never was delivered from Saul, and so this Psalm

is one which has or had a fulfillment partly in the case of David, and partly in the cast of the Lord Jesus.

Turning to Psalm 34:20, we read, "He keepeth all his bones; not one of them shall be broken." This, too, is "A Psalm of David," and was spoken "when he changed his behavior before Abimelech" (or Achish.—1 Sam. 21:13). Primarily it applied to David; but it also had reference to circumstances in connection with the crucifixion of Jesus, as we see from the citing of verse 20 by John. After stating that "they [the soldiers] brake not His legs," John said, "For these things were done that the Scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of Him shall not be broken" (John 19:32-36).

In Psalm 69:14 we read, "They that hated me without a cause are more than the hairs of my head." This language likewise has New Testament application in the life of Jesus. The Lord Himself cited the words when speaking of the opposition He encountered at the hands of His contemporaries, "But this cometh to pass that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause" (John 15:25). However, not all of Psalm 69 can be applied to Jesus. For instance, we read at verse 5, "O God, Thou knowest my foolishness; and my sins [margin, 'guiltiness'] are not hid from Thee." Who that knows how spotless and pure the life of Jesus was, would attribute "foolishness and sins" or "guiltiness" to Him? He being free from guilt, this passage cannot apply to Him.

Other passages in this Psalm apply to Jesus, such as verse 9, which says, "For the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up." This finds its New Testament counterpart in John 2:17. When we read, "The reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me," we find this in Rom. 15:3, and applied to Christ. The application and meaning of Old Testament prophecies is a matter which requires that one "study to show himself approved of God a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (11 Tim. 2:15). If this apostolic injunction is borne in mind, and scrupulously carried out, it will at once obviate confusion, and do much toward locating and identifying the Old Testament prophecies which relate to the different phases of the life of our Savior.

ISAIAH 7:14

Isa. 7:14, cited and applied to Mary in Matt. 1:23, is a passage which illustrates what we have been saying. That it related, in the first place, to circumstances in the time of Isaiah, we freely grant. But we do not admit that this exhausts its meaning and application. Isaiah, chapters 6-9, abound with prophecies pointing to Christ. Chapter 6:10 is cited by the Lord in Matt. 13:15; chapter 7:14 by Matthew in Matt. 1:23; chapter 8:14 is cited in Luke 2:34; Rom. 9:33; 1 Peter 2:8, and chapter 8:18 in Heb. 2:13. That the passage in chapter 9:6, 7, refers to Christ is, we

presume, doubted by no one who believes in the inspiration of the Scriptures. Yet, as we examine more closely the chapters containing the foregoing references, we find much in them that cannot properly be applied to Christ, while there are some passages which have a two-fold meaning. This is especially true of Isa. 7:14, which reads, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Immanuel." Let us note the following facts:

1. The LXX word for "virgin" is *parthenos*, the same as in Matt. 1:23.

2. Doubtless the "virgin" referred to in Isa. 7:14 was the same as the "prophetess," and probably was Isaiah's wife (chapter 8:1-3).

3. It cannot be shown that the child born of the prophetess was actually named "Immanuel." He was called "Mahershalal-hashbaz," which literally means, "In making speed to the spoil he hasteneth the prey."

It has been said that the child born to Mary was not actually called Immanuel. Neither can it be shown that He was actually named "Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace" (chapter 9:6, 7). Yet Jesus was or is what these terms import. In like manner He was and is what the name Immanuel signifies, that is, "God with us." God was with Christ, as so many passages unquestionably teach, and through Him God was with men.

Regarding Isa. 7:14, it is a fact that Mary was what the word *parthenos* means. It is said in Matt. 1:23, "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and bring forth a son, and they shall call His name Immanuel; which being interpreted is, God with us." This citation does not mention the statement in Isaiah concerning the "sign" to be given to Ahaz, but only that part which speaks of the conception by the virgin and the birth and naming of her son. This prophecy, like those others in chapters 6-9, had a wider scope than the local circumstances then existing. It looked to the "fullness of the time," when God would, by His Spirit, raise unto Israel a Savior in the person of His only begotten Son.

Such use of language as in Isa. 7:14 is by no means an unusual way of applying Scripture prophecy. Jesus cited Isa. 61:1, 2, up to the statement which says, "and the day of vengeance of our God" (see Luke 4:18, 19), and then stopped short. Why this? Because this was all of that prophecy that was applicable to the time. So with the prophecies contained in Isa., chapters 6-9. They were not quoted in full, but only so much of them as was pertinent to the matter in hand. That part of chapter 7:14 dealing with the conception of the virgin as a "sign" was not cited in Matt. 1:23, but only so much of it as dealt with the case in hand.

One writer says, in speaking of this passage, "If Jesus' miraculous begetting was to be a sign to the house of David, why did God so conceal it that only Joseph and Mary knew it? Does God give a sign, and then keep the people intended to see it, from seeing it? If Isa. 7:14 is a sign to the house of David, and refers to Christ, then we must conclude that prophecy is not yet fulfilled, for the house of Israel has not yet received that sign, but are ignorant of it. . . . We must still look in the future for a virgin to conceive and bear a son, and call his name Immanuel as a sign to the house of David."

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the application made of Isa. 7:14 in Matt. 1:22, 23, is wrong, what have we? Are we then rid of the objectionable "sign"? By no means! We have in Isa. 8:18 other "signs and wonders in Israel." "Behold, I and the children which God hath given me are for signs and wonders in Israel from the Lord of Hosts, which dwelleth in Mount Zion." In the first instance this language applied to the sons of Isaiah; but it is not limited to them, having a larger meaning, and broader scope. The writer in Hebrews applied it to Christ and the church: "Behold, I and the children which God hath given me" (Heb. 2:13). These "signs and wonders" were no more received by the house of Israel than was Jesus. Thus we read, "But as then he that was born after the flesh (Ishmael) persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now" (Gal. 4:20). They "both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, and have persecuted us [the apostles]; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men, forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway; for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost" (1 Thess. 2:14-16). Signs and wonders done by the Lord Jesus and the apostles had no effect upon them. When Jesus cured their demoniacs, they said, "He casteth out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils" (Matt. 12:24).

Challenging the authority of Jesus, they "would see a sign" from Him. But He answered them, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall be no sign given to it but the sign of Jonas" (Matt. 12:38, 39). When the Son of Man rose from the dead in pursuance of the divine purpose and His own announcement, neither were they then persuaded. At another time they would see a sign from heaven, whereupon Jesus said, "O ye hypocrites! Ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times? A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign" (Matt. 16:1-3). What were "the signs of the times"? Signs having to do with Jesus, His divine mission, and the "times" in which He was to appear according to prophecy (Rom. 5:6; Gal. 4:4). This was a sign to the house of Israel, but they did not receive it. Shall we therefore say, as this writer says, that because the house of Israel did not receive the sign sent to them, therefore we must look for it in the future?

Apart from the irreverence which the foregoing language betrays, we may ask, Must the begetting of the "son" in Isa. 7:14, or of Jesus according to Matt. 1:22, 23, take place in the sight of the people in order to be credible as a sign to the house of David? But we must advert to another matter in connection with Jesus as a sign. When the aged Simeon bestowed his blessing upon Joseph and Mary, and the child Jesus, he said, "Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising of many in Israel; and for a sign which shall be spoken against" (Luke 2:33, 34). Truly, the nation of Israel as such did not "receive" this sign, and during the life time of Jesus "spoke against" it, and after His glorification "contradicted and blasphemed" (Acts 13:45; 18:6). And not only so, but even some of His professed friends speak against this sign in language at once irreverent and unbecoming.

To say that Mary's Son was not called by the name Immanuel is beside the mark, for the prophecy in Isa. 9:6, 7, speaks of other terms to be applied to the child to be born. Though not actually called by these names, Jesus is what they mean, as well as Immanuel, God with us, as the Savior. The name Jesus was to be given to Him for the reason that He should "save His people from their sins." No one has power to forgive sins but God, as the Jews very fitly said (Luke 5:21); but the Son of Man also "hath power on earth to forgive sins" (verse 24). God gave to Jesus this power: and in this sense He was more truly "God with us" than Mahershalalhashbaz ever was. There is nothing in Matt. 1:22, 23, that does violence to or in any way conflicts with the language in Isa. 7:14.

Isa. 9:6, 7, speaks of the laying of the government upon the shoulders of the child to be born. Is not this child, this Son, the person Jesus? In Isa. 22:22 the Lord said, "And the key of the house of David will I lay upon His shoulder." Unquestionably this refers to Jesus. Let us hear Him: "These things saith He that hath the key of David; that openeth, and no man shutteth, and shutteth, and no man openeth" (Rev. 3:7). "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches" (Rev. 22:16). Yet in both Isaiah chapters 9 and 22 circumstances of a local character are mentioned which had nothing to do with Jesus (See Isa. 9:8-12; 22:15; also II Kings 18:18-37).

CALLED OUT OF EGYPT

Then we read, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son" (Hos. 11:1). In Matt. 2:15 this is referred to the return of Jesus from Egypt, whence Joseph and Mary had fled with the child on account of the desire of Herod to kill Him. Of course, the entire chapter in Hosea does not refer to this event, or even to Jesus, a circumstance which it shares with those just dealt with, and many others. Why try to get rid of this passage as referring to the child Jesus? Because if God called a Son out of Egypt, He had a Son there;

and the only way in which He could at this time have had a Son in Egypt was that His "Holy Child Jesus," with Joseph and His mother, had taken refuge there from the wrath of the king, as related in Matt. 2:12-15. We do not deny that Hos. 11:1 applied, in the first instance, to the return of the nation of Israel from Egypt; but it is also a fact that God called His Son Jesus out of Egypt. The things aforesaid written are for our learning (Rom. 15:4), and many circumstances in the life of the nation of Israel were for "examples," "figures," or "types" (1 Cor. 10:6, 11, margin). The nation of Israel as God's son was a type of His real Son.

Here we meet with another objection from Unitarians and other teachers of the human paternity doctrine. It is said that Joseph and Mary, with the child Jesus, could not go to Egypt, as narrated in Matt. 2:12-15, and at the same time dwell in Nazareth, as appears from Luke 2:39. It is unquestionably true that they could not be at two different places at one and the same time. But is it certain that the flight to Egypt and residence there, and the residence at Nazareth, were at one and the same time? There is nothing in the two accounts that requires such a construction. When all the facts are considered, it will be found that there is no more difficulty in these two accounts than there is in other matters in the Gospel narratives that are beset with seeming difficulties, and against which not a shadow of doubt is raised on that account.

The "house" into which the wise men came (Matt. 2:11) was not necessarily the "inn" where Jesus was born, nor was it necessarily at Bethlehem. It is certainly possible that the house was their dwelling at Nazareth. We read that Herod "inquired diligently of them what time the star appeared" (Matt. 2:7); and when he "slew the children that were in Bethlehem and all the coasts thereof," we note that it was "*according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men*" (verse 16). What had the "time" to do with this matter? It was to ascertain the age of the child Jesus. If the star had appeared only a few days before, there was no reason for slaying the children of "two years and under." We read that "Herod saw that he was mocked of the wise men." It was certainly not impossible that Joseph and Mary, with the child Jesus, returned to Nazareth not long after Jesus' birth at Bethlehem, and that thereafter Joseph was warned to "flee into Egypt" until after the death of Herod (Matt. 2:13-15). Thus the two accounts, instead of contradicting, supplement and mutually confirm each other.

ANGEL VISITS TO JOSEPH BY NIGHT

Not even the angel messages to Joseph escape adverse criticism. When it is said in Matt. 2:12, 13, 19, 22, that the angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream, with certain information and

warning to him, this is objected to on the ground that it was *in a dream*, and *at night*. This may be disposed of by referring to a few instances of angel visits recorded in both Testaments. Thus we read, "And the angel of the Lord spake to me in a dream, saying, Jacob! And I said, Here am I" (Gen. 31:11). The apostle Paul, while on his way to Rome, when the ship was in danger of sinking, comforted the men in charge, saying to them, "Be of good cheer, for there shall be no loss of any man's life, but of the ship. For there stood by me this night an angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve, saying, Fear not, Paul," etc. (Acts 27:23). There are other similar instances on record in the Acts of the Apostles (chapters 18:9; 23:11). We also read concerning Solomon, "In Gibeon the Lord appeared to Solomon in a dream by night" (1 Kings 3:5). The matter of angel visits to Joseph in a dream by night is not unlike such cases in both Testaments.

WAS JESUS A "HYBRID"?

One of the most exceptionable objections against the scriptural narrative of the begetting of Jesus that we have met with is this: "If Jesus was a man, He must have been produced or generated by a male and a female, or He would have been a 'hybrid.'" A hybrid is defined as a halfbreed or mongrel. Hence it would follow, according to this logic, that if Jesus was begotten of God by the Holy Spirit, as the record distinctly affirms, then He was a halfbreed or mongrel. Jesus was called both the "Son of God," and the "Son of Man." As the Son of God He owed His origin to the productive energy of God: His birth of a woman made Him the Son of Man. Was He therefore a hybrid, a mixture of the divine and the human, with neither clearly defined or predominant? As Son of God He did not descend personally or bodily from heaven; as Son of Man He was born of a woman, of the race of man, though not begotten of a male of that race, but of God.

TRINITY, PRE-EXISTENCE, AND MIRACULOUS CONCEPTION

To say, as has been said, that the doctrine of the miraculous begetting (as narrated in the Gospel accounts) is "a relic of the Trinity," is to say what is not historically correct. The doctrine of the Trinity is admittedly a doctrine which is the "result of reason speculating upon a revelation made to faith" (Prof. Flint, University of Edinburgh (in *Britannica*, 9th ed., article "Theism"). Centuries elapsed between Justin and Lactantius before the doctrine of the Trinity was "developed" into a clearly defined dogmatic system.

Equally wide of the mark is the statement that the Trinity, the pre-existence of Jesus, and the miraculous conception, are "linked together, and stand or fall together." The doctrine of the divine begetting of Jesus by the Holy Spirit was demonstrably centuries old when the famous Nicene Creed concerning the Trinity was

composed and adopted, and that doctrine was able to "stand" and maintain its position by an appeal to the scriptural testimony in existence as early as any part of the Gospels according to Matthew and Luke were in existence. This cannot be said of either the Trinity or the pre-existence dogma. Nor can it be shown that they are "linked together." Any linking that is done is an arbitrary and mechanical device. Moreover, pre-existence is incompatible with begettal, for the reason that one who has an actual and personal existence does not require to be begotten, understanding that begettal is the initial act in bringing into existence. If Jesus pre-existed before His begettal as one of the "persons" of the Trinity, then He could not be and was not begotten in order to have a personal existence.

And yet even some of the teachers of the human paternity of Jesus after all themselves believe in a kind of pre-existence. To them Jesus was begotten of Joseph, and born of Mary, and thereafter He "existed" (in reality *pre-existed*) for a period of thirty years before He was begotten as the "Son of God" at His baptism; and after this He once more existed (that is, *pre-existed*) for a period of several years before He was made the "Son of God" by resurrection from the dead to die no more." Those who accept the divine record of the begettal of Jesus do not believe in either kind of pre-existence, but rather that He was born of Mary as the Son of God by virtue of such begettal.

CALLED A NAZARENE

Another objection is raised against the record as we have it. When it is said, "And He came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene" (Matt. 2:23), the objection is made that there is not a passage in the prophets that contains such a statement. However, as we consult "the prophets" more closely we find that the word rendered "Branch," and applied to Jesus, is *netser*. "There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch (*netser*) shall grow out of his roots" (Isa. 11:1). That this applies to Jesus is clear from the fact that the Spirit of the Lord would rest upon the person so designated (verse 2). This Branch (*netser*) would have other branches (See Isa. 60:21). These are the class of whom Jesus said, "I am the vine; ye are the branches" (John 15:5). The Hebrew word *netser* in the Old Testament may have suggested itself to the writer when he spoke of the residence of Jesus with Joseph and Mary at Nazareth.

Many more objections, almost legion, have been raised by modern believers in the human paternity which are of no more force in overthrowing the divine record of the begettal of Jesus than are those just considered. But we pass them by for more important considerations.

THE CHARACTER OF JESUS

We feel moved to advert once more to the writings of some of the "fathers" cited at the beginning. Irenæus quoted Cerinthus as teaching that while Jesus was a son of Joseph and Mary, "He was nevertheless more righteous, prudent and wise than other men" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1, pages 351, 352). And Tertullian represented Carpocrates as maintaining that Jesus, though "of the seed of Joseph, was superior to all others in the practice of righteousness and in integrity of life" (Vol. III, pages 351, 352). A recent writer said that "Jesus was God's Chief Son because His truth was unmixed with error; His spirit unmixed with selfishness, and His life unmixed with sin." Whether we consult those in the early centuries who testified to the spotless character of Jesus, or those of the Tubingen School of Higher Critics, such as D. F. Strauss in his *Leben Jesu* (Life of Jesus), or more recent writers, we have the almost uniform testimony that the character exhibited by Jesus of Nazareth was divine in its ideals, and matchless in its purity.* The scriptural testimony shows that it was of a kind to merit the approbation of the Father, and secure for its possessor restoration to life from the dead, deathlessness of nature, exaltation to God's right hand as a Prince and a Savior, and ultimately installation as Monarch of all the earth. This nobility of mind, this purity of life, is a feature in the character of Jesus for which there is an adequate cause. While it is a fact that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23), of Jesus alone can it be said that He "*knew no sin*" (II Cor. 5:21), and, "*In Him is no sin*" (I John 3:5). The sinlessness of Jesus was a result, an effect. What was its cause? We observe the boy Jesus at the age of twelve, conscious that He had a "Father" different from Joseph, and He felt it obligatory, even then, to "be about His Father's business" (Luke 2:46, 47). Later on, when He was actively engaged in His Father's business, He said, "And He that sent me is with me. The Father hath not left me alone; for *I do always* those things that please Him" (John 8:29). *Here was the all-pervading and ever-present consciousness that He was the Son of God; that God was His Father; and that as "the Son of the Father" (II John 3) He was expected to do a "work" of the utmost importance, and connected with the most far-reaching results; a work entrusted to no other, and which no other could do.* Whence this consciousness? It had its basis in the fact that He was what He *knew* Himself to be—*The Son of God*, acknowledged as such by the Father at His baptism in Jordan, and testified by John thereafter. "And I saw [the Spirit descending upon Jesus], and bare record that this is the Son of God" (John 1:32-34).

* We note some exceptions to this rule in the writings of some modern teachers of the human paternity. *The Nazarene Messenger* for May, 1894, contains the following remarks:

From the sinless character of Jesus, when sin was possible, and He might have sinned, we know that He occupied a mental plane which was shared by no others. Whence was this? Because He was and knew Himself to be the Son of God in a sense in which no other was such. Though born of a human mother, and inheriting from her the human nature, He owed His mentality to His heavenly Father.

No man may glory in being the father, by begetting, of the world's Redeemer and Savior. No man may take the credit of having raised to Israel that Prophet, and to David a righteous Branch. It was God who announced, "I will raise Him up." And "in due time," "when the fullness of the time had come," the Son was "born of a woman," and thereafter "sent forth" (Rom. 5:6; Gal. 4:4). Jesus was the "body" "prepared" of God (Heb. 10:5). This preparation had its beginning in the begetting by the power of the Holy Spirit, and was carried to completion by the guidance and direction of that body through the indwelling of the Spirit of God. Joseph, whatever good traits he may have had, was not the medium through which that body was prepared (margin, 'fitted,' or made fit). It was God who had promised to do this; it was God who executed His purpose in the begetting of His Son, and to God belongs the praise.

GOD'S SON THE OBJECT OF SPECIAL PROVIDENCE

Then, too, Jesus being the Son of God in a sense and manner altogether unique, He was the object of God's special parental

"Jesus was a man like other men, or why did he require to be baptized of John, whose baptism was for the remission of sins? (Luke 3:3). If he did not require it for the purpose for which it was administered, he did the institution no honor. If he had no faults to be remitted, or sins to be washed away, he did wrong to pretend to comply with an ordinance given by God for the purpose of cleansing from sin. If he did not need it, and did it just the same, it was simple mockery and sham, instead of fulfilling all righteousness, as he did (Matt. 3:15). There could be no moral excellence if there was no moral requirement.

"But he felt his weakness, frailty, nothingness and uncleanness in the sight of God, and went down into the water to wash away his faults and shortcomings, and fulfilled that form of righteousness. He could not be human, and have no failings.

"Jesus felt that he was not perfectly clean before God, and went down into the water in obedience to his Father's commands, and washed away the faults of his youth. In complying with this form appointed of God he found acceptance and approval."

The following extracts are from a pamphlet entitled *Thoughts for Bible Students*:

Referring to the baptism of Jesus, the writer says, "What then are the self-evident truths as to this act of Jesus? It is clear to us that he felt weak and unclean in God's sight. He went into Jordan to wash away his sins and shortcomings, and fulfilled one form of righteousness. He had human faults because he was a human being.

"On the other hand, if Jesus was a divine being, the divine son of a divine Father, then no benefit could be derived from a deceptive pretense of washing away sins that he had never committed."

care. Not only did God give His angels charge concerning His Child, lest He dash His foot against a stone (Psalm 91:11, 12; Matt. 4:6), thus securing Him against disease and bodily injury; He also took care to properly instruct Him. Not without good reason is it said that "the child grew and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom." And why? Because "the grace of God was upon Him" (Luke 2:40). "And Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and man" (verse 52). Jesus could say to the Father, "For thou art my hope, O Lord God: thou art my trust from my youth. By thee have I been holden up from the womb. Thou art He that took me out of my mother's bowels. My praise shall be continually of Thee. I am as a wonder unto many; but Thou art my strong refuge. . . . O God, Thou hast taught me from my youth; and hitherto have I declared Thy wondrous works" (Psalm 71:5-7, 17). Constantly did Jesus appeal to the fact that He had been taught by and had learned of His Father, of which the following is a characteristic illustration:

"For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me. He gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that His commandment is life everlasting; whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak" (John 12:49, 50). Jesus, of whom it is written that He "continued all night in prayer to God" (Luke 6:12), lived in constant communion with His Father. There were three sources from which He could derive instruction:

1. Parental teaching.
2. The Scriptures of the Old Testament, of which He must have been a most diligent reader and student (See Psalm 119:98-104).
3. Direct revelation from God through the Holy Spirit.

We are informed that the Spirit wherewith God would endow Him would be "the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge in the fear of the Lord; and it shall make Him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord" (Isa. 11:2). Of Jesus alone is it said that "God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him" (John 3:34). To God's "servants the prophets" (Neh. 9:30) He gave His Spirit in such measure as was suited to their station, but to His Son He gave it *without* "measure." This was a special privilege of the Son.

Is it a wonder that, with God as His Father and Teacher, He "loved righteousness, and hated iniquity"? and that God was "well pleased" with Him, and His soul "delighted in Him" as His "beloved Son"? (Isa. 42:1; Matt. 17:5). Jesus was the Branch whom God had *made strong for Himself*, of whom it is said, "Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand, upon the Son of Man, whom Thou hast made strong for Thyself" (Psalm 80:15-17).

"I HAVE NEED TO BE BAPTIZED OF THEE"

When Jesus asked of John to be baptized of him, the latter remonstrated, saying, "I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest Thou to me?" (Matt. 3:14). Why this? It must be that John felt his inferiority to Jesus. 'But why inferior? John knew that he must "prepare the way of the Lord" (verse 3), and bore witness of Jesus, "This is He of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me; for He was before me" (John 1:15). Of Him John "bare record that this is the Son of God" (verse 34). This is "the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father," "full of grace and truth" (verses 14, 18). John, knowing that Jesus was the Son of God, felt somewhat diffident about baptizing such an august personage, and therefore said, "I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest Thou to me?" No wonder. Had Jesus been a son of Joseph, doubtless John would not have said this to Him, but would have told Him what to "do," the same as he told others (Luke 3:10-14); but we do not hear of John giving such instructions to the Son of God. On the contrary, both John and God the Father testified that of all who were baptized, Jesus was "THE SON OF GOD." Reader, it behooves us to accept the testimony of "two or three witnesses."

Why was Jesus baptized? One writer says, "How could He be called 'the Son of Man,' and also 'the Son of God'? Only upon the same basis as we can. A second birth is necessary for *all men* if they wish to become 'sons of God' (John 3:3); and if Jesus was 'a Man,' He also had to be born again or from above. This is why we see Him baptized of John in the river Jordan (Read John 3:5). He *became* the Son of God *because* He was led of the Spirit of God (Rom. 8:14)."

This is mere conjecture, and as such inconclusive and valueless. The outstanding object of John's baptism was testified by the Baptist himself, "This is He of whom I said, After me cometh a Man which is preferred before me, for He was before me. And I knew Him not; but *that He might be made manifest to Israel, THEREFORE am I come baptizing with water*" (John 1:30, 31). The mission of John was that he might prepare the way of the Lord, and his baptism was that of "repentance for the remission of sins" (Luke 3:3). Did Jesus confess having committed sins? (Matt. 3:6). Did He repent? Was He forgiven? Was He justified? A new birth involves all these; therefore the answer must in each case be a negative.

As regards Jesus' becoming the Son of God "because He was led by the Spirit," the reference (Rom. 8:14) does not bear out the writer's statement. "As many are led by the Spirit of God, they *are* the sons of God," not, they *become* such. The divine order of the reception of the Spirit is unmistakably indicated in Gal. 4:6, "And *because* ye *are* sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His

Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Sonship first; then the Spirit, is the divine rule. "*Thy Holy Child Jesus, whom Thou hast anointed*" (Acts 4:27).

GOD'S SON LEARNED OBEDIENCE

It is scripturally affirmed of Jesus, "Though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered" (Heb. 5:8). When did this obedience begin? It is said that when John the Baptist remonstrated against baptizing Jesus, the latter replied, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness" (Matt. 3:15). This was at least part of the obedience of Jesus, if not the beginning of it. If it was "becoming" that "thus" "all righteousness" be fulfilled, which was God's just requirement, then that righteousness could not be fulfilled without this act of submission and obedience. And when Jesus was baptized in water, knowing that "thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer" (Luke 24:46), He could not but think of the "baptism" of suffering wherewith He must be baptized and overwhelmed (Matt. 20:22, 23; Psalm 55:4, 5); and doubtless this was prefigured or foreshadowed to His active mind as He was submerged in the waters of Jordan. We repeat: Jesus did not *become* the Son of God by obedience, as others must do, but "though He *were* a Son, yet learned He obedience." This gives a force and meaning to those words which cannot possibly attach to them upon any other hypothesis.

TOOK ON THE SEED OF ABRAHAM

Attention is directed to Heb. 2:16, 17, which in the Authorized Version reads, "For verily, He took not on Him the nature of angels, but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren," etc. What is meant by taking on the seed of Abraham? The Revised Version comes nearer the truth in the rendering, "For verily not to angels does He give help, but He giveth help to the seed of Abraham." Who gives help? It is God. By what means? By means of Him who was "in all things made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." Emphasis is placed upon the words, "In all things made like His brethren," and it is urged that this must refer to begetting by a fleshly father. One writer even quoted the words thus: "In all things (or ways) made like unto His brethren." Yet there is one "thing" or "way" in which He differs from His brethren, and that is, while He "suffered for sins," it was "*the Just for the unjust*" (1 Peter 3:18); while He "made reconciliation for sins," it was not for sins of His own, but "for the sins of the people" (Heb. 2:17). He Himself "knew no sin" (11 Cor. 5:21), in Him is no sin (1 John 3:5), and He could conscientiously say to His enemies, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" (John 8:46). In respect

to committing sins, and having to make reconciliation for sins of His own, He was not "like His brethren." He "always" did those things that pleased the Father (John 8:29), which cannot be said of any of His "brethren." Why was this? While they need an Advocate, a High Priest, a Mediator, He approached the Father direct without a mediator, and He is "Jesus Christ *the Righteous*," who is their "Advocate with the Father" (1 John 2:1). Were they as righteous as He was, would they still pray to the Father in His name? The sinlessness of Jesus has a philosophical reason back of it, and this, in the last analysis, is the fact that He was the Son of God, the *only begotten* Son.

THE FULLNESS OF TIME

When did the Son of God appear? It was testified by the apostle Paul, "But when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made [Revised Version, 'born'] of a woman, born under the law" (Gal. 4:4). We note the following particulars:

1. That God has a Son.
2. That this Son was born of a woman and under the law.
3. That God sent forth His Son, "having been produced from a woman, born under the law" (*Diaglott*).
4. That this was when "the fullness of time was come."

Here the question occurs, What "time"? The context will furnish the necessary information. The apostle said that "the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world" (Gal. 4:1-3). The "children" here represent the nation of Israel; the "tutors and governors" the law of Moses. "The time appointed of the father" represents "the fullness of the time" which arrived with the appearing of Jesus, "His Son." This "fullness of time" for the sending forth of God's Son did not come by accident or chance. The "Son" did not *happen* to be born at this particular time, but at a definite "time appointed of the father," that is, God Himself. What "time"? The time previously designated as the time to "finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy" (Dan. 9:24). "The Messiah the Prince" was to play a most conspicuous part in all this. And who is the Messiah but Jesus the Christ (See John 1:41)? The fullness of the time appointed of the Father, and designated by Him, having come, "the Most Holy" was "anointed," which was apostolically styled "Thy Holy Child Jesus, whom Thou hast anointed" (Acts 4:27). This was "that Holy Thing" that was born of Mary as the result of the Holy Spirit coming upon her, and the power of the Highest overshadowing her (Luke 1:35). God's Son, having been born of a

woman, Mary; when the fullness of the appointed time arrived, God sent Him forth by the anointing of the Holy Spirit at His baptism, as previously pointed out.

If God appointed the time for Jesus to be born, and yet Joseph was His father, then there was a miraculous begetting without question, despite all remonstrances we have heard against it. For how could Jesus have been begotten of Joseph *at the right time*, "the time appointed of the Father," if there was no overruling Providence to regulate the time of the begetting? This "time" element, along with others mentioned in Gal. 4:4, is an important factor in the study of this subject.

THE GENEALOGIES

It is said that there are insuperable difficulties in the two genealogies of Matthew and Luke as we have them. This depends upon circumstances. If both are taken to be the genealogy of the same person along the same line, then we admit that the genealogical difficulty is not inconsiderable. But if one is the genealogy of Jesus through Joseph, the putative father of Jesus, and the other His genealogy through Mary, His mother, the difficulty is considerably reduced. When it is said by Unitarians and others that Mary was not of the tribe of Judah, of the house of David, we ask, Why not? The Authorized Version says that the angel Gabriel was sent to "a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David." The passage in Luke 1:26, 27, may without violence be read thus: "The angel Gabriel was sent of God . . . to a virgin (espoused to a man whose name was Joseph), of the house of David," thus leaving the main thought that Mary was of the house of David, which the genealogy of Mary as given in Luke also sets forth. The phrase, "espoused to a man whose name was Joseph," is thrown in as an explanatory statement. We do not question that Joseph was of the house of David. Thus both Joseph, the "supposed" father of Jesus, and Mary, His mother, were of the house of David. We must also note the words of the angel to Mary, "And the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David" (Luke 1:32). Remember, this was spoken to Mary. It would be a most egregious piece of stupidity and self-stultification for the historian to write a genealogy of Jesus which was a gross fabrication with not a single fact to establish its correctness. *These genealogies existed as far back as it is possible to trace the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.* They were demonstrably an integral part of those Gospels before the middle of the second century, and the facts they profess to narrate concerning the begetting of Jesus were from the very earliest post-apostolic times deeply impressed upon the consciousness of the Christians of that period. Cast out the genealogies, and the Gospels to which they belong go with them. Structurally, logically and chronologically they are bound up with the documents of which they have from the very first formed an integral part.

We note that the genealogy by Matthew, beginning with Abraham, and ending with Joseph, says that each "begat" the one following, thus: "Abraham begat Isaac; . . . and Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ" (chapter 1:2-16). It will be observed at verse 16 that it does not read, "And Joseph begat Jesus." The genealogy by Luke reads as follows: "And Jesus . . . being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was of Heli, which was of Adam, which was of God" (chapter 2:23-38). When it is said that Adam was (the son) "of God," it is evident to those who are familiar with the Bible account of the creation that Adam could not be "the son of God" in the same way in which Seth was "the son of Adam." Seth was begotten by Adam in the ordinary course of generation, but "God *formed man* out of the dust of the ground" (Gen. 2:7). And He formed Him out of the virgin soil which had not yet been tilled, and upon which as yet no rain had fallen. Adam was "a figure" (type) of "Him that was to come" (Rom. 5:14). God "made" (caused to be) both "the first man Adam," and "the last Adam" (1 Cor. 15:45). God "made" them both, the first man of the virgin soil as a figure, and the last Man of a virgin woman as the One that was to come.

In the beginning, when God was entering upon the work of bringing into being the multifarious forms that were to appear upon the earth, the Spirit of God was moving (Leeser, waving) upon the face of the deep; and thus again, when He was about to bring into being the second Man (1 Cor. 15:45), the Spirit of God hovered upon and overshadowed the virgin in Israel out of whose substance the second Man was to be "prepared" (Luke 1:35; Heb. 10:5).

The genealogy by Matthew, which speaks of one begetting another, is that of Jesus through Joseph, while Luke's genealogy, which says that one was "of" the other, is that of Jesus through Mary. Neither says that Jesus was begotten of Joseph. Both Matthew and Luke attribute the begetting of Jesus to God through the agency of the Holy Spirit.

One writer quoted the words of Matt. 1:16, "And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ"; remarking thereon that "of whom" means, "that is, of Joseph and Mary was born Jesus," etc. Is the phrase "of whom" in the Greek plural or singular? We shall see. In Matt. 1:16 it is *ek hees*, which is singular, and the pronoun *hees* is in the feminine gender. We have a like phrase in the English in Rom. 9:5, "Of whom Christ came," etc. "Of whom" here is from *ex hoon*, which is plural. From these premises we see that the singular pronoun *hees* in Matt. 1:16 finds its antecedent in Mary, and not in Joseph and Mary jointly. Every German translation we have, Luther, Elberfeld, and Reinhardt, says, *von welcher*,

which is in the feminine gender and singular number. The plural would be *von welchen*.

Another matter in connection with the genealogy in Matthew which claims our attention is that Joseph was a descendant of Jeconiah (Matt. 1:11, 12), who was pronounced childless of God. "Thus saith the Lord, Write this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days; for *no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah*" (Jer. 22:30). The Lord had said of him, "As I live, saith the Lord, though Coniah, the son of Jehioakim king of Judah, were the signet upon my right hand, yet would I pluck thee from thence" (verse 24). Even though Joseph had been the fleshly father of Jesus, in view of the disability divinely placed upon Jeconiah and his posterity, his son could not sit upon the throne of David, and rule in Judah. The reason why the Lord rejected Jeconiah is to be found in his father Jehoiakim, who destroyed the roll containing the words which Jeremiah had written at the Lord's command (Jer. 36:1-4). He cut the roll with a penknife and threw it into the fire on the hearth of his winter residence (verses 20-23). And not content with this, the king sought to take Baruch the scribe and Jeremiah the prophet, but the Lord prevented this by hiding them (verse 26). It was on account of this act that God said to Jehoiakim, "*He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David; and his dead body shall be cast out in the day to the heat, and in the night to the frost*" (verse 30).

It is a serious matter to mutilate and destroy the record containing the words of God. If God would cut off the sons of Jehoiakim from sitting on the throne of David because their father had attempted to destroy His words, it is no less serious today to mutilate the word of God. We find that God all along jealously guarded the integrity of His word. Jesus said when He "testified these things in the churches," "If any man shall add to these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book [or tree] of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book" (Rev. 22:16, 18, 19). If to mutilate and destroy the book of God in the days of Jehoiakim forever forfeited the right to reign on the throne of David, it will do no less to take from the divine record now, as believers in the human paternity have done from the days of Cerdo, Carpocrates, and Marcion down to the present time. Let us not lose sight of the fact that Joseph, being a descendant of Jehoiakim and Jeconiah, could not beget a son who would have the right to sit upon the throne of David.

The genealogy by Matthew comes down from David through Solomon, while that by Luke comes down through another son of David, namely, Nathan, next older than Solomon. It is not cer-

tain that the two names Salathiel and Zerubbabel, and occurring in Matt. 1:12, 13, and Luke 3:27, refer to the same persons, or that the two lines of Matthew and Luke converge in them. Salathiel in Matthew was the son of Jeconias, while the father of Luke's Salathiel was Neri; and the son of Zerubbabel in Matthew was Abiud, while the son of Zerubbabel in Luke was Rhesa. It appears to us as a coincidence that these two names should be found in such proximity in the two records. Zerubbabel means "a shoot of Babylon," and this name would be given to more persons than one who were born during the captivity.

ANTICHRIST

Several writers on the human paternity either cite or refer their readers to 1 John 4:1-3: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God, and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." Doubtless the object of such citation or reference is two-fold, viz.,

1. To show that the doctrine of the divine begettal of Jesus is out of accord with what is contemplated by the term, "Come in the flesh," and

2. That this doctrine originated with "that spirit of antichrist."

If this conclusion is correct, then it must be at once apparent that a very serious issue is raised, which creates an extremely awkward situation. Then either those who hold and teach the divine begettal of Jesus are antichrist, or else it is they who advocate the human paternity. In view of this there can be no fellowship between those who hold these antagonistic views; and, upon the hypothesis that there is no concord between Christ and antichrist (11 Cor. 6:15), a separation between the holders of the two views would suggest itself as the only consistent course. Yet we know that there are believers in the human paternity in different religious bodies who, notwithstanding their views upon this matter, continue in the communion of those whose teaching upon this question they regard as antichristian. We repeat, this raises a serious issue.

However, before we resort to drastic measures, let us calmly view the situation. It cannot justly be charged against those who accept the record of Matthew and Luke regarding the begettal and birth of Jesus, that they deny "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." What is it to deny this? It is the doctrine of Gnosticism, which began to be taught in its incipient form during the life time of the apostles, especially John, who outlived the rest. This doctrine regarded Christ as a spiritual emanation from God and

denied that He ever had any material, tangible existence. It denied altogether His birth of a woman, regarding Him as a spirit which had come from heaven, and returned thence. With Marcion, above referred to, it took the form that the person Jesus was begotten of Joseph and born of Mary, while Christ came down from heaven at Jesus' baptism, and when Jesus was arrested Christ forsook Him, and returned to heaven, leaving Jesus to die an ignominious death, never to rise again. Some of the Gnostics, even in the days of the apostles, entirely denied human birth and corporeality to Jesus; and it was this that drew forth the language in I John 4:1-3; II John 7-10, and also the apostle Paul's reference to the "oppositions of science [Greek, *gnosis*, knowledge] falsely so-called" (I Tim. 6:20). This, and not the divine begetting of Jesus, and His birth of a human mother, was the matter which the apostles condemned as "the spirit of antichrist," and against which they so earnestly warned. Marcion's *Evangelion*, which was a mutilation of Luke's Gospel, began with the words, "In the fifteenth year of Emperor Tiberius God came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee."

In view of the foregoing facts we say, either let the charge of teaching or holding antichristian doctrine be proved; and then let those who make it separate themselves from those who are committed to antichrist; or else let them be more careful and consistent in the use and application of Scripture.

THOU ART MY SON

This language, first used by David in Psalm 2:7, is applied to the Lord Jesus in Acts 13:33; Heb. 1:5; 5:5. It is evident that the "Son" here referred to was such because He had been "begotten" of the Speaker, which was "God." The words, "I have begotten thee," had their fulfillment in the "raising up" of the Lord Jesus, similarly as when a man is said to "raise up seed to his brother" (Luke 20:28).

It is taught in this chapter that the "Son" was the latter-day medium of communication between God and men (verse 1). "Hath in these last days spoken unto us by a Son" (or Son-wise.—verse 2). This Son "by Himself purged our sins," and then "sat down [or became established] at the right hand of the Majesty on high" (verse 3). It is further set forth that "He was made so much better than the angels" (verse 4). What is meant by this it is not difficult to see, for the explanation is made, "As He hath obtained a more excellent name than they." In what way did the Son obtain this more excellent name? It was "by inheritance." He was also "appointed heir of all things" (verse 2). To inherit is to take by descent. Christ descended from God, and is the Heir; others can at best be "joint-heirs" with Christ (Rom. 8:17). Christ is "the Heir" because He is "the Son" (Luke 20:13, 14). Then we read, "For unto which of the angels said He at any time,

Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee; and again, I will be a Father unto Him, and He shall be unto me a Son"? (Heb. 1:5). This question is equivalent to an affirmation, "To none of the angels said He at any time, Thou art my Son."

We are referred to Job 38:7, as showing that the angels are styled "sons of God." However, God never said to any of them, "Thou art my Son," for the obvious reason that He could not say to them as He said to Jesus, "Today have I begotten thee." Though the angels may, through obedience, have passed from the lower to the higher nature, yet there is a sense in which the Son has "a more excellent name" than they. Owing to His having been begotten of God, He is what they are not—God's "Son," and it is from this fact that "He inherited the more excellent name" than they. As to nature, we have every reason to believe that the angels are deathless, for others shall "die no more," being "equal unto the angels" (Luke 20:36). Jesus is "alive for evermore" (Rev. 1:18), and "death hath no more dominion over Him" (Rom. 6:9). Hence Jesus did not obtain a nature which is "more excellent" or higher than that of the angels. His excellency must therefore be one of rank. And why? Because it is "by inheritance." From whom? From God, who begat Him, and whose Son He is. While God said to the Son, "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool" (Heb. 1:13), the angels are only "ministering [or serving] spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation" (verse 14); and "angels and authorities and powers" have been made subject to the Son (1 Peter 3:22). Jesus could in the past send His "angel" to bear messages to the churches (Rev. 1:1; 22:16). The Son will come in the glory of His Father "with His angels" (Matt. 16:27), and will "send forth His angels" in the epoch of the judgment, when they will perform important services (Matt. 13:41, 42). When the first begotten is again brought into the habitable, He saith, "Let all the angels of God worship Him" (Heb. 1:6). By so much has the Son by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than the angels.

THE DISPUTERS OF THIS WORLD

The disputers of this world (1 Cor. 1:20) have ever and again exercised their critical powers upon the word of God, and sought to cast odium upon certain portions that did not suit their notions, or threw these out entirely. There were Cerdo, Cerinthus, Carpocrates, and Marcion, in the second century, who between them cast out all the Gospels except either Matthew or Luke, and these, as competent witnesses testified, "mutilated" until mere "fragments" remained; and also either threw out the Epistles of Paul entirely, or "dismembered" them almost beyond recognition; then a Celsus in the third century; a Socinus in the fifteenth century, who claimed the Bible was only "partly inspired," and lastly,

the Tubingen School of Higher Critics, represented by such men as Ferdinand Christian Baur, and others, who have ruled out as unauthentic all the New Testament books except Romans, I and II Corinthians, and Galatians. This movement has resulted in the production of what is styled the "Polychrome Bible," a Bible of many colors, in which the degree or absence of inspiration, according to the standard set by the Higher Critics, is indicated by different colors. Such has been the lot of the New Testament from its earliest existence until now. But "the word of the Lord endureth for ever"; and though it has passed through the furnace of destructive criticism, higher and lower, it has come through without the smell of fire upon it. The earlier critics passed away one after the other; their bodies have assimilated with their mother dust, and their literary productions have gone into deserved oblivion, except such portions of them as are preserved in the works of the men who wrote in defense of the Scriptures as we have them today.

"BORN WITHOUT A HUMAN FATHER"

We are asked to furnish "just one passage from the law and the prophets which proves that the Christ was to be born without a human father," and even a cash prize is offered as a stimulus to produce such proof. We are not interested in this cash prize, but we are most deeply interested in the evidence of the law and the prophets, and gladly call attention to the passages which prove beyond a question that Christ was to be born without a human father.

There are two lines of testimony which very clearly and conclusively prove the point called for.

1. There are those passages which say that God would have a Son by begetting. "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee" (Psalm 2:6). "I will be His Father, and He shall be my Son" (II Sam. 7:14).

2. The other line is that which says God would raise up unto Israel "a Prophet," and to David "a righteous Branch" (Deut. 18:15-18); Isa. 11:1; Jer. 23:5).

The sonship in the first line is based absolutely upon the divine begetting without a human father. "Thou art *my* Son; this day have I begotten thee." The apostle Paul said this promise was fulfilled in the raising up of Jesus (Acts 13:33). God could not have *this* Son without begetting Him, and had He been begotten of a human father, He would not have been the Son of God as contemplated in the promise in Psalm 2:6. Having been begotten of God, He was born without a human father, and is "Jesus Christ the Son of the Father" (II John 3); or, "the Son of God, Jesus Christ" (II Cor. 1:19).

The second line of passages, in perfect harmony with the first, says that God would "raise up" Christ. What is meant by this

raising up? One way of raising up as used in Scripture, and with which the people of Israel were perfectly familiar, is to beget children. In Deut. 25:5-7 a man was to marry his brother's childless widow in order to "raise up unto his brother a name in Israel." This was called "raising up seed unto his brother" (Matt. 22:24; Luke 20:28). This raising up was done by begettal. Now when God would raise up a Son, a Prophet, a Branch, in the person of Jesus, how would He do this? By begettal, as He very pertinently and directly said. Did He beget a child? The testimony says that He did (Matt. 1:20). Was the one so begotten called the Son of God? He was (Luke 1:32, 35). "Unto you God, having raised up His Son Jesus, sent Him to bless you in turning away every one of you from his iniquities" (Acts 3:26). "The God of our fathers raised up His Son Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree" (chapter 5:30). "Of this man's seed [David's] hath God according to His promise raised unto Israel a Savior, Jesus" (chapter 13:23). "And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that He hath raised up Jesus [R. V.]; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee" (chapter 13:32, 33). Here the apostle Paul, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, applied the raising up of Jesus directly to the divine begettal, and cited Psalm 2:6 to prove the correctness of the application. And note with care: The testimony does not say that He would raise Him up either by anointing or resurrection, and nowhere is it stated that it was so done. It was done by begettal; and it was upon the basis of such begettal that God owned Jesus as His "Son."

The promise, "I will be His Father, and He shall be my Son" (11 Sam. 7:14), was fulfilled in Christ (Heb. 1:5), and was expressive of God's set purpose and intention and, like many other promises contained in holy writ, was not contingent upon what man would do. When He said, "I will make a new covenant" (Jer. 31:31-34); or, "I create new heavens and a new earth" (Isa. 65:17), He simply declared what was in His mind and purpose to do.

The Prophet, the Seed, the Branch, whom God would raise up, was to be brought into being by the exercise of the sovereign will and power of God. "I will raise Him up."

As under the statute in Deut. 25:6, 7, one person "raised up seed" to another by begetting a son, so God raised up Jesus by divine begettal. The seed raised up under that law served to continue His Father's name. "His name shall be as a son to continue His Father's name forever" (Psalm 72:5, margin). Thus by divine begettal did God "raise up an horn of salvation in the house of His servant David" (Luke 1:69). As God now of "His own will begets children to Himself by the word of truth" (James 1:18), so of His own will He beget Jesus in a virgin in Israel,

of the "brethren" of Moses, by the power of His Spirit (Matt. 1:20; Luke 1:35).

While God intimated that He would raise up the Prophet, the Branch, of Moses' brethren, He did not state by what means, in what manner, or at what time He would put this promise into execution. However, it is evident from the language dealing with this matter that He would not delegate the raising up of this person to anyone else, but would do it Himself. "I will raise Him up." But the testimony in other parts of the law and the prophets clearly states that God would have a Son by begetting. "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." Thus was Jesus born without a human father. God was His Father by begetting. The Son so begotten learned obedience, and submitted to God's righteousness in being baptized in order to be made manifest to Israel, whereupon the Father gave Him the public testimony, "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Wherever the Son comes to view, we see that He was conscious of being God's Son, and that God was His Father. He was more than an adopted Son. He was His begotten Son, the "only begotten." And this was in fulfillment of what God had "promised afore by His prophets in the holy Scriptures" (Rom. 1:2).

THE FIRST MAN, AND THE SECOND MAN

We direct special attention to Adam and Christ, referred to by the apostle Paul as "the first man Adam," and "the last Adam," respectively (1 Cor. 15:45). It will be observed by the careful reader that both the first man and the last man were "made." The first man was formed of the virgin dust of the ground; the breath of life was breathed into his nostrils, and he became a living soul (Gen. 2:7). How much time the process of his creation consumed has not been revealed. But it is a fact that the first man owed his existence to the will and creative energy of God; wherefore he is also styled a "son of God" (Luke 3:38).

Adam being the first man, he was before all other men, at the head and front of a series of men of the same kind and nature with himself. However, neither he nor those descended from him were the ultimate of what God intended man to be. His aim was to have a man and a race of a higher origin and nature; and so we read that Adam was "a figure [or type] of Him that was to come" (Rom. 5:14). This coming one manifestly is the apostle's "second man" referred to in 1 Cor. 15:45.

That the second man did not ante-date the first is a fact too patent to require proof. He, too, was "made," not before, nor even when, the first was made, but "afterward." As in the case of the first man, so with the second, there was a process by which He was made. In this process there were several stages. We note that the second man, instead of being "made" out of the earth, as was the first, was brought into being in an entirely different man-

ner, that is, by begettal. In this begettal the moving factor was not the will of man, nor was the flesh the actor. The will of God, in conformity with the divine purpose conceived ages before to "raise up" a new man, was the impelling motive; and the Holy Spirit, coming from God, was the means by which that will and purpose was put into execution in the begettal in a virgin woman, without the intervention of man, of the child Jesus. This was the first act in the process of making the second man.

The next step was the anointing of Jesus with the Holy Spirit in connection with His baptism in the river Jordan (Matt. 3:16; Acts 10:38). The object of this impartation of the Spirit was to make Him "of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord" (Isa. 11:2, 3). This, along with His divine begettal, enabled Him at once to quickly discern the will of God and do it, so that He could say, "The Father hath not left me alone, for I do always those things that please Him" (John 8:29). His mind was characterized by deep spirituality, caused both by His divine begettal, and the indwelling of the Spirit.

The third and last step in the making of the second man was His exaltation to the divine nature, the change of His body from the mortal state to the immortal. He is now the finished product of "the second man, the Lord from heaven." He was "from heaven," first in His begettal; second, in His anointing with the divine Spirit, and lastly, in His immortalization.

WHY WAS JESUS CALLED THE SON OF GOD?

When the angel Gabriel announced to Mary that she should bear a Son who should be called "the Son of the highest" (Luke 1:30-32), she said in surprise and astonishment, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" (verse 34). Thereupon the angel informed her, "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (verse 35).

The idea has been advanced that the Holy Spirit coming upon Mary, and the power of the Highest overshadowing her, so far from being *the cause* of the begettal, was *an accompaniment* of it; that Jesus was begotten of Joseph; that Mary, from the moment of conception, was under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and thus constantly in a state of mind which would serve as a wholesome prenatal influence, and that, when the child Jesus was born, the latter had "two births at once," one caused by natural begettal, and the other by the Spirit of God. We have no doubt of the overshadowing presence of the Holy Spirit with Mary from the conception until the birth of the child; but the passage under consideration does not teach this. When Mary said, "How shall this be [that is, the conception referred to by the angel at verse 31], seeing I know not a man?" the angel in the most direct man-

ner possible explained to her "how" this should be, by referring to the presence and overshadowing power of the Holy Spirit. There is no hint or suggestion in this language that this child was to be begotten by a man; but because the Holy Spirit should come upon her, and the power of the Highest should overshadow her, "therefore," on this account, or for this reason, the child to be born of her should be called the Son of God.

However, let us test the theory by the facts related in this chapter. If the presence of the Holy Spirit before birth was the reason why this child should be called "THE SON OF GOD," then John the Baptist, who was born six months before Jesus, was in every way as much the Son of God as was Jesus. Not only do we read that Elizabeth, John's mother, was "filled with the Holy Spirit" (verse 41), but it was said by the angel to Zachariah, that John should be "filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb" (verse 15). Whatever "prenatal influence" there was in the case of Jesus, apart from His begetting, to constitute Him the Son of God, or to have "two births at once," the same prenatal influence was present in the case of John; from which it would follow that John also had "two births at once," and was therefore as much the Son of God as Jesus could possibly have been.

After the angel gave to Mary a satisfactory answer as to "how this should be," he stated that Elizabeth would give birth to a child in her old age, and explained that "with God nothing shall be impossible" (verse 37). Then Mary reverently and submissively said, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word" (verse 38). Let it be borne in mind that Mary had not known a man, being only "espoused," and not yet married, to Joseph (verse 27). Mary was at liberty, so far as Joseph was concerned, to make the journey to Elizabeth's home, and remain with her "about three months" (verse 56).

Was Mary with child during this time? The evidence shows that she was. After Mary's arrival, Elizabeth, full of the Holy Spirit, said to her, "Blessed art thou among women, and blessed be the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?" (verses 42, 43). The fruit of Mary's womb, a virgin who had not known a man, could not be blessed unless she had "conceived" in accordance with the angel's word. Elizabeth further said, "And blessed is she that believed; for there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord" (verse 45). Whereupon Mary herself broke forth, magnifying the Lord, and saying, "*For He that is mighty hath done to me great things; and holy is His name*" (verse 49). All of which shows that, although Joseph and Mary were not yet married during the visit of Mary with Elizabeth, Mary was with child, thus confirming the testimony of Matthew, who says that "before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 1:18, 20).

The theory that Jesus was the Son of God, not by Holy Spirit begetting, but by the Holy Spirit's presence at and after begetting by Joseph, while it is ingenious, is not true, being contradicted by the facts related in the testimony of Luke, and supported by Matthew. How much better it is to follow the example of Mary to "believe" what was made known to her, and the more so inasmuch as there has been since then "a performance of those things which were told her of the Lord" (Luke 1:45).

IS CORRECT BELIEF UPON THE SONSHIP OF JESUS IMPORTANT?

It is said by some that it is not important what one believes regarding the sonship of Jesus, and that salvation does not depend upon one's belief upon this question one way or the other.

The relative importance of a doctrine taught in the Scriptures may be determined by the place assigned to it by the authorized teachers, the position it occupies in the divine plan, and the things it does for those who accept and believe it. Applying this rule to the doctrine of the divine paternity of Jesus, we see at once that it is of the utmost importance. The fact that it is so clearly set forth in the testimony which is unimpeachable, and so often stated and re-stated throughout the entire New Testament, is proof that it was submitted for acceptance and belief. But this is not all. We find that the doctrine that Jesus is the Son of God was preached by the apostle Paul at the very threshold of his public ministry. It is related that immediately after his conversion, while he was with the disciples at Damascus, "straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that He is the Son of God" (Acts 9:20).

To the brethren at Corinth he wrote, some years later, "For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by us, even by me and Silvanus and Timotheus, was not yea and nay, but in Him was yea" (II Cor. 1:19).

The brethren at Thessalonica were reminded by the apostle of the entrance of the gospel among them, "For they themselves show of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for His Son from heaven" (I Thess. 1:9, 10).

From all this we see that this doctrine of the divine sonship of Jesus entered fundamentally into the apostolic preaching. Now, the proposition, "Jesus is the Son of God," could not fail to impress and convey to those who heard it, certain ideas. That such belief was an important factor in their conversion, is clear from the last reference. As a result of such preaching those persons were "turned from idols to God." Their conversion had a two-fold object, viz., (a) "to serve the living and true God"; and (b) "to wait for His Son from heaven." Being turned from idols, we see that they were Gentiles, and as such devoid of the knowledge of the true God. Being turned to the true and living God, it is manifest that they were instructed concerning Him to see the difference

between the living God and their lifeless idols; and in turning in order to render service to Him, they were instructed not only what constituted such service, but also what returns it would bring in the way of rewards.

Likewise they were instructed that the living and true God had a Son, that this Son had died and been raised from the dead, that He was in heaven, and would return from thence, as also the object of His return. All this entered into the apostolic preaching at the very threshold of the activities of those men, at Damascus, Corinth, Thessalonica, "in every place."

That such preaching was done in order to be believed, is clear from the fact that it was done. There is an array of testimony relating to this point which we shall consider.

One of the objects in the composition of the Gospel according to John was to induce the belief that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," the express purpose of such belief being, "that believing ye might have life through His name" (John 20:30, 31). This same author later inculcated the necessity for such belief.

"And this is His commandment, that we should believe on the name of His Son, Jesus Christ, and love one another" (1 John 3:23).

"Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" (chapter 5:5). Also at verse 10 the necessity for such belief is taught; and the basis for such belief is "the record that God gave of His Son."

The belief that Jesus is the Son of God is to be followed by confession. "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God" (chapter 5:14). We have upon record a number of such confessions. Peter upon two occasions confessed that Jesus was "the Son of God" (Matt. 14:33; 16:16). The last of those confessions was on behalf of the other apostles, as well as on his own behalf, and Jesus pronounced him "blessed" because of the knowledge of the truth embodied in that confession. The same confession is contained in John 6:69. Also Martha, the sister of Mary and Lazarus, confessed this great truth. "I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world" (John 11:27).

Next we note briefly the benefits that would accrue to those believing and holding this truth.

(a) It is said of the one confessing that "Jesus is the Son of God," that "God dwelleth in him, and he in God."

(b) Eternal life is predicated upon the acceptance of this truth. "These signs are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, and that believing ye might have life through His name."

"He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made Him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of His Son. And this is

the record that God hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye might know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God" (1 John 5:9-13).

Another advantage to flow from the apprehension of this truth is stated in these words, "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" (1 John 5:5). The world knew Him not who was (and is) the Son of God, and to believe this truth which God caused to be placed into the record of His Son, was to overcome the world.

That these truths were inculcated in the early believers at the beginning of their Christian lives is clearly set forth in the words of John, "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father. Let that therefore abide in you *which ye have heard from the beginning*. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye shall continue in the Son, and in the Father" (1 John 2:22-24). This "beginning" was the beginning of their Christian life when they by faith and obedience became related to God through His Son Jesus Christ. We have this phrase in Paul's letter to the Philippians: "Now ye Philippians know also that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me as concerning giving and receiving" (Phil. 4:15). This "beginning" was the commencement of the proclamation of the gospel in the parts mentioned.

A doctrine which was so scrupulously and persistently preached by the emissaries of the Son of God; so necessary to be held and maintained; so confidently believed by the early Christians; so essential to the indwelling of God in them, their overcoming the world, and their obtainment of eternal life, is beyond all question important, necessary, and indispensable. This is the result reached, not by an involved process of reasoning, but by the acceptance of the record which God gave of His Son.

CONCLUSION

The writer has sought to place before the reader as briefly, yet as fully as possible, the evidence, documentary, historical, and biblical, bearing upon the question of the paternity of Jesus, and feels confident that in this he has measurably succeeded. His wish and earnest prayer is that this effort may serve to make Him who is at once the Son of God and the Son of Man appear more lovely, and worthy of the highest possible service.

There is, as the reader will see, an entire absence in this treatise of personality, as well as a desire on the part of the author to avoid all bitterness in the discussion of the matter in hand. Since we

are not discussing men but things, we are not engaged in personal polemical strife; and such controversy as there is, is with wrong conceptions of the divine testimony, or faulty constructions placed upon it. With the motives of those whose ideas we combat we have nothing to do. For aught we know, they may be perfectly sincere in the view they hold. But if wrong, such sincerity will not make erroneous views right, nor in any way change the destructive character of their teaching.

“Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father; to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.” (Rev. 1:5, 6).



