

Birth of the Cell Doctrine By Dan Rhoads As a general rule of thumb, it is recommended to be familiar with the history of one's scientific field, and not merely the contemporary trends of thought.

The use of artificial means of birth control is forbidden in all circumstances because it is in conflict with Natural Law. We wish to focus on the interpretation of Natural Law that currently underlies such official Catholic teaching on sexuality. The main question we want to address can be summed up as follows: We explore this question in detail on a separate website www. There are at present two main interpretations of Natural Law. The assumptions underlying these interpretations are often hidden and the argumentation followed rather complex. These will clearly show the difference between them and serve as portals for more detailed documentation. God the Creator has clearly laid down his immutable intention in the way things are made. God has created human beings in his own image so that they can creatively shape their world. The reason why the artificial prevention of births is immoral is written into the very nature of the sexual organs and the marital act itself. The sex organs were made by God to reproduce the human race. Only when husband and wife unite naturally is the union of sperm possible. Therefore the primary purpose of the marital act is the conception of human life. As a result official Catholic marriage law forbids the use of contraceptives by married couples, homosexual intimacy, artificial insemination and so on. Transgressions are called intrinsically wrong. Implications Men and women are called upon to discern what is right and wrong within the complex and changing circumstances of their lives. For instance, within the overall situation of maintaining a loving relationship between husband and wife and providing a secure upbringing for children, artificial birth control may be discerned to be the right responsible choice. The same applies to other circumstances, such as a loving relationship between homosexuals and the responsible use of medical advances. Sources The physical interpretation of Natural Law adhered to by present-day Catholic authorities derives from scholastic philosophy and theology. However it has been re-formulated by modern theologians.

Chapter 2 : Immaculate Conception - Wikipedia

Birth of a Bush doctrine? The president stakes out a claim of enormous ambition in Iraq and beyond Feb 27th | WASHINGTON, DC. Add this article to your reading list by clicking this button.

Lewis had some insights to that issue! Behold, a virgin will be with child and bear a son, and she will call His name Immanuel. The allocation of space to this topic is limited to a single paragraph in Mere Christianity and less than four pages in Miracles. Yet, in spite of the brevity with which Lewis handles the topic, the problem is introduced, clarified, and resolved brilliantly. It is necessary to deal with the passage itself as it appears and is to be interpreted in Isaiah 7: It is necessary to establish the identity of the promised child. Once the background information is established, it is necessary to consider the importance of establishing the veracity of the virgin birth of Christ. Two key elements must be addressed. First, the reliability of the Bible is at stake when we question whether its prophecies are trustworthy. If it can be established that there was no virgin birth, than the entire text of the Bible, both Old and New Testaments, loses credibility. Second, the very nature of Christ is dependent on His virgin birth. Finally, it is necessary to consider the specific objections raised against the virgin birth that Lewis responded to. He dealt with two major objections. Identity of the promised child in Isaiah 7: If we consider the broad context of chapters we find three passages referring to the birth of a promised child 7: The three appear to be very closely related and use similar Hebrew expressions. This suggests that the two verses may be referring to the same event. Although, the identity of the immediate fulfillment is debatable, the fact of an immediate fulfillment is not. There is little debate that this is a prophecy of the coming messiah. Oswalt is quick to point to the fact that this child of 9: There are seven passages where the exact word used by Isaiah is used in the O. If that is so, much of the New Testament claim for the identity of Jesus must be discarded. The Importance of the Virgin Birth Having established the foundational issues of interpreting Isaiah 7: Does it make any difference whether Jesus was born of a virgin or not? It is a big deal. If Jesus was not born of a virgin then the Bible must be dismissed as unreliable. But can a book with mistakes be considered inerrant? How does Lewis weigh in on the topic? There appears to be some controversy as to whether Lewis considered the Bible to be inerrant. It may be negotiable among the liberal theologians, for whom the Bible need not be inerrant nor inspired, but the doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ is non-negotiable for the conservative believer. Either God is God and is able to predict the future through His prophets, or he is not God. Either God is perfect and inerrant himself and thus His word is inerrant, or He is not. Will you please get it quite clear that this has nothing to do with the fact that when Christ was born on earth as a man, that man was the son of a virgin? We are not now thinking about the Virgin Birth. We are thinking about something that happened before Nature was created at all, before time began. While this is controversial, it is undeniable that much of the father is transferred to the child in the fertilization process. That time He was creating not simply a man but the Man who was to be Himself: The whole soiled and wear universe quivered at this direct injection of essential life— direct, uncontaminated, not drained through all the crowded history of Nature. This is precisely what the Apostle Paul argued in his letter to the Romans chapter 5. The world, contaminated and fallen, needed a fresh start with a new creation that did not proceed from the loins of the first Adam. Hence, Adam was bypassed in one of the most incredible miracles in human history. The denial of the virgin birth is the denial of the second Adam and thus the denial of the very divine nature of Christ that would redeem mankind. Objections to the Virgin Birth While there are numerous objections to the virgin birth of Jesus, Lewis responded to what he considered the two most important ones. First, he dealt with the ethical objection which centered on the issue of a deity involving himself sexually with a human. Second, Lewis responded to the scientific arguments for the impossibility of procreation without intercourse. Ethical Objection In dealing with the ethical objection, Lewis is curt and dismisses it rather strongly. However, he responds by arguing that God is involved in the miracle of life wherever it occurs, whether among humans or even the animal kingdom. Therefore, if the intervention with Mary is considered adultery, then God must be accused of adultery with all women and even animals. Such people seem to have an idea that belief in miracles arose at a period when men were so ignorant of the course of nature that they did not perceive a miracle to be

contrary to it. Even they knew that virgins could not be pregnant. It is the instrument by which He normally creates man—no woman ever conceived a child—without Him. He does it this time without a line of human ancestors: Lewis tackles the virgin birth of Christ with the same clarity and strong rational arguments typical of his dealings with other controversial and difficult topics. Although Lewis deals with it rather briefly, the problem is introduced, clarified, and resolved brilliantly. Lewis, *Miracles* San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, , Zondervan, , Lewis, *Mere Christianity* San Francisco:

Chapter 3 : What is false doctrine?

Hoover Press: Zelnick/Israel hzeliu ch2 Mp_19 rev1 page 19 Birth of a Doctrine 19 lapse by dei-ning the "parameters" for resolving outstanding is-

Matthew 1 18 Now the birth of Jesus the Messiah took place in this way. When his mother Mary had been engaged to Joseph, but before they lived together, she was found to be with child from the Holy Spirit. Luke 1 26 In the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent by God to a town in Galilee called Nazareth, 27 to a virgin engaged to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David. The Lord is with you. In this vignette the prophet Isaiah informs King Ahaz that his enemies will be destroyed before a child born to a young woman in his retinue is old enough "to refuse evil and know good;" this child, he says, will be named Immanuel, "God is with us," because God is with Israel: Some, pointing out that the Greek word translated as "descendant" in some Bibles is sperma, which literally means "seed", and interpreting this as indicating descent through the male line, [29] take "descended from David according to the flesh" to mean that Joseph, a descendant of David, was the physical father of Jesus, thus denying the virgin birth of Jesus, others take it as indicating that Mary was also a descendant of David. Some scholars see this passage as reflecting a negative view of the developing virgin birth stories and their variant genealogies. The voice of Gabriel or Jesus consoled her and told her that God miraculously provides water to drink and dates to eat. Jesus in Islam The Islamic faith echoed some strands within Christian tradition that Mary or Maryam was a literal virgin when Jesus was conceived. The most detailed account of the annunciation and birth of Jesus is provided in Surah 3 Al Imran and 19 Maryam of the Quran where the story is narrated that God Allah sent an angel to announce that Maryam could shortly expect to bear a son, despite being a virgin. In the first instance, the bearer of the news who is believed by most Muslims to be the archangel Gabriel, delivered the news in 3: There are at least two rival explanations for the "double attestation" of Matthew and Luke regarding the virgin birth of Jesus: Both were aware of prophecies concerning a virgin birth and Bethlehem, and therefore these elements of their stories match. But each author wove these prophecies into an overall narrative in a different way. For example, both authors had to explain how Jesus was born in Bethlehem when he was known to be from Nazareth as mentioned in all four gospels and each came up with an independent explanation. It was unknown, or considered unimportant, in wide areas of early Christian belief the Pauline and Johannine sectors, for example. But from the third century onwards it became a firm component of the Christian creeds and theological christologies. The confession of faith in Jesus, the Son of God, the Lord, is independent of the virgin birth, and is not based on it. McKenzie notes that, if these two narratives were missing from the New Testament, "there would be no biblical mention of the virgin birth". He adds, "the event is unusual enough for one to wonder why an author who knew of it would not mention it. But it has always struck scholars as odd that the tradition which surely would be an important thing to know! Such an argument from silence cannot be determinative, but it is an important consideration for people who see the virgin birth as a feature created within the early traditions about Jesus rather than a historical occurrence. Those who doubt the historicity of the virgin birth argue that it was created by the early church as a way of honoring the coming of Jesus as the Son of God or of explaining the idea of God becoming flesh. Miraculous human birth stories are common in biblical tradition, going back to Abraham and Sarah Gen. The mother of Heracles, for instance, was said to have been impregnated by Zeus Diodorus Siculus, , 1â€” Denial of the virgin birth of Jesus Throughout Christian history a small number of groups have denied the virgin birth. The views of Celsus drew responses from Origen, who considered it a fabricated story. Brown states that the story of Pantera is a fanciful explanation of the birth of Jesus which includes very little historical evidence. The book referred to Pantera, or Pandera, as the father of Jesus. Van Voorst states that the literary origins of Toledot Yeshu cannot be traced with any certainty, and that, given its medieval composition without a fixed form, it is "most unlikely" to contain reliable historical information. Miraculous births Early modern woodcut showing fictionalized portrayal of Justin Martyr In 1st-century Judea, Jewish girls were betrothed around the age of twelve or twelve and a half. However, Justin also says that such pagan stories were given them by Satan, and the stories were

not really virgin births. Among the many traditions associated with Christmas are the construction of cribs and the performance of re-enactments of elements of the story in the Gospels of the birth of Jesus, a tradition started in the 13th century by the Franciscans. One theory is that they did so in order to oppose the existing winter-solstice feast of the *Natalis Solis Invicti* Birthday of the Unconquered Sun by celebrating on that date the birth of the "Sun of Righteousness". Annunciation in Christian art This doctrine of the Virgin Birth is often represented Christian art in terms of the annunciation to Mary by the Archangel Gabriel that she would conceive a child to be born the Son of God , and in Nativity scenes that include the figure of Salome. The Annunciation is one of the most frequently depicted scenes in Western art.

Chapter 4 : Natural Law as the Basis for Doctrine on Birth control - Catholics and Contraception

The virgin birth is an essential doctrine of Christianity: no virgin birth, no Redeemer, no Christianity. 1 The resurrection is the grand miracle. If one can believe the resurrection other miracles are child's play.

Stewart 2nd John 1: He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. Doctrines are composed of words. Thus words are critically important. God deliver us from deeper-life theologians who can quote the Bible, dissect it and expound upon it, but they never share the gospel with their neighbors and let the world die and go to Hell. On my website ministry, I aim to encourage everyone to be a soul-winner. Our part is to preach the gospel, sharing the good news of Jesus Christ Who died, was buried and rose again three days later for our sins 1st Corinthians Thus, it is critically important that we never stop ringing the bell of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, including the deity of Jesus, the virgin birth of Christ and His bodily, literal, resurrection from the dead. In an age when psychology is replacing Bible-preaching in our churches, and entertainment is replacing the power of God, the Doctrine of Christ cannot be stressed enough. The foundation has already been laid, so you cannot lay another foundation. The price for your sins have been paid in full. This is like a passenger in a car giving the driver contradictory directions, telling the driver to turn right and left at the same time. Either salvation is by grace or it is by works, but it cannot be both. We learn this truth in Romans But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: All I knew was that I was a sinner and Jesus was the Savior. Rice, I was saved in my early teens. I had never heard of these doctrines, except that Jesus was the only Savior in Whom I needed to trust for salvation, to be forgiven of my sins. But years later when I was first taught these doctrines, I immediately knew they were true and accepted them as facts, because I was already saved and had the Holy Spirit dwelling within. A true believer will accept Biblical teachings; not strongly deny them. But when someone showed me that Jesus was God, I got excited and wanted to learn all I could about my Savior. Jesus is Almighty God! I once spoke with a Catholic man about the deity of Jesus Christ. He immediately told me that he did not believe that Jesus was God. I knew right there that he was as unsaved as the Devil. This is evidenced in John The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus is almighty God!!! And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works. Why would they remove this word anyway? It is not a coincidence that Jesus said in Matthew 4: They removed Calvary, bottomless pit, regeneration, mercyseat, and a whole bunch more! People are starving spiritually from the NIV. The NIV also perverts Philippians 2: It is so tragic and sad. There is a demonic occult connection between all mainstream religions today part 2. The Doctrine of Christ is critically important, exposing every false religion in existence. The best way to expose darkness is to shine the light. The truth is the light! There is much heresy being spread around the internet, denying the Biblical doctrine of the Godhead. Some critics claim that the Trinity has its origins in many ancient pagan religions. But may I remind you that God said in Genesis 1: There is NO feminine aspect of the Godhead. Feminism is rebellion against the masculine authority of the Godhead, the Bible written in masculine gender, the husband, the father, and the man of God. In fact, Isaiah 9: It is imperative as Christians that we contend for the Biblical faith Romans They are both working relentlessly to gather all religions together under one umbrella of a one-world religion. Churchgoers are being led into the New Age doctrines, denying the power thereof 2nd Timothy 3: The true Gospel is a miracle of God John 1: New Age is turning salvation into a manmade experience, a mere feeling, and the truth of all men being guilty sinners deserving of eternal damnation in Hellfire is not mentioned Romans 3: She teaches that a great master and deliverer, a saviour is coming; but she is speaking of the Antichrist. How do I know? Bailey speaks vaguely so as to confuse naive people and make them think that the coming Antichrist is Jesus. Read the Satanic teachings of Alice Bailey for yourself see text photo below. I make an issue of New Age, because it is becoming the foundation of the new evangelicalism new religion in our churches; which is based upon feelings and experiences , instead of the promises of God in the Scriptures. She is of the Devil, denying the deity of Jesus Christ. Concerning the coming Antichrist, the Bible teaches in

Daniel That is exactly what New Age teaches, and the Bible condemns it as a false religion. New Age totally ignores the concept of sin. They totally reject the idea of man being inherently sinful. The Bible testifies of Jesus. She writes in one of her works that: *The Secret Doctrine II*; pg. No one will enter the New Age unless he will take a Luciferian Initiation. Max Lucado has written 2 books per year for over the past 22 years; and he promotes ecumenical unity between Catholics and Protestants, between unbelievers and believers. The Bible teaches for us to divide over truth, instead of uniting by error 2nd Corinthians 6: The elect simply refers to every born-again Christian. There are thousands of websites promoting mind, body and spirit teachings that are completely lacking of the Doctrine of Christ. They are websites published by heathens, psychologists, witches and New Agers. They are all Christ-rejecters, although they may vaguely mention some teachings of Christ to deceive others. Modern psychology is of the Devil. It is the promise of God by which we are saved 2nd Peter 1: That is the same promise found in John 3: Salvation is not a born-again experience nor a feeling that one has been born-again; but rather, being born-again is a miracle of God, where God honors His promise to save those who believe John 1: For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.

Chapter 5 : Apostolic Doctrine - The New Birth, The Oneness of the Godhead

False doctrine is any idea that adds to, takes away from, contradicts, or nullifies the doctrine given in God's Word. For example, any teaching about Jesus that denies His virgin birth is a false doctrine, because it contradicts the clear teaching of Scripture (Matthew).

The Septuagint is older and probably more reliable than the Massoretic text. That text is no longer available. Since it has been shown in Argument 1 that Isa 7: Additionally, the Septuagint was translated from Hebrew to Greek by Jews. I will address this argument in two sections; A Could Messiah have been fathered by a genetic ancestor of King David? B Could Messiah sit on the throne of David even though he was not begotten by a human father? That would make Yeshua the son of Joseph. How can it be said that he is the Son of Yahweh if Yahweh did not father him? Spiritually speaking he is the son of Yahweh just as any other believer would be a son of Yahweh. Sounds good, but it is not the whole truth. First, that would imply the prophets were sons of Yahweh in the same sense that Yeshua is. Yet, consider Mt There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country: And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. Again, he sent other servants more than the first: But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him. When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons. Prior to that, Yahweh the householder sent many servants prophets included who they also killed. Yet, those servants are not referred to as sons. There was only one son sent. Because the householder Yahweh only has one true son Yeshua. However, we know Yahweh brought Adam into being through creation from dust. Therefore, monogenes cannot be understood in that sense. Nor can it be understood in the sense of Yahweh bringing Abel into being through Adam and Eve. This is a reference to Gen This is based on Ps 2: Yahweh hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Additionally, there are several problematic verses that prove Yeshua could not be fathered by a man. After he taught them, he perceived his disciples murmured at his hard sayings. How can Yeshua declare he came down from heaven if he was merely born of Joseph? How can he imply he would ascend back to heaven where he originally came down from? Was there ever a time between his birth and this account in John where he ascended into heaven? If not, that proves he had to have a heavenly origin, not an origin from Joseph. Consider also Jn 3: Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: It comes from two root words. There can only be one conclusion, Yeshua did not have two earthly parents. Since Miriam was undoubtedly human, the other had to exist in heaven from which the Messiah issued out of and came down from. One other problematic verse is Mic 5: That may be true in certain circumstances, but not based on the context of this prophecy. Yet, this is a specific, identifying characteristic of the coming Messiah. It must be understood in such a way that it disqualifies most men just as being born in Bethlehem and becoming a ruler in Israel would disqualify most men. I believe the answer is yes. First, we know Joseph was of the seed of David Mt 1: We also have two genealogies showing Joseph to be a descendant of David. In other words, Jewish custom and law considered Joseph to be the lawful, legal father of Yeshua. How can that be? In the article, the author quotes the Talmud which many readers reject. I, too, reject most Talmudic writing. However, references in the Talmud to Jewish customs and culture at that time should be accepted as valid practices of the day. The bold print is mine. He would have just registered Yeshua as his son. Here is an example. And these are the sons of Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh, which Mered took. She was the daughter of Pharaoh who took Moses out of the bulrushes and looked after him. The quotes from the Talmud are as follows: Pazzi once introduced an exposition of the Book of Chronicles as follows: Why was she [the daughter of Pharaoh] called a Jewess? Because she repudiated idolatry, as it is written, And the daughter of Pharaoh went down to bathe in the river,

and R. But she only brought him [Moses] up? Why was he called Jered? Because manna came down [yarad] for Israel in his days. But was he [Moses] indeed born of Bithia and not rather of Jochebed? Sanhedrin 19b The Talmud Mas. Sanhedrin acknowledges it as a name. Then she was called Jehudijah when she married Mered, because she had joined the tribe of Judah. Amram and Jochebed, the genetic father and mother of Moses, are mentioned in Exodus 6: The Kenezites lived in the land that God had promised to Abraham and his descendants, and they are mentioned in Genesis. It appears, therefore, that Ezra Jephunneh was a Proselyte who worshipped the God of Israel and joined the tribe of Judah. The genealogy is as follows: It is difficult to verify whether or not the Talmud has correctly interpreted this passage in 1 Chronicles. However, the purpose of this study is not to establish a precise genealogy, but to investigate the Jewish view of adoption. The Talmud is universally accepted as an authentic account of Jewish culture and the statement that an adopted orphan is considered to be born into the household should be taken as authoritative. Here is another example which is easier to verify: Saul had two daughters, the older one was Merab and the younger was Michal. Merab was promised to David as a wife, but she was given to Adriel the Meholathite instead. David married Michal, the younger daughter of Saul 1 Sam. Michal was given to another man called Phalti after David had fled from Saul 1 Sam. She died childless, apparently as a judgement for her mockery. Therefore Michal the daughter of Saul had no child unto the day of her death. And the king \hat{a} took the five sons of Michal the daughter of Saul, whom she bore to Adriel the son of Barzillai the Meholathite. Now as to R. Korha, surely it is written, And the five sons of Michal the daughter of Saul whom she bore to Adriel. Was it then Michal who bore them? Surely it was rather Merab who bore them! But Merab bore and Michal brought them up; therefore they were called by her name. This teaches thee that whoever brings up an orphan in his home, Scripture ascribes it to him as though he had begotten him. Sanhedrin 19b The genealogy is as follows: The line of descent from David is through his son Nathan instead of Solomon. There are many more generations in Luke, and the names are different. According to Matthew, the father of Joseph is called Jacob. According to Luke, he is called Heli. It is not certain whether Matthan and Matthat are the same person, listed in Matthew and Luke respectively as the grandfather of Joseph. The only two names that appear identically in both lists are Zerubbabel and his father Shealtiel. However, a much more satisfactory explanation is that one or both lists include adopted children, and there is nothing in either of them to suggest who is an adopted son and who is a genetic son. To illustrate this, we should look at the two names that appear in both lists, Zerubbabel and Shealtiel.

Chapter 6 : Why is the Virgin Birth so important?

I don't believe the Virgin Birth Doctrine. So many think the Bible puts forth the notion that Jesus was conceived and born of a virgin, without having been known by a man, but I firmly believe that is not the case at all.

Christian Doctrines 9 1. We Should Study the Bible. God gave us the Bible to read and study. It is a textbook to study, not a picture-book to browse through. There is a big difference between simply reading a book and seriously studying it. One is leisure, the other is work. God wants us to study our Bibles, not use them for pressing flowers. To study the Bible is to research it to discover its meaning. Eisegesis is twisting the Scriptures to suit our preconceived notions 2 Pet. It Takes Faith to Study the Bible. When we study the Bible, we should set aside wrong presuppositions and preconceived ideas. We need to be teachable. We should pray before and during Bible study, and rely on the Holy Spirit in us to teach us what He says in the Bible. Faith comes to us by the Word of God Rom. Without faith, we can understand the Bible only in a natural way, not a supernatural way. Studying the Bible profits us nothing unless it is mixed with faith Heb. It Takes Work to Study the Bible. Search and you will find. Dig deep and you will find new treasures of gold hidden in this field. Alas, some Christians have not even read the entire Bible yet. Others try to read it through every year. It takes work, but the Holy Spirit enables us to understand cf. A lacksadaisical attitude betrays low respect for the Bible and little faith in God. But serious Bible study is work which brings rest. The Bible is Understandable. Though the Bible was originally written in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek, it is still understandable through reliable translations not to mention the scholarly study of the original languages. We may profit from preachers and teachers who explain the Bible to us Acts 8: The Bible is for everyone. Though some parts are harder to understand than others 2 Pet. Even a cursory study of the Bible will yield great results. We study the historical setting of Scripture human author, original readers, date, geography, manners and customs, archeology, etc , as well as the normal meaning of the language its lexical meaning, grammar, syntax, context, etc. We Should Study All of the Bible. We should study all of it, not just our favorite parts. Use a concordance and cross references to compare Scripture with Scripture. It has great variety. All Scripture is inspired and deserves our study. Just as God used many human authors, so he used their backgrounds and a variety of literary styles. In these, we find prayer and praise to God, and wisdom in dealing with life. Then other books are mainly laws Exodus-Deuteronomy, parts of others. Some laws are straight-forward commands or prohibitions, while others are case laws. Then other books are mainly prophecy, recording direct messages from God, including accurate predictions of the future. Lastly, there are the epistles of Paul and others. All these styles form a wonderful harmony. The Bible Centers on Christ. One important principle of Bible study is knowing and noticing that Christ is the center of Scripture. The Old Testament is filled with prophecies, types and symbols of the coming Messiah Gen. Jesus fulfilled these prophecies. Some are explained in the New Testament see Luke And sandwiched between the Old Testament predictions of the future and the New Testament explanations of the past, we find the four Gospels which describe the person and work of Christ in a special way. The Bible Teaches Us Salvation. Since it is a book about Christ, the Bible is therefore a book about how we may be saved from our sins through Him. It makes us wise unto salvation 2 Tim. Some parts of the Bible more directly discuss salvation, such as the four Gospels, Acts and Romans. But all parts of Scripture fit into this comprehensive entity. Thus, the Bible was given to us that we may know how to be saved and how to have the assurance of salvation John We can also use it to tell other people the Gospel of salvation. The Bible is Spiritual Food. The Bible is frequently compared to food. We ought to thirst for it like a baby thirsts for milk I Pet. The basic message of the Bible is like milk; the additional details are like meat Heb. The Bible is the means that God uses to nourish His children. It gave us the new birth and sustains our new life. We grow spiritually anemic when we ignore it. So, we need to regularly read and study it, and meditate on it like a cow chews the cud. The more we do, the stronger we will grow spiritually. The Bible Has Many Uses. We study the Bible to learn about God. When we study it, we always need to find what God wants us to do in light of that passage. It teaches us how to live for God and helps us resist Satan and temptation, worship God in the way acceptable to Him, and witness in the world. It encourages us through its

many promises, aids us in prayer, points out our sins and assures us of forgiveness, strengthens our faith, answers the basic questions we have for guidance, and so much more. So let us diligently read it, study it, believe it and obey it cf.

Chapter 7 : Basic Christian Doctrine - Faith Bible Church Online

The virgin birth of Jesus is the belief and Biblical fact that Jesus was conceived in the womb of his mother Mary through the Holy Spirit without the agency of a human father and born while Mary was still a virgin.

Basil be the author of these two passages , St. Jerome and Theodoretus in Isa. Ildefonsus De perpetua virginit. Jerome devotes his entire treatise against Helvidius to the perpetual virginity of Our Blessed Lady see especially nos. The contrary doctrine is called: The mystery of the virginal conception is furthermore taught by the third Gospel and confirmed by the first. How shall this be done, because I know not man? And the angel answering, said to her: The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the most High shall overshadow thee. And therefore also the Holy which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. Joseph , when perplexed by the pregnancy of Mary, is told by the angel: Sources of this doctrine Whence did the Evangelists derive their information? As far as we know , only two created beings were witnesses of the annunciation , the angel and the Blessed Virgin. Later on the angel informed St. Joseph concerning the mystery. We do not know whether Elizabeth, though "filled with the Holy Ghost", learned the full truth supernaturally, but we may suppose that Mary confided the secret both to her friend and her spouse, thus completing the partial revelation received by both. Between these data and the story of the Evangelists there is a gap which cannot be filled from any express clue furnished by either Scripture or tradition. If we compare the narrative of the first Evangelist with that of the third, we find that St. Matthew may have drawn his information from the knowledge of St. Joseph independently of any information furnished by Mary. The first Gospel merely states 1: Joseph could supply these facts either from personal knowledge or from the words of the angel: Luke , on the other hand, must ultimately be traced back to the testimony of Our Blessed Lady , unless we are prepared to admit unnecessarily another independent revelation. The evangelist himself points to Mary as the source of his account of the infancy of Jesus , when he says that Mary kept all these words in her heart 2: Zahn [1] does not hesitate to say that Mary is pointed out by these expressions as the bearer of the traditions in Luke 1 and 2. Luke derive his account from the Blessed Virgin? It has been supposed by some that he received his information from Mary herself. In the Middle Ages he is at times called the "chaplain" of Mary [2]; J. Nirsch [3] calls St. Luke the Evangelist of the Mother of God , believing that he wrote the history of the infancy from her mouth and heart. Besides, there is the implied testimony of the Evangelist , who assures us twice that Mary had kept all these words in her heart. But this does not necessitate an immediate oral communication of the history of the infancy on the part of Mary; it merely shows that Mary is the ultimate source of the account. Luke had received the history of the infancy from the Blessed Virgin by way of oral communication, its presentation in the third Gospel naturally would show the form and style of its Greek author. In point of fact the history of the infancy as found in the third Gospel 1: The whole passage reads like a chapter from the First Book of Machabees; Jewish customs, and laws and peculiarities are introduced without any further explanation; the "Magnificat" , the "Benedictus" , and the "Nunc dimittis" are filled with national Jewish ideas. As to the style and language of the history of the infancy, both are so thoroughly Semitic that the passage must be retranslated into Hebrew or Aramaic in order to be properly appreciated. We must conclude, then, that St. It is hardly probable that Mary herself wrote the history of the infancy as was supposed by A. Plummer [4]; it is more credible that the Evangelist used a memoir written by a Jewish Christian , possibly a convert Jewish priest cf. But, whatever may be the immediate source of St. As to the original language of St. Luke present a Hebrew rather than a Greek or an Aramaic colouring. Writers have not been wanting who have tried to prove that St. But these proofs are not cogent; St. Luke utilized it [8]. As the Greek of Luke 2: The Evangelist recast the source of the history of the infancy before incorporating it into his Gospel; for the use of words and expressions in Luke 1 and 2 agrees with the language in the following chapters [9]. Harnack [10] and Dalman [11] suggest that St. Luke may be the original author of his first two chapters, adopting the language and style of the Septuagint ; but Vogel [12] and Zahn [13] maintain that such a literary feat would be impossible for a Greek-speaking writer. What has been said explains why it is quite impossible to reconstruct St. Conrady [15] believed that he had found the common source of the canonical history of the infancy in the

so-called "Protevangelium Jacobi", which, according to him, was written in Hebrew by an Egyptian Jew about A. All we can say therefore, concerning St. The Virgin Birth in modern theology Modern theology adhering to the principle of historical development, and denying the possibility of any miraculous intervention in the course of history, cannot consistently admit the historical actuality of the virgin birth. According to modern views, Jesus was really the son of Joseph and Mary and was endowed by an admiring posterity with the halo of Divinity; the story of his virgin birth was in keeping with the myths concerning the extraordinary births of the heroes of other nations [16]; the original text of the Gospels knew nothing of the virgin birth [17]. Without insisting on the arbitrariness of the philosophical assumptions implied in the position of modern theology, we shall briefly review its critical attitude towards the text of the Gospels and its attempts to account for the early Christian tradition concerning the virgin birth of Christ. Integrity of the Gospel text Wellhausen [18] contended that the original text of the third Gospel began with our present third chapter, the first two chapters being a later addition. But Harnack seems to have foreseen this theory before it was proposed by Wellhausen; for he showed that the two chapters in question belonged to the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts [19]. Holtzmann [20] considers Luke 1: Weinle [22] believes that the removal of the words *epei andra ou ginosko* from Luke 1: Bardenhewer [27] weighs them singly and finds them wanting. In the light of the arguments for the genuineness of the portions of the third Gospel rejected by the above named critics, it is hard to understand how they can be omitted by any unprejudiced student of the sacred text. They are found in all manuscripts, translations, and early Christian citations, in all printed editions "in brief, in all the documents considered by the critics as reliable witnesses for the genuineness of a text. Furthermore, in the narrative of St. Luke, each verse is like a link in a chain, so that no verse can be removed as an interpolation without destroying the whole. Moreover, verses 34 and 35 are in the Lucan history what the keystone is in an arch, what a diamond is in its setting; the text of the Gospel without these two verses resembles an unfinished arch, a setting bereft of its precious stones [28]. According to the critics, verses and relate the promise of the birth of the Messiah, the son of Joseph and Mary, just as the verses immediately preceding relate the promise of the birth of the precursor, the son of Zachary and Elizabeth. But there is a great difference: The complete traditional text of the Gospel explains these differences, but the critically mutilated text leaves them inexplicable. The friends of modern theology at first believed that they possessed a solid foundation for denying the virgin birth in the Codex Syrus Sinaiticus discovered by Mrs. Gibson in, more accurately investigated in, published in, and supplemented in According to this codex, Matthew 1: Why did he leave the expression "the virgin" in the immediate context? How did he understand verses 18, 20, and 25, if he did not know anything of the virgin birth? Hence, either the Syriac text has been slightly altered by a transcriber only one letter had to be changed or the translator understood the word *begot* of conventional, not of carnal, fatherhood, a meaning it has in verses 8 and Non-historical source of the Virgin Birth The opponents of the historical actuality of the virgin birth grant that either the Evangelists or the interpolators of the Gospels borrowed their material from an early Christian tradition, but they endeavour to show that this tradition has no solid historical foundation. Justin First Apology 21 told his pagan readers that the virgin birth of Jesus Christ ought not to seem incredible to them, since many of the most esteemed pagan writers spoke of a number of sons of Zeus. I, xxxvii answered that Celsus wrote more like a buffoon than a philosopher. But modern theologians again derive the virgin birth of Our Lord from unhistorical sources, though their theories do not agree. The Pagan Origin Theory A first class of writers have recourse to pagan mythology in order to account for the early Christian tradition concerning the virgin birth of Jesus. Usener [30] argues that the early Gentile Christians must have attributed to Christ what their pagan ancestors had attributed to their pagan heroes; hence the Divine sonship of Christ is a product of the religious thought of Gentile Christians. Conrady [33] found in the Virgin Mary a Christian imitation of the Egyptian goddess Isis, the mother of Horus; but Holtzmann [34] declares that he cannot follow this "daring construction without a feeling of fear and dizziness", and Usener [35] is afraid that his friend Conrady moves on a precipitous track. In general, the derivation of the virgin birth from pagan mythology through the medium of Gentile Christians implies several inexplicable difficulties: Why should the Christian recently converted from paganism revert to his pagan superstitions in his conception of Christian doctrines? How could the product of pagan thought find its way among Jewish Christians without leaving as much as a

vestige of opposition on the part of the Jewish Christians? How could this importation into Jewish Christianity be effected at an age early enough to produce the Jewish Christian sources from which either the Evangelists or the interpolators of the Gospels derived their material? Besides, the very argument on which rests the importation of the virgin birth from pagan myths into Christianity is fallacious, to say the least. The Jewish Origin Theory Isaiah 7: Harnack [39] is of the opinion that the virgin birth originated from Isaiah 7: Modern theology does not grant that Isaiah 7: Matthew misunderstood the passage when he said: How do Harnack and Lobstein explain such a misunderstanding on the part of the Evangelist? There is no indication that the Jewish contemporaries of St. Hillmann [41] proves that belief in the virgin birth is not contained in the Old Testament , and therefore cannot have been taken from it. Dalman [42] maintains that the Jewish people never expected a fatherless birth of the Messiah , and that there exists no vestige of such a Jewish interpretation of Isaiah 7: Those who derive the virgin birth from Isaiah 7: Zahn [43] calls such a supposition "altogether fantastic"; Usener [44] pronounce the attempt to make Isaiah 7: Though Catholic exegesis endeavours to find in the Old Testament prophetic indications of the virgin birth, still it grants that the Jewish Christians arrived at the full meaning of Isaiah 7: The Syncretic Theory There is a third theory which endeavours to account for the prevalence of the doctrine of the virgin birth among the early Jewish Christians. Gunkel [46] grants that the idea of virgin birth is a pagan idea , wholly foreign to the Jewish conception of God ; but he also grants that this idea could not have found its way into early Jewish Christianity through pagan influence.

Chapter 8 : THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST

(AP/Kevin Lamarque) Birth of a shadow doctrine: How a small group of lawyers launched a war against international law From torture to drone strikes, international law is under attack in the U.S.

What is false doctrine? For example, any teaching about Jesus that denies His virgin birth is a false doctrine, because it contradicts the clear teaching of Scripture Matthew 1: As early as the first century AD, false doctrine was already infiltrating the church, and many of the letters in the New Testament were written to address those errors Galatians 1: It is important to point out the difference between false doctrine and denominational disagreements. Different congregational groups see secondary issues in Scripture differently. Church policies, governmental decisions, style of worship, etc. Even those issues that are addressed in Scripture are often debated by equally sincere disciples of Christ. Differences in interpretation or practice do not necessarily qualify as false doctrine, nor should they divide the Body of Christ 1 Corinthians 1: False doctrine is that which opposes some fundamental truth or that which is necessary for salvation. The following are some examples of false doctrine: The Bible describes hell as a real place of eternal torment, the destination for every unregenerate soul Revelation This false doctrine claims that, since God is love, He will accept any religious effort as long as the practitioner is sincere. Such relativism flies in the face of the entire Bible and effectively eliminates any need for the Son of God to take on flesh and be crucified for us Jeremiah Doctrine that denies the deity of Christ, the virgin birth, His sinless nature, His actual death, or His physical resurrection is false doctrine. Even many mainline denominations have begun the rapid slide into apostasy by declaring that they no longer hold to a literal interpretation of Scripture or the deity of Christ. This teaching may pay lip service to salvation by faith alone but insists that a religious ritual such as water baptism is salvific. Some groups even legislate hairstyles, clothing options, and food consumption. Paul dealt with this thinking in Romans 6. To know and love Christ is to obey Him Luke 6: A charlatan promoting false doctrine will show signs of pride, greed, and rebellion see Jude 1: We are wise to recognize how vulnerable we are to heresy and make it our habit to do as the Bereans did in Acts

Birth of the Kettering Doctrine: Fordism, Sloanism and the Discovery of Tetraethyl Lead Alan P. Loeb Argonne National Laboratory In , General Motors discovered that tetraethyl lead, when added to.

The intent of this project has been to encourage others to study the Bible for themselves regarding this subject. So many think the Bible puts forth the notion that Jesus was conceived and born of a virgin, without having been known by a man, but I firmly believe that is not the case at all. Rather, I believe that it is a teaching of man that has been handed down over the centuries and that notion was worked into various English translations of a few key verses. But the source texts tell a different story. I believe very few people ever question this doctrine because it is a fundamental tenet of Christianity that must be accepted in order to profess oneself to be a Christian. On the contrary, the most well-known criteria put forth all throughout the Bible is that the Christ is to be a physical seed of David, which naturally occurs by way of a man of the house of David knowing a woman and her conceiving and bringing forth a son. I believe much of Judaism rejects Christianity primarily due to this one monumental tenet, and sadly, because they think the New Testament purports this notion, many have tossed that testimony out. Rather, it strongly testifies of a natural born Messiah out of the house of David. According to Luke In the opening chapter of Luke, the author introduces the foretelling of the conception and birth of John the Baptist, stating the mission of this child is to fulfill a greatly anticipated prophecy. Upon hearing the news, Zacharias, an Aaronic priest, doubts the possibility of his wife conceiving and bringing forth a son at such an advanced age, despite the precedent of Abraham and Sarah conceiving and bringing forth Isaac in their old age. Then the author segue-ways into the foretelling of the conception and birth of Jesus, stating the destiny of that child to be a fulfillment of an even greater prophecy, the bringing forth of the Messiah. Unlike Zacharias, the virgin Mary, who was espoused to Joseph of the house of David, receives the news in faith. I believe she understood full well that this child would be that of the man to whom she was espoused. Then Mary quickly goes to visit the house of Zacharias and stays with Elisabeth for three months. In that time, I do not believe Mary conceived, since the author never indicated such. Rather, it was some time after Mary returned home, that she conceives. And I believe that conception happened naturally after having been known by her husband, particularly since the author never specifically states otherwise. According to Matthew In the opening chapter of Matthew, the author lays the groundwork of his book by stating the physical genealogy of Jesus, identified as the Christ or Messiah , being the son of David, son of Abraham, by way of his father Joseph. The author proceeds to explain that when Mary, his mother, was found with child of holy spirit, her husband Joseph, being righteous and unwilling to make a show or example of her, minded privately to send her away. The author was not dropping a bombshell here, suggesting this child Mary was holding in her womb was that of God as opposed to being that of her husband. That makes zero sense. Rather, the child she was carrying was understood to be holyâ€”set apart for a particular purpose, namely to be the greatly anticipated Messiah, son of David. She was betrothed to him before their coming together. And as far as the conception of the child, that naturally took place after they came together. Rather, I believe the author sought to convey how the conception and birth of the Messiah was a demonstration of how God was with His people Israel, by raising up a horn of salvation in the house of David as promised throughout the Prophets would take place following the Babylonian removal. After Joseph woke from his dream, he did as the messenger instructed and took to himself Mary his pregnant wife but did not know her until the bringing forth of her son, her firstborn. The author of Matthew states in the next two verses that the child was born in Bethlehem, confirming what the author of Luke stated in chapter 2 of his book. It seems to me that it was possible that when Joseph considered sending his wife away or dismissing her , this was when he was preparing to travel to Bethlehem for the enrollment. He was likely concerned for her welfare, knowing it was foretold by the priest Zacharias that a horn of salvation was being raised up in the house of David, and the teachers of the law understood the anticipated Messiah would be born in Bethlehem. This conclusion is based on putting these two accounts together. So, there you have it. Now, if those who claim the Bible to be their authority would just test this out for themselves, and then bear witness of their findings, then maybe the tide

can be turned on this false doctrinal stronghold. And those who are still waiting on the Messiah to come will be given a fair opportunity to recognize the Jesus of the New Testament to be that man. At least, that is my hope.