

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VII.

JUNE, 1927.

No. 6.

## The Virgin Birth of Christ.

Essay read before a conference by REV. G. ALBERT SCHULZE  
and published by request.

### II.

The *sedes doctrinae* of the Virgin Birth are not in conflict with any statement contained in the writings of the other two evangelists and the apostles. Fosdick and others of his type make much of the silence that we encounter in the rest of the New Testament with respect to this subject. Fosdick, in his sermon on *The New Knowledge and the Christian Faith*, says: "The two men who contributed most to the Church's thought of the divine meaning of Christ were Paul and John, who never even distantly allude to the Virgin Birth." Even if Fosdick were justified in making the assertion that John and Paul make no reference to the Virgin Birth, what would their silence prove? *E silentio non valet consequentia*. Does the fact that Paul and his colleagues do not say *expressis verbis*, "Christ was born of the Virgin Mary," give us the right to impute to them the intention of saying, "Christ was not born of the Virgin Mary"?

No significance whatsoever attaches to the silence of Mark. He begins his gospel with the public ministry of Christ and so has no occasion to enlarge upon the Lord's birth. But neither does he mention the youth of Jesus. Are we prepared to say that he would have us believe that Jesus had no youth? It is interesting to note that higher critics profess to find Mark ranged upon the side of the witnesses for the Virgin Birth. Orr, in *The Virgin Birth*, p. 106, says: "One curious circumstance in connection with this gospel may be noted in passing. It was the singular contention of the Tübingen critics — of Baur, Hilgenfeld, and others of the school, also of a scholar like Bleek — that Mark *did* know of the Virgin Birth. . . . It will be remembered that in Matthew's gospel the people of Nazareth are represented as saying, 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' (13, 33.) In Mark this saying appears in the

simpler form, 'Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?' How, then, these older scholars argued, do you account for Matthew's form, the carpenter's son, getting toned down into this milder utterance, the carpenter, the son of Mary? Can it be from any motive except the desire to avoid the impression that Jesus was really the son of Joseph — a precaution the more necessary that Mark's gospel does not contain an account of the birth? 'Mark,' says Hilgenfeld, 'does not tolerate the paternity of Joseph, even in the mouth of the Nazarenes.'"

St. John, in his gospel, nowhere attacks the teachings of other evangelists on the subject of Christ's birth. On the contrary, he makes numerous statements that cannot but be regarded as corroborative of the doctrine. Hastings in his *Dictionary of Christ and the Apostles*, says: "Silence in the case of John would presumably imply tacit acceptance. Unless the tradition were contradicted either explicitly or tacitly, the presumption in such a case is that it was accepted." I am willing to go a great deal farther than Hastings. Chap. 3, 6 John quotes Jesus as saying: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." Three verses above he had quoted Jesus as saying, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." I am convinced that the evangelist who in the opening chapter of his book has given us those magnificent words concerning the infinite majesty, the divine glory, of Jesus, could not consistently believe that He was flesh born of flesh and therefore by nature excluded from the kingdom of heaven. The very thought would have been rejected by him as blasphemous. His acceptance of the doctrine of the universal need of regeneration compels us to take for granted that he holds that Christ must be separated from sinners by birth. — Chap. 1, 14 he says: 'Ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. He does not say ἦν, but ἐγένετο. Something happens to one already existing. The preexistent λόγος comes into the world. If He already existed, how can He become a man begotten in the ordinary fashion? One can hardly understand what John was driving at if he did not have in mind the idea of the Virgin Birth. — In recent years it has become increasingly popular with theologians to credit John with teaching the Virgin Birth in so many words. "Liberal theologians like Harnack and Loisy, who do not themselves believe the Virgin Birth, argue for the singular in John 1, 13 because they hold that John certainly did believe it. Frederick Blass, the author of the *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, the great Zahn in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, and A. E. Brooke, in *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, argue for the singular. The last-named

writer says: 'The singular well leads up to v. 14, and the connection with what precedes is good; the sonship of Christians rests on His sonship. In particular the very emphatic threefold negative statement of v. 13 seems to be directed against some who affirmed the contrary, and such a denial was far more likely to be of Christ's supernatural conception than of the divine begetting of Christians in the spiritual sense.' Hort, in his edition of the New Testament, has deemed the variant with the singular important enough to mark it 'Western' in a special note. It is a fact that Irenaeus and Tertullian quote John 1, 13 in the singular reading: Irenaeus in speaking of the Incarnation and Tertullian in arguments against the Valentinians and the Ebionites, who denied the Virgin Birth. Furthermore, Justin Martyr and Augustine apparently knew John 1, 13 in the singular reading. The earliest quotations of this verse give the singular, and this date is a hundred and fifty years earlier than *Codex Vaticanus* and *Codex Sinaiticus*, the two oldest Greek uncials. The old Latin *Codex Veronensis* (b) has '*qui natus est*,' while the Curetonian Syriac has the relative pronoun in the plural, but the verb in the singular." (THEOL. MONTHLY, 5, 373.) That John never even distantly alludes to the Virgin Birth is not so certain; but that he does not deny it is indeed certain.

What is there to the argument based upon the silence of Paul? Nothing. Though it is true that Paul refers very little to the great events in the life of the Savior, with the exception of His crucifixion and resurrection, he occasionally intimates that he knows a great deal more about them than he says. He repeatedly uses words and phrases that would seem to indicate that he was perfectly familiar with what his brethren taught concerning the birth of Jesus. Gal. 4, 4, *e. g.*, he writes: "God sent forth His Son, made of a woman." A rather striking expression. In the original it is still more striking. There we read: *γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός*, that is, come into being of a woman, from the verb *γίνομαι*, which, according to Thayer's *Greek-English Lexicon*, means to come into existence, begin to be, receive being. In vv. 23. 25. 29 of the same chapter, however, where he speaks of the birth of Ishmael and Isaac, Paul uses the passive of the verb *γεννάω*, the first meaning of which is "beget." Why does the apostle, who is well acquainted with the word "beget," "bear," use a different expression when he speaks of the birth of Christ? We meet the same word Rom. 1, 3; likewise Phil. 2, 7. Why this peculiarity of expression in the case of Paul, who certainly knew the Greek language? Why does he employ the same word that John uses in the passage: *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*?

Furthermore, Paul ascribes sinlessness to Christ; *e. g.*, 2 Cor. 5, 21. He calls Him the Second Adam, who, in direct contrast with the first Adam, who brought sin into the world, saves man unto righteousness. Rom. 5. He calls Him Son of God. Rom. 1. He repeatedly refers to His resurrection. He points to His exaltation to the right hand of God. Phil. 2; Eph. 1. On the other hand, there is hardly a Biblical writer who emphasizes the total corruption of human nature so strongly, *cf.* Rom. 1—3; who is at such pains to point out the intimate connection of the human race with the first Adam, Rom. 5, 12, 19; who so plainly teaches that man, every man, is by nature a child of wrath and not a son of God, Eph. 2, 3; who so frequently threatens natural man with the wrath and punishment of God, Rom. 1, 18; 6, 23; 8, 6; Eph. 2, 12; etc. Now, if he makes an exception in the case of Christ and asserts the very opposite with respect to Him, we must resort to the use of rather poor logic to convince ourselves that he endeavors to tear down what Matthew and Luke have established. If he placed Jesus upon a level with us, there would be a contradiction between him and the evangelists. But since he ascribes to Jesus glories excelling every thing that may be called admirable in man, it is evident that he cannot but share the view of Christ's miraculous, mysterious entrance into the world. Paul could not speak as he does if he were not certain that Jesus, who is so different from other members of the race, whose life runs an altogether different course, whose exit from the world is so different from the end of ordinary human beings, had a different beginning. In addition, we must not overlook that Paul ascribes to Christ premundane existence. Col. 1, 16, 17. Would he, then, be disposed to deny that this Christ, the Son of God, who has been existing from eternity, became man in a supernatural way?

### III.

The old axiom, *Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet, Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet*, has its application also with respect to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. The prophets clearly foretell the Virgin Birth of the Redeemer. It has been customary for centuries to look upon Gen. 3, 15 as a prophecy of the Virgin Birth. Luther writes: "*Solches ist verkuendigt gewesen von Anbeginn, dass Gott sollte Mensch werden, und dass seine Mutter eine Jungfrau sein sollte, wie die erste Verheissung, welche Gott bald nach Adams Fall gegeben hat, zeigt, 1 Mos. 3, 15: 'Des Weibes Same soll der Schlange den Kopf zertreten.' Er spricht nicht, des Mannes Same soll es tun, sondern, des Weibes Same. . . . Darum muss dieses*

*Schlangentreters Mutter eine Jungfrau sein. . . . Wenn nun in den letzten Zeiten Schwaermer kommen werden und wider diesen Artikel plaudern, so seht, dass ihr fest steht.*" (St. L., 13b, 2676.) Though Eve misunderstood the words of God, yet it is as plain as daylight that the first evangelical promise points to the Virgin Birth. The term "Seed of the Woman" cannot be understood in a general sense as signifying posterity. It is certain that עֲלִמָּה can denote an individual. Gen. 4, 25; 22, 18. The context compels us to understand it here as referring to an individual; for in the second half of the verse we read: "He shall bruise thy head." Two persons are spoken of. The Scriptures throughout teach that one of the two can be none other than Christ. The prophecy is obviously Messianic (Eve seems to have understood it in that sense too, Gen. 4, 1). And even if we were not ready to admit that the expression "Seed of the Woman" is equivalent to the term "Son of the Virgin," we must at least concede that a careful reading of the words creates the impression that the promised Redeemer shall have a beginning different from that of ordinary men. Indeed, from the fact that the promise is made that the "Seed of the Woman" shall be victorious in the combat with the serpent, we cannot but conclude that He must be without sin. For if He is polluted with sin, He cannot overcome Satan, being completely in his power. And if He is without sin, He cannot be born according to the ordinary course of nature.

The clearest prophecy of the Virgin Birth is Is. 7, 14. Matthew, writing by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, insists that the words of Isaiah were fulfilled when Jesus was born. Keil: "*Matthaeus denkt unzweifelhaft, dass der Prophet direkt geweißt hat, der Messias werde von einer Jungfrau geboren werden.*" (Meyer, *Kommentar.*) The question arises: Does the term עֲלִמָּה, as used by Isaiah, really signify a virgin, a *virgo intacta*? The word occurs in the Scriptures seven times: Gen. 24, 43; Ex. 2, 8; Ps. 68, 26; Cant. 1, 3; 6, 7; Prov. 30, 19; Is. 7, 14. In some of the passages it cannot designate anything but a virgin. Orr (*The Virgin Birth*): "In all the six places in which, besides this passage, the word occurs in the Old Testament, it may be contended that this is its meaning. . . . It is true that the word means a marriageable young woman; but it is not less true that in its use in the Old Testament it means an unmarried young woman." (p. 133.) Stoeckhardt says: "*Die LXX und Matthaeus geben es wieder mit παρθένος, die Vulgata mit virgo, Luther mit Jungfrau. Und das ist die einzig nachweisbare Bedeutung.*" Luther declares: "*Nirgends in*

der Schrift heisst עֲלִמָּה ein verrueckt [married] Weib"; and he offers to give a hundred gulden to any one, Christian or Jew, who will prove that in the *usus loquendi* of the Old Testament עֲלִמָּה ever means as much as a young married woman. Stoeckhardt remarks: "*Die hebraeische Sprachforschung hat seit Luthers Tagen bis zur Gegenwart erhebliche Fortschritte gemacht. Aber Luther koennte auch, wenn er heute lebte, die hundert Gulden fuer sich behalten.*" In this passage the word cannot mean anything but a virgin. Think of the nonsense at which we should arrive if we translated עֲלִמָּה with young married woman. At the command of God, Isaiah is to give Ahaz a sign. What kind of sign would that be — a young married woman becoming pregnant and giving birth to a son? That happens in Albany every day; and in Judah it, no doubt, happened more frequently still, the population of Judah being larger and the Jewish women being more prolific. It would be rather strange if Isaiah merely wanted to say that a *virgo* was about to have sexual intercourse with a man, whether in or out of wedlock, and bear a son. Luther in his trenchant way remarks: "*Das waere kein gross Zeichen; das ist der gemeinen Natur Lauf.*" (St. L., 20, 1801.) — The Jews, and some who are not Jews, declare that the sign consisted in the birth of a son and not of a daughter. Here Luther remarks: "*Das waere kein Zeichen an der Jungfrau, sondern das Zeichen bestaende darin, dass Jesaias die Geburt eines Sohnes erraten hat; das ist aber schimpflich und kindisch.*" (St. L., 20, 1801.) One has very little inclination to occupy oneself with that kind of exegesis. Is. 7, 14 has very little sense of any kind if it is not to be understood as speaking of a virgin's son. "To say a virgin conceives, if something extraordinary is meant, is to say that a virgin while still a virgin conceives." (F. Pierce Ramsay, *The Virgin Birth*, p. 33.) The whole character of the prophecy connected with this passage leads to the conclusion of a supernatural origin of the promised Child. Take a few minutes of your time and read chapters 7, 8, and 9, and you will not be able to ward off the conviction that the child of whom we read chap. 9, 6. 7 that it shall be called Wonderful, . . . Mighty God, must have a beginning different from that of an ordinary Jewish boy. Cf. also chap. 8, 10.

Micah 5, 2. 3 teaches the same doctrine taught by Isaiah. The prophet says: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto Me that is to be Ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. Therefore will He give them up, until

the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth." There can be no doubt that Micah has the Messiah in mind. Matt. 2. And he speaks of the bringing forth by her "which travaileth." Not a word about a father.

The Virgin Birth is probably also taught Jer. 31, 22: "The Lord hath created a new thing in the earth, A woman shall compass a man." Matthew Henry comments: "Many good interpreters understand this 'new thing' created in that land to be the incarnation of Christ, which God had an eye to in bringing them back to that land and which had sometimes been given them for a sign. A woman, the Virgin Mary, encloses in her womb the Mighty One." Daechsel says: "*In der zweiten Haelfte des Satzes hat die Frage die Ausleger viel beschaeftigt, was dies Neue, das der Herr im Lande schaffen will, sei, indem er spricht: 'Das Weib wird den Mann umgeben,' und sind darueber ganze Buecher geschrieben. Luther sagt: 'Ich werfe den Verstand nicht weg, da die Alten sagen, Christus sei der Mann, von Maria umgeben, das ist, empfangen und geboren'; danach haetten wir hier die Erfuellung der Weissagung in Jes. 7, 14.*" Calov, in his *Biblia Illustrata*: "*Viri solent ambire puellas; non puellae viros. . . . Nos oraculum de Christo intelligimus, non sensu tantum mystico, sed proprio et literali, quod nempe femina Maria, virgo beata, circumdatura sit, et utero conclusura, non infantem aut puerum, sed virum, idque sine virili opera, quod vere est mirabile.*" He adduces twelve arguments in favor of his interpretation. (Luther: "*Man kann es nicht von Israel verstehen und erklaren: Israel ist eine Hure gewesen und wird sich bekehren und ihren Mann, das ist, Gott, wieder umgeben. Das ist nichts Neues. Israel hat oft gehurt und oft sich bekehrt.*")

It is immaterial, however, whether this passage foretells the Virgin Birth or not. We are positive that it was prophesied in the Old Testament. Here again there is perfect harmony between the Old and the New Testament. Were we to consider all the Messianic prophecies, we should no doubt easily convince ourselves that in all of them the doctrine that Jesus was not born naturally, that is, as the result of the cohabitation of man and woman, is involved and thus foretold, at least *implicite*.

#### IV.

The doctrine of the Virgin Birth of our Lord is very closely bound up with the cardinal teachings of Holy Writ; indeed, we may say that what the Bible teaches about the way of salvation presupposes the supernatural birth of Him who is set forth as the

Savior. As regards non-Christian religions, it is a matter of little moment what kind of persons their originators were. Mohammedanism, *e. g.*, remains absolutely what it is, whatever Mohammed may or may not have been. A Mohammedan may, perhaps, be ready to grant that the author of his religion was an epileptic visionary or a plain "nut" and yet remain a zealous adherent of the Koran. With respect to the Christian religion the case is entirely different. The Christian religion sets its central figure apart from the rest of humanity and places Him upon an infinitely higher plane. Indeed, the Christian religion is built up on the person of Christ.

The doctrine of the redemption is the very heart of our faith. That we need a Redeemer is taught on every page of the Good Book. According to its plain statements, all men are sinners, and sin is described as enmity, rebellion, against God. Rationalism, it is true, regards sin merely as an aberration from the path of virtue, which man is inherently able to atone for by outward reformation of his conduct. The rationalist needs no Redeemer. He is his own redeemer. He covers up the rents in his garment with a few rags, and all is well. Some rationalists do not deem it necessary to do any patching at all, flattering themselves that God and the universe are identical (pantheists). God is all in all; all in all is God; hence there is no sin, and hence no Redeemer is needed.

But the Scriptures teach the fact of sin and the consequent need of redemption. They declare that by nature man is not as God would have him be, but rather an enemy of God, Rom. 2, 23; 8, 7; that all who have come into the world in the course of nature are not God-centered, but self-centered, that man, left to himself, even though he would seek to find God, would constantly stray farther away from Him, Is. 53, 16; that he is dead in trespasses and sins, and that, therefore, there is no point of contact with God which would enable him to enter into communion with Him. The Bible furthermore teaches that sin holds man by a thousand chains. Man is not only at war with God; he is determined to continue in his apostasy. He cannot do otherwise. Even though he may lay aside some of his evil ways, yet in his heart the fire of sin burns without ceasing, and he cannot quench it. Rom. 8, 7. St. Paul complains: "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Rom. 7, 24. In the days of his connection with the Pharisees he had made strenuous efforts to rid himself of sin, but in vain. Luther and thousands of others made similar attempts in the cloister, but in vain. Others have tried other ways,

but in vain. Some eventually realize that the power of sin is so great that they cannot overcome it; the Buddhist, for example, who sees the only possibility of salvation from sin in the Nirvana, the extinction of the soul. Finally the Scriptures teach that sin has evil consequences, not only of a physical, temporal nature, but consequences that are far more terrible and horrible. Sin is an insult to God. God is infinite. And so sin places upon man the burden of infinite guilt. And because he is unable to rid himself of the burden, he is doomed to remain a child of wrath. Eph. 2, 3; Gal. 3, 10. "The wages of sin is death." Rom. 6, 23. Not only temporal death with all its prevenient and concomitant evils, the vast host of sicknesses, diseases, accidents, calamities, but eternal death, the everlasting separation of man and God, and uninterrupted pangs of damnation. — In fine, we are unable to cope with sin, which is essentially alienation from God, rebellion, has complete control over us, and condemns us to death, to hell. Truly, we need a Redeemer.

God, in His Word, presents Christ as the Redeemer of the world. And God, we know, is not a man that He should lie. And if God speaks the truth when He calls Him the Redeemer of our race, then Christ cannot but have had a miraculous birth. Of course, He must be a human being like us. *Τὸ ἀπόβλητον ἀθεράπειτον* (Gregory Nazianzen). This quaint saying is founded upon the Scriptures. Heb. 2, 16 we read: "He took not on him the nature of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham." Gal. 4, 4 the apostle says that He was made of a woman. Our Redeemer must substitute for us, must be what we should have been, do what we should have done, bear what we should have borne, suffer what we should have suffered, — must completely enter into our humanity. And no one but a human being can do that. Our Substitute must be a true man from the earliest moment of His earthly career. Man had sinned, and atonement for sin can therefore be made only by a man. If the Docetae were right, Christ could not be our Redeemer. A phantom that slips through the generative organs of a woman would be without value for us in spite of its outward beauty and glory. True, to insure His genuine humanity, a special mode of entering into the world would not have been absolutely necessary. Jesus would have been a human being even if He had been born in the natural way, in wedlock. On the other hand, we must ever maintain that a virgin can bring forth a true man, and that Mary did bring forth a true man, and not merely half a man. There are analogies in nature. Huxley: "Vir-

gin procreation is an ordinary phenomenon for the naturalist." (Orr, *V. B.*, p. 221.) The instances of parthenogenesis observable in nature prove that that which is generated in this manner bears the nature of the mother, even though there is no father connected with the act of generation. — As far as the bringing forth of the humanity of Christ is concerned, we must admit that it does not require a virgin birth.

Our Redeemer, however, must be not only a true man, but also a sinless man; for, as has been said, He must render perfect obedience to the Law. Jesus Himself says that He came to fulfil the Law. Matt. 5, 17. His active obedience to the Law is an essential part of our redemption. Our Redeemer dare not be a transgressor. Moreover, by our failure to fulfil our duties, we have loaded a heavy burden of guilt upon ourselves; what we have done must be undone; the guilt must be removed. And he that would pay our debt must have no debt of his own. Now, God says that Jesus was without sin, that He is without sin. Hence, He cannot have been born in the ordinary human way. Were He merely the product of the matrimonial relation, He would be a sinner. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." Enemies of the faith sometimes assert that the Virgin Birth is not essential for the establishment of the sinlessness of Christ. We do not say that the mere fact that Jesus had no human father renders Him sinless. In connection with the Virgin Birth we hold fast to the doctrine of Christ's conception by the Holy Ghost. But if we predicate absolute sinlessness of Christ, we are compelled to predicate His miraculous birth. He cannot be sinless if at His birth the same laws obtained that govern the birth of ordinary mortals. — But could not Christ be our Redeemer if He had come into the world a full-grown man? A foolish question. Who are we that we should presume *a priori* to pass judgment upon matters that lie beyond the horizon of our intellect, matters that only God can determine? A redeemer who entered life a full-fledged man, say of thirty years of age, would seem to be only half a redeemer. How could he satisfy the demands which the Law makes upon us from the days of our conception to the time of our maturity? How could he remove the guilt that we have brought into the world with us and which we have accumulated in the days of our childhood and youth? Dr. Pieper says: "*Christus muss seine Erloeserarbeit frueh beginnen. Es handelte sich um eine stellvertretende Darstellung eines heiligen Menschenlebens vom ersten Anfang an. Deshalb geht der Mittler zwischen Gott und den Menschen auf das allgemein-menschliche Werden ein.*"

*Der Kausalnexus der niedrigen Menschwerdung mit der Erloesung der Menschen ist klar bezeugt, wenn die Schrift sagt, dass Gottes Sohn auf dem Wege der Geburt aus einem Weibe und mit Unterstellung unter das Gesetz in die Welt gesandt worden ist in der Absicht (ἵνα), eben auf diese Weise die unter dem Gesetz sich befindenden Menschen loszukaufen. Gal. 4, 4. 5."* (Dogm., III, 365.) Pieper quotes Kromayer: "*Christus per omnes aetatis nostrae gradus venit, ut immundam nostram conceptionem et nativitatē radicitus curaret.*" Luther says: "*An diesem Artikel ist es gelegen. Christus hat wollen anheben da, da wir anheben; denn er hat uns durch und durch heiligen wollen. Wir heben in Suenden an.*" (XXIIb, 2676.) Our Lord's sinlessness requires a sinless birth, a birth such as is ascribed to Him by Matthew and Luke. Though it may be impossible to show *a priori* that the sinlessness necessarily implies the Virgin Birth, it certainly does condition a miraculous birth. And God assures us that it has pleased Him to accomplish this wonder by a miracle of this particular form. According to God's revealed plan of our redemption the sinlessness of the Redeemer and His Virgin Birth necessarily go together.

May God preserve us in the faith that Jesus was born of the Virgin! If we lose our faith in this doctrine, we shall have difficulty in retaining our faith in the redemptive work of Him whom we worship as our Savior. About thirty years ago a German preacher named Schrempf announced that he was unable to subscribe to all statements of the Apostolic Creed, particularly to the words: "Born of the Virgin Mary." The Consistory of the Ev. Luth. State Church of Prussia thereupon issued a public declaration in which we find the following words: "*Dass der Sohn Gottes empfangen ist von dem Heiligen Geist, geboren von der Jungfrau, das ist das Fundament des Christentums; das ist der Eckstein, an welchem alle Weisheit dieser Welt zerschellen wird.*" (L. u. W., 38, 316.) It is of the utmost importance that we maintain the *natus ex Maria virgine*. For although this article is not one of the *articuli fundamentales primarii*, without the knowledge of which salvation is impossible, its connection with the Scriptural teaching concerning the person and work of Christ is so intimate that consistent denial inevitably leads to rejection of the *articuli fundamentalissimi*. Impugners of the Virgin Birth are usually arrayed on the side of those who take a negative attitude toward the doctrine of the redemption of the world by the blood of Christ. The Virgin Birth is not an open question, but a vital part of the Christian religion.

(To be concluded.)