

The Virgin Conception of Christ

Between Science and Religion

Dr. Remoon Joseph

Translated from Arabic to English by

Martha Phrawon Abdel-Malak

مرسا فرعون عبد الملاك

COPYRIGHTED

The content of this book has been approved as a master's thesis research at Hope International University in California, For this the reader will notice between the lines some words that express that it is a research submitted to a university.

Some parts and chapters have been added to the first edition, and some words have been modified to hit the target and meaning more accurately.

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted by any means without prior permission of the author.

Author and Writer: Dr. Remoon Joseph

E-mail: dr.remo.jo@gmail.com

Facebook: Remoon Joseph

Layout, Printing and Publishing: Sparkle Printing Solutions

4 El Masode st., - Roxy - Misr El Gadedda - Cairo - Egypt.

Mob.: +2 0122 2117 812

Cover Design: Raed Magdy

Copy right : 29967 / 2021

ISBN : 978 - 977 - 85814 - 3 - 0

The thesis supervisor's Introduction

Dr. Remoon Joseph has taken a new look at the humanity and divinity of Jesus. As a physician he struggled with how the New Testament could portray Jesus divine while being human. From a scientific perspective the accounts about Jesus did not make sense to him and did not add up to scientific inquiry. This struggle made him tend to be atheist. However, having an inquiring mind and heart he was also led to investigate the depths of Christian Scripture.

Topics about Mary being a virgin yet giving birth intrigued him. Distinguishing between <seed> and <genealogy> opened his eyes to the depths of God's wisdom and power. The Holy Spirit gave him insights and guided him in his research, thinking and conclusions about the most important topic in the world: The Person of Jesus Christ.

Dr. Joseph's book will cause one to pause. Thought and prayer will be needed. Remoon's passion for Jesus will be felt. The reader will be challenged in their own thinking which will hopefully lead to one's faith in God through Jesus Christ.

Joseph C. Grana II, D.Min.

Special Assistant to the President
Hope International University
2500 E. Nutwood Avenue
Fullerton, California 92831

RENMOON

The Index

- ❖ **Chapter One:** The Author’s Introduction. 9
- ❖ **Chapter Two:** Linguistic and Scientific Introduction. 23
- ❖ **Chapter Three:** Main Features of the Problem and the Dilemma of Melchizedek 53
- ❖ **Chapter Four:** The Miraculous Conception and the Normal Birth. 69
- ❖ **Chapter Five:** The First medical report of Negation of Paternity “Genealogy” in the World. 79
- ❖ **Chapter Six:** Biblical Textual Evidences prove that Jesus is “Without Genealogy”. 83
 - **First Textual Evidence:** Without Father, Without Mother, Without Genealogy. 85
 - **Second Textual Evidence:** Woman, what Concern is that to You and to Me? 87
 - **Third Textual Evidence:** Woman, here is your Son 90
 - **Fourth Textual Evidence:** from them, According to the Flesh, Comes the Messiah 91
 - **Fifth Textual Evidence:** Gave Birth to the Male Child 93
 - **Sixth Textual Evidence:** Who is my Mother, and who are my Brothers? 96

○ Seventh Textual Evidence: The Genesis Chain “genealogy” mentioned in Luke 3	100
○ Eighth Textual Evidence: The Will that Desires the Act, not the Act Itself “without will”. or “the Will that Precedes the Act, not the Act Itself”. The Scientific Expression “Without Genealogy” and the Spiritual One “without a Will” are Two Faces of the Same Coin	123
❖ Chapter Seven: The Virgin Inspiration of the Bible	131
❖ Chapter Eight: Jesus Christ biologically in His flesh is not anything different from Adam, and in His humanity He is not only Adam; And the second man is not the first man, As the second man is not only perfect complete human but also GOD himself	141
○ First truth	147
○ Second truth	148
○ Third truth	149
○ Fourth truth	151
○ Fifth truth	158
○ Sixth truth	165
○ Seventh truth	180
○ Eighth truth	186
○ Ninth truth	189
○ Tenth truth	193
❖ Chapter Nine: The Inevitability of Incarnation as Born One not as Created	195
❖ Chapter Ten: Taking Part Not Borrowing	213
❖ Chapter Eleven: Adam the Head and the Root, who is a Type of the One who was to Come	225

❖ Chapter Twelve: Hypothetical Existence or Actual One? Public Existence or Hidden One?	233
❖ Chapter Thirteen: Representation and Substitution: Substitution + Presence (for me) Substitution - Presence (instead of me)	245
❖ Chapter Fourteen: Inheriting Sin and Inheriting Righteousness	257
❖ Chapter Fifteen: Mechanisms of Reproduction, Branch Grafting, Legal Union and Practical Union	267
○ Mechanisms of Reproduction	269
○ Branch Grafting	272
○ Legal Union and Practical Union	276
❖ Chapter Sixteen: The Perfection of Christ's Humanity in His Life, and Answer on Doubts about Christ's Divinity	283
❖ Chapter Seventeen: The Perfection of Christ's Humanity in His Death	289
❖ Chapter Eighteen: The Perfection of Christ's Humanity in His Burial	295
❖ Chapter Nineteen: The Perfection of Christ's Humanity in His Resurrection	303
❖ Chapter Twenty: The Perfection of Christ's Humanity as a Symbol	309
❖ Chapter Twenty-One: The conclusion and the final message	315
❖ References	333

RENMOON

Chapter One

RENEWMOON

The Author's Introduction

To every person tormented by questions and doubts, and is sincerely searching for answers supported by the word of truth, not by philosophies or personal opinions that do not have the revelation and enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. To every person who became an atheist or hasn't become one yet, but is struggling with atheistic thoughts. To everyone who is sceptical about God or denies his existence. To everyone who has doubts about the inspiration of the Bible and the inerrancy of the verbal plenary. To everyone who has gone astray in the darkness of philosophical existential, mystical theological questions, and is sincerely eager to reach a safe shore, to the Rock of Faith. To every person who is sincerely searching for evidences, proofs and enlightenment of revelation. I invite you all to read this research, where I would talk about the most magnificent and greatest person in the history of Human Kind. The greatest person in, and out of the realm of time; He is Lord Jesus Christ. Moreover, I will talk about the greatest book in the world, the inerrancy of the Bible **(without any possibility of error)** that is inspired by God verbally and in meaning. I would like first to say that this research is an apologetic research, in which I will present a collection of apologetic proofs. The ideas presented in this research are not "collected and presented" or "quoted, quoted with remodeling", yet I do not mean to

brag about what I will introduce in this research as the work of my intelligent mind. However, I say with great humility, when you go through difficult, dark times in your life, where every second is filled with despair, frustration and serious intellectual conflicts. When your report about that time would be «But that night they caught nothing» (John 21:3), and when your answer on the Master's question "Children, you have no fish, have you?" is "No", which comes out of your chest mixed with screams and groans of despair and frustration. Then suddenly in this gloomy, dark scene, the Lord Himself appears with a beam of light that renews hope inside of your heart again, saying with His known authority "Cast the net to the right side of the boat, and you will find some." And indeed, when you obey Him, and cast the net where the Lord tells you to, and search in the text that He pointed out and enlightened to you. Then your net will catch fish that exceeds your physical capacity. In a like manner, your mind will discover new dimensions and depth that is above its comprehending capacity. "So, they cast it, and now they were not able to haul it in because there were so many fish." Only then, you will discover that you are nothing because only God's Sovereignty made the fish come into the net, as well as, ideas flow into your mind, since you have tried to catch fish on your own many times and you have failed. Then in the middle of this overwhelming feeling of God's Sovereignty, when He commands you "Bring some of the fish that you have just caught" (John 21:10), I believe you have no choice but to obey, and bring fish just as you have obeyed before so you have caught.

In (Jeremiah 33:3), the Lord said, “Call to me and I will answer you, and will tell you great and hidden things that you have not known.” The word “Hidden” means covered, concealed things that need God’s revelation to be uncovered, they can be known by “I will answer you, and will tell you”. They are issues that cannot be reached by mere research, but they need an illumination given to you by the Omniscient One; penetrating your finite mind so that by being enlightened you can shine that light to others. For it is first and for most, a divine revelation not a human discovery. As has been pointed out, the Lord in this verse presents a wonderful promise to those who are hungry for knowledge and enlightenment; He promises to answer them, and to tell them. However, dear reader, this promise is presented to those who admit that they don’t know “great and hidden things that you have not known.” It is also presented to those who feel insignificant and there are great and hidden things above their comprehension. Also, it is presented to those who are calling upon the Lord, searching and are eager to know the truth “Call to me and I will answer you, and will tell you”. As for those with ego and think that they possess all the knowledge in the world, unfortunately, they don’t have any share in this promise.

I’ve always found it difficult for the imperfect one, no matter the heights of knowledge have been achieved by him, to try and fully describe the perfect one using a limited language vocabulary, no matter how smart that imperfect one is, or how precise and specific he tries to be. Since I

believe in the inerrancy of the verbal plenary of the Bible; subsequently, I believe in commitment to the usage of the biblical terminology, that the Holy Spirit carefully and accurately selected with no room for mistakes, I trust this is the best way to stay on the safe side when you address a matter related to Christ's nature. That way we won't unintentionally slip into superstitions or delusions of mistaken logics.

There are three ancient questions presented to us by the Bible, that were once have been asked and still cause people confusion and stumble them, yet at the same time a wonder about Christ.

The first question: is found in (Luke 4:22) «All spoke well of him and were amazed at the gracious words that came from his mouth. They said, "Is not this Joseph's son?"

The second question: is found in (Mark 6:3) "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary and brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon, and are not his sisters here with us?" And they took offense at him."

As for the third question: have been asked by Christ Himself in (Mathew 12:48) "Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?" This came as an answer when someone said to him, "Look, your mother and your brothers are standing outside, wanting to speak to you." We find Christ responds with the question (Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?). It is normal that people would ask and wonder, but for the Omniscient one to ask, who was born from Mary

“Who is my mother?” Well, that is a turbulent, shocking question which we need to think a lot about. Surely, His question has answers and messages to convey, still, we can say for now that He replied in a form of a question because He knows the answer, as we shall come to understand through this research.

Is not this Joseph’s son? Is not this Mary’s son? Who is Jesus Christ? Who is His father, and who is His mother? Jesus Himself joins those who are asking; replying with a question and asking as an answer “Who is my mother?” So, may be through His shocking, rhetorical question they would use their minds and realize the answer that Jesus meant. Sadly, to this day, in the celebrating scenes and parades of praise and glorification of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which exceed the limits of beatification and reach the level of idolization, I see Christ standing outside and whispering to every participant in these events with the same question “Who is my mother?”. Could it be that one would stop for a moment and think or review that question in his/her mind, thus the light of that penetrating question would cast out the darkness and the dust of the inherited beliefs that blind folded the eyes, so these eyes would be illuminated by the truth.

We have a child who came in history; His name is Jesus, who has divided time into two parts before Him & after Him, and many doubts are casted on His genealogy. Although the Bible tells us in (Luke 3:23) “Jesus was about thirty years old when he began his work. He was the son (as was thought)

of Joseph son of Heli,” Yet, in (Luke 1:32) the angel told Mary that David is His father “He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his ancestor David.” And though John wrote, moved by the Holy Spirit in his gospel that Mary was the mother of Jesus (John 2:1) “On the third day there was a wedding in Cana of Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there.” However, the Bible in another book shocks our minds with an ambiguous, appalling text in (Hebrews 7:3), where the writer was moved by the Holy Spirit uses an amazing metaphor saying “Without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but resembling the Son of God, he remains a priest forever.” Is there a contradiction between texts? Yes, but only an outward contradiction for shallow readers, yet there is a deep, satisfying and wondrous enlightenment, as well as, a great revelation, richness, and harmony to the sincere searcher for the truth.

Why haven't Jesus called Mary once in His life “mother” instead He used to call her “woman”? Why has He called His mother with the same word He used to address many other women like the Samaritan Woman, the Canaanite Woman? Why hasn't He favored her with a special word and title calling her “mother”? Why did the Holy Spirit, intentionally, delete Mary's name from her genealogy chain in (Luke 3)? Isn't that strange? The Bible mentioned Jesus several times as “Son of Man”, while in other texts, it is stated that He is a “Man”, which means a human being, so do these two words

contradict each other? Or there is a deeper meaning of these words? In (Revelation 22:16), Jesus said about Himself "It is I, Jesus, who sent my angel to you with this testimony for the churches. I am the root and the descendant of David, the bright morning star." Again, in (Revelation 5:5), the Holy Spirit said about Jesus "the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David," As Jesus, He is the seed/ descendant of David. Yet, as Jesus, and as He from the tribe of Judah, how can He be the Root of David? Is the Bible here talking about His divinity? And if the answer is "yes". Then why was the name "Jesus" used? And Is the Son of God in His divinity, the Root of David or the Lord of David? What is the difference between both of them?

In the beginning, I want to ask, is there any scripture(s) in the Bible that can resolve this paradox between texts? Is there a contradiction or there is a deeper meaning which exceeds our comprehension, one that we need to understand, and that would require a Divine illumination? All these questions about the nature of "Jesus" the great person, are waiting for answers, and by God's grace, I would be presenting the answers in this research as much as God has enlightened me. I would like to remark that escaping the case and ignoring the raised questions about it, claiming that the Bible is not a scientific book is actually the result of poor illumination although the reason is valid. Truly, the Bible is not a scientific book in general, but at the same time it has a clear revelation with bright light to illuminate the minds of thinkers whose minds have been worn out by wrestling with such questions.

And When it comes to the Virgin conception of Christ, the Bible has addressed both the spiritual and scientific aspects of that matter with clear texts, which unfold that paradox not only in way that impresses the mind but also harmonizes it. I would like to add that escaping the case and questions under the allegation of “the silence of the Divine Inspiration”, and what the Inspiration didn’t mention we also shouldn’t address is not always the right thing to do. Sometimes, what we see as silence of the divine inspiration is in fact a deficiency in our illumination and understanding of the inspiration. Therefore, allow me to ask you all, who holds the right to decide on the silence of the divine inspiration in this point or that? Why wouldn’t it be that the divine inspiration has indeed spoken and revealed things, yet in my finite and darkness, I didn’t understand has been revealed and thought that He was silent? Again, I would like to stress that the principle is right; we shouldn’t talk when the divine inspiration is silent, and if we do that, this would result in human error and heresies, yet our application of that principle is not always right. Silence about matters that the inspiration has revealed, even if it has been revealed in a hidden manner, is considered dereliction in research for truth and lack in praying with perseverance and persistence for illumination. Sadly, at the end that would be our loss because the divine inspiration is unlimited, surpassing our limitations and our brain’s insufficiency. How many times we thought that the divine inspiration has become silent while He was speaking? Yet we haven’t understood the meaning because His talk was encrypted, and needed illumination to unfold.

The important matter which involves the nature of Christ, has been addressed throughout the Bible, from the beginning in Genesis, when the Lord God said about the woman in (Genesis 3:15) "I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will strike your head, and you will strike his heel." This is the first time to mention the woman's seed, the divine inspiration hasn't been concluded until the Holy Spirit refers again to the same issue when Christ said His wondrous, hidden, and deep words in (Revelation 22:16) "It is I, Jesus, who sent my angel to you with this testimony for the churches. I am the root and the descendant of David, the bright morning star." As someone said: **The scarlet thread of the blood of Jesus is woven from Genesis to Revelation!** In the beginning in Genesis, Jesus is the seed, and at the end in Revelation, Jesus is the root. Furthermore, from Genesis to Revelation, there are hundreds of references that the Holy Spirit has hidden inside inspired pages, some of these are clear while others are ambiguous coded ones, yet all of them are in harmony and consistency with each other without any contradiction for the eyes of the careful reader who is sincere in his search.

The necessity to study the nature of Jesus Christ's humanity lies in determining your perspective about Him, hence the kind of faith you have in Him. If all of your knowledge about Christ comes down to consider Him as a person who is born and has a mother and a father just like anyone else, you will find it impossible to believe that He is the Son of God, who is God manifested in flesh. Not knowing

the truth about His humanity will surely hold you from knowing the truth about His divinity.

Also in this research, I will address what we can metaphorically call it “the Virgin Inspiration of the Bible” similar to “the Virgin Conception of Christ”. I will talk about the verbal plenary inspiration, which is being denied by many as they face some difficult biblical texts in which they can't explain.

Dear reader, I invite you with a humble heart and a sincere mind that is searching for the truth, to permit me to present a fresh perspective that might differ from our old inherited beliefs. So, what is the value of holding on to some old inherited beliefs that have are full of contradictions and many unresolved questions? Are we an assigned defender for old inherited beliefs or a sincere searcher for the truth? One day, all of these inherited beliefs will come to an end, whether they were true or false, and everyone will stand alone in front of God's judgement seat together with his faith, ideas, and beliefs that he embraced all his life; upon that his final fate would be determined. Therefore, I hope we would be careful about how serious this is, sadly using the inherited beliefs as an excuse wouldn't save us then.

Allow me to invite you to read the argument that I am about to present in this research with an alert, critical thinking mind, personally analysing and revising all of the biblical texts that I will present. I hope and pray that the Lord would use this research to lead us into a great depth in our perspective

about Christ and the Bible. I pray that I have succeeded in organizing ideas, formatting phrases, and selecting the words in a smooth, easy way for all to understand. I admit it was a hard mission to accomplish since the case that we are talking about is a controversial one. However, with a humble and loving heart I want to feed everyone from the feast that the Lord has fed me, and everyone to be satisfied as I have been as well. My heart desire is for weak hearts to be strengthened, and for thinkers with tormented minds to be spared the hell intellectual struggle which I know very well.

PREMOON

Chapter Two

PREMOON

Linguistic and Scientific Introduction

I begin this thesis with a linguistic and scientific introduction that is easy and simple, yet is very important to pave the way and evoke the reader's mind to understand this serious case. Just as we can't understand the abnormal without understanding the normal first; we can't understand the supernatural without understanding the natural first. What I am going to present in this scientific introduction is not an explanation, a link or a conclusion, but it is just an account of certain scientific facts that, if you wish to review and verify, you can go back to the documented scientific books and references which would be mentioned in the footnote. Before I dive into the details of the case, I simply state that any conception, whether natural or miraculous conception, is a process of forming, making and weaving of something new -or to be more precise- someone new. Not only that this is packed by science and reality but also by the Holy Bible. For Job has said to the Lord," Your hands fashioned and made me; and now you turn and destroy me." (Job 10:8)

In his message, apostle Jacob talks about the tongue and says, "With it we bless the Lord and Father, and with it we curse those who are made in the likeness of God." (James

3:9) God has all the glory as the Creator makes, weaves and forms a new person through conception. To be more specific and focused, I will only address ten essential points.

- **First:** there are three terms in the Arabic language that are used to describe and explain the subject of this thesis, and they are conception, pregnancy and give birth. Though in colloquial Arabic these terms are used interchangeably, they differ in their linguistic meanings:

1. Conception: it is a word that describes the process of forming or weaving the fetus in the mother's womb; according to the Arabic dictionaries it's a derivative from the process of making cords. It describes the interweaving and intertwining of coils to make electric cables or the interweaving and intertwining of threads to form strong cord. This exactly what happens in a microscopic process where the chromosomes and DNA strands are twisted, interweaved and intertwined around one another once the egg is fertilized, and united with the sperm to form the zygote or the seed of the new embryo.

Also, this term in Greek means to be held or imprisoned, as if this fetus or the new formation is being held in the mother's womb for nine months until is fully formed then is born into this world, and giving birth is the process of freeing the fetus from its confinement.

Moreover, the word also gives the meaning of a connector or cord that connects this fetus to his father and

mother, or rather the whole human race to each other as a single race, which explains some slang expressions such as “vein cord” to refer to close proximity.

The meaning will become even more apparent when we look at death which is an opposite process. Scientifically, death can be described as disintegration, dissolution, decay, and fusion. Apostle Paul stated that saying, “As for me, I am already being poured out as a libation, and the time of my departure has come” (2 Tim 4:6). The Greek word for “departure”, which apostle Paul has used, was mentioned only once in the whole Bible which is in this scripture. It means the disintegration and dissolution of any ligature to depart, the separation of parts and their dissolution with decay. ἀνάλυσις⁽¹⁾ *analysis an-al'-oo-sis (G359)*. Therefore, in conception there is connection, unity, formation, and weaving, while in death there is dissolution, separation, fusion and decay.

In the New Testament⁽²⁾, the word “conception” came in the Greek text 16 times, 5 times as “she conceived or was conceived” and 11 times giving other meanings away from the meaning of “conception” συλλαμβάνω *sullambanō sool-lam-ban-o* under no. (*G4815*), in the Old Testament⁽³⁾, in the Hebrew text it was mentioned 45 times הָרָה *hârâh haw-raw'*, under no. (*H2029*)

(1) STRONG, THAYER, KJC Dictionaries for meanings of words in Greek

(2) STRONG, THAYER, KJC Dictionaries for meanings of words in Greek

(3) STRONG, KJC Dictionaries for meanings of words in Hebrew

2. Pregnancy: This term isn't used to describe the formation of the fetus, it rather describes the process of carrying the fetus; to be more specific, it describes the woman's condition after conception as she is carrying someone new in her womb and uterus. As if I am saying someone is carrying a ball or a suitcase, and so on.

3. Give birth: this term is used to describe the process of letting out and freeing this fetus after it has been completely formed in its mother's womb for nine months from its mother's womb to the world. Thus, conception is the process of concealed formation which is hidden, while the process of giving birth is the process of revealing what's already been formed in hiding in public. The miracle that I am addressing in this thesis took place in the conception process and not in the giving birth process, as I will explain in later in this research according to the sequence of thought.

- **Second:** I stop a little at the first process, which is "conception" because the whole miracle happened in that process, and I add that there are four linguistically similar but distinct words to describe the dimensions and depths of the conception process and these are "seed, root, genealogy and loins". It's inevitable to understand their linguistic meaning and the slight differences between them before going deeper into the question of the virgin conception of Christ.

The first word "**Seed**" as the Bible said in (Genesis 3) the seed of the woman or seed of the serpent. Also, the seed of

Abraham or David as it was mentioned in different texts in the Bible.

The second word **“Root”**, the Bible mentioned it in (Isaiah 11:1),” A shoot shall come out from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots.”. It was mentioned again in (Romans 11: 17-18) “But if some of the branches were broken off, and you, a wild olive shoot, were grafted in their place to share the rich root[f] of the olive tree, 18 do not boast over the branches. If you do boast, remember that it is not you that support the root, but the root that supports you.” Also, when Jesus talked about himself in (Revelation 22) “I am the root and the descendant of David.” In that way there are many scriptures where that word is used.

The third word **“Genealogy”**, which is mentioned in (Hebrew 7) “Without father, without mother, without genealogy,” where the Bible talked about Melchizedek and in what way he resembled the Son of God. This word ἀγενεαλόγητος *agenealogētos ag-en-eh-al-og'-ay-tos (G35)* is mentioned only once⁽⁴⁾ in the whole Bible in (Hebrew 7:3) for the event described by this word (the incarnation of the Son) happened only once in the history of mankind and hasn't been repeated since. For any other child on the face of this earth and in any era has come to our world by birth and according to his genealogy has a mother and a father. Even those children who have entered our world as a result of an immoral and illegitimate relationship between a man

(4). STRONG, THAYER, KJC Dictionaries for meanings of words in Greek

and a woman outside marriage, has the genealogy of a father and mother, which can be proved legally, scientifically, and biologically.

The fourth word is **“Loins”**, we read in (Hebrews 7) that Levi was still in the loins of Ibrahim, the day the later met Melchizedek and gave him a tenth of the spoils, for that Levi paid tithes through Ibrahim at the same moment Ibrahim gave tithes to Melchizedek because he was in his loins.

Linguistically speaking, these four terms are close to each other, and the differences between them are very fine. Yet, if we are able to make a linguistic distinction between them, then we would be able, by God’s grace and illumination, to unlock the mystery of the virgin conception of Christ since part of this case is a linguistic matter. We can divide them into two groups; the first group consists of “seed & root”, while the second group consists of “genealogy & loins”.

The first group: the two words seed & root are both taken from the agricultural field to point out to the meaning of family tree or family chain. We find an explanatory synonym for them in the biblical expression “human’s seed” which is also taken from the agricultural field. When mentioned in a context, these two words aim to explain the tree or the family chain and not as a proof or negation of paternity “genealogy”.

The second group: the two words “genealogy & loins” are both taken from Genetics, which is related to scientific

studies of genes responsible for proof or negation of paternity and filiation “genealogy”. When mentioned in a context, these two words aim as a proof or negation of paternity and filiation “genealogy”.

Therefore, the word “seed” is wider than the word “genealogy”, for it refers to the grain as a whole whether it is “a sperm cell or an egg cell/ovum”. While the word “genealogy” is deeper than the word “Seed”, it doesn’t refer to the grain as a whole, but only to the DNA constraint present on that grain; the genetic content of this grain. Here is a simple illustration that would clarify the idea; the word “seed” refers to the flat as a whole, while the word “genealogy” refers to the furniture, which is the content of this flat. When I talk about the “flat”, I mean “its location, address, floor”, but when I talk about the “furniture, or the flat’s content”, surely, I don’t mean the location, address or the floor, but what is meant is “kind, style, and number of the pieces of furniture”.

The same applies here when I use the word “seed”, what is meant by it is “the family tree, the address of this person, or -in general -from which family did he come from”, but when I use the word “genealogy”, what is meant here is “the internal genetic content of that person specifically”.

Thus, the word “seed” doesn’t bear the genetic dimension within it as the word “genealogy” does. In (Isaiah 53:10) there is a text about Christ that says “Yet it was the will of the Lord to crush him with pain. When you make his life an

offering for sin, he shall see his offspring, and shall prolong his days; through him the will of the Lord shall prosper." The offspring here "seed" is a spiritual offspring, that has nothing to do with the genetic inheritance. In (Genesis 3:15), the Bible says the following about the judgement on the serpent "I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will strike your head, and you will strike his heel." Again, the offspring of the serpent is a spiritual one, where Christ mentioned them in (John 8:44) "You are from your father the devil, and you choose to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks according to his own nature, for he is a liar and the father of lies." Also, John the Baptist referred to them in (Luke 3:7) "You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" The Baptist was not uttering curses and insults, but he was only saying that they were the offspring of the ancient serpent, brood of vipers who would kill Christ yelling "Crucify Him, crucify Him" which is a fulfilment of the prophecy in (Genesis 3) "and you will strike his heel." And that from the root of the snake will come forth an adder as Isaiah said in (Isaiah 14:29) "for from the root of the snake will come forth an adder, and its fruit will be a flying fiery serpent."

The ovum/ egg cell is the seed of the female as the Bible refers to Christ that he is "the woman's Seed". Likewise, the sperm cell σπέρμα *sperma* **G4690** is the seed of the man, as the Bible says about Christ that he is "David's seed" or

“Abraham’s seed” and so on. Inside of each seed, either a sperm or an egg cell there are (23) chromosomes, divided into (22) pairs of numbered chromosomes called autosomes which are responsible for the physical inherited characteristics like: eye color, hair color, and whether the hair will be fine or coarse, etc..... And (1) Pair of chromosomes is called the sex chromosomes which is responsible for determining the gender of the baby whether a male or a female child. The child gets sex chromosome “Y” from his father, which is responsible for determining the gender of the baby to be a male, and it is found only on the sperm cell. As for the other sex chromosome “x”, the child gets it either from his father or his mother, for it is found on both sperm and the egg / ovum cells, which is responsible for determining the gender of the baby to be a female. Therefore, in terms of chromosomes, if the child is a male then he is “xy”, if the child is a female, then she is “xx”.

As the sperm cell unites with the ovum/egg cell, together they produce the “zygote” or a fertilized egg/ a seed of an embryo. This zygote is composed of (46) chromosomes, which is the result of a union of (23) chromosomes from the ovum/egg cell, and another (23) chromosomes from the sperm cell, so a normal human being by chromosomal terms means that he/she is (46) chromosome “not less or more”. Just for the record, there are other creatures and beings that have different number of chromosomes. For example, a cat has (38) chromosome, an ape has (48) chromosome, a beans seed has (12) chromosome, a tomato seed has (24)

chromosome and so on; this is in terms of the number of chromosomes. As for the structure of each chromosome, it is a mesmerizing structure. Each chromosome is made up of a piece of DNA strand tightly coiled on each other, and this strand is made up of thousands of shorter segments of different codes called genes. Each gene is composed of different repeated sequences of four nitrogenous bases called adenine, guanine, cytosine and thymine. These genes are responsible for the genetic coding or the genetic print which is a distinctive feature for every human being, and therefore it is responsible for proof or negation of paternity and filiation “genealogy”.

For further clarification, let me give you another illustration, a metaphorical one. Just as the cell phone is made up of hardware with a small piece called Bios fixed on it a software called IOS, so is the woman’s body. For a female’s body has living and tangible cells, tissues, and organs which represent the hardware, and on one of these cells which is the ovum, a copy of the operating system which is the software called DNA is fixed.

- **Third:** is a well-known information to us all, but allow me to address it to awaken your mind. It is considered a natural rule without any exceptions that every child who came or would come to this world till the end of time:
 - Is a result of the will of man and will of flesh, whether this happens either from a legitimate relationship (that is

within the frame of a lawful marriage), or by ethically and morally standards non-legitimate relationship (apart from a lawful marriage).

- This child is the seed and genealogy of his mother and of his father, which means that this child is their offspring “their seeds” and their genealogy “genetically identical to both of them” of this man and this woman together.

- **Fourth:** violating the ethical and moral laws can never violate the scientific, biological ones. Since these scientific, biological laws of reproduction and multiplying can't be modified or exceptionally changed unless through a miraculous act of God, because He is the one who established these laws. Thus, I dare say that the miraculous virgin conception of Christ as an exceptional, supernatural intervention in these laws, is considered one of the strongest evidences that God is the programmer and the founder of these natural biological laws of reproduction and multiplying. As a result, He was the only one able to make an exceptional, miraculous modification, without breaking the ethical and moral laws, which were founded by Him. Thus, the miraculous virgin conception is one of the strongest evidences that God is the Creator as we shall see through the rest of the research. Due to the importance of this point, and to close all doors for any skeptical voice, I repeat again that the virgin conception is indeed biologically a miraculous act of

God, but without even the slightest chance of breaking any small fraction of the ethical and moral laws. That's why, when Joseph wanted to dismiss Mary quietly the angel assured him saying, "do not be afraid to take Mary as your wife, for the child conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit."

- **Fifth:** the fact that these two words "seed & genealogy" are packed together, and can't be separated according to the biological laws of reproduction and multiplying whether the born child is a result of legitimate or non-legitimate relationship, doesn't mean that both are synonymous. In other words, being packed together doesn't mean they are equivalent in meaning. Though whenever one word is mentioned in a context, the other follows it, yet each word gives a distinctive dimension and significant meaning in relation to the biological laws of reproduction and multiplying.

One might ask early on what I mean by saying that each word gives a distinctive dimension and a significant meaning? To answer this question allow me to repeat what I have said earlier. In general, heredity whether of physical features or personal characters, is a process linked to the word "genealogy" not to the word "seed". Whenever we read the word "genealogy" in the Bible, it refers to heredity of physical features or personal characters, but whenever we read the word "seed" in the Bible, it refers to specifying the family tree & chain (the root and the branch, or the root

and the leaves), neither the heredity of physical features nor personal characters. Undoubtedly, this idea will become clearer according to the order and sequence of ideas in the research as we proceed with reading.

- **Sixth:** the proof of paternity “genealogy” is a scientific interpretation of the biblical expression “will of man, will of flesh”. In other words, proof of paternity of a child to his mother and father scientifically is considered as a proof that this child is the will of this man and the will of this flesh. Even if one of or both of them denied this child, or whether they had a legitimate or non-legitimate relationship. That denial doesn’t refute the fact that they are biologically the mother and father of this child by genealogy.

For this reason, I go ahead and say, in short, since the context is suitable, then I will explain it in details later in this research; if a child comes to this world through a miraculous virgin conception same as with Christ “without will of man, or will of flesh”, then consequently and inevitably that child would be “without genealogy”. For the scientific expression “without a genealogy” and the spiritual one “without a will” are two faces of the same coin.

- **Seventh:** there is no room for spiritualizing things when we are talking about the historical, physical incarnation of the Son of God with an actual, physical body with flesh, blood and bones that can be touched and seen as Christ once said. Naturally, any physical

body with flesh, blood and bones must have a genetic code and print, therefore, the Son of God in His humanity must have a genetic code, especially that He was born and not created. I would further add that as Adam the first, with his created physical body have had a genetic code, then it is more suited that the incarnated Son of God, who was born, would have a genetic code too. Thus, claiming that the humanity of the Son was a result of a miracle so He doesn't have a genetic code, is a spiritual exaggeration which wouldn't only gave the wrong meaning but also lead you to wrong, distorted beliefs, which in turn would lead to intellectual struggles. Even though it seemed spiritual elevation but in reality, it is delusional.

- **Eighth:** the word “humanity” isn't stated literally in the Bible, it is used to refer to “body & soul” together, not only “the body”. Therefore, using the word “humanity” to talk only about the body that God has prepared for the Son, is not an accurate or proper way to describe this body because the word “humanity” is more inclusive than just a “body”.

The human body is created from dust, but the human soul was placed inside this body when the almighty God breathed into him the breath of life “and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living being.” Therefore, the human soul inside our bodies came from God unlike animals whom their souls came into being through direct divine order not through breathing of God.

So, when we talk about “the humanity of Son of God”, we are actually talking about a body that doesn’t only have a breath of life inside it, but also we are talking about a body that God miraculously prepared for His Son (Hebrews 10:5) “But a body you have prepared for me”. For in Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. In Him dwelt the One who once breathed into Adam’s nostrils the first breath of life, that One himself dwelt fully not only a breath from him, and not just a temporarily dwelling, but in a permanent, everlasting unity, that’s why the angel said to Mary, “Therefore the child to be born will be holy; he will be called Son of God.”

- **Ninth:** The incarnation is the tangible, material part of the Christian faith, and it is one of the powerful keys to getting out the violent struggles of doubt and blocking the fiery arrows of atheism that make us incapable of believing in intangible spiritual matters.

“**Spiritual body**” is a strange expression mentioned in (1 Corinthian. 15). At first glance, it seems a contradiction, so how can a physical body be tangible and at the same time spiritual, intangible, and immaterial?! It is indeed a confusing expression, but at the same time, it is deep and carries many wonderful dimensions.

It is sheer stupidity, to look at our hands and say that they are clean and free of viruses only because we do not see any viruses in them. Likewise, it is stupid to say that this air that we see is clean and free of viruses only because we do not see viruses in it.

For those who only believe in visible, physical objects, I say that a simple **medical microscope** was able to completely crush your belief and destroy it. For your hand under the microscope is completely different from the one you see with your naked eye. I say to those who do not believe in the existence of another spiritual world only because they do not see it with their naked eyes, the **Bible** has completely crushed and destroyed your belief because it revealed the existence of spiritual evil hosts in the heavenly places even if we do not see them with our naked eyes.

The naked eye is a **biological device** that has a limited visual ability, through which God personified his limitless visual ability in its range, dimensions, and capabilities, but with the difference between God's visual ability and man's visual ability.

- The human eye is not designed to see **underwater** because it cannot see when it's in contact with water; therefore, it is necessary to wear goggles to keep around the eye an area and a measure of air, a water-free space, so that the eye can see. My question is why the human eye is not designed for vision underwater? Because humans are not designed to live underwater.

- The human eye is not designed to see in the **dark**. It needs light to see. When the ray of light hits an object, it is reflected on the retina; thus, a person can see and distinguish this object.

- The human eye is not designed to see **miniature** objects like viruses, and it needs a magnifying microscope to enlarge these objects thousands of times so that the eye can see them.

- The human eye is not designed to see objects in **space (extremely far objects)** such as planets, and it needs a space telescope to be able to see such objects.

- The human eye is not designed to see 360 degrees (that is, we cannot see in front of us and behind us at the same time) because the field of vision of the human eye is limited.

- The human eye is not designed to see things **behind dark barriers** that are opaque, such as walls because the ray of light will hit the opaque object (without penetrating through it) and reflect on the retina of the eye; thus the eye will see this opaque object (the wall) without being able to see what Behind it.

- The human eye is not designed to see **spirits** because by nature spirits are not bodies; therefore, when the ray of light falls on them will pass through them without being reflected on the retina to be able to see and distinguish these spirits.

- A person can lose his eyesight if this organ becomes ill or injured. As for God, He can never lose His vision, not only because no one is stronger than Him, but also because

His visual ability is an absolute ability that is not linked to a biological, physical organ called the eye.

So why did God create eyes for us if we cannot see all of these things? To answer this question, I say: For many reasons, but in my viewpoint, the first reason is that God created eyes for us so that we can perceive and know Him how is this? Because our minds cannot realize that God is a God who sees without having the ability to see to some degree, so without this **experience** and ability we will not be able to understand or realize the meaning of the action verb (**see**); Consequently, we will not be able to understand or realize what is meant by the process of (vision). Likewise, we will not be able to understand or realize the meaning of **God sees us**. God created us in His image (**He embodied in us some of His absolute abilities but in a limited way**) to know Him and perceive Him; thus, we can be in a relationship with Him.

Here, I resume my talk about the spiritual world, just as we needed a microscope that enables us to see infinitesimal objects, and just as we needed a telescope to enable us to see faraway objects in space, we need the Bible to see the invisible God. How did the Bible do this? How did the Bible enable us to see the unseen spiritual world? This happened through the light of the revelation that revealed the truth of the **divine incarnation**. Just as the microscope and telescope lenses revealed the existence of infinitesimal and infinitely faraway bodies, so the pages of the Bible by the Holy Spirit

revealed Christ God incarnate, the image of the invisible God.

It is an amazing and authentic reality that can change our perspective on life as a whole. There is a **spiritual body**. There is Adam, not the first but the last, who is a life-giving spirit. It is a miraculous, everlasting blending and union between the visible and the invisible, which enabled us to see the unseen. It is an eternal, wondrous union between the tangible and the intangible that enabled us to touch the intangible.

However, you may ask me how I touched the intangible and saw the unseen when He had come two thousand years ago before I had a public presence? Truthfully, your question is justified, because physically I did not touch, and literally I did not see. Yes, allow me to tell you that what has made me believe in the truth of the divine incarnation. Not only the history that proved that Christ is a **historical** figure that came two thousand years ago, as history confirms and documents the historical existence of a person without confirming the nature and character of this person, but also what made me believe the miracle of the divine incarnation in the first place is that the Bible through which I knew of the miracle is **originally a miracle**. For it is impossible for humans to write such a book with this amount of creativity and accuracy. I have seen, touched, and experienced Jesus through the revelation of the Bible. It is the book, **the revelation, and the proof** at the same time. The scriptures that talk about the divine incarnation in the Bible with verbal accuracy

beyond description, and a wonderful harmony beyond human capabilities, from Genesis to Revelation over 1500 years by many writers, are impossible evidence (I mean this word) impossible by all human standards to be destroyed, no matter how suspicious the minds of the wicked are, and whatever the arrows of Satan throw at the Bible. You might ask me how did I reach this confidence and this certainty? This is what I will try to clarify in this paper.

- **Tenth:** The linguistic and textual proof of the virgin conception of Christ to Him all the glory. First, the textual proof of the case in question must be provided before we can discuss its exact details, which requires further examination of the word “the virgin” which was used by the Holy Spirit in the divine inspiration to describe the virgin conception of Christ whether in (Isaiah 7) or in (Mathew 1). While in the Hebrew and Greek origin there are at least three words used by the holy revelation to express the word virgin.

“ בתולה *bethûlâh*⁽⁵⁾ *beth-oo-law*’ (H1330) in Arabic, it is pronounced “betolah”. This word was used in the Hebrew original text around 50 times; it means virgin, unmarried, maiden, chaste, spinster.

“ עלמה *‘almâh*⁽⁶⁾ *al-maw*’ (H5959) in Arabic, it is pronounced “ Al amah or ghulamah”. This word was used in the Hebrew original text around 7 times; it means virgin,

(5) STRONG, KJC Dictionaries for meanings of words in Hebrew

(6) STRONG, KJC Dictionaries for meanings of words in Hebrew

unmarried, maiden. It is the feminine form of “Ghulam” עֶלֶם *'elem*⁽⁷⁾ *eh'-lem* (H5958), in English it means young man and it was mentioned only twice in the Old Testament.

Παρθένος *Parthenos*⁽⁸⁾ *par-then'-os* (G3933), in Arabic, it is pronounced “barthenos”; it appeared in the New Testament (14) times. It means virgin, maiden, a woman who never had sex before.

I would like to cease this chance to present you with a biblical answer to the famous vilification by which the Bible critics try to question the divine inspiration and the reality of the incarnation of the Son of God born from a virgin.

The vilification addresses the well-known prophecy in (Isaiah 7:14) “Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. Look, the young woman[e] is with child and shall bear a son, and shall name him Immanuel.” This verse talks about the virgin conception of Christ. The divine inspiration in the original text used the Hebrew word “עַלְמָה *'almâh*” which means maid or young girl; the revelation didn't use the clearer word “בְּתוּלָה *bethûlâh*” which means virgin, maiden, chaste who hasn't married yet. And that's where they start to aim their arrows to question the virgin conception of Christ.

To provide an answer to this vilification, I address the following four points:

(7) STRONG, KJC Dictionaries for meanings of words in Hebrew

(8) STRONG, THAYER, KJC Dictionaries for meanings of words in Greek

1) Contextual Paradox: If the author's intent here is to talk about a young girl who may be married and not necessarily a virgin because the word chosen in the text doesn't completely assure her virginity, as a skeptical might vilify, then the context of the text would be contradicted and become incomprehensible. For where would be the miracle or wonder of a married girl getting pregnant and giving birth where the prophet says to the king "Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign"? Where's the miracle here? I therefore say that this vilification is a paradox in itself and carries in its essence the reasons of its rebuttal.

2) Paradox in scriptures: the Hebrew word "עלמה 'almâh" came in the Old Testament to describe a virgin unmarried girl who is "Rebecca", for more clarification let's go to the scriptures in (Genesis 24)

In (Genesis 24:14) we find this text: "The girl (*H1330 beth-oo-law'*) was very fair to look upon, a virgin whom no man had known. She went down to the spring, filled her jar, and came up." Here the divine inspiration uses the word bethoolaw which clearly means that Rebecca is virgin, for further confirmation the divine inspiration continues and adds to shut the door on a reasonable doubt (a virgin whom no man had known).

In (Genesis 24: 44-43) the scriptures says, "I am standing here by the spring of water; let the young woman (*עלמה 'almâh al-maw' H5959*) who comes out to draw, to whom I shall say, 'Please give me a little water from your jar to

drink,' 44 and who will say to me, 'Drink, and I will draw for your camels also'—let her be the woman whom the Lord has appointed for my master's son." The divine inspiration here uses the word "עלמה 'almâh" which means a young girl to describe the same character (Rebecca) whom was previously described by the word "בְּתוּלָה *bethûlâh*". Therefore, I say the description of "עלמה 'almâh" doesn't negate virginity. Hence, if we said that the word "עלמה 'almâh" mentioned in (Isaiah 7:14) negate virginity this wouldn't be considered as a paradox in context as I indicated in the first point, but also as a paradox in the scriptures. For the same word was used to describe Rebecca without negating her virginity. However, I add that as Rebecca was referenced to as (*H1330 beth-oo-law'*) and (*עלמה 'almâh al-maw' H5959*), Then we need another text about the virgin conception of Christ for further confirmation to reveal the relative ambiguity in the scripture in (Isaiah 7: 14), which by default take us to the third point.

3) Direct quotation: "interpreting a text with another text" instead of putting more effort in finding interpretation that might be accurate or inaccurate, let's see how the quotation in (Matthew 1: 22-23) solved this dilemma in a certain and logical way that appeals to the mind. The text explains the birth of Jesus Christ by saying, "All this took place to fulfil what had been spoken by the Lord through the prophet 23 'Look, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall name him Emmanuel which means, 'God is with us.'" Here Mathew being led by the divine inspiration quoted

the text in (Isaiah 7: 14) and used a powerful and certain Greek word which is (Παρθένος *Parthenos par-then'-os (G3933)* which means an unmarried virgin who never had sex before. Here the Holy Spirit clarifies the purpose from using the word “עלמה *’almâh*” mentioned in (Isaiah 7:14) because the quotation in (Matthew 1:22-23) isn’t considered an attempt to fix a mistake but to add a new dimension, it’s a clarifying and supplementary revelation to the text in (Isaiah 7:14), there is no drawback in that progression of the gradual increase of revelation in such matter in the Bible. For example, If I said that I had dinner in a small plate, then I add later that the plate wasn’t only small but never been used before; there will be no contradiction or conflict in my narration because the plate being small won’t contradict the fact that it is also new. Same applies for the young girl being “עלמה *’almâh*” doesn’t contradict that she is a virgin “Παρθένος *Parthenos*” on the contrary, it supports the fact that she is a virgin. To solve that external conflict, I say not only the word “עלמה *’almâh*” is used throughout the whole text to refer to virgin and unmarried girls such as (Rebecca in Genesis 24) and (Moses’ sister Mary in Exodus 2:8), but also the Holy Spirit interpret the word in the New Testament with the word “Παρθένος *Parthenos*” which means a virgin who didn’t marry and have never had sex before. The Holy Spirit did that so not to leave any chance for manipulation through translations, interpretations or ideologies because the ambiguate texts are rich environment for philosophical viruses and interpretive germs to grow and thrive. The word

“Παρθένος *Parthenos* ” revealed the purpose in which the Holy Spirit has hidden in the word “ עלמה *’almâh*”. This is considered as one of the wonders of the divine inspiration in his progression, consistency and harmony.

Now, I will present you with some of the texts where the word “ Παρθένος *Parthenos* ” is mentioned in the New Testament not only to prove that its linguistic meaning is “virgin” in the Greek dictionaries but also through the meaning in context in the divine scriptures.

The apostle Paul says in (1 Corinthians 7: 28) about Virgin Mary “But if you marry, you do not sin, and if a virgin “Παρθένος *Parthenos G3933*” marries, she does not sin.” That is a clear textual confirmation that a virgin “Παρθένος *Parthenos G3933*” is the girl who isn’t married yet. Same as Paul says in the same epistle and same chapter (1 Corinthians 7: 34) “There is difference between a wife and a virgin “Παρθένος *Parthenos G3933*” the unmarried woman careth for the things of the lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit” Also, the text in English is as clear as the sun itself “There is difference also between a wife G1135 and a virgin.G3933”

Without a speck of doubt, these two texts prove that the word “Παρθένος *Parthenos*” used in the quotation in (Matthew 1:23) describes a virgin who hasn’t got married or had sex before because both the linguistic meaning of the word and clear meaning used in the divine scripture says so.

4) the double negation of knowledge: not only the divine inspiration used determinative words and clear expressions, but also left no room for doubt and closed all doors for any skepticism and vilification by negating that Mary had any previous sexual activity in (Luke 1:34) “Mary said to the angel, ‘How shall this be, since I know not a man?’” Also, the Bible negated that Joseph hadn’t have known Mary as a wife before her conception (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”. And he had no marital relationship with her during the period of her pregnancy (Matthew 1:25) “And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name Jesus.” This double negation clarified the meaning and the situation in more details so that it leaves no room for the human mind to have any assumptions in relation to the linguistic meaning. As a result, I say If the words used to express “virgin” in the original Hebrew text carry a proportion of the intersectionality of meaning, which is, of course, not a fault in the divine inspiration, but a limitation in words and expressions because it is a human language. Then, the word used in the Greek text is “Παρθένος *Parthenos*”, in addition to the double negation of knowledge, has replaced the limitations of the word and the expression with additional explanatory and interpretative phrases, and has certainly confirmed that the conception of Christ was a miraculous virgin conception. Here, I say that if it is important to know

the meaning of words and expressions in the original text, it is equally important to know the context of the text, and to read both texts as it is to know the meaning of words and expressions used.

PREMOON

Chapter Three

RENMOON

Main Features of the Problem and the Dilemma of Melchizedek

Dear reader, allow me to present to you some biblical scriptures that would highlight the dilemma we are about to address. First, we should identify the exact features of the problem, so we can have the ability to recognize and understand the solution. By God's grace, I will prove that what you once thought to be a contradiction between texts is in fact a great consistency, and integration in meaning between them. You will discover by the end of this research not only the greatness of Christ and the ultimate perfection of His humanity but also the greatness of the Bible and its verbal plenary inspiration.

The Bible declares in many texts that Virgin Mary is Jesus' mother; I will mention only three of them for demonstration:

(Mathew 2:13) "Now after they had left, an angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream and said, "Get up, take the child and his mother, and flee to Egypt, and remain there until I tell you; for Herod is about to search for the child, to destroy him." The child and his mother are clearly stated here.

(John 2:1) “On the third day there was a wedding in Cana of Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there.” The mother of Jesus is stated in a clear and straight forward manner.

(John 19:25-26) “Meanwhile, standing near the cross of Jesus were his mother, and his mother’s sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus saw his mother and the disciple whom he loved standing beside her, he said to his mother, “Woman, here is your son.” In these few verses, the Holy Spirit stated four times that Mary is the mother of Jesus.

From the previous scriptures, we understand that the Holy Spirit stated clearly, with no doubt several times that Mary is the mother of Jesus. However, there is another verse about Christ in (Hebrews 7:3) which talks about Melchizedek saying “Without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but resembling the Son of God, he remains a priest forever.” Honestly, if we viewed this text superficially, the text would be very confusing to any reader. Logically, we can conclude from the text that since “Melchizedek” which is “the image” that bears the resemblance is “without father, without mother, without genealogy”, then the “Son of God” antitype or “the original” must be also “without father, without mother, without genealogy”. This where the dilemma with its features appears; a contradiction between the latter scripture which stated that he is without mother and the former scripture which clearly stated that Mary is the mother of Jesus. Dear

reader, I urge you to continue reading to discover that this is the miracle not the dilemma; in this superficial paradox the details of the miracle are hidden. As a result, there is a consistency and great harmony between these texts, unlike what you have thought before.

However, before I proceed to dive deep into the details of this miracle, I want to clear out something. The scripture that we are referring to in (Hebrews 7:3) is talking about the Son of God in His incarnation, in His humanity ⁽⁹⁾ because some people might try to escape the difficulty of this scripture by claiming that it is talking about the divinity of the Son of God, which is a wrong interpretation that contradicts itself as we will see now. For that, I will state eight clues that prove that this scripture is talking about the Son of God in His incarnation, in His humanity, so that the argument presented in this book would be built on a strong foundation. This scripture in (Hebrews 7:3) holds **the key** to unfold the mystery of the miraculous virgin conception and birth of Christ, as well as unfolding the mystery of other biblical texts. I will also cease the chance to address the mystery around the person “Melchizedek”, since the context is suitable, and both matters are relevant.

(9) Please review the second group of sources mentioned at the end of the research to verify that all of them interpreted this text as referring to the son at his divinity or priesthood, not in his birth, in his incarnation and his humanity nature, as i demonstrated in this research by a lot of conclusive evidence, and this is one of the exclusive points in this research.

◆ **First clue:** the expression “without genealogy” is indeed a genetic, scientific term; describing the physical ties “relations”, not the spiritual ones since the spirit or the divinity doesn’t have genes. Thus, when the Bible says “without father, without mother, without genealogy”, it is actually referring to the humanity of the Son of God “His body” and not to His divinity. In fact, what the Holy Spirit meant by saying that he is “without father” in His humanity is indeed right as he is biologically, in his humanity without father because He came through a virgin conception before Mary and Joseph came together. In addition, to confirm that the Holy Spirit meant the biological aspect not the legal registered facts in the Jewish birth records, He added “without genealogy”. One might ask how can the Holy Spirit say that the Son of God in His humanity is “without father”; while in other texts, He said that David is “His father”? The Bible here accurately stated that Christ is “without a father” from the view of the genealogy only “without father, without genealogy”, as from the view of the seed, He has a father who is David as He is David’s seed “from Mary’s side not Joseph’s” as we shall see later. Similarly, what the Holy Spirit stated that Christ is “without mother” is also accurate. Again, one might ask how can that be when the Holy Spirit said before that Mary is “Jesus’ mother”? The same answer applies here; the Bible accurately stated that Christ is “without mother” from the view of the genealogy only “without mother, without genealogy”, as Mary is still His mother from the view of the seed, for He is the seed of the woman. Thus, from the view

of the seed, He has a mother and a father “Mary & David”, while from the view of the genealogy, He is “without father, without mother”. For He is the seed of Mary and not her genealogy, and He is the seed of David and not his genealogy. This amazing truth that the inspiration revealed is the core of the miraculous virgin conception of Christ which I will explain in details as we proceed, using many biblical texts, leaving no room for any doubt, and showing the consistency in the meaning of the scripture and its coherency with the other biblical scriptures as well.

◆ **Second clue:** theologically, it is not right to resemble anyone to the Son of God in His divinity. For God in His divinity is incomparable to anyone, He said about Himself in (Isaiah 40:25) “To whom then will you compare me, or who is my equal? says the Holy One.” Thus, saying that Melchizedek resembles the Son of God in His divinity is theologically wrong, because it is not possible to resemble any human being whoever he is to God in His divinity. As well as, saying that the Son of God in His divinity is “without father”, is also theologically wrong for it is calumniating the eternal Sonship of Christ, which makes the scripture insufficient in itself; because how come the Bible means to say here that Christ in His divinity is “without father” then says afterwards “but resembling the Son of God”?!

◆ **Third clue:** one might argue back and say that the Holy Spirit used the term “Son of God”, to that I would answer that the term Son of God is not exclusively used to refer to

His divinity only, but it is also used to refer to His Humanity. When the angel told Mary about the conception of Christ, he said in (Luke 1:35) “The angel said to her, “The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore, the child to be born will be holy; he will be called Son of God.” Dear reader, notice here the wonderful combination of “the child to be born, he will be called Son of God”; the first part is a clear statement about His humanity, while the second part refers to His divinity, since in His humanity He is Son of God “For in him the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily”.

◆ **Fourth clue:** in (Hebrews 7: 13-14), we read “Now the one of whom these things are spoken belonged to another tribe, from which no one has ever served at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord was descended from Judah, and in connection with that tribe Moses said nothing about priests.” In these verses, the person referred to as “the one of whom these things are spoken”, descended from Judah, which is a clear sign of His incarnation and His humanity. Also, The Bible refers to Him as being “without father, without mother, without genealogy” same as the one who descended from the tribe of Judah.

◆ **Fifth clue:** in (Hebrews 7:22) we read, “accordingly Jesus has also become the guarantee of a better covenant.” Here, the Holy Spirit uses the name “Jesus”, which is the name of the incarnated Son of God, who was born from Mary.

◆ **Sixth clue:** the verses in (Hebrews 7) that we have read are all talking about the Son of God; of Him being The High Priest according to the order of Melchizedek. The eternal Word became actually a priest according to this priesthood order, when He incarnated, and presented Himself as a sacrifice to God; thus, these verses are talking about His humanity. Dear reader, you must have noticed the expressions used here “another priest arises, one who has become a priest”, these expressions are all talking about priesthood and humanity, yet there two resemblances in this chapter:

●● **First resemblance:** in (Hebrews 7:15) we read, “It is even more obvious when another priest arises, resembling Melchizedek,” here we find the Son of God being resembled by Melchizedek concerning the priesthood.

●● **Second resemblance:** in (Hebrews 7:3) we read, “Without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but resembling the Son of God, he remains a priest forever.” Here Melchizedek is the one resembled by the Son of God concerning the genealogy. I am aware that the following statement “having neither beginning of days nor end of life” is a problem for some of you dear readers, and makes hard for you to accept that the Holy Spirit here means the Son of God in His incarnation and humanity. This leads to the next clue, which would reveal that this statement specifically applies rightly to the incarnation of the Son of God and His humanity.

◆ **Seventh clue:** we read in (Hebrews 7:3) “Without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but resembling the Son of God, he remains a priest forever.” Not only it is scientifically proven in the reproduction and multiplying laws, but also to the common sense that the father and mother are the starting point of any child because he/she is the genealogy of that child because apart from the parents that child won’t exist. Therefore, **the genealogical relationship is a causative relationship** “reason of existence”. Yet in the virgin conception, Jesus came without father, without mother, without genealogy, hence He came without a starting point⁽¹⁰⁾ so the Holy Spirit followed saying “having neither beginning of days”, which seems logical conclusion in relation to what was said before “without father, without mother, without genealogy”. This in turn confirms that His birth was not the beginning of His existence, since His existence preceded His manifestation in the flesh, for He is only the seed of the woman and not her genealogy. Here, we also see the Holy Spirit goes back to eternity, as the perfect painter He is, creatively using a painting brush to mix colors of time with colors of eternity so the colors overlapped smoothly without any contradictions, since the Son of God incarnated in time without genealogy, as a perfect man, in

(10) The phrase “neither beginning of days” in the context of this text originally refers to the humanity of the son, because in his incarnation and his humanity he came without a father, without a mother and without genealogy, and therefore without a starting point. And that’s one of the exclusive points in this research.

His Humanity He doesn't have beginning of days. Therefore, His incarnation in the time doesn't contradict with Him being the eternal Son of God in His divinity. Now we can have a better understanding of the following scriptures in (Micah 5:2) "But you, O Bethlehem of Ephrathah, who are one of the little clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one who is to rule in Israel, whose origin is from of old, from ancient days." We can understand how He came out of Bethlehem of Ephrathah, incarnated from the tribe of Judah, and that doesn't contradict with Him being the same person whose origin is from of old, from ancient days. This was made possible through the virgin conception and birth, when the Son of God incarnated, without father, without mother, without genealogy. He doesn't have a starting point in the realm of time, yet His birth from Mary marks the beginning of His entrance into our world not the beginning of His existence. We read in (Hebrews 1:6) "And again, when he brings the firstborn into the world, he says, "Let all God's angels worship him." We see the Aseity of God, who said about himself "before Abraham was, I am." To demonstrate the greatness of the divine inspiration, and to confirm that the Holy Spirit meant the Son of God in His humanity, not His divinity, I would like to add the following: The Holy Spirit recommences by saying "nor end of life", though I expected He would continue saying "nor end of days" as He stated "having neither beginning of days" before it. But because He is talking about His incarnation and His humanity, and He means days of the realm of time not the days of eternity,

He didn't write "nor end of days". As Christ in incarnation in all of His glory died on the cross, thus, His days on Earth has come to an End. We have read what Jesus prophetically said to the Father in (Psalm 102:24) "O my God," I say, "do not take me away at the midpoint of my days, you whose years endure throughout all generations." If the writer said here "nor end of days", then that would be an implicit denial of the cross because it is talking about days of the time. God forbids! The Holy Spirit would never mention a text that might deny Christ's death on the cross, nor would He mention a text that would contradict with the rest of the Bible. The verbal inspiration wonderfully says "nor end of life", because after Christ has completed His days on earth by dying on the cross, He rose up again and He is alive forever and ever. He said about Himself in (Revelation 1:18) "and the living one. I was dead, and see, I am alive forever and ever;" and since He is alive forever and ever, the Holy Spirit continues saying "he remains a priest forever". Here, I would like to ask a question because the context gives a room for it; why can't the high priest who is taken from the people like Aaron remains as a priest forever? The Bible answers by saying in Hebrew "because they were prevented by death from continuing." Then, why would Jesus Christ continue to be a priest forever then? Is it because He didn't die? Or because his days on Earth didn't end by death? No, His days on Earth ended by dying for us on the Cross. Yet, He would remain a priest forever, because He died and rose up from death as an overcomer and a conquer, and shall never die

again. Then I can say He would remain a priest forever not because he did not die previously but because he will not die later, as by his death He defeated, destroyed death and rose up again, how powerful our Lord is! When the Bible states that “having neither beginning of days”, this refers to His **miraculous virgin conception** which is without genealogy. Then, His birth was not His starting point or the beginning of his existence, therefore, His birth into our world doesn't contradict with His eternal existence. When it says “nor end of life”, this implicitly refers to His **miraculous resurrection** which defeated and destroyed death. As well as, His death was not His end point, His birth is not His starting point, and so is His death is not His end point, how amazing is the Lord!! A watchful reader might anticipate the events and ask, if Jesus in His humanity is without father, without mother, without genealogy, then He is Adam and it would have been better to highlight that resemblance between Him and Adam the first rather than between Him and Melchizedek? This is a logical question, and the answer for that question is in the eighth clue, but before we go through it, allow me my dear reader through this research to express my appreciation of your attentive mind.

◆ **Eighth clue:** let me answer your question raised about Jesus and Adam, though I don't agree with you that Jesus in His humanity is Adam the first because this comparison has no accuracy in it. But I will say this to answer this precocious question; if the Holy Spirit would have stated that Jesus will come without father, without mother,

without genealogy through the resemblance between Him and the first Adam, then we would have understood that the last Adam would be created and not born just like the first Adam. And it would have been difficult for us to believe that Christ who is born from Mary is the incarnated Son of God, the promised Messiah that the prophecies talked about. Therefore, the Holy Spirit in His wisdom chose to reveal this truth through resemblance with a **born person** who is “Melchizedek”, and not a **created one** like “first Adam”. Accordingly, saying that Jesus Christ (last Adam) would be without father, without mother, without genealogy, although He would be born and not created. What a dazzling thing that is! For a long time now, we have been wondering about the reason and wisdom behind Melchizedek’s appearance in the text with this mysterious ⁽¹¹⁾ image, and how the Holy Spirit didn’t state his genealogy and birth chain. Until the Holy Spirit has revealed that He intentionally overlooked the genealogy of Melchizedek, so that He would use him as “an image” for the incarnated Son who would be without father, without mother, without genealogy, though He is the seed of the woman. For us this has been a dilemma, until the Holy Spirit revealed it as the riddle He used to articulate the essence of the miraculous virgin conception of Christ, which presented us with the “last Adam” who came to our world born and not created. Finally, I would like to add that the resemblance used between Melchizedek and the Son of God

(11) Unpacking and decoding the mystery of Melchizedek appearance on the pages of revelation in this vague and mysterious form without mentioning any genealogy chains to him, is one of the exclusive points of this research.

is a refutable proof that the Holy Spirit was referring to the Son of God in His incarnation and humanity, and not in His divinity. At the end of this point, allow me to stress again that “Melchizedek was a real person whom the Holy Spirit articulated his story, overlooking his genealogy to use him as an illustrative method, and a resemblance to the Son of GOD in His incarnation, to reveal to us a deeper dimension about the truth of incarnation”. Allow me to share with you a real example from life, if you saw a big shining phosphoric ball, hanging in the air at night. And you commented on that scene saying that, “This ball which hanging on nothing resembles earth which also stands hanging on nothing”. Your comment is a metaphorical one, may be the ball is hanging on a thin thread, that either you didn’t see or saw but decided to overlook to draw this resemblance to earth. In all cases earth is actually hanging on nothing. This is similar to the use of Melchizedek’s story; although he is a real person and human being who has a genealogy and birth chains, the Holy Spirit overlooked mentioning his genealogy chain to use him as an illustrative method, and as resemblance to the Son of GOD in His incarnation, who would come to our world, born without genealogy chain, as we shall see following the argument throughout the research. To conclude, there is a clear but not real paradox between some scriptures saying that Mary is the mother of Jesus, and other scriptures saying that He is without mother, is there a great divine purpose behind this outward conflict between these texts? Sure, there is an amazing purpose as we shall see.

REMOVED

Chapter Four

REMOVED

The Miraculous Conception and the Normal Birth

After hard and long thought, I couldn't find a closer example to explain how a child can be born of a woman without being her genealogy, but the one I am about to share. I just want to confirm that this example doesn't perfectly match what happened with the virgin conception of Christ. However, it would bring the idea closer to your mind to grasp how Jesus can be born from Mary, yet He is only her seed and at the same time not her genealogy. If we take a sperm cell from a husband (A), and an egg cell/ ovum from a wife (B), and fertilized them inside a laboratory to form the zygote or the embryo seed. Afterwards, we cultivated this zygote inside the womb of another woman (C); this embryo will grow inside the womb of this woman (C), and would be born after nine months. This child is born of the woman (C), but the woman (C) is not the child's mother by genealogy because woman (B) is. I again repeat, to spare you any confusion that this example doesn't apply perfectly to what happened in the virgin conception of Christ. The virgin conception of Christ is deeper than the above example, and the Virgin Mary wasn't at all a rented womb. The Bible states clearly that Christ came from her seed, and born

from her womb. In addition to that, the born child in this example from woman (C) is not her genealogy, but he is the genealogy of another woman and that is woman (B). On the other hand, what happened in the virgin conception of Christ brought Jesus not only without a genealogy of Mary but also without a genealogy of any other mother or woman at all “without mother, without genealogy”. In fact, what happened in that example by using recent scientific tools, God did it miraculously with the power of the Most High in a deeper way beyond our scientific tools, as I will further explain through the research. I only mentioned this example to illustrate how a child can be born of a woman without being her genealogy. Now, I can proceed with discussing the miraculous virgin birth of Christ. The birth process itself was very normal; and there is nothing miraculous about it. The Bible describes it in (Luke 2: 6-7) as follows “While they were there, the time came for her to deliver her child. And she gave birth to her firstborn son and wrapped him in bands of cloth, and laid him in a manger, because there was no place for them in the inn.” Neither the childbirth process itself was miraculous, nor the period of conception, for the Bible states clearly, “the time came for her to deliver her child”. The birth process separately was very normal without any miracles involved with the method of delivery included. Besides, any attempts to exaggerate the miracle by adding details that are not mentioned in the holy Bible would be intolerable triteness which might open a window for refuting the biblical text and cause negative implications. The miracle was orchestrated in the conception stage itself; how Mary

conceived with the child Jesus without coming together with Joseph, without any sexual intercourse, here lies the miracle. An amazing miracle took place, which was not by the natural laws of reproduction and multiplying, but by the power of the Most High. Mary asked the angel in (Luke 1:34) "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" he answered her in (vs. 35) saying "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be holy; he will be called Son of God." In our limited human language, we don't have enough expressions or vocabulary to describe or explain what the power of the Most High really is, that is if we understood it first. We can't even explain the potential power in the natural laws of reproduction and multiplying, as well as, we can't explain the effective power of the Most High in the miraculous virgin conception of Christ. Though we can't explain these powers and their dimensions "both the natural and the miraculous ones", yet we can understand the effect and the change these powers made and still make. In this research, I intend, with God's grace, to discuss what happened in this miracle and not how this miracle happened.

Let me explain the miracle from a scientific point of view; using the language of chromosomes. For it to be easily understood. It happened that one of Mary's ovum (23) chromosomes became by the power of the Most High a fertilized zygote (46) chromosome, without uniting or fertilizing by a sperm cell from Joseph since the conception happened before and without them coming together. To

further clarify, the Bible adds a significant text about Joseph to confirm that in (Mathew 1:25) "And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS." Therefore, they didn't come together before or during the conception period. Again, to eradicate all doubts Mary asked the angel in (Luke 1:34) "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" Thus, the Bible negated the knowledge from Joseph's side "And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son", and from Mary's side "I know not a man" to remove the doubt with certainty that this was a miraculous virgin conception. Indeed, a supernatural miracle happened in the living substance (DNA strand) present in the selected ovum from Blessed Virgin Mary's womb. This miracle changed the genetic features of this ovum, and it happened neither by a power of the natural biological laws of reproduction and multiplying, nor by any accidental genetic mutation randomly, because the accidental mutations lead to an abnormal, deformed embryo. Rather, this miracle happened through an external power that is the power of the Most High, to accomplish a predetermined eternal will of God, with an intentional arrangement of God. This power transformed the ovum from an ovum contains (23) chromosomes into a fertilized zygote contains (46) chromosomes. The question that should be answered by now, is there is any biblical texts to confirm what I just said, or these were mere conclusions based on scientific logic? Indeed, there are biblical scriptures prove what I just said, as we shall now see.

◆ **First proof:** The Biblical inspiration confirms many times that Jesus Christ is a man “a human”, some of these texts are: (1Tim 2:5) “For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, **the man** Christ Jesus;” (1Cor 15:21) “For since by man came death, by **man** came also the resurrection of the dead.” This is a reference to Christ through whom the resurrection of the dead has come. Jesus Christ is born of a woman, and the woman as a created being can’t give birth to any other creature but human beings. We read what Job said in his book in (Job 14:1) “Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble.” By Using the chromosomal language, a human being means (46) chromosomes. So how did a normal human being (46) chromosome, come from an ovum contains only (23) chromosomes? From where did the other (23) chromosomes come, that the zygote or the seed of this embryo is completed and became (46) chromosomes, a normal human being? There is no doubt that a supernatural miraculous act happened in the genetic code presented on that selected ovum from the Blessed Virgin Mary, multiplying the number of chromosomes on that ovum to be (46), for Christ to come as a full normal human being.

◆ **Second proof:** The Biblical inspiration confirms many times that Jesus Christ is “a **male** child”, and some of these scriptures are: (Luke 2: 21-23) “After eight days had passed, it was time to circumcise the child; and he was called Jesus, the name given by the angel before he was conceived in the womb. When the time came for their purification according to the law of Moses, they brought him up to

Jerusalem to present him to the Lord (as it is written in the law of the Lord, “Every firstborn male shall be designated as holy to the Lord”),” I hope you noticed phrases like “to circumcise the child, every firstborn male”, for such phrases are as clear as the sun, and need no further explanation. In (Revelation 12:5) “And she gave birth to a son, a male child, who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron. But her child was snatched away and taken to God and to his throne;” the Bible here is talking about the Israeli Nation, and the male child who came out of it, which is a clear reference to Christ. In (Revelation 12:13) “So when the dragon saw that he had been thrown down to the earth, he pursued the woman who had given birth to the male child.” The Holy Spirit continues to talk about the woman, again describes her child by “the male child”. Of course, there is no need to confirm that this description of the child as a male has nothing to do whatsoever neither implicitly nor explicitly with the heresy of Christ’s marriage to Mary Magdalene or to any other woman. As Christ didn’t get married at all according to the holy Bible, and anything that is not mentioned about that issue in the Bible is a fabrication in the minds of some. According to what the Holy Spirit highlighted for me the biblical inspiration has stated that Christ is a (male child) for two reasons at least:

First reason: Jesus is the last Adam, the head and root of the new creation. The Bible tells us that there was a man who came at the beginning of time; his name was Adam. He fell and lost his God given authority. But there is a second man who came at the fullness of time, Peter said about him

in (Acts 17:31) “because he has fixed a day on which he will have the world judged in righteousness by a man whom he has appointed, and of this he has given assurance to all by raising him from the dead.” Through this second man the will of the Lord shall prosper, and all creation shall submit to Him. Certainly, one might say that using the word “man” would have achieved the same purpose instead of using the word “male”, the answer to that will lead us to the second reason.

Second reason: the biblical inspiration meant a deeper dimension in the miraculous virgin conception of Christ. As the Bible did not only say that he is “a man” but also said with more detailed manner that he is “a male”. Here, what is scientifically proved that leaves no room for denial or ignoring is that for the child to be male, he has to get the chromosome (y) from his father, not from the mother, as chromosome (y) is only found on the sperm cell not on the ovum. So how did Jesus get the chromosome (y) to come as a male child, although he came only from an ovum of Mary without being fertilized by a sperm from Joseph, as has been stated before that Mary was found to have conceived without coming together with Joseph? Surely, there was a miracle performed by the power of the Most High in the genetic code and the chromosomes carried on this ovum, to form chromosome (y) for the child Jesus to come a male child.

According to these two proofs, we deduct that the power of the Most High not only just changed and modified

the number of the chromosomes on the ovum to multiply that Jesus would be born a human with (46) chromosomes, but also made changes in the genetic codes and the type of chromosomes to form chromosome (y). As a result, the child Jesus came a male child (xy). The power of the Most High made **quantitative** and **qualitative** modifications on the genetic code carried on Mary's ovum. All these changes and modifications in the genetic codes and the chromosomes on that selected ovum from Mary's womb done by the power of the Most High made this genetic code of this zygote **mismatching** and **non-identical** to the genetic code of Mary, thus Jesus came separated from Mary only in terms of genealogy, with this. The Biblical text in (Hebrews 7:3) that says He is without mother, without genealogy is fulfilled and confirmed. Again, my dear reader, I confirm that the Bible didn't say that Jesus is absolutely without mother, as it did not say he is without mother and then became silent as if the point meant has been delivered, but the Bible went on to say "without genealogy" as well. So, Jesus is without mother only in terms of genealogy as He remains Mary's seed, the seed of the woman. As we said earlier, the power of the Most High modified and changed the genetic features on this ovum and made it mismatching and non-identical to the genetic code of Mary, So Jesus is not Mary's genealogy (non-identical to her genetic code), but He is her offspring "her seed". That's why we say that **Jesus is the seed of the woman but not the genealogy of Mary**⁽¹²⁾.

(12) This phrase is one of the exclusive formulations and expressions in this research.

Chapter Five

RENEWMOON

The First medical report of Negation of Paternity “Genealogy” in the World

One might say that it is impossible to verify this idea in our time, as we can't get a sample of the DNA of Jesus and Virgin Mary to examine them in the laboratory to prove or refute the genealogy. This opinion is partially right, as for today, I am not going to analyze the DNA for it's impossible to get, but I am going to **analyze the Biblical texts** to show you that they have no contradictions with science whatsoever. In addition, all DNA lab analysis ends up with a paper medical report which either proves the genealogy or negates it, and we already have it in the Holy Bible in (Hebrews 7:3) which is the oldest, most accurate and truthful negation of paternity “genealogy” report in the world “Without father, without mother, without genealogy” This report was written more than 1900 years ago, which is the date of writing of the letter to the Hebrews (**67** or **69** AD), that's way before human beings discovered there is something called genes or DNA strands inside the human body. This **medical report** was written by the Holy Spirit who came upon the Virgin Mary in the time of the miracle, as an active doer and witness of that miracle. So, my dear reader, we are in no need for a medical proof done by a laboratory analysis which is subject

to failure or success, while we have the **most oldest and accurate report**⁽¹³⁾ of **paternity negation (*genealogy*)** in the world, written by God's inspiration who can never be wrong.

I briefly list the dates⁽¹⁴⁾ of some scientific discoveries that show and illustrate the gradient of the discovery of chromosomes, DNA and genes:

- In **1868** DNA was discovered by the Swiss scientist **Friedrich Miescher**.
- In the early **1900s**, some scientists, including **Theodor Boveri** and **Walter Sutton**, were able to see cell divisions and discover **chromosomes** responsible for the transmission and inheritance of genetic traits from generation to generation, at this point they agreed and emphasized **Mendel's theory**, which acknowledged the inheritance of genetic traits from generation to generation but did not know how this inheritance occurred.
- In the **1953**: American chemist **James Waston** and British **Francis Crick** were able to use some of the information reached by British scientist **Rosalin Franklin** to reveal for the first time the **double spiral wrapped shape of DNA strand**.

(13) No one has ever referred to this text as a forensic, scientific, medical paternity negation report, which is one of the exclusive points of the research. Please check with the second group of sources for verification.

(14) DNA – Wikipedia.

Chapter Six

RENMOON

Biblical Textual Evidences prove that Jesus is "Without Genealogy"

I present to you, my dear reader, **eight** evidences, which would leave no room for any suspicion and confirm that Jesus Christ in His humanity is without genealogy, He is only the seed not the genealogy.

✳ **First Textual Evidence:** without father, without mother, without genealogy (Hebrew 7:3) This straightforward, clear text doesn't need any explanation, yet allow me to state two points as to explain why this text is theologically inevitable:

- **First point:** I have said earlier that according to science and biological laws, the two words "seed and genealogy" are tightly packed together and can't be separated from each other. Anybody who is the seed is also the genealogy, therefore, if the Bible did not negate the genealogy of Jesus to Mary with a clear, direct negation like the one mentioned in the text, that means it is indirectly proving the genealogy as Jesus is indeed the seed of the woman. That's why this text in (Hebrews 7:3) is clearly stating "without genealogy", which is theologically inevitable so that the Holy Spirit wouldn't leave any room for human theories or interpretations. If Jesus was created "which is a fault assumption", there would

have been no need to refute the genealogy. However, since Jesus was born from Mary “the seed of the woman”, so need of a clear text that refutes His genealogy to Mary is theologically inevitable because these two words “seed and genealogy” are packed together according to the natural laws of reproduction and multiplication. Refute of genealogy is one of the strong evidences that it was a virgin miraculous conception.

•• **Second point:** Again, as I stated before, I would have imagined the Bible saying that Jesus is without father, without mother, without genealogy by drawing on the resemblance between the last Adam to the first Adam who was as well without father, without mother, without genealogy; not on the resemblance between Christ and Melchizedek. I would have expected the Bible to use the text in (Romans 5:14) “Yet death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one who was to come.” This is from my human perspective would have been the most suitable text to draw on the resemblance between Jesus and Adam the first, but the Bible was not written from a human perspective; for the Holy Spirit is its main author. If the Holy Spirit would have stated that Jesus would come without father, without mother, without genealogy through the resemblance between Him and the first Adam, we would have understood that the last Adam would be created and not born just like the first Adam. Therefore, it would have been difficult for us to believe that Christ who is born from Mary is the incarnated Son of God,

the promised Messiah that the prophecies talked about. For that reason, the Holy Spirit in His wisdom chose to reveal this truth through resemblance with a born person who is “Melchizedek”, not a created one “first Adam” to say that Jesus Christ “Last Adam” would be without father, without mother, without genealogy, though He would be born and not created. For a long time now, we have been wondering about the reason that Melchizedek appeared in the text with this mysterious image that the Holy Spirit didn’t state his genealogy chain. The Holy Spirit intentionally overlooked the genealogy of Melchizedek so that He would use him as an image for the incarnated Son of GOD who would be without father, without mother, without genealogy, though He is the seed of the woman. This was a dilemma, until the Holy Spirit revealed it as the riddle He used to articulate the essence of the miraculous virgin conception of Christ, the last Adam who came to our world born and not created.

✳ **Second Textual Evidence:** Woman, what concern is that to you and to me? In (John 2:3-4), we read these wonderful verses “When the wine gave out, the mother of Jesus said to him, “They have no wine.” And Jesus said to her, “Woman, what concern is that to you and to me? My hour has not yet come.” So why did Christ call Blessed Mary “woman” and not “mother”, though the Holy Spirit in the same verses stated that “the mother of Jesus” was there? Is Mary His mother or not or both? Actually, she is both; she is His mother according to the seed but not according to the genealogy. Here, when Jesus is addressing her with

“woman”, He wasn’t denying her motherhood. He was defining the kind of motherhood she had, only that of the seed and not of the genealogy. She is the woman whom Jesus came from her seed, to be the seed of the woman as a fulfilment of the prophecy in (Genesis 3). However, at the same time He is not Mary’s genealogy according to (Hebrews 7:3), He is the seed of the woman and not the genealogy of Mary where there is no clash or conflict in that. In addition, there is an opinion that says Jesus was calling Mary “woman” as a kind of respect or appreciation, which is right. However, this opinion is incomplete, and doesn’t satisfy a mind of a thinker or a sincere searcher; for He called other women the same way, which means He counts them all the same, same as the Samaritan woman, the Canaanite woman. Surely, He respects them all, but how can we explain this equality among them? That question is what the supporter of this interpretation didn’t address, so that what I have tried to highlight by my previous explanation; that He is the seed of the woman not Mary’s genealogy, and Mary wasn’t His mother according to genealogy, so He didn’t address her using the word “mother”.

Let me cease the chance to shed more light the expression that seems a bit vague “Woman, what concern is that to you and to me?” because it is related to the same issue we are addressing. This expression wasn’t ever a disrespectful one, but it has a deeper theological implication than the superficial view of it. “What concern is that to you and to me?” doesn’t have the same connotation of the slang

expression used nowadays (I have no business to do with you, or what have you to do with me), but what He meant was the **difference in the nature**⁽¹⁵⁾; He wanted to say to her I have a different nature from you Mary. This expression has been used repeatedly in the Bible, and it was used with the same meaning and purpose. For example, in (Mark 1:24-26) we read “and he cried out, “What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy One of God.” But Jesus rebuked him, saying, “Be silent, and come out of him!” And the unclean spirit, convulsing him and crying with a loud voice, came out of him.” Here, the demons cried out and said to Jesus “What have you to do with us”; we are of different nature than yours, for you are the Holy One of God while we are unclean spirits. In light of this explanation and perspective, what did Jesus mean when He said to Blessed Virgin Mary “Woman, what concern is that to you and to me?” He meant to remind her that He has a divine nature in addition to His human one; hence, He is different from her. He wanted to say to her that she was only the woman whom He came from her seed to be the seed of the woman, to fulfil the prophecies but she wasn’t His mother according to the genealogy for He is “without father, without mother, without genealogy” as we read in (Hebrews 7:3). He wanted to assure her that His divine nature is mighty that nothing can challenge it, that He is capable of doing anything but His hour hasn’t yet come. He wanted to say to her that you Mary might feel confused

(15) A new and exclusive perspective on the text.

whenever you face a problem or a challenge but I face no challenges and have no confusion whenever faced with any situation because nothing is too difficult for Me. Indeed, Mary have realized that when he attracted her attention to His divine nature by calling her “woman and not mother”, so she went to the servants and said to them “Do whatever he tells you.” As if she was saying to them don’t hesitate to do whatever He asks of you, for He has infinite nature that nothing is too difficult for Him.

✳ **Third Textual Evidence:** Woman, here is your son: We read in (John 19:25-26) “Meanwhile, standing near the cross of Jesus were his mother, and his mother’s sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus saw his mother and the disciple whom he loved standing beside her, he said to his mother, “Woman, here is your son.”

Again, we have to ask why did Christ call Mary “woman”, although the Holy Spirit stated four times in this small part of the scriptures that she is His mother “When Jesus saw his mother”? Is Mary His mother or not or both? Yes, my dear reader, she is both, and again the Holy Spirit is using the same narrative style for a confirmation that she is His mother according to the seed but not according to the genealogy. In the above scripture, when Jesus addressed her as “woman”, He didn’t deny her motherhood. He was defining the kind⁽¹⁶⁾ of motherhood she had, only that of the

(16) To clarify: The research does not negate the motherhood of the Virgin Mary to Jesus, but it determines the kind of this motherhood, and this dimension is one of the exclusive points in this research.

seed not of the genealogy. He wants to tell her by calling her “woman”, that even though she is seeing His face smeared, she shouldn’t be confused for He is God manifested in the flesh, in him the whole fullness of Godhead dwells bodily. For He is the same one who said to Her in the wedding in Cana of Galilee “woman”, so she doesn’t feel shaken up; that she is only His mother according to the seed and not according to the genealogy. How amazing and perfect Christ is! In joyful moments like in the beginning of His ministry in a wedding in Cana of Galilee, He didn’t allow His emotions to affect His actions and call Mary “mother” not even once as a compliment, but He said to her “Woman, what concern is that to you and to me?”. Again, in painful moments at the cross, while his hanging on the cross crushed and bruised, He remained focused and didn’t call Mary “mother” not for once before He leaves earth. Though, He said to her “Woman, here is your son”. What an amazing person Christ really is, in all life situations He knew exactly what to say and how to address people whoever they were. To conclude, I want to say that the fact Jesus never called Mary “mother”, not even once in His life here on earth as recorded in the scripture, is intentional and has a purpose to it.

✳ **Fourth Textual Evidence:** from them, according to the flesh, comes the Messiah, Is found in these beautiful scriptures in (Romans 9:3-5) “for I have wished, I myself, to be a curse from the Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen, according to flesh; who are Israelites; whose [is] the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and

the law-giving, and the service, and the promises; whose [are] the fathers; and of whom, as according to flesh, [is] the Christ, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen.” In these golden verses, Apostle Paul is describing his connection to the Israeli nation using three words “my brethren, my kinsmen, according to the flesh”, while he describes Christ’s relationship to the same nation, by using one word only “according to the flesh”, without adding the other two words “my brethren, kinsmen”. The question that requires an answer here is “Were these two words describing Christ’s relationship to the Israeli nation omitted intentionally or accidentally forgotten by the writer?” The answer here is that it wasn’t only intentional but also it is one of the evidences of the verbal plenary inspiration of the Bible, for the Holy Spirit is the main author of the Bible, whenever He states or doesn’t state something, He intentionally means it. Apostle Paul is from the tribe of Benjamin according to the seed and the genealogy, and the Israeli nation is indeed his brethren, so it is mere logic to describe them with these words “my brethren, my kinsmen, according to the flesh”. However, Jesus Christ is from the tribe of Judah, from the Israeli nation according to the flesh only and not according to the genealogy, as we have a clear text in (Hebrews 7:3) “without father, without mother, without genealogy”. Since He is “without father, without mother, without genealogy”, consequently, He in terms of genealogy without brethren. Therefore, it was normal and logical for the Biblical inspiration to drop the words “my brethren, kinsmen” and use only

“according to the flesh” when He was talking about Christ. As I have pointed out, this is one of the evidences of the verbal plenary inspiration of the Bible. In (Hebrews 7:3), the Holy Spirit clarified that Christ is without genealogy, through the resemblance drawn between Melchizedek and Christ. And in (Romans 9:3-5), the Holy Spirit also clarified that Christ is without genealogy, through the comparison drawn between Paul and Christ. In Hebrews, He said it clearly and directly “without genealogy”, while in Romans, He said it clearly yet indirectly by intentionally not stating some words. In Hebrews, the Holy Spirit negated the word genealogy, while in Romans He deleted the word kinsmen, or to be precise it wasn’t mentioned intentionally⁽¹⁷⁾.

✳ **Fifth Textual Evidence:** Male Child, Her child, In (Revelation 12:5), we read “And she gave birth to a son, a male child, who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron. But her child was snatched away and taken to God and to his throne;” then in (Revelation 12:13), we also read “So when the dragon saw that he had been thrown down to the earth, he pursued the woman who had given birth to the male child.”

These texts say two specific things about the Israeli nation, which is resembled by a woman who gave birth to “**a male child, or the male child**”, it also says that “her child” was snatched away. Notice how precise the Bible is, when

(17) This text is one of the strong evidence of the verbal plenary inspiration of the Bible, which meaning that when the bible is mentioning it means, and when it is not mentioning it also means.

talking about him as “the male child”; it didn’t say “her male child”, but said “a male child or the male child” without connecting the child to her, however as it talked about him as a child, it connected him to her by saying “her child”.

The word “**male**”⁽¹⁸⁾ has a genetical dimension to it; it expresses what kind of chromosomes the male child carries and has a connection to proof of paternity “genealogy”. If the Bible would have said “her male child” that would have been a proof of genealogy to that nation. It would have meant that this child as a male came as a result of natural conception, the result of an intercourse between a man and a woman so that the child can get chromosome (y) from the father to be a male. This doesn’t correspond to the truth; for this child as a male child came as result of a miraculous virgin conception, from woman without a man, through the power of the Most High and not as result of natural conception. Thus, as a male child, he is not “her male child”, but only a “son” who was born from her “had given a birth to a male child” without being her genealogy. On the other hand, He is the seed of the woman, and from this nation according to the flesh and not according to the genealogy, and the Holy Spirit connected Him to this nation by saying “her child”.

(18) Describing Christ as “the male child” is a very important description for at least two reasons:

First, because it confirmed that his body is real, which some challenged, saying that it was not a real body.

Second: it added a deeper dimension to the miracle of the virgin conception of Christ as I explained in the research.

On one hand, the Bible talks about Him as “the Firstborn”, and connects Him to Mary by saying in (Luke 2:7) “And she gave birth to her firstborn son”. In the talk about Him as “a child” in (Revelation 12:5), the Bible connects Him to the Israeli nation by saying “her child” because He is Mary’s seed and from this nation according to the flesh. On the other hand, in the talk about Him as “a male” in (Revelation 12:5, 13), the Bible doesn’t connect Him to the nation by saying “a male child or the male child”. Twice the Bible talks about Him as “male”, it doesn’t connect Him neither to the Israeli nation nor to Mary. For He is neither Mary’s genealogy nor the nation’s, because He is without father, without mother, without genealogy, He is the seed only not the genealogy.

The Holy Spirit oversaw the recording of the biblical texts so even the addition and/or omission of the possessive pronoun “her” was done accurately, for prophecy never came by the will of man. When the text mentioned the word “male” and was talking about “the male child”, the Bible omitted the possessive pronoun “her”, And as the text did not mention the word “male” and was talking about “child” only, the Bible added the possessive pronoun “her” saying “her child”. So, the person who led Paul to omit the two words “my brethren, kinsmen” in (Romans 9) to refute the genealogy of Jesus to the Israeli nation is the same person who led John to omit the pronoun “her” when he talked about Jesus as the male child in (Revelation 12). For the reason is the same in both cases, to refute the genealogy of Jesus to the Israeli nation. That person is the Holy Spirit. See,

my dear reader, how amazing is the Holy Spirit is! And how accurate is the verbal plenary inspiration⁽¹⁹⁾ of the Bible!

✳ **Sixth Textual Evidence:** In (Mathew 12: 46-50), Who is my mother, and who are my brothers? We read “While he was still speaking to the crowds, his mother and his brothers were standing outside, wanting to speak to him. Someone told him, “Look, your mother and your brothers are standing outside, wanting to speak to you.” But to the one who had told him this, Jesus replied, “Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?” pointing out to his disciples, he said, “Here are my mother and my brothers! For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother.” .

In the above scriptures, we read that someone came to Christ and said to Him “Look, your mother and your brothers are standing outside, wanting to speak to you”, notice how deeply and precisely Christ answered him, He **didn’t confirm or refute Mary’s motherhood ultimately**. He answered back with a rhetorical question “Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?”, as if He wanted to say to the one asking what do you mean by “my mother” and “my brothers”? Do you realize the impact of what you are saying? Do you realize the implications of these two words “my mother, my brothers”? If you mean my mother according to the genealogy, I am

(19) This text is one of the strong evidence of the verbal plenary inspiration of the Bible, not only by mentioning or not mentioning a word, but also by mentioning and not mentioning the pronoun of binding (her).

without mother according to the genealogy and likewise without brothers too. My dear reader, If Mary was His mother according to genealogy, then he would have brothers as well, and then His question would have been denial of their relationship to them. God forbids! Christ would never do that, and we shouldn't ever draw such a misconception of Him. Christ is perfectly noble and ethical, and He cared for Mary even when He was on the cross. He said to John "Here is your mother", it is impossible that He would deny her in His lifetime. In fact, she wasn't His mother according to the genealogy. Hopefully, His rhetorical question would draw the attention of the listener and later the reader to think and dispute all the inherited ideas and search for the truth by oneself. Through His rhetorical question, Jesus wanted to reveal Himself and His nature, by shacking up what was known, inherited and predominant. For, if it resonated in people's mind that Jesus had a mother and brothers just like any other ordinary human being, then they would consider Him so and would never discover His real identity and nature that He is God manifested in the flesh and born by a miraculous virgin conception. Again, Mary was not His mother according to the genealogy so He has no brothers according to the genealogy as well. This question was quite a shocking one, stimulates search and and invokes people to renew inherited ideas, especially when it comes from Jesus Himself who was born from Mary.

But what really amazes me, is how wondrous, and dazzling Christ is! He was very precise in His answers and

knew exactly what to say in different situations, that He didn't totally refute Mary's motherhood. For example, He didn't say that "I don't have a mother", because Mary is indeed His mother but according to the seed only not according to the genealogy, thus He neither confirmed nor refuted it⁽²⁰⁾.

Perhaps a watchful reader might say that the Holy Spirit mentioned in the Bible that Jesus had brothers in some texts, for example: In (John 7:10) "But after his brothers had gone to the festival, then he also went, not publicly but as it were in secret." In (Galatians 1:19) "but I did not see any other apostle except James the Lord's brother."

I answer that saying, what is strange about these texts, my dear reader, and deserve to catch your attention? What is strange here is that Jesus is the firstborn child of the Blessed Virgin Mary, who was born through a miraculous virgin conception without coming together with Joseph, so that Mary became His mother according to the seed only and not according to the genealogy. In addition, the word "firstborn" implies that Mary gave birth to other children as well afterwards, for the Bible hasn't mentioned that Jesus was her only child. These children were born through natural conception, as a result of a legitimate relationship between Mary and Joseph; they weren't conceived through a virgin conception like Jesus. So, those other children are the seed and genealogy of Joseph, and the seed and genealogy of Mary. They aren't Jesus' brothers from Joseph's side, because

(20) The intelligence of Christ in his answers.

biologically Jesus is not related to Joseph neither as his seed nor as his genealogy. However, they are Jesus' brothers from Mary's side only, and in terms of the seed only as they all came from the same mother, taking into consideration that Jesus is connected to Mary as He is **only her seed and not her genealogy**, for Jesus was born through a **miraculous** virgin conception, while other brothers are connected to Mary as they are **her seeds and her genealogy** since they were conceived with **naturally**.

Therefore, I repeat again, Jesus has no brothers from Joseph's side, according to neither the seed nor genealogy. Similarly, He has no brothers from Mary's side in terms of genealogy, for Mary is not his mother according to the genealogy. However, those brothers are His brothers from Mary's in terms of the seed only, for they were all born from her, and since Jesus is her first child so He is her firstborn. Thus, it is not strange that Paul, inspired by the Holy Spirit, said about James "the Lord's brother", or that John said about Jesus (His brothers). The whole issue is about defining the **kind of these ties and their dimensions** "motherhood, brotherhood, fatherhood", and this requires comparing the biblical texts to each other, without taking any part out of its context so that we would understand the Holy Spirit's purpose. For the abstract word can be ambiguous and confusing, yet if we studied it in its context, and compared texts to each other, there wouldn't be any problem to solve in the first place.

To further clarify this point, I give an example of reality, if I said that “Nancy” is the sister of “Hani” from his father and his mother, but she is the sister of “Adel” from his mother only, In both cases i used the word “**sister**” to describe the kind of relationship between Nancy and Hani and Between Nancy and Adel, Yet the word “sister” did not give the same dimension and depth in both cases, Both relationships were described and expressed through use the same word “**sister**”, although the difference in dimensions and depths of the **ties**⁽²¹⁾ in both relationships.

✳ **Seventh Textual Evidence:** the genesis chains mentioned in Mathew 1 and Luke 3 The evidence is found as we look closely and examine the two genesis chains of Jesus Christ that are wrongly called “genealogy chains”, located in Mathew 1 & Luke 3.

There are two chains that talk about the genesis of Christ in flesh, the first one in (Mathew 1) and it talks about Joseph’s side “it ends up with Joseph, Mary’s fiancé”. The second one in (Luke 3) and it talks about Mary’s side “it starts with Heli, Mary’s father”. Most of our discussion would be about the genesis chain in (Luke 3), because the one in (Mathew 1) is concerned with Joseph, Mary’s fiancé, and Jesus is not related to Joseph biologically neither in terms of the seed nor of the genealogy; as He was born through a miraculous virgin conception before Mary and Joseph

(21) The issue is not only to prove or refute relationships and ties, but also to understand the dimensions, depths and aspects of those ties.

came together. Thus, we can surely say that Jesus Christ biologically in His humanity is without father according to the genealogy. Notice the accuracy of the Bible here; Jesus is not without father in the absolute, because according to the the seed He has a father who is David. He is the Son of David according to the seed, through Mary and not Joseph, as we shall understand from the genesis chain in (Luke 3). However, what needs more clarification and illustration is the relationship of Jesus Christ biologically, in His humanity to Mary and ultimately to David as well.

The first question we need to address is who is the Blessed Virgin Mary? The Bible stated clearly that she is Jesus' mother.

The second question is what kind of motherhood, that of the seed or of the genealogy? The Bible also clearly stated that the motherhood is according to the seed, for Jesus is "without mother, without genealogy". The idea that Jesus is "the seed of the woman and not the genealogy of Mary", that He is "without mother, without genealogy" shines brightly in the birth chain in (Luke 3) like in no other text. Here, we need to stop for a moment because this requires more explanation; hopefully I would succeed in articulating the ideas clearly to all readers. I invite you, dear reader, to embark on this journey with me armed with your full attention as I explain how the Holy Spirit revealed and proved this central idea, which is the core of the miraculous virgin conception of Christ. I promise you that you would see the

brilliance of the verbal plenary inspiration of the Bible, and the consistency and harmony between its texts; as well as, discover an illumination about the problematic issues of this birth chain in (Luke 3).

In the beginning, a logical question poses itself to every watchful reader, and I present this question, my dear reader, to stimulate your mind and invoke the thought in you. That is if the birth chain in (Luke 3) is about Jesus' birth from Mary's side, why haven't the divine inspiration mentioned from the beginning of this chain that Mary is Jesus' mother? Why did it start with an opening phrase saying in (Luke 3:23) "Jesus was about thirty years old when he began his work. He was the son "as was thought" of Joseph son of Heli,"? Why do we read this phrase "He was the son (as was thought) of Joseph", although this genesis chain is not Jesus' genesis chain from Joseph's side? Keeping in mind that Jesus is not related to Joseph neither according to the seed nor according to genealogy, as I mentioned before, and Joseph is not the son of Heli. To address these deep and serious questions, I need to divide the answer into 3 parts as follows:

- **First:** (Heli) is neither the father of Joseph nor his grandfather, for the grandfather of Joseph is (Matthan), and the father of Joseph is (Jacob), as we read in (Mathew 1:15-16) "and Matthan the father of Jacob, and Jacob the father of Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom Jesus was born, who is called the Messiah." In addition to that, Joseph is a descendant of David's son (Solomon) as we read in (Mathew

1: 6-7), and the birth chain in (Luke 3) begins from David's son (Nathan) as read in (Luke 3:31). Thus, Heli is the father of Mary, from whom the Holy Spirit started to narrate the genesis chain of Jesus from Mary's side. If this chain is Mary's and Heli is her father, so why didn't the Holy Spirit start the chain with her? Why did He intentionally ignore the mention of her name at the beginning of this chain? Why didn't He say something like "He was the son (as was thought) of Joseph son of Mary son of Heli"? that takes us to the next point, where we shall find the answers to these questions.

•• **Second:** the genesis chain in (Luke 3) is also Mary's genealogy chain, so if the Holy Spirit said at the beginning of this chain that Jesus is "Son of Mary" that would be like a paternity proof report of Jesus to Mary, and Jesus would be part and link of the genealogy chain of Mary. As a consequence, not only the divine inspiration would be contradicting itself, but also contradicting the stated truth in (Hebrews 7:3), and that is Jesus in His humanity is "without mother, without genealogy". So how come we read in (Hebrews 7:3) that Jesus is "without mother, without genealogy", then we would read in the genealogy chain of Mary in (Luke 3) that He is the Son of Mary? Thus, not mentioning Mary's name at the beginning of this chain is a theological inevitable, so that the biblical texts would be consistent together, without any contradiction; at the same time, they would be consistent with the truth that Jesus in His humanity is without father, without mother, without genealogy. This is an irrefutable evidence that the text in (Hebrews 7:3) meant the Son of

God in His incarnation, in His humanity and not His divinity. This is how the verbal plenary inspiration⁽²²⁾ of the Bible dear reader works, the inspiration in its consistency and unity of its topics, this is the Holy Spirit who whenever stating or ignoring something He intentionally do so.

I add, so you can have more enjoyment and satisfaction of the divine inspiration, that in (Luke 3:38) we find the genesis chain ends with the Son of God “son of Enos, son of Seth, son of Adam, son of God.” At the same time, it didn’t start with Son of Mary; as the genesis chain of Jesus that ends with the Son of God can’t the ologically and logically starts with the Son of Mary. When the Son of God was incarnated, He came without mother, without genealogy, and that is consistent with the pivotal text in (Hebrews 7:3) “Without father, without mother, without genealogy, but resembling the Son of God,” in this text (Hebrew 7), Paul stated it clearly and in (Luke 3), Luke did the same in this birth chain, in a mysterious way by which he was hiding inside the chain the proof of its true revelation. Here we see the Bible as “the proof” not just “the revelation”, the Bible reveals truths using texts articulated in a special and accurate ways, using different persons to write these texts in a way that they carry in them the proof of their honesty. These are the Holy Scriptures which are able. This leads us to the third point;

(22) Not mentioning Mary’s name or that Jesus is the Son of Mary in the chain in Luke 3 is a theological necessity, not just a cultural one, it is also one of the strongest evidence of verbal plenary inspiration of the Bible, and one of the exclusive points in this research, please review the third group of sources to verify this.

if this birth chain is about Jesus from Mary's side and (Heli) is the father of Mary, what does Joseph have to do with it? Why was he mentioned here? Why did the Holy Spirit say about Jesus at the beginning of this chain "as we thought he was the son of Joseph"?

•• **Third:** we understood from the previous point that there was a theological necessity to delete or omit the name of Mary and not mention that Jesus is the Son of Mary in the chain existing in Luk 3. Therefore, if the Holy Spirit wouldn't have pointed out to Joseph, Mary's fiancé while talking about Jesus, and if he wouldn't have mentioned the segment "He was the son (as we thought) of Joseph" and directly said "He was the son (as was thought) of Heli" without mention of "The Son of Joseph" first, then we wouldn't have known to which Jesus this genesis chain was referring to. For the Holy Spirit didn't connect Jesus neither to Mary as it was a necessity to delete her name, nor to Joseph as He is not his son biologically. However, He connected Jesus directly to someone else called "Heli", and since we don't know who "Heli" was, thus we won't know "Jesus son of Heli". For example, if I do not know who is "Safwat" first, I will not know who is "Hani the son of Safwat" as well. So, it would have caused suspicions and doubts to rise about this genesis chain, and about the identity of Jesus saying that the writer probably meant another Jesus rather than Jesus who is born of Mary. And if any doubt is casted over the evidence, that would weaken it and may cause the loss of its deductive argument and strength.

One might ask, what seems to be the problem here? My answer would be, there was a cultural importance and theological necessity for not mentioning Mary's name, and that Jesus is her son explicitly in this genesis chain, in order to refute the genealogy. At the same time, there is a theological necessity to point out to Mary so that we would know that this genesis chain is related to her, and that Jesus who is mentioned in it is the One born of Mary, not another Jesus. So how would the Holy Spirit resolve this problem? How would He point out to Mary without the mention of her name?

We shouldn't worry about that, for nothing stands as a problem for the Holy Spirit, the creative one forever and ever. Indeed, He articulated it with incomparable accuracy and preciseness; He implicitly pointed out to Mary without a frank mention of her name, through referring to "Joseph" her fiancé. The Holy Spirit, instead of starting this chain by identifying Jesus as "He is son of Mary son of Heli", started by identifying Jesus as the one the Jews thought that he is the son of Joseph "Mary's fiancé". By that, the Holy Spirit had defined and confirmed to everyone that He is talking about Jesus who was born of Mary (was thought to be son of Joseph) and not another Jesus. Also, by that, the Holy Spirit confirmed that this genesis chain is related to Mary and not Joseph, since Heli is not Joseph's father, so he must have been Mary's father. The Holy Spirit did all of that through confirmed implications, without having to mention Mary's name or that Jesus is her son frankly.

This introductory phrase “He was the son (as was thought) of Joseph” aimed at identifying that the writer is talking about Jesus who was born of Mary and not another Jesus, without explicitly referring to Him clearly as “son of Mary”. The writer linked Him to Joseph (Mary’s fiancé), using the prevailing thoughts that people had about Jesus being son of Joseph. Simply, the writer wanted to say that he is talking about Jesus who was thought to be son of Joseph to specify the identity of whom he is talking about without having to mention Mary’s name, or that Jesus is the son of Mary frankly. This phrase is a declarative phrase and not an original part or a link in the chain mentioned in (Luke 3) because the chain is not Joseph’s and he is not a part or a link of this chain, it is Mary’s genealogy chain. Therefore, saying (son of Joseph) at the introduction of this chain can’t ever mean to prove the genealogy of Jesus to Joseph biologically, as some is casting doubts about that, because this is not the genealogy chain of Joseph; as well as, Jesus came from a miraculous virgin conception.

Also notice, the Holy Spirit didn’t say “Jesus son of Joseph”, but He articulated the phrase in a very precise way saying “He was the son (as was thought) of Joseph”. As if the writer is saying that, these were the thoughts⁽²³⁾ of the people not the Holy Spirit’s opinion about it. The Holy Spirit led Luke to write it in that way; reporting the prevailing thoughts of the people and that doesn’t mean He approved

(23) The creation of the Holy Spirit in using even the widespread suspicions, thoughts among people to reach the right truth that he wants to clarify.

them. He only used their prevailing thoughts to point out the identity of whom He is talking about; Jesus born of Mary and not any other Jesus, by referring to Joseph. The usage of the word “thought” implicitly refutes these thoughts from being a theological truth, or the personal opinion of the Holy Spirit. When the Holy Spirit reveals His opinion, the words like thought or assume are not used, for He is Omniscient.

How amazing the Holy Spirit is! That He is using even the prevailing thoughts among people to reveal the truth that He wanted to reveal clearly and precisely. How amazing the Bible is, for though Mary’s name is not mentioned at the beginning of this genesis chain, yet it is Mary’s genealogy chain. And though Joseph’s name is mentioned at the beginning of this chain, yet it is not Joseph’s genealogy chain, and he is not even part or a link in it!

One might say that the Bible stated in another text that Jesus is the son of Mary, for example in (Luke 2:7) we read “And she gave birth to her firstborn son and wrapped him in bands of cloth, and laid him in a manger, because there was no place for them in the inn.” Here, the Bible states clearly that Jesus is “her firstborn” Well, the Bible didn’t deny neither the motherhood of Mary nor the son-ship of Jesus to Mary by flesh. Jesus is her son according to the seed only and not the genealogy, so we shouldn’t be surprised when we read texts that state Mary is His mother, while others refute that she is, we only need to look closely at the context of each text to understand it correctly. To clear any confusion,

I should say that stating in any parts of the Bible that Jesus is the son of Mary is one thing, while the mention of that within the genealogy chain is another, since the genealogy chains were written only to prove the genealogy. That is why the Holy Spirit in this genealogy chain intentionally ignored mentioning Mary's name, and that Jesus is her son to refute the relationship between them both only in terms of the genealogy. Specifically, it refutes Mary's motherhood to Jesus according to the genealogy, not in the absolute sense for she is His mother according to the seed. Again, that is why the Holy Spirit in other texts states that Mary is Jesus' mother, so we can have a deeper and a wider understanding of Christ's question (who is my mother?); that is "what do you mean by my mother?". This word has a different dimensions and depth to it; do you understand these dimensions? If so, which of them do you mean?

I still see that you are not displeased dear reader, as you are not fully convinced yet. well, as the issue we are discussing is not a simple one so understanding the text and its full context is very important to grasp the meaning of the words and expressions used. If we separated any word from its context then we would surely misunderstand its meaning. To picture my idea, I will give you, dear reader, example from real life, then a couple of other two from the Bible. These examples to support my point of view that the context can change the meaning of the same word or expression, and that the mention of words like (son, or mother, or father) is not always enough proof of genealogy, for these words can

be used to express different meanings, and family ties based on the context.

- **First:** an example from real life: when I say:
 - * I left home late, got into my car and drove quickly to catch my flight. However, unfortunately the front wheel got out of its place, so I parked the car and took a taxi so that I won't miss my flight.
 - * I left home late, got into my car and drove quickly to catch my flight. When I reached the airport, I parked my car, and pulled my suitcase while running to catch up the front desk before they close off. However, unfortunately the front wheel got out of its place, so I ran carrying my suitcase to the front desk.

In the previous stories, the phrase “unfortunately the front wheel got out of its place” was repeated, yet the meaning of it in each story is totally different. In the first story, it meant the car tire, while in the second one; it meant the small wheel of the suitcase. Although the stories look so much alike in terms of the words used, yet we understood them differently each time based on the context of each story.

- **Second:** example (1) from the Bible: Christ said about John in (John 19:26) “When Jesus saw his mother and the disciple whom he loved standing beside her, he said to his mother, “Woman, here is your son.” Jesus said to the

Blessed Mary that John is her son. Did He mean the son-ship according to genealogy? Of course not, for John isn't her son neither in terms of seed nor genealogy. What He meant to say was that John is a kind of compensation for His absence, as if He is saying "consider him like your own son", thus the word "son" doesn't necessarily mean the son-ship according to genealogy. However, stating the word "son" in genealogy chains is meant just as a proof of the genealogy, and that is exactly what the Holy Spirit wanted to refute when He deleted Mary's name and/or that Jesus is her son from the genealogy chain in (Luke 3).

- **Third:** example (2) from the Bible: It was said about Jesus in the letter to the Romans that He is the seed of David, in (Romans 1:3) "Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh". Notice that the Bible said, He is the seed of David not the genealogy of David, and it wasn't mentioned in any other texts in the Bible that Jesus was the genealogy of David. Yet, the Bible mentions that David was His father, for example in (Luke 1:32) "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 ". Therefore, we conclude that David is His father according to the seed only and not according to the genealogy. From this idea, we understand that the relationship according to the seed only without genealogy can grant a person the state of fatherhood or motherhood, which is a very important point.

Indeed, Jesus is the son of Mary, but what kind of son-ship we mean? It is the son-ship according to the seed by birth, and not according to genealogy by the genetic identification. Indeed, Jesus is the son of Joseph, but what kind of son-ship we mean? It is the legal son-ship and not the biological one.

Surely, Mary is Jesus' mother, but what kind of motherhood we mean? It is the motherhood according to the seed by birth, and not according to the genealogy by the genetic identification. Surely, Joseph is Jesus' father, but what kind of fatherhood we mean? It is the morale legal fatherhood as he was Mary's fiancé, ***the fatherhood which was documented and recorded in the official Jewish records, and not the biological one that is recorded in the scientific documents through DNA and genes.*** This is the concluded biblical truth from the clear text in (Hebrews 7:3) "without father, without mother, without genealogy." **Which I consider not less than a scientific spiritual discovery** ⁽²⁴⁾.

Therefore, by not mentioning Mary's name, and that Jesus is Mary's son at the beginning of this chain, by breaking up this link in the chain, the Holy Spirit has separated the genealogy of Jesus from Mary. Consequently, He has separated the genealogy of Jesus from the rest of the chain from which Mary comes from. I think this is very logical scientifically; if the negation of genealogy of a child to his mother was proven, then it also means the negation of genealogy of this child to his grandfather "from his mother's

(24) This text is in fact a scientific and spiritual discovery.

side”, and so forth to the whole chain from which his mother comes from.

By separating the genealogy, the Holy Spirit has turned or switched⁽²⁵⁾ this chain for Jesus in (Luke 3) from a chain of “genealogy” to a chain of “seeds” only. Thus, this chain has been divided into two paths from its beginning; **the first one** is concerned with all the names of persons who came through natural conception, so all of them are the seed and genealogy of their parents till they all end to the root Adam. While **the second one** is concerned with Jesus only, who came through miraculous virgin conception, and by separating His genealogy from Mary at the beginning of the chain, He became also separated from the rest of the chain in term of genealogy. Therefore, Jesus came as the seed of Mary and seed of David, without being the genealogy of either one of them.

One might ask why are things so complicated? If the Holy Spirit wanted to refute the genealogy of Jesus to Mary so there was no need to mention this chain from the very beginning. To answer that, we would say that it would have been the case if humans were writing the Bible, but the Holy Spirit doesn't have this limited way of thinking. He has gone beyond our limited minds, the Bible in its greatness and accuracy, ignored mentioning Mary's name in this genealogy chain to refute the relationship according to genealogy, but didn't ignore to mention the chain itself as a whole to prove the relationship according to the seed. So that to prove the

(25) This explanation is one of the exclusive points in this research.

incarnation, and that the Son of God came to the world in the fullness of time, born of a woman. Jesus who is mentioned in (Luke 3:23) "Jesus was about thirty years old when he began his work. He was the son (as was thought) of Joseph son of Heli," is the same person, the incarnated Son of God in (Luke 3:38) "son of Enos, son of Seth, son of Adam, son of God." The Holy Spirit had to mention this chain, while at the same time He had to not mention Mary' name; mentioning the chain was a theological necessity to prove the seed relationship, and having not to mention Mary' name was also theological necessity to negate the genealogy relationship. Indeed, how amazing and accurate that is!⁽²⁶⁾

So the question remains, why do we have this chain in (Luke 3)? It was mentioned in the Biblical text for at least five reasons, they are as follows:

- **First reason:** to refute that Jesus is Mary's genealogy, or to be more precise to refute the motherhood of Mary only according to genealogy, so the Holy Spirit didn't mention at the beginning of this chain which is a genealogy chain that Jesus is the son of Mary.

Also, there is a text that we have to explain and comment on, in (Acts 2:30) "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;" This text is saying that God swore with

(26) The creativity and intelligence of the Holy Spirit in the formulation of the Holy bible.

an oath to David that Christ would come from him, the text didn't say that Christ would come from his loins "genealogy" but He swore with an oath that Christ would come "from the fruit of his loins". The inspiration is saying that the fruit from which Christ will come who is Mary is from David's loins, this is mere logic because all the births from David to Mary are natural ones, thus, all these fruits are the seed and genealogy of their fathers. However, this fruit "Mary" conceived through a miraculous virgin conception, so her child "Jesus" is her seed but not her genealogy. Therefore, the fruit "Mary" was in David's loins, and came from his loins, so she is his genealogy. However, Jesus who was born of this fruit, is only her seed and not her genealogy because He was never in her loins, and so Jesus was never in David's loins as well. Thus, David is Mary's father according to the seed and the genealogy while being Christ's father according to the seed only "David' seed".

The writer here is saying "that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ", which means the same as what Paul said in the text (Romans 9:5) when he talked about the relationship of Christ to the Israeli nation "and from them, according to the flesh, comes the Messiah". In both texts, the Bible is saying that Christ is from them according to the flesh, and not according to the genealogy. Therefore, this text in (Acts 2:30) is a confirmation which proves that Jesus is the seed of the woman, and the seed of David, while refuting that Jesus is Mary's genealogy and consequently not David's genealogy as well.

- **Second reason:** to prove that Jesus is David's seed, from Mary's side and not from Joseph's. That is why the angel announced the good news to Mary and not to Joseph in (Luke 1:32) "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" It doesn't make any sense that the angel would announce to Joseph that baby Jesus would sit on the throne of David His father "according to the seed", when Jesus himself is not related to Joseph neither according to the seed nor to the genealogy; even if Joseph himself is from David's seed. This is what God confirmed to David when He swore with an oath to him "that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up the Christ", swearing with an oath is quite a strong assurance. In (Acts 2:30), it says "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne" And this what the inspiration confirmed in more than one text across the Bible, for example in (Romans 1:3), it says "Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh;"

One might ask how did the chain in (Luke 3) prove that Jesus is from David's seed? The answer is that it has been proven through the text at the middle of this chain in (Luke 3:31), which says "son of Melea, son of Menna, son of Mattatha, son of Nathan, son of David," Jesus is son of David through Nathan (one of David' sons).

One might ask, how was Jesus is connected to David according to the seed only, while at the same time separated from him according to the genealogy? This took place through the miraculous virgin conception, where Jesus was separated in His genealogy from Mary and the Holy Spirit articulated this truth by not mentioning Mary's name or that Jesus is her son at the beginning of this chain. Consequently, Jesus became separated from the rest of the chain from which Mary came from in term of genealogy, and came as Mary's seed and not her genealogy, as well as David's seed and not his genealogy.

For more clarification, I would repeat what I've said before that the genealogy relationship is a causative relationship "reason of existence, or the starting point of existence", so when I say that I am my father's genealogy, this means that my father is my starting point of existence for he brought me into this world. So, if we wrongly assumed, which was never mentioned by the Bible, that Jesus is David's genealogy, that means David is considered the starting point of Jesus. This assumption is false since Jesus in His humanity is without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life. Thus, His birth into this world cannot be the beginning of His existence; it is just the beginning of His manifestation.

- **Third reason:** to prove that Jesus is from the tribe of Judah, as we read this in (Luke 3:33) "Which was the son of Aminadab, which was the son of Aram, which was the son of Esrom, which was the son of Phares, which was the

son of Judah,” This matches the text in (Hebrews 7:14) “For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moses said nothing concerning priesthood.” Again, it matches the text in (Revelation 5:5) that He is the lion of the tribe of Judah.

- **Fourth reason:** to prove that Jesus is the seed of Abraham, fulfilling the text in (Galatians 3:16) that says, “Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.” This verse is a very strong clear proof that Christ is a seed of Abraham not his genealogy “And to thy seed, which is Christ”, the promises are in a seed⁽²⁷⁾ not in a genealogy, because all Abraham’ genealogies are a sinners, as by genealogy they inherited the sin from him since he also by genealogy inherited the sin from Adam.

Now, how did this chain prove that Jesus is the seed of Abraham? It was proved by the text in (Luke 3:34) “son of Jacob, son of Isaac, son of Abraham, son of Terah, son of Nahor,”

How was Jesus connected to Abraham according to the seed only, and at the same time separated from him according to genealogy? This took place through the miraculous, virgin conception, where Jesus is separated in His genealogy from Mary, and the Holy Spirit articulated this truth by not mentioning Mary’s name or that Jesus is her son

(27) A new perspective and dimension of the text, which is one of the exclusive points in this research.

at the beginning of this chain. And so forth, Jesus became separated from the rest of this chain from which Mary came from in term of genealogy, and He came as Mary's seed and not her genealogy, and David's seed and not his genealogy, and accordingly Abraham's seed and not his genealogy.

- **Fifth reason:** to refute Jesus genealogy to the fallen race of Adam that inherited his sin, and to prove that Jesus born of Mary is the Son of God. How did that happen?

At the end of this chain, the Bible says in (Luke 3:38) "son of Enos, son of Seth, son of Adam, son of God." If the Holy Spirit would have said in the beginning of this chain that Jesus is Mary's son, that means He is her son according to genealogy as well, for this is a genealogy chain, and that means He also was in Mary's loins. And Mary is the daughter of Adam according to genealogy, so she was also in Adam's loins, which means that Jesus also was in Adam's loins. This last conclusion is totally false and goes against the Biblical truth, why so? **Firstly**, if we said that Jesus was in Adam's loins, that means Adam is His father according to genealogy, which totally contradicts the text in (Hebrews 7) that Jesus is without father, without mother, without genealogy. **Secondly**, this means He can't be the head of the new creation because Adam is His father according to genealogy. **Thirdly**, this also means that Jesus was in Adam's loins in Eden when Adam fell, thus Jesus' death on the cross can't be atoning death because He would have died naturally, since death

spread through Adam to everyone, as in Adam all dies. However, Jesus was never in Adam's loins, and was never Adam's son according to genealogy; that is why Jesus didn't inherit(28) Adam's sin though He was born. This is a brief answer on the famous question; how did Jesus come into this world without inheriting sin although He was born and not created?

One might ask, how can that be while the Bible ends up the chain in (Luke 3) saying "Son of Adam son of God"? to answer this I have to address each expression "son of Adam" and "Son of God" separately as follows:

First: the word "*son of Adam*" doesn't refer to Jesus according to genealogy, how so? This happened in the miraculous virgin conception, when Jesus was separated in His genealogy from Mary, and the Holy Spirit expressed that by not mentioning Mary's name or that Jesus is Mary's son; consequently, Jesus was also separated from the rest of this chain which Mary came from according to genealogy. Thus, Jesus is not Adam's son according to genealogy, however, the question remains, why did the Holy Spirit mention the word "son of Adam" in this chain? Because the rest of the names in this chain are all Adam's children according to genealogy, so the word "son of Adam" had to be mentioned. Whereas, with the separation of Jesus' genealogy from Mary, from the

(28) An answer to the famous question: How did Jesus not inherit Adam's sin though he was born of a woman's seed? The answer is Because he is without genealogy to Adam, because he is without a father without genealogy, so he was never being at adam's loins, and this interpretation is one of the exclusive points in this research.

beginning of the chain, this chain has been divided into two separate tracks from its beginning. One track is concerned with Jesus alone, and another track was concerned with the rest of the names in this chain. Therefore, the word “son of Adam” which we find at the end of this chain, doesn’t apply to Jesus, as it does to the rest of the names in this chain since He is separated in his genealogy from this chain from its beginning. So, Jesus came not as son of Adam but as the last Adam.

The Bible said that Jesus is the seed of the woman not her genealogy, and He is the seed of David and not his genealogy. Also, He is the seed of Abraham and not his genealogy. Yet, in Adam’s case, the Bible didn’t say that Jesus is Adam’s seed or genealogy, why? Because Jesus is the last Adam, as we read in (1Corinthians 15:45) “Thus also it is written, The first man Adam became a living soul; the last Adam a quickening spirit.” We have to observe carefully the characterization of Jesus’ relationship to David and Abraham, and that to Adam; He is “the seed of David”, “the seed of Abraham”. However, He is the last Adam, and even after the fall in Eden, the prophecy was about “the seed of the woman” and not “Adam’s seed”.

He is “the Son of Man” because He is the seed of the woman, but at the same time he is (the man) because he is not the genealogy of the woman. He is the second man, the man Jesus Christ is the last Adam. (this point I will discuss later with more details according to the sequence arrange of the ideas in the research).

Second: the word **“Son of God”** is stated at the end of this chain, has different implications on Jesus and the rest of the names in that chain; what caused this difference? Again, as we said before, since Jesus is separated in His genealogy from Mary from the beginning of this birth chain, this caused the chain to divided into two tracks.

on one hand, a miraculous track that talks about the separation of Jesus in His genealogy from all the chain, since He was separated from the beginning in His genealogy from Mary.

On the other hand, natural track that talks about the rest of the names in the chain as being the natural children, all connected to each other’s genealogy; thus, all of them are Adam’s children according to genealogy.

Therefore, the word “Son of God” at the end of the chain refers mainly to Jesus, so that it wouldn’t be mistakenly thought that Jesus is no longer Son of God by being the seed of the woman. So, the chain that started with Jesus, ended with Son of God, for Jesus is truly the Son of God, incarnated as a born child not a created one, as the seed of the woman not her genealogy, and there is no contradiction here. The angel said to Mary that “the child to be born[d] will be holy; he will be called Son of God.”. At the same time, we can view the word “son of God” from another angle that it can refer to first Adam, as he is son of God by creation, for he was created and not born.

So, Jesus is truly the Son of God, while Adam is the son of God by creation. Jesus is the seed of the woman and not Mary's genealogy. He is the seed of David and the seed of Abraham, while He is neither David's nor Abraham's genealogy. He is the last Adam, and not Adam's genealogy. Jesus is the Son of Man, and at the same time The Man, He is the Son of God who is God. Jesus was never in Mary's loins or in David's loins; as well as, neither in Abraham's loins, nor in Adam's loins.

✳ **Eighth Textual Evidence:** the will that desires the act, not the act itself (without will) or "the will that precedes the act, not the act itself". The scientific expression "without genealogy" and the spiritual one "without a will" are two faces of the same coin.

Any project that was accomplished in reality was just an idea or a dream or an image in somebody's mind. Where the idea grows gradually in the mind of that person and takes over or take hold of his mind, which then generate a strong, serious will in the soul to accomplish it in reality. When this will is activated, it uses all the available potentials and executing tools that the person has to accomplish this idea in reality. Then this idea or dream is transformed to be a tangible reality.

The secret lies in **this will** that desires the act and precedes it, that because the will became independent from God and refused to submit to Him since the fall of the first man in Eden "this is the simplest and shortest definition of

the original sin". This will started acting in separation from God, thus everything that it desires is rejected from God regardless the kind or nature of the acts that it desires or does, whether good or evil, righteous or corrupted.

In (Ephesians 2:3), this idea is stated clearly, where the Bible is saying these words about the believers before they came to faith "among whom *we* also all once had our conversation in the lusts of our flesh, doing what the flesh and the thoughts **willed** to do, and were children, by nature, of wrath, even as the rest". Notice, dear reader, that the Bible here didn't mention a list of the acts that have done, for example: stealing, lying, or committing adultery. It just stated that these acts were done by the **will** and desire of the flesh and thought without providing a list with these acts. Even the righteous acts are looked at as defiled garments and are rejected as they are the desires and will of the flesh and thoughts. So, the issue here is not the kind or nature of these acts, but the desires and will that precede them. They are independent will and desires that are separated from God, and that alone is a strong reason for these acts to be condemned and rejected by God, and to make us the children of wrath, regardless of the nature or kind of these acts.

Another text in (John 1:13) which makes this idea crystal clear by talking about the second birth or the regeneration "who were born, not of blood or of the will of the flesh or of the will of man, but of God." Notice that the problem isn't

the act of the flesh but the will of the flesh, where the focus in this text is on the will of man not his acts. The problem isn't in the acts, but in the will that precede these acts and wants to achieve them. For this will is not submissive to God, it has rebelled against Him, became independent from Him, and refused to submit to Him. This will is the **real root** of the problem, and I will use the contrast here for clarification, that the second birth/ regeneration is a life changing event because it is an act of God's will "but of God" and not of the will of the flesh or of the will of man.

By comparison between the birth of Christ and the birth of David, through the contrast we can see the meaning clearly. David has described himself in (Psalm 51:5) in a way that a person would abstain from using even if it was true, he said "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." David wrote this psalm after Nathan rebuked him on his famous sin (committing adultery with Bathsheba and plotting to murder her husband). In that psalm, David admits with tears that he has discovered that the problem wasn't just in committing such a sin in that age (adultery and plotting to murder). The problem goes beyond that and goes way back in time when he was in his mother's womb. Honestly speaking, I often wondered if the conception with David as a baby was a result of an illegitimate relationship between his mother and father, so that he would say this about himself? Of course not, David came as a result of a legitimate relationship between his parents who didn't break any moral, godly laws. So why did David give that

hideous description of himself? The answer lies in the word “will or desire” and not the act. The will that desires the act, the will that precedes the act. Therefore, the problem in the conception of David’s mother from his father Jesse is not in the act itself, but in the will behind the act or the conception which desired that act. David came to the world through natural conception; this conception is the result of the will of the flesh and the will of man “the will of the flesh and thoughts”. And this will is independent and rebellious, not submissive to God, even though if the act is within a frame of a legitimate marriage.

On the other hand, the birth of Christ recorded in (Mathew 1:20) (But just when he had resolved to do this, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream and said, “Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary as your wife, for the child conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit.”), The Bible didn’t use the same description when the Blessed Mary conceived baby Jesus like David’s mother “when my mother conceived me”. The conception process here is quite different; Mary didn’t conceive Jesus by her own will. In David’s birth, his mother was **the doer** “*when my mother conceived me*”, but in Jesus’ birth, Mary is not the doer “*the child conceived in her*”. In a linguistic sense, Mary is **an object**⁽²⁹⁾ **not a subject**. For the doer, the initiator of the conception is the Holy Spirit with His power and will “*for*

(29) An exclusive comparison between the two acts (conceived) and (conceived in her), in the first the mother is a doer, and in the second the mother is objective not subjective.

the child conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit. There is a great difference between **“she conceived”** by her own will, and **“conceived in her”** without involving her own will.

One might ask, how do you say that Jesus was conceived in Mary without her will being involved, though she replied to the angel “let it be with me according to your word”? Mary’s reply doesn’t mean that conception with Christ was her own idea or according to her own will, for she was a virgin. Mary’s reply means that she is submissive and obedient to the Lord’s will, “let it be with me according to your word” means though it wasn’t according to her own will, she submitted to God’s will. It is God’s will, not Mary’s and she submitted to His will. This is very important, because it is a confirmation that God is the one who brings the firstborn into the world and not Mary, or for more precision, it is God through Mary. We read that in (Hebrews 1:6) “And again, when he brings the firstborn into the world, he says, “Let all God’s angels worship him.” God is the one who brought the firstborn into the world; the idea, the will and the power are God’s “the Holy Spirit and the power of the Most High”. Mary was only the blessed vessel to fulfill God’s will, that Jesus would come as her seed. Again, just for confirmation, I repeat that Joseph Mary’s fiancé had no will and had nothing to do in the conception with baby Jesus, for it was a miraculous virgin conception without and before Mary and Joseph came together.

In conclusion, the baby Jesus came to our world according to no human will at all. Indeed, there were longings and desires from godly men and prophets in the Old Testament to see the promised Savior, and they were waiting for the Savior coming into our world. However, bringing Him into the world was not according to any human will, it was purely God's will. And God's will is always perfect, and flawless, and this is one of the reasons behind the perfect humanity of Christ, Holy, didn't inherit sin although He was the seed of the woman.

For more clarification, David came into the world through natural conception, preceded by human will so he was a sinner from the womb. On the other hand, Jesus came into the world through a miraculous virgin conception, preceded by God's will, with zero percentage of human will so He was called Holy from the womb. We read this in (Luke 1:35) "The angel said to her, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be holy; he will be called Son of God."

Since the conception with Christ was "without a human will", then it is "without genealogy" to any human as well. The scientific expression "without genealogy" and the spiritual one "without a will" are two faces of the same coin. Now, I can here you wondering how is this possible? To clarify this point, it is a fact that every child comes into our world through natural conception is a result of intercourse

between a man and a woman, which the Bible calls it “will of a man and will of the flesh”. Also, scientifically, this child is “the seed and genealogy of both this man and this woman”. So, if the child came into our world through a miraculous virgin conception like Jesus, through a woman and by God’s will, without a man “without human will”, then this child will be also “without genealogy to any human”. Without genealogy to any father or mother because it was a virgin conception without intercourse with a man, therefore without a will of man or will of the flesh. That’s why, the scientific⁽³⁰⁾ expression “without genealogy” and the spiritual one “without a will” are two faces of the same coin. That exactly what the Bible stated about the incarnation of the Son of God, issuing truthful report of negation of paternity in (Hebrews 7:3) that He is “without father, without mother, without genealogy.

(30) An exclusive summary, formulation and conclusion of this research.

PREMOON

Chapter Seven

PREMOON

The Virgin Inspiration of the scripture

I would like to share with you a small idea about the written word of God “the Bible”. We saw that the incarnated Word of God, Lord Jesus Christ is the seed of the woman and not Mary’s genealogy. Also, that He didn’t come into our world as a result of human will “will of a man or the will of the flesh”. Indeed, He came through a human vessel “the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary”, but not as a result of a human will.

So does the Bible, it came to us through human vessels “the minds and mouths of the inspiration writers” not by a human will. We read that in (2 Peter 1:21) “because no prophecy ever came by human will, but men and women moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God”. We can say what happened in the birth of the Incarnated Word, similarly happened with the prophetic written word. **For it is the seed of the minds of the divine inspiration writers, but not the genealogy of their minds⁽³¹⁾**, because no prophecy has ever come by human will, but they were moved by the Holy Spirit. As we call the miraculous conception of the incarnated

(31) An exclusive phrase for this research, and a new dimension to approximate and explain how the scripture formed and given.

Word **“the Virgin Conception”**, we can also figuratively call the miraculous inspiration of the written Word **“the Virgin Inspiration”**. Allow me to demonstrate some points about the miraculous verbal plenary inspiration of the Bible, which shows clearly that the Bible is no less than a real miracle.

- We read what the Bible said in (Genesis 3) “the seed of the woman and not the genealogy of the woman”, and it is accurate and precise.
- The book that said in (Isaiah 11:1) “A shoot shall come out from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots.” Ten verses later in (Isaiah 11:10), it called the same person which was called earlier (a branch) that he is (a root) “the root of Jesse shall stand”. Also, the Bible is accurate and without any contradictions.
- In (Revelation 22:16), the Bible said “I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.” and it is accurate and precise.
- The book said about Christ in (Romans 1) that He is “the seed of David and not his genealogy”, and it is accurate and precise.
- The book talked about Christ’s relationship to the Israeli people in (Romans 9), that He is “from them according to the flesh”, without saying that they were

“His brethren” or “His kinsmen”, and it is accurate and precise.

- The book said about Christ’s relationship to the Israeli people in (Romans 9), that He is (from them according to the flesh), without any contradiction with what has been said about Christ in (Hebrews 7) “without their genealogy”, and it is accurate and precise.
- In talking about Jesus as “the firstborn”, the Bible linked Him to Mary saying in (Luke 2:7, her firstborn son). Also, in talking about Jesus as “the child”, it linked Him to the Israeli nation saying in (Revelation 12:5, her child) because He is the seed of the woman, and came according to the flesh from this nation. However, in talking about Him as “the male child”, the Bible didn’t link Him to the Israeli nation, yet said precisely in (Revelation 12:5, 12:13, a male child or the male child) because He isn’t the genealogy of this nation.
- The book that didn’t mention Mary’s name in her genealogy chain in (Luke 3), and instead mentioned Joseph’s name, and though such thing seemed strange, yet again the Bible is precise and accurate.
- It is the same book that issued in (Hebrews 7:3) the oldest, most accurate and truthful medical report of negation of paternity “genealogy” in the world “without father, without mother, without genealogy”.

This was written in the year (68 AD), which is almost (1900) years before humankind discovered anything about genes or DNA; yet again the Bible was precise and accurate.

The book that has all of these miraculous verbal plenaries inside it, just in one issue though, is written by many human vessels. I believe it is God's infallible inspiration, inerrant verbally and in meaning. I believe that a book with such verbal inerrancy can't be anything but God's word. I believe that no prophecy ever came by human will, but God's holy men who were moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God, in a miraculous way. I called this figuratively "Virgin Inspiration (32) of the scripture"; the words were born from the mouths of the divine inspiration writers; without any interference of their own will not in a dictation mode but miraculously.

In the same way, the Holy Spirit **overshadowed** the human vessel Mary, by the power of the Most High modifying, and rearranging the genetic codes on Mary's ovum so that baby Jesus would be born from her, yet without any interference of her will. The same happened as the Holy Spirit **moved** the inspiration vessels, **created the ideas** inside their minds, **articulated the phrases, selecting specific intended words from their linguistic store, arranging the thoughts inside their minds in a certain intended sequence**

(32) An exclusive expression for this research.

so that the Bible was **formed** and **born** from them, yet without any participation of their will; therefore, it is **not a dictation mode** of writing. However, it is a process of **creating, articulating, arranging of ideas, and phrases inside the minds of the inspiration writers**, to form according to **pure God's will**, what I will call figuratively "**the Holy Bible zygote⁽³³⁾**", that would be uttered afterwards by the mouths of the inspiration writers.

It is important to clarify that the phrase "**without will**" doesn't mean "**unconsciously**". As Mary was fully conscious of what was happening with her, as well as, the inspiration writers were. **The genetic formation of the embryo inside Mary's womb, and the verbal formation of the ideas and phrases inside the inspiration writers' minds were devoid of any human will.** However, the birth of this baby who was inside Mary's womb happened consciously by Mary. Likewise, the uttering of those ideas and phrases that were formed inside the inspiration writers' minds happened consciously by those writers.

As God used the **linguistic stock** stored inside the **egg** selected from the Virgin Mary (**DNA⁽³⁴⁾ letters**) to prepare **body** for the **incarnated word**, He also used the **linguistic stock** stored inside the **minds** of the writers of revelation (**Hebrew and Greek letters**) to make the **written word** (the Divine declaration and revelation).

(33) An exclusive expression for this research.

(34) As Francis Collins named the DNA in his book "the language of GOD".

To make more clarification to this idea, I can say it is process near to what happened in John chapter 21 with disciples, they tried to fish all the night, but the result was **BIG ZERO**, they did not catch even one small fish, yet just after daybreak, Jesus stood on the beach and asked them to cast the net on the right side of the boat, and they will find some, they did as he said and they were not able to haul the net because there were so many fish. Then Peter hauled the net ashore, full of large fish 153, and though there were so many fishes, the net was not torn. And Jesus said to them “bring some of the fish that you have just caught”

Now my comment is that the scripture inspiration happened in a process near like what happen here, **the will of God only** without any percentage of the will of the disciples **drove, moved, selected and determined number, size and type** of the fishes which will enter the net, it is not all the fishes of the sea as the net will not tolerate, and on the other hand it is not Zero, it is the enough amount of fishes to fell the net without being torn. And the role of the disciples is to catch and haul the net to the earth after being full of fish.

The mind of the inspiration vessels is like this net, the **creation** of ideas inside the mind, the **formation** of phrases, the **selection** of words and verbs, the **arrangement** and the **sequences** of events, are determined by the pure will of GOD without any will of any human being, the Holy spirit by his pure will drove the ideas to be **created** inside there mild as he drove the fishes to **enter** the net, then the inspiration vessels

spoke these ideas as if they **gave birth** of them through their mouths.

And from my point of view Jesus said cast the net to the right side of the boat to referee to **the power, the authority and the will** of GOD as we understand that from many places in the bible mention **“the right side”** as literally there is no difference between right and left side in the sea, the same as literally there is no difference between the right hand of the Majesty and the left hand of the Majesty on high, as literally there is no right and left there, but it just referee to the power and the authority of the Majesty on high.

And as Jesus said to the disciples “Bring some of the fish that you have just **caught**”, the bible said about the scripture that “the holy men of GOD **spoke** as they were moved by the Holy spirit.

Just as Christ didn't contradict with Himself, so did the texts of the Bible. Any paradox between Biblical texts is only an outward contradiction due to our limited and superficial abilities. However, as we study God's word earnestly and with prayer, we would discover an amazing harmony between its texts, and deeper outstanding meanings.

PREMOON

Chapter Eight

PREMOON

Jesus Christ biologically in His flesh is not anything different from Adam, and in His humanity He is not only Adam; and the second man is not the first man, as the second man is not only perfect complete human but also GOD himself

With this marvellous miracle, the miraculous virgin conception or what I call **“the separation⁽³⁵⁾ of genealogy”** (*this term is from my own thought to clarify the meaning and not found or taken from any book*), the genealogy of Jesus was separated from Mary’s. Thus, Jesus was separated from the rest of Adam’s race that Mary came from, and so Jesus was separated from sinners as well. Jesus came holy, separated from fallen race of Adam, as we read in (Hebrews 7:26) “For it was fitting that we should have such a high priest, holy, blameless, undefiled, **separated⁽³⁶⁾** from sinners, and exalted above the heavens.” This word “holy” is powerful and it

(35) (Separation of Genealogy) is an exclusive expression for this research, through which i described what happened in the virgin conception of Christ according to the light GOD gave to me.

(36) Separated from sinners since the first moment of formation of this body inside the belly of Virgin Mary, and this happened by the power of the most high through the miracle of separation of genealogy.

reminds us of what the angel said to Mary “the child to be born will be holy”. Jesus was holy while He was still a fruit in the womb, and even when He was just a seed, how did that happen? It happened in the miraculous virgin conception, where the Holy Spirit came upon Mary and the power of the Most High overshadowed her. So, the genealogy of this seed was separated from Mary, thus from all the fallen race of Adam. And Jesus Christ came in the flesh without any human will; without father, without mother, without genealogy, blameless, undefiled, holy and separated from sinners as well, though He is the seed of the woman.

Notice, dear reader, what the Blessed Virgin Mary said in (Luke 1:49) “for the Mighty One has done great things for me, and holy is his name.” Mary’s words are deep, expressive words, she said “the Mighty one has done great things for me”, then added “and holy is his name”. She didn’t say “and great is his name” in relation to the great things that He has done, though great is His name indeed. Yet, Mary chose to say “and holy is his name”, as if she is saying that this name goes well with the miracle that God performed according to His holiness and holy measurements, it is the miracle of separation of genealogy.

My dear reader, we can say that the Blessed Virgin Mary was the **connecting ring**⁽³⁷⁾ between Jesus and the house of **David “connection of the seed line”**; at the same time, she was the **separating point**⁽³⁸⁾ between Jesus and the fallen race of **Adam “separation of the genealogy line”**.

(37) , (38) new idea, dimension and expression, exclusive for this research.

We can also say that the Blessed Virgin Mary is the daughter of the first Adam, and at the same time, the last Adam was born of her. Indeed, she has all the right to sing “for the Mighty One has done great things for me”, and that from now on all generations will call her blessed.

One might ask, what do I mean by “last Adam was born of her”? Does that mean biological Adam (that Christ came with a body carrying the same genetic code of the first Adam)? Or figuratively mean Adam who is the head, the new root of a new creation? This question takes us to the next point, to discover what the genetic code of baby Jesus is, who was born of Mary. Yes, Mary isn’t his mother according to the genealogy as we previously explained, so who is He biologically? Did the Bible offer any answers to these questions? Is it important to research that matter? Yes, the Bible offered answers to these questions, and it is important to research that matter, as there are many core theological doctrines that are founded on these answers as we shall see further. To answer this question, let me present you with some facts that would lead to an affirmative answer which is briefly, “yes”. Yes, I mean Only in His flesh “only the body as one of the components of the humanity of Christ” Only the body that the Father prepared for the Son, carries biologically the same genetic code of Adam the first without sin because He came to the world through a virgin conception. But, my dear reader, have some patience as the story isn’t finished yet. Remember that in this body the whole fullness of Godhead dwells, from the very first

minute of formation inside the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary. So, in His humanity “body and soul together”, not only He was without sin but also infinite. Therefore, biologically in His “body” He is not anything different from Adam, and in His humanity “body and soul” He is not only Adam. And as a whole man “body, soul, and spirit”, He isn’t only fully normal human, except for sin and limitations, but He is also fully God for in him the whole fullness of Godhead dwells bodily.

For more clarification for this interrelated point, I say, any human being is a three dimensional being “body, soul, spirit” So, if we said that “only the body” of Jesus Christ the man that God prepared for Him, carries the same genetic code of the first Adam, that doesn’t mean that the humanity of Jesus Christ the man “body and soul together”, is the same humanity of the first Adam. Consequently, it doesn’t mean that Jesus Christ the man “body, soul, spirit” is the first Adam.

The comparison from the perspective of the body only is a misbalanced reduction; therefore, according to this narrow perspective, the monkey would be superior over human beings. As The monkey carries in his body, genetic code composed of (48) chromosomes, while a human being carries only (46). However, a human being is a sophisticate, higher creature than a monkey, for God has breathed into him spirit and soul, and that made him more sophisticated and higher than other creatures though physically he is weaker than they are. It is important to state this in the beginning

of our discussion to avoid any confusion or overlapping in meanings; the second man isn't the first one, the last Adam isn't the first Adam. Even if in His body, Christ carries the same genetic code of the first man or Adam, as we shall see in the following proofs and the decisive Biblical texts:

✳ **First Truth:** Man "Human Being" The Son of God in His humanity is fully human, yet without sin as I have previously explained. He came fully "human", in every sense of the word. Externally, He was just like any other human; to the extent, that John the Baptist needed a sign to distinguish Him from the crowd "He on whom you see the Spirit descend and remain is the one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit".

Biologically, (human being) is (46) chromosomes, and this means that he surely has a genetic code in his body. This took place by the power of the Most High in the miraculous virgin conception, where the zygote of (46) chromosomes was formed from an ovum of (23) chromosomes without being fertilized by a sperm from a man. If you don't believe, dear reader, that Christ in His body had a genetic code, then you are basically denying the incarnation whether you realize that or not. For the incarnation of the Son through a miraculous virgin conception, born of a woman and not created means that He must have a genetic code, nothing else. And when the Bible says that the Word became flesh "assumed a body", that He shared flesh and blood, which means that He assumed a genetic code, and that doesn't bear any other meanings. As The human body that Christ

assumed in its origin, description and cells is composed of genetic information, recorded on the genetic code of the DNA, yet without sin, or else we couldn't have described Him as being human.

There is no room here for spiritualizing things, as we are talking about the incarnation of the Son, which happened literally and historically with a physical tangible visible body, made of flesh, blood and bones as Christ said. Likewise, any physical body, made of flesh, blood and bones must have genetic code, therefore the body of the Son of God in His incarnation must have a genetic code especially that He was born and not created. Even the body of the first Adam who was created, had a genetic code, then it makes more sense that the body of incarnated Son of God who was born, must have had a genetic code too. Any exaggeration in saying that since this body was formed miraculously then it didn't have a genetic code, can cause the factual historical event of incarnation to be turned into a science fiction story. This would cause the formation of distorted, wrong beliefs in one's mind, which would lead to sever intellectual struggles, even if it sounded spiritually appealing at first. Therefore, we end this point saying the same; the person whom we are talking about is "human being / man", so He must have a genetic code.

✳ **Second Truth:** Male Boy The man Jesus Christ as the Bible describes Him is a male boy, or the male child, which is not a conclusion but it is what the inspiration confirmed

many times across the Bible. If the inspiration didn't say that Jesus Christ the man is "male", no one would have dared to say it. Based on that we are dealing with a sacred text that states facts not a deduction which is subject to right or wrong. The word "male" is a genetic word that specifies the gender, and doesn't have logically and scientifically but one meaning; that is the genetic code of the body of Jesus Christ contains the (y) chromosome. This chromosome was formed by a miracle done by the power of the Most High, because the conception with Christ was a miraculous virgin conception, without any intercourse between Mary and Joseph to obtain the (y) chromosome. Also, the word "male" is a confirmation of the first truth that we discussed which is that the body of Jesus Christ in His humanity must have a genetic code and chromosomes or else how can the Holy Spirit describe Him with the word "male"! Therefore, we end this point saying that the information we have about Jesus Christ is that He is "**human being/man, male**".

✳ **Third Truth:** Without Father, Without Mother, Without Genealogy. The Son of God in His humanity is "without father, without mother, without genealogy" as the inspiration stated in (Hebrews 7). The word "without genealogy" is a genetic word used to describe the physical bonds, because the spirit doesn't have genes. It also means that this body carries a genetic code that is not linked by any genealogy relationship to any genetic code that precedes it. And Since the body as one of the components of a human being "body, soul, and spirit" is without genealogy, therefore

the human being as a whole is without genealogy, which is exactly what the Bible confirmed “without father, without mother, without genealogy”. Also, this genetic code is not linked by any genealogy relationship to another genetic code that follows it, because the man Jesus Christ never got married according to the truthful inspiration of the Bible.

So, the total sum of the information we got from the Biblical revelation about this person is **“human being/ man, male, without father, without mother, without genealogy”**. Whose genetic code can be described by these words? It is the genetic code of the **first Adam**, therefore when the Holy Spirit describes the humanity of the Son of God in His incarnation with these words; this means that in His humanity, He carries the same genetic code of Adam the first in His body, without sin. Again, this doesn’t mean at all that the second Adam is the same as first Adam as I have previously explained; we are talking about the last Adam who came in the fullness of time not at the beginning of time, was born and not created.

One might still think that the presented facts are not enough to prove that Christ in His body biologically carries the same genetic code of the first Adam. For God who brought the first Adam into being as “human being/ man, male, without father, without mother, without genealogy” can do it again, and bring another Adam with the same descriptions “human being/ man, male, without father, without mother, without genealogy” without having the same genetic code

as the first Adam. This leads to the fourth truth to answer those comments.

✳ **Fourth Truth:** Born not Created Indeed, God can create not just “another Adam” with the same descriptions “human being/ man, male, without father, without mother, without genealogy”, and at the same time with a different genetic code than the first Adam. God is able to create thousands of “another Adam”, with many different genetic codes that are different from the first Adam, with the same descriptions “human being/ man, male, without father, without mother, without genealogy” Whoever did it once, certainly can do it dozens or even hundreds of times, But you missed that Christ didn’t come created but was born; not only born but also born from the same living substance, and of the same DNA strands, and of the same genes and chromosomes, and of the same human genome which Adam the first is head of it. This human genome with all its codes and genetic sequences doesn’t contain expect for one genetic code that can be described with these descriptions “human being/ man, male, without father, without mother, without genealogy”, which is the code of the first Adam. And when The Bible said that Christ came a “human being/ man, male, without father, without mother, without genealogy”, born of the same human genome which Adam is its head, this can only have one explanation. It means that in His humanity, Christ carries the same genetic code that the first Adam had in His body, without sin.

We can also say that by performing this miracle, God **brought back** the same genetic code of the first Adam biologically without sin, and **did not create a new code out of nothing**. (On this point, which I will explain later in more details, the legality of the cross grounded)

Therefore, the first Adam is a “human being/ man, male, without father, without mother, without genealogy, created”. While Jesus Christ in His humanity is, “human being/ man, male, without father, without mother, without genealogy, born of a miraculous virgin conception from the same human genome, which the first Adam is its head”. Since He is without father, without mother, without genealogy, then biologically His body must carry the same genetic code of the first Adam without sin As All other genetic codes that come out of that human genome is a result of natural conception, have a father and mother according to genealogy.

This is one of the most important dimensions in the incarnation of the Son of God, by being born from a miraculous virgin conception; he came without father or mother according to genealogy, so that biologically in His body He would carry the same genetic code of the first Adam without sin. It is also one of the most important dimensions of the inevitability of the incarnation of the Son of God born and not created, so that biologically in His body He would carry the same genetic code of the first Adam without sin, and not a created typical copy of it as He was not created.

Thus, in the miraculous virgin conception, God the Most High by His power was able to make changes on the DNA

strand carried on the selected ovum from the Blessed Virgin Mary. He did that not just to separate the genealogy of this embryo from Mary, but also to bring about **a definite human being in his imagination**. A man who carries in His body a certain, specific genetic code, which is the genetic code of the first Adam so that He would be the last Adam, the head and the root of the new creation. if I may say, God made and prepared biologically a body that carries the same genetic code of the first Adam so that He would be “human being/ man, male, without father, without mother, without genealogy”, but this time born and not created, without sin, He is Jesus the last Adam.

Allow me, dear reader, to tell you exactly what happened before I proceed to present the rest of the truths, and textual evidences written by the inspiration that support the presented argument. As any argument that is based on logic deduction only would remain a hypothesis that requires the biblical texts to support and strengthen it, so that it is transformed into a godly truth which can be accepted by faith through revelation. Although I have always supported my argument with biblical texts, there are still more texts that can strengthen the presented ideas as well.

First, let me explain what happened in a form of a short simple story: The story⁽³⁹⁾ started in the beginning when

(39) This part is a summary of the content of what I have mentioned and what I will mention in this research, but in the form of a short story to be easy and simple, because deep theological facts sometimes need some simplification to unscrew them and bring them closer to the mind of the reader, and the anecdotal style is a wonderful and easy methods in achieving this goal.

God out of His perfect love, decided to create man in His image and likeness, so He created Adam and Eve; Adam was created and all the human race was in his loins “in his genetic code”. However, Adam fell when he disobeyed God and ate from the forbidden tree. And with Adam, all human race that was in his loins fell as well; though Adam and all human race fell but God’s project didn’t fail and His love never stopped or ceased. The human race continued to live in misery, until another wonderful story took place in the fullness of time after nearly (4000) years from the first story.

It started with the conception of a virgin called Mary in a miraculous extraordinary way. she was engaged to Joseph, but before they lived together, she was found to be with child from the Holy Spirit. After nine months, she gave birth to her firstborn, an amazing child. He was “human being/ man, male, without father, without mother, without genealogy”, He was without father, and without mother according to genealogy, as Mary was His mother according to the seed only. He was the head of a new creation, though He was born and not created, and though His genetic code was taken from the same human genome and was not created out of nothing. Thus, biologically, in His body He surly carries the same genetic code of the first Adam without sin As this human genome dose not contain a genetic code that can be described as “human being/ man, male, without father, without mother, without genealogy” except for that one of the first Adam only, He is the last Adam who came born miraculously and not created miraculously as well. How amazing is that!

He lived a pure life, didn't know sin and definitely didn't commit it, and there was no sin in Him; He fully pleased God and then He went to the cross. On the cross, during the three dark, horrible hours, He accepted out of His love to us and perfect obedience to God the Father that the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all. And as the Father did that, He saw Jesus as "our old self/old man", I say that trembling, and I wonder how did that happen? How the Father saw Jesus like that, this happen because Jesus biologically in His body carried the same genetic code of the first Adam "without sin", laid on him the iniquity of the first Adam voluntarily. Here, the iniquity (single) of us all (plural), because it was the iniquity that we all shared in by being in the first Adam when he fell in the garden. And if Jesus biologically in His body wouldn't have carried the same genetic code of the first Adam without sin, the Father wouldn't have seen Him as our old self/old man, even if this iniquity that was laid on Him was Adam's, since He would be biologically another person. **For a human being is identified⁽⁴⁰⁾ biologically with his genetic code and not with his deeds or the deeds laid on him**; for example, if David's adultery was laid on me that wouldn't make me biologically David.

When the Father saw Jesus as "our old self/old man", He poured on Him all His wrath and judgement. He judged the sin in Jesus' body "which is in its identity the body of the first Adam, since Jesus carried in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam without sin". When these

(40) An intuitive (axiomatic), fundamental scientific fact.

dark horrible hours ended, Jesus cried with a loud voice and said “it is finished”, gave up His spirit, died and was buried. But, as He was righteous in Himself and holy, and the iniquity was laid on Him and not done by Him. And He was made to be sin “an offering for sin”, though there was no sin in Him. So, the Father accepted His offering and counted His death a substitution atoning death, fulfilling what was said in the Bible “the righteous for the unrighteous”, therefore, He was risen from the dead.

Jesus Christ “the last Adam” has risen from the dead after He paid the wages of our sins, fulfilling what the Bible said in (1Corinthians 15:45) “the last Adam became a life-giving spirit.” Notice that (became a life-giving spirit) did not mean that he became something new that He wasn’t before. As Christ is a life-giving spirit, always was and always will be, for He has life in Himself, He is the life, and the one who gave life to the first Adam. The meaning here is legal; that by His death and resurrection, He was able legally to give us life after He placed in the cross the legal basis to revive us again. Also, Jesus became the root and head of a new creation, fulfilling what is said in (Revelation 22) “I am Jesus, I am the root of David”. By resurrection, Jesus didn’t only become head, for He is already the head by the miraculous virgin conception since He came “without father, without mother, without genealogy”. But through His death and resurrection, Jesus became the head of a new creation, because He defeated death and gave us life. He removed all the legal barriers that stood between His Spirit and ourselves, to grant us life. Thus,

a new creation is now formed in this head “Christ”; He was able to see His offspring since He made His life an offering for sin.

Here I have to confirm that, Jesus came as a head by the miraculous virgin conception; He is head from the first moment of His incarnation and from the first moment of conception in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary since He is “without father, without mother, without genealogy”. Through His death and resurrection, Jesus became not only a head, but also the head of a new creation, that came into existence because of Jesus’ death and resurrection. He is the last Adam from the first moment that He came into the world, and by His death and resurrection, He was able legally and legitimately to revive us again and make us a new creation in Him. A creation that He is its head “life- giving spirit”, which we read in (1Corinthians 15:45) “Thus it is written, “The first man, Adam, became a living being”; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit.” He is the last Adam by the miraculous virgin conception and birth, and this last Adam is originally a life-giving spirit in Himself, and legally and legitimately life-giving spirit through his death, meaning able to give live based on His death and resurrection.

Simply, if Jesus Christ came into our world by virgin conception, and didn’t die an atoning death, He would be the last Adam. He would be a head, because in His humanity, there is no other head that preceded Him for He is without father, without mother, without genealogy. But He wouldn’t

have been the head of a new creation, because without His death and resurrection, this new creation won't exist so that He would be its head. We read that in the biblical text in (Isaiah 53) "When you make his life an offering for sin, he shall see his offspring, and shall prolong his days;" Therefore, if He didn't make His life an offering for sin, He shall not see his offspring, but He would still be a head. A head without an offspring, as this offspring is conditioned (41) by His death, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains just a single grain, as the Bible says in (John 12:24) "Very truly, I tell you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains just a single grain; but if it dies, it bears much fruit." Thank God that the Branch through His death, grew and bore much fruit "a branch shall grow" (Isaiah 11:1).

This put an end to the old self/old man issue for it was convicted, and totally eliminated in the cross. Let us proceed with the rest of the biblical truths and texts that support the presented argument.

✳ **Fifth Truth:** our Old Self/Old Man was crucified with Him; there are two important, inseparable biblical texts though they came in different epistles. This is the magnificence of the Bible and the unity and consistency of its topic. the first text is in (Romans 6:6), Paul says, "We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the

(41) A fundamental fact and an important realization.

body of sin might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin.” The second text, Paul says in (Galatians 2:20) “I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless, I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.” We can detect two confirmed truths from these texts, they are:

- The first truth: our old self/old man was crucified with Christ.
- The second truth: Paul was crucified with Christ.

If we assume that Christ came into the world, carrying in His body the genetic code of the first Adam, yet as a created man not born (that means in the fullness of time, God would create again an exact typical replica with the same genetic codes of the first Adam and the same genetic features as He did once in the beginning of time with Adam the first). If that took place, the Holy Spirit wouldn't have said in the Bible in (Romans 6) “our old self was crucified with him” when God has laid on Christ the iniquity of us all. Because, although this code is an exact typical replica with the genetic code of the first Adam with the same descriptions and codes, but it isn't “our self/our man” but “an exact typical replica of our self/man” created **recently** in the fullness of time. Thus, we aren't related to this replica, and we have no biological representation in it because we didn't come from it; it is a **new recent** replica not an old one to be “our old self/our old man”.

To clarify the issue, let me give you an example from real life. If a hard-disk has a storage capacity of (500 giga) for example, and it has files and information on it. If it was infected with a virus, then the files on it would be infected as well. If we hypothetically destroyed this hard-disk and manufactured a new recent replica typical to it to solve the virus problem completely. This new replica wouldn't have the old files, and those files can't consider the new recent hard-disk (its old one) though it is a typical replica.

If we assumed that Christ came to our world born and not created, but He carried in His body another genetic code different from that of the first Adam. It wouldn't have been possible for Him legally or biologically to be our representative or substitute, because we don't have any biological representation in this new, different genetic code. For we as human race have only a biological representation in the genetic code of the first Adam, whom we were in his loins and came from him. Therefore, if the incarnated Christ came carrying in His body another new genetic code different from that of the first Adam, the Bible can't have said in (Romans 6) "our old self was crucified with him" when God has laid on Him the iniquity of us all. As Again, this new genetic code is not "our self/our man" but it is the code of "another new self/man" that it is not "our self/man", and we don't have any biological representation in it. As we said before, we as human race have only a biological representation in the genetic code of the first Adam "old self/man", whom we were in his loins and came from him.

For more clarification, let me give you an example from real life, the same hard-desk we talked about before. If we destroyed this infected hard-desk and manufactured a new recent one to solve the virus problem completely, and manufactured a new one with bigger storage space than the old one to save more files on. Though this new one is bigger in storage and more advanced, it wouldn't have the old files. And those files can't consider or look at this recent new hard-desk as (its old one) though it is bigger and more advanced.

So how were these previous two biblical texts fulfilled? They were fulfilled when the incarnated Christ through virgin conception from Mary, took the same genetic code of the first Adam "the same genetic code and not a created typical replica of it" without sin, Then He went voluntarily to the cross, and there God has laid on Him the iniquity of us all, at that moment God saw Him as "our old self/ our old man" because He carried in His body the genetic code of the first Adam, laid on it the iniquity of the first Adam. And when God saw him as our old self/our old man, He poured on Him His wrath and judgement. So what Paul said "our old self was crucified with him" was fulfilled; hence what Paul said "I have been crucified with Christ" was also fulfilled, because he was in the loins of this old self when he was crucified with Christ. Just as Paul fell when Adam fell in the garden since he was in his loins, Paul was also crucified with Christ when the old self/man was crucified with Christ because Paul was in that old self, represented in Him and came from Him. Therefore, if Christ took another genetic code that is different from

that of the first Adam, or took a typical replica of the genetic code of the first Adam but newly, recently created, then Paul wouldn't have been able to say "our old self was crucified with him" when God laid on Him the iniquity of us all. Hence, Paul wouldn't have been able to say "I have been crucified with Christ". Then, we can say that God prepared a body for the Son through the miraculous virgin conception, when He **brought the same⁽⁴²⁾ genetic code of the first Adam without sin, and didn't create a recent typical replica of it out of nothing.**

For more clarification, let me give you an example from real life, the same hard-desk we talked about before. If we took the infected hard-desk with the virus back to the factory. And there, it got fixed or reset without deleting the files it contains, so we now have the same old hard-desk with the same files on but without the virus "**without sin**". This is exactly what happened in the miraculous virgin conception; it brought Christ who is the last Adam, the head who is without father, without mother, without genealogy, without sin. In His body, He carried the same genetic code of the first Adam, in which we are represented in and came from it. And In the cross, God laid the same virus "sin" on the new hard-desk "notice that this new hard-desk didn't contract the virus by surfing untrusted websites or something like that, yet somehow God laid on that desk the virus; the iniquity of us all". Then God saw this new hard-desk as if it is our old

(42) A very important fact to understand the legitimacy of redemption and the cross, and the legitimacy of the representative work of Christ.

one “our old self”, because in its inner form, it is the same old hard-disk, placed on it the same virus that infected the old one, and not a typical replica made recently. So, GOD poured on him His wrath and convicted this virus “sin”, that’s when I was convicted as one of the files on the hard-disk. This only an example to clarify the idea, but there are more dimensions to be explained in the rest of the research.

Notice, dear reader, that Paul said in (Romans 6) said **“we know”** that our old self was crucified with him, and not **“we assume or we consider”**. He presents this truth as a **“fact”** not just **“assumed by faith”**. The crucifixion of our old self with Christ is a historical real event not just something assumed by faith; it is real information we know, not something we need to assume. And as I go back in my mind to the garden, and see Adam and Eve clothed with the garments of skin which point to the sacrifice of Christ, (Genesis 3:21) “And the Lord God made garments of skins for the man and for his wife, and clothed them.” I begin to realize faintly, some of the dimensions of what was said that “our old self was crucified with him”. Also, I can see an embodied image of what Paul is saying in (Galatians 3:27) “As many of you as were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ.”

Notice, dear reader, the accuracy of the inspiration, for he said that our old self was crucified **“with him”** and not **“in him”**, for two reasons at least:

- **First:** because if he said “in him”, it means that Christ in His humanity doesn’t carry in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam, but another genetic code that contains in it the code of the first man. Just as we were “in” the first Adam, and so we don’t have his same, exact genetic code. This is not true because Christ carries in His body “one of the elements of humanity” the same genetic code of the first Adam (I am just repeating as we explained before to remind you, that carrying the genetic code of the first Adam doesn’t mean that in His humanity Christ was the first Adam, neither does it mean that as a man, He is the first Adam).
- **Second:** It is not biblically or theologically right to say that “our old self is crucified in him”, because there is no sin in Christ (1John 3:5) “You know that he was revealed to take away sins, and in him there is no sin.” How amazing and accurate is the Bible.

In addition to that, the Bible said in (Romans 6) that “our old self was crucified with him” and not the “old Adam”, because it means Adam “as the head of creation”, not Adam “as a person”. It means that this crucifixion has an extended impact, which included all the creation not just its head. Although, the two words refer to the same person but they have different dimension; for example, there is a difference between talking about the President “as the head of the state”, and talking about him “as a person, an individual”. In

both cases, we are talking about the same person, however in the first case; we are referring to the head of state or deputy of the nation so we don't need to mention his proper name. In the second case, we are referring to him as an independent person, as an individual so we have to mention his proper name for identification.

When the Holy Spirit decides by the divine inspiration through Paul; that he "Paul" is crucified with Christ, it doesn't mean we are just talking about an individual case, but it was stating a general rule, that applies to everyone who believed before or will believe later in Christ same as Paul did. It means that Paul is a living example that applies to others as well.

✳ **Sixth Truth:** The Second Man and the Last Adam. One might ask, why didn't the Bible declare it with a documented text, so it wouldn't be just a deductive truth? Before we say that it is a documented truth with clear texts, even the deductive truth "for example God is a triune God" is certain and documented by many biblical texts. The word "deductive" doesn't mean "uncertain", however, it means that it is a declared truth and ideas in many texts, without being explicitly stated in words.

Regarding the point we will discuss here, the Bible has stated it clearly and explicitly, however the problem lies in our limited minds to understand it completely. The revelation of the biblical inspiration needs illumination from the Holy

Spirit to understand its depth and dimensions. There are two biblical texts concerning Jesus the last Adam which we have to address; first, in (1Corinthians 15:45) “Thus it is written, “The first man, Adam, became a living being”; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit.” Second, in (1Corinthians 15:47) “The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven.”

In fact, the expression “**the second man**” refers to the order of His coming, after the first man whom we read about in (Genesis 1:26) when God said “Let us make man in our image”. It is “the second man” using the definite article “the”, in reference to the existence of “the first man” who is known. If the Bible here wasn’t pointing to the first man, it wouldn’t have used the word “second” with the definite article “the” when describing the second man. However, so that no one thinks the second man carried in His body a different genetic code than the first Adam, the Bible called Him “Adam” not the first but the last. Indeed, it is an amazing statement that refutes that Christ biologically carries in His body a different genetic code than that of the first Adam, for the Bible called him “Adam”. As well as, refuting that Christ in His humanity “body and soul”, or as a whole human being “body, soul, spirit”, He is the same “Adam the first”, for the Bible called him “Adam the last not Adam the first”.

Again, as I go back by my mind to the garden, and see Adam and Eve clothed with the garments of skin which point to the sacrifice of Christ, (Genesis 3:21) “And the Lord God

made garments of skins for the man and for his wife, and clothed them.” I begin to realize an embodied image that the second man “Christ” in His flesh is not anything different from Adam, because He carries in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam, without sin “Adam the first was incorporated in Him”. And in His humanity “body and soul” He is not only Adam, and as a human being “body, soul, spirit”, He is infinite for in Him the whole fullness of Godhead dwells bodily, because He is fully God.

Thus, the expression of “the second man” using the definite article “the” means that this person in one of his aspects “the body” is considered a replay in time of the human being who came before, yet without sin. He came to give the dead human race a second chance of life through Him. This expression of “the last Adam” means that this Adam will not be repeated again later; **He is a nonrecurring replay, and an unrepeated repetition.**

One might think from the two words “**replay and repetition**” or the two words “**second and last**” that Christ is the image and Adam is the original, this is not true for Christ is the original and not the image. Christ is the original while the first man is just an image or a type of Him “Adam, who is an image of the one who was to come”. Christ is the original but in time He came later and last, and once the original one comes, we don’t need any images or copies anymore. He is “the Son of Man” because He is the seed of the woman, while at the same time, **He is “the second man, the last**

Adam” because He is not the woman’s genealogy⁽⁴³⁾. How amazing is He!

Since He had to come from the same human genome and not created out of nothing, so that He would carry in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam. chronologically, He had to be “the second, the last” and not “the first”, because God had to create Adam the first and Eve from his rib to prepare the vessel “the woman” from which the last Adam would be born from her seed. It says in (1Corninthians 15:46-47) the following “But it is not the spiritual that is first, but the physical, and then the spiritual. The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven.”

Perhaps someone might ask: How does Paul say by the Holy Spirit about Christ that He is the **second** man, at a time when Christ himself testifies of himself that He is the **first**? He said that more than once to confirm it, to mention a few:

(Revelation 1:17-18) “When I saw him, I fell at his feet as though dead. But he placed his right hand on me, saying, ‘Do not be afraid; I am the first and the last, and the living one. I was dead, and see, I am alive for ever and ever; and I have the keys of Death and of Hades.”

(Revelation 2:8) “And to the angel of the church in Smyrna write: These are the words of the first and the last, who was dead and came to life:”

(43) An important and useful explanation of some biblical expressions.

(Revelation 22:13) “I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end”

Does Jesus mean in these scriptures that He is the first in His divine essence? Surely, He is the first in His divine essence; however, the scriptures here say that He is the first in His humanity too. The absolute proof that He means His humanity lies in the following expressions, **“I was dead”, “who was dead and came to life”, “I am Jesus”, “I am the seed of David”**. Therefore, what did Jesus mean when said about Himself **“the first”** though the Holy Spirit spoke of Him and said that He is **“the second”**, in the following verse **“the second man is from heaven.”** Are there any conflict or contradiction in the scriptures?

There may be an apparent conflict or contradiction, but this apparent contradiction contains in its essence an impressive harmony and consistency. **Genetically, He is the first in His humanity; chronologically, He is the second.** On one hand, He is **the first in His genetic nature** because He is without a father, without a mother, and without genealogy. On the other hand, according to **chronological order, He is second** because He is the seed of the woman, and therefore he had to come second. **He is the first in His humanity because He is without a genealogy, while He is the second because he is a seed** ⁽⁴⁴⁾.

(44) A new interpretation and expression of this research, according to the understanding and the light that GOD gave to me.

However, Christ continues and says not only that he is the **first** but also the **last**, and here I stand wondering for the second time: How can one be the first and the last at the same time? You are either the first and then you are not the last, or you are the last and then you are not the first. The Bible in another scripture and another incident says this, **Matthew 20:16, "So the last will be first, and the first will be last."** From this scripture, we understand that someone can't be the first and the last at the same time. Nevertheless, Christ says of himself that he is "the first and the last", "the beginning and the end", "the alpha and the omega", how is this logical?

For you to be logically the first and the last at the same time, you must be the **whole** as well, because you cannot logically be the Alpha and the Omega at the same time unless you are **all**⁽⁴⁵⁾ **the letters** as well. Similarly, you cannot be the beginning and the end at the same time unless you are All too. This is Christ; He is the Alpha and the Omega because He is all, He is the beginning and the end because he is all. He is the first and the last because He is all. Because He is all, he is not only the Alpha but also the Omega. because he is All, he is not only the first but also the last. because he is All, he is not only the beginning but also the end.

It is worth noting or clarifying that both words "**the first and the last**" and "**the beginning and the end**" and "**the alpha and the omega**" do not mean at all that Christ has

(45) Logical biblical interpretation.

a beginning and has an end, but rather that **He is the first who isn't preceded by anyone and the last after which there is no other. He is the first that there is no first before him; however, He has no beginning (eternal), and the last one after which there is no other; however, He has no end (everlasting).** There is no contradiction in this point. **For He is the last that extends to infinity, the last after which there is no other, and for which there is no end.** Indeed, this seems very logical to me because if there is no other after Him then He is indeed the last. The miraculous thing is that this last in His nature is without end, eternal to infinity.

There is a wonderful scripture mentioned in the Epistle to the Colossians, Paul says, led by the Holy Spirit about Christ in Corinthians 1: 18: ***"He is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, so that he might come to have first place in everything."*** How did He become the head of the body? He became the **head** when Christ in all His glory came and incarnated without a father without a mother without genealogy. In other words, He became the head because in his incarnation no other head preceded Him. Also, He became **the head of the body** because by His death and resurrection He has an offspring **(When you make his life an offering for sin, he shall see his offspring, and shall prolong his days)**. This offspring and this body have a legal, lawful genetic relationship to the head, which is that they have a genetic representation in this head because this head carries the same genetic code of Adam the first except for sin. Thus, the Apostle follows this directly

by saying **“He is the beginning”**. What a short but powerful phrase as a powerful arrow in the heart of the rebuttal that says the Son in his humanity through incarnation is no longer the beginning as it is the case in His divinity! This phrase definitely confirms that in His humanity He is still the beginning because in His incarnation He came without a father, without a mother, and without genealogy. Genealogically, no one was His beginning. Whoever has no one as his beginning, then surely and logically would be the beginning. Next, the apostle continues his talk, saying **“Firstborn from the dead”** which is another wonderful and deep expression, and I say that the word **“firstborn”** here does not mean precedence in terms of **time**, but precedence in **the quality and the kind of the action (an action that has never been matched before)**. **What is meant here is uniqueness, supremacy, and progress in the kind of state, not in time** ⁽⁴⁶⁾ to clarify the meaning, allow me to give you an example from Olympic sports, in the 2019 long-distance running race. One of the competitors broke a record by crossing the required distance in four minutes, but in 2022 another competitor might break that record if he ran the same distance in three minutes and fifty seconds. Though chronologically the latter isn't the first (2022 and not 2019) except that in terms of performance, condition, and record numbers, he is the precedent, the first, the superior, and he is the most advanced. That is why the scriptures which the subject of our talk, resume, saying, **“so that he might**

(46) Interpret the biblical text with a different perspective (qualitative superiority not chronological superiority).

come to have first place in everything.” What is meant by the word “first” here is the progress in the **nature** of this resurrection, and the superiority in **the quality and nature** of this event and not in the chronological order. Since other resurrection processes have taken place in both the Old and New Testaments which precede the resurrection of Christ **chronologically and not qualitatively**. I mention some important differences between the resurrection of Christ and those resurrections that preceded Him chronologically:

First: Christ has risen with a **glorified body**. As for all those who rose from the dead other than Christ, they were raised with their **natural, earthy bodies** that are inhabited by sin.

Second: Christ has risen and left the tomb **without returning** because the death He died, He died to sin, once for all (Romans 10: 6). As for all those who were raised from the dead other than Christ, they died and **returned** to have their dead bodies reside in the tomb again.

Third: Christ **raised himself** from the dead (Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up). As for all those who were raised from the dead other than Christ, they did not raise themselves. Rather, **God has raised them** using his prophets as Elijah, for example, or Christ raised them with his direct authority because he is God who appears in the flesh as Lazarus. There is a huge difference between touching a wrestler to enter the wrestling ring to play on your behalf and defeat your opponent, and between you defeating your

opponent, crushing and ending him completely by yourself. It is worth mentioning here that Christ to whom be all the glory, raised the dead by **direct command** ⁽⁴⁷⁾ and raised the dead by **direct action** ⁽⁴⁸⁾. During His life on earth, He raised the dead by direct command as He did with Lazarus (Lazarus, come out!). In his death, He raised the dead by direct action, when He cried with a loud voice and breathed his last. Then, the earth shook, and the rocks were split. The tombs also were opened, and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised. Here, Christ hasn't uttered any direct command for resurrection just like what He had done with Lazarus because to Him is all glory died and breathed His last. However, the effect and power of His death spilt rocks, opened tombs, and raised many of the bodies of saints who were fallen asleep. **They restored their breathing when he breathed his last.** In His life **He used His authority** to raise the dead; as well as, in His death, **He broke the authority of death** when He destroyed by death that one who had the authority of death, that is, the devil. **In His life, He revived the dead, and in His death, He abolished death itself,** 2 Timothy 1: 10 *"but it has now been revealed through the appearing of our Saviour Christ Jesus, who abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel"* He is firstborn from the dead, and He truly deserves to be the first in everything.

When the Bible says about him that he is the first in **"everything,"** the Bible literally means it **"everything."**

(47) , (48) The beauty, the greatness and the power of Christ.

Although he was not the first in his birth according to the chronological order (He was preceded by many births), He is the first, unique, advanced, and superior in terms of the **type, nature, and impact** of this conception and this birth, the virgin conception. **Genetically**, He came as the head and the beginning because He is without a father, without a mother, and without genealogy; though He came as the second man according to the **chronological** order. Although in terms of chronological order, He is not the first to rise from the dead (He was preceded by many resurrections), but He is the first, unique, advanced, and superior in terms of the **type, nature, and effect** of this resurrection, as I previously explained. He is advanced in stature and not in time, He is the firstborn from the dead.

In addition to that, Christ had to carry in His body specifically the genetic code of the first Adam and not any other code; not only to be our representative as our head and root of new seed but also to represent the first Adam himself “as a separate individual not just the head of fallen creation” in front of God to redeem him. That’s why Christ was called in the Bible “the second man, the last Adam”, both expressions refer to the same person but from different angles.

It should also be noted here that, as the last Adam Jesus in His flesh is not another Adam created out of nothing, but He is born of the same human genome and carries in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam, without

sin. So, the expression **“the new creation”** doesn’t mean that it is “another creation” created out of nothing, but it is a complete inclusive **“renewing”** process of the old creation. A renewing process that eliminates any remains and remnants of the old or the first as mentioned in (Titus 3:5) “he saved us, not because of any works of righteousness that we had done, but according to his mercy, through the water of rebirth and **renewal** by the Holy Spirit.” The new creation in its essence is a renewal process to the old one, done by the Holy Spirit, and not a creation of a new creation instead of the old one out of nothing. Also, this is what Paul confirms in (Romans 8:39) “Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.” Therefore, God didn’t replace the fallen creation with another created one out of nothing, but He recreated it in Christ again after He convicted it in the cross to provide the legality and legitimate cover for the renewal process.

One might, in the light of what I’ve said above, ask what does it mean **“had passed away”**? this word is found in (Revelation 21:1) “Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more.” And in (2Corinthians 5:17) “So if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation: everything old has passed away; see, everything has become new!” Notice, dear reader, the word **“everything”** has become new, the new creation means that “everything” becomes new, and not **“nothingness”** becomes a new creation. Again, the same

idea is found in (Revelation 21:5) “And the one who was seated on the throne said, “See, I am making all things new.” He isn’t going to create another creation out of “nothing” or from “nothingness”, but He is “going to **make**” and “not **create**” “**all things**” and not “**nothingness**” new. For it is not a recreation process out of “nothing”, but it is a process of making “everything” new. The difference would be clearer if we compared the text in (Revelation 21:5) “And the one who was seated on the throne said, “See, I am making all things new.” With the one in (Genesis 1:1) “In the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth,” Thus, we can say that the word “had passed away” means complete renewal “everything, all things”. This renewal was complete and ultimate, it was able to eliminate completely the old things, after it was legally convicted in the cross, nothing remained of it “everything old has passed away”; see, “everything” has become new!

In (Ephesians 2:10), it says “For we are what he has made us, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand to be our way of life.” We understand from this text that the new creation isn’t a creation “**out of**” ⁽⁴⁹⁾ nothing or a creation made of any other different substance, but it is the creation which recreated us “**in**” ⁽⁵⁰⁾ Christ Jesus. So, if anyone is “in Christ”, he is a new creation, that is an important point because God didn’t create another creation out of nothing, but He recreate us again in Christ Jesus “we ourselves, were created again”.

(49), (50) The new creation is the creation (in) Christ, not the creation (out of) nothingness.

we also read in (2Corinthians 5:4), “For while we are still in this tent, we groan under our burden, because we wish not to be unclothed but to be further clothed, so that what is mortal may be swallowed up by life.” The new creation isn’t execution or annihilation of the old dead and replacing it with a new creature made out of nothing. However, it is the removal and extermination of what is mortal by being **swallowed up** by the power and strength of the life in Christ Jesus. When that mortal soul came to life again by being clothed with the new or with Christ, so that what is mortal couldn’t bear the power of this life so it was swallowed up.

We also read in (Hebrews 8:13) “In speaking of “a new covenant,” he has made the first one obsolete. And what is obsolete and growing old will soon disappear.” In this text, the Bible adds another dimension to the word “new”, by comparing between the old and the new covenant. The word “new” means “**growing old and disappear**” of the old. The word (disappearing) or (vanish away) is mentioned again in (James 4:14) “Yet you do not even know what tomorrow will bring. What is your life? For you are a mist that appears for a little while and then vanishes.” It means to disappear, doesn’t exist anymore, or to have no traces of it.

Therefore, the new creation doesn’t mean the disappearing of the old or destroying it and creating new one out of “**nothing or nothingness**”. But, it means the disappearing and destroying of the old creation through a complete **renewal**⁽⁵¹⁾ **process**, by making “**everything**”

(51) A different perspective of the expression “the new creation”, it is a process of complete legitimacy renewal of the old creation, not creating another creation out of nothingness.

new, so that what is mortal may be **“swallowed up”**, the old and the first may be **“disappeared and vanished away”** and **“everything old has passed away”**. This legally and legitimately took place in the cross, and still takes place practically in its right time according to God’s schedule and measures.

To clarify the idea, let me share with you an example from real life. If I had an old apartment that I’ve ruined through my misuse. Then, someone took the old apartment which I completely destroyed and renewed / renovated it, eliminating all the destruction done to it and bring it back to its original design. Thus, I can call it a new one though it is still the same old apartment. For the old destructed one is gone and there is no trace of it to be found, since the complete renewal/ renovation was done based on legal and just basis “burning and convicting the old one”. This is just a simple example to clarify the idea we have discussed earlier.

The idea of not creating a new creation out of nothing is a one of the aspects of God’s triumph over the devil, who caused the fall of the first man so that he would sabotage God’s project and push Him to create another creation out of nothing. But God in the cross of Christ disarmed the rulers and authorities and made a public example of them, triumphing over them in it, when He took “our old self”, convicted and crucified it with Him in the cross, so that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us. Then He raised us with Him from death, and recreated us a new creation in Him, without creating another different or new creation out of nothing. How amazing that is indeed!

✧ **Seventh Truth:** Jesus Root of David and Root of Jesse; is found in the biblical texts in the book of Revelation that talks about Jesus being the root of David not just the seed of David. John moved by the Holy Spirit, said in (Revelation 5:5) about Jesus, these deep words “Then one of the elders said to me, “Do not weep. See, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, **the Root of David**, has conquered, so that he can open the scroll and its seven seals.” Also, Jesus said about Himself in (Revelation 22:16) “It is I, Jesus, who sent my angel to you with this testimony for the churches. **I am the root** and the descendant of David, the bright morning star.” Here, Jesus is talking about Himself as being “**the root of David**”, so is there any contradiction between being the seed of David, and being the root of David? Does the Bible mean that Jesus in His divinity is the root of David, as some are saying? If so, why did the Holy Spirit linked between talking about Jesus as the root of David and that He is the Lion of the tribe of Judah, which is an indication of His humanity? Why did Jesus while speaking about Himself, use the name “Jesus” when He said “It is I, Jesus,, I am the root and the descendant of David?”

Let’s address these great texts that tell us “Jesus is the root of David”, because it is an important issue and related to the fact that Christ is the last Adam. Indeed, Jesus in His humanity is the seed and descendant of David, yet how can we understand that in His humanity also, as the Lion of the tribe of Judah is the root of David? The common known answer is that the Holy Spirit meant that Jesus is the root of

David in His divinity not in his humanity as the Son of God whose origin is from of old, from ancient days. In fact, this answer is not convincing at all, not biblical and it is not in consistency with the rest of the text, for it talks about Jesus as the Lion of the tribe of Judah, not whose origin is from of old, from ancient days. If the text meant Jesus in His divinity is the root of David, it would have said something like “I am the Lord, the root of David, I am Jesus the descendant of David”. However, the choice was to use the name “Jesus”, which is His humanity name “being the root, and being the seed”, and Jesus is the name that He was called with in His incarnation, after His birth and during His earthly life. So, I stand astonished in front of the greatness of the biblical inspiration and the miraculous virgin conception of Christ, **for in His humanity⁽⁵²⁾, He is indeed the seed of David, as well as, the root of David for Jesus is the last Adam.** This is the result of the miraculous virgin conception; it brought the last Adam so that He would be the head and the root of the new creation, just as the first Adam was the head and root of the first creation. Just as Jesus was separated from Mary’s genealogy, He was also separated from the genealogy of David and Adam; He came as the new head, for the Bible says about Him that He is without father, without mother, without genealogy. Being the last Adam, He is the root of the new David, as the first Adam was the root of the old David, for Jesus Christ biologically, in His humanity carries in

(52) An exclusive explanation for this research. Jesus in his humanity is the seed of David, and also in his humanity he is the root of David.

his body the same genetic code as the first Adam, in which all of us are represented, but without sin. Therefore, in His humanity and through this code, He is the root of David just as Adam the first was the root of David with the same code, because David was biologically represented in this genetic code.

Notice, dear reader, that the Bible talked about Jesus being the root of David in connection to the victorious Jesus “the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has conquered”. This confirms what we said before; that Jesus came as root and head through the virgin conception, yet He was without offspring, however, He was able to see His offspring since He made His life an offering for sin. And when a grain of wheat fell into the earth and died, it didn’t remain just a single grain, it bore much fruit. And the shoot that came out of the stump of Jesse, as it dried and died on the cross, it blossomed and bore much fruit. Thus, As He was risen from the dead victoriously, He became the head and root of a new creation, the head of the church and the root of David.

My dear reader, from all what was previously discussed, we reach to a concrete conclusion, which is that the Bible is talking about Jesus in His humanity as the root of David and not in His divinity. Since it did talk about Jesus as the root of David as the Lion of the tribe of Judah, not whose origin is from of old, from ancient days, and it didn’t talk about Jesus as the root of David expect after His death on the cross, and

His victorious resurrection, bearing much fruit “the new creation”.

One might also say that Jesus was said to be “the root” in the Old Testament, before His incarnation and birth, in (Isaiah 11:10) it says about Him that He is “the root of Jesse”. Let’s view this text in (Isaiah 11:10), it says “On that day the root of Jesse shall stand as a signal to the peoples; the nations shall inquire of him, and his dwelling shall be glorious.” Notice, dear reader, the phrase “**on that day**”, here Isaiah is saying a prophecy in the Old Testament, to be fulfilled in the New Testament when Jesus Christ comes in flesh to be the head and the root as He is without father, without mother, without genealogy “the last Adam”. By His death on the cross, He made His life an offering for sin, so He was able to see His offspring, so He was not just a head and root but became the head and root of a new creation. Then, these words would be fulfilled that He is “**the root of David, the root of Jesse**”, when He comes to reign in His literal millennium kingdom as “the root of Jesse”. The Bible was very precise when it said “the root of Jesse **shall stand**, not the root of Jesse **who is**”. For here it talks about Him not as the independent Supreme Being from eternity, but as the victorious root, who was risen defeating death, versus the first defeated fallen root who brought death to all. This is not a personal interpretation, for the Bible explained itself when Paul quoted this same text in (Romans 15:12), saying “and again Isaiah says, “The root of Jesse shall come, the one who rises to rule the Gentiles; in him the Gentiles shall hope.” Though, this text is in the

Old Testament before the incarnation, but it is a prophecy to be fulfilled in the millennium kingdom, which is logically after the incarnation, death and resurrection of Christ; it is a text that talks about future events that yet to take place “The root of Jesse shall come”. Indeed, that’s how precise the Bible is!

Therefore, Jesus is the descendant of David, He is a **branch** that shall grow out of his roots (Isaiah 11:1), for He is the seed of David. But since He is not the genealogy of David because He is without father, without mother, without genealogy, then He is also the head, **the root** and not just the branch and seed. And so we can understand the depth of what Jesus said in (Revelation 22) “It is I, Jesus,.....I am the root and the descendant of David,”. I am the root of David because I am without father according to the genealogy to David and so I am the last Adam, and I am the descendant of David because I am the seed of David; Thus, I am the Son of David. This is one of **the most precious gems and deepest secrets** of the miraculous virgin conception of Christ by which **Jesus came** ⁽⁵³⁾ **as seed and root at the same time, as this miracle brought Him seed without genealogy**. So, Jesus in His humanity is the root of David, not just the seed of David, but in **His divinity** according to the Bible is **“the Lord of David”** not **“the root of David”**. How wonderful the power of the Most High and how deep are His thoughts and purposes.

(53) Exclusive in this research: Jesus in his humanity by incarnation came seed and root at the same time, and this is one of the jewels and wonders of the miracle of the Virgin conception of Christ. .

When the Holy Spirit through John's words stated this joyful truth that Jesus is the root of David, as Jesus Himself said that "It is I, Jesus, I am the root and the descendant of David", this wasn't just an individual case. However, it was stating a general rule that applies to everyone who believed and would believe in Christ just as David did. It means that it is a general rule, where David and Jesse are living examples of it. One might ask why did the Holy Spirit choose David and Jesse specifically to declare this rule? He chose them to declare that this is an absolute rule which applies to everyone with no exceptions, even David from whom Christ came from his seed. Also, Jesse from whom Christ came from his root as a branch, this rule applies to them. The Holy Spirit mentioned those two as examples so that no one would doubt that David and Jesse might be exceptions to this rule.

How great and consistent is the inspiration of the Bible! in (Genesis 1) in the first chapter of the Bible, we read about the first man who was the root of all the old creation including David. The first man whom his genetic code is the root of all the other codes that came out of it and represented in it too. In (Revelation 22) in the last chapter of the Bible, we read about the second man "Jesus" who is the root of the new creation including David. How great is the inspiration of the Bible; we read what Jesus said in the last chapter of the Bible "It is I, Jesus, I am the root", as if the Holy Spirit didn't want to end the biblical inspiration without giving hope to mankind. A declaration for all the dead ones of the old root, saying that there is a new root. This was said after He

was incarnated and born of a virgin; being her seed without genealogy so that He would be the last Adam. Then the last Adam went voluntarily, and out of His love to us to the cross, and there He died for us to eliminate all the legal obstacles that stood in the way for His living Spirit to revive us. He was buried then He rose from the dead, carrying His sheaves to become a new root for a new creation. How amazing and deep this truth is! A new root saved us from our old dead root, and this isn't a deduction or assumption, but it is a belief based on a truthful text, for Jesus Himself said that "It is I, Jesus, I am the root".

In Genesis, Jesus is the seed of "the woman", and in Revelation, Jesus is both the seed and root of "David". In conclusion, this new root who victoriously rose from death is going to be the hope of the nations; **the old root has our wasted hopes while the new root restored them back.**

✳ **Eighth Truth:** The Male Child, her Child We read in (Revelation 12:13) "So when the dragon saw that he had been thrown down to the earth, he pursued the woman who had given birth to the male child." This text talks about Christ as "**the male child**" using definite article "the" who was born from the woman "the Israeli nation". As we discussed this text earlier, and said that the word "**male**" has a genetic dimension to it, specifying the **gender**, so it refers to the relationship according to genealogy. Now, I will address it here from a different angle according to the sequence of ideas, as the mind of the dear reader wouldn't have

comprehended before what I am about to say now. But since the dear reader's mind is well informed at this stage, then it is time to dig little bit deeper. It was said before that the Holy Spirit didn't link Christ as the male child to the Israeli nation, so He said that she gave birth to **"the male child"** and not to **"her male child"**, to confirm that as the male child, He wasn't her son and she wasn't his mother according to genealogy. Just as Mary was the "woman" from whom He came according to the seed only, but she wasn't his mother according to genealogy, so is the Israeli nation, for this nation is the "woman" from which He came according to the flesh, without being her genealogy. This happened because Jesus was born through a miraculous virgin conception without will or interference of a man.

If an individual in a nation gives birth through a miracle from above without having an intercourse with a man, like the Blessed Virgin Mary had, then the born male child isn't the genealogy of this woman. Thus, he isn't the genealogy of her nation as well, and this is logical sequence. Now, the question remains, if Jesus who was born of Mary as she is one of the members of the Israeli nation, is not her genealogy, therefore He isn't the genealogy of the whole Israeli nation as well, so who is He then? For this I say, any male child is born as a result of natural conception, is the genealogy of his mother for he came as a result of an intercourse with a man. However, if this male child is born of a miraculous virgin conception, without any interference of a man, then this child genetically and biologically isn't the genealogy

of his mother, and isn't the genealogy of the whole nation which this woman belongs to as well, symbolized in the text with the word "the woman". Therefore, he would be a head and a root, since he carries in his body the same genetic code of Adam the head, but without sin, because he is without father, without mother according to genealogy. Since, He carries in his body the same genetic code of Adam the head, then he can't be at the same time Mary's son according to genealogy, or the Israeli's nation son according to genealogy. **Scientifically and genetically, He can't be her genealogy and her root at the same time**, even if He was born from a miraculous virgin conception; **miracles don't produce contradictions, but they achieve impossible and supernatural**. On the other hand, He can be her root and her seed "her born child" at the same time, that's why the conception had to be a miraculous virgin conception and not a natural or normal one, this is exactly what took place and the Bible recorded it for us.

Jesus as the male child carries in His body the same genetic code of Adam the head, but without sin, so He is the root of David. Thus, scientifically and genetically, He can't be the son of David according to genealogy because He is the root of David. And Since David is the father of Mary according to genealogy, therefore Jesus can't be Mary's son according to genealogy, because He is the root of David "the root of her father". And since Mary is an individual who belongs to the Israeli nation, thus Jesus can't be the son of this whole

nation “according to genealogy only”, because He isn’t Mary’s genealogy. That’s why the Holy Spirit didn’t connect Him according to genealogy to this nation, He precisely said “had given birth to the male child” and not “had given birth to her male child”, though He is the son of this nation according to the seed “her child”.

In fact, Mary is the daughter of the first Adam, biologically she is his seed and genealogy, at the same time the last Adam biologically was born of her seed and not her genealogy. How amazing that is!

✳ **Ninth Truth:** God is the First and Most Skillful Genetic Engineer in the World. This last item is a logical truth; in case, dear reader, you are still not convinced that, the miracle we are discussing is logical. Surely, you have heard about the possibility of using genetic engineering to produce a custom-made child “for example, with green eyes, black hair, white skin, etc). If man was able to use science to achieve what he wants, then why can’t God use His power “the power of the Most High” to achieve what He wants? Is it too much for God who made all these laws to use His power to prepare a body with a specific feature for a specific person in his mind according to His will? Of course not, the logical question should be who is that person whom God had in his mind? He is Adam, and we knew that when God revealed His thoughts during the creation process, when He said in (Genesis 1:26) “Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness;” Adam was the scale model

of the project that was in God's mind, but sadly Adam fell, so would God's project fall with him then? Of course not, God was able to re-produce His project and brought the last Adam "the original" not through the miracle of creation, but through a miraculous virgin conception. By His power and without any scientific techniques God proved to be the first and most skillful genetic engineer in the world. The engineer who was able to "**reset**" the operating system (DNA) that He created, and **readjust** the living substance on the selected ovum from the Blessed Mary to **the factory state** ⁽⁵⁴⁾. As if He made a flashback to the beginning of time, to **recall** and evoke biologically the same genetic code of the first Adam to bring about the last Adam, who carried in His body this same genetic code of the first Adam but without. Thus, He could be described as "human being/man, male, without father, without mother, without genealogy", but this time came as born and not created. How amazing this is!

What's so weird about that, dear reader? Didn't God do it before when he took a rib from Adam, and built this rib into a woman and brought her to him. God here did not create out of nothingness. The building of Eve is not a process of creation out of nothingness, otherwise Eve would not be considered from Adam as Paul said in the New Testament (For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man). **She is of Adam not of nothingness.** it is an amazing

(54) The analogy aims to bring the image closer to the reader's mind so that he can imagine and realize through the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit what happened in the miracle of the virgin conception of Christ.

building process done by the greatest genetic engineer in existence, GOD the Great Creator, through which he was able to bring into existence a **female (XX)** using the living genetic substance (DNA) in the rib cells taken from Adam the **male (XY)**. He did this through a miracle with his great power, neither by creating a new genetic living substance from nothingness nor by natural reproduction through the normal biological genetic laws of reproduction and multiplication, As Eve was the **first woman** on the earth, So Eve is not Adam's daughter by genealogical relationship although she is from him. With the same supreme power, God through a supreme miracle prepared a body for the son using the living genetic substance (DNA) found in the cells of the selected ovum of the virgin Mary. it is a miracle of virgin conception not a normal natural reproduction by the natural biological genetic laws of reproduction and multiplication, because the conception done without a sexual relationship with a man, And it is also not a miracle of creation of a new living genetic substance (DNA) from nothingness, So Jesus Christ came as **the Male child (XY)** from the virgin **Mary (XX)** without being her genealogy, **of her without being her child in the term of the genealogy, just as Eve was of Adam without being his daughter by a genealogical relationship.**

The first Adam became a head through **creation** because he was without father, without mother, without genealogy, while the last Adam became a head through the **miraculous virgin conception**, for He is without father, without mother, without genealogy. The first Adam became the root of

the first creation as he produced more offspring through **reproduction**, while the last Adam became the root of the new creation when a grain of wheat fell into the earth and **died**, it didn't remain just a single grain, it bore much fruit. The first Adam is an **image** "Adam, who is an image of the one who was to come", while the last Adam is **the original**. The first Adam was created in the image of God, while the last Adam is the image of the invisible God for He is God. The first Adam **failed**, while through the last Adam the will of the Lord shall **prosper**. The first Adam is **finite** for in his nostrils is a breath of life only, while the last Adam is **infinite** for in Him the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily. The first Adam is **created and not born**, while the last Adam is **born and not created**. The first Adam is **dust who became a soul**, while the last Adam is the **Word who became flesh**. The first Adam is dust from earth, while the last Adam is the Lord from heaven. The first Adam became a **living being**, while the last Adam is a **life-giving spirit**. The first Adam was breathed in his nostrils the breath of life; while the last Adam after His resurrection breathed on them "a life-giving spirit" and said to the disciples receive the Spirit, for He is God who breathed life into first Adam's nostrils. Biologically, the last Adam carries in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam, without sin, so biologically in His flesh is not anything different from Adam. However, since in this body the whole fullness of Godhead dwells, so He is infinite, and thus in His humanity "body, soul" is not just the first Adam. Therefore, the second man "body, soul, spirit" isn't the same

first man as some claims. He is the last Adam, the Holy one, the infinite, not created, He is the man Jesus Christ, and He is God manifested in the flesh.

✳ **Tenth Truth:** In Hebrews Chapter seven there is a story that has deep dimensions and contains a strong message, it is the story of **Levi**, who paid tithes through Abraham. The question now is: how did Levi been paid the tithes although he was still not exist when Abraham met Melchisedec? The answer is that Levi was existing a **concealed existence, invisible, hidden, secret existence** in the loins of his father Abraham (Heb7:10), but as this kind of existence is invisible does not mean that it is not real or true, **it is a real existence**, even though it is invisible to our eyes as it is visible to the eyes of God. That's why Levi has been paid the tithes when Ibrahim paid the tithes to Melchisedec because he was in his loins when he met Melchisedec. And because Levi was in the loins of Abraham when he met Melchisedec, all what Abraham did are considered as a credit for Levi as if Levi is the doer. by the same measurement, I was in Christ when he was in direct facing with the father above the cross, paying the prices of our sins, and when Christ fulfilled all my debts, Now no condemnation is to me, as I was in Christ when he paid the whole debt and said **"It is finished"**. This would not happen **legally** if I was not actually been in Christ, in his loins, and I could not be in him unless he incarnated and carry in his body the same genetic code of Adam the first, yet without sin, because this is the only genetic code in which we all have a biological genetic representation, because

we were in it and we came from it. Accordingly, I repeat in another formulation to confirm and clarify, the **legitimacy and legality** of considering the results and the fruits of what Christ did on the cross for us is **based on** our existence in him, and our existence in him is based on his incarnation, carrying in his holy body the same genetic code of Adam the first yet without sin, because this is the only genetic code that carries the biological genetic representation of each of us. This is what the bible declared when he said in 1cor15:22 **for as all die in Adam, so all will be made alive in Christ**. My dear reader notice the word **(for as)**, the word **(in Adam)** and the word **(in Christ)**.

Chapter Nine

PREMOON

The Inevitability of Incarnation as Born One not as Created

Again, did the miraculous virgin conception or the miracle of the separation of genealogy made Jesus Christ a creature? Of course not, because Jesus Christ is born and not created and that is declared in many biblical texts. For example, in (Galatians 4:4) “But when the fullness of time had come, God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law,”. In this miracle, God the Most High didn’t recreate a living substance of DNA out of nothing, but He modified the living substance of the DNA strand present already on the selected ovum of the Blessed Virgin Mary “as previously explained, a qualitative and quantitative modification”. So that He would prepare a specific body which contains the same genetic code of the first Adam, but without sin. Thus, the genetic code or the genetic print on that ovum became a different one from Mary’s, so Christ came separated, without a mother according to genealogy. Not only that, but also He carried in His body the same genetic code of the head the first Adam, but without sin.

We can say that the miracle was like **recoding**⁽⁵⁵⁾ of the living substance of the DNA, and not a miracle of **recreating**⁽⁵⁶⁾

(55),(56) The expressions are mix between electronic technology and biology, to bring the idea closer and clarify the image as much as possible.

a new living substance of the DNA out of nothing. This leads us to the next point in our discussion, which is why did the Son of God has to be incarnated as a born one? Why didn't He incarnate as a created one just like the first Adam? To answer this important question, let me present some of the reasons according to the light that God gave me

✳ **First:** He couldn't be incarnated and come to our world created, because He is the creator and in Him and through Him all things were created. Also, logically, the creator can't come as a created one, this would discredit His identity as the creator. **The creator can't be created, and the created one can't create (out of nothing like GOD).**

✳ **Second:** He couldn't be incarnated and come to our world created out of nothing, because he is God, who fills all in all. And creation out of nothing presents a starting point of any creature, before it that creature didn't exist. While God, to Him all the glory is eternal, He existed before His incarnation, which is called **"the Aseity of God"**. Jesus said about Himself **"before Abraham was, I am"**, since according to the flesh, He is the seed of Abraham **"that is after Abraham"**; **So, He is both before and after Abraham at the same time.** For His birth isn't the starting point of His existence, but the starting point of His manifestation in the flesh; and that is exactly what John the Baptist said about Christ, "He who comes after me ranks ahead of me because he was before me." It isn't a wrong equation or an ambiguous mystery, but it is the riddle of the amazing Christ, who came into our world through a miraculous virgin conception.

✳ **Third:** He can't have come into our world created from the ground dust, because the ground was cursed after the fall. We read this in (Genesis 3:17) "And to the man he said, "Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten of the tree about which I commanded you, 'You shall not eat of it, 'cursed is the ground because of you; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life;". Christ came into a cursed ground but not from it; He is **the fruit of the womb "born"** and not the **fruit of the ground "created"**. He is the fruit of the womb "blessed is the fruit of your womb", but it fell into the ground and died so it bore much fruit. The Bible confirms this in (1Corinthians 15:47), it says "The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven." He is the second man, from heaven and not from earth.

We can say that the first Adam is created "**the dust became a soul**", (Genesis 2:7) "then the Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living being." However, the last Adam is born "**the Word became flesh**", as in (John 1:14) "And the Word became flesh and lived among us, and we have seen his glory, the glory as of a father's only son, full of grace and truth."

✳ **Fourth:** He had to come born of a woman to prove His humanity. The birth from a woman is a proof that the born child is a human being, since the woman is a human being so she can't give birth to any other creatures but humans,

(Job 14:1) "Man, born of woman, is of few days, and full of trouble.". If He came as a created one, and claimed to be a human being, we couldn't have investigated and verified that claim. But, as He is born of a woman, we no longer need to verify His humanity/ being a human being.

✳ **Fifth:** He had to come born so that He could substitute and represent us in front of God, because if He came to our world with a body that carried the same genetic code of the first Adam without sin, but created recently, "which means that God created a recent typical replica with the same sequences and genetic codes of the first Adam", He wouldn't be able to substitute and represent us in front of God. Also, the Bible wouldn't have said in (Romans 6) "our old self was crucified with him" when God laid on Him the iniquity of us all in the cross. although this code is a typical replica of the genetic code of the first Adam, yet it is not "our old self" because it has been recently created, we don't have any representation in it and it is not related to us because we didn't come from it.

In addition to that, He had to incarnate not only born and not created, but also born from a miraculous virgin conception from the same human genome which Adam is its head, so that He would come without genealogy to any father or mother. carrying in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam the head, without sin, in which we are represented in and came from, For Him to be our head, representative and substitute in front of God. It is a **summoning process** of the same genetic code of the first

Adam itself, but without sin, and not a creation process of a new genetic code out of nothing.

✳ **Sixth:** He had to come born so that He would be the seed of King David, to assume the throne of His ancestor David and rule as the Son of David. This is exactly what the angel said to Mary in (Luke 1:32) “He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his ancestor David.”

There is a great text that records a deep phrase said by Christ Himself during his trial in front of Pilate, (John 18:37) “Pilate asked him, “So you are a king?” Jesus answered, “You say that I am a king. For this I was born, and for this I came into the world, to testify to the truth. Everyone who belongs to the truth listens to my voice.” Here, Christ replied to Pilate’s question “So you are a king?” with this amazing **dual** answer **“For this I was born, and for this I came into the world”**. The question is why did the two come together, although one of them would have been a sufficient answer? Before we answer this question, we need to say that the phrase “For this I came into the world” was said by Christ many times, let’s review some of them:

(John 9:39) “Jesus said, “I came into this world for judgment so that those who do not see may see, and those who do see may become blind.”

(John 10:10) “The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy. I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly.”

(John 12:27) “Now my soul is troubled. And what should I say—‘Father, save me from this hour’? No, it is for this reason that I have come to this hour.”

These are some of the texts where Christ repeated the same phrase “For this, I came”, and not a single one of them is paired with the phrase “For this I was born”, except for His talk with Pilate during the trial. So is there a certain purpose behind that? Of course, there is a deep and meaningful purpose because the speaker is the genius Christ Himself.

Pilate’s question to Christ was **“So you are a king? Are you the king of the Jews?”**, and Christ’s answer was **“You say that I am a king. For this I was born”**. If what Christ meant was that He came to the world to be a king, then the phrase “and for this I came” would have been sufficient. However, what He meant was beyond that, yet Pilate being proud didn’t understand it or give himself a chance to do so. What Jesus meant to say was that in order for Him to be the king of Jews, first He had to be born from the seed of King David to be the legitimate heir of the throne of David. Thus, what the angel said to Mary would be fulfilled “and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his ancestor David”. Jesus wasn’t only trying to say to Pilate that He was the king of the Jews, but He also wanted to give him the **proof** on that which is coming to the world as born **“For this I was born⁽⁵⁷⁾”**. As if He wanted to say to Pilate “overlook My marred visage that didn’t give any clue that I am the king of the Jews and

(57) A new dimension in Christ’s answer to Pilates, “for this I was born”.

just hear Me out as I present the proof on that". Because of the context of the talk and its timing, Jesus answer had to include these two parts "For this I was born. And for this I came", for the main focus was on Him being the King of the Jews, and also as He was talking in a moment of weakness not strength. How amazing and logical were His answers!

One might ask did Jesus have to come born from the seed of David to be a king? My dear reader, my answer is that Jesus Christ in His divinity is **the King of Kings** and Lord of Lords, because He is God manifested in the flesh. But for Him to be **the king of the Jews**, He had to come from King David's seed to be legally and legitimately the heir of the throne, and this is the deep meaning of Christ's reply to Pilate saying "**For this I was born**". In the future, when Jesus sits on the throne of King David as the king of the Jews, He will prove with no doubt that He came as born from a virgin to be from the seed of the David according to the flesh. His future reign as the king of the Jews would be a concrete proof on His virgin conception from David's seed. That's why announcing His birth was associated with announcing His kingship "and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his ancestor David". How amazing and precise the words that Christ said, and how precise the biblical inspiration is!

In another incident in Mathew, we see once again "the birth and kingship" paired together, when the wise men came to pay him homage in (Mathew 2:2) "wise men from the East came to Jerusalem, asking, "Where is the child who

has been born king of the Jews? For we observed his star at its rising, and have come to pay him homage.” This is an amazing **dual fact** “**the child who has been born, king of the Jews**”; they didn’t just say “where is the child who has been born?”, or “where is the king of the Jews?”. Those wise men had a special illumination, and understanding that He was the king of the Jews because He has been born from David’s seed, so He is the heir of King David’s throne. There is a great difference between the question of the wise men “**Where is the child who has been born king of the Jews?**”, and that question of Pilate “**So you are a king?**”. The wise men knew His identity “King of the Jews”, but they were asking about His place “Where is he?”, however, Pilate with pride and arrogance of authority didn’t know His identity so he asked “Are you the king of the Jews?” sadly, Pilate’s question was for many possible reasons, but surely wanting to know the answer wasn’t one of them, for he didn’t even wait to hear it.

If you are following the argument presented so far in the research, you would say that if Jesus as the Son of David is the king of the Jews and the heir of David and his throne, so how come He didn’t inherit sin? You have answered yourself, but for more clarification, let me ask what did Jesus inherit from David exactly? **He inherited⁽⁵⁸⁾ the throne of King David because he is the seed of David, but he didn’t inherit⁽⁵⁹⁾ the fallen nature of David because he isn’t David’s genealogy as**

(58), (59) Christ is an heir and not an heir at the same time: heir to the throne of David because he is the seed of David, and not an heir to the fallen nature of David because he is not the genealogy of David.

he was separated in his genealogy from all the fallen human race when he was separated in his genealogy from Mary. Kingship is a status and a role, it is an **external bestowed position** that David got when Samuel anointed him king and is inherited through the seed relationship. While the fallen nature is an **internal formation** that David got by birth from Adam, as he said about himself “a sinner when my mother conceived me”, and it is inherited through genealogy relationship only. Since Jesus is the seed of David and not His genealogy, therefore He is the heir of David’s throne and not the heir of David’s fallen nature. How amazing is the Bible as it gives answers to relief minds of thinkers and eliminates question marks.

It is worth noting, dear reader, that I draw your attention that Jesus Christ is **the king⁽⁶⁰⁾ (*king of the Jews*)** because He is the **seed of David**, but He is also **the priest⁽⁶¹⁾ (*on the order of Melchizedek*)** because He is **not the genealogy of Levi**. After all, the priesthood of Christ is higher in rank than the priesthood of the Levi, as it does not derive its legitimacy from natural, genealogical inheritance. Rather from the perfection of the person of Christ Himself, every priest who is ordained from people must offer sacrifices for himself as well as for the people because he has a weakness. However, Christ has no weakness, He is without sin and weakness because He is without genealogy to Levi or anyone else because He is

(60), (61) Christ is a king and priest: king because he is the seed of David, and a priest because he is not a genealogy of Levi (priest on the order of Melchizedek).

without a father, without a mother, without genealogy. This change in the priesthood is the reason for the superiority of the priesthood of Christ over the priesthood of Levi.

✳ **Seventh:** He had to come born under the Law, to redeem those who were under the Law. We read this in (Galatians 4:4-5) “But when the fullness of time had come, God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, in order to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as children.” One might ask why He should come born under the law, to redeem those who were under the law? To answer this, we have to break it down in small points as follows:

- As sinners, according to the Law we were convicted to die, and for Christ to carry our condemnation and judgement in His body, He had to come under the same Law by which we were convicted. Since the Law is binding on human being only as they are the only rational beings of all God’s creatures, as we read in (Romans 7:1) “Do you not know, brothers and sisters—for I am speaking to those who know the law—that the law is binding on a person only during that person’s lifetime?” So Jesus Christ had to come in the form of a man so that He would be under that same Law.

- For Christ to fulfil the demands and judgement of the Law, He had to die though He is righteous and perfect, because the demands and judgement of the Law can be summarized in one word, which is “death”, so Christ came and died for us on the cross, and thus fulfilled the law.

•• For His death to be counted to us, we had to die with Him on the cross, so that the judgment of the Law would be fulfilled in us. This is what Paul explained in (Romans 8: 3-4) “For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and to deal with sin, he condemned sin in the flesh, 4 so that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit.” How was the just requirement of the Law fulfilled in us? It was fulfilled when our old self was crucified with Christ in the cross, and so I was crucified with Him as well since I am represented in this old self. This happened because Jesus Christ in His humanity carried in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam, but without sin. So, when God laid on Him the iniquity of us all, He saw our old self; therefore, He poured on Christ His wrath and judgement since all of our sins were laid on His pure body. When I believed in this truth, and believed in my actual and historical death with Christ in the cross, the requirement of the law was fulfilled in me since I also died with Him.

One might ask (62) what is the necessity of incarnation to condemn sin? For sin to be condemn, A body should be available for condemnation to be executed on this body. Therefore, God condemned sin in the body of Christ on our behalf. God has poured all His wrath and judgment on that pure body, so that we can sing “there is therefore now no condemnation for those who are (in Christ Jesus).”

(62) A logical question and a logical answer.

✳ **Eighth:** He has to come born so that He would conquer and crush Satan, for eventually God has to conquer. Satan has succeeded with his deceit and conning to deceive the woman and make her fall into sin and disobedience, and since then the creation was separated and became independent from God. However, God in the fullness of time, brought the Savior from the seed of the woman whom Satan has tempted. Through His love and justice on the cross, the savior was able to restore the creation, by His redemption and atonement without creating another Adam or another creation out of nothing “which would have been a victory to Satan”. We can say that God was summoning and calling for the first man, through preparing a body for the Son that carried the same genetic code of the first Adam but without sin, and crucifying him with Christ in the cross when God laid on Christ the iniquity of us all. So, the creation was renewed again by being recreated in Christ, thus fulfilling what the Bible said “So if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation: everything old has passed away; see, everything has become new!”.

✳ **Ninth:** He had to come born so that He would share **the same**⁽⁶³⁾ **flesh and blood** which we shared but without sin, not just to be able to die but also to be able to represent us. To be able to die he needs flesh (any flesh), but to be able to die for us and represent us he needs to

(63) The importance of Christ for him the glory sharing with the children in the flesh and blood, is not only that he can die because he has taken a body, but also that he can legally and legitimately represent us before God because he shared the same our human nature (flesh and blood) but without sin.

share ***the same our flesh*** with us (**the same things**), the same our flesh nature yet without sin, This is exactly what the Bible tell us in (Hebrews 2:14) “Since, therefore, the children share flesh and blood, he himself likewise shared **the same things**, so that through death he might destroy the one who has the power of death, that is, the devil,”. And to do that he should come born from one of the staff of our humankind to take the same our things (flesh and blood) but through miraculous virgin conception to take the same things without sin. Of course, what died was His humanity and not His divinity, which can’t die. However, in uniting His divinity with His humanity, this made Christ’s sacrifice has an infinite value because God in His divinity is infinite, and so He was able to pay off the infinite eternal debt in three hours on the cross and three nights in the grave.

✳ **Tenth:** He had to come born so that He would be able to purify and forgive, we read this in (Hebrews 9:22) “Indeed, under the law almost everything is purified with blood, and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins.” So, He had to share in the flesh and blood, and with love accepts the shedding of His blood on the cross so that God would forgive us our sins on a just basis.

✳ **Eleventh:** The virgin conception and birth was a theological necessity, not only so that Christ would carry in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam but without sin, and not a typical replica of it created recently, but also so

He can be legally our head, substitute and representative in front of God. Also, so that the characteristics of God would be **in harmony**⁽⁶⁴⁾ with each other, and without contradiction. **If He came as a created being this would discredit His divinity and the fact that He is eternal, and if He came born from a natural usual conception and not a miraculous virgin one that would discredit His divinity and the fact that He is holy.** In both cases, if He came created or born from a natural usual conception, that would discredit the legality and legitimacy of His representative substitutional death for us on the cross. Thus, Christ carried in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam, not through creation for He wasn't created like the first Adam, and not through heredity for He wasn't born from a natural usual conception like us. But He carried in His body this genetic code when the Father prepared for Him a body through the miraculous virgin conception.

And since He had to come as born and not created, He had to be second and not first. God had to create the first Adam first, then form Eve from one of his ribs to prepare the vessel "the woman" from which the last Adam would come born from her seed. We read clearly in (1Corinthians 15: 46-47) "But it is not the spiritual that is first, but the physical, and then the spiritual. The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven."

(64) The incarnation of the Son as born not created was theological necessity, not only to be able to redeem us and represent us before God, but also the characteristics of God would be in harmony with each other without conflict and conflict.

Let me repeat what I have mentioned several times throughout the research; for the context here is suitable and the meaning would be clearer. I would have imagined that the Bible would say in (Hebrews 7:3) that Jesus is without father, without mother, without genealogy as the last Adam, in resemblance to the first Adam not through resembling Him to Melchizedek. As we all know the first Adam was created without father, without mother, without genealogy. Let us assume here that it would have been possible for the Bible to give an example through using the scripture in (Romans 5:14) to compare this resemblance “Yet death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one who was to come.” From a human perspective, that text would have been more suitable for the Holy Spirit to declare that Jesus is without father, without mother, without genealogy same as the first Adam who is a type of the one who was to come “Christ”. That perspective would have been right if the writer of the Bible was a human being who was writing his own thoughts and not an inspiration from the Holy Spirit. If the Holy Spirit declared that Jesus is going to come without father, without mother, without genealogy like the first Adam, we would have understood that the last Adam would come created as the first Adam was and not born. We would have never thought that He would come without father, without mother, without genealogy, though He would be born. And it would have been difficult for us to believe that Jesus Christ born of Mary is the incarnated

Son of God who would come to our world, and that He is the promised one in the prophecies. However, the Holy Spirit in His wisdom chose to declare this truth by making resemblance with someone who is born “Melchizedek”, and not with someone who is created “the first Adam” to state that Jesus Christ “the last Adam” would come without father, without mother, without genealogy, though He would come born and not created. For a long time now, we have been wondering about the reason why Melchizedek appeared in the text with this mysterious image, and why the Holy Spirit didn’t state his genealogy and birth chain. Until, The Holy Spirit revealed His thoughts that He intentionally overlooked the genealogy of Melchizedek so that He would use him as a type for the incarnated Son who would be without father, without mother, without genealogy, though He is the seed of the woman. This was a dilemma, until the Holy Spirit revealed it as the riddle He used to articulate the essence of the miraculous virgin conception of Christ, the last Adam who came to our world born and not created.

Chapter Ten

PREMOON

Taking Part Not Borrowing

Why the theophanies (manifestations) of the Son in the Old Testament, in the form of a human or a man such as His appearance to Abraham at the tent in a form of a man, are not sufficient or valid for the completion of redemption, which made the incarnation of God inevitable? What is the difference between those theophanies and the incarnation?

To answer this question, first, we have to understand the nature of these theophanies of the Son in the Old Testament. So that we can decide whether they were sufficient or legally and legitimately valid for the completion of redemption. There is one possibility out of two for understanding the nature of these theophanies:

1. The first possibility for these theophanies: is that it's merely an appearance in a **bodily form**, such as that form in which the Holy Spirit appeared in at the moment of Christ's emergence from the Jordan River "**a bodily form like a dove**". This happened only so that the eyes of Abraham or the eyes of the prophets of the Old Testament can see Him because the human eye cannot see spirits. And when the beam of light falls on them, it passes through without reflecting on the retina so that the human eye can capture an image of it and identify it. This bodily form is **not a real body**; it is just a

visible form that enables the limited human eyes to see these bodies, and since it is not a real body it cannot die. Also, if we suppose that it is a real body that can experience death, which God created it momentarily by His ability in one way or another, then his death would not be of our concern or relative to us in anything, and it cannot bring us any benefits or blessings. Therefore, it cannot represent us or act on our behalf because it is not of our human nature or humanity, and this is the dimension the apostle meant when he spoke of the Incarnation depicting a beautiful image in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chapter two, saying: **“Forasmuch then as the children have partaken of flesh and blood, He Himself likewise took part of the same, that through death He might destroy him who had the power of death, that is, the devil”** Hebrews 2:14. The Bible did not say that the Son “He also has partaken in flesh and blood”, but rather said “He Himself likewise took part of the same” that is, in the same flesh and blood, **in the same kind or type of flesh and blood**, in our humanity and human nature “apart from sin” so that He can represent us and act on our behalf before God. And this required that He must be born from a member of this humanity and this human race so that He may take the same kind of humanity and human nature, but apart from sin.

My dear reader, I would provide you with the following example to explain my point further:

If we assume that there is a person who holds American citizenship or an American passport, can this person be a representative of the Egyptian state or its deputy at the United

Nations? Of course not, because he is not Egyptian (he does not have Egyptian nationality or hold an Egyptian passport). He must first obtain Egyptian citizenship and an Egyptian passport to be an Egyptian citizen to represent the Egyptian state or be its representative at the United Nations. Christ is heavenly, so He must become flesh “and the Word became flesh” so that He can legally and legitimately represent the human race and represent our humanity before God. From all of the above, we conclude that appearing in a bodily form does not legally enable the Son to complete the redemption process.

2. The second possibility of these theophanies: is that the Son has temporarily dwelt in one of the members or elements of our human race so that Abraham’s eyes could see Him. And here I pause to ask: Is this appearance, through this temporary dwelling in someone, suitable lawfully and legitimately to complete the process of redemption? Surely not, for the following reasons:

- **First:** “No,” because the sacrifice will be imperfect, as this body in which the Son dwells in is a son of Adam and an inheritor of sin “**a body inhabited by sin**”; therefore, the sacrifice will be imperfect and unacceptable to God.
- **Second:** “No,” because this would defame and lessen God’s justice, for this someone in whom the Son dwelt in is the one who died for us and not the one for whom Christ has died for. Therefore, the Bible cannot say “For God so loved the world”. Instead, it would say “For God

so loved the world apart from this person”, and this will detract from the absolute justice of God even if it is about one person out of seven billion people (approximately the current population of the earth).

- **Third:** “No,” because this would nullify the eternity of the redemption or the everlasting results of the act of redemption. Why? for the dwelling is a **temporary action** that began with the dwelling of the Son in one person, and its effect has ended when the Son has left this person after the task for which He dwelt in him has come to an end. Unlike the incarnation, this wouldn’t be a **permanent union** for eternity. Therefore, the Bible could not have narrated the following scripture “For by one offering He has perfected forever those who are being sanctified.” (Heb. 10:14). Another scripture is “He entered the Most Holy Place once for all having obtained eternal redemption” (Heb. 9:12). For the dwelling is a temporary process that ended with the Son’s separation from this body in which He dwelt in.
- **Fourth:** “No,” because the Son’s dwelling in someone else is a **borrowing** of flesh and blood and not a process of **taking part** of the flesh and blood, as the Bible said in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chapter two. This is a very important point to prove the legitimacy and legality of the incarnation and redemption. He had to take part of flesh and blood and not borrow flesh and blood, and this is what the Biblical scriptures have confirmed more than

once. That He had to **own** the flesh and blood, and not to borrow either of them to complete a certain role in the redemption process. To clarify and prove the idea, I will mention the following scriptures:

◆ **Hebrews 9:12** “Not with the blood of goats and calves, but with His own blood He entered the Most Holy Place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption.” How powerful, accurate, and great this phrase is “**His own blood**”! If the appearance of the Son was through the dwelling of the Son in someone and was not through the incarnation of the Son, this blood would not be His own blood, but rather the blood of that person whom He dwelt in. As a result, this will nullify the legitimacy of redemption and atonement. To give and shed blood, He had to own it; to be able to give something, He had to own it first, and this is what the Bible expressed in the phrase “**His own blood**”. Since this is His own blood which is resulted from the incarnation by an eternal union and not from a temporary dwelling in the body of someone, then the redemption resulting from this process is an **eternal redemption** and not a temporary one, a redemption that has a continuous effect forever because it is the result of an eternal union and not a temporary dwelling.

◆ **Hebrews 13:12** “Therefore Jesus also suffered outside the city gate in order to sanctify the people by his own blood.” For the second time, we find the Bible highlighting this point, stressing repeatedly on the same

expression **“His own blood”**, as if the Bible wanted to say that this blood is not borrowed blood made from the Son’s dwelling in someone, but it is His own blood resulting from the union of the Son with our humanity in the incarnation. This is one of the strongest pillars for the legitimacy of redemption and incarnation.

- ◆ **Ephesians 1:7** “In Him we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace.” Again, the Bible confirms that the blood is **“His blood”** and not any borrowed blood from anyone. It is His blood, resulting from His union with our humanity, His taking a body, and His taking part of the same type of flesh and blood “apart from sin” in the incarnation.
- ◆ **Romans 3:24-25** “being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, 25 whom God set forth as a propitiation by His blood, through faith...” Once again, the Bible affirms that the blood is **“His blood”** to confirm that the legitimacy of the atonement is based on the fact that this blood is His blood; by the eternal union through the incarnation and not the borrowed blood from someone by a temporary dwelling in him.
- ◆ **1 Peter 2:24** “who Himself bore our sins in His own body on the tree.....” The Bible stresses in this scripture that the body is **“His own body”**. If the matter was merely a matter of a temporary dwelling in someone’s

body, then the Bible would not have said “who Himself bore our sins in His own body” because it is not His own body, but the body of someone else in whom He dwelled. This is one of the strongest pillars for the legitimacy of redemption and atonement.

- ◆ **Revelation 1:5** “.... To Him who [b]loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood,” with **His own blood**, not with just any blood. From all of the above scriptures, the importance and inevitability of the Incarnation are confirmed, and that the legality and legitimacy lie in the fact that it is a process of taking part eternally of flesh and blood and not a temporary process of borrowing flesh and blood.
- **Fifth:** “No” so that Christ can purchase and obtain the church. You cannot purchase or obtain anything unless you have the purchase price; you cannot own or buy a car unless you own the purchase price, and Christ cannot purchase or acquire the church as long as He did not possess the purchase price, which was blood, and this is what the Bible said in Acts 20:28 “..... the church of God which He purchased with His own blood” **with the blood of his own Son, His own blood** and not with blood of anyone. He had to take part of flesh and blood, to possess this price so that He can pay this price and purchase the church and obtain it.
- **Sixth:** “No” to ensure the permanence and eternity of Christ’s relationship with the Church and the Church with

Christ, to ensure that Christ will not be separated from the Church or the Church from Christ later on. For the Church is the body of Christ. I only list some scriptures that confirm this fact:

- ◆ **Ephesians 1:22-23** “And He put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be head over all things to the church, 23 which is His body, the fullness of Him who fills all in all.” The church that is His body.
- ◆ **Colossians 1:24** “I now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up in my flesh what is lacking in the afflictions of Christ, for the sake of His body, which is the church.” His body is the church.

From these two scriptures, the Bible confirms that the church is the body of Christ. Then, how can the church be His body when He did not possess a body? If we assume this, then this connection will be temporary because it results from the Son’s dwelling in someone’s body, and will end with the Son’s parting from this body. Accordingly, Christ’s relationship with the Church will be a temporary relationship and not an eternal one. However, the Son was incarnated, united with our humanity, took part of flesh and blood, and owned a body. Therefore, the connection of Christ with the Church, or the connection of the head with the body, became an **eternal and permanent** connection because it resulted from an eternal union by the incarnation and not by a temporary dwelling in someone’s body.

Christ has entered our world, used a lot of things, and borrowed a lot of things to use. Once He borrowed Peter's ship and entered it to address the crowds, His tomb was a borrowed tomb "And they made His grave with the wicked— But with the rich at His death".

One day, He said answering someone "Foxes have holes and birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay His head." What a powerful and genuine expression it is! "**He has nowhere**".

However, when the Holy Spirit speaks about the body of Christ, the Bible says these words in Hebrews 10:5 "Sacrifice and offering You did not desire, But a body You have prepared for Me." How strong is this expression "**a body you have prepared for me**"!

Christ used the things of this world, He borrowed many things of this world to use without owning them "**has nowhere**". Since He entered our world, He did not own anything but the body "**a body you have prepared for me**". Here lie the legality and legitimacy of what Christ did in terms of actions and deeds on earth. For his possession of the body made atonement, redemption, justification, forgiveness, and sanctification processes 100% legal and legitimate because the Son was incarnated and took part of flesh and blood, and did not just dwell temporarily in someone's body.

Christ did not own a stater (coin) to pay the tax, but He owned His blood to purchase the church.

PREMOON

Chapter Eleven

PREMOON

Adam the Head and the Root, who is a Type of the One who was to come

There is a deep and important biblical text that highlights the idea of the head and the root, which is an essential one for the legality and legitimacy of the cross. Paul led by the Holy Spirit says in (Romans 5:14) “Yet death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one who was to come.” This text, which clearly states that Adam trespassed, is also saying that Adam is **a type of the one who was to come “Jesus Christ”**. Why did the Holy Spirit say in this context that Adam is a type of the one who was to come? From which angle is Adam a type of the one who was to come? The Bible answers these questions saying that death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam. This means that they didn’t break any law or commandment as Adam did because the Law wasn’t given yet; legally and legitimately sin is not counted if the Law didn’t exist yet, so why did death exercise dominion over those people? It is because they were **in Adam’s loins** at the garden when he trespassed and sinned; that is when Adam sinned in the garden, all sinned with him by being in his loins. The same

text that said “even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam”, also said that “**because all have sinned**”; thus, it doesn’t mean by this the actual sins that they committed after their birth from Adam, because sin wasn’t counted to them as the Law wasn’t yet given. However, the text is referring to the **imputed sin** of transgression that all have committed in the garden, as they were in Adam’s loins, for Adam isn’t just an independent individual; he is the head and the root of all those who came from him. So, death exercised dominion over them, not because they have sinned **like the transgression of Adam**, but because they have sinned **the same transgression of Adam**, as they were in his loins when he ate from the forbidden tree and broke God’s commandment.

What actually happened in the garden wasn’t an inheritance of sin, because we inherited sin outside the garden after we were born from Adam; **inheritance occurred by birth, and where there is no birth, there is no inheritance as well**. What happened in the garden is that we actually broke the commandment and disobeyed God when the first Adam our head broke the commandment and disobeyed God, because we were in his loins when he trespassed, so we all participated in what he did since we were in his loins on that day. From this angle and that fact that the first Adam was the head and the root of the first creation, that all came from him, he is a type of the one who was to come. Jesus Christ the one who was to come the head and the root of the new creation, and from Him this new creation would

gain the rights of all new things because it is created in Him **“created in Jesus Christ”**.

Allow me, dear reader, to share with you what actually happened in the garden, to clarify the difference between ***the imputed sin, the inherited sin, and the actual committed sin.***

God created humankind in a world with no sin, a world ruled by a certain commandment. Since sin is the transgression of the commandment, and the commandment is given to humankind as they are the only sane creatures with a will to obey or disobey **“other creatures aren’t sane, and commandments aren’t given to them”**, therefore the only living creature who would have caused sin to enter the world was humankind. Satan knew this very well, he played his twisted game and tempted Eve who fell and disobeyed God by eating from the tree, not only that but she gave her man as well to eat. At that dark moment of the world’s history, the ***first disobedience act*** was committed, and that creature called humankind did the ***first transgression***.

This sin **“singular”**, committed by one man **“singular”** as the Bible says in (Romans 5:18-19) “Therefore just as one man’s trespass led to condemnation for all, For just as by the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners,” is actually **the iniquity of us all**, which the Bible mentioned in (Isaiah 53:6) “All we like sheep have gone astray; we have all turned to our own way, and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all.” Thus, it isn’t the iniquity of just one man,

but of us all, it is the iniquity that we all shared in since we were in Adam's loins at the garden. This happened because Adam isn't just an independent or individual person; he is the head and the root of the first creation. We were in the loins of this one man when he disobeyed God in the garden, so we also disobeyed God with him, that's why the Bible says in (Isaiah 48:8) about humankind while still in the womb "You have never heard, you have never known, from of old your ear has not been opened. For I knew that you would deal very treacherously, and that **from birth you were called a rebel.**" How did a human being become rebel from birth, which commandment did we break from the womb? We disobeyed God when we were in the garden and not in the womb, when our head the first Adam rebelled and broke the commandment, since we were in his loins. What happened from birth is that we were **called** rebels, when we came into public existence, because we are indeed rebels; **a name that fits who we really are.** Actually, without any euphemism, it's a well-earned name.

With this one sin, one act of transgression, one act of rebellions, sin came into the world as we read in (Romans 5:12) "Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned— ". The phrase "**all have sinned**" means that all sinned by being in Adam's loins the day he sinned, and therefore the **virus of sin** entered and infected all humankind because of this act of transgression. This virus is what we all **inherited** from Adam by birth, and this virus is

called “**the inherited sin**”, “**the original sin**” or “**the ancestral sin**”.

For more clarification, I need to mention that we didn't inherit Adam's rebellion in the garden, but we inherited the virus of sin that entered the world and infected all humankind as a result of Adam's rebellion. Again, **we didn't inherit Adam's action “act of transgression and rebellion”, because we actually participated with him in the same act by being in his loins in the garden, so how come we inherit something that we already participated in it?!** Also, **since inheritance occurs only by birth, and where there is no birth, then there is no inheritance as well** ⁽⁶⁵⁾, **and up to that moment, Adam haven't given birth to his first child yet.** Therefore, what we inherited is the virus that the Bible calls “sin”, which entered the world as a result of Adam's transgression and rebellion. We got that virus after we were born from Adam outside the garden. Therefore, the **imputed** sin occurred **inside** the garden before we were even born because Adam is the **head** of us all, while the **original inherited** sin was what we have inherited **outside** the garden after we were born from Adam, because he is our **root**.

This virus, the original sin, or the sin of being independent of God, or the fallen nature are all expressing the same thing, and we read what Paul said about it in (Romans 7:20) “Now

(65) The fact is not only logical but also scientific, that confirms that our fall in paradise was not a result of a process of inheritance because inheritance in the kingdom of people occurs only by birth, and until that moment the first birth was not done. but it was a fall resulting from our participation with The Head Adam in his disobedience by being in his loins.

if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I that do it, but sin that dwells within me.” It is sin “**the doer**” and not sin “**the action**” that Paul says about it dwells “**within**” him, and not just the action that is done “**outwardly**”, it is the vicious virus that is within every human being born from Adam. And this virus is the doer of all the actual sins that are done by humans, therefore the fall events order goes like this:

Number (1) the sin and rebellion of the first man, which is the first “act” of transgression that led to **number (2)** the entrance of sin “the doer” and not sin “the action”, or the entrance of the virus of the original sin into the world, which led to **number (3)** committing sins “actions” of murder, adultery, lying, stealing and so on and so forth.

We **participated** with Adam in the first transgression because we were in his loins in the garden, then we **inherited** the second from him outside the garden by birth. Then we **committed** the third one outside the garden as a result of the second one, we read that in (Romans 7:20) “Now if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I that do it, but sin that dwells within me.”

Thus, we can say that Adam sinned with his **full will** before sin entered the world, while we sin **unwillingly** as a result of sin entering the world because we have become slaves to sin. Adam sinned not because he was created a sinner, but we sin because we are born sinners. **Adam fell because he sinned, but we sin because we have already fallen.**

Chapter Twelve

PREMOON

Hypothetical Existence or Actual One? Public Existence or Hidden One?

One might ask what is the nature and kind of this existence that we have in the head or the root Adam whether “the first or the last”? Is it a real actual, physical, materialistic existence or a hypothetical, imputed, incorporeal one? although I didn’t use my hand to take the fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and didn’t open or use my mouth to eat it, I have been considered transgressor like Adam and sinner by his disobedience. Is being considered a transgressor because of my existence in Adam’s loins, makes this existence a hypothetical imputed and incorporeal one, not an actual real physical materialistic one? To answer this great question, I say that on one hand being considered a transgressor because of Adam’s transgression confirms that my existence in him was real, actual, physical and not a hypothetical incorporeal one. This is because if I wasn’t actually, really and physically in him, I shouldn’t be considered a transgressor because of his transgression, and I shouldn’t be considered a sinner because of his disobedience since there is no relationship that connects us both together to become a transgressor due to his transgression and a sinner due to his rebellions. On the other hand, if my presence in Adam is a hypothetical and not an actual one, why was I made an

actual sinner not a hypothetical one by his disobedience?! Therefore, our existence in Adam is real, actual and physical though our transgression is imputed one, for we participated with him in his act of transgression as we were in his loins. In addition to that, being born of Adam afterwards is the biggest and strongest proof that our existence in him is an actual real existence and not a hypothetical one.

Let me add another feature to this existence to make it clearer, so that the picture in our mind would be clear and complete; though this existence in Adam is physical, real and actual, yet it is a **“hidden and unrevealed”** one, which wasn't seen and revealed to us as humans except after being born of Adam. However, it was known and seen before birth only to God. Being unseen and hidden to us doesn't make this existence unreal or hypothetical, for there are many unseen things that are real though they are unseen by our naked eyes. Let me share with you a biblical example to explain it to you; the parable of the hidden treasure in a field that Christ mentioned in (Mathew 13:44) for through this parable we would have a deeper understanding of the nature and the kind of this existence. The Bible says that, *“The kingdom of heaven is like treasure hidden in a field, which someone found and hid; then in his joy he goes and sells all that he has and buys that field.”* Here, the field refers to the whole world, while the treasure refers originally to the Israeli nation and figuratively and in a meditative way is applied to the church, and the man who bought that field is Christ. Notice, dear reader, that Christ in this parable **didn't assume** that there

is a treasure in that field, but He confirmed that there is an actual real treasure “which someone **found**”, though this existence of the treasure is real and actual yet it is a hidden one “**treasure hidden in a field**”. So, Christ had to buy the entire field to get the treasure; for the treasure can’t be acquired without buying the entire field because it is hidden in it. **For application**, we say that the beloved Son had to incarnate born, carrying in his body the same genetic code of the first Adam, where the entire human race existed in his loins “*symbolized by the entire field*”. Thus, He would be able to acquire the genetic codes **hidden** in the loins of this genetic code of Adam (**David, Paul and others – the hidden treasure in a field**). Therefore, this existence is **real and not a hypothetical one**, but it is **a hidden and unrevealed one**.

Let’s take David who is one of the jewels of this precious treasure as an example to explain this point. When David confessed his infamous sin, Nathan said to him these deep words in (2Samuel 12:13) “David said to Nathan, “I have sinned against the Lord “Nathan said to David, “Now the Lord has put away your sin; you shall not die.” David’s sin was “put away”, the question we have to ask here, based on the text is on whom was David’s sin laid on? It was laid on Jesus Christ as the Bible tells us in (Isaiah 53:12) “yet he bore the sin of many”. But how did Christ bear the sin of David as one of the Israeli nation, and one of the jewels of this hidden treasure in a field? This happened when Jesus Christ bought the whole field, when He took a body carrying the same genetic code of the first Adam but without sin. Then He went to the cross,

and there crucified it with Him, so He was able to represent David **“as one of the jewels of this hidden treasure in a field”** as a **hidden genetic code in the loins of this genetic code**, and stood in David’s place in front of God, only then He was able legally and legitimately to bear David’s sin.

Let me give you another example from modern times to clarify the idea of the hidden existence to you, it is the same example of the hard-disk which has a storage capacity of “for example 500 giga”. It has a lot of files and information, where we can hide those files not by deleting or erasing them but by using **“hide file”** option. These hidden files wouldn’t show up in the search results because the owner of the hard-disk has hidden them inside it. However, these files still exist on the disk, though not seen for its existence is **“hidden existence”**. Thus, anyone who holds this hard-disk in his hands, also carries these hidden files as well, and if any virus infected this hard-disk, it would infect these hidden files too because they exist on the disk though they are hidden.

Figuratively speaking, to solve the virus problem “sin”, God took that hard-disk with all its hidden files and information that is infected by that virus, and sent it back to the factory. There, it was readjusted to factory setting but without deleting those files, so that we would have the same harddisk with the same hidden files, but without the virus “sin”. So, this new hard-disk is the same old one, with the same files, but without the virus “sin”. And this is like what happened in the miraculous virgin conception of Christ; it is a miracle that brought to us Jesus Christ who carries in

His body the same genetic code of the first Adam the head “without father, without mother, without genealogy”, but without sin. However, since the old hard-desk with all its files is condemned to death, so in the cross, God laid the same virus “sin” on the new hard-desk “notice that this new hard-desk didn’t contract the virus by surfing untrusted websites or something like that, for He is without a virus “sin” yet somehow God laid on that desk the virus; the iniquity of us all”. At this moment, God saw this new hard-desk as if it is our old one “**our old self**”, because in its inner form, it is the same old hard-desk and not a replica made recently. God placed on it the same virus which has infected the old one, Then God poured on him His wrath and convicted this virus “sin”, and there I too was convicted as one of the hidden files on the hard-desk and the requirement of the Law was fulfilled in me.

For me, this concept seems logical and biblical, it isn’t strange to the Bible; for the Bible approved when it stated in a similar situation in (Hebrews 7) when it said that Levi paid tithes through Abraham, for he was still in the loins of his ancestor when Melchizedek met him.

It is amazing how situations turn around! what a great difference between what God said to *Adam* “**you shall die**”, and what he said to *David* “**you shall not die**”; Christ the Lamb of God is the one who made that difference by the sacrifice of Himself. Also, to clear any confusion, it is important to say that the requirement of the law was fulfilled in those who believed in the death of Christ, and their death with Christ, and that

God condemned sin in Christ's body on their behalf because they were in Him when that took place.

But one might ask that Nathan said to David "the Lord has put away your sin", he said "**your sin in a singular form**" and not "your sins in plural", though David committed several sins "murder, lying, and adultery" then how can that be explained? The explanation is that "**your sin**" here doesn't mean the actions "murder, lying, adultery and others", but it means the original inherited sin that dwells within David. It means **sin the doer** of all these actions, and others as Paul says in (Romans 7) "But in fact it is no longer I that do it, but sin that dwells within me." This inherited sin from Adam has been attributed to David and became his own sin "**your sin**" as he inherited it by birth and dwelt within him, so it became his sin "**possessed by him**" and not just sin "**in general**". Just as God has made all from one blood, as we read in (Acts 17:26) "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," However, this blood as it runs in my veins, it became "**my blood**" not just blood "**in general**". The same applies to the original sin, as it dwelt within me by inheriting it through birth from Adam, it became "my sin" specifically and not just "sin" in general.

And since condemning any action requires condemning its **doer**; and since **sin is the doer** and that doer dwelt within David's body, so it had to be condemned in his body. Yet, God in His love for David put away David's sin "**the doer**" on Christ who bore the sin of many (Isaiah 53:12) "because he poured out himself to death, and was numbered with

the transgressors; yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.” When He bore the sin, the doer **“in singular”** of David as one of those many sinners, thus He bore all the sins, iniquities and actions **“in plural”** of David that done by this doer (Isaiah 53:11) “Out of his anguish he shall see light; he shall find satisfaction through his knowledge. The righteous one, my servant, shall make many righteous, and he shall bear their iniquities.” Also (1Peter 2:24) “He himself bore our sins in his body on the cross, so that, free from sins, we might live for righteousness; by his wounds you have been healed.” In the cross, Christ, to Him be all the glory, stood in David’s place and confessed all the actual sins **“in plural”** that David committed as if He was the doer. I tremble and feel awed as I hear Christ saying to God prophetically in (Psalm 69:5) “O God, you know my folly; the wrongs I have done are not hidden from you.” though He is the holy and righteous one, He says to God **“my wrongs”** as if He, to Him be all greatness, holiness and the glory, is the doer of these wrongs. And when Christ bore the sin on David’s behalf and was made a sin offering for us, God condemned sin **“the doer”** on all that it has done of sins and iniquities, one by one in Christ’s precious body so that the requirement of the Law be fulfilled in David. We read this in (Romans 8: 3-4) “For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and to deal with sin, he condemned sin in the flesh, so that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit.” The requirement of the Law was fulfilled in David because

he was actually and literally in Christ when God condemned David's sin in the body of Christ, for Christ carries in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam but without sin, that in which David was hidden in it.

To clarify this let me use a metaphoric example; the knife that cuts the sandwich wouldn't cut the meat slice unless it is inside the sandwich, so if the meat slice is inside the sandwich then the knife would cut it as well. Therefore, when God condemned sin in Christ's body, the requirement of the Law was fulfilled in us because we were in Him since this body in its origin is a genetic code which is that of the first Adam, but without sin. Actually, we are biologically represented in this genetic code because that's where we came from; this is one of the dimensions of the inevitability of Christ's incarnation as born one to share in the flesh and blood with us. Lastly, if our existence weren't actual in Christ at the time of His death on the cross, then His death would have nothing to do with us, wouldn't benefit us, and the requirement of the Law wouldn't be fulfilled in us either.

For God sees Christ's sacrifice present through all times, past, present or future; it is actually present before time; for all eternity, so Nathan promised David through the Holy Spirit and before Christ's incarnation saying **"you shall not die"**. Again, if the Holy Spirit meant by the word "your sin", only the adultery he has committed "the action and not the doer", then Nathan wouldn't have been able to promise David saying "you shall not die" since the rest of David's sins are still there with him and only one of them is a sufficient reason

for his death. However, by putting away sin the doer from David with all the evil deeds done by it, then by condemning that sin, the Holy Spirit could promise him “you shall not die”. To explain this idea further, allow me to use the following analogy; carrying a basket filled with eggs, means that you are carrying all the eggs that are inside. The same happened by condemnation of my independent, disobedient will “my sin, the doer”, all the evil deeds done by this doer have been condemned as well. For more confirmation, let’s view the following biblical texts:

- ◆ The first text in (Isaiah 53:11) “The righteous one, my servant, shall make many righteous, and he shall bear their iniquities.”
- ◆ The second text in (1Peter 2:24) “He himself bore our sins in his body on the cross,”
- ◆ The third text in (Isaiah 53:12) “yet he bore the sin of many,”

One time it says He bore the sins and iniquities “**in plural**” of many, and another time it says He bore the sin “**in singular**” of many, is there any contradiction between these texts? Of course not, it is perfectly logical and in harmony, for He bore the actual sins and iniquities when He bore sin the doer of these sins and iniquities; *He carried all the eggs in the basket when he carried the basket itself.*

Lastly, my dear reader, I just can’t let such biblical text that is filled with love and grace go unnoticed, in (Isaiah 53:11) “Out of his anguish he shall see light; he shall find satisfaction

through his knowledge. The righteous one, my servant, shall make many righteous, and he shall bear their iniquities." Here, I ask His knowledge of what? I answer this in tremble and fear; His knowledge of all that you have done and will do of iniquities publically and privately. I can hear Him saying to the angels of the churches in Revelation "I know your works", and I can hear Peter saying to Him in (John 21:17) "Lord, you know everything;" indeed He knows everything you have done good or evil; He knows all your iniquities. Nevertheless, be assured dear reader, for He knows them not to hold them against you, but to bear them for you and be condemned by them on your behalf so that He would justify you, for "Out of his anguish he shall see light; he shall find satisfaction through his knowledge. The righteous one, my servant, shall make many righteous, and he shall bear their iniquities"; He knows these iniquities to bear them, or else how would He bear something which He doesn't know?! He knows to cover not to expose, to forgive and not to humiliate or disgrace, to justify and not to condemn. Truthfully, the Bible was faithful when it said in (John 3:17) "Indeed, God did not send the Son into the world to condemn the world, but in order that the world might be saved through him." Truly, the sincere worshiper was faithful when he said these beautiful words about Jesus (*He didn't come to condemn us, He didn't come to blame, instead He came to redeem us, He came to justify the blamed*), how wonderful is our God in his grace and love!

Chapter Thirteen

PREMOON

Representation and Substitution Substitution + Presence (for me) Substitution - Presence (instead of me)

It is a good opportunity to explain the difference between **representation** and what we call allegorically **substitution**, I said “**allegorically substitution**” not because I deny it as a strong biblical idea and concept; however, the word “substitution” hasn’t been used even once throughout the Bible to describe the death of Christ. It is considered a **reduction** of what really happened on the cross, for what happened is deeper and wider than this word can ever describe. If we looked more closely, we would find that all the verses in the Bible which talk about the death of Christ, the Holy Spirit used the word “**for me or for us**” and didn’t use the word “**instead of me or instead of us**”. The question here is why did the Holy Spirit use “**for me or for us**” and not use “**instead of or instead of us**”?

On one hand, the word “**instead of me**” means that I wasn’t present as an accused in the cross, which means that I was absent from the court room. For example, when we say that the President sent the Minister of Finances to attend an economic summit instead of him, this means that the President wouldn’t be present in this summit. This wasn’t

the case with the cross, for **I was actually there**, to the extent that Paul said **“I have been crucified with Christ”** to prove and confirm his actual presence and existence on the cross.

On the other hand, the word **“for me”** includes the substitution, while at the same time it doesn't eliminate or negate my presence and existence in the court room. Since, Christ carries in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam but without sin, so when God laid on Him my sin, He became my representative, substitute and intercessor who spoke on my behalf and died for me, **in my presence not in my absence**. Therefore, the word **“for me”** means **“substitution + presence”**, while the word **“instead of me”** means **“substitution - presence”**. That is why Paul said in (Galatians 2:19-20) **“I have been crucified with Christ”** and finished this great scripture saying **“the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.”** not **“gave himself instead of me”** because he was actually present in the cross and was crucified with Christ. In turn, this idea confirms the legality and legitimacy of the sacrifice of Christ and His death on the cross for us, and also confirms that Christ in His humanity carried in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam but without sin.

The word **“ instead of me” = “substitution – presence”**

The word **“for me” = “substitution + presence”**

Now, let me share with you some biblical texts that talk about the death of Christ so that you would see for yourself that the Holy Spirit used the word **“for me”** and not **“instead of me”**:

(Ephesians 5:25) “Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ loved the church and gave himself up **for her,**”

(Galatians 2:19-20) “I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself **for me.**”

(1Peter 3:18) “For Christ also suffered for sins once **for all**, the righteous **for the unrighteous**, in order to bring you to God. He was put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit,”

(John 15:13) “No one has greater love than this, to lay down one’s life **for one’s friends.**”

(Romans 5:6) “For while we were still weak, at the right time Christ died **for the ungodly.**”

(Romans 5:8) “But God proves his love for us in that while we still were sinners Christ died **for us.**”

(Romans 8:32) “He who did not withhold his own Son, but gave him up **for all of us**, will he not with him also give us everything else?”

(Romans 14:15) “If your brother or sister is being injured by what you eat, you are no longer walking in love. Do not let what you eat cause the ruin of one **for whom** Christ died.”

(1Corinthians 5:7) “Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed **for us.**”

(2Corinthians 5:21) “For he hath made him to be sin **for us**, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.”

(Ephesians 5:2) “and live in love, as Christ loved us and gave himself up **for us**, a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God.”

(Hebrews 2:9) “but we do see Jesus, who for a little while was made lower than the angels, now crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death, so that by the grace of God he might taste death **for everyone.**”

(1Corinthians 11:24) “And when he had given thanks, he broke it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken **for you**: this do in remembrance of me.”

After I have listed all these biblical texts that support the presented argument; for more clarification for on difference between representation and substitution, I say that every person born from Adam has **two verdicts** of death and judgment, not only one verdict but two, and they are:

•• **The first verdict:** is the verdict of death and condemnation that became ours as a result of being in the head Adam, for we have sinned when he sinned in the garden, we have trespassed when he trespassed and we broke the commandment when he broke the commandment in the garden, we have done all that because we were in his loins. In fact, this is clear in Paul’s statement in (Romans 5:18) “Therefore just as one man’s trespass led to **condemnation for all**, so one man’s act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all.”

•• **The second verdict:** is the verdict of death and condemnation that became everyone's who has sinned and sins by trespassing and breaking the Law even if he breaks only one commandment, for whoever keeps the whole Law but fails in one point has become accountable for all of it.

I can see the representation of all in the biblical verse **"and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all"**, the iniquity **"singular"** that we all have participated in committing in the garden by our existence in Adam's loins; it is the transgression and rebellion of eating from the forbidden tree. This representation took place when God summoned our old self who is the real doer and who had the real presence of the act of transgression in the garden, summoned him in the cross and was crucified with Christ. Since the doer was judged for his transgression, then the gift is now available and presented to all the people who are in His loins to be justified and vindicated from the first verdict. We read this in (Romans 5:18) **"Therefore as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."** The gift is now available and presented to everyone, but I wonder that would everyone benefit from this great opportunity?

However, I can see the actual substitution, the one with presence not the substitution with absence, for many and not for all in some biblical verses, for example **"yet he bore the sin of many"**, also **"The righteous one, my servant, shall make many righteous, and he shall bear their iniquities"**,

again **“He himself bore our sins in his body on the cross”**. This took place when God judged sin the doer in the body of Christ, with all that it has done from breaking the law to the actual sins so that the requirement of the Law might be fulfilled in those many, so that they would be vindicated from the second case and saved from the second verdict. As it is written in (Romans 8:3-4) **“For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and to deal with sin, he condemned sin in the flesh, so that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit.”**

Accordingly, I say that the most common and known idea that Christ as representative for all, bore the original sin “doer sin” for all, and as substitute for many, bore “the actual sins” for many is not accurate and has a lot of disputed meanings that distorted the truth of what actually happened. For rectification according to the light given to me by God, I say that Christ wasn’t a representative for all in bearing the inherited sin for all, for the Bible says that He bore the original sin /inherited sin **for many “yet he bore the sin of many” not for all**. However, He was representative for all when God laid on Him the iniquity of us all. What is meant by “the iniquity of us all” is the iniquity and transgression of Adam that we all participated in committing in the garden as we were in Adam’s loins, and not the original / inherited sin that came into the world as a result of Adam’s transgression and iniquity.

As for the actual substitution or the substitution with presence, it is the process where Christ bore **the inherited sin of many and not for all**. He bore the sin **“doer”** of many; thus, He bore with it all what those many have done of sins and iniquities, **driven** and **motivated** by this inherited doer that dwells inside them.

To confirm this idea, I say that the representation of all only didn't come in the Bible paired with **justification** and **intercession**. This is because representation only without substitution deals with the issue of **“the imputed sin”** for everyone, for through it Christ bore “the iniquity of us all”, but it doesn't deal with the issues of **“the inherited sin, and the actual sins”** to justify us. However, representation paired with substitution, together they deal with all the issues **“the imputed sin, the inherited sin, and the actual sins”** for many, since through them both, Christ bore **“the iniquity of us all, the sin of many, the sins and iniquities of many”**, so justification and intercession was done “justified many, made intercession for the transgressors”.

For more confirmation on the idea that the death of Christ was representative and substitutional death not a normal one, I will only mention one event which took place at the same moment of Christ's death on the cross, that would stress this idea. That's because some people think that as Christians, we hold the death of Christ more than it can bear, for these people admit His death on the cross but say that His death has nothing to do with us.

In (Mathew 27:50-53), the Bible said these amazing words **“Then Jesus cried again with a loud voice and breathed his last. At that moment the curtain of the temple was torn in two, from top to bottom. The earth shook, and the rocks were split. The tombs also were opened, and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised. After his resurrection they came out of the tombs and entered the holy city and appeared to many.”**

It is a strange thing indeed, for what is the relation between the death of Christ “breathed His last” and the resurrection of many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep? Why did those were raised at same the moment He died? Is there a **connection** between both incidents? Indeed, there is, because **“the one”** who died is a head who carries in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam but without sin, in which **“those”** are actually being represented. Therefore, the death of **“Christ”** was a **representative death** for **“those”**. By the death of **“Christ”**, the vindication verdict of **“the dead saints”** those was issued, for the death of **“Christ”** wasn’t a normal one, but it was death to redeem them from the transgressions as we read in (Hebrews 9:15) **“because a death has occurred that redeems them from the transgressions”**. For that reason, God raised some of the dead saints to give us a **sample** of the proof and confirmation that there is a **relationship**⁽⁶⁶⁾ between **Christ**

(66) This event is a strong documentation of the existence of a relationship between the crucified Christ and these saints who rose up from death at the same moment when Christ shouted to him all the glory, saying (It is finished).

and **those ones**, thus there is a **relationship** between **His death** and **their resurrection**. I have attended the funerals of many and never witnessed that the death of someone would cause the resurrection of another. However, I have seen this at the moment of Christ's death on the cross, for in the same moment I heard Jesus cried again with a loud voice and breathed his last in a complete surrender to the Father God, I have seen the earth shook, and the rocks were split, the tombs also were opened, and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised because His death is a **representative substitutional death**. How powerful and victorious this scene is! It is a calling for those who received life to come out of their tombs for Christ has risen.

To conclude this point, I want to express my gratitude and thankfulness for God's grace, for in the garden, we were condemned and in the cross this condemnation was executed on us, how amazing Christ really is, for He is filled with grace and truth. So, I wonder asking can the infinite be filled? Yes, if He is filled with **infinite grace**. Thus, I ask again, can the infinite be exhausted? Never, and that is why from His fullness we have all received, grace upon grace. One day, when the door is closed, this river of grace would stop flowing, not because it has been exhausted or drained, but because the human being refused the flow of the river of grace to run inside him.

PREMOON

Chapter Fourteen

PREVIEW

Inheriting Sin and Inheriting Righteousness

One might ask what is the importance and value of Jesus being the new head and root? The importance of that issue lies in the **possibility of inheritance**, because if Christ wasn't head and root, and we are the seed, then it wouldn't have been ever possible or available for us to be justified. Why is this? Because **inheritance is the only way of justification**, and everything that we have attained from God by grace is based on the principle of **inheritance**; just as we inherited sin from the first Adam, so we inherited righteousness from the last Adam "Christ".

I can still see that you aren't quite convinced, dear reader, by the principle of inheritance, though I have explained for you before that we didn't inherit the act of rebellion but we inherited the virus of sin that entered to the human race as a result of the act of rebellion of Adam. So, let me share with you a biblical example that would prove that beyond any reasonable doubt. Paul who is the son of Adam recorded in the Bible a personal experience which he went through after he believed in Christ, he says these decisive phrases (Romans 7:17) **"But in fact it is no longer I that do it, but sin that dwells within me."** He continues to say in (Romans 7:18) **"For I know**

that nothing good dwells within me, that is, in my flesh. I can will what is right, but I cannot do it." Here, he isn't talking about evil deeds that he has been doing "sins", but about an evil doer who dwells within him, he called it "sin" that dwells within him. If the speaker here were Adam, there wouldn't be any inheritance involved, because Adam fell and so did his nature. But the speaker here is Paul "**who came nearly 4000 years after Adam**", and there are many generations that separate between both, however Paul is saying that he found something that dwells in his flesh called "sin". He is saying that he "knows" not that he "thinks" that "nothing good" dwells within him, for it is real information and not a hypothetical thought. So, the questions we should be asking are: when and how did this sin come as a doer and dwelt in Paul's flesh? To answer this, we say that it is the virus of sin that were transmitted from Adam to him by birth, it is the fallen nature that is rooted deep within him to the point that he can't be separated from, or get rid of it except by death. Since this is Paul's experience, not Adam's, then logically there is an inheritance involved here. Therefore, I say by denying or rejecting the notion and principle of inheriting sin, we are in fact shutting in front of us the door and opportunity to attain God's blessings forever, why so? Because inheritance is the only way to attain anything from God, since we are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ.

- Inheritance is the only way to attain salvation as we read in (Hebrews1:14) "**Are not all angels spirits in the divine service, sent to serve for the sake of those who are**

to inherit salvation". Inherit salvation not holding it by any other means but inheritance.

- Inheritance is the only way to attain righteousness as we read in (Hebrews 11:7) **"By faith Noah, warned by God about events as yet unseen, respected the warning and built an ark to save his household; by this he condemned the world and became an heir to the righteousness that is in accordance with faith." He became an "heir" of righteousness and not a "holder" of righteousness by any other means but inheritance.**

- Inheritance is the only way to attain the gracious gift of life; we read this in (1Peter 3:7) **"Husbands, in the same way, show consideration for your wives in your life together, paying honor to the woman as the weaker sex, since they too are also heirs of the gracious gift of life—so that nothing may hinder your prayers."**

- Inheritance is the only way to attain the earth, blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the earth, and **"not buy the earth or attain it by any other means"**. When Abraham asked God about the land in (Genesis 15) **"And he said, Lord GOD, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?"**

And so forth many other biblical texts. So, by denying the principle of inheriting sin from Adam, we are in fact at the same time denying the possibility of inheriting righteousness from Christ since it is the same principle; for we are denying the principle of inheritance in general, thus the possibility of

our justification **doesn't exist**. Those who deny the principle of inheriting sin though it is proved biblically, and claim that we are sinners for we commit sin and not that we are heirs of sin, are the same persons who whether intentionally or unintentionally reject the principle of inheriting righteousness and implicitly endorse the principle of justification by deeds⁽⁶⁷⁾. In other words, they are saying, whether intentionally or unintentionally, that “you are a sinner because you commit sin, and you are justified or righteous because you commit good deeds”. **What a deceitful poisonous idea that this!** For they are implicating themselves and their followers, since the Bible clearly stated that **“not the result of works, so that no one may boast.”**

This is the importance and the inevitability of Christ being the new root and head, for He died and made His life offering for sin, he shall see his offspring, and shall prolong his days. He was the grain of wheat that fell into the earth and died so He bore much fruit with the seed of Him (Genesis 1:11). And because He is from heaven, He brought heavenly fruits with the seed of Him, (1Corinthians 15:48) “As was the man of dust, so are those who are of the dust; and as is the man of heaven, so are those who are of heaven.”

Again, if Jesus wouldn't have carried in His body the same genetic code of Adam the head but without sin, He wouldn't

(67) Those who reject the principle of inheriting sin implicitly support the principle of justification by good deeds. Their tongue saying: You are sinner because you did sin and not because you inherited sin, and you are justified because you did righteousness and not because you inherited righteousness (this principle is totally wrong and not biblical).

have become head and root for because we wouldn't have had a biological representation except in this genetic code of Adam the head. Therefore, the legality and legitimacy of the inheritance would be annihilated, and all the legal and legitimate pillars of inheriting righteousness would be annihilated, which would in return demolish the atoning work on the cross totally, As, it will be worthless to justify human beings.

To clarify things more, let's assume the following hypothesis; if we assumed that we weren't born of Adam, then we wouldn't have any public existence in this world **"we would still be hidden in Adam's loins"**, thus we wouldn't inherit sin since we weren't actually born. This way, we would only be convicted with one verdict which is death and condemnation **"not two"**, that became ours as a result of breaking the commandment and in trespassing since we were in Adam's loins in the garden when he trespassed and broke the commandment. In this case, we would become righteous through **obedience** to Christ and by His death as our representative on the cross, just as we became sinners through Adam's transgression and rebellion as our representative in the garden, without the need to be born again since we weren't born in the first place. **For the second birth isn't inevitable nor required, and can't happen to those who weren't born first, because their existence is still hidden in Adam's loins.** Therefore, in this hypothetical case, we can say that the representative act of Christ for us all "alone without individual substitution or substitution for many" when he bore the iniquity of us all is enough to justify us.

However, since we are already born of the first Adam, then we do have an **actual existence** in this world, and we became heirs of sin by being born of Adam. In this case, to be born again is both inevitable and not optional so that we can attain the blessings and gains of the cross, and become present in the new head who is Christ. So all who was born of Adam, the first birth and have actual existence in this world have inherited sin from Adam, so he/she has to be born again from God. Or else that person wouldn't inherit righteousness from Christ, and wouldn't have an actual existence in the kingdom of God because he wasn't grafted in Christ the second man and the last Adam. Or else, that would be what we call **existential nihilism**, I would even be more frank and say that nihilism or nothingness is a way better scenario for that person. That's because our true identity and existence is in Christ, therefore, when Paul realized that fact, all his goals in life was to gain Christ "**and be found in Him**" for this is **the real existence**.

Let's also take a look at text in (Romans 5:19) that says "**For just as by the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man's obedience the many will be made righteous.**" This text confuses many people, because they don't understand Paul's usage of the word "**many**" in the two cases "Adam's disobedience, Christ's obedience", it is supposed that through Adam's disobedience, that made "all" and not "many" sinners.

To try to resolve this issue, first, I say that the word "all" is a huge one that no one really knows its **actual size**,

capacity and population it represents except for God alone. For it doesn't only refer to "all" those who were born of Adam, but also "all" who were in Adam since the beginning of time "**whether they were actually born or not yet**". So to speak, I can say that it presents the *productive capacity of this genetic code since the beginning of creation, and till the end of time*, which is of course an unlimited capacity as long as this genetic code exists. That's what we understood from some of the biblical texts that contained the word "all", for example:

- In (Romans 5:12) "Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned—"Here it means that all have sinned in the garden when they were in Adam's loins the day he sinned.
- In (Isaiah 53:6) "and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all." It is one iniquity for us all; it means the transgression of us all in Adam's loins in the garden when he trespassed.

The Bible uses the word "**all**" to refer to the first man in the garden **before any offspring is born of him**, therefore, this word doesn't only refer to those who were born "*who have an actual existence*", but also to those who weren't yet born "*who have hidden existence*". It is a continuous **counter** that produces massive numbers of human beings and can't be stopped except by the order of the One who started it.

However, the biblical text in (Romans 5:19) used the word “many” in “the many were made sinners” referring to all who are **born of Adam**. They were made sinners by being born of him and inherited the sin that came into the world as a result of his disobedience. On the same basis, the word “many” in “the many will be made righteous” refers to all who **would be born again from God** and would inherit the righteousness of Christ. In this eloquent text, the Holy Spirit is talking about **many and not all**, thus He means **the inherited sin and not the imputed one**. The word “many” refers to all who are born of Adam, and at the same time, it refers to all who are born of God.

Chapter Fifteen

PREMOON

Mechanisms of Reproduction, Branch Grafting, Legal Union and Practical Union

* Mechanisms of Reproduction

Before we discuss grafting and union, let's address the mechanisms of reproduction. There are **two different mechanisms of reproduction** the Creator placed for offspring production; the first one can be seen in the *plant kingdom*, which produces fruits and seeds through *death and burial*. The second one can be seen in the *animal kingdom and human kingdom*, which produces offspring through *sexual intercourse between males and females or through fertilization of an ovum with a sperm*.

We have acquired the old nature from the first Adam by birth, through the reproduction and multiplication law that is prevailing in the human kingdom. We have acquired the new nature by birth from God, but this new birth has attained its **legality** and **legitimacy** through **Christ's death** as we read in (Isaiah 53:10) "When you make his life an offering for sin, he shall see his offspring, and shall prolong his days;". This verse means that if he makes Himself an offering for sin, then legally and legitimately He can see His offspring,

while if He didn't make Himself an offering for sin; legally and legitimately He can't see His offspring. Therefore, I can say that this offspring is **conditioned** and **contingent** on His death for us. Since the legality and legitimacy of seeing Christ's offspring was fulfilled through His death which same as the reproduction and multiplication law that is prevailing in the plant kingdom, that's why most the images drawn in the Bible to describe such matter is taken from the plant kingdom, for example:

- He is a grain of wheat as we read in (John 12:14) "Very truly, I tell you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains just a single grain; but if it dies, it bears much fruit."
- He is a branch that carried fruit so it became a root as we read in (Isaiah 11:1-10) "A shoot shall come out from the stump of Jesse,a branch shall grow", and in (Revelation 22) "It is I, Jesus,I am the root of David".
- He is the true vine as we read in (John 15:5) "I am the vine, you are the branches. Those who abide in me and I in them bear much fruit, because apart from me you can do nothing."
- He is the tree of life, which human beings were forbidden to eat from after the fall in the garden so that they wouldn't eat from it and live in sin forever without settling their legal position, (Genesis 3:22) "Then the

Lord God said, "See, the man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil; and now, he might reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever". (Genesis 3:24) "He drove out the man; and at the east of the garden of Eden he placed the cherubim, and a sword flaming and turning to guard the way to the tree of life." However, through the incarnation of Christ, and His representative death on our behalf, He provided the legal and legitimate cover for the eating and the revival, the flaming sword has stopped from turning, and Christ, to Him be all the glory, has become available to eat Him by faith; we heard Him say that in (John 6:57) "so whoever eats me will live because of me."

"He shall see his offspring, and shall prolong his days" what an amazing phrase that reflects the strength and power of the head and root of this new seed. It is the seed where its head has conquered death, and rose from death victoriously so He was able to give His seed a new life that *isn't threatened by death again* **"shall prolog his days"**. The head, to Him be all the glory, was taken from our world in His early days when He died on the cross so that He can grant His seed prolonged days. The first Adam has **shortened** the life and days of his offspring when he fell and sin, allowing illness and death to enter the world, while the last Adam **prolonged** the days of His seed when He condemned sin, carried illness, and destroyed death with the sacrifice of Himself.

* Branch Grafting

There is an amazing process called **“the grafting”**, it is done by faith and it makes us branches in Christ the root. I will only mention one biblical text as a proof of the grafting process, though the context is talking about something else, yet I am quoting the concept in that text and not its whole content. In (Romans 11:17-18) **“And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.”** In this text, it talks about the gentiles who were grafted in the olive tree by faith, and became partakers in the root of this olive tree and obtained its riches and blessings. **This grafting process transferred them from a root to another one**, from a wild olive root to a good olive root. Then comes this wonderful and deep phrase, where writer tells the grafted branches not to boast, and remember that they **bearest not the root**, but the root thee. Thus, from this text we understand that there is **a possibility to be transferred from a root “the first Adam”, to another root “the last Adam”** through **grafting process**. To David and all Jesse’s family I say, though Jesus is “a branch of its root” but you shouldn’t boast, for that root is bearing you for Jesus is **“the root of Jesse”** and **“the root of David”**.

One might ask how did these branches were grafted in this new root and became in Christ? What is required from

it to be grafted in this new root? The only clear answer is that it was grafted in this new root **by faith**, without doing anything else (Roams 11:20) “That is true. They were broken off because of their unbelief, but you stand only through faith. So do not become proud, but stand in awe.”

Thus, through the miraculous virgin conception, the last Adam came to us, came as the new root and the new head, for He came “without father, without mother, without genealogy”, and through death and resurrection, He eliminated all the legal and legitimate barriers that stood against our revival again. This is the meaning of the phrase “the last Adam became a life-giving spirit”. This means that through His death and resurrection, He was able legally and legitimately to give life to the dead in sins and iniquities; that’s He provided the legal cover of the revival process for He paid the wages of our sins on the cross. Through believing in His death and resurrection for us as real historical events, as a fulfillment of the message of the gospel, then we can be grafted in this new root. One might ask, why through faith? Because Christ’s atoning work is **perfect**, there is nothing needed from us to be done, Christ has cried out “**It is finished**”, so what else do we want to do or add? Christ has finished the work perfectly, and has paid all of our debt, and He plugged all the loop holes that Satan and his followers might sneak through them.

This grafting process is a miraculous act of God inside the human soul, just as He took a rib from the first Adam, the old root and made the woman from it, which is metaphor of

what yet to happen later, it is the same by faith God grafted us as branches in the new root, the last Adam. Only through the cross, this grafting process by faith is a legal, legitimate and fully paid process; whereas, without the cross, the door wouldn't have been opened for this grafting process to happen. Naturally, all requests of the branches to be grafted in the tree of life would have been rejected because the flaming of the sword would have been still turning. Just as it wasn't possible to take that rib from Adam until God made him fall asleep, the same is true with the church, for it can't be built without the crucifixion and death of Christ. You might have noticed, dear reader, through **two** processes "**taking and grafting**", *taking the rib and grafting the branch*, a relationship is developed that connects between the root and the branch, or the head and the organ, and all this is done through an amazing process other than the biological intercourse.

And just as Eve who was taken from Adam was called "**woman**" because she was taken out of man, the same happened with the disciples; they were called "**Christians**" for they were created in Christ. It's worth noting, to mention that God didn't make another rib for Adam instead of the one He took, but He closed up its place with flesh, because **this rib wasn't lost to be replaced with another one**, for God built out of it the woman and gave her back to Adam, in a different form. How wonderful that is!

To the one asking about "*How did the grafting happen?*" , I say the issue isn't in the mechanism of grafting in the new root, but the issue has to do with the legality and legitimacy

of this process. The problem isn't about how the grafting of the branch would take place in the new root for God is **Omnipotent**, but it is about how this process would be legal and legitimate.

The legality of this grafting process doesn't just lie in the death of Christ on the cross, but also in the fact that this person is the head who carries in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam but without sin, in which we are presented in it too. Thus, our grafting is a legal and legitimate one since we have roots and existence in Him, just as Eve was a rib in Adam before she came into being.

And I say to those who think that by birth from Adam, we become **separated** from him since we started to have a public independent existence, that this way of thinking is wrong because our birth from Adam **proves** that we were in him, and not separated from him. Our birth from Adam has set us out from the hidden existence in him into the public one, but it didn't separate us from him. The only thing that can separate us from Adam is **death with Christ and the grafting in the new root by faith**. I repeat, **death with Christ and not just the natural physical death**. Since the natural death wouldn't separate us from Adam as we will be resurrected in the end of time while we are still in Adam and having the same old head who is Adam.

✧ Legal Union and Practical Union

I hear you wondering, my dear reader, and asking how did we become united with Christ as the biblical text in (Romans 6:5) says, **“For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we will certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his.”** What kind of union is meant here? The most common answer is that we became united through faith and baptism to His death **“in a death like his”**. Though this is a great answer, yet it is too brief which makes it unclear; personally, I don’t understand it because **faith** doesn’t make the historical event **“union”** happens, but it believes, through the declaration, in actual, historical event that really took place. **Baptism** doesn’t make the historical event **“union”** happens, but its strength and effect lie in its symbol for this actual, historical event that really happened. Therefore, if there was no **actual literal historical union** that happened in the cross, and if there was no **actual literal historical crucifixion of our old self with Christ in the cross**, then the result union from faith and baptism **“in a death like his”** is in fact **a nominal illusion and a worthless one**. What is the value of believing in an event that didn’t really happen? And what is the value of burial declaration through baptism for a dead one (the old self) that didn’t really and historically die with Christ in the cross? If there was no actual literal dead one, so who is the person that is being buried in baptism? And if we didn’t die with Christ for real, literally and historically, then baptism to His death is just another **nominal ritual worthless act**.

To clarify the following point of view, for you to be perfectly convinced of this point, let's take Christ Himself as an example. John the Baptist has baptized Christ in the Jordan River at the beginning of His earthly ministry. Let's review the biblical texts that talk about this incident to conjure up the holy scriptures and its words in front of you as it came in the Bible; in (Mathew 3:13-17) **"Then Jesus came from Galilee to John at the Jordan, to be baptized by him. John would have prevented him, saying, "I need to be baptized by you, and do you come to me?" But Jesus answered him, "Let it be so now; for it is proper for us in this way to fulfill all righteousness."** Then he consented. And when Jesus had been baptized, just as he came up from the water, suddenly the heavens were opened to him and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and alighting on him. And a voice from heaven said, **"This is my Son, the Beloved, with whom I am well pleased."** Now, I present you with following question in order to provide the answer to it. Why did Christ get baptized by John the Baptist at the Jordan River? The answer is: for many reasons:

1. To be an example.
2. To be anointed by the Holy Spirit-be ordained.
3. To Begin Ministry.
4. To Fulfill Righteousness.

But I want to press on the fourth answer that Christ said Himself **"Let it be so now; for it is proper for us in this way to fulfill all righteousness"**. Based on that, I ask again, did Christ fulfill all righteousness by being baptized in water?

Of course not, He fulfilled all righteousness when He finished His ministry and perfected His obedience to the Father and went to the cross where we heard Him cry out **“it is finished”**. On the cross, which was symbolized by the baptism, Jesus has finished everything. Christ said to John the Baptist for it is proper for us **“in this way”** to fulfill all righteousness, in this way means the way of death, it is through death all righteousness would be fulfilled. So, if Christ didn't die literally and historically then He wouldn't have fulfilled all righteousness though He was baptized by John the Baptist. Thus, when the Father from heaven said that He was well pleased with His Son after He came up from the water, it wasn't because of the baptism, but for the **willingness of the beloved Son to obey till death** which was shown by His insistence on being baptized by John though He was met by John's refusal at first.

Similarly, we read in (Romans 6:4-6) that **“Therefore we have been buried with him by baptism into death, so that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we too, For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we will certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his. We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the body of sin might be destroyed, and we might no be enslaved to sin.”** These verses are saying that the value of baptism as a declaration of the death of Christ lies in being **“in a death like his”**; it symbolizes His death. Its value lies in being a symbol of this historical truth that

actually happened in the cross, which states that our old self was crucified with Him, **thus our burial with Him by baptism is an event with deep and significant meaning, not just a mere ritual without any historical background that gives it value and beauty.** This is exactly what Paul meant when he started this part to the Romans saying “Do you not know”, as if he wanted to say to them, do you not know that our baptism into Jesus isn’t an empty ritual, but we were baptized into His death. So in the moment we believe, it is a declaration from us of the historicity of both truths, **Christ’s death and our death in Christ as well.** Do you not know that we were historically crucified with Christ when our old self was crucified with Him for we were in that old self? Do you not know that the power of baptism as a burial declaration lies in the historicity, literacy and certainty of the crucifixion of our old self with Christ?

For it’s worth noting, I say that the kind of union meant here when he said “united with him in a death like his” is the **practical union** which takes place **the moment we repent, believe and be baptized,** not the **literal, legal, legitimate and historical union** that took place the moment **we died with Christ on the cross.** The greatest proof that the Bible means by baptism the practical union not the legal historical one, is that it stated previously these words **“so we too might walk in newness of life”**, which is the **practical behavior.** Then, it stated afterwards that **“we might no longer be enslaved to sin”**, again it refers to the **practical life.**

We conclude from all of what have been discussed so far, that surely an actual, literal and historical death happened, and so did an actual, literal and historical union as well. The question that demands to be answered is: When and how did we become literally and historically united with Him so that we can unite with Him practically through faith and baptism? This actually happened when the beloved Son with great humility, emptied Himself, taking the form of a slave, being born in human likeness, sharing in the flesh and blood. He did that to unite Himself to us in the incarnation through the miraculous virgin conception, where God prepared for Him a body that carried the same genetic code of the first Adam but without sin, in which we are really represented in. Exactly at this point, the actual, literal and historical union took place. Then in the cross when God has laid on Christ the iniquity of us all, our old self was crucified with Him, and so did we; since we are represented in this old self; for it is **“our old self”**.

Therefore, when I believe in that literal, historical union that actually happened, and be baptized by water as a declaration of that faith, then the impact of this union is **practically activated** in my life now through the power of the Holy Spirit because this is a real literal and historical union. Every union that is real and historical has an impact and implications. when I realize that, only then, I can say with Paul (Galatians 2:19-20) **“I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me.**

And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.”

Notice, dear reader, that he is talking about the **present life “the life I now live”**, he is talking about the practical behavior through faith now, and not the literal historical union that happened in the past as we previously explained. **Faith** has started to have a role in my life now because the union happened literally and historically **“And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God”**, and the **declaration of baptism** started to have a role and significance in my life, because our old self has been crucified literally and historically.

After I finished my argument concerning the perfection of Christ in his birth, now I will mention in brief the perfection of Christ in his **life, death, burial, resurrection and as a symbol**, to show you how Christ is perfect in his humanity and how the scripture is accurate, perfect and trusted in its consistency.

PREMOON

Chapter Sixteen

PREMOON

The Perfection of Christ's Humanity in His Life, and Answer on Doubts about Christ's Divinity

It was forbidden for the Jewish person to touch a leper, as well as a bleeding person, and a dead body; according to the Law those three were unclean and whoever touches them becomes unclean as well. However, Christ has touched the leper (Mark 1:40) and didn't become unclean, He touched the bier of a widow's son (Luke 7:14) and didn't become unclean. Also, He was touched by a woman suffering from hemorrhages (Luke 8:44) and didn't become unclean. These are all evidences of the perfection of Christ's humanity, and that He was without any sin; He, to Him be all glory, didn't have any **receptors to respond to or react** to any uncleanliness. **For He is used to send out without any receiving.** He sent to the leprous a cleansing power that cleansed him, when He touched the bier of the dead young son, He sent the power of life and raised him from the dead. Again, when He was touched by the woman suffering from hemorrhages, a healing power came out of Him and immediately her hemorrhage stopped.

Furthermore, the perfection of Christ's humanity in His life is shown through His perfect obedience to the will of His

Father. The writer in (Hebrews 10:10) talks about the will of the Father and says **“And it is by God’s will that we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.”** Did Christ obey this will? Yes, He obeyed to death, the two wills matched perfectly, and Christ as a perfect man didn’t do or say anything from Himself. Let me share with you, dear reader, some of the biblical texts that confirm the absolute obedience and submission of Christ to the Father:

In (Hebrews 10:7) “Then I said, ‘See, God, I have come to do your will, O God’ (in the scroll of the book it is written of me).”

In (John 4:34) “Jesus said to them, “My food is to do the will of him who sent me and to complete his work.”

In (Isaiah 50:5) “The Lord God has opened my ear, and I was not rebellious, I did not turn backward.”

In (John 17:4) “I glorified you on earth by finishing the work that you gave me to do.”

In (John 8:28) “So Jesus said, “When you have lifted up the Son of Man, then you will realize that I am he, and that I do nothing on my own, but I speak these things as the Father

In (John 12:49) “for I have not spoken on my own, but the Father who sent me has himself given me a commandment about what to say and what to speak.”

In (Luke 22:42) “Father, if you are willing, remove this cup from me; yet, not my will but yours be done.” The

perfection of Christ's humanity means that His submission to the Father's will was absolute and complete, without any kind of disobedience not even once, because it took *only one act of disobedience from the first Adam* for the whole human race to fall. How perfect is the perfection of Christ!

I wouldn't miss the chance to address some of what has been said concerning the will of Christ, which I call messing around with the words of Christ. Where, to Him all glory, said, **"yet, not my will but yours be done"**. They say using their inadequate minds that if Christ is God, then they would have the same will or one will, not two wills, so how come He said to father "not my will but your"?

I reply to those who adopt such dark ideology, who, whether intentionally or unintentionally, denied that Christ had **two natures**, Christ is fully God "For in him the whole fullness of Godhead dwells bodily", as well as, He is fully man "but without sin". If we said that Christ as a perfect man and God had one will, then we would be challenging the perfection of Christ's humanity, because His perfect humanity was shown clearly in His **absolute obedience** to the Father, unlike the disobedient Adam. We read that in (Romans 5:19) **"For just as by the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man's obedience the many will be made righteous."** If they both had one will, then there was no need to mention obedience or submission in any biblical text, since it requires two wills, each party should have a will for the act of submission of one to the other to take place. Or else, how it is possible for the one who does not possess a will

for himself to obey someone else?! This is the pure revealed truth in the Bible. Therefore, the accurate meaning of this text, which is being criticized, is highlighted by the words of Christ “not my will but yours” for there is indeed two wills, but **totally matching** with each other through Christ’s submission and full obedience to the Father “yet, not my will but yours be done”. This **absolute obedience** is one of the dimensions of the perfection of Christ’s humanity and of being without any sin, also this great, deep, and genius text confirms and proves the divinity of Christ, Because the will of someone (**X**) can’t be in **harmony, consistency, and congruence** with the will of another (**Y**) in absolute congruence, a congruence that is not distorted by even one act of disobedience, and is not tainted by any defect of quarreling, strife or fighting, without (**X**) being himself (**Y**) . This absolute congruence of the two wills is conclusive and definite proof that **Christ is God**.

Chapter Seventeen

PRENMOON

The Perfection of Christ's Humanity in His Death

Christ in His divinity doesn't die and **can't** die, because He is Spirit without flesh and blood. Death in its simple definition is the separation of the spirit and soul from the body, and if there is no body then there is no possibility of death as well.

However, **Christ in His humanity**, as perfect man doesn't die as well, because death is the wage of sin, and Christ in His humanity is holy without sin. Though He doesn't die because He is without sin, yet He **can** die if He wanted to as he shared in the flesh and blood.

Death is a powerful enemy; it spread to all human beings because of the entrance of sin into the world when Adam fell into sin and brought death onto himself and to the whole human race as we read in (Romans 5). But since Christ is as a perfect man without sin, so the natural death which spread from Adam to all can't reach Him for He is **without genealogy to Adam**. And since in His humanity Christ is without father, without mother, without genealogy, thus He is out of this circle that Paul referred to in (Romans 5) by saying "**spread to all**".

So how did Christ die? To answer this essential question, I say that Christ didn't die the **natural death** which spread from Adam to everyone, but He died by **hands of killers**; He was murdered. This is what Peter said by the Holy Spirit in (Acts 3:15) addressing the Jews *"and you killed the Author of life, whom God raised from the dead. To this we are witnesses."* again he repeated in (Acts 2:23) *"this man, handed over to you according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God, you crucified and killed by the hands of those outside the law." By the hands of those outside the Law which means by hands of killers.*

Therefore, Christ's death as murdered by hands of killers not the natural death is one of the strong proofs on the perfection of His humanity, and that He is without sin. In addition to that, if Christ wouldn't have been murdered by hands of killers, and if He wouldn't have allowed humans to do that under His perfect and absolute authority; still, He wouldn't have died even in His humanity because He is holy and without sin or iniquity.

Let me formulate this significant fact to you in simple phrases, dear reader, so that you memorize in your mind easily. Death have spread to all humans, since all have sinned as they were in Adam's loins when he fell. However, **death didn't spread to Christ** because He is without sin, since He wasn't in Adam's loins because He is without father, without mother, without genealogy. Thus, **Christ went to death** because He was driven by His everlasting love to us and for

the sake of the joy that was set before him. So, we can say that ***death didn't come to Christ, but Christ is the one who went to death.*** He went to it to defeat it and this is one of the dimensions of the perfection of Christ's humanity in His death.

PREMOON

Chapter Eighteen

PREMOON

The Perfection of Christ's Humanity in His Burial

In (Psalm 146:4) the Bible describes the death of the son of Adam with these words *“When their breath departs, they return to the earth; on that very day their plans perish.”* In (Psalm 22:15) Christ prophetically is saying about His death *“my mouth is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue sticks to my jaws; you lay me in the dust of death.”*

You might have noticed, dear reader, the difference between “they **return** to the earth” and “you **lay** me in the dust of death”. For any son of Adam after he dies, shall return to his origin; return to earth, to dust as the biblical text says, for he is dust and to dust he shall return. As for Christ, His body was laid in the dust, which is a reference to His **burial** (Luke 23:53) *“Then he took it down, wrapped it in a linen cloth, and **laid** it in a rock-hewn tomb where no one had ever been laid.”* However, His body didn't decompose, never returned to dust and **didn't see corruption**. Christ's burial was **only laying** His honourable body on dust, and **not returning** to dust **“laid not returned”**. This complete accuracy in word choice is one countless proofs which confirms the verbal plenary inspiration of the Bible.

But one might say that the non-corruption of the body of Christ isn't a proof of the perfection of His humanity, for you can preserve bodies after death using *mummification*. This is true, but this wasn't the case with Christ, for the Holy Spirit intentionally mentioned all the details of burying Christ and His resurrection to answer any skepticism related to this issue. Just read the verses in (Luke 24:1-3) **“But on the first day of the week, at early dawn, they came to the tomb, taking the spices that they had prepared. They found the stone rolled away from the tomb, but when they went in, they did not find the body”**. The women planned to preserve Christ's body as they prepared spices and ointments, but God had a different opinion on that matter *“but when they went in, they did not find the body”*; Christ has risen from the dead before the women got to the tomb. What a satisfying truth that is dear reader; we worship a **living Christ** who has risen from the dead, and **not a mummified** ⁽⁶⁸⁾ **dead one**, a Christ who moves, goes, appears and visits many.

The angel said to Mary while Christ is still in her womb **“the child to be born will be holy”** and Christ prophetically said to God, referring to His time in the grave **“or let your holy one see corruption”**. How perfect is Christ's humanity; He is holy while still in the womb, and He is holy while being in the grave.

One of the most fascinating images painted by the Holy

(68) We do not worship a mummified Christ, but a living Christ who rose up from the death.

Spirit in the Old Testament to describe the burial of Christ in fine details beyond imagination is the story of The Prophet **Jonah** in the belly of the fish. Christ himself confirmed the similarity when he said to him all the glory in (Matthew 12:40): **“For just as Jonah was in the belly of the great fish three days and three nights, thus shall the son of man in the heart of the earth three days and three nights.”** A story in which we see Jonah in the belly of the whale and see the Holy Spirit with his feather paint a magnificent picture, picking phrases have purpose when Jonah said in his prayers (Jonah 2:5) **“weeds were wrapped around my head”**. Is it by chance the Holy Spirit describes Jonah’s head in the whale’s belly by this description? Is it by chance he describes it as “wrapped by weeds”? Of course not, every letter and every point of the scripture was written with great precision and care and for a far and deep purpose. It is a genius image for Christ, who will later be buried in the heart of the earth for three days and three nights, in which his **body** will also be **wrapped** in a clean linen cloth and his **head wrapped** in a handkerchief. (Matthew 27:59) **“So Joseph took the body and wrapped it in a clean linen cloth,”** and in (Luke 23:53) the book says, **“Then he took it down, wrapped it in a linen cloth and laid it in a rock-hewn tomb where no one had ever been laid,”** Jonah in the whale’s belly, his head wrapped in weeds. Christ is in the tomb and his body is wrapped in linen, **weeds are a plant and linen are also a plant**, O creativity!! But the creativity do not stop here, as we read in more details about the head of Christ that is wrapped in a handkerchief

(John20:7) **“and the handkerchief which was upon his head, not lying with the linen cloths, but folded up in a distinct place by itself”**, and once again I see creativity when I see the head of Jonah wrapped in weeds and the head of Christ wrapped in a handkerchief, and i am stunned when I read that the scripture says that the whale spit Jonah on the land **without** saying that he came out on the ground and his head wrapped in weeds as it was while he was inside the belly of the whale, The reason is that Jonah is a symbol of Christ who rose from the dead and went out the tomb, **leaving** the shrouds placed in the grave and the handkerchief which was on his head, not with the shrouds, but wrapped in a **distinct place alone**, O creativity!! Here I asked myself why the scripture was interested in telling us that the handkerchief which was on the head of Christ was wrapped and placed in a distinct place alone and not lying with the rest of the shrouds? And a ray of light penetrated my mind and revealed the greatest purposes and thoughts of God, which is **the Church** (the body of Christ), the Church which formed after the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and Christ who is risen from the dead became the head of that body, head of the Church, and this head after the resurrection will ascend to the heaven as a precedent for us to be in a distinct place alone, and will not be present **literally** with the body, and for this the Holy Spirit said with excessive accuracy that the handkerchief which was on his head (**resampling Christ the head**) is not placed with the shrouds (**resampling church the body**) but wrapped and placed in a distinct place alone, it looks like that the

holy spirit is writing an **encrypted message**, but when this message been decoded ⁽⁶⁹⁾ by his light it reveals his greatest purposes and ideas.

(69) From the story of Jonah we see the creativity of the Holy Spirit in drawing symbolic images with excessive and stunning accuracy, giving clear references and signs to deep theological facts.

PREVIEW

Chapter Nineteen

PREMOON

The Perfection of Christ's Humanity in His Resurrection

In (Acts 2:24), Peter described the resurrection of Christ with an eloquent and powerful expression, he said about Christ **“But God raised him up, having freed him from the pains of death, because it was impossible for him to be held in its power.** “I will stop here to address two very important and deep expressions in this text;

the first is “having freed him from the pains of death”,

the second is “because it was impossible for him to be held in its power”.

●● **First:** having freed him from the pains of death, In order to know how Christ in His resurrection, was freed from the pains of death, we need first to know what does the Bible mean by “the pains of death”? Were these physical pains? I don't think so, for death is a relief from all physical pain and sufferings. They are these psychological deep pains and sufferings; it is drowning in a deep well of fear, anxiety, frustration and losing hope. It is the fear from a dark unknown future that has no end, they are the pains of a broken, locked up and chained spirit by the devil's thick robes and bonds. Christ has destroyed by His resurrection these pains when

He brought life and immortality to light, when He released these locked up spirits, and when He brightened the future for us and became known and eliminated all fear and anxiety. This is what Paul is also saying in (2Corinthians 5:1) “For we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.” He destroyed the pains of death when He gave hope by His resurrection to every desperate, frustrated person who lost hope. He reversed the equation of death and made way of the whole earth “round trip and not only going “, the big fish that swallowed Jonah spit him again after three days, and the day has come when the rocks were broken, tombs were opened and spit the dead ones who have been swallowed before to life again.

●● **Second:** because it was impossible for him to be held in its power, This phrase came more powerful in some translations of the Bible; it says that it wasn't possible for the power of death to **detain** Him. Death is a powerful, cruel and ruthless enemy, the Bible calls it “**the king of terrors**”, which can hold and detain any human being, for it drives its legitimacy from the presence of sin in human beings for the sting of death is sin (1Corinthians 15:56). However, a person came whom the Bible says about him that it wasn't possible for death to detain or hold Him in its power, then this is a decisive proof that this person is without sin, and so the sting of death couldn't instil its claws in Him.

This is one of the dimensions of the perfection of Christ's humanity, which appeared in His resurrection; there was no

man who came to this world, fought death, and death was unable to hold Him except for only Christ the holy one for it wasn't possible. Christ fought death and destroyed it, He defeated and conquered death and made it lose its grip so it couldn't hold Him.

Christ has risen victoriously and triumphantly from death, but He didn't do this alone; He raised us up with Him and seated us with Him in the heavenly places. How did that happen? This happened because Christ in His humanity is the head, and His body carries the same genetic code of the first Adam but without sin, in which we are represented in, So we were crucified with Him, thus we were raised with Him and seated with Him in the heavenly places.

Just as we fell when Adam fell because we were in Adam, our head; we were also crucified when Christ was crucified, and we were raised from the dead with Him. And we were raised up with Him and seated with Him in the heavenly places because we were in Christ our head, for He carries in His body the same genetic code of the first Adam but without sin.

Nevertheless, one might say that there were others who were raised from the dead "for example Lazarus, the widow's son at Nain and others". indeed, this happened but they didn't do it by their own strength but Christ raised them the dead by His power, and they returned again to the grave. However, only one who is perfect in His humanity, who died only once and rose from the dead (Romans 6:10) **"The death he died, he died to sin, once for all; but the life he lives, he**

lives to God.” Once and for all He destroyed death, and rose from the dead, and never entered the grave again, for the empty grave stands today as a witness to Christ’s power and perfection, and to the breaking of death and annihilating it.

In addition to that, Christ has raised other people from the dead during His earthly ministry, and He raised Himself from the dead as well. How great is He when He said to the Jews in (John 2:19) **“Jesus answered them, “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.” “He was referring to His body”**. This is indeed an encouraging news for everyone who lost a loved one; Christ has risen from the dead and became the first fruits of those who have died, and soon what the Bible said would be fulfilled **“God will bring with him those who have died”**.

Chapter Twenty

PREMOON

The Perfection of Christ's Humanity as a Symbol

“Whole/without blemish” is a word that was repeated many times in the Old Testament to describe all kinds of sacrifices, it was repeated several times specially in the book of Leviticus, as if it is a non-negotiated condition. **“Whole”** is a wide and deep word that has many synonymous meanings to it including *flawless, with no defect, with no disease, with no deformation* and all these were fulfilled in Christ. It was said about Christ that He **knew no sin** (2Corinthians 5:21), He **committed no sin** (1Peter 2:22), and in Him **there is no sin** (1John 3:5). It is Christ who stood confident in who He was and in His holy nature defied everyone and said in (John 8:46) **“Which of you convicts me of sin? If I tell the truth, why do you not believe me?”** and the writer in (Hebrews 7:26) said about Him **“holy, blameless, undefiled”**. Notice, dear reader, that the Bible didn't say that He “didn't commit any thing to be blamed for or defilement”, though this is true but the Bible said what is even deeper “blameless, undefiled” **in His nature.**

And because He was whole, He was able to make the broken ones whole again, to heal deformations and restore the lost things, let me remind you of some biblical texts that

would make that clear to you; He is whole that is why He was able to rectify things again:

In (Mark 5:34) “He said to her, “Daughter, your faith has made you well; go in peace, and be healed of your disease.”

In (Mathew 12:13) “Then he said to the man, “Stretch out your hand.” He stretched it out, and it was restored, as sound as the other.”

In (Mark 8:25) “Then Jesus laid his hands on his eyes again; and he looked intently and his sight was restored, and he saw everything clearly.”

In (Acts 4:10) “let it be known to all of you, and to all the people of Israel, that this man is standing before you in good health by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead.” This is the healing of the crippled beggar, and notice how amazing Peter is by witnessing to Christ and not stealing the glory to himself **“by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth”** that crippled man is standing before you in good health.

The restoration that Christ made didn't stop at the physical health only, but it was extended to include a deeper healing for souls and creating and renewing of spirits (Luke 4:18) **“The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to bring good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free,”**.

Relax and rest assured, dear reader, and know that no one can establish the truth on earth except the One who is whole, flawless, who said about Himself **“I am the truth”**. No one can make the rough places a plain except the Son whom the Bible said about Him in (Hebrews 1:8) **“But of the Son he says, “Your throne, O God, is forever and ever, and the righteous scepter is the scepter of your kingdom.”** No one can rectify things except the one who is whole, and in His first coming, He was able to restore human beings. Again, in His second coming, He will be able to rectify things and restore the whole creation when He makes a new heaven and a new earth, and righteousness would dwell in it. Thus, the words of the one who was seated on the throne would be fulfilled (Revelation 21:5) **“And the one who was seated on the throne said, “See, I am making all things new.”** And since He is whole, all the eyes are towards Him and all nations’ hope is on Him.

PREMOON

Chapter Twenty-One

PREMOON

Conclusion

With this marvelous miracle, the miraculous virgin conception or what I call ***“the separation of genealogy”***, the genealogy of Jesus was separated from Mary’s. Thus, Jesus was separated from the rest of Adam’s race that Mary came from, and so Jesus was separated from sinners as well. Jesus came holy, separated from fallen race of Adam, as we read in (Hebrews 7:26) “For it was fitting that we should have such a high priest, holy, blameless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and exalted above the heavens.” This word “holy” is powerful and it reminds us of what the angel said to Mary “the child to be born will be holy”. Jesus was holy while He was still a fruit in the womb, and even when He was just a seed, how did that happen? It happened in the miraculous virgin conception, where the Holy Spirit came upon Mary and the power of the Most High overshadowed her. So, the genealogy of this seed was separated from Mary, thus from all the fallen race of Adam. And Jesus Christ came in the flesh without any human will; without father, without mother, without genealogy, blameless, undefiled, holy and separated from sinners as well, though He is the seed of the woman.

Notice, dear reader, what the Blessed Virgin Mary said in (Luke 1:49) **“for the Mighty One has done great things for**

me, and holy is his name.” Mary’s words are deep, expressive words, she said “the Mighty one has done great things for me”, then added “**and holy is his name”**. She didn’t say “**and great is his name”** in relation to the great things that He has done, though great is His name indeed. Yet, Mary chose to say “and holy is his name”, as if she is saying that this name goes well with the miracle that God performed according to His holiness and holy measurements, it is the miracle of separation of genealogy.

Also notice, dear reader, what Elizabeth has said about baby Jesus while He was still in Mary’s womb, we read that in (Luke 1:41-42) “When Elizabeth heard Mary’s greeting, the child leaped in her womb. And Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit and exclaimed with a loud cry, “Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb.” How powerful is that expression “blessed is the fruit of your womb”, how did a blessed fruit come from the fallen race of Adam? It is the miraculous virgin conception, the miracle of separation of the genealogy, for you and I, dear reader, are born sinners. David said in (Psalm 51:5) “Indeed, I was born guilty, a sinner when my mother conceived me.” We inherited sin and came into this world sinners bearing the curse. However, Jesus came holy, didn’t inherit sin so that He would carry our own sins and justify us, came as a blessed fruit to bear our curse to bless us, came blameless, and undefiled to cleanse us

I will also take this occasion to answer the easy objection which asking: why Elizabeth said about Mary (**mother of**

my Lord) and not (Mother of Jesus), as the Holy Spirit said in John 2 at the wedding of Cana galilee? I say that she said (mother of my Lord) and not (mother of Jesus) because she was talking about Jesus while he was still a fruit in the womb, Jesus was not actually born and named (Jesus) as stated in the Gospel of the Angel (and you call his name Jesus because he saves his people from their sins), “Jesus” is the name that he had been named with after his birth, and this name until this moment when Elizabeth said these words was not yet known, and that is why she said “Mother of my Lord” and not “Mother of Jesus” as mentioned in John 2 at the beginning of his service,

And I also add that he is really **Lord** since he was a fruit in the womb, because from the very first moment of the formation of this flesh in the womb of the Virgin Mary, all the fullness of divinity dwelt in him, And the Holy Spirit, through this cry of Elizabeth (mother of my Lord) wanted to announce that the union between the divinity and humanity was actually done in the womb and not after the womb, before birth from the first moment of formation and not after birth, this **compound expression** (Mother of my Lord) consists of two words, the word (**Mother**) which refers to the side of the **humanity** because divinity does not have a mother, and the word (**my Lord**) which refers to the side of **divinity**, and through this **linguistic** ⁽⁷⁰⁾ **overlap, union** and

(70) “mother of my lord” is a compound expression, The Holy spirit through mixing the word (mother) with the word (my lord) want to declare that the union between the humanity and the divinity started and done since the first moment of formation of this body in Mary’ womb.

mixing the two words (*mother and my Lord*) together in one expression (*Mother of my Lord*), the Holy Spirit declared that the union between divinity and humanity, And the dwelling of all the fullness of the divinity in the humanity has been actually occurred in the womb since the very first moment of formation.

I also occasion this occasion to answer the ancient thought of the early centuries, which says that: **“The Holy Spirit came upon the Virgin Mary before the conception, and purified her, so she conceived by the beloved son and gave him a human nature. As long as Mary is as purified as Adam and Eve before sin, So it is theoretically supposed that the human nature of Christ be like that of Adam and Eve in paradise. That’s theoretical. But in fact, Mary suffered pain once and also died.”**⁽⁷¹⁾. This theological thought is far from the biblical right and truth proclaimed in the Bible for at least two reasons:

- ◆ **First**, man is not purified of his sins (whether inherited or actual) by coming of Holy Spirit upon him or by physical biological reproduction, but by faith in redemption, cross and blood of Christ, which purify us of every sin (**Indeed, under the law almost everything is purified with blood, Heb 9:22**), for this reason, Christ to him all the glory went to the cross to make by himself a purification for our sins (**Heb1:3**).

(71) Review the book “The Secret of Divine strategy” (incarnation) «سر التدبير الإلهي» (التنجيد) Its Author Aspero Jabbour, page 151,152, in the second group of sources.

- ◆ **Secondly**, the reality is that Mary' journey on the earth has been ended by death, and therefore the death that passed from Adam to all people, has passed to her (**by being in Adam**).

To answer to this non-biblical thought, I say: The text in **Lu 1:35** as stated in the Greek origin says, **“The Holy Spirit will come upon you and the power of the Most High will overshadow you, therefore the child to be born will be holy; he will be called Son of God”**, from this text we understand that the coming of the Holy Spirit upon Mary and the power of the Most High are making the body of Child to be born Holy (**the child to be born will be holy**) and not purifying the body of the Virgin Mary (**i.e. making her without sin**). Coming the child Jesus with a holy body and not hiring Adam's sin occurred through the miracle of the virgin conception and the separation of his Genealogy from Mary (**without mother without genealogy-separated from the sinners**), and not by purifying the body of the blessed Virgin Mary and making it without sin. Only to be clear, I say, of course, Virgin Mary is pure and honorable literary, morally and spiritually, but as Adam's daughter, she is like all sons and daughters of Adam hiring the sin.

My dear reader, we can say that the Blessed Virgin Mary was the **connecting ring** between Jesus and the house of David **“connection of the seed”**; at the same time, she was the **separating point** between Jesus and the fallen race of Adam **“separation of the genealogy”**.

We can also say that the Blessed Virgin Mary is the daughter of the first Adam, and at the same time, the last Adam was born of her. Indeed, she has all the right to sing “for the Mighty One has done great things for me”, and that from now on all generations will call her blessed.

All of the natural conception processes resulting from a relationship between a man and a woman always lead to children who are the seed and the genealogy of their parents. Therefore, these children are the seed of their parents but aren't their root. However, this doesn't apply to Christ's birth which happened through the miracle of virgin conception, in which Jesus Christ came as the seed and not the genealogy. In other words, He came as the seed of the “woman” but not her genealogy, the seed of David but not his genealogy, the seed of Abraham but not his genealogy; therefore, ***He came as the seed and the root at the same time***. He is the seed because He is the seed of Mary, David, and Abraham; He is the root because He isn't the genealogy of Mary, David and Abraham.

Thus, Christ by birth through the miraculous virgin conception is the head because by this wondrous conception He came without a father, without a mother, and without genealogy. He who has no mother or a father by genealogy is the head; like Adam the first but Adam came created not born while Christ came born not created.

Christ is the head by birth through virgin conception, but he is the head of a new creation by resurrecting from death. By

His death and resurrection, a new creation was founded in Christ, so Christ isn't only the head and the root, but also the head and the root of a new creation. Very truly, I tell you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains just a single grain; the grain of wheat remained the head and the root but without a seed, without branches or fruits.

And because Christ is the root for He carries in His holy body the same genetic coding of Adam the first but without sin; based on this truth I, literally and not just by faith, exist in Him biologically, genetically, and truly and not only spiritually and fiducially. This truth is the legal and lawful foundation of redemption, and it is what made the incarnation inevitable and necessary. The legitimacy of our physical bodies' redemption in the future lies in the literalness of our existence in Christ as we were in the first Adam. Indeed, it is a concealed existence, but being concealed doesn't mean that it's unreal, untrue, or unilateral. Just as our existence in Adam in the garden was real, true, and literal though it was concealed.

The faith with an idea does not convert it into a true real fact as this idea may be false, but the idea itself should be already proofed as a true real fact to be worthy to activate our faith to catch it. the faith do not create or make the truth, but the truth should be already real and proofed to be able to be accepted by the faith. The faith for sure is hungry for evidences, but the evidences are not the only need of the faith, it needs also illumination and revelation.

The humanity of Christ is not contradict with his divinity because he is the seed of the woman not her genealogy, seed of the woman not genealogy of Mary.

At the end of this research, I would like to express my gratitude to God who enlightened me and gave me insight, wisdom, and strength to complete this work. I can't find better words to describe how deep and amazing the miraculous virgin conception is, than the words of Paul who was led by the Holy Spirit said in (1Timothy 3:16) ***“Without any doubt, the mystery of our religion is great: He was revealed in flesh,”***

Now dear reader, I have placed in front of you two roots; the old root that you have inherited from the first Adam from whom you inherited sin and death, and the new root the last Adam who wants to make you an heir of righteousness, who came so that you can have life and have it abundantly. And it is up to you to choose which one of them you want to continue your life with, you might say that you **“neither want the first, nor the last”** of course you have the right to say so; however, out of honest I must tell you that as a **created being** you can't really reject both, for you are already in the old Adam. Thus, by rejecting both, your existence in the old Adam won't change, but you are rejecting the grafting process in the new root, and that would deprive you of life and righteousness that would have been the result of being grafted in the new root. And in order not to deceive you, I have to say that to you; by rejecting the old you won't be uprooted from it, but by accepting the new is the only thing that enables you to uproot from the old

and grafted in the new. As a creature, **you must have root**, for you have been designed this way and if you tried to break that design and become independent, you will die for sure. I fear that you might have those prideful, arrogant and deadly tendencies in your heart to be independent, so let the words of the Bible warn you in the parable of the sower (Mark 4: 5-6) **“Other seed fell on rocky ground, where it did not have much soil, and it sprang up quickly, since it had no depth of soil. And when the sun rose, it was scorched; and since it had no root, it withered away.”** For the living word of God is trying to penetrate you, to establish its roots inside you, in order to revive you and plant you in the new root. So, I invite you to respond to it, for there is nothing but dryness and death apart from it **“since it had no root, it withered away”**, for this is the fate of anyone who have no root, is that what you really desire?

Exclusive new concepts and expressions

Some **exclusive and new ideas and interpretations** in this research, and some **exclusive and new expressions** through which I formulated these meanings and ideas that I present in this research under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and according to the light given to me by the Lord:

- “Without father, without mother, without genealogy” is a **scientific medical legal report (a negation of paternity report) same** as those legitimate medical laboratory reports that affirm paternity or deny it in our time. None of the honorable servants of God or the writers of spiritual interpretation books have addressed the central scripture (Without a father, without a mother, without genealogy, Hebrews 3:7), from a scientific perspective or as a reference to the humanity of Christ and the incarnation of the Son which what the researcher did when he based his research on this scripture. In other words, all servants of God have dealt with this scripture from the perspective of the divinity of the Son or the uniqueness of the priesthood of Christ. This is not because of their lack or lax research, but because the scientific aspect of the concept of the word **“genealogy”** did not shine and became clear except recently after the discovery of genes and DNA, and therefore I consider this declaration is a light for this generation (the generation of multi questions), and I always believe in God has a new light for every

new generation. And I also say that the more scientific discoveries, the more certain we will be in the validity of the Bible and wonder by the greatness and accuracy of the scripture in our hands.

- The virgin conception of Christ in its essence is a miracle of **“separation of genealogy”**. This, in turn, is the biblical scientific answer to the wrong old idea said that **“the child Jesus is holy because in the miracle of the virgin conception of Christ, the Holy Spirit came upon the virgin Mary, and the power of the Most High overshadowed her, which led to purifying her and making her without sin, and therefore her child Jesus came without sin”**. The child Jesus came with holy humanity without sin because his genealogy was separated from Mary by the miracle of the Virgin conception, not because the Virgin Mary was purified and made without sin.
- Jesus Christ is **“the seed of the women, not the genealogy of Mary”**. This, in turn, illustrates the dimensions and depths of the motherhood bond between Mary and Christ, that it is the motherhood of the seed, not the motherhood of the genealogy, that it is his mother on the one hand and not his mother on the other. None of the previous writers addressed the genealogy of Mary mentioned in the Gospel of Luke 3 from a theological aspect. Also, no one explained the absence of Mary’s name in that genealogy from the

theological aspect, all have dealt with it from the angle of Jewish tradition and contemporary culture at the time.

- It is known that Jesus Christ in his humanity is **biologically without father** as he came through miraculous virgin conception, but **the new** that I presented here in this research with many sharp new proofs is that he is also **genealogically without mother** according to genealogy only, as he is only seed of the women without being her genealogy (**DNA and genes are taken from her but not matching or identical to her**). To say that Jesus in his humanity is without mother even after explanation clarifying that he is without mother from genealogy side only and not absolutely, is a little shocking truth to some people, but the truth is solid, the doctrine is concrete and the verse that the truth had been built on is very clear (without father, without mother, without genealogy).
- Revealing the purpose of the scripture from the declaration that Jesus Christ is a **(male)** boy and not just a **(man)**, and the importance of this declaration in discovering new dimensions and depths in the conception of Christ miracle, especially it was an virgin conception without any intervention of Joseph the fiancé of Mary.
- I can say that the Blessed Virgin Mary was the **connecting ring** between Jesus and the house of David

“connection of the seed”; at the same time, she was the **separating point** between Jesus and the fallen race of Adam **“separation of the genealogy”**.

- Jesus Christ, in his humanity through the miracle of the Virgin Conception, has come both, **seed and root together at the same time**, seed of David and root of David, because with this miracle he came seed without genealogy (the seed of David, not the genealogy of David), and this is one of the deepest secrets and most precious jewels of the miracle of the Virgin conception of Christ. None of the previous writers have dealt with the scripture in Revelation 22, which talks about Jesus as the root and the seed of David, in terms of humanity. For all have addressed the scripture that Jesus is the root of David in His divinity and the seed of David in His humanity, even though this scripture talks about Jesus as the root and the seed of David in His humanity as it has been explained thoroughly in the research.
- The scientific expression **“without genealogy”**, and the spiritual expression **“without will”** are two faces of the same coin.
- The miracle of the virgin conception of Christ is a **re-coding** of living DNA and not re-creating of a new DNA living material out of nothingness.
- The virgin conception of Christ was a necessity so that the characteristics of God would **be in harmony** with each other, and without contradiction. **If He came as**

a created being this would discredit His divinity and the fact that He is eternal, and if He came born from a natural usual conception and not a miraculous virgin one that would discredit His divinity and the fact that He is holy.

- Man Jesus Christ is **a heir and a non-heir at the same time**, a heir to the throne of David because he is the seed of David, and is not a heir to Adam's sin because he is not genealogy of Adam.
- Jesus Christ is a **king** because he is the seed of David, and a **priest** because he is not the genealogy of Levi (priest in order to Melchizedek).
- **Unpacking and decoding** of the mystery and code of the appearance of Melchizedek in this mysterious and puzzling encoded way on the pages of revelation is one of the exclusive interpretations in this research.
- **"Zygote of the Holy Bible"** is one of the exclusive expressions in this research.
- The **virgin revelation** with the written word (Scripture) in the same style of the **virgin conception** with the incarnated word (Christ).
- The written word (scripture) is **the seed of the minds of the writers of the scripture, not the genealogy of the minds of the writers of the scripture**, the seed (holy men of God **spoke** moved by the Holy Ghost) and not the genealogy (**no prophecy ever came by human will**).

- Jesus Christ in his humanity is the first (**genetically**) because he is without genealogy and the second (**chronologically**) because he is a seed.
- Jesus Christ is the first that there is no first before him; however, He has no beginning (eternal), and the last one after which there is no other; however, He has no end (everlasting). He is the last after which there is no other, and for which there is no end.
- Christ is the fruit of the womb (**born**) and not the fruit of the earth (**created**).
- Christ had to be born, not created, to share **the same** flesh and blood that we shared but without sin, not only to be able to die, but also to be able to **represent us** before God.
- The differentiation between **“Substitution + Presence (for me), and Substitution - Presence (instead of me)”** to describe the work of redemption of Christ on the cross, and the difference between the word **“for me”** and the word **“instead of me”**.
- Jesus Christ in his humanity is not anything different from Adam, but not just (only) Adam.
- The new creation is creation (**in**) and not creation (**from**), creation **in Christ** and not creation **from nothingness** like the first creation.

- Christ to him all the glory has raised the dead by **direct order** (Lazarus) and by **direct action** (the bodies of the lying saints who were raised, when to him the glory gave his last breath).
- The new creation is that God will make again **(everything)** new and not that God will create another creation out of **(nothing)**.
- Christ in his life **revived the dead** and in his death he **abolished the death**.
- Reveal the secrets and the dimensions of the phrase mentioned in john 20:7 **“and the cloth that had been on Jesus’ head, not lying with the linen wrappings but rolled up in a place by itself”**.
- Christ did not own a stater (coin) to pay the tax, but He owned His blood to purchase the church.

References

PREMOON

References

• The first group

- ❖ The Holy Spirit, who opened the mind and gave the first spark, which in turn ignited and drew the mind to research this issue from this scientific and linguistic point of view.
- ❖ Bible Arabic version of Smith Vandyke.
- ❖ Bible English version NKJV
- ❖ Bible English version NRSV
- ❖ Bible English version NIV
- ❖ Strong dictionary of word meanings in Greek and Hebrew.
- ❖ Thayer dictionary of word meanings in native languages
- ❖ KJC Dictionary of Word Meanings in Native Languages
- ❖ Cyclopedia and Wikipedia has been used to research, know and review some scientific, historical and linguistic parts.
- ❖ **رياض- يوسف**، كتاب المزامير المسياوية، الناشر مكتبة الأخوة، القاهرة، الطبعة الأولى ٢٠٠٢
- ❖ **كولينز- فرانسيس**، كتاب لغة الله أو لغة الإله، ترجمة د. صلاح الفضلي، مكتبة الكويت الوطنية، ٢٠١٦

• The second group

وفيهما أسرد الكتب والمراجع التي إستعنت بها خلال بحثي هذا، والتي تناولت النص المحوري في هذا البحث (بلا أب بلا أم بلا نسب عب ٧:٣) من زوايا أخرى خلاف تلك الزاوية العلمية الطبية التي أشرت إليها في هذا البحث:

❖ **الأب متى المسكين**، كتاب الرسالة الى العبرانيين شرح ودراسة أغنى الرسائل في التعرف على شخص المسيح، مطبعة دير القديس أنبا مقار، القاهرة، الطبعة الثانية ٢٠٠١

❖ **إتلي. بوب**، سلسلة الدليل الدراسي التفسيرية للعهد الجديد، الجزء العاشر، الرسالة الى العبرانيين، Bible Lessons International, Marshall, Texas. ١٩٩٩

❖ **إدي. وليم**، مجلد الكنز الجليل في تفسير الإنجيل، الجزء الثامن، شرح العبرانيين إلى الرؤيا، مجمع الكنائس في الشرق الأدنى، بيروت، ١٩٧٣

❖ **القديس أثناسيوس الرسولي**، كتاب تجسد الكلمة، نقله للعربية دكتور جوزيف موريس فلتس، الناشر مؤسسة القديس أنطونيوس، المركز الأرثوذكسي للدراسات الأبائية، القاهرة، الطبعة الأولى ٢٠٠٢

❖ **القديس يوحنا ذهبي الفم**، كتاب تفسير الرسالة الى العبرانيين، ترجمها الى العربية دكتور سعيد حكيم يعقوب، مؤسسة القديس أنطونيوس - المركز الأرثوذكسي للدراسات الأبائية، القاهرة، الطبعة الثانية ٢٠١٥

❖ **القمص يعقوب. تادرس ملطي**، تفسير وأقوال الأباء، ١٩٨٢، يقول في تفسيره أن المسيح بلا أب من جهة الناسوت وبلا أم من جهة اللاهوت

❖ **أيرونساييد. ه**، دراسات في الرسالة إلى العبرانيين، Loizeaux Brothers, INC، نيوجرسي، الطبعة الأولى ١٩٣٢، مترجم الى العربية بواسطة فريق من المترجمين.

❖ **باركلي وليم**، كتاب تفسير العهد الجديد، الرسالة الى العبرانيين، مترجم للعربية بواسطة القس جرجس هابيل، الناشر دار الثقافة، القاهرة، ١٩٧٥

- ❖ **براون-دان**، كتاب شيفرة دافنتشي، "The Da Vinci code" for Dan brown، مترجم للعربية بواسطة (سمة محمد عبد ربه)، الناشر هو الدار العربية للعلوم، الطبعة الأولى ٢٠٠٤
- ❖ **جبور-أسبيرو**، كتاب سر التدبير الإلهي (التجسد)، سوريا، الطبعة الأولى ١٩٨٠
- ❖ **جوثري-دونالد**، كتاب التفسير الحديث للكتاب المقدس، العهد الجديد، الرسالة الى العبرانيين، ترجمة القس بختيت متي، دار الثقافة، ١٩٩٤، النسخة الإنجليزية الأصلية منشورة بواسطة Inter-Varsity Press، England، ١٩٨٢
- ❖ **داربي-جون نيلسون**، موجز أسفار الكتاب المقدس، الجزء الخامس من رسالة تسالونيكى الأولى الى سفر الرؤيا، بيت عنيا- مركز المطبوعات المسيحية، القاهرة، الطبعة الأولى ٢٠١٤
- ❖ **سفير-أدولف**، كتاب تفسير رسالة العبرانيين، مطبوعات مكتبة الإخوة، القاهرة،
- ❖ **سميث-هاميلتون**، كتاب شرح موجز فى الرسالة الى العبرانيين، مطبوعات بيت عنيا، القاهرة
- ❖ **كلارك-أدم**، Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible, Hebrews, Published in 1810-1826 - E-Sword App
- ❖ **كوزيك-ديفيد**، كتب تفسير وشرح الكتاب المقدس، العبرانيين، خدمة الكلمة الثابتة (الباقية) «Enduring word Arabic»، ٢٠٢٠
- ❖ **كوفيليه-إليان**، كتاب ميلاد وطفولة ابن الله (يسوع المسيح في بشارة متي)، تعريب القس يوسف سمير، الناشر دار الثقافة، القاهرة، ٢٠١٠
- ❖ **كول-جراهام أ**، سلسلة الدراسات الحديثة في اللاهوت الكتابي ٣٠، كتاب الله الذي أصبح بشراً (اللاهوت الكتابي للتجسد)، إيليني الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية، تم التعريب بواسطة ناردين موريس، والنشر بواسطة دار النشر الأسقفية، بالقاهرة، ٢٠١٦
- ❖ **ماك أرثر-جون**، تفسير الكتاب المقدس، نسخة الكتاب المقدس فاندايك-البستاني الجديدة، رسالة العبرانيين، دار منهل الحياة، لبنان، الطبعة الثانية ٢٠١٢

- ❖ **موسى. سلوان**، كتاب سر التجسد، الناشر تعاونية النور الأرثوذكسية للنشر والتوزيع، بيروت، ٢٠٠٦
- ❖ **هنري. متي**، مجلد التفسير الكامل للكتاب المقدس، العهد الجديد، الجزء الثاني، مترجم للعربية بواسطة مجموعة من الخدام المسيحيين تحت إشراف المعلم الأستاذ جوزيف صابر، الرسالة الى العبرانيين صفحة ٥١٥، مطبوعات إيجلز، القاهرة، طبعة أولى ٢٠٠٢
- ❖ **هول. ف.ب.**، كتاب دراسة فى رسالة العبرانيين، مترجم للعربية بواسطة رشدى ميخائيل، دار الإخوة للنشر، القاهرة، الطبعة الأولى ٢٠٠٦
- ❖ **يسى. أديب**، كتاب دراسة فى الرسالة الى العبرانيين، مطبوعات مكتبة الإخوة، القاهرة، ٢٠١٨

• The third group

- عدم ذكر اسم مريم أو أن يسوع هو ابن مريم فى السلسلة الواردة فى لوقا ٣ هو حتمية لاهوتية وليس فقط ثقافية، وهذه أحد النقاط الحصرية فى هذا البحث، وهو ما لم يذكره أو يتطرق إليه أى من الكتاب والمفسرين لشرح سلسلة نسب مريم الواردة فى لوقا ٣، وأسرد بعض هذه الكتب والمراجع التي تناولت بالشرح سلسلة النسب الواردة فى لوقا ٣:
- ❖ **الأب متى المسكين**، الإنجيل بحسب القديس لوقا دراسة وتفسير وشرح، مطبعة دير القديس أنبا مقار- وادي النطرون، القاهرة، طبعة أولى ١٩٩٨
 - ❖ **إدي. وليم**، مجلد الكنز الجليل فى تفسير الإنجيل، الجزء الثاني، شرح إنجيلي مرقس ولوقا، مجمع الكنائس فى الشرق الأدنى، بيروت، ١٩٧٣
 - ❖ **أمين موسى.** هلال، كتاب تفسير إنجيل لوقا، مطبعة الإخوة، القاهرة، الطبعة الثالثة ٢٠٠٤
 - ❖ **بالكين. جون، كوتريل. بيتر، آخرون**، كتاب مدخل الى الكتاب المقدس، يشتمل على تحليل لكل سفر من أسفار الكتاب المقدس بعهديه القديم والجديد، إنجيل لوقا، نقله الى العربية نجيب إلياس، الناشر دار الثقافة، القاهرة، ١٩٩٣

- ❖ **باركلي وليم**، كتاب تفسير العهد الجديد، إنجيل لوقا، مترجم للعربية بواسطة القس جرجس هاويل، الناشر دار الثقافة، القاهرة، ١٩٧٥
- ❖ **داربي. جون نيلسون**، موجز أسفار الكتاب المقدس، الجزء الرابع (تفسير إنجيل يوحنا)، بيت عنيا- مركز المطبوعات المسيحية، القاهرة، الطبعة الأولى ٢٠١٤
- ❖ **عدلي. رضا**، سلسلة كلمة الحياة، مقدمات أسفار الكتاب المقدس، البشائر الأربع وسفر الاعمال (متى-مرقس-لوقا-يوحنا-أعمال الرسل)، الناشر دار الثقافة، القاهرة، ٢٠٠٧
- ❖ **سعيد. إبراهيم**، كتاب شرح بشارة لوقا للدكتور القس ابراهيم سعيد، الناشر دار الثقافة، القاهرة، ١٩٨٦
- ❖ **كوزيك. ديفيد**، كتب تفسير وشرح الكتاب المقدس، إنجيل لوقا، خدمة الكلمة الثابتة (الباقية) «Enduring word Arabic» ٢٠٢٠
- ❖ **ماك آرثر. جون**، كتاب تفسير الكتاب المقدس، نسخة الكتاب المقدس- فاندريك البستاني الجديدة، إنجيل لوقا، الناشر دار منهل الحياة، لبنان، الطبعة الثانية ٢٠١٢
- ❖ **موريس. ليون**، كتاب التفسير الحديث للكتاب المقدس، العهد الجديد، إنجيل لوقا، ترجمة نيكلس نسيم، المحرر المتول جوزيف صابر، الناشر دار الثقافة، القاهرة، ١٩٩١
- ❖ **هنري. متى**، مجلد التفسير الكامل للكتاب المقدس، العهد الجديد، الجزء الأول، مترجم للعربية بواسطة مجموعة من الخدام المسيحيين تحت إشراف المعلم الأستاذ جوزيف صابر، إنجيل لوقا، مطبوعات إيجلز، القاهرة، طبعة أولى ٢٠٠٢

PREVIEW