

11-29-2010

**Ethereal Virginity —a Dispatch to Young People**

Dear E \_\_\_\_\_,

I feel the joy of the Lord when I see that you and the group continue to meet to study weekly. It is wonderful that the focus of your study now is the MSC's latest book, 5.0 entitled, *Confederacy Trap*. Such is certain to garner for you much benefit. It is also a good thing that the teachers of that group touch base with me to assist them in their doctrinal challenges. The great expanse of geography which separates us limits personal, face-to-face communion. You asked the following questions:

**E-mail One**

*"This past Sabbath [20-Nov-2010], as the E\_\_\_\_\_ group continues to study the *Confederacy Trap*, a question was posed by one of the young women in the group re: whether or not Mary (mother of Jesus) was still considered a virgin after being impregnated by God the Father---Luke 1:35. We were differentiating the virgin woman in Isaiah and the child born to her, Immanuel, and how they did not fit the profile of Mary and Jesus. Then the question around whether or not the 'Highest' actually impregnated Mary by physical penetration, hence the need for the Holy Ghost to act as a barrier, was posed. There are some in the group that believes that 'Father did 'know' Mary, as Father is a Man (i.e. Son of Man, '...no man knows the Father except...' and '...let Us make man in Our image...' etc). I cannot find anywhere to say Mary was prophesied to be a virgin when she gave birth, but only that she was a 'virgin espoused to a man' thus providing further differentiation to the virgin woman in Isaiah 'who shall conceive and bear a son'. Is this revelation further 'KNOWledge' of God? Would this be the first time Father actually came to Earth if He physically penetrated Mary in order to impregnate her? This understanding can also open up questions around Christ and His Righteous Sexuality. If Father can impregnate a woman, can Christ? In addition, you touched on the virtue of being a 'virgin', and so was Mary considered 'blessed' because she was a virgin or because of the Highest 'KNOWing' Mary or because of the 'fruit of [her] womb'?" —Your E-mail, Tuesday, November 23, 2010 11:34 PM. Parenthesis belong; brackets added*

These questions engendered by a “young woman” and then expanded by others in your group have pointed you in several diverging directions —some are relevant to our work. The one that I find most beneficial is the “virtue of being a virgin” as it pertains to Mary’s favor with God. This very issue, appropriately raised by a “young woman” in your group, opens up the Bible to give practical lessons in righteousness today. In order to expound, all, young and old, must first gain

**MASTERY OVER SPIRITUAL LAXITY.**~~~~~The questions that have sprouted forth from the original are quite diversionary or loosely reined to the subject, “is Mary the virginal woman described in the prophecy of *Isa seven*?” Before expressing how this is so, let me commensurate: It requires great discipline to harness the intellectual energy needed to stay on subject because the book is very doctrinally compressed and challenging —more so than other subjects of prior study in ages past. The heightened challenge can be illustrated by considering the difference between consuming milk and steak. The latter requires much more intensity of mastication. Quite naturally then, to mix metaphors, our flesh compels our spirit to seek an easier path, one allowing greater laxity, a slope not so steep and a path not so narrow. Resultantly, if not careful, we fail to resist temptation by foregoing the “difficult chew”, the intellectually-challenging themes of the book and to, instead, pick up on topics which, by their divergence, relax our minds.

Much hard evidence has been given in the book to show that, as the details of the prophecy demand, *Isa seven* does not precisely “profile” the experience of Mary and Jesus. If we ignore the

## *Ethereal Virginity — a Dispatch to Young People*

non-applicable distinctions, then, not knowing which facets of the prophecy are true and which are to be ignored, we can benefit from none of it. Such a theology of darkness does not honor the Lord's promise in *Matt five* which says that all prophecies, down to the jot and the tittle, will be fulfilled. We should not harbor doubt by occupying time and energy seeking to find the weakest link in the MSC's analysis to challenge its explanations about the virgin birth unless we can provide a superior study which harmonizes both Texts in a better way. If, after the entirety of world history, no better explanation can be given by any, all must accept the light and count the experience to be a victory over spiritual laxity. Yet, on one level, we cannot deny that Jesus was Immanuel. To explain, I must first quote to you another E-mail, one where you expanded your above question:

### **E-mail Two**

*“One questioned how it states 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet' but our understanding today re: the text in Isa seven does not pertain to Mary and Jesus. I gave the lesson around the understanding how the Comforter or 'the angel of the LORD' and the inspiration (prophecy) that men receive from the Comforter may fail as stated by Paul in 1 Cor. 13. In this case, the Comforter gave Joseph inspiration re: Mary and the birth of Jesus and tied it with Isa seven. Today, we can see that Isa seven fulfillment did not come to fruition 2000 years ago as explained in your book. So we can extend this lesson to those inspired by the Comforter, like EGW and VTH, the Comforter's understanding is limited and those prophecy and understanding will fail, unlike the Father or the Lord, Whose Words never fail. Furthermore, this passage in Matthew differentiates 'angel of the LORD' with 'spoken of the Lord by the prophet'. I thought I'd share this with you as you reply to those who continue to question the inspiration of the Holy Ghost to EGW and VTH to be equal to the Bible”*—Your E-mail, Sun 11/28/2010 1:27 AM.

Our work is not to impeach the Comforter's efficacy for the church. We must understand that He, being directed by Christ, delivered the exact same message which was intended. The same applies to the New-Testament, Gospel-declaring prophets including Matthew, EGW and VTH. The resolution to the issue is not to denigrate the Comforter's work as we compare it with that of Father or Christ; instead, it is to encourage all to reject “shame” and become careful students. Simply put, the diligent students must wisely case their question as follows: “Does *Matt one*, disagree with *Isa seven*”, and if it does, then, “Why do I feel inclined to elevate the lessons of *Matt one* above *Isa seven*”? Further, they should ask, “Has God given me wisdom to deny any of His Word?” If the heart is searched and honesty prevails, the only answer available is found in the cozy couch of spiritual malaise, the zeal for students to remain “settled on their lees”. They are tempted to prefer the false security of their traditionally-inherited and popular ideas above the seemingly disorienting dilemma of new light. If this bottom-line issue were not the case, then why do they not discredit *Matt one* because of what *Isa seven* reveals? Or why does not the inquiring one seek the more arduous task to discern, “How to rank the Scriptures;” how to heed the commission to, “**Study to shew thyself APPROVED unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, RIGHTLY DIVIDING THE WORD OF TRUTH.**” —2Tim 2: 15. Paul, in this Text, speaks directly to the younger Timothy, his “own son in the faith”(1Tim 1: 2), these applicable words of wisdom. He suggests that it is shameful to not apply ones energies in study and to rely instead upon others to divest them of their traditionally inherited ideas. Young people, particularly young females (as your *E-mail one* so designated), need not make this counsel to be applicable to only men or “workmen”; instead, the counsel should be, for those seeking leadership, considered generic and inclusive of both males and females. But if they chose to allow the men in their lives, their husbands, to shoulder this burden of study, then they must do so in accordance to heaven's justice: They must welcome for him all of the Lord's rewards for his due diligence, his struggle and exertion to attain God's “approval”. It is wrong for them to saddle him with their burden and then seek to jealously deny to him his greater reward. They too can win the benefits of discipleship as they garner mastery over spiritual laxity. Thus, it is my hope that all who have pressed these questions upon you have carefully studied the answers already given in the book, 5.0.

Having said these preliminary comments, I must answer the issue by saying, we have absolutely no contradiction between *Matt one* and *Isa seven*. *Matt one*, commanded to Joseph by the

Comforter is expressed as follows: “...**the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph...thou shalt call his name Jesus**”—Matt 1: 20, 21. This is a “thou shalt”, a commandment expressed directly from heaven; it manifested the Father’s privilege to name His son. Those who ignore this command must bear the responsibility that comes with commandment breaking. After the command, Matthew, the Bible commentator, next gave an interpretation and said, “**Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.**” —verses 22, 23. Matthew was merely interpreting a prophecy, and as you correctly alluded to, all New Testament (NT) prophecies shall fail. We know for a certainty that Matthew’s prophetic interpretation was destined to fail for, in his theological exegesis, he only loosely quoted *Isa seven* leaving many of the specific details out—a glaringly obvious criterion to identify all partial prophecies. The very words, “partial prophecy” perfectly summarizes Matthew’s exegesis of *Isa seven*! Consequently, if there ever was such a thing as a “milk interpretation”, Matthews gives to us the best example.

But, keep it upper utmost in mind, having the vantage point to comment more than 34 years later, after the ascension, Matthew looked backwards upon Jesus’ work. If you read with laxity instead of intensity, you may presume that the two separate details from Joseph’s dream to Matthew’s interpretation, events compressed in three consecutive verses, were all contemporaneous; that is, you may be duped to think that moments after Joseph’s dream, Matthew was handed his interpretation of both Joseph’s dream and *Isa seven*. The truth is, Matthew gave to us “a principle of the doctrine of Christ” by saying, “**they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.**” He gave to us a NT prophecy, one that now can be ranked as either milk or strong meat so that we, as approved workmen, may “**rightly divide the word of truth**”.

This factor, given consideration, commends and inspires us to praise the Comforter’s work, ascribing to it great accuracy, as we realize that Matthew gave to us a true prophecy: Humanity has, and now still does, call Jesus by a name which violates heaven’s commandment; they do indeed call Jesus by the name Immanuel. Beyond that, the MSC, though it holds to the exact promise of Immanuel given in *Isa seven*, still does not disagree with the world’s expanded use of the name; instead it trumpets this validated prophecy from the proverbial roof top. It accedes to Matthew’s doctrine that teaches to us the intricacies of Jesus’ ministry: That the God of the Old-Testament was with them, the disciples, as expressed through Jesus’ ministry. Is not this the very center piece of the MSC’s doctrine as expounded from *Deut 18*? Jesus had help in His teaching: God was with Him—in perfect affirmation of Matthew’s interpretation. In fact, by His help, he delivered to us the very teachings of the Highest. Thus did He prove this fact by uttering the following words released from the Father: “**Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness.**” —John 3: 11. To use *Matt one* to cancel *Isa seven* is a different matter, one of convenience and of extreme spiritual malaise. Like an inefficient carpenter who nails with his lumber instead of using the iron head of his hammer, such Bible tactics cannot ever become the “workmanship” of which God can approve. Neither Isaiah nor Matthew have ever said that Immanuel has only one application, that God cannot be with any others apart from the man profiled in *Isa seven*. On the other hand, the name Immanuel as deployed by the *mustard seed* is accompanied by 242 pages of documentation. The difference in usage of the name is not unlike the title, pilot; it “**which being interpreted is**” one who can navigate an airplane. Because you find one pilot, does that mean there are no others? Now if you more specifically define the term pilot, as *Isa seven* does the term Immanuel, then you have a different matter. You may define a pilot who flies for *Air Canada*, then you eliminate all other pilots who fly other airlines. Without further beating this dead horse, the sum of the matter is simple: The Comforter warned us of the price we must pay for maturity: It is mastery over spiritual laxity. He said that when we consume strong meat, we will ‘**leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ and go on unto perfection**’ —Heb 6: 1. Today the *mustard seed* has heeded this wisdom; it distributes

## *Ethereal Virginity — a Dispatch to Young People*

important, Bible-validated, Comforter-inspired, God-the-Father-endorsed strong meat which journey beyond Matthew's partially-prophetic interpretation and accepts the perfected light on Immanuel.

Moving onto other issues from your *E-mail one*; righteousness demands that we look to the Bible evidence supplied for our faith without seeking to uncover intricacies beyond what the Bible has chosen to give to us. Compliant to this counsel, we must not seek to increase our "knowledge of God" by seeking to peer into the unrevealed details of His impregnation of Mary. Nonetheless, the questions seeking more details about Mary's virginity can win a ministerial assignment for us as it compels us to assess the heretofore hidden, albeit significant value of female virginity. Before venturing onto that subject, we must first address issues pertaining to:

**THE PRIVACY OF SEXUALITY.**~~~~~For both young people and old, it is hypocritical and dishonorable for them to extol their needs for privacy while they find cause to demand the complete picture and perfect knowledge when it comes to God. Few, even in their graying maturity, want to contemplate the sexual activity of their elderly parents; yet they profess to "know" their natural parents all while they are agreeable to accept the fact that such things are done privately, veiled from the vast public's vivid view. Instead of this same deferential respect for God, they demand all the details pertaining to His interaction with Mary. Sometimes, the only intimate facts that parents give to us is our birth date; this they do leaving us in the lurch pertaining to all other related details, and for them we harness our curiosity with nil a protest. We never feel that we have been cheated from knowing them because we do not know their private functions. Like the perfect parent, God will tell us what we need to know; He did so in *Luke one* with details more generous than those surrendered to us by our parents. We must accept those words, and if we are still driven by unharnessed curiosities —ever seeking sensationalism— we have license to relieve our inquisitive minds by turning our focus towards understanding our own sexual history and its impact upon us now. If we demand the exposure of Father's "unrevealed" secrets; then, in righteousness, should we not accept the same principles of full disclosure pertaining to ourselves? We must remember that God is a Man, and having done so, heed the Lord's counsel now reminded to us by the Comforter, "**And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.**" —Luke 6: 31. If we demand complete knowledge pertaining to Father's insemination of Mary, then will we likewise rejoice if He reveals our own hidden, sexual secrets, the things that we do in our privacy?

One question which has a Bible answer is an exception to this rule of sexual curiosity: You pose the question, did Father physically penetrate Mary? My search of the Bible reveals an answer that Father is a spirit; therefore, though He did inseminate Mary, He would not have "physically" penetrated her. Jesus affirms this finding for He said, "**...handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have**" —Luke 24: 39. To venture beyond that Bible answer requires for one to understand the spiro-biological nature of Spirits/spirits. Should we not first master the physical biology of man? If the Lord has revealed to us earthly things, as revealed more fully below in our study of ethereal virginity, and they are perplexing causing us to recoil with shyness, then the Lord asks, "**how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?**" —John 3: 12

The MSC merely explained what the Bible teaches: Father inseminated Mary. That is validated fact enough to prove that Jesus did not pre-exist His conception. It has no Bible basis to explore beyond that description or to speculate more deeply into the conception of Jesus. What is needed, seeing that the term is deployed both literally and spiritually —as is the case with the 144,000— is a more careful definition yielding a

**REFINED CONCEPT OF VIRGINITY.**~~~~~Regarding Mary's station as a virgin after impregnation, what possible difference does it really make for the Gospel today? Especially is this question germane since we know that her conception did not fulfill the promise of *Isa seven*. How does knowing the physical, bodily evidence garnered after Father's insemination of her bring any clarity to the questions that arise from the book, 5.0? If she was afterwards left with

verifiable, physiological changes, would that help to prove that she was the virgin of Isaiah's prophecy? Could you take that as a just basis to wrongly divide the word of truth and elevate Matthew's prophesy above Isaiah's? Instead of pondering to uncover more insight about Mary's virginity, we should elevate the concept and standard of female virginity amongst ourselves allowing today's daughters to likewise win heaven's favor. Recent Bible studies have shown that, in the first dominion, the Lord highly prized virgins, women who contained themselves until marriage. Men, perceiving the Lord's very high standards, servants after His own heart, must grow to appreciate virginity exalting it to the same heightened perch of sanctity and virtue. Also and perhaps even more importantly, females today who fit the Bible definition need to know their elevated status with Christ allowing them to walk confidently in the approbation of God. Today female virgins receive very little respect and many eventually become violated and then trashed. Such is displeasing to the Lord as He demanded of those men of yesterday who were fortunate enough to marry such a prize to never put them away. In fact, in *Deut 22* the Lord issues a penalty for a husband who even-so-much-as insulted one of His "virgins of Israel", saying,

**"If any man take a wife, And go in unto her, and hate her, and give occasions of speech against her, and bring up an evil name upon her, and say, I took this woman, and when I came to her, I found her not a maid: Then shall the father of the damsel, and her mother, take and bring forth the tokens of the damsel's virginity unto the elders of the city in the gate...And they shall amerce him in an hundred shekels of silver, and give them unto the father of the damsel, because he hath brought up an evil name upon a virgin of Israel...he may not put her away all his days."** —Deut 22: 13-15, 19.

Exploring this commandment is central to this study. It includes several family members, the husband, the wife, and the parents. Therefore, a young woman, presumably after respecting and honoring the will of her parents', marries, she must be respected by her husband. Such respect must be given even though she may have character defects or personality qualities which are so drastic that her newly-wed husband, even after having had intercourse with her, causing her to lose all "**physical**" evidence of her virginity, develops "hatred" for her. It points to the true and psychologically hidden question behind the issue raised in your meeting. Even after her first sexual experience with her husband, this woman of virtue is still conveyed special honor; she is a figurative virgin, a woman that has honored heaven's high ideals, one who walks, not by the flesh, but by the spirit. Having been penetrated, she is not a literal virgin but an ethereal virgin. Instead of ignoring the insult to her, the Lord condemns her husband a man who first has had sex with her changing her physiological body, then who afterwards hates her and casts "**an evil name upon (her) a virgin of Israel**". Her virgin status is still preserved in the Lord's eyes as expressed in His identification of her, "a virgin of Israel". Such an ethereal value shows some marginal semblance of credibility to the erroneous position of the Catholic church when they laud "mother Mary" to be a perpetual virgin. Only in this newly revealed, MSC sense, even after she had other children in addition to Jesus, she was still lauded as virtuous by heaven. This is not unlike an Olympic, gold-medal-winning sprinter of yesterday, though he may never again repeat his feat to run a record-breaking, 40-yard dash, and though others afterwards may have achieved even greater speed, he is still eternally cited and recognized for his superior achievement, an Olympic gold-medal winner. Such is likewise, according to the above verse, an achievable honor available to most all women — not men— they merely need to strive for the gold! It could be the very reason why the Lord gave careful regard to Saul's wives after he died. Many were no doubt likewise ethereal virgins, women who have won the Lord's tender regard for preserving themselves until marriage. Thus, being exposed to facing their remaining days in husbandless isolation, the Lord gave them a highly-seated place under the protectorate of David's throne.

All women who resist the urge to have sexual relations before legitimately receiving a husband in marriage are likewise honored of the Lord, and their gold-medal achievement is recognized eternally. What about the others who have failed in this achievement; can the gentile culture find for them equal relief? Victory over sin will always be an achievement to which the Lord extends

### *Ethereal Virginity — a Dispatch to Young People*

special honors. But suffice it to say, not every participant in the race can be given the gold; some, because of their own life choices, must accept a reward of less virtue. Sadly, for such women, when their husbands become gripped with the spirit of jealousy, the Lord offers no protective consolation to assuage their wounded hearts, and honest answers to his, the husband's, prosecutorial inquisitions is the only formula for peace. Hidden within the above Text from *Deut 22*, and others like it, we as well have an acknowledgement of male, sexual and emotional instability. As shown in many Bible places, men can deeply burn in love for a woman, his heart could meditate upon her day and night—as explicitly shown in (*2Sam 13*) the story of David's son Amnon and Absalom's sister, Tamar—yet, after finally winning her and having sex with her, stealing away her virginity, he can then begin to hate her. This quality in men must be conveyed to all virgins for it plainly manifests that believing men who profess love before they get the woman is, even if genuine, not a good barometer to anticipate their feelings afterwards. To protect women from this fickle quality of men, the Lord mandated virginity on the daughters of Israel and when married, He commanded the men to, with few exceptions, never to put them away. It could be the very reason why He gave to Jacob Leah first and then, after several years of marriage to both Leah and Rachel, He took Rachel: Jacob may have deeply loved Rachel, but the record does not affirm that he maintained that emotion. A man's passions for a woman yesterday is simply not an indication of how he will feel tomorrow. Even today, the women who are displayed before us as beautiful, the movie stars, the models, the cheer leaders, those whom we admire and occupy the thoughts of our hearts, require much more than external beauty to sustain a man's love. These are considerations which all young women must take to heart; virginal or not, when they pray to the Lord for a specific man as a husband.

So we now have a standard of virtue: Only a virgin was given legal protection against her husband's profanity. Indeed, this issue is more complex than we ever perceived. Women, even the special virgins of Israel, obviously had other distasteful qualities. This can be proven by the fact that her husband could potentially grow to hate her even after being the first man to sexually penetrate her; yet, she was still prized by the Lord. This shows the love of Christ and the basis for His and therefore heaven's favor. It shows that women can win His favor and garner happiness without regard to the opinions of others. He gave absolutely no regard to the issues which preoccupy the male mind yielding spousal love or hate: He did not consider whether she was a nice woman, a beautiful woman, a wealthy woman, an educated woman, a drunken woman, a thin or fat woman, a light or dark-skinned woman, an argumentative woman, a quiet woman, a gossiping woman, a lazy woman, a woman devoid of kitchen skills, an infertile woman, a masculine-mannered woman, etc—she was credited favor merely by being a virgin woman. What is likewise noteworthy is that a physically-defined, technical virgin could have had, in her premarital history, various hidden sexual indiscretions—short of vaginal penetration. Such indiscretions done with other males, or females, or even by herself could likely yield a social demerit and potentially could yield an appalled reaction from her husband, a reaction that emotionally separates rather and joins them together. Just like developing males, females likewise also have intense sexual curiosity that is expressed in their naughty, adolescent or even adult behavior. These things in their private history cannot be used to bring public reproach or “**an evil name (upon) a virgin of Israel**”. How then today, in her husband's pursuit of “oneness” with her, should such hidden and guarded secrets ever be revealed? Only her husband, a man who has mastered the commission to cleave unto his wife, can rise to the task of gentle, private reprimand. This is facilitated by his imaginative suspicions and his inquisitions. He desires to cleave unto her; thus, as stated above, he must gain better knowledge of himself, his other half, the deeply hidden secrets of her intimacy. This he can now begin to do instead of exploring that which God has hidden, God's intimacies with Mary. How else could the two become one flesh when the wife hides her identity? Most all women have such hidden, sexual secrets for—like other biological functions—no one is born with full self control. It is only the maturation process which causes us to become upstanding beings. Nevertheless, many ethereal virgins, though now married legitimately have, as young premarital girls, behaved themselves badly, and their husbands having never properly valued virginity are oblivious to their

past. Despite the very naughty behavior of their youth, young girls who have often fantasize and acted upon relieving themselves sexually, the above biblical command still pertains. Again, with Christ, it did not matter; her virtue was vested merely in her refusal to illegally engage in premarital, vaginal penetration. If such was not the case, then her parents could not produce evidence to clear her name when her churlish husband brought offensive charges against her. Having now seen the Lord's favor extended to virgins of Israel, we have a basis to estimate the answer to your question and see His favor for Mary until the day of her death.

The refining concept of virginity gets deeper: Women who have never been penetrated before marriage, but who have other guarded indiscretions in their lives, are not left unpunished. It is possible that her husband's successful inquiry could yield much heartache for her from his reprimands and his prosecutorial investigation. But how can it be otherwise? How can the two ever become one flesh if the man does not fully perceive her true identity? Of a surety, she will repine, "my past does not matter." But if it truly did not matter, she would never point to the good things: her years of virginity, her educational experience, her fond memories of home life, her alluring physical dimensions of yesterday's petite figure, her good deeds and other awards of honor, etc. Women repel against the negative and private conducts of their past because the revelation of such deeds—some may still be presently practice—efface the false image, the mask behind which they hide. Thus, as done on a resume, they only list the positive qualities. Should such secrets, once revealed, bring to her disrepute, then she must willingly pay that price, a strike against her esteemed character. It is the reward for the true life that she has lived; yet, her husband cannot ever put her away for reasons other than adultery. Then, knowing in her life the fruits of her embarrassing indiscretions, she build a better society by teaching it to her daughters so that they may realize that "...**there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known**" — Matt 10: 26.

If this refined concept of virginity were not the intended meaning from *Deut 22*, then the Lord would have spoken of the above marital law differently: Instead of describing the offended woman as virgins, He could have used the same terminology used by Lot when he described the virtues of his daughters: Remember, he said, "**behold, I have two daughters who have not known a man**" — Gen 19: 8. The Expression, "not knowing a man", brings a more restrictive connotation: It implies that the damsels had not only never been vaginally penetrated, but that also they have never sexually fondled a man's genitals or personally stimulated him, or herself with him, in other ways. For to "know a man" is also an abstract concept: It is to know how to sexually and physically illicit excitement with him. Lot's daughters achieved that level of sexual discretion—at least as far as Lot knew.

Why then is it so important that a female

**AVOID PREMARITAL VAGINAL PENETRATION?**~~~~~The Lord assures us that all of His laws are for our own good. He says, "**And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee...to keep the commandments of the Lord, and his statutes, which I command thee this day FOR THY GOOD.**" —Deut 10: 12, 13. For the answer to this question, without an explicit Scripture to explain, we must seek access to the lessons taught to us by experience, the lessons which, when joined to a Bible theme, give to us a greater knowledge of good and evil. Such is an essential duty of a judge, the duty conveyed upon all disciples. We have the law carefully defined for us, and it must be resultantly respected by faith in its goodness. However, to teach its efficacy to our students and children, to show to them its purpose for our "good", we are required to use judgment. The Lord commanded as much: "**For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven**" —Matt 5: 20— "**Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees for ye...have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith...**" —Matt 23: 23. Judgment takes the Law and applies it to our unique circumstances.

### *Ethereal Virginity — a Dispatch to Young People*

The *mustard seed's* judgment is that a female's first vaginal penetration causes her internal size to be molded to the shape and size of that first man. Her joy in sex will not become re-accommodative if another man with different dimensions becomes her partner. The uncomfortable fit that comes when a non-virgin takes a husband, a different man than her first, will yield potential, future problems that will frustrate both of their joy as his fullness would not be well received to the optimal. Those who have this problem need not despair. The Lord has now freed up other eccentric expressions of sexuality, revealed in prior studies, which were denied to the faithful under previous ministries. These imaginative expressions allow for creativity and can also bring joy. Yet, as women keep secrets, so do men, and he, out of love and sensitivity to her, may never articulate to her his frustrations. But wisdom demands that all options be kept open; therefore, it is 'for both his and her good' that women preserve themselves from any vaginal penetration until her wedding night. Let this be our message to young people.

This fact neatly summarizes the earthly reality that we must know to measure our steps in life before we begin to explore heavenly things. Enough food for thought has now been given so that all may uncover the hazards of

**EXPANDING THE FORTRESS.**~~~~~Sadly, today in Assyrian society, men have little to no regard for virgins; this yields oppression and hardship for all. Her men often take virginal women and, by not ascribing to them any special merit, abuse and misuse them then, at some point in their lives, they recklessly discard them. In this they multiply sexual frustration. This also puts men on an eternal search for a compatible sexual partner; as they scan the horizon, they use as temporary stand ins the women who are their current sex partners. This multiplied threat to the home causes the women to become more and more insecure and fearful of abandonment. Disease spreads; marital strife multiplies; male honor and integrity is lessened, and the fiber of society erodes. All of this comes by the obliteration of the standard of female chastity. This is the evil result of a society that has likewise trashed the righteousness of the Law.

More can be inferred to answer your question about Mary's value to heaven. Her value was not merely due to some physiological boundary set for herself and her husband; instead, it is a statement of a woman's commitment to righteousness. Such a commitment is validated and authenticated by her physiological status; however, her value extends beyond her wedding night as indicated above. A woman who has never been married but has had several sexual partners is not, at least in OT times, given the same value. The virgin struggles, sometimes against enormous pressure, to withhold herself from other men until the right man arrives. For this she should be considered by all wise men and women to be a hero. This forbearance is a statement of character, of self-denial, of honor to God and her parents. She is making a personal commitment to preserve the purity of the Lord's kingdom by self control. Mary, a woman who was thusly preserved, by agreeing to receive the Father's insemination neither degraded herself, nor the Kingdom, nor any standard of purity; to the contrary, she was counted blessed because she gave opportunity for heaven to exalt humanity.

Her blessed status with heaven yesterday is a good topic to discuss with the group. The same cannot be encouraged regarding the question of the Father's impregnation of Mary. It cannot because this has been an issue—not of new light, but—for Christians to courageously resolve over the past 2000 years. In fact, Jesus' standing as the Son of God was an issue for debate at Nicaea in the fourth century. The church has been timid and shy failing to discuss the specific, Bible facts even about the issues that have been revealed pertaining to Mary's conception; the MSC has not. Therefore, the full brunt of human titillation and curiosity regarding this issue is not to become a matter for the *mustard seed's* ministry to dissolve in its limited time. It as a topic, not being new light, falls within the jurisdiction of all honest Christians, a Catholic, a Baptist, an Adventist, etc. All can put away their Christmas-card clichés and read *Luke one* to embrace the entirety of the Bible-revealed details of this question. The MSC has sought to educate Davidia by merely pointing to the Christmas story so as to affirm that Jesus did not pre-exist. This is its contribution to that Bible drama, the issue which it is called to explain. This assignment has been difficult enough and has yielded enough controversy. Yet, the *mustard seed* boldly takes responsibility for its teachings,

and it fields all questions thereto pertaining. Many of the older, 2006 E-mails proves this point by the discussion therein contained pertaining to Jesus' conception. With the release of the book, 5.0, there are some new perspectives which can contribute to the conversation and the study that are very appropriate. To cite a few, you may decide to consider the issue of Jesus' being formed in the womb, the fable of Jesus existing before His conception, the definition of conception, the eternal sonship of Christ, etc. Instead of these issues, some choose to strain over the well-known Christmas story. To them, this question should be asked: Since the MSC has not changed the Bible account or has not unfolded any additional Bible studies found elsewhere in Scripture to expand our understanding of "divine sexuality", then what was your belief regarding Mary's impregnation before you studied the MSC? Or, why did not the issues beforehand evoke or arouse your curiosity? For two thousand years we have known this Bible account; therefore, what were the answers to your inquisitive spirit before you began to study the MSC? If it was a non issue then, why not make it a non issue now? The MSA, today's light, was given the burden to plainly articulate the *Testimony of Jesus*. This is an enormous assignment for Immanuel requiring great discipline to fulfill. The MSA, in the book, 5.0, has 246 pages of doctrine which it is prepared to defend. Why should any add to that well defended fortress by expanding the message therein contained? Think for a moment of the burden you seek to place upon the MSA and upon yourself presuming authorship over the Father's unrevealed works. Any misspoken word, any slip of the tongue, any misconception or misrendering will be used to impeach your credibility and do harm to our heaven-appointed Gospel. The result of such a "black eye" will seduce some to discredit the MSC for a story that it did not originally interpret or originate. It would compel heretofore attentive students to backslide under the ministries of people who can not give better answers and who have slyly ignored or fablelized this issue for 2000 years.

In final summation, from reading your questions, it appears that you were discussing Immanuel of *Isa seven*, and then someone piped out the question leading to a diversion from the topic at hand. The response should have led to your question, do you see anything in *Isa seven*, *Luke one*, or *Matt one* which affirms the traditional teaching that Jesus is Immanuel? If so, have you examined the book's reply to those presumptions? The book shows that Mary's child shall be named Jesus; yet, it also says, 'He shall be called Immanuel,' do you understand the linguistic difference? Finally, can you uncover any reason why we should do honor to traditional thought and abandon the Bible-founded doctrines of the book? Both the MSC and the *Rod* give ample evidence to prove that Immanuel, described, in *Isa seven*, is not a description of Jesus. This evidence is the issue which the MSC has contributed to the Christian discussion. Let us not diverge from that solid foundation and venture upon less stable ground.

Sincerely,

Derek