amount to invalidation. Paul acknowledges the writings of both Matthew and Luke as scripture, because he quotes passages from them as such (1Tm 5:18, Mtt 10:10, Lke 10:7).

Why then should we think that Paul would not accept the accounts of Jesus's birth, in the writings of Matthew and Luke, also as scripture, and therefore just as true as any other scripture?

But is the rest of the New Testament really silent about the virgin birth? Whenever it uses the term "the Son of God", it implies agreement with the reason that Gabriel gave for calling Jesus "the Son of God".

Mary pointed out to the angel that she was a virgin, that she had not known a man carnally.

The angel, in tacit acceptance of Mary's claim, replied, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you, and for that reason the holy offspring shall be called the Son of God" (Lke 1:34-35).

This promise by Gabriel forms the theological basis for calling Jesus "the Son of God" and loads that title with the implication of divine conception and virgin birth.

The assertion that the New Testament is largely "silent on the virgin birth" is therefore mistaken, since repeated use of the title "the Son of God" acknowledges that Christ was conceived and born of a virgin by the power of God.