

# ISSUES IN ISAIAH 7:14



A TERM PAPER FOR  
LEE DAVIS: INSTRUCTOR  
THE BOOK OF ISAIAH  
ONLINE ACADEME OF  
BIBLICAL STUDIES

Jerry D. McDonald

**KEYWORDS:** Virgin, Almah, Bethulah, Partheneos, Christ, Deity, Biblical Criticism, Messianic, Horus, Andre Resner.

**ABSTRACT:** To look at the issues surrounding Isaiah 7:14 and the virgin birth of our Lord Jesus Christ to see if Isaiah 7:14 is straight line Messianic prophecy or if it has any relation to the virgin birth of Jesus Christ at all, or if Jesus Christ was even born of a virgin. The liberal teachings, both in and out of the Lord's church (especially those from within), have taken its toll upon Christians faith concerning the deity of Christ. If you cast aspersion on the deity of Christ then you cast doubt over the whole body of faith because our faith is predicated upon Jesus Christ being born of the virgin Mary by miraculous conception of the Holy Spirit. People are walking away, either, into religious or atheistic humanism every day because false teachers have been allowed to cast doubt upon the deity of our Lord. This paper is written for the purpose of destroying the arguments that the opposition makes, and supporting the Biblical record that Isaiah 7:14 is indeed straight line messianic in prophecy and that Jesus Christ was indeed miraculously conceived by the Holy Spirit (Mt. 1:20), and that he was indeed born of a virgin (Mt. 1:21-25).

## INTRODUCTORY MATTERS:

*Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. (Isaiah 7:14)*

The arguments over whether or not Isaiah 7:14 has reference to the Messiah have been going on for many generations. Bible critics who have argued that there is no reference to the Messiah have fought long and hard to keep this battle going and are unwilling to back down. Tom Bright made the following statement:

“The battle over the ‘virgin birth’ of Christ has been with men for more than 300 years. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it was the ‘destructive critics.’ The nineteenth century saw the modernists, while the atheistic Historical Critical Method has graced the twentieth century.

These same centuries have manifested those who have been just as dedicated. Even though they have been in the minority, their devotion to defending the miraculous conception and virgin birth of Jesus Christ has been long and unwavering.

There is no ending to the struggle in the foreseeable future. This struggle will end only when the Christ comes to judge the world. Neither side is about to run up the white flag of surrender. The issue has been clearly stated, the problem has been defined, and the battle lines have been drawn” (*Third Annual Houston College of the Bible Lectureship, Isaiah, Volume 1, Chapters 1-39, pp. 20,21*).

Why is Isaiah 7:14 so important to the virgin birth of Christ? The Revised Standard Version simply translates this passage “*Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. Behold, a young woman shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanu-el*” (Isaiah 7:14). The term “young woman” as translated in the RSV could mean a young woman of marriageable age whether she was a virgin or not. So when one looks at the issues involved in this matter the importance is easily seen. If Isaiah 7:14 is not talking about a virgin, but about a young woman of marriageable age, then doubt is cast upon the deity of

our Lord Jesus Christ. This is what the Bible critic has been working toward for the last 300 years. There are three fronts to this battle:

- A. Some argue that the word "almah" does not have to have reference to a woman who has never known a man sexually.
- B. Some argue that Isaiah 7:14 is not messianic in promise.
- C. Some argue that the Bible does not teach the virgin birth of Christ.

It is our duty as Christians to keep the fight going, to continue to be "*set for the defence of the gospel*" (Phil. 1:17). The word "defence" comes from the Greek word:

**ἀπολογία** "apologia **Thayer Definition:** 1) verbal defence, speech in defence 2) a reasoned statement or argument **Part of Speech:** noun feminine **A Related Word by Thayer's/Strong's Number:** from the same as **G626**" (*Thayer's Greek To English Lexicon, e-Sword*).

The *Complete Word Study Dictionary* defines the word this way:

"**G627** ἀπολογία *apología*; gen. *apologías*, fem. noun from *apologéomai* (**G626**), to give an answer or speech in defense of oneself. A plea, defense before a tribunal or elsewhere (**Act 22:1**; **2Ti 4:16**). Generally (**2Co 7:11**; **Php 1:7**, **Php 1:17**). Followed by dat. of person, against whom (**1Co 9:3**; **1Pe 3:15**); by *perí* (**G4012**), concerning, and the gen. (**Act 25:16**); with *prós* (**G4314**), toward, and the acc. (**Act 22:1**). **Syn.:** *apókrisis* (**G612**), the act of answering; *apókrima* (**G610**), an answer, sentence; *eperótēma* (**G1906**), an answer in the form of an interrogation. **Ant.:** *sigé* (**G4602**), silence; *hēsuchia* (**G2271**), quietness" (*e-Sword*).

Unless we stand up and give a strong defense of the truth on this matter we are going to continue to have problems trying to get people to be faithful to the Lord. There are plenty of people in the world who are working to lead people away from the truth on this matter so is our responsibility to stand for the truth so as to offset these efforts.

## DISCUSSION:

As we begin looking at this issue we want to begin by looking at the meaning of the word "almah" in Isaiah 7:14.

"עַלְמָהּ 'almāh: A feminine noun meaning a maiden, a young woman, a girl, and a virgin. The word describes young women in different categories: Rebekah was understood to be a marriageable young woman by Abraham's servant ([Gen 24:43](#)); as was the maiden described in [Pro 30:19](#), for in this case, the man was wooing her as a possible wife. Moses' sister was probably in this category ([Exo 2:8](#)). Sometimes it is unclear how old or mature these young maidens were ([Psa 68:25](#) [26]). The most famous passage where this term is used is [Isa 7:14](#), where it asserts an 'almāh will give birth to a son. The author of [Mat 1:23](#) understood this woman to be a virgin" (*The Complete Word Study Dictionary, e-Sword*).

*Brown, Driver-Briggs Hebrew Definitions* defines the word almah as

### H5959

עַלְמָה

'almāh

#### **BDB Definition:**

- 1) virgin, young woman
  - 1a) of marriageable age
  - 1b) maid or newly married

**Part of Speech:** noun feminine

**A Related Word by BDB/Strong's Number:** from [H5958](#)

**Same Word by TWOT Number:** 1630b (*e-Sword*)

The newly married here would be someone who has just been married and who has not yet consummated the marriage by intimacy with her new husband.

The ISBE states

"(2) עַלְמָה, 'almāh, rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) by either "damsel" ([Psa 68:25](#)), "maiden" (so usually, [Exo 2:8](#), etc.), or "virgin"

with margin “maiden” ([Son 1:3](#); [Son 6:8](#); [Isa 7:14](#)). The word (see *OHL*) means simply “young woman” and only the context can give it the force “virgin.” This force, however, seems required by the contrasts in [Son 6:8](#), but in [Son 1:3](#) “virgin” throws the accent in the wrong place. The controversies regarding [Isa 7:14](#) are endless, but Septuagint took *ʿalmāh* as meaning “virgin” (*parthénos*). But in New Testament times the Jews never interpreted the verse as a prediction of a virgin-birth - a proof that the Christian faith did not grow out of this passage. See IMMANUEL; VIRGIN BIRTH" (*International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, e-Sword*).

Now both of these define the word *almah* as being a "virgin" or "maiden", one who has never known man sexually. The *almah* virgin never has to be qualified as never having known man, it is always understood. And the *almah* virgin is never used to refer to a married woman who has known a man. *Brown, Driver-Briggs* does use it to refer to a newly married woman, but this would be to one who has just been married else there would be no reason for stating that she was “newly married.” When translated from Hebrew into Greek *almah* always translates into *parthenos* which is defined as:

"παρθένος

*parthénos*; gen. *parthénou*, masc.-fem., adj. In the NT:

**(I)** In the fem. as a subst., *hē parthénos* means a virgin, maiden.

**(A)** Particularly in the sense of one who has not known a man ([Mat 1:23](#), "A virgin shall be with child," quoted from [Isa 7:14](#); [Luk 1:27](#) [cf. [Luk 1:34](#)]; Sept.: [Gen 24:16](#); [1Ki 1:2](#)). Used metaphorically ([2Co 11:2](#)).

**(B)** Generally it refers to a maiden or damsel of marriageable age ([Mat 25:1](#), [Mat 25:7](#), [Mat 25:11](#); [Act 21:9](#); [1Co 7:25](#), [1Co 7:28](#), [1Co 7:34](#), where the "virgin" stands as equivalent to the unmarried; [1Co 7:36-37](#) referring to a virgin daughter, marriageable but unmarried; Sept.: [Gen 24:14](#), [Gen 24:43](#), [Gen 24:55](#); [Gen 34:3](#)).

**(II)** Used as a masc. adj. in [Rev 14:4](#), referring either literally to chaste, pure men who have not known women or are unmarried for the sake of greater devotion to Christ ([1Co 7:33](#)), or figuratively to the spiritually pure, God's people who have not defiled themselves with the daughters of this world (i.e., the world- system, called Babylon in Rev.).

**Deriv.:** *parthenía* (G3932), virginity.

**Syn.:** *ágamos* (G22), unmarried, (subst.) an unmarried person.

**Ant.:** *guné* (G1135), a woman or wife; *anér* (G435), a man or husband" (*The Complete Word Study Dictionary, e-Sword*).

Some argue that if Isaiah had meant a virgin he would have used the word *bethulah* because they say that *bethulah* is the word that means a pure virgin.

Notice the definition of the word:

"**בתולה**, *b<sup>é</sup>thūlāh*, from a root meaning "separated," is "a woman living apart," i.e. "in her father's house," and hence "a virgin." *B<sup>é</sup>thūlāh* seems to have been the technical term for "virgin," as appears from such a combination as *na'ārāh bh<sup>é</sup>thūlāh*, "a damsel, a virgin," in [Deu 22:23](#), [Deu 22:28](#), etc. An apparent exception is [Joe 1:8](#), "Lament like a virgin (*b<sup>é</sup>thūlāh*)...for the husband of her youth," but the word is probably due to a wish to allude to the title "virgin daughter of Zion" (the translation "a betrothed maiden" is untrue to Hebrew sentiment). and the use of "virgin" for a city ([Isa 37:22](#), etc.; compare [Isa 23:12](#); [Isa 47:1](#)) probably means "unsubdued," though, as often, a title may persist after its meaning is gone ([Jer 31:4](#)). The King James Version and the English Revised Version frequently render *b<sup>é</sup>thūlāh* by "maiden" or "maid" ([Jdg 19:24](#), etc.), but the American Standard Revised Version has used "virgin" throughout, despite the awkwardness of such a phrase as "young men and virgins" ([Psa 148:12](#)). For "tokens of virginity" ("proofs of chastity") see the commentary on [Deu 22:15](#) ff" (*International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, e-Sword*).

While the word *almah* never refers to a woman who known a man, and never has to be qualified with statements like "never having known man" like the word *bethulah* does. Joel 1:8 says "*Lament like a virgin girded with sackcloth for the husband of her youth.*" Adam Clarke wrote: "**Lament like a virgin - for the husband of her youth** - Virgin is a very improper version here. The original is

**בתולה** *bethulah*, which signifies a young woman or bride not a virgin, the proper

Hebrew for which is [עַלְמָה](#) *almah*. See the notes on [Isa 7:14](#) (note), and [Mat 1:23](#) (note)" (*Clarke's Commentaries*, e-Sword). When referring to Rebekah as a *bethulah* virgin you notice that a qualification was given: "*neither had any man known her: and she went down to the well, and filled her pitcher, and came up*" (Gen. 24:16). Rebekah is also called an *almah* virgin and when she is this qualification is not given "*Behold, I stand by the well of water; and it shall come to pass, that when the **virgin** [almah] cometh forth to draw water, and I say to her, Give me, I pray thee, a little water of thy pitcher to drink*" (Gen 24:43).

[בְּתוּלָה](#) *b<sup>e</sup>tûlâh*: A feminine noun meaning virgin. Some scholars prefer to translate the term loosely as maiden or young woman. Yet in [Gen 24:16](#), Rebekah is described as a beautiful woman and a *b<sup>e</sup>tûlâh*. **The text states that no man had known Rebekah-that is, had sexual relations with her. Also, [Jdg 21:12](#) states that there were "four hundred young *b<sup>e</sup>tûlâh*, that had known no man by lying with any male."** In these verses, this Hebrew word certainly connotes virginity. But in [Joe 1:8](#), the Lord describes the *b<sup>e</sup>tûlâh* mourning for the husband of her youth. In this case, the word means young woman. Moreover, the word also refers to cities or countries that are personified as females ([Isa 37:22](#); [Isa 47:1](#); [Jer 18:13](#); [Jer 31:4](#), [Jer 31:21](#); [Amo 5:2](#)). For further occurrences of this Hebrew word, see [Deu 22:23](#), [Deu 22:28](#); [Jdg 19:24](#); [2Sa 13:2](#), [2Sa 13:18](#); [1Ki 1:2](#); [Est 2:2](#); [Zec 9:17](#)" (*The Complete Word Study Dictionary*, e-Sword).

Then in reference to Rebekah as an *almah* virgin the same dictionary says:

[עַלְמָה](#) *‘almâh*: A feminine noun meaning a maiden, a young woman, a girl, and a virgin. The word describes young women in different categories: Rebekah was understood to be a marriageable young woman by Abraham's servant ([Gen 24:43](#)); as was the maiden described in [Pro 30:19](#), for in this case, the man was wooing her as a possible wife. **Moses' sister was probably in this category ([Exo 2:8](#))**. Sometimes it is unclear how old or mature these young maidens were ([Psa 68:25](#) [26]). The most famous passage where this term is used is [Isa 7:14](#), where it asserts an *‘almâh* will give birth to a son. The author of [Mat 1:23](#) understood this woman to be a virgin" (Ibid).

Was Moses' sister anything other than a pure virgin? No! She was just a child! So why wasn't the word *bethulah* used in reference to her rather than *almah*? Simply because, as we have already seen *bethulah* can refer to a married woman and does sometimes have the qualification of having never known man, while *almah* never refers to such.

There are those who will argue that *almah* can refer to a woman who is not a virgin. Michael Levy wrote:

Christians with whom I've debated these issues assert that "almah" always means virgin. You need only find one other instance where this word is used but does not refer to a woman with no previous sexual experience. Rabbi Dovid Kimchi (Redak), who lived nearly a thousand years ago, showed that this is provided in Proverbs 30:18-20.

**Proverbs 30:18** There are three that are beyond me and a fourth that I do not know: [19] the way of an eagle in the heavens; the way of a snake upon a rock; the way of a ship in the heart of the sea; and the way of a man with a **young woman**. [20] Such is the way of the adulterous woman: She eats and wipes her mouth and says, "I have done no wrong." (Artscroll)

The word for "young woman" here was "almah." The rabbinical commentator Ibn Ezra explained that just as the eagle, snake and ship leave no trail in their path, adulterers wipe their mouths clean and leave no trail of their fornication. Clearly, "almah" does not explicitly mean virgin (<http://messiahtruth.org/isa7140.html>).

Let us look at what is being said in this Proverb. He says that there are three things which are too wonderful for him and the fourth thing is something that he just cannot know or understand because it is just so wonderful.

1. There is the way of an eagle flying in the air. This is wonderful and he does not understand it. How majestic it must be to be the eagle

and fly up that high and be able to look down upon all of creation as he does, and yet when it is gone, it cannot be traced.

2. There is the serpent upon a stone. The stone is smooth and hard, and the serpent has not feet upon which to walk yet it is able to crawl upon that stone and all the while not leave a trace of evidence that it was there.
3. The way of a ship in the midst of the sea. Having served in the US Navy, I can certainly see Solomon's point. It is difficult to understand how that Carrier could stay afloat in that sea even when the sea was rough. Though the sea was mighty, the ship was able to stay its course and go to its destination. Once it has passed it is as though it was never there.
4. The way of a man with a maid (*almah*-virgin). Matthew Henry wrote:

2. The fourth is a mystery of iniquity, more unaccountable than any of these; it belongs to the depths of Satan, that deceitfulness and that desperate wickedness of the heart which none can know, Jer\_17:9. It is twofold: - (1.) The cursed arts which a vile adulterer has to debauch a maid, and to persuade her to yield to his wicked and abominable lust. This is what a wanton poet wrote a whole book of, long since, *De arte amandi* - On the art of love. By what pretensions and protestations of love, **and all its powerful charms, promises of marriage, assurances of secrecy and reward, is many an unwary virgin brought to sell her virtue, and honour, and peace, and soul, and all to a base traitor**; for so all sinful lust is in the kingdom of love. The more artfully the temptation is managed the more watchful and resolute ought every pure heart to be against it." (*Matthew Henry's Commentaries e-Sword*).

In the next verse Solomon tells about the adulterous woman “*Such is the way of an adulterous woman; she eateth, and wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness*” (Pro 30:20). But this woman is not like that! No, she does no wickedness and she is not considered an adulterous woman. It is amazing to Solomon the tricks that the man will use toward this virgin to lure her in without leaving the faintest bit of evidence of what his real motive is. According to Henry, the man tries to lure the virgin to commit adultery with him. On the other hand Solomon talks about the way of an adulterous woman. She leaves no trail either. She eats and wipes her mouth and says that she has done nothing wrong. She too covers her trail. Again, the *almah* here is a virgin, not one who has known man.

Mr. Levy has completely misread what this Proverb has to say, as has everyone else who has understood this *almah* to be anything other than a chaste virgin.

The argument that *bethulah* has reference to one who has never known man and *almah* can have reference to one who has known man is exactly backwards and is promoted to by Bible critics to weaken peoples faith in the deity of Christ. These critics know that most people will not check the evidence out, and that they will just take their (the critic’s) word for the matter. That, in fact, is the very case of what is taking place in the world today. Paul commanded Timothy to “*Study to shew thyself approved unto God*” (2 Tim. 2:15) so that he could know how to rightly divide the word of truth, and because Timothy did study he was

able to rightly divide the word of truth and was able to hold to the truth. However, people (for the most part) have quit studying and this is why we have so many being led away by false teachers. Those who do stay with religion do not have a faith based on anything other than feelings because they have given up on the word of God. The others give up their allegiance to God altogether and join in with the atheists and live their lives in accordance with the hedonistic doctrine of “If it makes me happy, then that is what I will do.”

The next step in our study is to notice that Isaiah 7:14 is messianic in promise. There are three standard schools of thought along this line two of which are false. We will look at the two false positions first. The first of the two positions we will look at is the position that Isaiah 7:14 has no application to the messiah whatever. Below is a copy of an email post from Dr. James Price’s response to Dr. Bob Schiermeyer on Isaiah 7:14

Hi TCoders:

In this post I answer the critical comments of Dr. Bob Schiermeyer's on Isaiah 7:14 and the virgin birth.

Dr. Bob:

**THE NEW TESTAMENT USE OF ISAIAH  
A VIRGIN or THE VIRGIN?  
SHALL CONCEIVE or HAS CONCEIVED?  
THEY WILL CALL or SHE WILL NAME?**

**Matthew 1:22-23**

(22) Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, (23) Behold, a virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel.

Isaiah 7:14-16 (correct Hebrew)

(14) Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, THE young maiden IS with child [she is pregnant], and she is bearing a son, and SHE shall call his name Immanuel. (15) Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good. (16) For before the child

shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.

The Hebrew word that the KJV translates as virgin (Almah) is more correctly translated as young maiden. Hebrew has a specific word for virgin: Betulah. Most virgin females are young women, but not all young women are virgins. Therefore, the best translation of the Hebrew word Almah is young maiden. [Even the Greek word used in the Septuagint, parthenos, is not specific for virgin; it described Dinah after her rape by Shechem (Gen 34:2-4).]

<http://www.answering-islam.org/BibleCom/is7-14.html>

Genesis 34:3 does use the word “parthenos” in the Septuagint, and I am not sure

why, but it does: “καὶ προσέσχεν τῇ ψυχῇ Δυνας τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἰακωβ καὶ ἠγάπησεν

τὴν παρθένον καὶ ἐλάλησεν κατὰ τὴν διάνοιαν τῆς παρθένου αὐτῆ. It could be that the

translators of the Septuagint simply mistranslated it because as we earlier

pointed out the word partheneos means:

### G3933

παρθένος

*parthénos*; gen. *parthénou*, masc.-fem., adj. In the NT:

**(I)** In the fem. as a subst., *hē parthénos* means a virgin, maiden.

**(A)** Particularly in the sense of one who has not known a man (Mat 1:23, "A virgin shall be with child," quoted from Isa 7:14; Luk 1:27 [cf. Luk 1:34]; Sept.: Gen 24:16; 1Ki 1:2). Used metaphorically (2Co 11:2).

**(B)** Generally it refers to a maiden or damsel of marriageable age (Mat 25:1, Mat 25:7, Mat 25:11; Act 21:9; 1Co 7:25, 1Co 7:28, 1Co 7:34, where the "virgin" stands as equivalent to the unmarried; 1Co 7:36-37 referring to a virgin daughter, marriageable but unmarried; Sept.: Gen 24:14, Gen 24:43, Gen 24:55; Gen 34:3).

**(II)** Used as a masc. adj. in Rev 14:4, referring either literally to chaste, pure men who have not known women or are unmarried for the sake of greater devotion to Christ (1Co 7:33), or figuratively to the spiritually pure, God's people who have not defiled themselves with the daughters of this world (i.e., the world-system, called Babylon in Rev.).

**Deriv.:** *parthenía* (G3932), virginity.

**Syn.:** *ágamos* (G22), unmarried, (subst.) an unmarried person.

**Ant.:** *guné* (G1135), a woman or wife; *anér* (G435), a man or husband” (*The Complete Word Study Dictionary, e-Sword*).

Now the word that is used to describe Dinah in Gen. 34:3 is a different word

“**H5291**

נַעֲרָה

*na<sup>a</sup> rāh*: A feminine noun referring to a girl, a young woman, a maidservant. It is used of a young girl ([2Ki 5:2](#)); or young daughters ([Job 41:5](#) [[40:29](#)]). It indicates a young girl who is marriageable ([Gen 24:14](#), [Gen 24:16](#), [Gen 24:28](#), [Gen 24:55](#), [Gen 24:57](#); [Exo 2:5](#); [Pro 9:3](#)); and to those attending her ([Gen 24:61](#)). It points out a virgin ([Deu 22:15-16](#), [Deu 22:23](#), [Deu 22:29](#); [Jdg 21:12](#); [1Ki 1:2](#)). It is used figuratively of the maidservants or attendants of wisdom personified ([Pro 9:3](#)). It describes young female gleaners in the fields ([Rth 2:5](#), [Rth 2:8](#), [Rth 2:22-23](#))” (Ibid).

Those who hold to the position that Isaiah 7:14 is not messianic in scope look at the context and argue that this child was either going to be born of Isaiah’s wife or of Ahaz’s. They have brought up several points that we will look at.

- They argue that there would be no reason for Isaiah to make a prophesy of the coming savior at this particular time. It wouldn’t make any sense. This was right in the middle of a national crisis, so how could Isaiah’s giving a messianic prophecy have any relevance to Ahaz’s current problem?
  - First this is not out of line for Isaiah, but is quite in synch with style of writing. In chapter 39 he is in the middle of a national crisis when he stops in the middle (chapter 40 and

verses 1 through 3) and gives a messianic prophecy concerning John the Baptist coming to prepare the way for Christ.

- The coming of the Spiritual kingdom had as much relevance to Ahaz and the kingdom of Judah in his day as it would anyone. They were, after all, looking for the coming Messiah.
- Ahaz had been given a chance to ask God for a sign as to what to do and he refused, so God, through Isaiah, turned his attention to the house of David, and gave it a sign.
- Verse 15 states that the child will eat butter and honey before he reaches the age of accountability. Many people don't see how this has anything to do with the coming Messiah.
  - The butter and honey shows that the land will be free and food will be plentiful.
  - The two kings that distress Ahaz will be destroyed before any of this will happen. These two kingdoms must be brought down before this child can be born and grow up in this land of milk and honey.
  - While this prophecy does not give an exact date, it does give hope for the future. Today we look for the second coming, but we don't know when that will be. We still preach that it will happen. We still prepare for it. We tell our children about it and help them to prepare for it. We hope that it will come in our life time, but we don't know. Isaiah did not

know when this child was going to be born, he just knew that the child would be born.

- In the fullness of time, when the time was right, then the child would be born of a virgin and sent to live among men. We look back upon it more than 2000 years after this writing and we say that it cannot refer to the coming Christ because of the long interval between the two, but when you take into consideration that Isaiah did not know when this glorious event would take place, you can see that it does refer to the coming Messiah.

There is no logical reason to argue that Isaiah 7:14 is not messianic in scope because it certainly is. The other false doctrine is that there is a dual fulfillment; that it some how fulfilled a prophecy for a child back in Isaiah's day and also it fulfilled the coming Christ. This position is nothing but an attempt to compromise with the Bible critic. In other words, the holder of it says, "Okay, I'll grant you that it fulfilled a child back in Isaiah's day, but it also fulfilled the coming Christ." No, it only had one fulfillment and that fulfillment is found in Matthew chapter one:

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 (Mat 1:22-23).

Now either Matthew was telling the truth, or he wasn't. There is no middle ground here. In his book *Logic and the Bible* Thomas Warren wrote: "the law of excluded middle for propositions is: every precisely stated proposition is either

true or false (not-true)” (p.21). Now Matthew has made a precisely stated proposition “Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying.” Now I contend that this statement and the statement that goes with it is either true or it is false. If it is true, then it is straight line messianic prophecy. It cannot have a dual fulfillment because Matthew said that it was spoken of the Lord by the prophet. He didn’t say it was spoken of the Lord and some other child, he said that it was spoken of the Lord by the prophet.

Our salvation depends upon Isaiah 7:14 being straight line messianic prophecy for more than one reason. It depends upon it because as we have already mentioned the law of excluded middle excludes anything other than the Lord being the one of whom is the subject. God doesn’t exclude things unless he wants them excluded. It depends upon it because if it isn’t then the Bible is not inerrant because Matthew said that it was spoken of the Lord. Our salvation depends upon it because if Jesus is not the child of promise then he was not born of a virgin and we do not have salvation because our savior can only come from one who was born of a virgin that way there is no way that anyone can say that he had an earthly father. The virgin birth proves the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and without that, we have nothing. So when people start making compromises they need to start looking at the consequences. The only hope we have is if Jesus Christ was born of a virgin, lived a sinless life on this earth, died on the cross and was raised from the dead on the third day and ascended into heaven. Without those things, we have no hope of everlasting life.

Finally we want to notice that the Bible teaches that Christ was born of a virgin. The quickest way of destroying the Christian faith is to--

(1) Destroy the Christian's creed book or his faith in that book--the Bible and many are working on doing just that. Debates are conducted the year round on the internet by atheists constantly trying to get people to see that the Bible is not the inspired and inerrant word of God. Most religious people today don't believe in the inerrancy of the Bible. They don't listen to Paul's words:

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works” (2 Tim. 3:16, 17).

(2) A second way is to destroy the Christian's faith in the savior's death, and resurrection. I have had two written debates in my life on the subject of the resurrection and am completing a third. The atheist will stop at nothing to destroy the Christian's faith in the resurrection, even to the point of arguing that Christ was some sort of extra-terrestrial being from an alien planet who was crucified and rose by alien technology (the angels were his fellow aliens). Anything rather than to admit the words of the apostle Paul:

For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures: And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time. (1Co 15:3-8)

(3) Then there is the effort to destroy the Christian's faith in the virgin birth of Christ (Mt. 1:23-35). This is not only done by the atheist, but by many religious people as well. Take a look at what one preacher wrote:

“Christmas At Matthew's House by Andre Resner.

Though we're still quite surprised by Matthew's covert statement "she was found to be with child from the Holy Spirit," Matthew has set us up for it. It's a sort of "Here we go again, folks...." Another sexually questionable woman. And what about Joseph's faith in the face of Mary's story? For it was he, who after a single dream, went ahead and married her. A dream that was real, yes, but still a dream. Could it have been a message from God? Or, could it have been his won imagination, wanting to believe her so much that his subconscious produced a nocturnal justification for marrying her, even in the face of such an outlandish excuse? But there's Joseph, crawling into bed with her every night the rest of his life, relying on a dream, believing in her word, that she really hadn't slept with another man and used him to cover her shame. If we've paid attention to the women of Matthew's genalogy we're not entirely surprised by Mary's (Joseph's?!) predicament. If God used those of the Messiah's family tree thus, why wouldn't the Messiah himself come from a similar situation?"  
[http://www.wineskins.org/filter.asp?SID=2&fi\\_key=250&co\\_key=1962](http://www.wineskins.org/filter.asp?SID=2&fi_key=250&co_key=1962)

Given time and space we could go into answering Rubel Shelley and other so-called gospel preachers who have taken similar positions on this, but this will suffice. Resner called Mary “another sexually questionable woman.” Now he did issue an apology, but not for calling Mary another sexually questionable woman, but because he said that he didn’t know that anyone born before 1945 was going to read the article. I guess all of us born 1945 and after are supposed to have some special insight about this other than Mary being called “a whore”? I mean, what else would you call a sexually questionable woman. I was born in 1954, and I was raised up with the values that women who are sexually questionable are whores; don’t associate with them. I don’t know how Resner was raised, but apparently he doesn’t think there is anything wrong with a sexually questionable

woman! O...wait...yes he does...that's why he followed that statement with this one: "And what about Joseph's faith in the face of Mary's story?" Do you think for one minute that Resner was innocently talking to the baby boomers? No, he was slamming the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ and was doing so with the blessings of Rubel Shelley and all those who supported *Wineskins*. He knew it was wrong when he wrote, otherwise he wouldn't have written it to sound like Mary had done anything wrong. The picture he painted of the mother of our Lord is shameful to say the least and then to say that this is how God wanted to do things, to use women of ill repute to bring his Son through because Matthew mentioned Tamar and Rahab. Resner really did a job on Tamar with that red dress and black fishnet stockings. Resner left out the real reason that Tamar and Rahab were included in the genealogy, because of Tamar's lineage and Rahab's aid to the spies and her marrying into the house of Israel. Boaz was her descendant. No, he focused on the wrongs they committed and left off the right things they did. Yes, Tamar sinned, and so did Rahab at one time, but their sins were not what got them listed in Matthew's list. The reason they were listed in Matthew's list is because of place in the line from Abraham to Jesus.

If Christ was not born of a virgin, then the Bible is a lie (Jn. 17:17). If the Bible is a lie, then we have no salvation because our faith is in vain (1 Cor. 15:17). The Bible teaches that Christ was born of a virgin (Mt. 1:25). The word "virgin" comes from:

παρθένος parthénos; gen. parthénou, masc.-fem., adj. In the NT: (I) In the fem. as a subst., ἡ παρθένος means a virgin, maiden. (A) Particularly in the sense of one who has not known a man (Mat\_1:23, "A virgin shall be with child," quoted from Isa\_7:14; Luk\_1:27 [cf. Luk\_1:34]; Sept.:

Gen\_24:16; 1Ki\_1:2). Used metaphorically (2Co\_11:2)" (*Word Study Dictionary, e-Sword*).

Christ had no earthly father. He was conceived of the Holy Spirit (Mt. 1:20). So to tamper with this, even in the least, destroys the text and takes people's salvation from them (2 Thess. 1:7-9).

#### CONCLUSION:

We have no right to question the messianic application of Isaiah 7:14. Those who do only do so to compromise with the world so they can either live in the world or live with the world. Either way they are living in opposition to God. God gave strong warnings against tampering with his word (Deut. 4:2; Rev. 22:18,19).

Whenever the word is tampered with souls are at stake. We cannot, even for a moment sit by while the world claims that Isaiah 7:14 is not straight line messianic in promise. We are the soldiers of the cross and as such it is our duty to defend our King and his deity.

In Christ Jesus

Jerry McDonald