

BAYT AGOODAH, INC.
HEBREW YISRAELITE EDUCATIONAL CENTER



**"ALLEGED CHRISTOLOGICAL REFERENCES
IN THE BOOK OF ISAIAH: PT. 1"**

by
Zebulon Ben Lewi Hedeqyah

It is the popular view of Christians, as well as some Israelites, that **Isaiah 7:14** is a prophecy of the "virgin birth of Jesus Christ". Though this is a convenient and believable concept on the surface, when we apply the "microscope of Reason" to the text, we find that the doctrine of **Isaiah 7:14** being proof of the "virgin birth", is nothing more than erroneous speculation and religious indoctrination.

The **first** step in interpreting **Isa. 7:14**, is to research the word "virgin". There is only one word in the ancient Hebrew language for "virgin", and that is "**bethulah**". According to the **STRONG'S EXHAUSTIVE CONCORDANCE TO THE BIBLE**", the word "bethulah" is defined as:

**1330. בתולה bethuwlah, beth-oo-lah; fem. pass.
part. of an unused root mean. to separate;
a virgin (from her privacy).**

Now, since there is only one word in Hebrew for "virgin" (bethulah), we should then expect to find the word "bethulah" in the original Hebrew text of **Isa. 7:14**. However, we actually find something quite different; the Hebrew word found in **Isa. 7:14** is not "bethulah" but "**almah**", and according to "STRONG'S CONCORDANCE", it is defined as:

**5959. עלמה 'almah, al-maw; fem. of 5958; a lass
(as veiled or private).**

As we can see, there is a clear & distinct difference between these two Hebrew terms; one is simply a "virgin", the other is simply "a lass". To be sure that these terms are in fact different, let's observe the definitions from "**MERRIAM WEBSTER'S COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY, TENTH EDITION**":

Virgin: an absolutely chaste young woman; an unmarried girl
or woman; a person who has not had sexual intercourse.

Lass: a young woman; girl; sweetheart.

"ALLEGED CHRISTOLOGICAL REFERENCES IN THE BOOK OF ISAIAH: PT. 1"

(continued)

So, we can see that there is a distinct difference between these two terms; they both can mean "young woman", although **only "bethulah" (virgin) implies virginity!** Therefore, if Isaiah meant to say "virgin", he would have used the only word in the Hebrew language that conveys "virgin", and that's **BETHULAH** / בתולה. But since he didn't use this term, we cannot assume that he meant "virgin". Since the Word of YAH is true and doesn't lie (*Isa. 34:16; Ps. 33:4*), we have to accept the verse for what it says, and not for what we want it to say. So the verse must be read in the Hebrew Understanding of the Scripture:

"Behold, a young woman shall conceive..."

The **second** point we must observe in *Isa. 7:14*, is the name "Immanuel". According to this verse, the child who is born to this "young woman" will be named "IMMANUEL", and many "Christian-minded" individuals believe that this also is a prophecy of "Jesus Christ". Well, this problem is easily solved, just by asking ourselves the following questions:

- #1. What name did the "angel of the lord" tell Joseph & Mary to give their newborn son? Jesus/"Yehoshua": Matt. 1:20-21**
- #2. What name did they give him? Jesus/"Yehoshua": Matt. 1:24-25**
- #3. Was he named Immanuel? NO!**
- #4. Is he ever referred to as Immanuel anywhere in the "New Testament"? NO!**
- #5. If Jesus is nowhere in the Bible called/referred to as "Immanuel", is it logical to conclude that Isa. 7:14 is NOT referring to him? YES!**

It should be obvious that Isa. 7:14 isn't speaking of "Jesus". But you may be wondering, "If this verse isn't referring to Christ, then who is it talking about?" This question brings us to the **third** point of reference, and that is this: We must read Isa. 7:14 within the context of the surrounding verses and chapters! Now, to be more technical, the original Hebrew Bible did not have chapters and verses as we know them today. The text was arranged in "thought paragraphs", which are paragraphs that stay on a particular topic, and when that topic has been completed, the paragraph ended. This is the case with Isa. 7:14; in all actuality, the complete vision is chapters 6 thru 12! But if we were just to start at the beginning of chapter 7, we can clearly see who this prophecy (7:14) is speaking of.

There is a civil war going on between the Northern Kingdom of Israel and the Southern Kingdom of Judah. The Kingdom of Israel joined with the Syrians in order to destroy the Kingdom of Judah. Ahaz, king of Judah, is quite afraid concerning the situation. The Most High then sends Isaiah (and his son) to speak to Ahaz, comfort him and assure him that the king of Israel (Pekah) and the king of Syria (Rezin) will not succeed in their war against Judah (verses 3-7). Ahaz is told that **"within threescore and five years (65 years) shall Ephraim (Israel) be broken, that it be not a people"** (verse 8).

Now, although the Prophet Isaiah tells Ahaz that he (Ahaz) must have faith in the Most High YAH in order for this event to occur (vs. 9), Ahaz still has his doubts about it. Perceiving this doubt, the Most High (thru Isaiah) tells Ahaz to ask for "a

"ALLEGED CHRISTOLOGICAL REFERENCES IN THE BOOK OF ISAIAH: PT. 1"

(continued)

sign", something that would prove to Ahaz that the "65 Year Prophecy" (vs. 8) would indeed come to pass (vss. 10-11). After Ahaz refuses to ask for the sign, Isaiah the Prophet "forces" the sign upon Ahaz (vss.12-14)! Now, we can get a comprehensive understanding of verse 14; the sign of the "young woman bearing a child and naming him Immanuel" was meant for AHAZ, not for the "New Testament" times! Do we need further proof?? Well, let's look at verses 15-16 as it describes this "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.

In the Hebrew culture, when a child reached the age of 12-13, he was considered a man, because at that age, he is legally accountable for his actions, and not under his parents' jurisdiction of "grace" He is at the age where he is sent to the temple of Higher Learning because he has mastered the Foundational Teachings of Scripture (*refer to Lk. 2:39-52; Ethics of the Fathers 5:24*), and therefore, would obviously be able to discern between "good and evil" (refer to Heb. 5:14). So, when we read Isa. 7:16 with the historical/cultural background of our Ancestors, we can see that scripture is telling us that, before this "Immanuel" became 12 or 13 years old, both kings that fought against Ahaz (Pekah, King of Israel & Rezin, King of Syria) would be dethroned and removed from their kingdoms! Now, since this prophecy (according to traditional chronology) occurred in 787 B.C.E., then the birth of this "Immanuel" would have been in about that same year; hence, 13 years later, the child would become a man, thus marking the end of the King of Israel & the King of Syria, 774 B.C.E.

As we read further, in chapters 8 & 9, we see that the name "Immanuel" is symbolic, for it is describing the spiritual and prophetic condition of the Children of Israel. For instance, according to 7:15, "Immanuel" shall eat "butter and honey", as a sign to king Ahaz; but if we continue to read up to verse 22, the Children of Israel who remained in the land, would eat butter and honey!!! To take this even further, the child who was to be born of the "young woman" in 7:14 is not only called "Immanuel" (meaning: God is with us), but is also called "**MAHERSHALALHASHBAZ**" (meaning: quickly spoiled, speedily plundered). The "virgin" (young woman) of 7:14 was a prophetess who was apparently known to Ahaz and Isaiah (8:1-4), and the bringing forth of this child (and other children of the prophets like "Shearjashub" in 7:3) was to serve as signs and wonders to Israel, to give them an understanding of their spiritual and prophetic condition, as mentioned above. The Prophet Isaiah confirms this, by stating:

**"Behold, I and the children whom YAH
have given me are for signs and for wonders in
Yisrael, from YAH of Hosts, which dwells
in Mount Tziyon." (Isaiah 8:18)**

This scripture further confirms why the child was born to the Prophetess (young woman) in 7:14, was called "Immanuel" first, and then "**Mahershalalhashbaz**"; it was a symbolic description of the coming and impending destruction of the

"ALLEGED CHRISTOLOGICAL REFERENCES

IN THE BOOK OF ISAIAH: PT. 1"

(continued)

Israelites, by the hands of the Assyrians (*Read:7:17-20; 8:1-10*). We should keep in mind, that the practice of women having children, and them being given symbolic names, is *not new* in Isaiah. We also find in the book of *Hosea*, where he was commanded by the Most High to *"marry a whore"* and the children that were born of this unholy union was symbolically representing the sinful conditions of the Israelites, and the children's names reflected this fact!. (*Read: Hosea, chapters 1-3*) Even Hosea marrying a "whore", was a symbolic act in reference to Israel (1:2).

By now, the point should be clear as to the proper and accurate interpretation of Isa. 7:14 and the related scriptures thereof. Now that we understand that chapters 6-12 are dealing with the same prophecies concerning the birth of a child called "Immanuel/Mahershalahashbaz", when we come to *Isaiah 9:6*, it is easy to solve the "mystery" contained in it:

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."

Now, if this scripture is speaking of "Jesus", all we have to do is apply the same understanding from earlier (7:14); this is still speaking of the child born to the Prophetess (*7:14; 8:1-4*)! If one has a problem accepting this, let us ask the following questions:

- #1. Does this scripture (9:6) say that this child would have a name, symbolic or otherwise? YES.**
- #2. Do Christians believe that this verse is speaking of "Jesus"? YES.**
- #3. Was "Jesus" ever called "Peleh Yo'aytz" (Wonderful, Counselor)? NO.**
- #4. Was "Jesus" ever called "El Gibor" (Mighty God)? NO.**
- #5. Was "Jesus" ever called "Abi 'Ahd" (Everlasting Father)? NO.**
- #6. Was "Jesus" ever called "Sar Shalom" (Prince of Peace)? NO.**
- #7. Since "Jesus" was never named or called by these terms, is it reasonable to conclude that this prophecy did NOT apply to him? YES.**

A Christian who believes in the "trinity", may argue that the term "Everlasting Father" would apply to "Jesus", since they misinterpret *John 10:30* (I and the Father are one"). Now, aside from the fact "Jesus" is never called "Everlasting Father", let us also consider a vital point here. Although in the English translation, the term is expressed as "Everlasting Father", the original Hebrew Text slightly **disagrees!** In Hebrew, the term is written as:

עד	אבי
'Ahd	Abi
Everlasting	Father

"ALLEGED CHRISTOLOGICAL REFERENCES IN THE BOOK OF ISAIAH: PT. 1"

(continued)

Unfortunately, the above term **doesn't** mean "Everlasting Father"!! The Hebrew word for father is אב (Ab). If you look at the Hebrew term above, you'll noticed that there is an highlighted letter; this is the letter "yod" (י). According to the rules of Hebrew grammar, when this letter is attached to the end of a noun, it becomes a "possessive pronoun"; this means that the letter "yod/" has a possessive nature and becomes the word "MY". This can be verified in any Hebrew-English dictionary. Therefore, when we attach the yod/י to the end of the word אב/אב, we now get the word "אבי/אבי", which means "My Father"; and then reading the whole name, we would get "אבי אהד", which means **"My Father (is) Everlasting" or "My Everlasting Father"**! Thus, this name is giving praises and honor to the Father (YAH), and not to the person of whom the name belongs!

So in conclusion, for **anyone** (Christian or otherwise) attempting to utilize Isaiah 7:14 and subsequent scriptures in order to prove the "coming of Jesus", we've now seen that there isn't a leg to stand on! Over **90% of Christian/"messianic" doctrine is firmly established and interdependent upon Isa. 7:14; therefore, once this scripture is clearly interpreted and explained, all the other "christological references" fall like the proverbial dominoes.**

:ΔΗΚ ΕΥΕΛ ΥΥΛΕΚ ΕΥΕΛ ΛΚΑΥΛ ΟΥΩ

