religions

MDPI

Article

Evangelicalism and Old Testament Messianic Prophecy

Walter Creighton Marlowe

Old Testament Department, Evangelical Theological Faculty, 3001 Leuven, Belgium; creig.marlowe@etf.edu

Abstract: A major plank in the Evangelical apologetics platform (especially for the Jewish witness) has always been the predictive prophecy about Jesus in the Hebrew Bible. The number of these prophecies or "predictions" varies widely among Conservative–Evangelical sources. A brief survey of claims about the number of Christ-related Old Testament (OT) prophecies ranges from 50–400+. Regardless, the assertion of direct, intentional Old Testament prophetic pronouncement about Jesus has been a non-negotiable mainstay of Evangelical thought and theology since its beginning. However, today, those who align with the Evangelical movement in general, would disagree on technical grounds with the traditional way that Messianic prophecy has been explained hermeneutically or exegetically. Progressive Evangelicals, however, generally are concerned with the interpretation or exegesis of biblical passages in their grammatical–historical–cultural contexts. The focus is on texts rather than traditions. An irony is that traditional and untraditional Evangelicals who favor contextual exegesis in principle are still very divided when it comes to explaining how the NT used the OT, especially in relation to Messianic prophetic texts. This article describes the problem and illustrates it with examples of how some older and newer Evangelicals disagree when commenting on OT Messianic prophetic passages.

Keywords: evangelical; messianic; prophecy; hermeneutics; exegesis

1. Introduction

A major plank in the Evangelical apologetics platform (especially for the Jewish witness) has always been the predictive prophecy about Jesus in the Hebrew Bible (HB)—not only its mere existence, but a multitude of examples. Jesus said, "These are the Scriptures that testify about me" (John 5:39b; NIV), but neither he nor others in the New Testament (NT) explained how many times or how they did so. The number of these prophecies or "predictions" varies widely among Conservative–Evangelical sources. Often these are not academic, but this is irrelevant to some, mostly fundamentalist, Evangelicals.[1] A brief survey of claims about the number of Christ-related Old Testament (OT) prophecies ranges from 50–400+.[2] The number calculated is affected by whether these are defined as direct predictions or indirect prophecies (e.g., typologies, midrash, et al.). Also, the authors employ different hermeneutical approaches to what is meant by a "Messianic" text. Regardless, the assertion of direct, intentional Old Testament (OT) prophetic pronouncements about Jesus has been a non-negotiable mainstay of Evangelical thought and theology since its beginning. However, today, those (including myself) who align with the Evangelical movement in general would disagree on technical grounds with the traditional way HB/OT Messianic prophecy has been explained hermeneutically or exegetically.[3] Whether or not someone qualifies as a "true Evangelical" or "biblical" or "theologically correct" (in practice, in current conservative/fundamentalist church culture) depends on their alignment with numerous traditional interpretations; yet (problematically) not only just foundational,

Academic Editor: Malachi Hacohen

Received: 27 January 2025
Revised: 6 March 2025
Accepted: 19 March 2025
Published: 31 March 2025

Citation: Marlowe, Walter Creighton. 2025. Evangelicalism and Old Testament Messianic Prophecy. *Religions* 16: 449. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16040449

historic doctrines (like biblical inspiration or Jesus' deity), but increasingly special interest interpretations (or misinterpretations) of texts out of context and/or based only on the English translation, especially the 1611 KJV and its revisions.

Progressive Evangelicals, however, are concerned with the interpretation or exegesis of biblical passages in their grammatical–historical–cultural contexts. The focus is on texts rather than traditions. There is openness to the possibility or probability that some past Christian understandings and uses of OT (especially) and NT texts were incorrect or insufficient.[4] At the same time, traditional Evangelical scholars were often at the forefront of pioneering and defending the foundational necessity of exegesis or contextual hermeneutics or the grammatical–historical interpretation (GHI) of Scripture. Today, some more progressive Evangelicals also adhere to contextual exegesis, yet find their research rejected by Evangelical conservatives.[5] Others like Young and Kaiser defend contextual exegesis vigorously, yet ignore the Jewish hermeneutical cultural context and fall back on supernatural predictions about Jesus as the Messiah to explain texts like Isaiah 7:14 (see, e.g., Kaiser 1995; Young 1965).

An irony is that traditional and untraditional Evangelicals who favor contextual exegesis in principle are still very divided when it comes to explaining how the NT used the OT, especially in relation to Messianic prophetic texts. What follows will describe the problem and then illustrate it with examples of how some older and newer Evangelicals disagree when commenting on OT Messianic prophetic passages.

2. Grammatical–Historical Interpretation and Hermeneutics

In today's trends towards intercultural hermeneutics (as Evangelicals are evangelizing non-Western lands like Africa and Asia), much attention is being given to "African" or "Asian" hermeneutics, as opposed to what has been seen as a mistake: the imposition of grammatical–historical hermeneutics, which is supposedly a Western bias. Instead, we need to let other 2nd- or 3rd-world people make their own translations and use their own cultural eyes and methods to read and interpret God's Word. In an article on Intercultural hermeneutics, L. Caldwell argued:

> The truth, however, is that the idea of one preferred universal approach to hermeneutics grew out of the colonialization efforts of European and American missionary movements of the 19th and 20th centuries. During these two centuries these global North missionaries brought their preferred grammatical-historical approach to Bible interpretation with them as they carried out their missionary activities among the culture of the global South. (Caldwell 2024, pp. 347–64)

But it is the more progressive Evangelicals, especially in missions, that call for intercultural hermeneutics. I commend a sensitivity for Bible translation and interpretation that does not seek to educate non-Western people through Western presuppositions, paradigms, and practices. However, a terminological problem is involved. A hermeneutic is an interpretive strategy, but people speak about different kinds of hermeneutical approaches with different objectives in mind. A grammatical–historical interpretation (GHI) has the goal of reproducing what a communicator meant by the words used and how they were used in communicating to an audience in a particular situation, time, and setting (historically and culturally). Much of this is accomplished intuitively in real time because people in the same culture using the same language usually understand the communicator's subject and setting, along with current idioms and allusions. Understanding an ancient text by moderns is more complicated because the very different linguistic and social bridges must be researched, built, and crossed. This has always involved a GHI by necessity and universally.

Caldwell is right to complain about the imposition of narrow culturally bound interpretations on other cultures. A GHI is foundational to clear and correct communication and the interpretation of what a text says and does not say. Misunderstanding this is the Achilles heel of Caldwell's argument. Communication in all languages (to be understood accurately as intended, as much as that can be resurrected) requires that the audience know how the language works (grammar) and receive the words as used in the immediate social and cultural context (history). To the degree these are or not understood, is the degree that the meaning is understood or not. So, a GHI is unavoidable. But other hermeneutics exist and are important; they just have different objectives other than contextual exegesis. When Christians encounter "feminist", "ecological", "same sex/gender", "Western", or "Eastern" hermeneutics, they are dealing with specialized issues or strategies that call for sensitivity to how various Bible readers encounter or receive the biblical texts. But they are not a GHI per se, although they may use a GHI to some degree in addition to asking how the Bible is applicable to topics about which the biblical world was unaware and did not seek to address. With Scripture, we have the double-duty of translation into another (receptor) language and then finding how best to put the same idea across in the translation tongue. Any mistake in the initial translation/interpretation of the source language will be magnified in the transfer to another language. The interpreter/translator has both to handle the source language accurately (contextually and grammatically) and to transfer that meaning to a translation/interpretation in another language, which may function very differently.

A GHI or exegesis is how we best approach and approximate an accurate understanding of what a biblical text was meant to communicate specifically to a certain audience at a certain time and in a certain place. This is the literary–grammatical, historical, and cultural sense in a text and time, which should not be a meaning the audience reads anachronistically back into the text in relation to its current concerns. At the same time, we admit that recovering fully this intended sense from the speaker/author is always limited by the skill of the interpreters and their knowledge of the historical–cultural contexts. There is still much we do not know about biblical languages and biblical times. However, this is the best route where we must recover what the authors meant by what they said. It is at the root of clear communication in all cultures. Beyond this, all people groups, N. American, Western, Eastern, European, minority or majority world, African, southern or northern hemisphere, et al., have cultural traits that are distinct. This naturally is their hermeneutic: how they read and identify with and apply, interact with, or react to various Scriptural passages. This is where it is essential to respect cultural differences. They are not about reproducing the original intended meaning of the author/speaker, but about reactions to a biblical text that are tribal-, cultural-, and generational-specific principles. This is not exegesis, but if it is too far from what the text teaches then it is not representative of what the biblical text communicated historically. Even those missionaries who taught the GHI to people in the majority world at times had biblical beliefs far removed from how the text should have been understood or how it should have been used because they might teach traditions that may be more cultural than exegetical and perform the GHI very sloppily. What a biblical text contextually conveyed and conveys is not rightly subservient to any reader's or interpreter's culture. The missionaries' mistake was not teaching the GHI, but often making their culture superior to that of their target group's culture. Each culture should strive to produce indigenous scholars to create the most accurate as possible interpretive translations of the Bible and commentary that explains the text in its ancient context and language with appropriate applications to their respective nations or cultures.

Not only Asians or Africans, etc., struggle with English or other foreign translations and commentary. English-speaking Christians also struggle with the many conflicting English translations and interpretations from preachers and teachers. Whether your first

language is English or an African, European, or Asian, etc., tongue, everyone is at the disadvantage of not being a native user of the ancient biblical languages of classical Hebrew and Aramaic (OT) or Greek (NT; and LXX). The colonial powers have (until recently) failed at providing excellent translations and commentary that make appropriate (or any) use of the ancient Near-East and 1st-century CE cultural/historical contextual data. The clarion call is for worldwide sensitivity (in every culture and continent) to *exegesis* (=GHI), which allows the biblical texts to speak in their own contexts (linguistic, literary, social, etc.) to derive the best translations and interpretations that reflect, not the readers' world, but what the ancient author meant to say by the words he used in Hebrew or Greek to his immediate audience.

3. GHI and the Evangelical Interpretation of OT Prophecy

With all this in mind, we now turn to a specific focus on how past and present Evangelicals (as well as just those of the current generation) differ over the OT Messianic prophecy. This revolves around the GHI, an interpretive approach both generations share (but not exclusively), and which traditional Evangelicals would not say moderns or progressives have imposed or use inappropriately. Of course, neither newness nor oldness is a guarantee of more accuracy. An interpretation (both a translation and commentary) is always human, so subject to subjectivity and factual slips. The New Evangelicals must beware of blindly following every new trend, but their justification is in the willingness to make necessary changes when contextual exegesis supports a new view as a valid option.

Being an Evangelical should be based on commitment to Jesus' Evangel (Good News) and not to a myriad of traditional and fundamentalist views for the sake of tradition (so-called "truth"). Evangelicals are increasingly (although they remain committed to the Evangel) finding that older explanations of certain interpretive issues bear rethinking, but in the light of biblical research. One such area is the New Testament's use of the Old Testament. Older Evangelicals will argue that when, e.g., Matthew used Hosea 11:1 as "proof" that Jesus is the promised Messiah/Christ, he was telling his audience what Hosea really meant (despite its contradiction with Hosea's immediate context). A progressive Evangelical will counter that, in context, Hosea's "son" is Israel not the "Messiah", especially Jesus directly. The old-school Evangelical will counter that Matthew trumps Hosea's context and gives the reader God's meaning, which a person of faith (like Matthew or any Christian) should see. But what happened to the basic rule of communication in which context determines meaning? When asked why the Jews never could or can see Jesus in Hosea 11, the traditional Evangelicals will usually say that the Jews are blinded by God for His own purposes. But then why are they still held accountable? Regardless, progressive Evangelicals will explain that there is no conflict between Hosea meaning *Israel* as God's "son" and Matthew meaning *Jesus* because Hosea was not making a conscious, direct predictive prophecy about Jesus or the Messiah.[6] Yet Matthew (as a converted Jew evangelizing a Jewish audience) was using a standard 1st-century Jewish hermeneutical principle that his target audience intuitively understood. He was not giving a contextual exegesis of Hosea 11:1; rather, he was making an out-of-context spiritual or theological application, pointing to a parallel between Israel as God's son and Jesus as God's Son. But this is more than a mere technicality in interpretive science between older and newer Evangelicals. When I was a PhD student and shared this interpretational strategy with a conservative/fundamentalist Baptist acquaintance, he responded by saying this was evidence I was not really a Christian, not that I was incorrect for reasons he could spell out academically. Many years later (today), I still encounter similar resistance (although not questioning my faith) and rejection off-hand from traditional Evangelicals (even with PhDs) of the idea that the OT Messianic prophecy is not usually predictive and futuristic, but immediately

prophetic for the prophet's intention and his audience's understanding. What follows are selected examples taken from the Hebrew Bible to provide evidence for why Evangelicals such as myself (for good exegetical reasons) disagree with past (non-contextual) interpretations of OT Messianic texts.

4. Can a Scholar Believe the Virgin Birth?

An article by a Jewish scholar appeared in 1988 in *Bible Review* in which the argument was made that no valid scholar could take the Virgin Birth of Jesus seriously, based on an interpretation of Isaiah 7:14, since a scholar respects context as crucial to the meaning of a text and, on close inspection, the larger context of this verse makes it clear that Isaiah was not talking about Jesus, but a Jewish infant of the 8th-century BCE (Barrett 1988). If so, then it was concluded that Matthew was reading the passage out of context and cherry-picking details (like using the Greek OT translation's παρθένος for "virgin" and not following the Hebrew text with עַלְמָה meaning "maiden"). Evangelicals and other conservative "Bible believers" generally are appalled at such a view because it opposes a fundamental and famous Messianic prediction about Jesus as well as his virgin-birth and the miraculous nature of biblical prophecy. Yet even an Evangelical like myself, trained in biblical exegesis or contextual interpretation, must admit the Jewish author makes some very valid points about Isaiah's line of thought. Both the Jewish author and most, or all, of his traditional Evangelical opponents assume that Matthew is being an exegete of Isaiah, making a contextual interpretation. This assumption requires Isaiah to be speaking consciously and directly about Jesus and predicting a future virgin birth. Barrett's point is that "Isaiah is simply not talking about what Matthew says Isaiah is talking about, but rather about an event in Isaiah's own time" (Barrett 1988).

What he means (and he is correct) is that Isaiah "firmly ties the prediction of Emmanuel's birth to the threatened invasion by saying: 'For before the child knows how to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land before whose two kings you are in dread will be deserted' (*Isaiah 7:16*)" (Barrett 1988). How can Isaiah place the Emmanuel child in the time of famine created by the Assyrian invasion (7:15–17) and simultaneously or alternatively predict his virgin birth 500+ years later? Logically and textually, he must have meant one or the other. If we read both this passage and its use by Matthew literally and historically, then one of them is (or both are) in error. Evangelicals have traditionally and typically solved this by claiming "double fulfillment". Isaiah's text means two different things simultaneously! But this is easy to say and impossible to prove (apart from adopting a presupposition that the Old Testament authors often spoke using double entendre).

However, a historically verifiable Jewish hermeneutic employed by Matthew is the likely solution (which, surprisingly, the Jewish author of the article fails to suggest, but which Evangelical interpreters routinely resist). If we understand that Matthew was not giving a grammatical–historical interpretation of Isaiah, rather making a spiritual or analogical application (which was more popular in the 1st-century CE in Palestine among Jewish rabbis, using Hillel's rules and partial to midrash and pesher interpretations),[7] then it makes sense that Isaiah's prophecy about a child named "God with us" (as an encouragement during an invasion by a foreign army) could be used figuratively by Matthew to show that Jesus' birth is a re-enactment of Israel's experience, indicating the Messiah, and with the added reality of a virgin birth (which Matthew describes in detail in addition to citing Isa. 7:14).[8]

5. Current Illustration

5.1. The Voice Bible and "Jesus the Anointed"

A recent and relevant illustration of Evangelical fundamentalism still alive and kicking is when *The Voice, New Testament* (Bible version) chose to translate Χριστοῦ as "Liberator" or "Anointed One" rather than the traditional "Christ" (e.g., Matt. 1:1; Luke 1:4) (see (The Voice 2008, vol. 2, p. 100)). Conservative/fundamentalist Evangelicals were outraged. Attention-grabbing and misleading headlines appeared like "The name Jesus Christ does not appear in *The Voice*" (see (USA Today 2012)), or others with something like "new Bible version takes Christ out of the Bible". Similar anxiety was felt also over missing English words like "angel".[9] The irony here is that opposition was and is based on charging the translation with failing to accurately translate, which meant not "literally" translating and following a word-for-word translation methodology. Some evangelicals have adapted to "thought-for-thought" (or dynamic equivalent) translations like the *New International Version* (NIV).[10] The *King James Version* (KJV; 1611 original) and its more modernized English-language editions remain the favorite or exclusive Bible for the most conservative Evangelical Christians, despite all the advances to date in linguistics related to biblical languages and translation which are relied upon by those producing Bible (especially New Testament) translations for a multitude of different cultures and languages around the world.[11] One may recall when the publisher of the NIV attempted to market the TNIV (*Today's New International Version*) based on gender sensitivity (e.g., using gender-neutral words like "people" instead of "men", when the group in question likely combined men and women). The book was a failure as to sales and was pulled off the market. It appears that numerous Evangelicals have remained tied to literalism as a guarantee of truth;[12] yet they do not speak their own language by the same rigid rules or by using words with meanings no longer active. When they today say "conversation", they mean "talking"; but in KJV English it means "walking" (i.e., how one acts, not articulates). People often are curious about so many versions published in one language like English. One reason is different translation methods (literal, paraphrase, dynamic equivalent, et al.), but another is the need for the receptor or target language to be updated over time to keep up with changes in word usage and communication style. Consequently, the KJV is anachronistic even if accurate in its day and fails to take advantage of any new scholarly and widely accepted data that call for a change in how a Greek or Hebrew word or OT or NT passage should be understood. With words like "angel", it and others are not really translations at all. "Angel" is merely an English transliteration of the Greek *angelos*, meaning "messenger". The Hebrew word for "messenger" is *mal'akh*, which literalists in this case do not transliterate, but translate as "angel" (since the long-standing use of "angel" has led to its adoption into the English language as "spirit being with wings", based more on medieval paintings than Scripture). In the Bible, the words for "messenger" are used for humans and seemingly supernatural agents. A more correct translation and interpretation would distinguish between human and heavenly messengers.[13] But tradition is stubborn. Thankfully, today, more Evangelicals are emerging who insist that traditions must stand the test of biblical scholarship rather than time.[14] As for "Christ" in the New Testament, again we have a transliteration of (not always upper-case) *xristos*/*Xristos*, meaning "anoint; anointed"). For the 1st-century audience, Jesus was called "anointed" (as the Old Testament spoke about various "anointed" people, such as a priest, prophet, or king, or a future leader, using Hebrew *meshiach*, "anointed"). In this sense, numerous people in the OT were "messiahs" (since English "M/messiah" is derived as a transliteration of *meshiach*). Even Cyrus the Persian king was called "My messiah" by God (Isa. 45:1).[15] In biblical times, "anointed ones" or "messiahs" were frequent,[16] but one was a unique "Anointed One" prophesied in the OT and revealed as Jesus "the Messiah/Anointed One" in the NT. So, it may be untraditional, but "A/anointed" as a

translation, rather than "C/christ" (or "M/messiah") as a transliteration, is more accurate. David Capes (a lead scholar with *The Voice* project) explained (sadly),

> ["Anointed"] is a more accurate translation for modern American readers… many people, even those who've gone to church for years, don't realize that the word "Christ" is a title. They think that Jesus is his first name and Christ is his last name.[17]

Translation is supposed to be the science and art of transferring the same *meaning* from a source language to a target language. How that is carried out depends on the languages involved and should respect how the meaning (and interpretation) of the original text is influenced by its contexts (literary, social, cultural, historical, and grammatical, as much as they are known by the translator). Advances in knowledge about these areas is a major reason why translations need to change over time, and commentary (and likely theology as well) with them. Flexibility is a trait less seen in older rather than newer Evangelicals.[18]

5.2. NT Use of the OT in Evangelical Debate

5.2.1. Hosea 11:1

This well-known messianic prophecy about God's servant was mentioned briefly in passing already. We now will look at this interpretive controversy among traditional and progressive Evangelicals in more detail. Matthew 2:13–15a says that, after the visitation of the Magi (2:7–12), a messenger from God[19] instructed Joseph to take the mother and child to Egypt and wait for further instructions (2:13). They went and stayed in Egypt until after Herod's death (vv. 14–15a), which Matthew claimed fulfilled what God "spoke" (not predicted) through Hosea, "Out of Egypt I called my son" (v. 15b).

Matthew reported for his Jewish audience that Hosea's words (in what we call 11:1b) had meaning connected to Jesus' return from Egypt.[20] Some traditional Evangelicals[21] explain this phenomenon as a conscious, predictive prophecy about Jesus.[22] A literal translation and interpretation have historically characterized Evangelicals. But even going back to a commentary in 1871, Hosea's comments about Israel (as God's son) were viewed as applied to Jesus by Matthew, and "typically and primarily referring to Israel, antitypically and fully to Messiah" (Jamieson et al. 1871, para. 15315). However, Matthew's 1st-century Jewish audience would not have heard it this way exactly. To convince his Jewish audience, he would have tapped into a contemporary Jewish hermeneutical practice (presumably, or he would have been ignored). This assertion remains a sore spot for some contemporary conservative Evangelicals.[23] Whether they literally view Hosea as making a direct prediction, or view Matthew as making Jesus an antitype to Israel's type, they expect Hosea's text to contain some actual built-in reference to Jesus as God's son, even if this is only in God's mind as Hosea speaks the inspired words. I have experienced a kind of emotional excommunication more than once (from fellow Evangelicals) when I have explained that Hosea 11:1 exegetically and contextually is only about ancient Israel, and that Matthew's out-of-context use is legitimized by his application and spiritual interpretation of Hosea's words about Jesus for a 1st-century Jewish audience which was familiar with the current and very popular analogical hermeneutical practices of the rabbis, such as midrash and pesher techniques. However, most Jews still rejected and continue to reject Jesus as the promised Messiah for personal, social, and/or theological reasons, despite Matthew's argument being familiar hermeneutically.

When Hosea quoted God as saying, "When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son" (11:1), the "son" is unmistakably Israel in the historical and immediate literary contexts. Matthew only cited the last half of verse 1 (so clearly out of context). Hosea goes on to explain that this "child" (*na'ar* not "son"*ben*), although loved as shown by his rescue from slavery in Egypt, remained idolatrous no matter how much

God kept calling (11:2). If the child of 11:1 is Jesus, then Jesus is also the idolater in 11:2. There is no reason for Hosea's Jewish audience then or later to interpret this child as any other than Israel. Longenecker noted:

> The context of the statement "out of Egypt I called my son" in Hosea 11 clearly indicates that the prophet was using "my son" as a collective term for the nation Israel—which as a "child" was dearly loved by God, but as time went on drifted away from God into idolatry. (Longenecker 1999, p. 128)

Matthew (in the 1st-century CE hermeneutical climate of Judaism) could say that Jesus fulfilled the words "My child called out of Egypt", not because "my child" had a double meaning, but because Jesus re-enacted, re-lived, or paralleled this particular Israelite event (he also returned to Canaan from Egypt), but not what Israel did as an idolator in 11:2–12. Matthew was not suggesting that the "child" was a Messianic prediction (as we use the term). He was making use of the interpretive principle known as corporate solidarity and was "rereading his Old Testament from an eschatologically realized and messianic perspective" (Longenecker 1999, p. 128). We could say this "child" is a foreshadowing or type of the Messiah. However, this could not be said until Jesus' ministry and Hosea were read in retrospect. Butterworth explained, Hosea's statement is not primarily a prophecy about Jesus, but an interpretation of a historical event. But the parallels with Jesus are very striking: God preserved Israel (Jacob and his household) from famine by giving them a place in Egypt. From there he brought them out to fulfil his purposes (Butterworth 1994).

5.2.2. Isaiah 7:14

This verse is probably the most significant and selected text for Evangelical apologetics related to the Old Testament predictive prophecy about Jesus as the anticipated Messiah. Evan a scholar like E. J. Young (in his Isaiah commentary, beloved by traditional Evangelicals) describes the "sign" promised directly to Ahaz in v. 14 as "the birth of a wonderous Child" (Young 1965, p. 283). But how could a child born in the 1st-century CE be a sign to King Ahaz in the 8th-century BCE? It is possible if a child born in his lifetime was a type of the Messiah. Ahaz, as Young explains, did reject the sign. The usual conservative Evangelical take on this text is that Isaiah's meaning was that a distant future child would be born to a virgin, which should have been understood by those in the prophet's presence as he spoke (see, e.g., (as above and in the Sources below), (Young 1965; Kaiser 1995).

However, this reasoning is moot when the immediate text and context are considered.[24] The debate is often centered on the translation/interpretation of the woman to birth this child, "the '*almah* (הָעַלְמָה)". For traditional Evangelicals, this must mean "virgin" or a powerful apologetic is lost and Jesus may not be divine. But if we understand Isaiah's historical and textual contexts, and Matthew's hermeneutical context, then these beliefs still stand even if we translate '*almah* as "maiden". But, current Evangelicals are divided over NRSV's "young woman" as exegetically correct or as liberal anti-supernaturalism (Cf., e.g., Heiser 2009; Oakes 2022). So, what about these contexts?

First, the virgin birth (whatever is said about Isaiah 7:14) is firmly established by Matthew before he cited the verse. For him, there is no question that Jesus is "the Christ [Χριστοῦ]", "anointed one"; Matt. 1:18a. His mother is pregnant (via the holy spirit)[25] while only betrothed, and before she and Joseph had any sexual union (v. 18b). Joseph was ready to file for divorce (v. 19) but was stopped by an ἄγγελος κυρίου "Lord sent messenger" (v. 19), who informed him that (1) her conception was from the holy spirit (v. 20), that (2) she would bear a son (which is a prediction), and (3) he is to name him Jesus (OT Joshua; "deliverer") because (4) he will deliver his people from their sins (v. 21).

Then Matthew informed his audience that all this happened as a "fulfilment" (πληρωθῇ) or "completion" of what the Lord spoke through Isaiah, and then quoted (what

we call) Isaiah 7:14 with the added translation of the name עִמָּנוּ אֵל as μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός, "with us the God". Matthew must have known (and knew his contemporary Jewish teachers knew) that the context of this verse in Isaiah 7 did not allow Jesus to be whom Isaiah specifically had in mind. So, his understanding of how Jesus fulfilled it is reasonably related to Matthew's Jewish hermeneutical environment. When we look close at the immediate context of this Immanuel child in Isaiah 7:14, we notice that immediately (v. 15) Isaiah explains that whoever this child is, he will have a diet of curds and honey (typically a diet during a famine) by the time he reaches an age of moral accountability.[26] Also, by that time, Samaria (i.e., the "land of the two kings he dreads") will be wasted (v. 16). What is said here was described earlier when *Yahweh* told Isaiah to meet Ahaz and tell him not to fear the two "burning stubs of firewood" (Samaria/Israel/Ephraim and Aram/Syria) who were plotting Judah's ruin (7:3–6) because Judah refused to align with them against Assyria. Then Ahaz learns that this united front against him will fail and within 65 years, Ephraim/Israel will fall (vv. 7–8), so he must stand firm (v. 9). After that, Ahaz was allowed to make any request to God (vv. 10–11), but he declined hypocritically (v. 12); so, Isaiah chastised him and his house for testing God's patience (v. 13), which leads to the famous Immanuel prophecy (not just v. 14 but vv. 14–17).

In verses 14–17, the prophet pronounces that a sign will be given when an '*almah* (girl old enough to be married) *gives birth to a son and names him Immanuel* (v. 14; here is the miraculous prediction; how otherwise did Isaiah know the child would be male and have this name?).[27] And if Isaiah meant to pronounce a virgin birth, why did he not use the technical Hebrew word for "virgin" (*betulah*)?[28] The arguments about '*almah* never meaning a married woman is limited to its OT uses mostly,[29] but in the context, her "virginity" as a "young woman ['*almah*]" is assumed (while not guaranteed) or is "[b]y implication in Hebrew culture".[30] In the positive context of Isaiah 7, it simply means "sexually mature young woman" as a suitable candidate for marriage (Witherington 2017, p. 77). *Parthenos* ("virgin") was at times (e.g., Joel 1:8) used for a *married* woman. This reminds us that words (even '*almah*) have a variety of *uses* and cannot be limited to one "root", basic, or "only" meaning.

This boy will eat food related to a famine (see n. 26) by the time he is morally accountable since Ephraim/Samaria/Israel will have been devastated (vv. 15–16) by the Assyrians (v. 17). Isaiah places the child he has in mind in Judah when the Assyrians conquer (721 BCE) the Northern Kingdom, Israel. Isaiah contextually was not talking about Jesus and his virgin birth during Herod's rule. So, how could Matthew legitimately claim that Jesus' birth "fulfilled" Isaiah's text?

Traditional Evangelicals took the route of ignoring the context and claiming that Isaiah either used language with multiple meanings or had the virgin birth of Jesus in mind as a prediction despite what is said in the other verses (which of course did not exist when these texts were first written). More progressive Evangelicals recognize these issues and respect contextual exegesis as determinative for meaning. They also accept the virgin birth as factual, but use Matthew's discussion as biblical evidence, leaving Isaiah's prophecy historically connected to Ahaz's time; however, also understanding that Matthew's use of Isaiah 7:14 was not literal or exegetical, but rather in line with the application's or spiritual hermeneutical world (midrashic or pesher, et al.) of 1st-century Judaism. Matthew's Jewish audience, for the most part, would have recognized this. The Church failed to recognize it until the OT prophecy was understood to be more complex than a simple prediction and later repetition.

What do we find when we look closely at the Hebrew text of Isaiah 7:14? The text is הָרָה וְיֹלֶדֶת בֵּן וְקָרְאת הִנֵּה הָעַלְמָה שְׁמוֹ עִמָּנוּ אֵל. Literally, "Look at that pregnant young woman; she is birthing a son, and she will call his name *Immanu El*". This indicates that the woman

Isaiah has in mind is standing in sight of those present in Ahaz' house. The word for "young woman" is definite, so it is "the/that one". The word "pregnant" is an adjective, so there is no sense of "will be pregnant". She already is pregnant and pointed to by Isaiah. "Give birth" is a participle, so it can express immediacy ("she is about to give birth", which is not 600 years later). The child will be a boy, so this is what Isaiah predicts in addition to what his name will be. If, as some think, the woman is Isaiah's wife, then he has natural knowledge of the name to be used. But it would demand a supernatural revelation from God for him to know the gender. Then the following verses place this child in the 8th-century BCE. All this being the case, Isaiah could not have used '*almah* meaning "virgin" if indeed Isaiah announced, "Look at that pregnant '*almah*" (7:14b). The child was a sign to those present as other children had been. His name (meaning "God with us") would be an encouragement during the coming time of oppression (Assyrian defeat and destruction, described in 7:18–25).[31]

In the larger context, Isaiah explained "Here am I, and the children the LORD has given me. We are signs and symbols in Israel from the LORD Almighty, who dwells on Mount Zion" (8:18; NIV). Other children than *Immanuel* were signs. When he first went to meet Ahaz (7:3), he took along his son *Shear-Jashub* ("A remnant will return"). He later shared how he and his wife ("the prophetess"; 8:3) birth another son named *Maher-Shalal-Hash-Baz* (meaning "Hurry to the Spoil"), whose name was ordered by God to be written on a scroll (8:1–3). And by the time he reached an age of moral accountability, Damascus would be plundered by the Assyrian army (8:4). Chapter 8 ends with the recognition that nothing can stop the Assyrian advances, but still *imm-anu-el*, "with us is God!" or "Oh, [be] with us God!" (8:5–10). Three different children are named in the larger context whose names were signs to the people of God's presence despite disaster and deportation.

The application of Isa 7:14 to Jesus was probably considered by Matthew to be a case of the literal fulfillment of an explicit messianic prophecy (to use our more refined distinctions of today). The Greek παρθένος was undoubtedly commonly equated with the Hebrew עלמה in the synagogues of Judaism through the influence of the LXX. Whether it be judged legitimately or not, the association of the two words for two centuries or so must certainly have counted for something theologically. Furthermore, Isa 7:14 may well have been one of those passages identified by Jesus as being significant for his own person and ministry, thereby clarifying the enigmatic in an Immanuel passage and explicating the intended *sensus plenior* for his followers.

On the other hand, it may be that Matthew considered Isa 7:14 more a typological statement, which found its antitype in the Messiah Jesus, than a direct messianic prophecy, as we would understand a direct messianic prophecy. Distinctions of this sort, however, were probably not consciously present in the Evangelist's mind. His purpose was to lay stress on the fulfillment of God's redemptive activity in the person of Jesus Christ, whether that be later analyzed as "direct" or "typological". And in so doing, he used a pesher treatment of the passage in both its text form and its application.[32]

5.2.3. Genesis 5:21–24

One final and emerging example, in passing, is the matter of Enoch's "translation" by God in Genesis 5:24. A traditional interpretation is that Enoch was so righteous and God was so anxious to have him in Heaven that God transported him alive from Earth to His presence. The author of Hebrews in the New Testament followed this interpretation as found in the ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible (the Septuagint or LXX): καὶ εὐηρέστησεν Ενωχ τῷ θεῷ καὶ οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο, ὅτι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός, translated by (NETS 2014) as "And Henoch was well pleasing to God, and he was not found, because God transferred him". But the Hebrew text only says, "Enoch walked with God; then he

was no more, because God took him away" (NIV). The word for "God [*'elohim*]" (as usual) is plural, but also the first in v. 24a is definite, so could be translated "the God [or 'gods']" (as also in v. 22). The second use in v. 24b is anarthrous ("[a] G/god") as a subject of a 3ms verb (so cannot be "gods"), and the context could imply "the God/gods" as the sense intended for v. 24b.

The question (since LXX is a human interpretation) is if the LXX reading is exegetically accurate for the meaning intended by the author of the original text in Hebrew (as opposed to a fanciful application). As the Hebrew text stands, it could be interpreted to say that Enoch had walked with the God (v. 22; *ha-'elohim*), but later walked with the gods (v. 24a; *ha-'elohim*). In other words, he turned to idol worship. Therefore, God (*'elohim*) "took" (=took [his life]?). Anarthrous *'elohim* here could contextually be a variant for "[the] God". However, the contrast with *ha-'elohim* could be intentional and distinguish *Elohim* ("God") from "the-gods". "Away" is not in the Hebrew text. The Hebrew text says, "he was no more because *'elohim* took him", while the Greek says, "he could not be found because God removed him". The point is that an exegesis of these verses in the HB is not necessarily consistent with the LXX interpretation. For traditional Evangelicals the interpretation in Hebrews (11:5) is authoritative for the meaning in Genesis 5. But the author of Hebrews 11:5 based his thoughts on the non-authoritative interpretation of the LXX.[33]

Genesis 5:24 (Greek OT).	Hebrews 11:5 (Greek NT)	Genesis 5:24 (Hebrew OT)
καὶ εὐηρέστησεν Ενωχ τῷ θεῷ καὶ οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο, ὅτι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός.	Πίστει Ἑνὼχ μετετέθη τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, καὶ οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός. πρὸ γὰρ τῆς μεταθέσεως μεμαρτύρηται εὐαρεστηκέναι τῷ θεῷ·	וַיִּתְהַלֵּךְ חֲנוֹךְ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים וְאֵינֶנּוּ כִּי־לָקַח אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים׃
And Henoch was well pleasing to God, and he was not found, because God transferred him. (NETS 2014)	By faith Enoch was taken from this life, so that he did not experience death; he could not be found, because God had taken him away. For before he was taken, he was commended as one who pleased God. (NIV)	Then Enoch walked with *ha-'elohim* and he was no more because *'elohim* took him.

The author of Hebrews did not follow the so-called inspired Hebrew text (1500 BCE?), but the inspiring, imaginative interpretation by a translator in the 3rd-century BCE. It is very possible, if not probable, that the author of Hebrews was not exegeting Genesis 5:24 contextually, but following the popular "out-of-context" and more spiritual and application-based use of OT texts in 2nd-Temple and 1st-century Jewish hermeneutics. Jewish commentary about Genesis 5:24, at times, interpreted Enoch as sinful.[34] Traditional and more progressive Evangelicals today are divided strongly over this kind of interpretation that (for progressives) depends on Jewish hermeneutical practices, but for traditionalists (although these are located in biblical times when the NT was composed), depends on taking the author of Hebrews literally, at face value, to explain Genesis 5:24 as God's prize rather than punishment (as contextually it can and has been read).

6. Conclusions

What has happened in modern times is that traditional Evangelicals have been so tied to a directly predictive hermeneutic for the OT prophecy (e.g., Isaiah 7:14 explicitly projecting Jesus' virgin birth) that even otherwise good scholars have found creative ways to support the Hebrew text as meaning a virgin (meaning Mary, mother of Jesus) would have a son (Jesus), and then find more creative means to make the surrounding verses comply with this interpretation. Translating '*almah* as "virgin" in Isaiah 7:14 became a litmus test for orthodoxy. RSV, NRSV, and others were and are condemned as liberal and worse for supposedly removing the supernatural predictive prophecy of the virgin birth in Isaiah 7:14 by translating '*almah* as "young woman". One pastor even burned a copy of the RSV (Metzger 2001). Although his commentary on Isaiah is part of an Evangelical academic series, Oswalt skips over the critical textual issues of 7:14 when the passage is covered (Oswalt 1986), and one of the introductory essays is on the "significance of prediction", where he complains about interpreters who "deny… specific predictions", (Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah*, 46–47). Edward Hinson, on the faculty of the fundamentalist Evangelical Liberty University, in an article entitled, "Development of the Interpretation of Isaiah 7:14", wrote:

> In the interpretation of Isaiah 7:14, three basic positions have been historically taken by commentators: (1) that the reference is only, to an immediate event, of the prophet's own day; (2) that it refers only to the Messiah; (3) that it refers to both. The first position has been generally held by those who have denied the unity of the book's structure and supernaturalness of the content.[35] … From the time of the reformers most evangelicals have held the second, viewpoint…. However, during the middle of the nineteenth century, especially after the publication of Duhm's work, the concept of immediate contemporary fulfillment of all of Isaiah's prophecies became widespread. Unable to stem the rising flood of opinion, many conservatives retreated to a dual-fulfillment position, especially on this particular passage (Ellison n.d.). Thus, the position of the reformers, who saw fulfillment only in Christ, was abandoned. This influence affected the interpretation of the entire Immanuel passage, which came to be viewed by many as merely symbolic (Hinson 1969; Davidson n.d.).

Hinson added: "It may be noted from this chart that as the non-messianic interpretation gained impetus in Germany and began to influence writers in England and the United States during the last of the nineteenth century, conservative writers of the early twentieth century began to adopt a position earlier advocated by Barnes and Keith.[36] At the same time there was a noticeable drop in commentaries advocating a strictly messianic fulfillment" (Hinson 1969, p. 22). Hinson opposes Evangelicals who adhere to a "dual fulfillment" hermeneutic, as well as liberal and neo-orthodox critical scholars who interpret Isaiah 7:14 only historically and contextually. The former is semantically and contextually flawed,[37] and the latter has the better contextual–exegetical argument against his "single-fulfillment" approach, but he has nothing to say about Jewish hermeneutics of the 1st-century. Traditional and Neo-Evangelicals are at a stalemate. But the repeated appeal that '*almah* means "virgin" in Isaiah 7:14 (because it implies "virgin" (e.g., 'Got Questions 2016')) should no longer suffice as an acceptable exegesis for even the most conservative Evangelicals.

Granted, often critical scholars (yet also some current scholars who identify, to some degree, with the Evangelical movement) do find a literal "prediction" technically inaccurate to describe how Scripture functions when an OT passage is viewed as "fulfilled" by an NT event or person. This is because it is increasingly clear that the connection between some or most OT prophecies and their NT applications is more indirect than direct (as when Hosea called idolatrous Israel God's child or son, and later Matthew, a Jewish con-

vert, saw a hermeneutical correspondence between Israel and Jesus in that both returned from Egypt, which underlined the corporate solidarity between Jesus and Israel, supporting his Messiahship. The fulfilment is not a "prediction", as described in the past, but a "completion" related to different kinds of correspondences found in Jewish hermeneutical practices of the 1st-century CE (with which the NT authors and their audiences were familiar as most, initially, were Jewish). It makes sense that they would evangelize fellow Jews with OT interpretations based on familiar and already trusted Jewish hermeneutical principles to demonstrate that Jesus is the expected Messiah. The evangelical understanding of how the NT used the OT has and is still progressing from a time when the Jewish hermeneutical context of the 1st-century was absent or avoided as a contextual interpretive tool, to the present time when it is gradually being acknowledged and accepted more widely as an unavoidable exegetical component for NT translation and interpretation.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: The original contributions presented in this study are included in the article. Further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Notes

[1] This study has been carried out in connection with a theme in *Religions* related to the growth of the Evangelical movement from fundamentalist origins to its present academic and progressive expressions. This paper is written from the perspective of someone who sees "evangelicals" as dividing into two groups, "progressive" evangelicals with whom the author identifies and "traditional" evangelicals.

[2] The number claimed is not the most possible in each instance, but may represent a certain category of the total. For 50, see Konig (2024); for 65, see (Kaiser 1995); for 70, see Konig (2020), "Chart of Old Testament prophecies fulfilled by Jesus" (http://www.about-jesus.org/complete-chart-prophecies-jesus.htm, accessed on 10 March 2025); for 127 Messianic predictions, see J. Barton Payne, (Payne 1980) (as claimed by "Got Questions" [see below]). Payne does not have 574 of these in the OT, but does indicate this number for whole-Bible verses about a personal Messiah according to (Kaiser 2006), yet Konig (2024) "Chart" claims 191 personal prophecies for Christ; for 300, see https://www.gotquestions.org/prophecies-of-Jesus.html, accessed on 25 January 2025; for 300+, see (Forward Ministries 2020), "Jesus Fulfilled over 300 Prophecies Mathematically Proving that He is the Messiah" (https://www.clintbyars.com/blog/2020/7/20/jesus-fulfilled-over-300-prophecies, accessed on 25 January 2025); for 351, see ND https://www.newtestamentchristians.com/bible-study-resources/351-old-testament-prophecies-fulfilled-in-jesus-christ/, accessed on 25 January 2025; for 48 specific and 324 individual, see https://firmisrael.org/learn/how-many-messianic-prophecies-did-jesus-fulfill/, accessed on 25 January 2025; for 400, see "400 Prophecies about Christ in OT" (https://biblearchaeology.org/research/devotionals/3973-400-prophecies-of-christ-in-the-old-testament, accessed on 25 January 2025); and for 456, see (Edersheim 1886), 170. Cf. (Wilson 2023).

[3] When I say I "align" with the Evangelical movement (more specifically, its progressive arm), I mean that I (as a Jesus-the-Christ follower) support the spread of the "Good News" (εὐαγγελίζω) he and others proclaimed in the NT, and at least all his teachings as the best means (if widely accepted) for a righteous humanity. "Evangelical" encompasses all who align with the Evangelical Theological Society or who distance themselves from fundamentalists (or KJV-only adherents), Neo-evangelicals (especially progressives, who are re-thinking traditional dogmas), and most of what challenges a traditional or conservative consensus since the end of the 20th century. By "exegesis" I mean deriving (as much as is possible) the contextual and historical meaning of the author. By "hermeneutics", the science of interpretation is meant, which today encompasses numerous approaches including exegesis and others that focus on the text or the current readers as the locus for "meaning", or interpret the Bible, or one of its Testaments, in relation to a special hot-topic (such as women, sexuality, creation care, political theory, immigration, the poor, etc.). My concern herein is only related to how certain conservative/traditional interpreters (followed, it seems, by most evangelicals in my experience) have dealt with the Messianic prophecy in relation to their traditional commitment to Bible interpretations based on (at least in theory) a literary, grammatical, or historical exegesis (but which, in practice, has often ignored the historical–cultural aspect, as indicated by the immediate setting of the passage in question). People can communicate when they share the

same language and understand its rules, which involve morphology and syntax. My presupposition is that biblical language operates the same way, so what biblical speakers meant to communicate to their audiences can be reconstructed fairly accurately, based on a passage's setting and sense created by its use of Classical Hebrew or Koine Greek, bearing in mind the impact of any literary devices and the determination if a statement uses literal and/or figurative expressions. This affirms the importance of exegesis (a contextual interpretation), but does not deny any value of other hermeneutical approaches (text- or reader-centered, etc.). My analysis of the evangelical (similar to conservative, traditional Protestant) interpretation of the Messianic prophecy in the OT is focused on its own commitment to exegesis. My theological education in evangelical seminaries was based on the idea that "a text without a context is a pretext". My question is if conservative/evangelical commentators consistently apply this.

[4] See, e.g., (Enns 2020). Almost any book by Enns serves this purpose.

[5] See note 4 (above), regarding Peter Enns, whose work is often not appreciated by conservatives (especially fundamentalists) and who was dismissed from a faculty position (at Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia) for some of what he wrote in his first book (see *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. [Grand Rapids: Baker 2015]), although the book is praised by some evangelical reviewers, and most of the faculty at Westminster agreed with him). See "Editorial Reviews" (https://www.amazon.com/Inspiration-Incarnation-Evangelicals-Problem-Testament/dp/0801097487, accessed on 25 January 2025). One summary says, "Enns… addresses Old Testament phenomena that challenge traditional evangelical perspectives on Scripture. He then suggests a way forward, proposing an incarnational model of biblical inspiration that takes seriously both the divine and the human aspects of Scripture" (see https://www.amazon.com/Inspiration-Incarnation-Evangelicals-Problem-Testament/dp/0801097487, accessed on 25 January 2025).A Southern Baptist PhD student once told me I could not be a legitimate Christian and believe (agreeing with those like Enns [above] and Longenecker [in Sources below]) that Matthew used Jewish midrash as a means to explain how Jesus fulfilled the OT prophecy.

[6] When following research, e.g., presented by (Longenecker 1999).

[7] See (Longenecker 1999, pp. 28–78, 134, 143–52). I am indebted to this book for opening my Evangelical eyes to the reality of the Apostolic interpretation of the OT being non-contextual and informed by ancient Jewish interpretive practices. I often use the term "exegesis" (also in this essay) synonymously with "contextual interpretation" or grammatical–historical interpretation (i.e., what the text or author meant by the words used to an immediate audience). Longenecker's title uses it interchangeably with "interpretation" or "hermeneutics" that often indicate not one, but several methods or topics (e.g., feminist, ecological, or intercultural). In theory, Evangelicals have long praised exegesis as objective and text-based, giving the author's intended meaning in context; but in practice, they have often rejected good exegesis when it clashed with orthodoxy or orthopraxy. Current progressive Evangelicals are also human and fallible, but are moving away from letting traditional views or doctrines create a straight-jacket that has led to the presuppositional theology controlling how a text is understood (translated and interpreted).

[8] Past Evangelical commentary on Isaiah 7:14 is preoccupied with showing that Hebrew *'almah* means "virgin", technically for Isaiah. But, context controls meaning and Isaiah 7:14 reads, "Look at that pregnant '*almah*" (the word "pregnant" being an adjective). This woman and her child for Isaiah lived in the 8th-century BCE, as the following verses (15–17) demonstrate (see Isaiah 7:14 discussion below).

[9] Evangelical versions like NIV consistently render *angelos* ("messenger") as "angel", *satan* ("accuser") as "Satan", *sheol* ("grave") as "Hell", or *ruach* ("wind, breath, spirit") as "[Holy] Spirit". There is a tendency to anachronistically read much later theological ideas artificially into the thoughts of biblical speakers. Such corrections to traditional versions (especially KJV) may be viewed as liberal or radical, although they fit the historical context.

[10] Evangelicals were behind the production of the NIV (Zondervan) and even paraphrases like *The Living Bible* (Tyndale), *The Message: The Bible in Contemporary Language* (NavPress), and *The Voice* (Thomas Nelson). Yet more recently, a return to more literal approaches was led by the creation of the *English Standard Version* (ESV; a result, in part, from the very conservative scholarship of Wayne Grudem) to counter the popularity of NIV for evangelicals and the NRSV for main-line churches.

[11] Such as the evangelical Bible translation mission Wycliffe Bible Translators.

[12] When Bible translation is debated, the word-for-word vs. thought-for-thought approaches still strongly divide Evangelicals. See, e.g., (Brunn 2015).

[13] Another example (but not related to *The Voice*) is the use of "baptize". Again, this is a transliteration of the Greek *baptizo* and not a translation. As with all words, there is not only one "meaning", but a variety of uses. Translators must decide which of the usages (current, when a text was produced verbally or graphically) best fits a given context. One of several uses of *baptizo* was for dipping a cloth in dye. The problem now is that this choice (correct or not in context) would skew a translation in favor of a particular denominational baptismal theology. A published Bible version is intended for all Christians using its language, so for the publisher, a potential large financial profit is anticipated. Sales would drop drastically if a published version attracted only a limited section of the Christian market. The question with *baptizo* becomes how to translate it cross-denominationally. Also, words have literal and figurative uses. This word metaphorically can indicate "identify with something". But this interpretation would cause other problems. Evangelicals are now beginning to wake up more and more to understanding the Bible contains various literary genres and was communicated initially with ancient audiences and their worldviews and concerns in mind. It is

not a mere book of propositions directly from God's mouth to the Church. As divine revelation, it still was created by inspiration working in and through human instruments and language. Theology based only on human translation is dangerous. Some early Evangelicals knew this, of course, but a greater number are waking up to this reality presently, due to the rise of Evangelical graduate schools with teachers trained academically and broadly.

14 See, e.g., again the publications of Peter Enns (formerly at Westminster and now at the Eastern Seminary) as well as those of John H. Walton (formerly at the Moody Bible Institute and now at Wheaton College). One of Walton's colleagues at Wheaton (Gregory Beale, formerly at Westminster and Reformed in Dallas)—and as a member of IBR and ETS—is an outspoken critic of Walton's approach to Old Testament topics in his "Lost World" series (IVP; e.g., Walton 2009). This involves differences over the use of the cultural hermeneutics in his interpretation.

15 In the Greek OT translation (LXX): Οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῷ χριστῷ μου Κύρῳ; and in the Hebrew text: כה–אמר יהוה למשיחו לכורש.

16 "A/anointed" appears 86 times in the KJV and 128 times in the NIV. In Psalm 2:2, the NIV has "Anointed" and KJV "anointed". In Daniel 9:25, NIV's "Anointed One" is "Messiah" in KJV. Both call Cyrus the Persian king "[YHWH's] anointed" in Isaiah 44:1.

17 See (USA Today 2012). In this same article, Mike Norris of Franklin Road Baptist Church in Murfreesboro disagrees, admitting that his congregation believes the KJV is the most accurate translation in English: "Other translations", he says, "don't stick to a word-for-word translation. They say the other translations are easier to read and more accurate. We disagree".

18 Again, e.g., see publications by Enns and Walton (mentioned above and in the Sources below).

19 The frequent genitive constructs (like "angel of the Lord") in both the OT and NT are regularly left uninterpreted by translators in English versions, leaving a literal rendering. "Angel" of course is also not translated, being a transliteration of the Greek *angelos*. But what is meant by "of the Lord"? The word "of" in the OT and NT is not present in the texts as a physical term (as in English), but symbolizes the existence of the genitive construct morphology, which the interpreter/translator was expected to explain. Translators avoid this because they must choose between interpretive options for the genitive case; so, they err on the side of caution (encouraged by publishers), not wanting to "over interpret" (as if translators are not interpreters whatever they do or not do). Regardless, in this case it seems (fairly) obvious that a source genitive is involved ("*from* the Lord"). Leaving the interpretation to the typical untrained layperson does not solve the problem. Most preachers will not explain a source genitive to the congregation.

20 Although NT authors often cited the Greek text (LXX; ca. 250 BCE), Matthew cited from the Hebrew: וּמִמִּצְרַיִם קָרָאתִי לִבְנִי (ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου "and from Egypt I called my son"). LXX (Ralfs 2012) has καὶ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ ("and from Egypt I called his child").

21 "Traditional" or "older" here indicates an earlier time, but not exclusively. The traditional, conservative, or fundamentalist people dominated an earlier period, but these same views continue today, and often still as the majority view because progressives are outnumbered although growing.

22 Academic Evangelicals are more circumspect (and generally more informed broadly) than popularists and preachers, so the most simple or non-technical treatments are found in devotional books or sermons and on the Internet, e.g., Hosea 11:1 is named among 11 OT prophesies where the OT "accurately predicts Jesus' birth and death" (Haynes 2024).

23 A distant but somewhat related event took place when Robert Gundry (an NT scholar at Westmont; ETS member; PhD from Manchester) resigned (before being ousted) from the ETS (Evangelical Theological Society) in 1983 due to outraged opposition in the Society after the publication of his commentary on Matthew, in which he seemed to argue that "Matthew adapted the story of Jesus to appeal to the intended audience". Although he maintained his commitment to the inerrancy of Scripture, he also argued, "that the Bible was never meant to be a work of history and that the religious content contains no errors". Many in the ETS supported him. Most problematic was his assertion that "Matthew made historical additions to the infancy story in Matthew 1 and 2". See (Theopedia n.d.). In the end, the verdict was that his views were not consistent with the ETS understanding of inerrancy. Similar debates occurred in 2002–2003 when Clark Pinnock and John Sanders were "in the dock" over their Open Theism views and publications (mid-1990s–2003). See (OPEN THEISM 2003). Ten years later, the question could be asked, "Is Open Theism still a factor 10 Years after ETS Vote?" In 2014, "Many Evangelical Arminians reject open theism out of hand. Yet open theism emerged among Arminians as a possible solution to the 'problem' of God's exhaustive foreknowledge as it relates to his providence and man's free will". Bruce Ware (ETS president in 2009), an ardent opponent of Open Theology, said, "the view itself remains alive and growing within some pockets of evangelicalism". See (Robinson 2014). The author of this article (Jeff Robinson) confesses he argued in a 2001 plenary address at the ETS against Open Theism as a "viable evangelical position. Sadly, some have disagreed with me".

24 Grogan observes, " …his context raises major problems. These verses certainly imply a close historical relationship between the child and the political situation of Isaiah's day" (Grogan 1994, n.p.).

25 Upper-case is not used for this title here (as in traditional Evangelical versions like the NIV) because historically and contextually, no concept about a Trinity was current, meaning no one would have been communicating what we perceive when capital letters are used.

[26] What the diet of "curds and honey" was is debated. Aquinas called these "manly foods", indicating his humanity and pointed to *Wisdom* 7:3 (Aquinas 2021, p. 145). *Witherington* mentions that this food is eaten by royalty in some Mesopotamian texts (Witherington 2017, p. 75). Grogan calls it the solid food characteristic of the land (Grogan 1994, n.p.). Matthew Henry observed that the Messianic child would eat the normal food of these countries and not angel food although conceived by the Holy Spirit (Henry 2017, n.p.). The *Pulpit Commentary* (https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Isaiah-7-14_meaning/, accessed on 25 January 2025) says "His fare shall be of the simplest kind", pointing to 7:22, "And because of the abundance of the milk they give, he will have curds to eat. All who remain in the land will eat curds and hone" (NIV).Another source says "curds" is a butter product (as seen in Mesopotamian texts), where it is regularly served with honey for rituals, food, medicine, or offerings to the gods. Such food was available from the land naturally outside of farming, which fits a time when a person would be unsettled (Walton et al. 2000, p. 593). Young cited Lindblom saying this food was indicative of a prosperous and blissful time (Young 1965, I:291, n. 40 and 507 mentions Lindblom, *A Study on the Immanuel Section of Isaiah*, Lund 1958). Based on this, he calls the food a symbol of a "royal diet" and mentions how the ancient world believed one who eats the "food of the gods" is a supernatural being (Young 1965, I:291, p. 292), and suggests that Isaiah at least used this to show Jesus was unusual if not divine (Young 1965, I:292). Kidner (1970, p. 638) says, "the *curds and honey* are enigmatic, they are symbols of natural plenty (cf. 22; Ex. 3:8) yet also of a land depopulated (22b) and untilled (cf. 23–25)".

[27] Young alerts the reader to other similar expressions when a child is named: Hagar and Ishmael (Gen. 16:11); Sarah and Isaac (Gen. 17:19); Manoah's wife and Samson (Judg. 13:3).

[28] The virgin birth and literal interpretation of Isaiah 7:14 are also fueled by the LXX's (Ralfs 2012) translation and interpretation of the Hebrew 'almah with the Greek word for "virgin" (*parthenos*). Admittedly, this is curious, but it is the Hebrew text that is normally considered inspired, even for most traditional Evangelicals, and usually not any translation (although the KJV-only people will ascribe inspiration to that English translation of 1611). Yet, the LXX (Ralfs 2012) use of *parthenos* is not proof that '*almah* meant "virgin". The '*almah* was unmarried and, therefore, assumed a virgin; but to confirm that a woman was a virgin, *parthenos* would or should have been used. And as often, when the OT is cited, Matthew quoted not the authoritative Hebrew text, but its non-authoritative Greek *translation* because the Greek Bible was the popular text of the time (since Jewish people had been losing the use of Hebrew due to Hellenization and then Roman domination, except for the scholars).

[29] Young mentions Luther's wager of 100 *Gulden* to anyone who could document '*almah* used of a married woman. He also discounts the claim that Ugaritic *ǵlmt* (Semitic counterpart to '*almah*) is used for the Canaanite goddess and wife of the god *El* (contra Coppens, Kidner 1970, p. 638). See Young (1965), I:287, nn. 35–36; and Kaiser (1995), p. 160.

[30] Lee-Thorp (2013), p. 60; citing (Young 1965; Barker 1985; Leupold 1968; Kidner 1970; Witherington 2017), notes that the use of '*almah* implying "virgin" (rather than *betulah* "virgin" pr se) can justify the (Ralfs 2012) use of *parthenos* ("virgin" implicitly). The historical context can be interpreted apart from a miraculous virgin birth. No pre-NT Jewish texts indicate a messianic interpretation of Isaiah 7:14. But could the LXX translator have seen a wider fulfilment in the light of chapters 7–11?

[31] Isaiah 7:18 In that day the LORD will whistle for flies from the distant streams of Egypt and for bees from the land of Assyria.[19] They will all come and settle in the steep ravines and in the crevices in the rocks, on all the thornbushes and at all the water holes.[20] In that day the Lord will use a razor hired from beyond the River—the king of Assyria—to shave your head and the hair of your legs, and to take off your beards also.[21] In that day, a man will keep alive a young cow and two goats.[22] And because of the abundance of the milk they give, he will have curds to eat. All who remain in the land will eat curds and honey.[23] In that day, in every place where there were a thousand vines worth a thousand silver shekels, there will be only briers and thorns.[24] Men will go there with bow and arrow, for the land will be covered with briers and thorns.[25] As for all the hills once cultivated by the hoe, you will no longer go there for fear of the briers and thorns; they will become places where cattle are turned loose and where sheep run. (NIV). The Assyrians would lay waste the lands of Aram and Israel, which they did in 733–732 BCE (see Grogan 1994, "Isaiah", n.p.).

[32] (Longenecker 1999, pp. 127–28). He also noted that "Aquila's translation reads ἡ νεανίς ("young woman") rather than ἡ παρθένος, but Aquila's version is later than Matthew's Gospel and may be in reaction to Christian usage. Likewise, Symmachus's translation" (p. 127, n. 25). According to Grogan, "Matthew's concept of fulfillment is wide-ranging and flexible and embraces different kinds of correspondence between an [OT] passage and a [NT] event" (Grogan 1994, n.p.).

[33] One anonymous source is even so presuppositional (due to the Greek versions) that it declares "The exact text (Gen 5:24) states, 'Enoch walked faithfully with God; then he was no more, because God took him away'". See "The Man Who Walked With God: Biblical Insight On Enoch, Son Of Jared", Digital Bible, https://digitalbible.ca/article-page/bible-study-biblical-characters-who-is-enoch-in-judaism-1699570175572x952046085430926700, accessed on 25 January 2025. This is a claim about the Jewish story (Gen. 5:21–24), which says nothing about Enoch being faithful. Apparently, as often, the interpreter took the New Testament use literally, assuming no other use is an option. This is a frequent misunderstanding about the NT's use of the OT.

[34] In the light of Psalms 49:15 (v. 16 MT) and 73:24, Cassuto concluded that the Scripture had no intention to say that Enoch did not die, just that his death was unusual (Cassuto 1972, p. 286). He also revealed that "occasionally they [the Jewish sages]… not only refuted those who declared that Enoch never knew death… but they even interpreted the text to his [Enoch's] discredit,

asserting that Enoch was not inscribed in the Book of the Righteous but in the Book of the Wicked" (Cassuto 1972, p. 284, citing *Bereshith Rabba* xxv:1; Targum Onkelos, v. 24, "for the Lord slew him").

[35] Here, he gave the examples: (Driver 1888; Gray 1912; Duhm 1922; Boutflower 1930; Mowinckle 1954; Mauchline 1962; Leslie 1963; Knight 1964).

[36] In n. 25, Hinson complains that A. Keith (*Isaiah As It Is*, [Edinburgh, 1850], pp. 67–69) agrees with those who, due to the "sign", say Immanuel was one of the other sons named in Isaiah 7–8, and later in n. 34 (at the same place as this n. 41) admits "There is good reason to doubt whether Keith can actually be considered a 'conservative'". This illustrates how it has become common for traditional Evangelicals to question the theological integrity of those who (on good technical, exegetical, or contextual grounds) advocate interpretations that vary in methodology (even if not in message) from traditional views. Those more progressive Evangelicals (who advocate Jewish hermeneutics as the lens through which to interpret the NT's use of the OT and find indirect [like typology] rather than direct [like predictive] connections between the OT and NT) usually share mostly the same theological/Christological conclusions (i.e., Jesus is the Messiah and Son of God and virgin-born) with the conservatives. The debate is over how technically to explain the phenomenon of the NT's use of the OT in the light of curious contextual and lexical issues. Those Hinson would question as orthodox are trying to be as honest about the text as possible, and even if they make mistakes in this process, they do not deserve to be questioned as to their theological orthodoxy. The challenge is to demonstrate where they are in error exegetically. If their data are true to the text, then charity is in order along with continued scholarly and gentlemanly discussion.

[37] Apart from literary devices like double-entendres or puns, a normal indicative statement can be literal or metaphorical, but does not communicate two different things at the same time. As with Isaiah 7:14, the immediate context and wording clarifies that Isaiah's '*almah* is a pregnant young woman whose son's name will signify God's presence.

References

Primary Sources

BHS. 1997. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia Tagged*, rev. ed. Edited by Karl Elliger und Wilhelm Rudolph and Adrian Schenker. Weiherhammer: BHS.

BHS. 2010. *Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart Groves-Wheeler Westminster Hebrew Morphology* (v. 4.14. Version 2.5). Weiherhammer: BHS.

HALOT. 2000. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Version 3.7). Edited by Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner. Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill. Electronic text hypertexted and prepared by Oaktree Software.

KJV Online. n.d. Isaiah 7:14 Meaning. Pulpit Commentary. Available online: https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Isaiah-7-14_meaning/ (accessed on 25 January 2025).

NRSV. 1989. *New Revised Standard Version of the Bible* (Version 5.0). USA: OUP Oxford. part of a software program, Accordance; The Scripture quotations contained herein are from the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyrighted, 1989 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, and are used by permission. All rights reserved. Version 5.0.

Secondary Sources

Aquinas, St. Thomas. 2021. *Commentary on Isaiah*. Translated by Louis St. Hilaire. Steubenville: Emmaus Academic and Aquinas Institute.

Barker, Kenneth, ed. 1985. *The NIV Study Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Barrett, J. Edward. 1988. Can Scholars Take the Virgin Birth Seriously? *Bible Review* 4: 10–15, 29. Available online: https://library.biblicalarchaeology.org/article/can-scholars-take-the-virgin-birth-seriously/ (accessed on 27 January 2025).

Boutflower. 1930. *The Book of Isaiah*. London: SPCK.

Brunn, Dave. 2015. The Great Debate About English Bible Versions: A Call for Realism and Civility. *Christian Research Institute*. May 17. Available online: https://www.equip.org/articles/the-great-debate-about-english-bible-versions-a-call-for-realism-and-civility/ (accessed on 25 January 2025).

Butterworth, Mike. 1994. Hosea. In *New Bible Commentary*. (Version 2.5). Oxford: University and Colleges Christian Fellowship, Electronic text hypertexted and prepared by OakTree Software, Inc.

Caldwell, Larry W. 2024. Intercultural Hermeneutics. In *Handbook on Postconservative Theological Interpretation*. Edited by Ronald T. Michener and Mark A. Lamport. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, pp. 347–64.

Cassuto, U. 1972. *A Commentary on Genesis. Part One: From Adam to Noah*, English reprint ed. Translated by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magness, University Press, 1944 (Hebrew); 1961 (English); 1972 (reprint). First published in 1944.

Davidson, Andrew Bruce. n.d. *Old Testament Prophecy*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, p. 268.

Driver, Samuel Rolles. 1888. *Isaiah: His Life and Times*. London: Nisbet and Co.
Duhm. 1922. *Das Buch Jesaia*. Gottingen: publisher Duhm.
Edersheim, Alfred. 1886. *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. First published in 1883.
Ellison, Citing H. n.d. *Men Spake from God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Enns, Peter. 2020. *How the Bible Actually Works*, reprint ed. San Francisco: HarperOne.
Forward Ministries. 2020. Jesus Fulfilled over 300 Prophecies. Available online: https://www.clintbyars.com/blog/2020/7/20/jesus-fulfilled-over-300-prophecies (accessed on 22 January 2025).
Got Questions. 2016. Is 'Virgin' or 'Young Woman' the Correct Translation of Isaiah 7:14? Available online: https://www.gotquestions.org/virgin-or-young-woman.html (accessed on 25 January 2025).
Gray, George Buchanan. 1912. *The Book of Isaiah*. New York: Scribner's Sons, vol. I.
Grogan, Geoffrey W. 1994. Isaiah. In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary—Abridged Edition: Two-Volume Set (NIV Commentary)*. (Version 1.6). Edited by Kenneth L. Barker and John R. Kohlenberger, III. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, Electronic text hypertexted and prepared by OakTree Software, Inc.
Haynes, Clarence L., Jr. 2024. Bible Study Tools. 11 Times the Old Testament Predicts Jesus' Birth and Death. Available online: https://www.biblestudytools.com/bible-study/topical-studies/times-the-old-testament-predicts-jesus-birth-and-death.html (accessed on 25 January 2025).
Heiser, Michael S. 2009. The Almah of Isaiah 7:14. NAKED BIBLE. Available online: https://drmsh.com/the-almah-of-isaiah-714/ (accessed on 25 January 2025).
Henry, Matthew. 2017. *Matthew Henry's Commentary*. (Version 3.2). Indore: OakTree Software, Public Domain Electronic Text Downloaded from the Bible Foundation e-Text Library. Available online: https://www.amazon.com/Matthew-Henrys-Concise-Commentary-Whole/dp/1538538369 (accessed on 25 January 2025).
Hinson, Edward E. 1969. Development of the Interpretation of Isaiah 7:14. *Grace Journal* 10: 19–25.
Jamieson, Robert, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown. 1871. *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible (JFB)*. (Version 2.6). Public Domain. Indore: OakTree Software, Inc.
Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. 1995. *The Messiah in the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. 2006. The Promise of the Messiah. *Decision*. November 22. Available online: https://decisionmagazine.com/the-promise-of-the-messiah/ (accessed on 25 January 2025).
Kidner, F. Derek. 1970. Isaiah. In *The New Bible Commentary*, rev. ed. Edited by Donald Guthrie and J. Alec Motyer. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
Knight, George A. F. 1964. *Christian Theology of the Old Testament*. London: SCM.
Konig, Ray. 2020. Chart of Old Testament Prophesies Fulfilled by Jesus. Available online: http://www.about-jesus.org/complete-chart-prophecies-jesus.htm (accessed on 22 January 2025).
Konig, Ray. 2024. *Jesus the Messiah*, 2nd ed. Phoenix: Zealization. Available online: https://www.amazon.com/dp/1965048935 (accessed on 22 January 2025).
Lee-Thorp, Karen, ed. 2013. *LifeChange: Isaiah*. The Navigators, The LifeChange Bible Study Series; Colorado Springs: NavPress.
Leslie, Elmer A. 1963. *Isaiah*. New York and Abingdon: Abingdon.
Leupold, Herbert. C. 1968. *Exposition of Isaiah*. Grand Rapids: Baker, vol. 1.
Longenecker, Richard N. 1999. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Mauchline, John. 1962. *Isaiah 1–39*. New York: Macmillan.
Metzger, Bruce M. 2001. *The Bible in Translation*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
Mowinckle. 1954. *He That Cometh*. New York and Abingdon: Literary Licensing, LLC Abingdon.
NETS. 2014. *A New English Translation of The Septuagint*. (Version 4.0). Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. USA: International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Used by permission of Oxford University Press. First published in 2007.
Oakes, John. 2022. Does the Word Almah in Isaiah 7:14, Which Means Young Woman, Not Virgin, Imply That This Is a Messianic Prophecy? Evidence for Christianity. Available online: https://evidenceforchristianity.org/does-the-word-almah-in-isaiah-714-which-means-young-woman-not-virgin-imply-that-this-is-a-messianic-prophecy/ (accessed on 10 February 2022).
OPEN THEISM. 2003. Available online: https://www.christianitytoday.com/2003/01/closing-door-on-open-theists/ (accessed on 25 January 2025).
Oswalt, John N. 1986. *The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 1–39*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Payne, J. Barton. 1980. *Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy: The Complete Guide to Scriptural Predictions and Their Fulfilment*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
Ralfs, Alfred. 2012. *Rahlfs Tagged Greek Septuagint*. (Version 5.6). Kraft/Taylor/Wheeler Septuagint Morphology Database v. 4.8, Bernard A. Taylor and Dale M. Wheeler. *Septuaginta*. Edited by Alfred Rahlfs Editio altera by Robert Hanhart ©2006. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Robinson, Jeff. 2014. Available online: https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/article/is-open-theism-still-a-factor-10-years-after-ets-vote/ (accessed on 25 January 2025).

Theopedia. n.d. Robert Gundry. Available online: https://www.theopedia.com/robert-gundry (accessed on 25 January 2025).

The Voice. 2008. *The Voice: New Testament*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

USA Today. 2012. The Voice Bible Translation: The Name Jesus Christ Doesn't Appear in *The Voice*, a New Translation of the Bible. Available online: https://www.chron.com/lifestyle/houston-belief/article/the-voice-new-bible-translation-focuses-on-3513502.php (accessed on 25 January 2025).

Walton, John H. 2009. *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

Walton, John H., Victor H. Matthews, and Mark W. Chavalas, eds. 2000. *IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament*. (Version 2.3). Indore: OakTree Software.

Wilson, Michael W. 2023. *Is Fulfilment of Old Testament Prophecy Recognized by Jesus the Messiah? God Thoughts*. San Francisco: Word Press, August 25, Available online: https://quotesthoughtsrandom.wordpress.com/2023/08/25/is-fulfilment-of-old-testament-prophecy-recognized-by-jesus-the-messiah/ (accessed on 25 January 2025).

Witherington, Ben, III. 2017. *Isaiah Old and New: Exegesis, Intertextuality, and Hermeneutics*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Young, Edward J. 1965. *The Book of Isaiah, Vol. I: Chapters I–XVIII*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.