

worthy of credence, and not to be accepted as divinely inspired, rather than to profess to believe in their inspiration, and then exert one's utmost ingenuity in twisting and perverting the plainest of statements they may contain to a meaning the very opposite to their natural and obvious import. Not even the necessities of Christianity can justify that kind of work.

In the opinion of our Christian friends, one of the most direct and convincing proofs of the divinity of Jesus of Nazareth to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures is that which they say is given in the verse in Isaiah which they cite as foretelling his miraculous birth.¹ In that verse the prophet Isaiah tells Achaz, king of Judah, that, as a sign from the Almighty, a certain young woman would become the mother of a son, and would call his name Immanuel. As the mother of Jesus did not call his name *Immanuel*, which means "God with us," and as he was never called by that name, it does not suit our Christian friends to interpret that part of the verse in a literal way; they therefore pretend that the word *Immanuel* should not be regarded as a proper name, but only as descriptive of the nature or character of the child to be born; and that Jesus was *Immanuel*, because he was "God with us." We will pass over the question of the child's name, although it is as much an essential part of the sign as is his birth; and we will only consider the verse from the point of view of its applicability to Jesus of Nazareth.

The verse in question is susceptible of two interpretations, each of which depends on the different

¹ Isaiah vii. 14.