

Isa 5-4  
> produce what seems to us an extremely rapid transition from one to the other.

*For Immanuel is Hebrew for 'God with us.'*  
Those who interpret this prophecy as referring entirely to the present take it as dealing only with the matter of relief from the attack of Ephraim and Syria. They consider it to mean simply this,--a <sup>son</sup>man will be born, and before this child is old enough to distinguish between things which are good and things which are harmful the region that is now hostile will be forsaken of both its kings. This seems quite natural in the light of the context, since the situation of immediate danger was very prominent in the minds of the king and of all the people. A tremendous objection to this view is found in the fact that it allows no element of rebuke whatever. It makes the whole thing a promise of comfort and blessing, and causes verse <sup>13</sup>thirteen to be utterly meaningless.

The opposite extreme is to take the entire passage as referring to Christ. In view of the unworthiness of Ahaz it is quite natural to find here a prediction that God is going to replace him with His only-begotten Son, the true Immanuel, the virgin-born One. The difficulty with this view is that it seems to lack sufficient relationship to the immediate situation. It leaves altogether out of the account the difficulties of the people in the face of the attack by Ephraim and Syria, and it strikes great difficulties in the interpretation of verses <sup>15</sup>fifteen and <sup>16</sup>sixteen. The suggestion has been made that verse <sup>15</sup>fifteen is a prediction of the simple life of our Lord as a child. This does not seem particularly reasonable, especially in view of the fact that the same phrase, "butter and honey shall he eat," is used later on in the chapter (v. 22) in a description of the condition of depopulation which the exile is to bring. There will be so much produced by the cows and by the bees that the few people left cannot possibly eat all of it. Even greater