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INTRODUCTION

The seven problems for translators and exegetes of Isaiah 8:1–15 include four lexical difficulties, one scribal error of confusing a ש and a ו, and two cases of words and verses which have ‘migrated’ from their original position in the text. The two phrases in Isa 8:1–15 which must be restored to their former places are:

1. The MT שְׁלֹשֶׁת קָרָא אֲתָא בְּלִי כָּלָה (‘with Rezin and the son of Remaliah’) in 8:6, which must be restored to 8:4, so that the text reads, “... the wealth of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria—along with Rezin and the son of Remaliah—will be carried away before the king of Assyria.”

2. Verses 14–15, “And he will become a sanctuary (?) and a stone of offense and a rock of stumbling to both houses of Israel . . .,” must be restored to the end of 8:8, with the subject of the verb בְּשַׁלֵּם being the king of Assyria who is mentioned in 8:7 (see below).

The four words in Isa 8:1–15 which are problematic are the שְׁלֹשֶׁת קָרָא אֲתָא בְּלִי כָּלָה “rejoicing” in 8:6, the לְמַעֵד “its wings” in 8:8, the נָשְׁתָה “be terrified” in 8:9, and the לְמַעֵד “sanctuary” in 8:14.
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However, by looking at Arabic cognates of these four words contextually appropriate definitions and translations become available, requiring only the emendation of the one ד to a ר in 8:14.

A PREFERRED READING FROM THE SEPTUAGINT

The second of these three words, the כנפי in 8:8, appears to reference the breadth of the flooding of the Euphrates. However, it appears in the Septuagint as παρεμβολή, meaning “a fortified camp, barracks, an enclosure.” The relevant line from 8:8 reads,

ψάλτης Μεθοδής-Πλάτανος Κέλας Ράκα Αλλάτας
and it will become the stretchings of its wings the filling of the breath of your land
καὶ ἔσται ἡ παρεμβολή αὐτοῦ ὡστε πληρώσαι τὸ πλάτος τῆς χώρας σου,
and his camp shall thus fill the breadth of thy land.

Hatch and Redpath (1954:1068) did not identify the MT כנפי as the text behind this Greek translation. Commentators, such as Gray (1912:148), Clements (1980: 97) and Blenkinsopp (2000: 241), ignored the Septuagint translation of the verse. However, the Greek translators were obviously aware of a meaning of כנף in Biblical Hebrew which was lost in post-Biblical times—though it survived in Arabic. The Arabic verb כֶּנַּף (kanafa) “to guard, to protect, to provide with an enclosure” and the noun כֶּנָּף (kanaf) “shelter, fold, protection, wing, aegis” (Castell 1669: 1760 [cinxit, custodivit, protexit, circumtextit]; Lane 1893: 3004; Wehr, 1979: 988) corresponds perfectly with the Greek παρεμβολή “a fortified
enclosure, camp.” In light of this Arabic cognate, the Septuagint provides the best interpretation of the נְפִיקַן in 8:8. Thus, the paraphrase of נְפִיקַן as “its branches” (Blenkinsopp 2000: 240), when speaking of the river rather than the king, is unnecessary; and the objection of Clements (1980) that

The sudden transition to the imagery of a bird with outstretched wings is awkward and unanticipated, with most modern commentators it should be regarded as a later addition . . .
can be not be sustained. Moreover, Irvine’s (1990: 193) interpretation that “The words to Immanuel depict Yahweh as a great bird . . . [and] the temple iconography is probably the source of Isaiah’s metaphor” can be readily dismissed since he has to reach back thirty-one words in the Hebrew text—skipping over the masculine nouns נְפִיקַן and נְפִיקַן—to reach the נְפִיקַן for the antecedent of the suffix of נְפִיקַן “its/his wings.”

FROM “REJOICING” TO BEING “BARELY VISIBLE”

By appealing to the Arabic cognates of the three other problematic Hebrew words in Isa 8:1–15, clarification becomes immediately available. Consider next the נְפִיקַן in Isa 8:6, which has been variously translates as

• “rejoice” (KJV, NKJ, NIV, NIB, NLT, YLT, WEB, RWB, and the Syriac ﴽ (hādaʿ) being the basis for Lamsa’s “rejoice”).
• “melt in fear” (RSV, NRS)
• “tremble” (NJB)
• “to take up” (DRA, Vulgate adsumptsit)
• “desires to have . . . a king over you” (LXX βούλεσθαι ἐχεῖν . . . βασιλέα ἔφ’ ὑμῶν).

Fullerton (1924) and Sweeney (1993) have provided summaries of the varied scholarly interpretations of this מישהות (which is followed by the direct object sign מ or the preposition “with”), beginning with Kimhi and Gesenius who read it as a construct noun or a verbal noun with the force of a finite verb, meaning “they [many in Judah] will rejoice with them [Rezin and ben Remaliah].” However, a number of scholars opted to emend the MT מישהות “and rejoicing” to מישהות וָסַמְמ “and dissolving, melting, fading away,” or “gently,” including Hitzig (1833), Bredenkamp (1887), Procksh (1930), Wildberger (1972), Schoors (1972), Clements (1980), and Kaiser (1983). Honeyman (1944) emended the מישהות to מִנָּה “to draw up,” to convey the idea that Judah’s water bucket “drew up” the dangerous kings Rezin and Pekah. A number of other commentators dismissed מישהות as a gloss, including Schroeder (1912), Fullerton (1924), and Dietrich (1976). But Irvine (1990: 187) cautioned, “Without textual evidence to the contrary, however, the Masoretic text should be retained and the historical background understood accordingly.”

Auret (1990: 112–113) and Sweeney (1993: 46–52) likewise rejected all proposed emendations and claims about glosses. In order to accommodate the MT מישהות “rejoicing,” Auret argued for a change of assumptions about the historical setting, shifting it from the time of the Syro-Ephraimite war (735 B.C.E.)—when no Judean would have rejoiced with Pekah or Rezin—to the time of Tiglath-Pileser III (732 B.C.E.). Auret stated,
With the overrunning of Aram and the Northern Kingdom by the invading troops of Tiglath-Pileser III, it requires no major feat of the imagination to picture the satisfaction and joy of Ahaz and his court . . . , permitting his translation of 8:6 to be “Because these people rejected the calm waters of Shiloah and rejoice in (implicit: the face [sic] of the destruction of) Rezin and the son of Remaliah . . . .” Thus, Auret emended only the context, but not the text. Instead of rejoicing with Rezin and Pekah, the Judeans addressed in 8:6 actually rejoiced with the destruction of the two kings, a fait accompli. 6

By contrast, Sweeney rightly argued that the MT פֶּשַׁלָּהוּ “rejoicing,” lies behind the יָרָא הָאָרֶץ “they preferred / delighted in,” found in Targum Jonathan. But with less success, he argued that the Septuagint’s βούλεσθαι ἔχειν . . . βασιλέα ἐφ’ ὑμῖν, “desires to have . . . a king over you,” corresponds to a verbal understanding of MT פֶּשַׁלָּהוּ as “delight in” or “choose.” But to the contrary, the Greek ἔχειν . . . βασιλέα reflects the identification of the MT פֶּשַׁלָּהוּ with the Hebrew stem סָס/סָס (saws/sás) “he ruled, he governed, he became head, chief, commander” (Lane 1872: 1465; Wehr 1979: 514), providing another example of the Septuagint translators’ knowledge of rare words in Biblical Hebrew which became lost in post-Biblical and rabbinic Hebrew. Moreover, the βούλεσθαι “to desire” was probably a translation of the MT חָוָה, which must have appeared in the Vorlage of the Septuagint with full spelling as חוָֹה and was read as the construct of חוָֹה “desire.
Similar to Auret’s changing the historical context of Isa 8:6 to a time when the people of Judah could be expected to rejoice over the demise of Rezin and Pekah, Sweeney opted to interpret Isa 8:6 in the light of Isa 66:10–14, which also speaks of overflowing streams and of people rejoicing (יהיה), coupled with the use of רLikes with these two verbs, like the רLikes מלחשים in 8:6. His conclusions (1993: 49–50) that “... there is no secure alternative to the reading um’šōš in Isa. 8.6,” and “the reading of מלחשים may appear awkward, but it must stand,” can be sustained—but for different reasons and with different definitions than those found in Sweeney’s study.

The MT מלחשים is the Hebrew cognate of the Arabic adjective מוששים/מושושים (mušawis/mušawiš) which Lane (1872: 1618) defined as “water hardly to be seen, by reason of its remoteness [from the surface of the ground] or its paucity and the depth to which it has sunk.” The vocalization of the MT מחששים needs to be repointed as מחששים or מחששים and read in conjunction with the four words which precede it rather than the four word which follow it, so that the entire phrase reads as מחששים מלחשים יָהַלָּהַל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל הָלָּל Halmash, “the waters of Shiloah that flow gently and are barely visible,” with the “barely” focusing on the paucity of the water and the “visible” focusing on its partial invisibility.

It is well known that (1) some sections of the aqueduct from the Spring of Gihon to the Pool of Siloam were covered with slabs, while other parts of the channel were underground due to higher rock levels; and (2) the water which gushed from the Spring of Gihon was sometimes scarce, but always sporadic (gushing out of the spring only twice a day at the end
of the dry season, but four to five times a day after a rainy season). The Hebrew מָשָׁאָשׁ, like its Arabic cognate, referenced both the paucity of the water and its being scarcely visible at certain places and at certain times. Another hint of the Shiloah aqueduct’s being partially covered appears when it recognized that לַאֲחָה “gently” (i.e., לַאֲחָה plus לַאֲחָה) is a homograph of the stem לַאֲחָה “to cover” (which in Modern Hebrew also means “to speak softly, gently”). The imagery of the “gently flowing and barely visible waters of Shiloah” presents quite a contrast to the imagery of the conspicuously surging and overflowing Euphrates.

THE AMBIGUITY OF רְעֵהֶם IN 8:9

The identification of the stem of MT רְעֵהֶם has proven to be quite controversial. While no one has read it as the imperative of (1) רְעֵה ה, (stem I) “be shepherds!” or (2) רְעֵה ה, (stem III) “be desirous!” three other stems were recognized in the various translations and commentaries, namely,

- רְעֵה ה (stem II) “to associate with” (the Vulgate’s con-gregamini, followed by KJV, NRS, WEB, RWB, DRA, YLT)
- רְעֵה ה “to break” (NKJ, RSV, NAV)
- רְעֵה ה “to shout” (NIV, NIB).

The Septuagint’s γνωτε “know ye” reflects a Vorlage with רְעֵה ה, and has been followed by Gray (1912: 149), Kaiser (1972:115), and Blenkinsopp (2000: 239). But contextually it does not appear to have been the original
Seventh definition must be added to the list to accommodate the reading of the Peshitta, namely רָכִּית (stem II) “to be frightened, to tremble with fear.” It is the cognate of the widely attested Arabic رَأَعُ/رَوُعُ (rūʕ /râʕ) “he was frightened, it affected his heart [rūʕ] with fear, fright,” and the nouns رُوُعَ/رُوُعَة (rawʕ /rawʕ‘at) “fright, fear” (Castell 1669: 3552, territ, timor, timuit; Lane 1867: 1187–1189; Wehr 1979: 426). This seventh definition of רָכִּית “to tremble with fear” is the perfect parallel for the imperative רָּכִּית “be dismayed, scared, terrified” which follows. It is obvious that the Syriac translator knew of this rare Hebrew word which became lost in rabbinic Hebrew but survived as a cognate in Arabic.

Unfortunately, the Peshitta text of 8:9 was ignored by Gray, Kaiser, Clements, Irvine, Blenkinsopp, and others, but was recognized by Wildberger (1991: 349) only to be dismissed because it “does not establish a parallel to לָחֲמָן וְרָכִּית (gird yourselves) and לָחֲמָן נְחֵל (forge a plan).” Wildberger was apparently unaware of the Arabic cognate cited above; but with that cognate now in focus, his conclusion is unacceptable.

The Vulgate translated the repeated לָחֲמָן וְרָכִּית in 8:9b in two different ways. The first one became confortamini “strengthen yourselves” and the second one became accingite vos “gird / prepare yourselves.” This reflects the same semantic range of אָזָר in Hebrew as that found in Arabic, where أَزَر (‘azara)
means (1) “he aided, assisted, helped, strengthened him” and (2) “he clad, covered, girded him” (Lane 1863: 52–53; Wehr 1979: 17). The Targum’s repeated טַמְעַס אָנָּה “to strength one’s self” reflects the fact that the Biblical יָשָׁר had a semantic range comparable to that of its Arabic cognate, but the targumist opted to use the more common verb עָלָה.

FROM “SANCTUARY” TO “OPPRESSOR”

A number of emendations have already been proposed for the MT לאָבָאש נָה in Isa 8:14. Gray (1912: 151) left the word untranslated and commented, “Not improbably לאָבָאש is a corruption of לאָבָאש [‘for a snare’], which was itself erroneously substituted from the following distich for the term which stood in the original text.” Driver (1955:82) emended the text to עֲשַׁיְרָא “cause of difficulty”; and Clements (1980: 99), noting that “sanctuary sounds strange in a verse which affirms the threatening aspect of Yahweh’s purpose towards Judah,” likewise opted for the הiphil participle meaning “one who conspires against.” Blenkinsopp (2000: 241) also thought that sanctuary “makes no sense in the context” and agreed with Clements and others, but opted for the piel participle עֲשַׁיְרָא “co-conspirator.”

Irvine (1990:203), unimpressed with the emendations of others, offered his own. For the MT לאָבָאש נָה לאָבָאש נָה “for a sanctuary, and for a stone of offense,” he divided the words as לאָבָאש לאָבָאש נָה, which, with the הiphil, means “Then he [Yahweh] will become for the sake of his holy domain a stone of offense ....” But isolating the first and last of the seven ב’s in a series in this verse as alternatives for the
usual לַמֵּיתָן “for the sake of”—in order to prove that “Isaiah 8:14 makes good sense as a promise of divine protection for Zion and the Davidic house”—is less than convincing.

As Blenkinsopp noted, the problem in 8:14 is partially one of context. The more appropriate context for the metaphors “a stone of offense, and a rock of stumbling . . . a trap and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem” is at the end of Isa 8:8, where the metaphors would apply to the king of Assyria who is mentioned in 8:7. But, in this restored context, a reference to the king of Assyria being a “sanctuary” for both house of Israel and for the inhabitants of Jerusalem makes no sense. Therefore, an emendation of the MT לַמֵּיתָן לַמֵּיתָן (i.e., changing the מ to a ר and reading a hiph’il participle rather than a noun) is required. The Hebrew כֹּרֶת is the cognate of the Arabic كَرَّتُ “it oppressed, it afflicted, it grieved [him]” (Lane 1885: 2604; Wehr 1979: 959–960, where كَارَتُه “disaster, catastrophe, torrential rains” is also noted). Thus, the king of Assyria—not Yahweh—will become the “oppressor” (literally, “the grief-maker”) as well as his becoming “a stone of offense, and a rock of stumbling, . . . a trap and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.” The biblical book of Lamentations, though it is from a later period, illustrates well the grief generated by Israel’s oppressors.

**Conclusion**

Other minor problems can be identified in these fifteen verses, like the MT כְּרַת “conspiracy” in 8:12 being twice translated in the Septuagint as σκληρόν “hard,” indicating that its Vorlage read כְּרַת rather than כְּרַת. But the major
problems have been addressed and Arabic cognates have facilitated the recovery of rare Hebrew words—some of which were known to the Greek, Latin, and Syriac translators but subsequently became lost in post-Biblical Hebrew. These rare words can now be restored to the lexicons of Biblical Hebrew.

The relocation of the phrase “with Rezin and the son of Remaliah” may have been an early editorial change, since, as stated in the restored version of Isa 8:4, Isaiah said that Rezin and Pekah would be carried away before the king of Assyria. But according to 2 Kings 16:9, Rezin was killed in Damascus; and according to 2 Kings 15:30, Pekah was killed by Hoshea, a fellow Israelite. Neither king was literally “carried away before the king of Assyria.” Thus, their names were retained in the text but moved out of the *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* prediction passage.

Once the original שָׁלַשְׁיָם “oppressor, grief-maker” was misread as the noun שָׁלְאֶה “sanctuary,” a pseudo-correction was made which involved moving the words associated with the שָׁלְאֶה to be in proximity to the verse containing the verb שָׁלַש. This transposition was done quite early for the Qumran scrolls and the versions reflect the same placement of these verses as that found in the MT. Unwittingly, this led to the subject of the verb שָׁלַש becoming Yahweh, rather than remaining the king of Assyria. Thus, simple misreading of one as a led to a pseudo-correction, and it in turn has led to a wide variety of pseudo-interpretations about Isaiah’s understanding of the nature and workings of Yahweh. The transposition of Isa 8:14–15 to follow 8:8, coupled with the recovery of the rare word שָׁלַש in Isaiah’s vocabulary, re-defines the parameters of the discussion.
An English translation of Isa 8:1–15 is provided here for a summary and a conclusion. My own proposed readings and the proposal of others which have been adopted are in **bold small caps** and transposed texts are in **bold**.

**Isaiah 8:1–4**

Then Yahweh said to me, “Take a large tablet and write upon it with a **soft** stylus, ‘Belonging to Maher-shalal-hash-baz.’” And I got reliable witnesses, Uriah the priest and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah, to attest for me. And I went to the prophetess, and she conceived and bore a son. Then Yahweh said to me, “Call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz; for before the child knows how to cry ‘My father’ or ‘My mother,’ the wealth of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria, **along with Rezin and the son of Remaliah**, will be carried away before the king of Assyria.”

**8:5–8 and 8:14–15**

Yahweh spoke to me again: “Because this people have refused the waters of Shiloah that flow gently and are barely visible, therefore, behold, the Lord is bringing up against them the waters of the River, mighty and many, the king of Assyria and all his glory; and it will rise over all its channels and go over all its banks; and it will sweep on into Judah, it will overflow and pass on, reaching even to the neck; and his [the Assyrian king’s] outspread garrisons will fill the breadth of your land, O Immanuel.” **And he** [the King of Assyria] **will become an oppressor and a stone of offense, and a rock of stumbling to both houses of Israel, a trap and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.** And many shall stumble thereon; they shall fall and be broken; they shall be snared and taken.”
TREMBLE WITH FEAR, you peoples, and BE TERROR-STRICKEN; give ear, all you far countries; STRENGTHEN YOURSELVES and BE TERROR-STRICKEN; STRENGTHEN YOURSELVES and BE TERROR-STRICKEN. Take counsel together, but it will come to nought; speak a word, but it will not stand, for God is with us. For Yahweh spoke thus to me with his strong hand upon me, and warned me not to walk in the way of this people, saying: “Do not call conspiracy all that this people call conspiracy, and do not fear what they fear, nor be in dread.” But Yahweh of hosts, him you shall regard as holy; let him be your fear, and let him be your dread.

NOTES

1. Instead of identifying אַחֲרֵיָ֖יו חֲלִיאִ֑ים חַלְיָאִ֖ים as a misplaced fragment, Fullerton (1924: 267), partially following Giesebrecht (1888: 227), proposed deleting the phrase and the יַמִּשְׁרֵי which precedes it as a gloss which originated as a marginal comment. With the removal of these five words, Fullerton argued, 8:5–8a becomes a coherent literary unit.

2. Compare Fullerton’s proposal (1924: 289) to move 8:8b–10 to precede 7:10.

3. Talmage (1967: 467) suggested that the Arabic cognate אָמַת (‘amāṭa) “soft, blunt” provides the clue for understanding the phrase חַלְיָאִים in Isa 8:1 (usually translated “a man’s pen”) to “refer to a broad nibbed, flexible pen capable of making the bold stroke expected in the context.”
4. Even if the 3ms suffix of ְָּנִיה בְּרֵעֵה referred to the river, rather than to the king, the Arabic ְָּנִיה (kanaf) would still be relevant because it can also mean “the right and left side” of a person or place and would permit the translation, “and it will come to pass (sg.,) the [river’s] stretchings (pl.) to its right and its left, the filling of the breadth of your land, O Immanuel.” This interpretation would also mitigate against Aaret’s argument (1990:109–110) that a redactor has made the “wings” which would cover Judah to be those of Immanuel (= Yahweh, not Hezekiah), “which changes the original message of doom to one of promise.” Sweeney’s suggestion that the reference to the “wings” of the king of Assyria carries sexual overtones comparable to the spreading of one’s skirt, is less than convincing.

5. Fullerton (1924: 265–266) rejected this emendation, stating, “It is one of those ingenious conjectures which at first sight captivate the hard-pressed exegete but which prove in the end to be will-o-the-wisps, leading him off into false paths.” Unfortunately, too few commentators took Fullerton’s criticism seriously.

6. If there is any historical validity to the account in 2 Chron 28:5–15 and 2 Kings 16:5–6 about Rezin’s and Pekah’s plundering Judah and Jerusalem—killing well over one hundred twenty thousand and taking two hundred thousand Judeans as prisoners to become slaves in Samaria—it is difficult to concur with Irvine’s speculation (1990: 191) that

On the eve of the Syrian-Israelite invasion, a large part of the country was ready to accept a new non-Davidic leadership that would cooperate with the Syrian and Is-
raelite kings. . . . If (my italics) the wider Judean public outside the capital city and its environs opposed the Davidic regime and “rejoiced in Rezin and the son of Remaliah,” disaster would overtake them as well.

The “if” (in my italics) is a big if. Irvine invests great historical validity in the Targums’ reading of Isa 8:6, “Because this people despised the kingdom of the house of David . . . and are pleased with Rezin and the son of Remaliah.” But he unfairly faults Fullerton—who asserted, “. . . every datum in vv 7 and 8 except 8:6b indicates that he [Isaiah] was doing his utmost to allay the popular fear of the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition in order to prevent both court and people from appealing to Assyria for help”—for simply assuming “the reliability of the Kings text and so infers Isaiah’s opposition to both Ahaz and ‘this people.’” However, Irvine’s assumptions about the Targum of Isaiah are not as compelling as Fullerton’s assumptions about the Hebrew of Kings and Chronicles.

7. Sweeney (1893: 52) also argued that the implicit sexual imagery of Isaiah 8 and Isaiah 66 “present parallel but contrasting descriptions of the circumstances that led to the punishment and the results of the restoration”—supporting his claim that the יִסְמָא in Isa 8:6 was there already by the time of Trito-Isaiah.

8. The identification of this Arabic cognate was first made by Popper (1923: 348) but, aside from a footnote in Fullerton’s study (1924: 267) it has received scant attention since then.
9. The “barely visible waters” is not a reference to Hezekiah’s tunnel which was constructed about thirty years later (Isa 22:11; 2 Kings 20:20; 2 Chron 32:30; and Sirach 48:17).

10. Wildberger (1991: 350) noted that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion’s συναθροίσθητε “assemble” and the Targum’s יאדוים “gather together” are based upon this stem.

11. Wildberger (1991: 350) noted that this is the preferred reading of Schmidt (1930: 7) and Sæbø (1964: 132).

12. The problems with the מִקְדֶשׁ “sanctuary” in 8:14 led Blenkinsopp (2000: 241) also to emend unnecessarily the MT מִקְדֶשׁ “you shall regard as holy” in 8:13 to דְּבָרִים “with him you shall conspire.”

13. In light of the Arabic variants قَارَأْتِي (qaraṭani) and كَارَأْتِي (karaṭani) “it grieved me” (Lane 1885: 2509, 2604), coupled with the frequent interchange of ב and פ in Hebrew (e.g., בָּלַע and פָּלַע, בָּלַע and פָּלַע), there is no need to emend further the מִקְדֶשׁ to מִקְדֶשׁ. The Arabic ب (b) routinely becomes a ב in Hebrew.

14. For other examples of the confusion of the ב and the ב, see Delitzsch, 1920: 114, § 116c-d.
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SEVEN PROBLEMS IN


Seven problems in Isaiah 8:1–15. Introduction. A preferred reading from the Septuagint. From “Rejoicing” to “Barely visible.” The ambiguity of Resh-ayin-waw in Isa 8:9. From “Sanctuary” to “Oppressor.” Conclusion. Isaiah 8:1–4. 8:5–8 and 8:14–15. The seven problems for translators and exegetes of Isaiah 8:1–15 include four lexical difficulties, one scribal error of confusing a. d. and a. r., and two cases of words and verses which have migrated from their original position in the text. Thematic Bible. Themes in Isaiah 8:7. All. Themes in Isaiah 8:7. Choose Book Choose Chapter Choose Verse. ×. Then one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls came and spoke with me, saying, “Come here, I will show you the judgment of the great harlot who sits on many waters, Verse Concepts. Babylon Angels as God’s servants Seven Spirits Seven Things Angels Doing God’s Work. The Great Prostitute Voice Of The Archangel The judgment of Babylon whores. Revelation 17:15. And he said to me, “The waters which you saw where the harlot sits, are peoples and multitudes and nations and tongues. Verse Concepts.”