

APPENDIX

ISAIAH 9:6 (5 in the Hebrew) foretells a ruler who will be, among other things, אָבִי עֵד A-BHEE AHD, rendered “Eternal/Everlasting Father” or the like - all incorrect. A-BHEE (“Father of”) is a construct noun always followed by another noun (cf. GENESIS 4:21, 10:21; DEUTERONOMY 22:19; CHRONICLES I 2:23). AHD’s meaning depends on context. Its temporal sense here is inconsistent with Isaiah’s message and its being an adverb; its prepositional “until” does not fit A- BHEE (“Father of until” makes no sense even with the most pliable poetic license). Translators therefore tried to fit the words to what they thought Isaiah meant but that is לְעֹלָם וָעֶד L’OH-LAM VA-ED (FOREVER - EXODUS 15:18) or מִעוֹלָם עַד־עוֹלָם MEI-OH-LAM AHD OH-LAM (AT ALL TIMES - PSALMS 90:2; CHRONICLES I 29:10). Those equating AHD to לְעֹלָם LA-AHD, the preposition itself taking a ל “Lamed” {"to"} prepositional prefix, are also misguided, for this is an adverb meaning “indefinitely” [cf. AMOS 1:11; MICAH 7:18; CHRONICLES I 28:9 and how Isaiah himself uses it in 64:8] or “permanently” [cf. JOB 19:24; PROVERBS 12:19, 29:14]; neither matches the adjective “eternal”. The same goes for the construction at the end of ISAIAH 45:17. AHD is here a noun meaning “prey” (cf. GENESIS 49:27; ISAIAH 33:23 - Driver’s Concordance cites authorities who render the phrase “father [distributor] of booty”, reading AHD correctly but not what the prophet had in mind). Isaiah is referring to the poor and weak “preyed upon” (cf. ZEPHANIA 3:8) but shielded by a “father” (cf. GENESIS 45:8, when Joseph tells Jacob he has become Pharaoh’s אָב ABH, and JOB’s declaring himself ABH to the destitute [JOB 29:16]). He will protect the disadvantaged exploited by the powerful, far more consistent with the passage and biblical grammar. Conventional translators may marshal proof from עָלְמָא שְׁכֵן עָלְמָא SHOH-KHEIN AHD (PERPETUAL DWELLER - ISAIAH 57:15); the two are not comparable. SHOH-KHEIN, an intransitive verb, has an implied indirect object [common in biblical style] and thus an implied prepositional adverb. Nor is it like AH-DEI when that is itself in construct state, an adverbial noun indicating extremes or the utmost (cf. NUMBERS 24:20; JOEL 2:12; PSALMS 147:6).

Some take AHD as “infinite time”, reading the phrase as “dwells forever/inhabits eternity” (a modern version is “Father of Continuity”, barely intelligible today and not at all 2700 years ago). The verb for this is יוֹשֵׁב YOH-SHEIBH (SIT), associated with permanent homes (cf. Genesis 37:1; Exodus 2:21). Abraham experienced a more tenuous וַיֵּשֶׁב VA-YA-GAR (SOJOURNED - cf. GENESIS 21:34). Other words for “dwelling/living” are לָלֵךְ LA-LEEN (BOARD - cf. PSALMS 25: 13), לָדוֹר LA-DOOR (RESIDE - cf. PSALMS 84:10 [84: 11 in the Hebrew]), זָבַח Z’BHOOOL (BENEFICE - cf. GENESIS 30:20) and חֲנִיָּה CHA-NEE-YAH (QUARTERS - cf. NEHEMIAH 11:30). For these, context informs location or length of stay. SHOH-KHEIN tells us the purpose of a subject’s venue and how it relates to its surroundings. It is thus natural that SHOH-KHEIN contributed the word for “neighbor”, שָׁכֵן SHA-KHEIN (cf. EXODUS 3:22; NUMBERS 42:2), like the Divine Neighbor residing in the מִשְׁכָּן MISH-KAN (TABERNACLE - cf. EXODUS 25:8). {This corrects another error that, in its usual rendering, seems to refute our contention but, when rectified, supports it. In DEUTERONOMY 33:20, Moses blessed the tribe of Gad כְּלִבְיָא שְׁכֵן K’LA-BHEE SHA-KHEIN, usually translated “He dwells/lives [there] like a lion”, though we are not told how one lives like a lion or why that was desirable. Moses said nothing of the sort. The errors arose from reading SHA-KHEIN as a verb – that is שְׁכֵן SHOH-KHEIN. SHA-KHEIN is a noun, making the phrase “like a young lion [who is] a neighbor”. Coupled with the rest of the verse, “tearing off an arm, even a head”, it focuses on the Gadites living on the other side of the Jordan river in territory not part of the tribal allocation but adjacent to it; as Israel’s neighbors, they served as a guard fiercely repelling enemy incursions. This passage attests to the text’s antiquity, for the Israelites readily understood these symbolic strategic allusions.}

ISAIAH 57:15 elaborates, not with BA-MA-ROHM V’QA-DOHSH ESH-KOHN (I WILL RESIDE ALOFT IN HOLINESS) nor MAH-ROHM V’QA-DOHSH SH’KHOO-NA-THEE (MY DWELLING IS ON HIGH AND HOLY) but literally “I will reside (as) a lofty holy One” but with דָּכָא וְשִׁפְלֵי רִיחַ DA-KA U-SH’PHAL ROO-ACH (THE CRUSHED AND LOWLY OF WIND - i. e. discouraged), supporting the reading of SHOH-KHEIN as “resides with the oppressed”, as we translate AHD in ISAIAH 9:6. Had an Israelite understood AHD as related to “eternal”, he would have taken SHOH-KHEIN AHD to be, not “Eternal dweller” but “Eternal neighbor” - and would have found it a strange metaphor. This error recurs in HABAKKUK 3:6, where הַרְרֵי עֵד HA-R’REI AHD is rendered “everlasting mountains”. That is הַרְרֵי HA-REI (“mountains of”); HA-R’REI are hills that are strongholds, like the fortresses and castles in Europe that dominated their regions and housed troops that despoiled or exacted tribute from passing merchants. Thus, HA-R’REI AHD are “mountains of prey”, far more consistent with the rest of the passage. Lest this be seen as far-fetched, there are analogous phrases, like PSALMS 76:4 [76:5 in the Hebrew], where הַרְרֵי טָרֵף HA-R’REI TA-REPH can have no other meaning but “mountains of pillage”. Similarly, ISAIAH 26:4, where אַחֲדֵי עֵדֵי אַחֲדֵי AH-DEI AHD is translated as “forever”. That would be לְעֹלָם L’OH-LAHM (cf. PSALMS 118:1-4). The phrase is a double-superlative construct, “the lowliest of the oppressed”, a meaning at once obvious when one continues to the next verses. Neither does the word at the end of that verse, עוֹלָמִים OH-LA-MEEM, mean “eternal”; the plural of that noun does not connote longevity but invariance (cf. SAMUEL II 7:16) - He is the steadfast “Rock”.

The next phrase, שֹׁרֵן שָׁלוֹם SAHR SHA-LOHM, is universally rendered “Prince of Peace”; that requires הַשְׁלוֹם HA-SHA-LOHM (cf. JEREMIAH 25:37; ZACHARIAH 8:12). The closest Hebrew for “prince” is נָסִיךְ NA-SEEKH (“[one]

elevated/installed” - cf. JOSHUA 13:21; MICAH 5:4; DANIEL 11:8); SAHR is an official (EXODUS 18:21), courtier (GENESIS 40) or officer (CHRONICLES II 11:21). SAHR SHA-LOHM is “peaceful officer” (“peaceable ruler” [The Israel Bible] is close), like the greeting שבת שלום SHABBAT SHALOM (“peaceful Sabbath” - cf. ECCLESIASTES 3:8; ESTHER 9:30); Isaiah predicts a reign of benign equanimity, not overbearing despotism.

To those maintaining these passages are sufficiently ambiguous to make the conventional translations possible, we offer an example where such pretense is untenable. Translations of נַשְׁקוּ-בֶר פֶּן-יִצְאֶנּוּ | וְתֵאבְדוּ לְדֶרֶךְ NA-SH’QOO BHAHR PEN YEH-EH-NAPH V’THO-BH’DOO DE-REKH (“Kiss the Son lest He be angry and ye perish from the way” - PSALMS 2:12) were inspired by post-canonization theologies and would have sounded bizarre to early audiences (which accounts for versions like “Serve the Chosen One/Worship the Elected One”, more neutral phrasings ([one even has “Kiss his feet”, echoing a Levantine protocol])). To see if these reflect the Hebrew at all, we parse the verse.

“Kiss the son”: בֶּר BAHR is “son” in Aramaic, not Hebrew. [Scripture contains some Aramaic but not in Psalms.] Translators made the same error in PROVERBS 31:2, rendering it “my son” three times. PROVERBS has בֶּן BEN (“son”) in its first verse and over 50 times thereafter. The Hebrew BAHR is cognate to בָּרָא BA-RA (CREATED), which connotes removal of what is not needed or wanted (see Exposition 1:1). מָה MAH, in each phrase, is not interrogative but exclamatory - “How pure (honest) my actions, how clean my stomach (I eat permitted foods not ill-gotten) and how perfected my vows (I keep my promises)”, all in accord with the mother’s instructions in the previous verse and supported by the “Vav” [“and”] conjunction in the second phrase, usually omitted but here added to emphasize the phrase as an independent category. If BAHR did mean “son”, NA-SH’QOO as a transitive verb with BAHR its direct object (it is BHAHR in the text because it follows a diphthong) needs the direct object indicator ETH or, if intransitive, a “Lamed” prefix on BHAHR (cf. GENESIS 27:27, 29:11; EXODUS 4:27; SAMUEL II 20:9); poetic meter in PSALMS can override rigid syntax but the absent definite article “Heh” prefix to BAHR rules out conventional interpretations.

Some treat BAHR as an adverb, allowing variations like “Accept Him in purity/Submit to Him in good faith” and the like. These hew closer to the meaning of the radical root “Beth-Resh” but are still grammatically defective, for NA-SH’QOO would be NA-SH’QOH and “Him” an indirect object needing a dative “Lamed” prefix (cf. PSALMS 118:1) that cannot be inserted here because the object is implied by a vowel suffix. Such adverbs also need a prepositional “Beth” prefix (see preceding verse). All traditional interpretations are refuted by one insurmountable defect they share, regardless of how they translate NA-SH’QOO. They are all constrained to treat this verb as jussive (the imperative is ruled out by lack of the “Taph” prefix) but, when the first letter of a verb’s root is “Nun” (a “Peh-Nun” verb), the jussive doubles the initial “Nun” - it would be N’NA-SH’QOO, exactly as in this Psalm’s verse 3 - וְנִתְקַדַּח N’NA-T’QAH (LET US SUNDER). This last rule alone eliminates all extant translations of this phrase.

“Lest He be angry”: Translators had no choice with this; it followed from their take on the first phrase. *It is also a path of least resistance for interpreting the presumed root “Aleph-Nun-Peh” (“face”, an archaic form preserved in the Aramaic אַנְפִּין AN-PIN. Hebrew dropped the “Nun” to make it “Aleph-Peh”, which serves for both “nostril” (GENESIS 2:7) and “face” (GENESIS 33:3). The former was borrowed for “anger” based on its typical manifestation - flaring nostrils and heavy breathing, but in all its occurrences, whether transitive (cf. KINGS I 8:46; EZRA 9:14) or reflexive (cf. DEUTERONOMY 1:27; KINGS II 17:18), it is followed by a prepositional phrase indicating the object of the anger or displeasure, even if obvious from context. יִצְאֶנּוּ YEH-EH-NAPH should be followed by בָּכֶם BA-KHEM (WITH YOU - cf. DEUTERONOMY 1:37; KINGS I 11:9). Its absence means the translations are wrong. Its problematic nature is further shown by the qualifier פֶּן PEN (LEST), which implies a contingent outcome, not a certainty (cf. GENESIS 38:23; EXODUS 19:22). The anticipated consequence must also arise directly from existing conditions, not the intervention of an agency not initially present. [The failure of translations to reflect these points in the conversation between the woman and the serpent in GENESIS 3:3-4 caused serious misinterpretations of that episode.] Had the prophet’s intent here been to forestall adversities, he would have said לְבִלְתִּי לְבַלְתִּי L’BHIL-TEE (SO THAT [IT] NOT - cf. GENESIS 4:15; EXODUS 8:18; DEUTERONOMY 17:20).*

“Ye perish from the way”: If they are forced “off the road/righteous path”, it is וְתֵאבְדוּ מִן הַדֶּרֶךְ V’SOH-BH’DOO MIN HA-DEH-REKH (cf. GENESIS 38:16; EXODUS 32:8; DEUTERONOMY 11:28). If they suffer mishaps while traveling or it is “the course [leading to] doom”, it is וְתֵאבְדוּ בְּדֶרֶךְ V’SOH-BH’DOO BA-DEH-REKH (cf. GENESIS 45:24; EXODUS

28:20; DEUTERONOMY 25:17). Overlooked by savants is that no reason is given why retribution must wait for a journey. It also cannot be “You will lose your way”; that is ותאבדו הדרך V’SOH-BH’DOO HA-DEH-REKH (cf. EXODUS 13:21; DEUTERONOMY 1:22; JUDGES 4:9). DE-REKH with no prefix or suffix is identified by a succeeding adjective or phrase (cf. GENESIS 18:19; EXODUS 8:23, 13:17; NUMBERS 20:17). Since none of these are here, it is discerned from the verb of which it is the object. *Those associating “Aleph-Beth-Daled” with destruction or ruin ignore the fact that V’SOH-BH’DOO is an active verb, not passive. Disobedience leading to an untoward end is explicitly spelled out (cf. DEUTERONOMY 8:19, 28:22,51; JONAH 1:6); for deliberate destruction, the intense “Pee-el” form applies (cf. DEUTERONOMY 12:2; KINGS II 11:1; ECCLESIASTES 9:18). The “Qal” form used here indicates something was lost by its disappearance (cf. EXODUS 22:9; DEUTERONOMY 22:3). But since the verb is active, the individuals addressed are not being lost or destroyed; they are doing the losing - of an entity characterized as a “way”.*

This verse must be read in context. The Psalmist addresses kings and rulers, exhorting them to abandon efforts against His anointed and attend to their subjects. *BAHR*, an indefinite noun, means “provisions” (cf. GENESIS 42:3; AMOS 5:11; PROVERBS 11:26) and is naturally joined to NA-SH’QOO (STORE UP - cf. GENESIS 41:40; ISAIAH 33:4; ZEPHANIAH 2:9). YEH-EH-NAPH in the second phrase has nothing to do with “face” or “anger”. Its root, “Ayin-Vav-Peh”, means “to fly/raised aloft”. Its doubled prefix (cf. וַיִּזְעַקוּ VA-YEI-AN-CHOO [AND THEY GROANED] - EXODUS 2:23) to the radical “Nun-Peh” (the “Nun” indicating extended action involving elevation, like נִפְּחָהּ Y’PHEI NOHPH [PSALMS 48:2 {3 in the Hebrew}], best approximated by “a beautiful, elevated view”) makes this a warning that lack of preparation could result in the “flight/evaporation” of resources. What will then be “lost” is their ability to continue the “path” to prosperity. [The abstract “path/way” is used often in Scripture (cf. JOSHUA 1:8; KINGS I 13:33, 15:26; JONAH 3:10).] These potentates were told “Store provisions (for your people) lest they (resources) be exhausted and you lose (the ability to stay on) your path”. *This reading is supported by the vertical line [inserted by the Masoretes] separating the second and third phrases, stressing that what happens “on the way” is not a result of “anger”.* Lack of resources results from failure to store provisions for the nation. The next phrase explains the urgency: His anger can flare up in little [time]; unpreparedness will bring turmoil and upheaval to the community. This is how the Israelites understood this verse; there is no other tenable translation. Those proffered over time are so far off the mark that, to quote physicist Leo Szilard’s reaction when a student presented an exceptionally unsound hypothesis, “That is not even wrong!”