

How Isaiah 9:6 really reads

Isaiah 9:6 is one of those verses someone changed at different times, depending on which version of the Bible you look into. Most of the scholars who translate these things are Catholic, with Catholic Trinitarian bias.

King James

Isaiah 9:6: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace."

(Isa 9:7) "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD (Strong's H3068 - Yehovah) of hosts will perform this."

Septuagint

(The Septuagint is the version the Apostles used and approved of according to St. Augustine and Jerome). This version says:

"6 For a child is born to us, and a son is given to us, whose government is upon his shoulder: and his name is called the Messenger of great counsel: for I will bring peace upon the princes, and health to him."

A very different message from what is written in modern translations. However, could the error in the translation be simpler, perhaps a misunderstanding of specific words in Hebrew with bad understanding of Hebrew grammar?

Traditional Jewish Exegesis (Rashi's Commentary):

Rashi famously explains the verse by linking the divine attributes to God rather than as the personal proper name of the child:

For a child is born to us, and a son given to us, whose government is upon his shoulder: And his name will be called: The Holy One Blessed Be He, who is Wonderful in Counsel (mifli aytza / wonderful in counsel), Mighty God, Eternal Father, [and] He called his name the "Prince of Peace."

Moffatt Translation / Historic Commentaries: Renders the clause as a throne-name describing office or character: *"Wonderful in counsel is the Mighty God"*

The grammar in verse 6 switches from feminine to male, and suggests two different entities it is talking about--and there is a mysterious *וְשֵׁם* "HIS NAME," which doesn't necessarily refer to the

Son. There is also וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ "HE called his name "the prince of peace." In English, does this sentence make sense to have a colon where it is placed, after shoulder? Is it more likely a semi colon should be there or it's a full stop period?

Let us suggest the phrase "His Name" is not necessarily referring to the Son, but the Father!

With this understanding the translation will say something more like this:

"For a child has been born to us, a son given to us, and authority is upon his shoulder. His Name (I AM), the wondrous adviser, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, → He called his name "the prince of peace."

This sentence has both a Father and a Son. It is not suggesting they are one and the same!

"and He called his name X."

In other words, שְׁמוֹ ("His name") is the object of the naming action, and what follows supplies what the name is, who is the Son. The Father names the Son. We find this construction repeatedly in Genesis: וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ...("and he called his name").

Another example, Genesis 3:20: וַיִּקְרָא הָאָדָם שֵׁם אִשְׁתּוֹ חַוְּוָה "and the man called the name of his wife Eve."

So וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ naturally leads the reader to expect: **"and He (God) called his (Son's) name [X]."**

Verse 9:7 confirms this distinction between Son and Father by saying **"Yehovah of hosts will perform this"**.

Yehovah is the everlasting Father, the mighty God and he named his son the 'prince of peace'! Yehovah sent his son to put all nations under his feet, and as it says in John 3 or John 5, God gave him authority to execute judgement and this authority is given to him without measure.