

“Precept upon Precept, Line upon Line”

An Approach to Understanding Isaiah 28:7–13

Terry B. Ball

Terry B. Ball is a professor of ancient scripture
at Brigham Young University.

Isaiah 28:7–13 is one of the more controversial and enigmatic passages of the eighth-century prophet’s text, with verses 10 and 13 of the pericope perhaps being the most difficult to translate and interpret. To illustrate, compare the following English renditions of verse 10:

For precept *must be* upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, *and* there a little:

King James Version

For it is: Do this, do that, a rule for this, a rule for that; a little here, a little there.

New International Version

He tells us everything over and over—one line at a time, one line at a time, a little here, and a little there!

New Living Translation

“For He says, ‘Order on order, order on order, Line on line, line on line, A little here, a little there.’”

New American Standard Bible

That same mutter upon mutter, murmur upon murmur. Now here, now there! For it is precept by precept, precept by precept, line by line, line by line; here a little, there a little.

Jewish Publication Society of America Version

You don’t even listen—all you hear is senseless sound after senseless sound.

Contemporary English Version

They speak utter nonsense.

GOD’S WORD Translation

Indeed, they will hear meaningless gibberish, senseless babbling, a syllable here, a syllable there.

NET Bible^t

The discrepancies in translation and understanding of this verse appear to arise primarily from two issues: (1) the difficulty in translating the obscure Hebrew phrase *saw lāsāw saw lāsāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw* found in verses 10 and 13, and (2) the difficulty in identifying the voice that is speaking in verses 9 through 13 of the pericope.

This study will review several of the commonly proposed approaches to translating this difficult passage and then discuss an approach that perhaps resolves some of the difficulties in understanding the text by interpreting it in the context of entrapment rhetoric. It will further discuss how, in the context of entrapment rhetoric, language from the King James Version (KJV) of the text may relate to the use of similar language found in Restoration scripture.²

The Meaning of *saw lāsāw saw lāsāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw*

The meaning and correct translation of the Hebrew phrase *saw lāsāw saw lāsāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw*, translated as “precept upon precept; line upon line” in the KJV (Isaiah 28:10, 13), is widely debated among scholars. For example, by giving a different vocalization to the Hebrew letters of the text than does the KJV, Kennett suggests that the words are actually a parody of a schoolteacher giving a simple spelling lesson to little children. He sees the teacher explaining to the children that *sadeh* (ש) and *waw* (ו) spell *saw* (שו), repeating it twice, and that *qoph* (ק) and *waw* (ו) spell *qaw* (קו), again repeating it twice.³

Hallo, on the other hand, finds evidence in Ugaritic abecedaries⁴ indicating to him that the original names of the Hebrew letters *sadeh* and *qoph* may have simply been *saw* and *qaw*. Rather than a spelling lesson, Hallo appears to see the phrase as an attempt to mimic a schoolmaster trying to teach children the successive letters of the Hebrew alphabet, *sadeh* and *qoph*, using their original names, *saw* and *qaw*. Thus, he renders verse 10, “For it is *saw* for *saw*, *saw* for *saw*, *qaw* for *qaw*, *qaw* for *qaw*.”⁵ Watts points out how incoherent such a lesson would be when taught by a drunken teacher.⁶

Driver agrees that *saw* and *qaw* could indeed be the original monosyllabic names for the Hebrew letters *sadeh* (ש) and *qoph* (ק), for which the vocalization *sadeh* and *qoph* were later substituted, but he feels no direct evidence has yet been found to support the idea. He further wonders why, if this is a lesson in the alphabet, the teacher would begin in the middle of the alphabet rather than the beginning, and even why a teacher would be trying to teach the alphabet to just weaned infants. He rather understands *saw* and *qaw* to be nothing more than the senseless cries and shouts of the drunken priests and prophets asking for more drink, perhaps chosen to echo the Hebrew words *qî* meaning “vomit” and *sō’āh* meaning “filth” or “excrement” in verse 8. He translates verses 9 and 10, “To whom is the prophet giving

instruction, Whom will he make to understand what they hear—babes newly weaned, just taken from the breast? [internal quotation marks omitted]. He then explains, “No, but it is ‘Ho!’ answering to ‘Ho!’, ‘Hey!’ to ‘Hey!’ and ‘another drop here, another drop there!’”

Rogers, too, suggests an intentional connection between the *sō’āh* and *qî* of verse 8 with the similar-sounding *saw* and *qaw* in verse 10. He concludes that *saw* is actually a parody of a small child trying to say *sō’āh* and that *qaw* is a similar infantile attempt to say *qî*. Accordingly, he translates verse 10 with childish English equivalents for excrement and vomit rendering the verse, “Doo-doo to doo-doo, doo-doo to doo-doo, Yuk-yuk to yuk-yuk, yuk-yuk to yuk-yuk, A little here, a little there.”⁸

Van der Toorn puts an entirely different twist on the interpretation. He sees the prophecy as a polemic against necromancy. He argues that *saw lāsāw saw lāsāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw* is an attempt to mock the bird-like uttering of necromancers, pretending to communicate with the dead that leaders had been seeking counsel from rather than God.⁹ Equally as ingenious is van Selms’s hypothesis that *saw lāsāw saw lāsāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw* is not Hebrew at all, but rather Assyrian language which should be translated as, “Go out! Let him go out! Go out! Let him go out! Wait! Let him wait! Wait! Let him wait!”¹⁰

Other possible interpretations of the phrase include an attempt to imitate the meaningless babble of babies, a mocking summary of Isaiah’s teachings spoken through the slurred and drunken lips of Isaiah’s adversaries, or even an attempt to imitate a postulated speech impediment that Isaiah suffered.¹¹ Hays and Irvine combine approaches by concluding that the phrase is intended to show how God’s words to the drunken priest and prophets “will be like childish gibberish but will be taught by the Assyrians.”¹² Some avoid the issue in verse 10 by leaving the phrase entirely untranslated.¹³

These examples of how *saw lāsāw saw lāsāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw* has been translated and interpreted over the years are intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive. Still, they demonstrate that this obscure passage has attracted a considerable amount of attention and generated a wide range of ideas.

The Question of Voice in Verses 9–13

Identifying the voice throughout the passage has been equally problematic. Verses 9–13 are couched in a confrontation that Isaiah is apparently having with the political and religious leaders of the kingdoms of Israel (Isaiah 28:1–8) and Judah (Isaiah 28:14–22) in regards to the Assyrian crisis.¹⁴ It seems clear in verses 7 and 8 of the passage that Isaiah is rebuking the priests and prophets of Israel who have either literally or figuratively so intoxicated themselves that, as they wallow in their own vomit and filth, have lost both the proper vision and the clear judgment needed to deal with the Assyrian threat. “But they also have erred through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way; the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment. For all tables are full of vomit and filthiness, so that there is no place clean” (Isaiah 28:7–8). However, in the following verses, 9 and 10, it is unclear whether Isaiah continues to speak or if the words in these verses are the response of the drunken priests and prophets to Isaiah’s scolding. “Whom shall he teach knowledge? and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts. For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little” (Isaiah 28:9–10). Brevard Childs illustrates the difficulty in identifying the voice in the passage when he concludes that verses 7–13 must be a redactor’s collection of several “independent

units from different periods” assembled into a “kerygmatic unity,” leaving one with little information to help sort out the various speakers involved in the verbal exchange.¹⁵

The Voice of Isaiah

If one understands the voice in verses 9 and 10 to be Isaiah, then a common way to understand the KJV text is to interpret it as the prophet’s further attempts to explain to the drunken priests and prophets, at least those who have been weaned from their mother’s milk (Isaiah 28:9), that God gives knowledge and doctrinal understanding to individuals “precept upon precept, . . . line upon line, . . . here a little and there a little” (Isaiah 28:10).¹⁶ The KJV translates “precept,” from the Hebrew *saw*, apparently considering the word a derivative of the primal root *swh*, meaning to *command, appoint, order*, etc. It translates “line” from the Hebrew *qaw* apparently considering the word a derivative of the primal root *qwh* meaning to *tie or bind*, hence a line or chord used for measuring.¹⁷ This interpretation continues with the warning that those who “would not hear” will not enjoy God’s rest but would find God speaking with “stammering lips and another tongue” and ultimately “fall backward, and be broken, and snared, and taken” (Isaiah 28:11–13). While this interpretation is common and popular, many do not find it tenable. For example, Driver notes that while “precept” is a formally possible translation of *saw*, it is not found anywhere else in the Old Testament. Moreover, he does not find translating “upon” from the Hebrew preposition *lamed* (ל) in *lāsāw* and *lāqāw* justifiable in this context.¹⁸

Hays and Irvine, who identify Isaiah as the voice in verses 9–10, but, who, like Driver, find the KJV translation untenable, understand the prophet to be using the phrase *saw lāsāw saw lāsāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw* to illustrate to the irresponsible leaders how infantile or nonsensical the Lord’s word will sound to them as a consequence of their drunken state.¹⁹ In contrast, Watts suggests that Isaiah is using the

phrase to liken the incompetence of the leaders to that of drunken teachers trying to teach little children.²⁰

While the identity of the voice in verses 9–10 is much debated, most scholars agree that the voice of verses 11–13 is Isaiah’s, and the verses themselves are understood to be a warning that because of their rejection of Isaiah’s words, the rebellious leaders would come to be taught and chastised through the “stammering lips” of “another tongue,” likely an allusion to the language of the Assyrian invaders (Isaiah 28:11). Further, because they would not hear the “rest” and “refreshing” that God offered (Isaiah 28:12), his words would continue to sound like the babyish or nonsensical *saw lāsāw saw lāsāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw* to them, resulting in their fall and capture (Isaiah 28:13).²¹

The Voice of Israel’s Priests and Prophets

The preponderance of commentators prefer to identify the voice in verses 9 and 10 to be not that of Isaiah, but rather that of the inebriated priests and prophets he scolded in verses 7 and 8 of the passage. From this perspective, verse 9 can be understood as the drunkards taking exception to the way Isaiah has spoken to them, indignantly questioning, “Who does Isaiah think he is trying to teach? Little children just weaned?” The priests and prophet’s resentful questions of verse 9 are then followed in verse 10 by their attempt to mockingly mimic Isaiah’s words to them, complaining that they sound like *saw lāsāw saw lāsāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw*. If this phrase is, indeed, an attempt by the offended leaders to mock the way Isaiah has tried to scold them, then whether one translates it as a childish school lesson, the slurring of drunkards, a cry for more wine, the chirping of a necromancer, the language of the Assyrians, or some form of baby talk, the message is the same. The leaders deem Isaiah’s words as too infantile, unintelligible, insignificant, or uninteresting to be worthy of their consideration. In response to their mocking rejection of his

words, Isaiah then issues the warning of verses 11–13, typically interpreted as discussed above.

Another Approach: Entrapment Rhetoric

Most interpretations reasonably assume that the phrase *saw lāsāw saw lāsāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw* should have essentially the same meaning in both verses 10 and 13. Wildberger, however, concludes that in verse 13, Isaiah intentionally uses the same mocking phrase spoken by his opponents in verse 10 to give them a new meaning.²² While Wildberger does not indicate what that new meaning might be, Watts presents an intriguing suggestion. In his translation, he leaves the phrase *saw lāsāw saw lāsāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw* untranslated in verse 10, but in verse 13, much like the KJV, he translates it “Precept for precept. Precept for precept. Line for line. Line for line.”²³ He suggests that as the mocking words of the drunkards are spoken by Jehovah through his prophet in verse 13, they are turned “into an authentic word to Israel.” Thus, as Isaiah speaks the phrase, he does so in such a way that *saw* is indeed understood as precept or command and *qaw* is indeed understood as line. Watts concludes, “What began in v[erse] 10 as mumbling incompetence is turned by the Lord in v[erse] 13 to be an instrument of judgment leading to their [the drunken leaders’] destruction.”²⁴

Watts’s translation makes excellent sense if the passage is interpreted in the context of an entrapment episode. Kangas defines entrapment as a rhetorical device wherein one frames their message “in such a way that the real meaning is not revealed until the listener has engaged themselves fully. The listener is forced to render judgment on themselves when the curtain is pulled back and the subject of judgment is shown to be the hearer.”²⁵

Entrapment rhetoric is common in the Old Testament. One of the earliest uses of the device can be found in the parable of the ewe

lamb that the prophet Nathan used to lure David into pronouncing his own condemnation (1 Samuel 12:1–14). Other examples include the smitten prophet who used entrapment to lead Ahab into pronouncing his own death sentence (1 Kings 20:35–42), Elisha’s entrapment of Joash to warn of his future limited success in combating Syria (2 Kings 13:14–19), and Tamar’s desperate entrapment of her father-in-law, Judah (Genesis 38:1–26). O’Connell sees entrapment as a major rhetorical strategy throughout the Book of Judges as it makes the case for a monarchy,²⁶ and others see it employed in the opening chapters of Amos to lure Israel and Judah into their condemnation.²⁷ Isaiah himself uses a form of entrapment to foretell the Babylonian captivity to the perhaps overly-hospitable Hezekiah (Isaiah 39), and, in the song of the vineyard, to warn of the punishment awaiting the apostate covenant people as he invites them to ponder, “What could have been done more to my vineyard?” (Isaiah 5:1–7). In each of these examples, a trap is set by creating a situation that leads the hearer to pronounce or think of a condemnation or judgment, only to learn that in doing so they have incriminated themselves.

Interpreting Isaiah 28:7–13 in the context of entrapment rhetoric can be an insightful approach. In verses 7–8 the prophet sets the trap as he tells drunken prophets and priests that they “have erred through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way; the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment. For all tables are full of vomit and filthiness, so that there is no place clean” (Isaiah 28:7–8). The priests and prophets “take the bait” when they indignantly respond to the rebuke by taking exception to the condescending manner in which Isaiah has spoken to them asking, “Who does Isaiah think he is talking to, little children just weaned?” (Isaiah 28:9). They then attempt to mock and mimic Isaiah’s teachings in some fashion with the words “*saw lāsāw saw lāsāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw*” (Isaiah 28:10), thereby springing the

trap. Isaiah then responds by explaining to them how they have pronounced their own condemnation. He declares that they will indeed be confronted by those speaking with stammering lips and in another tongue (Isaiah 28:11), even the Assyrians.²⁸ Moreover, their refusal to hear his warning has caused them to forfeit the opportunity to enjoy the “rest” God offered them (Isaiah 28:12). Then, as Watts suggests, Isaiah takes the very phrase they used to mock him, *saw lāsāw saw lāsāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw*, and turns it deadly serious by changing the tone and context, perhaps using a play on the words, to give it the exact meaning that the KJV translators understood—a description of how God has tried to teach them, “precept upon precept; line upon line . . . here a little and there a little,” the rejection of which will cause them to “fall backward” and “be broken and snared, and taken” (Isaiah 28:13).

Isaiah 28:7–13 and Restoration Scripture

Interpreting Isaiah 28:7–13 in the context of entrapment rhetoric may help Latter-day Saints better understand the occurrence and relationship of similar language to that of the KJV found in Restoration scripture. The similar phrase “line upon line, precept upon precept” occurs three times in Restoration scripture. In each case, it appears to be explaining the way God reveals truth to his children on earth. In the Book of Mormon, the prophet Nephi declares, “For behold, thus saith the Lord God: I will give unto the children of men line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little; and blessed are those who hearken unto my precepts, and lend an ear unto my counsel, for they shall learn wisdom; for unto him that receiveth I will give more; and from them that shall say, We have enough, from them shall be taken away even that which they have” (2 Nephi 28:30). Similarly, in August of 1833, Joseph Smith declared in prophetic fashion to the Latter-day Saints who

had suffered physically and lost property to persecutors in Missouri, “I give unto you a commandment, that ye shall forsake all evil and cleave unto all good, that ye shall live by every word which proceedeth forth out of the mouth of God. For he will give unto the faithful line upon line, precept upon precept” (D&C 98:12). Nine years later, in a letter written to Church members, Joseph Smith reviewed events and revelations that were part of his prophetic experience and explained that they were given “line upon line, precept upon precept; here a little, and there a little; giving us consolation by holding forth that which is to come, confirming our hope” (D&C 128:21).

Because the phrase “line upon line, precept upon precept” is clearly being used to explain how God reveals truth to his children in these passages, one might question what the relationship is between the language in these Restoration scriptures and the similar KJV phrase “precept upon precept” in Isaiah 28, which, by most interpretations, has an entirely different meaning. Several possible explanations for the occurrence of the similar language exist.

Some may conclude that because the meaning of the language appears to be very different as used in Restoration scripture and Isaiah 28, the similar language must be coincidental and unrelated. This explanation is not very convincing. Nephi declared that his soul delighted in Isaiah’s words and he quoted from them often, admonishing his people to liken them to their own situation (1 Nephi 15:20; 19:23; 2 Nephi 6:4–5; 11:2, 8; 12–25). It is hard to imagine that he was not thinking of Isaiah when he explained “For behold, thus saith the Lord God: I will give unto the children of men line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little” (2 Nephi 28:30). Bokovsky sees Nephi’s inversion of the KJV phrase in the Book of Mormon from “precept upon precept; line upon line,” to “line upon line, precept upon precept” as an example of Seidel’s Law, wherein one intentionally inverts a phrase to alert the listener that he is quoting from

a familiar source.²⁹ Not only in Nephi's writing, but also throughout the English translation of the Book of Mormon, the text consistently uses KJV language wherever Isaiah is quoted (e.g., Mosiah 14; 3 Nephi 22), thereby affirming the close relationship between the texts. Likewise, KJV Isaiah is found throughout the Doctrine and Covenants. Nearly one third of the revelations recorded in the Doctrine and Covenants share some characteristic language, phrases, or terms with prophecies recorded in Isaiah. While some of the shared language in the Doctrine and Covenants occurs in the form of extended passages taken from Isaiah's writings, the preponderance of the language found in the two texts is in the form of short phrases and terminology.

Moreover, the Doctrine and Covenants draws language and phrases from more than half of the chapters of Isaiah, yet surprisingly, nearly 80 percent of the shared language or phrases are used three times or less in the entire Doctrine and Covenants text. Thus, the Doctrine and Covenants draws both broadly and abundantly from the words of Isaiah.³⁰ Again, given this ubiquitous use of Isaianic language in the Doctrine and Covenants, it would be difficult to argue that the occurrence of "line upon line, precept upon precept" (D&C 98:12; 128:21) in the text is coincidental and unrelated to Isaiah 28.

Some may conclude that Nephi and Joseph Smith simply misunderstood what the KJV "precept upon precept, line upon line" really meant, and so, in their ignorance, misused the similar language in Restoration scripture to describe how God reveals truth. Ascribing ignorance to prophets is not a satisfying or convincing resolution for most. Others may conclude that Nephi and Joseph Smith understood well what the KJV "precept upon precept, line upon line" really meant, but as God spoke to them he repurposed

the language and meaning to teach how he reveals truth. This seems a more tenable resolution.

Some may conclude that because the Restoration scriptures use the phrase “line upon line, precept upon precept” to explain how God reveals truth, only the KJV has the translation of Isaiah 28: 7–13 correct and it must be understood to have the same meaning in all texts. This conclusion is likewise not entirely convincing. The reasoning and evidences presented for many of the various other interpretations as discussed above are typically logical, well founded, convincing and, for the most part, not easily dismissed. However, in light of the controversy among scholars over how to understand the passage, those who accept Restoration scriptures as part of their canon should feel free to reasonably argue that the affinity of those texts for Isaiah and their clear support for the KJV interpretation of the passage should also be allowed to inform the discussion.

Perhaps the most reasonable explanation for the similar language in Restoration scripture and Isaiah 28:7–13 can be found if the Isaiah passage is interpreted in the context of entrapment rhetoric. As an entrapment episode, Isaiah is allowed to cleverly change the meaning of the drunkards mocking phrase in verse 10 to teach God’s paradigm of revelation in verse 13. Thus, the verse 13 language would be the very inspiration and meaning for the similar language’s use in Restoration scripture. If one prefers this explanation for the relationship between the texts, then it seems wiser to reference verse 13 rather than verse 10 of Isaiah 28 when cross-referencing the Restoration scripture language with Isaiah.

The debate over the proper interpretation of Isaiah 28:7–13 and its relationship to Restoration scripture will likely persist in the years to come. This study has endeavored to illustrate that there are many tenable approaches and answers.

Notes

1. Interestingly, the Septuagint, perhaps in line with the first copy of Isaiah in the Dead Sea corpus, renders the verse with words that, when translated into English, read "take for your selves tribulation upon tribulation hope upon hope, yet a little, yet a little." For a discussion, see Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39*, trans. Thomas H. Trapp (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 16.
2. I use the term "Restoration scripture" to refer collectively to the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants, and the Pearl of Great Price.
3. R. H. Kennett, *Ancient Hebrew Social Life and Custom as Indicated in Law, Narrative and Metaphor* (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), 12.
4. An alphabet table.
5. William W. Hallo, "Isaiah 28:9–13 and the Ugaritic Abecedaries," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 77, no. 4 (December 1958): 324–38.
6. John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 1–33*, vol. 24 in *Word Biblical Commentary* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985), 363.
7. G. R. Driver, "Another Little Drink," *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 54–56, 62.
8. J. J. M. Rogers, *First Isaiah: A Commentary*, vol. 29 in *Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015), 348, 351.
9. K. van der Toorn, "Echoes of Judean Necromancy in Isaiah 28, 7–22," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 100, no. 2 (1988): 199–217.
10. A. van Selms, "Isaiah 28:9–13: An Attempt to Give a New Interpretation," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 85, no. 3 (1973): 332–39.
11. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39*, 23. For a review and bibliography of these and other such interpretations, see K. van der Toorn, "Echoes of Judean Necromancy in Isaiah 28, 7–22," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 100:2 (1988): 199–217.
12. John H. Hayes and Stuart A. Irvine, *Isaiah the Eighth-Century Prophet: His Times & His Teachings* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987), 325.
13. For an example, see Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39*, 14.

14. In the eight century BC, Assyria was building its empire by conquering neighboring nations and making them vassal states.
15. Brevard S. Childs, “Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis,” *Studies in Biblical Theology*, Second Series 3 (London: SCM Press, 1967), 27–28. For another discussion of the issue of voice, see A. van Selms, “Isaiah 28:9–13: An attempt to give a New Interpretation,” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 85, no. 3 (1973): 332–39.
16. See for example *The Interpreter’s Bible*, 12 vols. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), 5:316; Matthew Henry, *An Exposition of the Old and New Testament* (New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1853), 126–27.
17. Watts, *Isaiah* 1–33, 361.
18. Driver, *Words and Meanings*, 54.
19. Hayes and Irvine, *Isaiah the Eighth-Century Prophet*, 325. The Contemporary English Version and NET Bible translations presented above appear to follow the Hays and Irvine interpretation.
20. Watts, *Isaiah* 1–33, 363. The GOD’S WORD Translation presented above appears to follow Watts’s interpretation.
21. For examples of this interpretation, see Rogers, *First Isaiah*, 351; van Selms, “Isaiah 28:9–13,” 332–39; Joseph Jensen, *Isaiah 1–39* (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1984), 217.
22. Wildberger, *Isaiah* 28–39, 25.
23. Watts, *Isaiah* 1–33, 359.
24. Watts, *Isaiah* 1–33, 364.
25. BillyKangas, “Entrapment: The Biblical Art of Cloak and Dagger Rhetoric,” *Patheos*, <http://www.patheos.com/blogs/billykangas/2012/02/entrapment-the-biblical-art-of-cloak-and-dagger-rhetoric.html>.
26. Robert H. O’Connell, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges* (New York: E. J. Brill, 1996), 6, 268–304.
27. “Amos,” *Bible.org*, <https://bible.org/seriespage/3-amos>.
28. It is also tenable that verse 11 is still the voice of the drunkards, in which case they appear to be accusing Isaiah of speaking to them with stammering lips and in another tongue.

29. David Bokovoy, "Inverted Quotations in the Book of Mormon," *Insights* 139 (2000): 2.
30. Terry B. Ball and Spencer Snyder, "Isaiah in the Doctrine and Covenants," in *You Shall Have My Word: Exploring the Text of the Doctrine and Covenants*, ed. Scott C. Esplin, Richard O. Cowan, and Rachel Cope (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center; Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2012), 108–33.