

ISAIAH

ISAIAH 20:1-21:10, ORACLES ON VARIOUS NATIONS

Next, the prophet returned to a subject that concerned contemporary history. He revealed a prophecy about Assyria's attack against and victory over Ashdod, Egypt, and Ethiopia. Hezekiah was considering an alliance with Egypt, then ruled by Ethiopia, to resist Assyria's advances in the region. The prophet revealed the folly of such an alliance, which, in fact, never happened.

The chapter begins with the mention of Assyria's conquest of Ashdod, which was one of the five principal Philistine cities. Obviously, this is quite close to Jerusalem and the Assyrian Army would have traveled through what once had been Israel, the Northern Kingdom, to get there. By this time, 711 B.C., Assyria had conquered Israel which took place in 722 B.C. Assyria's depredations in the area were frightening for everyone.

Isaiah 20:1 ¹In the year that the commander [תַּרְתָּן] came to Ashdod, when Sargon the king of Assyria sent him and he fought against Ashdod and captured it,

Commander, תַּרְתָּן, was the title or the official designation for the highest commanding officer in the Assyrian Army. Some refer to that position as commander-in-chief, but that seems a bit much for those of us who think of the civilian president as the commander-in-chief; therefore, I think chief commander (HCSB) or commanding general (NET Bible) is a more appropriate English translation. The context of this verse suggests that the King of Assyria, Sargon, was the commander-in-chief; the commander went to Ashdod on the king's orders. The word is related to an Akkadian word meaning "second." In this case, he would be the second in command after the king. That is the sense one encyclopedia gives it. "[Tartan is] the title of an Assyrian general in command of a military force and listed in the Assyrian Eponym texts as the next highest official after the king" [s.v. "Tartan," *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, Volume 5, Q-Z, 5:603*]. It certainly refers to the highest-ranking army officer that took the Assyrian Army to Ashdod. Other translations simply transliterate the word and those texts read "Tartan came to Ashdod" (KJV, NKJV, ASV, YLT).

The historical background for this Scripture is Ashdod's revolt against Assyrian domination of the city and the subsequent payment of tribute Assyria required of them. Assyria attempted to quell the uprising by removing Ashdod's king and they replaced him with his younger brother who was presumably more amenable to kowtowing to the Assyrian king. The people, however, continued to rebel and proclaimed a Greek named lamani (or Jaman or Yamani) to be their king. That resulted in the assault and conquest of Ashdod that Isaiah chronicled in this verse. lamani fled to Egypt. The Ethiopian dynasty ruling Egypt turned him back over to the Assyrians, proving the point Isaiah was making to Hezekiah that Egypt could not be trusted in any alliance with them. Ashdod was also in a strategic location in terms of launching an invasion into Egypt which was something Assyria desired to do, if for no other reason, because Egypt had been encouraging the nations between Egypt and Assyria to revolt against Assyria based on promises of Egypt's assistance—which were not reliable promises. It was such a strategic location that years

later Alexander the Great conquered Gaza and used that area at the launching pad for his invasion of Egypt.

Isaiah was then commanded to remove the garment of sackcloth he was wearing, and preach his message warning against an alliance with Egypt and Ethiopia while naked and barefoot. Whether Isaiah was wearing sackcloth in mourning for some reason, or whether that was his customary dress as a prophet of God is unknown, but he was wearing it at that time.

Isaiah 20:2 ²at that time the LORD spoke through Isaiah the son of Amoz, saying, "Go and loosen the sackcloth from your hips and take your shoes off your feet." And he did so, going naked [עָרוֹם] and barefoot.

Naked, עָרוֹם, means naked or undressed, mostly or completely unclothed. It refers to being naked pertaining to being unclothed and bare skinned, in some contexts it implies shame, and in others it is a display of destitution. It does not always refer to complete nudity; it may refer to being inadequately clothed, and it may apply to a person with the upper garment removed.

It was shameful for one's body to be uncovered; therefore, it is somewhat inconceivable to think that Isaiah, the prophet of God, was completely without clothing. The story of Ham seeing his father's nakedness (Gen. 9:22), and the prohibitions on nakedness in the Mosaic Law, clearly reveal the shame associated with being naked in front of others. The prophets generally wore sackcloth and sandals, but they had the usual undergarment on under the rough cloth. "[S]tripping oneself of the sackcloth did not mean complete nakedness, but only comparatively speaking. The Lord would never have commanded His prophet to walk about 'stark naked,' since this would be an indecent act. Yet for Isaiah to walk about publicly in his undershirt called for a great measure of self-humiliation, especially for a prominent person of Isaiah's stature and aristocratic background.... Isaiah's 'nakedness' was to be a sign and wonder, that is, a symbolic act of what the Lord had purposed for Egypt and Ethiopia: defeat and extreme humiliation" [Victor Buksbazen, *The Prophet Isaiah: A Commentary*, 220]. The NET Bible uses the word "undergarments" rather than "naked" in its translation of the word. "Naked," however, is probably the best translation since it does include the concept of being clothed only in the undergarments. Gesenius related that the word could be used to indicate ragged or badly clad, and to describe "one who, having taken off his mantle, goes only clad in his tunic" [H. W. F. Gesenius, s.v. "עָרוֹם, עָרוֹם," *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, 653]. When David danced before the ark of God, Michal said he was doing so uncovered and she considered it shameful, but he was wearing a linen ephod at the time (2 Sam. 6:14, 20); therefore, the concept of wearing underwear and yet considered to be naked is not a concept foreign to the thinking of the time.

Appearing in public unclothed down to the undergarments would have emphasized the importance of the prophet's message. Going completely naked certainly would have attracted attention, but because it was a shameful thing to do, it would have diverted attention away from the message itself. "With the great importance attached to the clothing in the East, where the feelings upon this point are peculiarly sensitive and modest, a person was looked upon as stripped and naked if he had only taken off his

upper garment. What Isaiah was directed to do, therefore, was simply opposed to common custom, and not to moral decency" [C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament: Isaiah*, vol. 7, 7:242]. Being clad in his undergarment attracted attention and enhanced the platform he had for preaching God's Word, and it preserved his dignity without being scandalous.

There is, of course, the possibility that Isaiah was commanded to strip down and appear completely naked. Because of God's viewpoint concerning nakedness as shameful and because the people thought it shameful, it is probably best to define this word according to the definition of undressing down to the underwear since that is a possibility within the parameters of the definition.

The prophet was commanded to present his message in this manner; "go" is an imperative, that is, a command, from God. He was told to deliver this message while naked and barefoot. This is the only symbolic activity the prophet was ordered to undertake during his ministry, and it was meant to symbolize the plight of captives. Ashdod had relied on the promises of Egypt to protect them and their reliance proved foolhardy. Isaiah was warning the people of Judah not to make the same mistake and end up in captivity as the people of Ashdod and Egypt did.

"Verse 2 seems to require that Isaiah's sign act began in the year of Ashdod's conquest, which would not prevent him from beginning his sign act a few months before Ashdod fell. This timing would allow his audience in Judah to interpret his nakedness in light of what was happening with the people of Egypt who did not rescue Ashdod. The connection of this sign act with the fall of Ashdod would teach Isaiah's audience in Judah not to trust Egypt as the people of Ashdod did, for if they do they will also end up going naked into captivity just like the Egyptians and the people of Ashdod" [Gary V. Smith, *The New American Commentary: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture: Isaiah 1-39*, 366].

Through the prophet, the Lord revealed that Assyria would, in fact, conquer Egypt and Cush.

Isaiah 20:3-4 ³And the LORD said, "Even as My servant [עֲבָדִי] Isaiah has gone naked and barefoot three years as a sign and token against Egypt and Cush, ⁴so the king of Assyria will lead away the captives of Egypt and the exiles of Cush, young and old, naked and barefoot with buttocks uncovered, to the shame [עֲרֹוֹתָ] of Egypt.

In these verses, the reason for the prophet's appearance, naked and barefoot, is confirmed. That is the way captives were treated by conquering armies, and Isaiah was symbolically portraying that truth. Hezekiah was under pressure from people in his nation to enter into an alliance with Egypt; therefore, Isaiah's prophecy was meant to be a wake-up call for them concerning the folly of relying on a nation that was itself destined for destruction and enslavement. "During those three years, Isaiah's observers doubtless concluded that his condition represented the fate of the people of Ashdod. At the end of three years, God told Isaiah to explain the significance of his strange behavior. That he had portrayed the Egyptians and Cushites, and not the people of Ashdod, would have shocked the Judeans, because many of them favored relying on Egypt and Cush for

protection against Assyria" [Thomas L. Constable, *Thomas Constable's Notes on the Bible, Volume IV: Isaiah-Daniel, 4:62*].

God's recognition of Isaiah as "My servant" is significant in that it implies Isaiah was a faithful servant who did the will of his master, Yahweh. Servant, עֶבֶד, simply refers to a slave or a servant. In this context, it refers to one who helps in service to another person but not necessarily a possession of another person. It is a title of humility for someone in a position of lower authority or stature whether in a relationship between two people or between a person and God. Servants may be faithful or unfaithful, good or bad, but when God refers to a person as "My servant" in a context that is commending him for revealing that which God wanted revealed, it indicates a high degree of commendable faithfulness to God. God held Isaiah in high esteem as a faithful servant.

The reason Cush was included with Egypt is due to the fact that the Ethiopians had conquered Egypt and an Ethiopian was Pharaoh at the time.

The description of the fate of the Egyptian and Cushite captives is the reality of Isaiah's symbolic portrayal of them being led away into captivity in whatever form that was destined to take. We do not know what happened to these people, but we do know the Assyrians were some of the most evil, cruel people known to history.

It wasn't just the people who would be shamed, it was Egypt as a nation; this defeat was a humiliation for the entire nation. There is a reason why being unclothed is related to shame; people, or at least most people, are naturally shamed when they are exposed in public particularly when it is forced upon them. Shame, עָרְוָה, means nakedness; it is a word used for genitalia. In this context, it is used figuratively to refer to the shame and humiliation Egypt would feel as a nation. Nakedness, the exposure of shame, is a feature of judgment. Shame and nakedness are related in terms of the Fall going back to Genesis 3:7. The captives were literally naked and shamed, but the nation was figuratively shamed and therefore naked before the world in humiliation and subjugation.

Isaiah next addressed the people who thought it would have been a good idea to enter into a mutual aid pact with Egypt.

Isaiah 20:5–6 ⁵"Then they will be dismayed and ashamed because of Cush their hope [מִכּוּשׁ] and Egypt their boast [תִּקְוַתְּךָ]. ⁶"So the inhabitants of this coastland will say in that day, 'Behold, such is our hope, where we fled for help to be delivered from the king of Assyria; and we, how shall we escape?'"

One of the things the Israelites should have known was that Yahweh was their protection and they therefore had no need to enter into alliances with pagan nations. One aspect of the blessings they were promised for obedience was safety and protection. God was the only alliance they needed.

Leviticus 26:6–8 ⁶"I shall also grant peace in the land, so that you may lie down with no one making you tremble. I shall also eliminate harmful beasts from the land, and no sword will pass through your land. ⁷"But you will chase your enemies and they will fall before you

by the sword; ⁸five of you will chase a hundred, and a hundred of you will chase ten thousand, and your enemies will fall before you by the sword.

Deuteronomy 28:7 ⁷"The LORD shall cause your enemies who rise up against you to be defeated before you; they will come out against you one way and will flee before you seven ways.

The only reason they had to fear hostile nations was due to their unbelief, disobedience, and rebellion. Israel had identified themselves with the nations to the extent that they were nearly indistinguishable from them; they were not living the set apart life God desired them to live. Any consideration of alliances with Assyria or Egypt or with any other pagan nation would have been a moot point, if only the people had been faithful to obey God's commandments. To do so would have meant entering into the divine blessings Yahweh promised them which included divine protection from any enemy nation. Because they were not obedient, they suffered the curses promised them for disobedience which included suffering, defeat, and humiliation at the hands of their enemies.

Leviticus 26:17, 25, 33 ¹⁷I will set My face against you so that you will be struck down before your enemies; and those who hate you will rule over you, and you will flee when no one is pursuing you.... ²⁵I will also bring upon you a sword which will execute vengeance for the covenant ... so that you shall be delivered into enemy hands.... ³³You, however, I will scatter among the nations and will draw out a sword after you, as your land becomes desolate and your cities become waste.

Deuteronomy 28:25, 49-50, 52 ²⁵"The LORD shall cause you to be defeated before your enemies; you will go out one way against them, but you will flee seven ways before them, and you will be *an example of terror* to all the kingdoms of the earth.... ⁴⁹"The LORD will bring a nation against you from afar, from the end of the earth, as the eagle swoops down, a nation whose language you shall not understand, ⁵⁰a nation of fierce countenance who will have no respect for the old, nor show favor to the young.... ⁵²"It shall besiege you in all your towns until your high and fortified walls in which you trusted come down throughout your land, and it shall besiege you in all your towns throughout your land which the LORD your God has given you.

The people of Judah who supported this alliance will be dismayed that Egypt and Cush were not the saviors they thought they would be. The fact that Cush and Egypt had been the hope and boast of Judah highlights the fact that sinful man relies on sight and on faulty human judgment, clouded by the sin nature, and based on observable factors rather than on God and on His Word. Obviously, the Israelites, of all people who knew the history of the incredible, delivering power of Yahweh, should have been relying on faith rather than on sight. The words hope and boast indicate that Judah was dazzled by the splendor of Egypt and allowed that to not only cloud their judgment, but to lead them into at least considering, in this instance, disregarding the warnings issued by God's prophet. Unfortunately, this was nothing new.

Hope, מִבְּטָח, means expectation, to hope in, to trust in, to rely on, referring to believing in someone or something to the extent of placing reliance, trust, or expectation with a focus on the object being trusted in.

Boast, תִּפְאָרֶת, means beauty and glory; it refers to the quality of being magnificent or splendid.

Egypt's capitulation to the power of Assyria, apparently gave Hezekiah a wake-up call and resulted in his decision not to enter into an alliance with Egypt at that time.

The people of the coastland must refer to the Philistines who had already placed their hope in Egypt for protection only to realize those hopes were misplaced and Egypt was powerless to defend them.

The next prophecy concerns the fall of Babylon in temporal terms; however, we cannot divorce ancient Babylon from the Babylonian world system of the end. The Medo-Persian conquest of Babylon is the temporal conquest of Babylon in this Scripture.

Isaiah 21:1–2 ¹The oracle concerning the wilderness of the sea. As windstorms in the Negev sweep on, It comes from the wilderness, from a terrifying land. ²A harsh [הַקָּשָׁה] vision has been shown to me; The treacherous one *still* deals treacherously, and the destroyer *still* destroys. Go up, Elam, lay siege, Media; I have made an end of all the groaning she has caused.

Even though Babylon was an evil, pagan nation that was being punished for the destruction she had caused, this vision was unsettling for the prophet. The Bible doesn't explain why, but the prophet referred to his vision as "harsh," הַקָּשָׁה, which means hard, severe, cruel, harsh, or fierce pertaining to that which is very difficult and causes great hardship. This could mean one of two things. It could refer to the severity of the destruction Medo-Persia was going to inflict on Assyria, or it could refer to the shock that the prophet felt for the people who were going to suffer in the conflict. That is not out of the question for a prophet of God who, presumably, as a man of God empathized with people living under dire circumstances. My preference is for the former; this was going to be a very destructive, vicious beat down in the area.

Babylon was referred to as "the wilderness of the sea" which is a figurative reference to the marshes of the lower Euphrates River; it is as though the city is floating on this watery bed. Jeremiah called Babylon the city "who dwell[s] on many waters" (Jer. 51:13). Assyrians referred to southern Babylon as "sea land." It is possible this reference to the sea is a textual issue; the Septuagint does not have it reading, "As a squall might pass through a desert, coming from a desert out of a land fearsome."

Just as a destructive south wind that comes in from the Negev, so will the invasion of Babylon be that brings that nation to her knees. Elihu made a reference to storms that come out of the south in Job 37:9; this is a common occurrence in that part of the world. This is a figurative expression referring to the army that is going to destroy Babylon. The prophet identified the Medo-Elam army as the force that destroys Babylon as a nation. At the time of this prophecy, Assyria was still the power player in the region; Babylon

would eventually replace them, but that was still in the future. By the time that would come around, Elam became Persia. Just because Babylon itself was not physically destroyed, does not mean there was not death and destruction along the way to conquering the city.

The reference to a terrifying land, may be due to the fact that Media and Elam/Persia were considered to be outside the bounds of civilized Middle East society. I'm not real sure what the standard was for determining what was meant by "civilized" since the Assyrians were some of the most bloodthirsty, vicious people in the history of mankind that itself has displayed remarkable tendencies to kill one another in seriously vicious ways.

The prophet's emotions about the situation are forcefully expressed in the next two verses.

Isaiah 21:3–4 ³For this reason my loins are full of anguish; Pains have seized me like the pains of a woman in labor. I am so bewildered I cannot hear, so terrified I cannot see. ⁴My mind reels, horror overwhelms me; The twilight I longed for has been turned for me into trembling.

What Isaiah actually observed in this vision is not revealed, but it shook him to the core even causing him to experience physical pain. He thought he could escape the situation at night while sleeping, or at least relaxing during a quiet evening, but that didn't offer him any solace either. Some theologians were perplexed about the prophet's feelings concerning Babylon which was, after all, the nation that was destined to destroy Judah and the Temple. That fact does not diminish the ability of the prophet to empathize with people who were suffering no matter how just the suffering being experienced.

The next verse revealed that Isaiah almost certainly received a vision of the last night that Babylon existed as an ancient nation. The vision was that of the banquet Belshazzar was going to be celebrating with the nobles of his Babylonian kingdom (Dan. 5:1).

Isaiah 21:5 ⁵They set the table, they spread out the cloth, they eat, they drink; "Rise up, captains, oil the shields,"

Rising up to oil the shields is an indication that the Babylonians were enjoying their feast ignorant of the imminent danger they were in, but once they discovered it, they needed to prepare to defend themselves. However, by then, it would be too late. This is also an indication that they were totally unprepared for an attack. Historically, we know that the Medo-Persian army was able to enter the city and begin to take it some time before the king and his nobles would even be aware of what was happening. How long that was we do not know, but we do know that very night "Belshazzar the Chaldean was slain" (Dan. 5:30).

Some theologians believe this verse involves a feast in Jerusalem when Merodach-baladan visited Hezekiah and was shown the treasures of Jerusalem (Is. 39:1-2). Pretending to be friends, they were instead plotting the demise of Judah. However, since this is a prophecy about the fall of Babylon, it seems more likely to be a reference to the last night of that nation's existence.

Next, in the vision, God tells Isaiah to station a watchman on the walls of Babylon and report what he sees. Eventually, what he will see is the fall of Babylon.

Isaiah 21:6–7 ⁶For thus the Lord says to me, “Go, station the lookout, let him report what he sees. ⁷“When he sees riders, horsemen in pairs, A train of donkeys, a train of camels, Let him pay close attention, very close attention.”

These verses present a sharp contrast to the reality of the failure of the Babylonian watchmen to detect the Medo-Persian invasion of the city. How did they divert the water without being detected especially in a very short period of time? How did they get a sizable group of soldiers into the city without being detected in some way, particularly by means of sound? It is difficult for a large contingent of men carrying military gear to be totally silent. How did they get through the mud of the river bed once the water was diverted? Surely the Babylonians had a watch set of some sort on the walls and possibly outside the walls. At any rate, their security measures were obviously completely inadequate to the point they were totally compromised. Furthermore, the Babylonians knew the Medo-Persian army was in their nation attempting to conquer them. They thought their city was impregnable behind those massive city walls, and that they could hold out in a siege due to the availability of water from the river and the storehouses of food they had laid up for a situation such as this. In other words, they must have been very complacent and dangerously overconfident in the face of this invasion. Of course, we cannot discount the role the sovereign God played in ensuring these conditions were met to bring about the downfall of Babylon.

Day after day, the people engaging in the normal activities of travel and commerce paraded in and out of the city as this watchman faithfully carried out his duties. The purpose of the watchman was to examine those people approaching the city to ensure they were what they appeared to be, that is, travelers and merchants and citizens engaging in the day-to-day business of living their lives. If the watchman detected anything out of the ordinary that could suggest a group approaching the city with bad intentions, particularly an approaching army, he was to report it to the authorities up the chain of command so they could react to it and issue directives for dealing with it.

At some point, amidst the day-to-day activities, the watchmen will see the unmistakable approach of an army. Horseman in pairs and the armies' supply train will be approaching. There are also historical accounts of the use of donkeys and camels by the Medo-Persians to somehow overwhelm and confuse an enemy force.

The next verse relates the patience of the watchman as he performs his duties.

Isaiah 21:8 ⁸Then the lookout called, “O Lord, I stand continually by day on the watchtower, And I am stationed every night at my guard post.

We have to remember that this prophecy was revealed before Babylon was even yet the nation and power it was to become. Assyria was still the power in the region. As a political and militarily powerful nation, Babylon's fortunes had ebbed and flowed. At the time of this prophecy, Babylon was part of Assyria. The Babylon that conquered Judah under Nebuchadnezzar lasted less than a century as an independent national power

before Cyrus conquered it. Isaiah's prophecy concerns that event which was still about 200 years into the future. We also cannot discount the fact that the destruction of Babylon at the time under consideration here, is a type of the destruction that Babylon will experience at the end of the Tribulation.

This verse reflects the perseverance that it takes for God's people to allow for the time necessary, in God's timing, for God's plans to play out. Once again, implicit in all this is a warning to Judah not to get entangled in foreign alliances. In this case, with Babylon. In God's sight, Babylon was just as weak and just as doomed as every other pagan nation, and God's people had no business getting into alliances with any of them.

Finally, Babylon's destruction came into view.

Isaiah 21:9 ⁹"Now behold, here comes a troop of riders [רָכָב], horsemen in pairs." And one said, "Fallen [נָפַל], fallen is Babylon; And all the images of her gods are shattered on the ground."

This verse suggests that both chariots and cavalry are approaching the city although that is not very apparent in our NASB translation. The best translation seems to be, "...here comes a chariot of men with a pair of horses ..." (NKJV). The word translated "riders" in the NASB is רָכָב, variously means the chariot itself as a means of conveyance or as an offensive weapon of war, the charioteer or driver, or a military chariot group.

This is likely a picture of the victorious army announcing their victory. In pagan cultures, it was significant to have one's idols shattered and left lying around like so much rubbish. It was a proclamation that the victor's gods were more powerful than the gods of the vanquished. In this case, however, God is the mighty God who saw to it that these idols were shattered and the false gods "defeated." Whether it was the Medo-Persian soldiers, unknowingly acting as God's agents, who shattered the idols, or God Himself who did it is beside the point. The false gods of idolatry are impotent and the God of the Bible is omnipotent. God also predicted through the prophet Jeremiah that He was going to destroy Babylon's idols.

Jeremiah 51:47, 52 ⁴⁷Therefore behold, days are coming When I will punish [פָּקַד] the idols of Babylon; And her whole land will be put to shame And all her slain will fall in her midst.... ⁵²"Therefore behold, the days are coming," declares the LORD, "When I will punish [פָּקַד] her idols, And the mortally wounded will groan throughout her land.

Punish, פָּקַד, means to punish, to impose a penalty on or to inflict punishment on.

Here, the watchman proclaims that Babylon has fallen to Medo-Persia which is the same proclamation that will be proclaimed when Babylon falls for the final time at the end of the Tribulation.

Revelation 18:2 ²And he cried out with a mighty voice, saying, "Fallen [πίπτω], fallen is Babylon the great! She has become a dwelling place of demons and a prison of every unclean spirit, and a prison of every unclean and hateful bird.

Fallen in both Hebrew and Greek means the same thing. In Hebrew, נָפַל, means to suffer defeat, failure or ruin; in Greek, πίπτω, means to fall, or to fall in ruins. What happened long ago is going to happen again in the future.

The next verse is a message to Judah.

Isaiah 21:10 ¹⁰O my threshed [מִדְּשָׁה] *people*, and my afflicted [בָּן] of the threshing floor [גֶּרֶן]! What I have heard from the LORD of hosts, The God of Israel, I make known to you.

Isaiah offers words of comfort to his people, a people who have suffered at the hands of others then as they still do today. Threshed, מִדְּשָׁה, is used in this context as an agricultural metaphor meaning thing trodden on; that which is threshed by trampling on a threshing floor as a figurative extension of a downtrodden, beaten, distressed people. This is linked with the threshing floor, גֶּרֶן, confirming the metaphor. This is a picture of serious oppression. Israel will not fully realize the finality of these words until the Tribulation ends and the Kingdom begins.

Afflicted, בָּן, is actually the word son; therefore, a literal rendering is son of the threshing floor (LEB, YLT). This suggests a perpetual condition under which the Israelites, God's people, are living. This is not surprising though given the promises made in the blessings and cursings of Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28. Israel has been under the curses for a long period of time due to her disobedience and rebellion.

God identified Himself here as the God of Israel, אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל, which was meant to be a comfort to them; they were not forgotten and Babylon would one day be destroyed as recompense for the evil they visited upon His people. They would be destroyed by the God of the armies, Yahweh of hosts, יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת. In the first instance of Babylon's destruction, Medo-Persia would be His agent of punishment, but in the second instance of Babylon's destruction, God Himself will destroy Babylon.

Revelation 19:21 ²¹And the rest were killed with the sword which came from the mouth of Him who sat on the horse, and all the birds were filled with their flesh.