

Then, that ~~s~~ certainly seems a reasonable interpretation here , doesn't it~~?~~/.

Stu: Schaff makes a division there between 9 and 10. I didn't read it in detail, however, he ~~makes~~ doesn't connect a division at verse 2, he includes verses 1 to 9 , the downfall of the worldly powers, and Zion's joyful resurrection. Well, that should be (9 1/2)

MacR: Yes, he makes a division then between verse 9 and 10. Verse 7 says, is Israel wrecked like the other nations, the wicked nations are ~~w~~recked? No, he says, he chastises them in measure when (10)

He chastises them but he does not recognize, and the iniquity of Jacob is to be forgiven--

stu: by this, by the chastisement.

MacR: yes, good, this is the (10 1/4) that's very good. Well, then verse 10, does verse 10 start a new section or continue the same discussion. What are verse 10 and 11 dealing with?

stu: Could that, in verse 2, could that extend in detail, the chastisement? (10 1/2)

He says that they are a people of no understanding, it seems that they could well retain the same logical subject as what has preceded, still talking about Israel.

MacR: 10 and 11 can be related to what precedes certainly, but it could relate, in talking about Israel or in talking about Israel's enemies, and which is it?

stu: suggested the one clue, that it is a people of no understanding, why would he retain the singular as though he were still speaking to the point of (11 1/4)

MacR: Well, he might be giving a specific example of an answer. That would be a possibility.

stu: If you take it as Israel, then how do you explain verse 11? (11 1/2)