

tion is that they did it, because v.18 uses the narrative tense which seems to show something which follows, which occurs following what was just before.

SH: Yes, then 18 is narrative...8....

AAM: No, no, 18 I would say then is narrative, telling what happened. The Lord was jealous for his land and pitied his people, and He answered and said to his people, so and so. And then we have the Lord's promises. The Lord answers and gives some promises, and then looks forward to the last days, and gives them some .....8 $\frac{1}{4}$ .....

SH:.....that if 1:1 to 2:19 was one unbroken discourse, .... that would mean that the imperfect here would be something that would surely come to pass, but not come to pass yet.....8  $\frac{3}{4}$ .....

AAM: Yes, I would think so. I would think that in view of the tenses you were justified in that, but that makes the best sense out of it, as a whole. Well, then, does that cover that? All right, what would you say next, Mr. A., then?.....

AAM: A very good suggestion, the outcry of the people for .....9  $\frac{1}{4}$ ... and then in v.8.....9 $\frac{1}{2}$ -10.....

Generation after generation won't be like this 2:2 here, I think that is better than many generations. We don't know how long. We go on and on forever, or we go on and on for a while ~~xxxxxxx~~ and then eventually something like that...., we are just looking way ahead. We don't say how long. Many sort of implies that there will be after many. I don't think this implies there will, but I don't think it says it is internal. Well, it means a ~~xxxxxxx~~ long time, but it doesn't say whether it is forever. Yes?.....10 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....

Olam is a long stretch.

WA: ~~xxxxxxx~~ It can be used to refer to past time, or to future time, when it refers to past time it is ancient days.

AAM: Way back, so far that it is sort of disappears into obscurity. The parallel lines seem to meet

WA: I know the participle is very clear, but would it be possible to take