Where is thetransition. What versews are referring to both of them.

Would-the- This wfirst verse we see is specifically the calling of the Gentiles.

How far does that go. Which was verses refer in specifically to I srael, We have what a sign already in the was first ten verses of it, what-only- there are only 7 more. I would suggest that for our next meeting, you review those 10 so as we to ke have well in mind the meaning of the 10. Then that you look at the chapte as a whole, particularly those 10 to see what is speaking of I srael and what is she speaking of the Gentiles, and then if you still have time, go on to the Hebrew of what follows. But look at it in the English,

We notice that there- they are very clear chapters, the baring of them are but when you come to 54 there is much in it that is far less clear and of course the immediate question is Who is he taling talking to, and we have whad a great deal before this in chaper 40 ... so the m question ixx that has been talking to Israel. So-the-question-is Now, this must have caused a real problem, to the people in that day. They would wonder it how to interpretthis verse. We would say, Sing, O barren, thou that-bareet- hast not borne, it is the perfect it is not thou that doest not bare. In I could imagine that asomeone there saying he is talking to Israel, of course, and you woul say x how does this fit Israel, yes, they are in exile. They are not there, but to say that they have not borne, because Israel has had tremendous accompleih- ishments, before, Israel God x called Abraham, Isaac, and Joseph, and he has the great prophets leading them, & Samuel and David, and there were great wonderful kings in the old days, and if you think of thetime the tite- time in which Isa.origianall lived, to say that I srael had never borne, it just doesn't make sense, to say you that do not bare, that would be different. The Participale would fit perfectly -- you am who have not borne m just doesn not fit I srael. And then he goes on