

And what about the words in between . For your ~~hus~~-husk-How can you say your maker is plural. Are your ~~husban~~-husbands plural. ~~and~~ and the Lord of Hosts is His name. That seems inconsistent, ~~ee-~~ doesn't it. That leaves us a problem. ^{If it was} The Lord of Hosts is their name, ~~and~~ then ~~or~~ you would have various makers who are their husbands, but in the whole context we have had it said, the Lord is ~~occupyong~~ occupying a relationship similar to that of ~~ta-~~ a husband to a wife, and we ~~are-~~ are taught ~~universally~~ ~~in the Bible and even those who-~~ universally in the Bible and ~~and~~ even those who ~~are-~~ think that early parts of the Bible are not ~~definti-~~ definite ...and that would be your maker not your (8) and that would be your maker not your makers. But it is plural . Your makers are ~~his~~; your ~~husband---~~ husbands. Now, is he talking to ~~individu-~~ individuals who have been ~~make~~ made by different ones, who have ~~did-~~ different husbands. That would...and so the sensible interpretation of ~~kit~~, when you have his ~~name as the-~~ name as the... particularly and when you have been told right along that her husband is the Lord. ~~It~~ would ~~would~~ ~~be~~ the ...to take it ~~as-~~ that this is the plural of ...now, that is ~~not-~~ now that is not common. But it does occur ...God uses the plural in speaking of Himself, ~~and~~ as the one who makes ~~mak~~ man, yet monotheism is very clearly taught. Now, here monotheism is ~~very~~ very clearly taught. But in ~~this--~~ these two words we have a plural, and the only reasonable way to interpret it , particularly in view of the singular right after ~~it~~ it. Is to take it as a plural ...Yes, that verse is a problem which gets into the whole question of progressive revelation. The Lord ~~is--~~ The Lord gives His ...and then explains . As he says, Unto us ~~is-born-~~ a child is born, and unto us a son is given, but