At Micah 5:3 the prophet takes his stand once more in his own 1 timeand connects his prophecy with what he has said about Israel's sin and defections. "Therefore will he give them up until the time that she who travaileth has brought forth." The wicked condition of Is rael continued from the time of Micah till the coming of the Messiah's sojourn on earth. It might have ended if Israel had repented and had accepted their Messih. However, "fle came unto his own, and they that were his own received him not" (Johnl:ll). In all his public ministry the Messiah labored for his people, but they would not hear. And $h$ -

> \e said finally: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her! How of ten $y^{\prime}$ would I have gathered they chidren together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!"

The second part of Kicah 5:3 reads: "Then the residue of his brethren shall return unto the children of Israel." Reading that $f$ verse as a whole the impression easily obtains that when the time of the birth of Christ shall have come, "THEN" the reintegration of Is rael would occur, that is, immediately after the birth of the Messiah. Howver, this has not taken place in all these i8 or 19 centuries. Hence that word "then" must express an indefinite lapse of time. A similar case is given in Luke 4:16-20, where Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth read from Isaiah 61, and in the second verse he stopped at a comma, saying, that what preceded was being fulfilled in their waxx owndays. Our Lord said nothing about the "day of vengeance" which did not come in that time not has as get been fulfilled.

Continuing now with Micah 5:3, the second past, this important sentence occurs: "Then the residue of his brethren shall return unto

