

Vs. 11 is a little different in the LXX from what James says it to be. "Instead of in that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David, "I will return and build again the tabernacle of David." He has a different start here. Why does he say that he will return rather than In that day as Amos says? In the original it says in that day does it not. He does say a people for his name and he is quoting verses 11 and 12 almost verbatim but at the beginning of v. 11--he says after this I will return--why does James put all that in--does he just not remember. That is quite a change--was that an accident or did he do that intentionally? What does this add to the writing? Supposing we had a great American at the time of the writing of the Constitution who said, A time is coming when the United States will be a great nation and suppose you have another one who says, "That in the future the U.S. must be careful how it conducts ~~itself~~ itself. Now what would be the point of combining these two--the U.S. must be careful as to how it conducts itself and combine the two. You see what I mean--to take the phrase of another prophet doesn't add to the meaning unless there is meaning in that point; if there is a meaning in the phrase what is the meaning in the simple phrase like this--I don't see the point of saying that it ~~is~~ is from another prophet. His argument doesn't rest upon this--taking three words from one prophet and two verses from another prophet and then putting them together--your argument must rest on the whole idea. God is taking out a people for his name--why does he start thus. To my mind it shows what James considered and proved something to be about circumcision. It is extremely vital to his argument. It is as if Roosevelt would say back in 1940 that we are going to fight the Germans to the bitter end and going to conquer them--we are going to establish in Berlin headquarters and suppose I were to quote in 1944--Roosevelt, after we conquer Germany we are going to establish a headquarters to rule all of Germany--I could put in a phrase to show when his statement referred. I might know from the context and general teaching and viewpoint, when he felt these words would come to pass--is he not meaning to say that after Christ returns, after this present age in which we now are, Christ has promised that He is going to return and when He returns he is going to do that which Amos declared. Amos has given us a picture of what Christ is going to do when He returns. He is giving us a bearing and show us **how** it fits into the scheme of things. In other words He is showing us how ~~it~~ it fits in with the millennium **and** relates to the