

still good now. That's not saying, they will last forever. The thought in ordinary practical life, the thought of continuance without end, is not a thought that would naturally occur. It had ~~nothing to do~~ <sup>connection</sup> with anything to do with it. It is a philosophical term. Now we may find a word that would philosophically fit this idea. But we are not apt in ordinary life to have such a word, and therefore it is something which will grow up in connection with philosophical relation from it. And so I say, when you find a word, you have to prove it has this definite philosophical idea in it. You can't just say it is .12 $\frac{1}{2}$

And this word, the very fact that it says something, they go on forever and ever, shows that just forever isn't without end. It stresses it. It goes on, way on, for  $\text{בְּיָמָיו}$ . Well then, when you say an  $\text{בְּיָמָיו}$  of an  $\text{בְּיָמָיו}$ . Why that just - you think as far ahead as you can see and then divide it into inches and for every inch you make another ~~small~~ stretch of lines you can see, so that's on and on and on. But it still is the thing that doesn't have an end. If they want to say, it has no end, they can say it. See it is easy enough to find common words to get the idea. There will be no end to it. It will never come to ~~end~~ and end. But one particular word  $\text{בְּיָמָיו}$  says that cannot be assumed, and in the case of  $\text{בְּיָמָיו}$  it can easily be proven not to be the case, because these <sup>of</sup> /instances where ~~these~~ the men of  $\text{בְּיָמָיו}$ , were the mark of  $\text{בְּיָמָיו}$ , did have a beginning, and in this case it is not speaking of going on to the future, without end, it is speaking of the past, and this says from  $\text{בְּיָמָיו}$ , and I would think that would be saying from before antiquity, from away back. And it either means - if it goes with what is before, we have been from away back, or else if it goes with what follows, it means you didn't rule over us from away back. And in either case, it seems to me that it is showing a long time in which Israel has been God's people. We have been, or have become from way back, or else we have been from way back, you have not ruled. And you say, the American Standard has a ~~problem~~ and it is an unusual sentence. It is not an easy sentence to get the sense out. In order to get it the King James inserts the word thine, in italics. It is not in the original. So they say, we have been, and they call themselves, the people of thy holiness, We are the people as thy holiness. They only possessed it a little while. Why should ~~the people~~ God let the people of His holiness have it only for a little while, and ~~then~~ then let their adversaries take it. Only a little while, we have been and the authorized version inserts