

the word thine, which fits with the previous passage but which is not expressed here, maybe it is wrong to insert it. So the American standard says, we have no right to insert a word like that.

Isaiah 66. (0)

We have no right to insert a word like that, unless we are sure it was wrong. Well, in the light of the context it is a good guess. But suppose it isn't. We have become as - if it had said [?] $\text{לְפָנָיו יְהוָה יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה} \text{ .}$ If we have become like the one who. But it doesn't say לְפָנָיו יְהוָה . We have become, not that you bear over them, to rule over there. We have become not that you rule over them. If it makes that as an ellipse, for we have become like those, we have become those who you didn't bear. Well, then it certainly doesn't mean that we have become those you didn't bear. So the King James version of asserting the word thine, the American Standard is inserting the word like. Since the Hebrew expresses a [?] ~~man~~ [?] become. We have become like those, but there there is no [?] used. So the verse is not extremely simple to know exactly what Isaiah means. But I question the American Standard very definitely because he refer~~s~~ to that as. If there is no as here, we have become like him. It doesn't mean we have become. So if it is, we have become, we have become, thou never bore rule over them. Now that is possible. But I don't think we should become like those, we become those thou never barest. And how would we become if God had never ^(?). Well, you might say that's a strong statement. But I think there is difficulty with either rendering. But then we have the word בְּפָנָיו , and how does the authorized version, how does the Revised version translate the phrase o בְּפָנָיו ? Mr. Watt could you tell us? I think that the basic idea of this verse is affected, by the Revised version. I don't think it affects the basic meaning of the verse, and I think that it is rather an elliptical way to take it, so I think that we can't be at all sure ~~mf~~ that the American Standard is right. I wouldn't say that the King James is necessarily right of the two. I think the two ~~mm~~ are more or less equal with a little balance. Whichever way they take it, I think that, from what it says here, that we have - we who are God's people, who ~~have~~ been His people for a long time are now being put in the category of those that have never been His people. And the argument is, we're His people. He ought to take care of us. Instead of giving His