

on a viewpoint of Hebrew syntax , is this a ...has Paul simply made a very bad mistake in his translation and His interpretation. Well, Paul has ~~not~~ followed the Septuagint and somebody said , Well, the Hebrew is the Bible , after all, not the Septuagint, but over against that ~~they~~ they say, The Septuagint was translated by Jews at least 100-200 years before the time of Christ, they didn't know anything about Christian doctrine. and it is true that we have ...about the way that Paul had it , and now it is true that we have some septuagint manuscripts that ~~are~~ ^{about} have the way Paul had it, and others have it with the first... turned around, and which is more like the Hebrew, and you turned it around the way Paul did... it is a little bit clearer. I do not think that . It makes it a little clearer that it is being actually found who had not sought and ... it does not make much take it exactly as the King James Version ... in Isaiah 65, and you have ~~it~~ just about exactly what Paul said. I guess I did not read to you anything but King James Version. It says, "I am sought of them that did ~~not~~ ^{also} ask for me ~~on-h-not-look~~ ~~for-me,~~ and I am found of them that sought me not." Now, Paul says something as the Septuagint manuscripts do... but it is interesting that the King James Version goes on, ^{Behold me, Behold me, unto a nation} translating the Hebrew, and I said, Now, ~~Paul does not quote that part of the verse.~~ which was not called by my name. Now, Paul does not quote that part of the verse. But if he had quoted that part of the verse, it would make it even clearer to explain that God is here predicting that he is turning them over to the Gentiles, because the Israelites was in exile... the Israel was ... still it is called by the name of God. Jeremiah says, "Ye must not say, these are the temple of the Lord, these are the temple of the Lord.