interpretation is taken as a description of what occurs when Jesus sets up his kingdom restoring the breaches in the house of David and setting it up again that it gives a valid reason why circumcision need not be placed as a requirement upon Gentiles. If, however, it is simply a statment that Gentiles can come into the church now it says nothing whatever about whether they are to be circumcised or not and has no validity in connection with the argument.

Thus it would seem that the pre-millennial interpretation of the passage - the interpretation that What Jemes is describing what the situation is to be when Jesus restores the kingdom and of David and sets up His realm upon this earth is one which givws a reason for the conclusion which the Council reaches, whereas if it is taken simply as a description of the setting up of the church now it proves nothing whatever about circumcision. This is borne out by the introductory phrase, "Behold, I will return and". This is a problem which those who take a non-pre-millennial interpretation of the passage find it impossible to spd answer satisfactorily. The attempt is made by some of them to say that this is simply a translation of a Hebrew phrase meaning to do again, to return and do again. However, there is not such phrase in Amos at this place. Furthermore the idea of doing again is fully expressed in the passage which follows. I will set up again the kingdom, the house of David which is fallen. phrase introducing it, "Bedhold I will return and" is not a part of the quotation from Amos. It is used by James as the means of introducing the quatation. It is as if James were saying, "I want to give you a quotation from Amos in which he describes the conditions which will occur when Jesus comes back to this earth". It ways what will happen at His return so he begins with the word, behold I will return and, having thus given the context and shown the general situation to which the passage which