would say, well, now these things have happened, where's the child? And then not

finding the child, but the things having happened, you have to say well he was a

measuring stick but he hasn't come yet. ~~And~~ From the whole context, the house of David,

and everything, it would seem, I would think it very strange if there were not that

(3 1/2)   who were considering this as a definite promise of the Messiah.

Prior to the time of Christ. But it would be likely that most of them would become

Christians, ~~or~~ so they wouldn't be there to write in the Talmud. Yes? (stu) Well, there

are certain verbs. Of course, now, a predicate adjective, a participle is an adjective,

so a participle in the predicate is a predicate adjective. But there are quite a number

of places where a participle is used so much that it comes to be disassociated from the

verb and thought of as an adjective. And then there are also cases where ∅ verbs

instead of having the normal participle form have a different form which may have

started as some sort of an adjective but which has come to have a verbal significance,

(4 3/4)   but the participle is

And there instead of it being   it's   and there are a few

that would

so that being the case, there being quite a number of parallels in other passages

(record not clear in the discussion of Hebrew , the voices fade down quite a bit.)

(starting again at 6 3/4)...it might be more useful almost if we discussed this first

before you looked in the commentaries. Unless you come across one that is startlingly

different. (7.stu)   ...that in Daniel (7)   is either Antiochus

Epiphanes or it is the AntiChrist, one or the other, but there is one case where there

is quite a little (7 1/4)   says he is an

adumbration of the antiChrist. Just what does that mean?   He is an adumbration.

I tried to get that out altogether, but I think they got rid of the word adumbration, but

they kept the idea, that while this is , fits Antiochus Epiphanes, it is also a picture of

the AntiChrist. It seems to me it is a very dangerous principle of hermeneutics, that