

Does that mean he has no existence? Does that mean he is going to completely disappear? Does that mean he's going to lose all his money? Lose his position? ~~XXX~~ What does this mean: Shall have nothing? And that translation introduces an element which is not in the Hebrew.

"He shall be cut of and have nothing" implies he shall be cut off and as a result shall have nothing. This is what it implies by the cutting off. If that was what the original meant it surely would use *lo* instead of *---* this is a noun clause not a verb clause. It does not express a situation will occur as a result of his being cut off. It expresses a condition, a situation.

I came across a verse which is an exact parallel to this. It is found in Judges 14:6. There we have *ayin* used in exactly this way. The first part of that verse. It tells in Judg. 14:6 about how Samson killed a lion, and it says, The spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him and he rent the lion and he rent the kid and he had nothing. The only difference from this other is that it has "in his hand." Lit. there was to him nothing in his hand. Just as the other is "and there is, was, or will be (the copulative is not in it in Heb.)" Here what it means is Samson did not have a weapon in his hand. He ~~was~~ killed a lion without having a weapon in his hand, and the nominal phrase would be more accurately translated, though the assumption that something future is not impossible, it would be slightly more accurately translated: "He will be cut off while having nothing." Does that mean, While he had no troops to protect him? While he had no support?

The Theodotian translation made in the 7th cent. A.D. renders it: He was cut off while having no *krima* (the Gk. word from which our English word crime is derived, a word which more specifically means judgment, condemnation). Tho having no condemnation he was cut off. Thus we see that the KJV while having its precise representation of the atonement -- "not for himself" -- goes beyond the Hebrew. But yet perhaps it is nearer to the Heb. than the modern translations which say he will be cut off and ~~XXXXX~~ have nothing, as if the having nothing is the result of his being cut off. In any case a bit of a bit of a paraphrase has to to be made. And have nothing is a paraphrase in that it means as a result he will have nothing.

"And not for himself" means he won't be cut off because of guilt of his own. That may very well be the nothing he does not have. And so this can be a description of the atonement but we cannot take that as a starting point and say that it must be. So I think you have to say that while the KJV is not strictly accurate here, most of the modern versions are less accurate in getting the actual meaning of the verse.

Now what is there that is absolutely definite that we can stand on? Unfortunately the most definite thing in this account was accusted by Theodotian and has been lost in our KJV but it is the point on which we can be most definite. That is the 70 wks. described in v. 24 ~~ma~~ are made up of 3 segments. Vs. 25 says: Know therefore and undertand . . . unto the Messiah the Prince (neither of those "thes" is in the original) -- unto an anointed one a leader, literally. The word is used of Israelite kings,