53:9

details of it. And ##/b# we, I believe, have gotten down, I think we have
looked at the statement in verse 9, that he made his grave with the wicked, and with the
rich in his death. I don*t believe we have discussed, lest I didn*t. Yes, yes,
I*ve mentioned that this is an inorganic prediction that in predicting something
which does not add to his exatation or highkligtion humiliation does not
show how(13.60) It is \$\not the part of the manner
the win which God carries out his work, but simply an indication of a fact/ that this indeed
is/the one that/is predicted, a specific detail of it(13.25)
to show that this is indeed the one who is predicted, and there is onething I with
did not mention, // this / time last time, that the phrase / the / rich in his death.
In his death is questioned by many scholars 3303 (1300) 77.102
And many think instead of it should be And
if yound take it, it will be which means a tomb. So
it will be with the rich in the tomb. And the Jewish version which was published
may-be 40 years by Prof. 1 Margholas(?) of Dropsie College, and his translation
is calded the Jewish version of the Old Testament. They call it the Holy Scriptures.
It translates"with the rich in the tomb," which actually seems to make <i>it</i> clearer than the way it is in our version where it says @
the connection with Christ 1n/4/way/xtxis/xhx6utxfutsion "with the rich in his we have stuck with it.
death. Of course,/The Hebrew points exactly as they are. That is a very slight the
change in/Hebrew points, but it is an interesting point to have in mind. Here is
a case where a conjentural emandation actually makesrather than
.(12.23) But it is/very, very slight/ conjectural change. Yes?
tge the Just/Beth, /beth, #1 most a motho, amotho. I am not even sure that the change is
absolutely necessary, but I think it is though, it has to be $\frac{1102}{102}$.
But you see 1702 in his death. You couldn*t have 30002.
because you couldn't have an article before a personal \$#\$#/ pronominal suffix.