Heb. Syn. #68

all of us... now he is so and so... now the Lord caused to light upon him... he, now he ... but it was not... but the hoo comes after the niggash. Now, is there any reason for that? (Q) Why should he emphasize the ____ any more than (12.90) the he of oppression? What is the reason? Does anybody see a reason? That would be taken here meaning the Lord ... I think that it is speaking of Him, but it seems to me that putting the He second there emphasizing that these two verses are put in a wy way in construct, one shows what happens to him, the other is the Niphal in the rel- reflexive, it is showing that ...but he suffered this and the k reflexive ... and what was the Niphal ordinarily ... exactly , He was oppressed, it He was driven, what did he do, did Hefight back --nobody should submit to oppression unless there is a purpose purpose in it, but here we find the son of glory being placed under tyranny, being driven by these forces, and what is His reaction, He submits to it voluntarily. He is driven but for Him , He humbles himself. He submits voluntarily to His treatment ... He said that He was doing this for a purpose. And this word could be translated as a passive. Or it can be translated as a reflexive, but we don't see any reason for the ...in the xxx xxxxxxxxxxxxx second clause here, in the passage xxx ex= pressing a further statement...but if it expresses His response, there is a reason for the ...but the response is to humble Himself. And that gives perfect reason for having the who there, it gets some sense out of having the who there instead of k where it would ordinarily be ... and in addition to that, did anybody notice another reason why this seems a better translation. How about the rest of the verse--how about xbbex what follows.. Yes, what is that, He takes it, He submits to it. When he is driven tyrannically, when it He is given these false charges, He opens not His mouth, because this is the person that purpose for which He