

This is called O. T. Problems, and the idea is that we spend one hour together, and you spend three hours by yourselves, or else you spend four hours by yourselves studying problems that we discuss together.

Mr. Abernathy, could you briefly mention ideas that you have for what would be most useful for us to do this year, or what you would be most interested in.

Mr. Ab. Well, one was the use of the waw consecutive in the Hebrew, and the evidence for the traditional view as compared to ....1 3/4... Dr. Young. And the other one was a textual comparison of the Dead Sea Isaiah with the Masoretic Text. ....2.....

AAM: Yes, now this second one we did some work on that, Mr. Meznar and Mrs. Wilson and I last spring. We didn't get very far in it, I think we opened up something of method, and we touched a few interesting passages. But it is a tremendous field, and you either take a little area and you go into it, and you learn quite a bit about the method, or you take some selected ones and of one type or another, or you could make a survey of things that have been written on it, and take their conclusions, and try to check their evidences and see what you thought of their conclusions, whether they were justified or not, examining key evidences. Those would be three ways that could be done. Mr. Hayes, what occurs to you of particular interest?

Mr. H. I don't know, I haven't thought of anything.

AAM: Well, now, just in general what is your interest now, even in connection with your thesis? Just so it is beyond the hours of your thesis. You are particularly interested in the LXX I believe. You are particularly interested in the LXX but now also in the Hebrew, I believe. Hebrew grammar, Hebrew vocabular, Hebrew reading, and so on? Are you not? But more in the LXX. Oh, I see, you mean you would put the two on a par. ...3 1/2.....

Mr. Meznar, you are visiting us today, you don't have an idea that particularly occurs to you, of something that you would be particularly interested in, or something that you think would be interesting for them

to work in?

LM: Well, I am interested in learning how to interpret passages, especially in finding out how to use etymology and usage. X

AAM: Yes, that's very good, how to use etymology and usage. Well, now, of course, that would be very interesting in taking any passage and working through it. It would be very interesting in that connection, or also it could come in if you were to take up a grammatical point, like there are two grammatical points that occur to me. This matter that Mr. A. mentioned, of the waw consecutive. The matter of interpretation of the Waw cons. with the perfect would be an interesting problem. These theories he speaks of pretty well make an effort to account for the development of the waw conv. with the imperfect, but they don't have much to say about with the perfect.

Mr. A: I talked to Dr. Harris about that, and he says that is the crucial point, because if the imperfect is an old past tense, archaism, held over, why then you have also the perfect ~~xxxx~~ tense with the waw, not only with the waw cons., but also with the waw conjunctive. That is old, because ....5..... compound forms together, but he says the critical thing is if you can prove that the waw, not the waw cons., but ~~the~~ plain conjunctive, the regular waw with the perfect, is an old usage, and that it ~~doesn't~~ doesn't change the meaning, and then you have side by side, according to their theory, two past tenses, both held over from ancient times. So the waw with the perfect is the critical point.....5 3/4....

AAM: BUT the waw conj. rather than the waw conv.

Mr. A. He says the waw conj.....6..... that would mean that if the imperfect is an old past tense, ~~why~~ why you have two past tenses side by side, and perhaps there is a difference in meaning. The waw conj with the perfect isn't a simple conjunctive, and maybe we could ~~study~~ study and see whether that.....6 $\frac{1}{4}$ .....

AAM: Yes, well, now that wouldn't be so easy to ~~study~~ study, because the waw conv. would be very easy to study because you have grammars that give you discussion, and you could probably find most of the passages listed.

Now to find passages where you had the waw conjunctive with the perfect ~~is~~ probably would be, unless there happened to be one somewhere, <sup>there</sup> would be no specific discussion of it. Now, there may be though, because it would be rather rare, wouldn't it? Waw conj. with the imperfect is not common. Waw conj with the perfect ~~might~~ might be very rare, so that mightn't be so hard to find. But what I had in mind is two possibilities in the ~~the~~ field of grammatical studies, and one is the waw cons with the perfect, to study that and to see the different usages of it, and see what light you could get on its meaning. Now, it is much less common than the waw cons. with the imperfect, so there is less material to cover, and in doing that you have to interpret each passage and see what light the passage would throw upon it, and to do that you would have to see how to interpret these passages in ~~many~~ matters of etymology and usage would enter in, very definitely. They would be examples of how to do this constantly, as you were studying those problems. But that would be the study of the waw with the perfect, and it might be that you could take all waws with the perfect, I don't know. But that would be an interesting study that I should think we could make considerable progress in, in the course of the semester. Now, the second study that is possible goes out of the study I did two or three years ago with a class in grad. Hebrew. We studied the hithpael. As you know the common statement in the grammars is that the hithpael is reciprocal and reflective., and most grammars, some will not say anything more, others will say it is reciprocal and reflexive, it is occasionally, it is rarely ~~passive~~ passive. Well, we looked at all the hithpaels in the O.T. and we found that out of them all there were not over one third you could call reciprocal, and we could call reflexive, and we only found two verbs that could properly be called reciprocal. And so that the reciprocal really doesn't belong in the grammar at all. Reflexive we found about a third, and that's a very respectable usage, but not enough to say that that is what it is, it is only a third. Now we found that nearly a third were definitely passive. And that's very important on the promise to

Abraham, where they say that they will bless themselves in his name, because the niph'al is usually reflexive, and the fact that in three cases it is hithpa'el rather than niph'al proves it must be reflexive. When actually the hithpa'el is reflexive in a quarter of its usages, nearly a third, very definitely passive. So that that statement is said in nearly all the grammars that it is rarely passive, and it just is not true. Well, now, we looked at them, and then we found that there are a great many usages of which grammars will say there are cases where the hithpa'el is indistinguishable from a qal or a piel. Well, actually, why should it be indistinguishable? What it means is, you haven't seen what the distinction is. It means you don't distinguish it. There must be a distinction. Well, one of those is Enoch walked with God, and they say that that is reflexive. Well, what does that mean? He walked himself with God. And that Satan came to Job, and he said that he was walking up and down in the earth. And they say that's reflexive. What's reflexive about that? Well, now, actually about a third of the cases of the use of hithpa'els in the light of the context, differ from qal or piel only in this, and very definitely in this sense, that they are frequentative. Enoch walked with God means he frequently, he habitually walked with God. And Satan came back, not that he made a trip through the earth, but that he went back and forth here and there, he walked in the earth, and we found probably a third of the usages are definitely this, and it is not mentioned in the older grammars at all. Not mentioned in any grammar I know, and yet here is the use which is as common as any of the hithpa'els. Well, now, the next problem in that line would seem to be ~~rather~~ reasonable to look into would be to say what is the niph'al? Well, now that is a bigger problem, I mean a more difficult one, because there are more usages of it than the ~~niph'al~~ hithpa'el.. It is much commoner than the hithpa'el. But ~~it~~ is it ....ll.....passive, is it reflexive? What is the niph'al actually? And in one hour we couldn't do a great deal, but we could take some grammars, and find some proof of passages, and study them, and interpret them, and see what light etymology, and usage, and context would throw on the reason why the

niphal is used. Now, that's just another possibility. Those are two possibilities in the study of forms, the study of grammar, either of which I would think would be quite interesting. Then there is this textual comparison of the dead sea Isaiah which opens a big field which would be of interest, and of course, if we went into that, Mr. Hayes would be interested in noting the relationship of variants to the LXX. And then of course there is the possibility of taking a passage anywhere in the Bible, a passage, and studying it and comparing it with the LXX, and dealing with the textual points we find, and the points of interpretation, where the grammatical points as they come up, we come upon a great deal of interest in just about any passage in the Bible, to study and go into it. And that would be a possibility. But I think of these various possibilities it is well that we concentrate on one. Now, have you thought of anything further by this time, Mr. Hayes.

Mr. H. Well, I found a very interesting Hithpael in Ezekiel. Nobody seems to know what it means in the Hebrew of ch.1. It is the hith. of ... $l_2^1$ .. of all things, and it doesn't seem to make any sense.

AAM: ~~ExeEzekExe~~ In Ezekiel 1, what verse?..... Exod. 9:24, what does it mean there?

SH: Well, it is translated mingle, ~~min~~ lightning mingling with hail.

AAM: Mingling, yes. And here?

SH: I think it is translated in the KJ as enfolding (?13) ~~itself~~ itself, or something like that.

AAM: Oh, yes, well the two are very similar, aren't they? You are sure it is lakak (?)? I would think that the idea that the frequentative idea would be ~~akak~~ all right in either one of them. If you get to the question of the root, I don't know, but the idea here, the fire is enfolding, it is doing this, and doing it, and doing it. It is not just one lightning, but a repetition of lightnings.

SH: Well, that would fit very well with halak, but it is not halak.

AAM: BDB makes it ~~axxExeExeExe~~ combination of reflexive idea, and the frequentative. Fire taking hold of itself.

SH: Taking hold, is that an established meaning in the qal?

AAM: The qal is to take or to buy. ....14 $\frac{1}{2}$ .... He says of lightening, exact significance dubious, in close succession.....14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ....taking, taking, taking, fire taking this lightening from there ~~down~~ down.....14 3/4... it's not such a terrible jump from lakak. It is interesting, very interesting....end of 0 1

0 2

SH: I kind of like that idea of the ~~hithpael~~ hithpael. I don't know what Mr. Abernathy thinks.

AAM: Oh, well, I think we have solved the problem of the hith. pretty well. Of course, there are further details that could be gone into in the hith, and if you wanted, for instance to go over the hith, Mr. Crozier wrote a thesis on it, and in that thesis he listed the ones which were clearly....  
I had ~~to~~ <sup>him</sup> go through every one, and list under each one, is it clearly a frequentative? Is it clearly a ~~passive~~ passive? Is it clearly a frequentative? Does it not fit in any one of these three categories? And then we ~~had~~ had the list of the ones which he didn't seem to fit in any categories, and there were very few of them, but then there are those which could fit in any one of two categories. There aren't so many of them. Usually it is just one. But there are the ones he listed as problem cases. If you wanted to take the hithpael, we could take this list, and we could look at a few examples of each type, and then we could take his problem cases and study them. That would be one thing, for one hour a semester that might be very much worthwhile, and of course in connection with that, we would very well use the LXX too on some of the cases, for the light it would throw on it. Now the other possibility was to go forward in the same type of work, but taking up the niphal. Well, now, let's not take much time, because we will gain much value from any of these, and it is simply a matter of taking something and going forward in it. What was it I asked you to read today, Mr. A.?

WA: You asked me to read the Hebrew of .....2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ..... Joel.....

AAM: Yes, Joel. Yes, I asked you to read some Hebrew in Joel to check on the theory (of the waws?). Well, now would you like to tell us a little

about the theory? I think that would be valuable. Of course, these theories as I understand it, are not so much a matter of a theory, as to how it is to be interpreted, as they are a theory as to how it came into existence. And at that point, ~~my~~ I personally am not quite so certain as a lot of people are that we can be sure that a lot of things came into existence. We find things, and very often we can see how one thing developed out of something else, but when you come to, I have heard Dr. Speiser spend hours telling how the hiphil began, and how the piel began, and he works up theories, and they are very interesting, and they may be true, but nobody every has any evidence that cases like that ever developed. So that it is theorizing more or less in a vacuum. And his theories are very excellent, but to me what I am most interested in is what do we have, rather than how does somebody guess it may have come, because it may have come an entirely different way, or God may simply have created it that way. But of course the interesting thing in this waw conversive business here is that it is a ~~development~~ development which is pretty much confined to Hebrew. There are many things in Hebrew which you will find in all the semitic languages, and there are some things in Hebrew you find in Babylonian, and some things you find in Hebrew you find in Arabic. But here is something which is not found to any extent at least in any of the other Semitic languages, and that makes it seem to be unique to Hebrew, as if there probably is a special source from which it came, some historical development, or some influence of some other nation, or something like that, but if it is a common source, and easily explained source from which it came, not the result of relationships with foreign nations, one might wonder why is it in Hebrew, and not in Aramaic? and not in Arabic?

WA: Arabic has a waw, doesn't it? At least that's.....4 3/4..., but this article lists the arabic waw as a sentence adverb, and gives....5... circumstantial clauses....5.....

AAM: But what I mean is, the what used to be called the waw conversive. Dr. Robert Dick Wilson was very insistent on keeping the conversive, tho most scholars had changed it ~~to~~ to ~~consecutive~~ consecutive, but a waw which has the

quality of changing perfect into imperfect, or imperfect into perfect. Now some today say it doesn't change, but ~~that~~ the fact of the matter is that the waw with the imperfect is translated pretty much the same as the perfect would be without. And a waw with the perfect is translated pretty much the same, so if you don't say exactly, at least it is ~~enough~~ enough in that direction to constitute a phenomenon for which I know of no extensive parallel in any one of the other three ....5 3/4...

WA: These where the waw is used as a sentence adverb changes the sense of the verb and the sense of the sentence....6... they consider that as a parallel, but it is prefixed to the verb, as a sentence adverb, and changes the sense, not necessarily the time, modifies the whole ~~sentence~~ sentence in other words. The sentence without the waw would have a different meaning, than if you put the waw on that.

AAM: Is that common in Arabic?

WA: Well, he lists these five ways as used, and gives an example of each one.

AAM: In Arabic. Well, now, that would be very interesting to check into how common they are.....6½... but of course, Arabic syntax is one of the most involved and extensive things in the world. You can find most anything in ~~it~~ it somewhere. But I believe I have Wright's Arabic Grammar, two big volumes, which is quite extensive. One could get a pretty good idea on a problem.

WA: I would like to take up the waw conjunctive or the waw cons., or I would like to study the niph'al, either one.

AAM: Yes, I see, you feel you would rather do that than take a passage, and take everything as we come to it?

WA: That would be all right.

AAM: I see, in other words, you don't care which it is.

WA: Why no, I'll learn more Hebrew that way.

SHZ: ~~What~~ What do you mean, to take a passage? These subjects you have mentioned here?

AAM: No, I meant just to take a passage, and just read it and study whatever we come across. There might be a textual problem, or there might be a question of syntax. I mean, we would find something we would get interested in, and we would look into it a little ways, and see, and then we would come across a waw with the perfect, and we would look in Gesenius Grammar, and see what he says about it, and maybe look at a few parallels, and take a little time, but not go extensively into one problem. And we take the matters of use of participles when we come to participles when we come across them and so on, and see what we would gather about them from the one passage. Now, those are the possibilities, and of the three I don't care a bit. Mr. A. thinks all three ~~is~~ sound interesting to him. You mean if you had thirty votes to cast as among the three, you would cast ten on each one of them?

WA: I would cast 11 on the waw with the perfect. And next I would prefer a passage, and then the niph'al.

AAM: Well, let's drop the niph'al then. Now, as between the other two then. Mr. Hayps?

SH: Well, I like the passage a little bit better than the other.

AAM: Well, what passage would you think of?

\* \* \* \* \*

AAM: What would you think of Joel.

WA: I would think it is very good. It isn't such easy Hebrew that I could breeze right through it. It would take some work. And it is very important as to the references in the N.T.

AAM: Well, let's look at Joel then. It would be good if we would compare, first get the passage in Joel, and see what you find that is a problem in interpretation, or any textual problem you noticed in the passage itself, and then look into the LXX, and compare the LXX, and if anybody wants to compare the Aramaic or Syriac, it is all right, and then note grammatical points that we might look for comparison. Take the first verse, then now. Mr. A, ~~was~~ how far have you gone?

WA: Well, I have worked on the first two chapters.

AAM: ~~W~~ Oh, I meant to say too, look at the American Standard, and the RSV, and see what light they throw on it, or ~~what we think~~ of their rendering. Now, let's take then the first verse. Mr. M. would you read that?

AAM: ...the Lord, which was to..., what does that mean in English, which was to? Do you ever say that in English?

LM: Well, it came to Joel in some past time.

AAM: Came. In other words, you don't think this is a copula, then? I think there we have a very important point right in this first verse. We have here this word hayah. What does hayah mean? Now is it ever a copula, or is it a copula just in late Hebrew? Is it a copula in Genesis 1, when the world was without form and void? Does it ever mean that, or does it always mean became? Does it mean become here? The wor~~ld~~d of the Lord which became to Joel, came into to being to Joel. There is a change, it is a dynamic word. It is an active word. It shows action. It doesnt ~~was~~ show..., now I think it is very interesting that in Gen. 1:1....end of 0 2

0 3

...~~Index~~ In Gen. 1 you can go through the chapter and you find the English word was occurs, maybe, I don't know, off ~~hand~~ hand, let me say, forty times. "And he saw what he made and it was good." "And the Lord said, Let there be ~~light~~ light, and there was light." "And it was evening and it was morning." You find the word "was" occurs maybe forty time. One of them is this one in v.2, which is the one under consideration. Leave that out of consideration, and take all the rest, and look up in the Hebrew, and you will find that in half of them it is expressed in Hebrew, and the other half it isn't, and ~~it~~ in the half where it is "was" in the English, the form of "to be" in English, but not in Hebrew, what you have is a simple copula. "He ~~was~~ saw that it was good." He looked, what did he see? Why, it is good. It is a copula. There is no hayah. But when it is used, it is dynamic. Let there be light. That isn't like saying the book is red. It means, let it become light, or let light come into ~~being~~ being. "And it was light" means light came into being.

The word in BDB he gives as the meaning of the word, "To become, to happen, to come to be." They don't not give "be". It is not "be." It is a dynamic word which shows action, shows change. It does not show merely...2.. And so the word "was" to him, like the book was to me, that is my book. No. It means it came to be. Now, of course, I should make ~~clear~~ clear that I don't think by any means that that proves the reconstruction theory, because I think either way you take, it is to come. God created the world, and it came into being, there became a world without form and void, or God created the world, and it fell into sin and terrible cataclysm, and as a result of this change it came to be. But in ~~either~~ either case, it is dynamic. It is not ....2½... Now, I think this hayah here is very interesting. I consider that it is important here. Well, now, Mr. A. read us the next verse.

Yes, now there is an interesting thing, the elders. We wouldn't say that in English. Here it is the elders. I notice the KJ says, "Hear this, ye old men." Now, it is very interesting that in Kings they come to the king and they say hammelek, it seems to be a rather definite term of address in Hebrew to use an article. Here this, thee, Oh, King. Oh, the king.

We wouldn't say that. We ~~would~~ would say, Oh, king. The article seems to be pointing out the one to whom you are speaking. After all, that is the purpose of the article, pointing, pointing out the one to whom you are speaking. How ~~common~~ common is this vocative....3½.... that must be here sort of a vocative use. All right, continue, Mr. A.

.....

AAM: Yes, now, give ear, or listen. The "give ear," of course, is a very literal rendering, isn't it? It is the Hiphil, cause to ear, literally, give ear, or listen, all the ~~inhabitants~~ inhabitants of the land. You of course, all realize that it is the inhabitants of, because land has the article. So the the is with the inhabitants. the dwelling ones of the land. It is interesting there to note the kind of a genitive. They dwell in the land, they inhabit the land. So they are dwellers of the land. In English that means dwellers in the land, ~~rather than~~ that would be better than dwellers

of the land.. The inhabitants of the land, you have already got the "in" in inhabit, dwellers in the land, I think, or inhabitants of the land. Yes. Mr. Hayes, continue.....

Now, how do you get shall/ out of that? Yes. Has this become? Now that's a good point. It is dynamic. It doesn't say, Was there a condition like this. It is did things like this happen. Did it come into this condition. Did it happen thus? Has it been, in the sense of has it happened? Has it become? Has this become? Has such a thing come to pass, continuing Mr. Hayes?.....

AAM: Yes, in your days, talking to the old men. They have got a lot/ more days than the young men/ have. In all the days you have had has such a thing happened. Continuing.....

AAM: Yes, now that is very interesting. we-im. Im usually means "if", doesn't it? Even if you think of the days of your fathers. Or if in the days of your fathers. Is it just an ordinary "or," ~~or~~ or is there a definite "if" meaning ~~involved~~ in it? It would be interesting to look at parallels and see what BDB says about it, and see what the meaning might be in this im here. It doesn't seem to me to be just "or". You could just use a waw for that, couldn't you? Has this been in your days, and in the days of your fathers?

Mr. A.....6 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....

AAM: That's an interesting question. You say, usually used with an interrogative, but how is it used with an interogative? To continue....

WA: The two go together.....7.....

AAM: Yes, now that's very interesting ~~add~~ we could look into that. It would be good to look into Gesenius, or into ~~BDB~~ BDB, and see what they say about that. Very interesting, and next verse. Mr. Meznar.

LM; I don't think I can do that one.

AAM: Why not? Well, start in and see how far you can get on it. ... Your children, and your children tell to their children, and their children to another generation. In other words, this situation is such a

tremendous thing that you won't forget it. Now, here's a man, and he crosses the ocean. He leaves his home in Europe, and he comes over to America, and that's a tremendous thing, isn't it? And when his children are ~~growing~~ growing up here, he tells them all about how he left home and he came over here. And he remembers it, and they thrill to it. Maybe they tell their children about it, maybe they don't. And do their children tell their children about it? Well, we ~~can~~ can be sure the man who came in the first place was so impressed by it that he told lots of people about it, and he told his children. But have they passed it on? Every one of us who are here has an ancestor somewhere, probably a lot of them, who picked up and left their home in ~~the~~ Europe, and made the difficult trip over here, and settled in a new land. But how many of us have ever heard any detail about the coming of our ancestors over here. It was a great event which was told to your children in each case, but ~~did~~ did they tell it to their children. Now, this is so great an event that it won't stop with one generation. This is such a tremendous thing that you are going to tell it to your children, and they are going to tell it to their children, and they are going to tell it to another generation. It is going to make an impression and an impact on the race, ~~like~~ like the story of the flood did. And so we have the Babylonians writing it down with many details correctly remembered, like the Biblical one. Well, the next verse.

WA: These four words for locusts, I can't find what they all mean.

AAM: Yes, well now, of course, that gets us into a very interesting field. Dr. R. D. Wilson said once to me that if you take the twelve stones of the ~~breastplate~~ breastplate of the high priest, and you take the various ancient translations you will find that every one of them is translated four or five different ways in different translations. How are we to know just what they mean? Unless we have the ~~breastplate~~ breastplate? Or unless they are common enough things that the word will be used, will be continued. Dr. Wilson told me that ~~when~~ when he was in Germany studying Arabic, he said they would find an Arabic text which discussed the care of the raising

of horses, and in these Arabic texts about the horse you would read, there would be a word he would find in Arabic, and the only dictionary he had was a dictionary from Arabic into French. So he would look it up, and find ~~xxx~~ they French for the meaning of this Arabic word, and then he said he used his French-English Dictionary to find the English word, and then he would use his English-German dictionary to find what the German word was, and he would go into class and translate it into German, but he couldn't have found it on the horse. He didn't know where it was on the horse, and where it came to describing the harness, and all these details of the horse, he~~x~~ didn't know what they meant. It was words, and of course words are supposed to represent things, but when the things are not kept in our consciousness, or kept near us, it is very easy to forget what the words are, and I am sure if you folks are a bit like me, you use a good many English words without having much idea exactly, precisely what they mean. And, of course, I have found that anybody today who knows anything about the navy knows the difference between a boat and a ship. The ordinary person in their mind use boat and ship correctly, but they couldn't define them. They have the idea there, but it is sort of vague. And when you come to mention four kinds of locusts if you were to put the four locusts in front of me down here, I couldn't tell you which, I just have no experience in that particular field. This is all the Hebrew we have, the Bible. And consequently we do not have a ~~book~~ book preserved from ancient times with a discussion of the ~~various~~ various types of insects, ~~namely~~ naming them all, and telling about them, and describing them, and we can't be sure of the details about all the different kinds of locusts. But we have here four kinds, and we can tell something ~~ab~~ from etymology about them, but not a great deal, and it shows you something about how great the attack was, there were so many different kinds there, and you may find something that throws light on any one of them, or you may come across a cognate word in Arabic or somewhere in some story where there is much detail on them. And then again you may not.

LM; When BDB lists cognate words, can we put much weight on that?

AAM: They were pretty good scholars, of course fifty years ago. And I wouldn't rest upon it, implicitly, but I would say that it is at least worthy of consideration, and of course a person really ought to learn the letters of the other language enough that he could look it up if he wanted to in a dictionary, the Arabic or the Syraic, and see whether they give it as a common word, or whether they give it as a rare word. That would be helpful.

Well suppose you start in from here next time, and don't worry about trying to remember unusual words, but work on trying to understand all you can, and see ~~what~~ what there is of interest, and what there is of problems, and of course if a word is used a few times, it is good to memorize it. If a word is a rare word, I don't see any value in spending alot of time just ~~try~~ trying to remember it. That is necessary in the early phase of a language, you have to get your fundamentals, get the vocabulary. Well, then we continue there ~~next~~ next time.....end of 0 3

0 3a

.....figure out the anatomical differences in these different kinds of grasshoppers, you could get into matter of biology, and etymology, and the background of the words, and the various ways they are used in other languages, and it could be a very interesting study, but I doubt if it would be particularly valuable, at least unless one was specializing in insect life, or in geography. Even from the viewpoint of linguistics, I doubt if it would be very valuable, because names of that type are so often pretty much accidental in languages. If you studied them thoroughly in Arabic and the cognates, you wouldn't be apt to ... $1\frac{1}{2}$ .....view which you often find stated by people that the word, it is even in the American Scientific Affiliation, the book, Modern Science and the Christian ~~Faith~~ Faith, in the section on geology there, as originally stated there ~~that~~ the man who wrote it didn't know much about Hebrew. He had done a good bit of study in geology, and he wrote the statement that Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 there could not mean become. Because that would be a different word, well I pointed out that it did, and this is the word, so then he changed it to a different expression, by which

he meant hayah le rather than hayah, but actually my personal ~~h~~opinion is that the word hayah means to become, and a study of Genesis 1 seems to me to prove that, but that the le with it is like the in, when you say he walked in the room, or he entered, yes. Now,.....2½.....he walked in the room, he walked into the room. Or you might even ~~mak~~ make it somewhat like the eth, the ~~sign~~ sign of the accusative. It is not necessary. It makes it more precise, but you can have exactly the same meaning without it. That is, I looked ~~into~~ into it fairly thoroughly, but it was fifteen ~~years~~ years ago, maybe twenty years ago, I don't have it right at my fingertips, everything I looked at, but my very definite impression was, ~~that~~ my ~~an~~ impression now of what I found then was very definite that I found instances where the meaning become without a le was absolutely certain, I mean, instances which were absolutely identical to the case with the le. And so I feel that it is something which can naturally be put in, it is involving the idea, but it is not necessary... Well, now, that is a recollection without the evidences right before me, and on further study of it somebody might possibly lead to change it. But I don't think so, because I believe I looked into it a fair amount at that time.

WA:.....4.....

AAM: No, I think you can definitely say it is not...4..., because if you take Genesis/ 1. Did I mention this time/ ?.....4..... Well, you noted that every one of those where the hayah is used in Gen. 1 leaving v.2 out of consideration, which is the subject of discussion, every one of them is ingressive. I don't remember a single one that was stative, and there are just about as many more cases where the copula is used in English where it is stative ~~where~~, but in no one of them in Gen. 1 is the ~~xx~~ word hayah used. Now, I don't say that hayah cannot be used statively occasionally, but I would say that it is a later development somewhere, it is a derived meaning, the stative, that it is originally always ingressive. That is my very strong feeling on it, as a result of the evidence.

WA: ....I didn't see....5... ingressive.

AAM: Well, it depends on what you mean by ingressive. I wouldn't have

used that word. I would have used dynamic, rather than ingressive.

~~AAM~~ WA: Well, dynamic. I can see that....5....something as your result of a process....but not describe the ~~porcess~~ process.

AAM: You mean they don't all describe the porcess. Certainly some of them do.

WA: Well, I would say they describe the result rather than the process.

AAM: When God says Let there be light, you mean He is describing the result of a process, and implying a process, rather than<sup>to</sup> to describe the process?

WA: Well, he is saying, Let there ~~be~~ be light.

AAM: Yes, that means, let ~~light~~ light come into being, doesn't it? Well that's ingressive, definitely there~~d~~, isn't. Let this area which is without light become an area in which there is light.

WA: I don't quite see the idea~~d~~ of ingressive. It is a change. It has to be a change.

~~WA~~ AAM: Well, doesn't~~d~~ ingressive mean anything more than change?

WA: Well, I gues not.....

AAM: ...any case where there is a perfect, in Genesis, at least, that I would say ~~is~~ is stative. It is used, I believe, in Abraham had become an old man. Now that's ingressive. Some will translate it, And Abraham was an old man. But what it is doing is showing that a change has taken place between the previous chapter and this chapter. Abraham has now become an old man, and certain things happen. It is always showing a change from one phase to another phase. It is never simply describing the existence of a thing. Now, in late Hebrew, like in Chronicles, that may be a derived meaning, to come to mean so just a state, having been used to show a process of change into a state, it may then come to be used simply to show the result of a process. But it is my impression that in the overwhelming majority of cases where it is used, in fact I would say in practically all of them, except for very late Hebrew, that it shows a process rather than a statement, or it shows a process....the result, but there is always a process involved

at least. He said, Let there be light, let light come into being. Light came into being, and then he looked upon what He had made, and it was good. You don't say it had become good. Now, you have described the process, light came into being. He had made it. Now you look at what is there, and you see it is good, and we don't need any hayah anymore. You just see something stated.

WA: But hayah ~~is~~ is used as a copula in these noun clauses, a few times anyway.

AAM: Well, let's leave Chronicles and the very latest books out of consideration. Would you still make the statement?

WA: ....8... Gesenius, he gives a couple reference.

AAM: I wonder where they would be? What references? Do you remember what heading it was under?....page 453, the noun clause, he says "the syntactical relation between subject and predicate of ~~the~~<sup>a</sup> noun clause is <sup>∞</sup> a rule expressed by simple .....8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ....without a copula of any kind/. What period of time the statement implies must be inferred from the context." ~~Ex~~ Then he says, "N<sub>t</sub> infrequently, however, a connection is established between subject and predicate, a. by adding the separate pronoun of the third person, singular, ~~plur~~ or plural. Or b, especially for the sake of a more exact specification of time, by the help of the verb hayah." Then he says, examples of a. Then we say b. "Naturally this does not apply to the examples of ~~xxx~~ which hayah in the sense of to become, to fare, to exist, still retains its full force as a verb." You see, retains its full force. His idea is that originally it is the verb showing become, and then it may lose its force and become a copula. "And where according the sentence is verbal and not a noun clause, especially when the predicate precedes the subject." And then he speaks about Gen. 1:2 where he ~~ex~~ takes the view that it is merely a copula there, which I think ~~is~~ without any justification. Then he says, ....9.... might also appear ~~xxx~~ in the form of a pure noun clause, cf. Gen. 3:1. Well, what is Gen. 3:1, and the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field? I believe that's it, isn't it? And there, I don't think you have any copula.

.....10..... of a process which had occurred. The serpent, what's the serpent, it is just ~~xxxx~~ one of the animals. But the serpent let ~~xx~~ Satan come in and take control of it, the serpent had become more subtle than any beast of the field. It would show a change in the serpent to make it different from the rest of the animals .....10<sup>+</sup>.....could talk to her, and could mislead her, and so on. I would feel that that is at least a possible interpretation... "somewhat numerous instances in which it occurs in the connecting word between the subject and the participial predicate, and it gives two instances of that. And then he says the imperfect of ~~xxx~~ hayah announces what is future, in Num. 14:33, etc., cf. ~~xxxx~~ 116r. However, especially in the latter case, hayah is not wholly without verbal ~~force~~ force. But comes very near to being a mere copula, and ~~xxxx~~ its use is more frequent in the later book than in the earlier. Well, I mean I hadn't seen any specific instance he's given, here. The imperfect of hayah announces what is future, in Numbers 14:33. But might that not be, and it will come to pass, it will become? If it is future. I mean, if there is no change, it would be present. If it is the same future, present, and past, then you don't need to say it is future. The book will be black in the future, well, if the book isn't black now, you might as well say it will become black. If the book is black, you might as well just say it is black. Time wouldn't affect it. A child will be born, and the child will be blueblooded, well, the child will be<sup>y</sup> born is an action, comes into existence. And then, is blue<sup>y</sup>-blooded, you don't need a participle. You won't need a hayah there, would you. I would hardly expect it there. But if you did have one, I would think that it probably would mean that after this child was born, it had a crisis in which its circulation ~~xxx~~.....12...., and it became blue-blooded. If it was really used as a copula, in early books you would think there would be loads of instances, as there are loads of instances of the dynamic use.

WA: But I don't think Gesenius means it was simply a copula, and I don't mean it was simply a copula either....but expresses the state rather than the activity....the idea he sets forth, that it expresses the state rather than

the activity...., but I can see very well what you mean by it.

AAM: You see, now BDB very definitely take it as dynamic. The meanings which they give for it are all three of them dynamic. Here, he says verb, fall out, come to pass, become, oh, and then he says be. Then he gives the meanings under that, 1. fall out, happen, 2. come into being, become, and 3. be, often with the subordinate idea of become, exist, be in existence. That is, originally have come into existence. So he takes it, originally he puts dynamic, but loses its dynamic force as time goes on, and I think there is no doubt it does that, chronically. The question might be, how soon does it begin? ...

I don't see any harm in translating the four words etymologically that way, four kinds of locusts, the only ~~the~~ thing is that the four words are not mutually exclusive. If it was the red, then what the red ones have left the blue ones will eat, and what the blue ones have left the green ones will eat, and what the green ones have left, the white ones will eat, they will tell us alot. But, if it is what the tall ones have left, the live (?) ones will eat, and what the live ones have left the devourers will eat, and what the devourers have left the springing ones will eat, why, they are not mutually exclusive, and so they would seem simply ~~to be~~ to be a designation of different kinds, types, rather than a division.....end of O 3a

O 4

Yes, I think that it is possible for the perfect here to represent the future, ~~the~~ what one leaves, the rest will have devoured. Entirely possible, but I just incline to think in the context that he is describing the terrible situation facing them, and each wave has come, and has seemed to take everything that was left, and yet there was something left, because there was something for another wave (raid?) to come. Each of them took alot, and it impresses me that ~~he~~ he is describing the situation as taken after several waves, rather than predicting, so really, I think that it was wrong to put it in the future there. In making it a situation in which they had disturbed God already...1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ..... That's my impression. All right, then Mr. A.

AAM: Now, this is very interesting. Weep ye drunkards, and ~~we~~ howl ye drinkers of wine, because ~~yayin~~ you have lost your minds, you are no longer intelligent, your ~~we~~ money's all gone, you are wasteful. These terrible things have come on ~~yayin~~ you because of your drink. That's not what this says, because it is cut off...2..., and so I would personally incline to feel it is at least possible that what is said here is not actually a denunciation in any sense at all, but a description of people who are losing that which they are accustomed to...2½..., and of course, drunkards, it doesn't seem...2½... Weep drunkards, because you can't get anymore liquor. Well, of course, you could say that, but it ~~is~~ certainly out of place in our circles, but this word sheqorim may be not drunkards, but drinkers of ~~sheqor~~ sheqer....2 3/4....., and Dr. Harris has advanced the theory that sheqor which I believe is translated strong drink, actually means beer, in which case it is really not a strong drink. I guess beer is a lighter drink, ...3.. and strong drink is probably not really a good translation. Well, I mean, what does it mean, strong drink? We know that wine is fermented grape juice, and beer is fermented barley, and fermented cereal/, and they are simply two different types of drunk. And the mild beer, and the mildly fermented wine have been common objects of drinking in all lands, and it is only when they are allowed to ferment too much that they become harmful, and I would incline to think that in many places in the Scripture they are not used to indicate harmfulness, but with the meaning of the normal drink....3 3/4... that would seem to be involved here, and if that is so, then this drunkards is not a very good translation.

SH.....Dr. Harris thinks that yayin is the strong form of wine...and the Old Testament teaches that it was wrong to drink yayin.

AAM: I am not sure that you could make a sharp distinction between them. I would incline to think that tirosh is the absolutely fresh drink, and that without refrigeration it would very soon become a very mild yayin, which would be quite harmless, but that after the ~~yayin~~ yayin ferments further it ~~becomes~~ becomes very dangerous, and very harmful, and that is what is spen

about very strongly, but it isn't speaking against any touching of it, but against the use of it to extent, or the use of it after it has become more fermented.

SHZ: In other words, there are~~d~~ all stages of yayin from.... $5\frac{1}{2}$ .....

AAM: I would think so, yes. Now, in~~y~~ Germany when I was there the average person in Germany drank loads and loads of beer, and it probably had very little more effect on them than drinking milk was, the main effect being that you wouldn't get your vitamins you get in milk. The harm would be in filling you up without the food value, but along in the spring they had the bock beer festival, in which they drink the heavy beer, and then the drunkenness was terrific. And the ~~xxx~~ bock beer is the real heavy harmful beer which certainly did terrific damage. But the ordinary beer was quite a harmless drink. And to my notion the reason for a total abstention~~ion~~ from liquor, my objection is not that there is anything harmful in drinking light alcohol per~~s~~ se, that it is sinful ~~per se~~ per se, but that in our civilisation, for one thing, we have so much rapid communication, rapid transportation, that it constitutes a menace to so many, and secondly that in our civilisation there has been this sophisticated artificial means of making it so tremendous, and so prominently available that it does so much harm to the drunkards and ~~xxx~~ alcoholics, that it is a good thing to set the example of total abstinence, but not that there is any sin in a mild use. I see no Scripture for that.

WA:.....

AAM: Which word is this?.....7.....yes, for ..... EDB say sweet wine, properly pressed out ~~juice~~ juice from assas (?) to pres or ~~crush~~ crush by treading down, ~~pressed out~~ pressed out juice. They give references, Amos 9:13, Joel 1:5, and 4:18, and similarly Is. 49:26, and the construct in Cant. 8:2., so it is not a very common word, but deriving it from the word, press, or ~~crush~~ crush by treading, they take it as ~~pressed out~~ pressed out juice, sweet wine. Now, it is very easy in anything like that that it is used much for various types of terms to develop~~e~~ which may not be mutually exclusive, but may overlap a good bit. All right then, Mr. Ha~~y~~es:

AAM: .....on account of context, but I think the form is better..., that is, went up would ordinarily be the waw conv. with the imperfect, and ...8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ... and it has happened. The perfect is more apt to be used to show a condition that has come into existence as the result of a change, <sup>an event</sup> ordinarily. For it has come up, shows that he means the result of it having happened, rather than a narrative of things that occur. So I incline to think that that is the better rendering here. Yes.

SH: For a nation has come up upon my land, mighty .....8 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....

AAM: It is hard to prove a thing like that. You find it in the Scripture, and if you have sufficient indication..., there are two kinds of ...9... but is the difference one of sex, or is it one of particular quality, or just what is it.

SH: Is there any difference at all? What is the difference between...9..

AAM: Yes... parallelism, and I don't think that you often find two words that are identical, but the two words may be so similar that in a particular sentence there is no distinction between their meaning. ~~They~~ But there would be somewhere some difference between the two words, probably, or they wouldn't have two different words. They might fall together to be almost identical. They might even eventually become identical, but usually there will be some difference in their start. Of course, not ~~always~~ always, you ~~take~~ take in English we have the fiddle and the violin, and as far as I know they are identical, and we have the frying pan and the skillet, aren't they identical? As far as I know they are. We do have identical words, but as a rule there is a difference between words, but ~~in~~ there are many contexts in which there would be no difference in meaning between them. It is only that the use there refers to the same thing, but it is only a part of the meaning of the word, and there may be an overlapping in two directions of the meaning of the word. All right, Mr. A.

WA: .....10 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....

AAM: How do you mean? pointed up the book.....11.....

SH:.....11..., and doubtless there are other books in the Hebrew Bible

that were written about the same time.....11... seems funny that they didn't use some of these words, or use the ~~xxx~~ root of a related word, or something.

AAM: Yes, but after all, it is a comparatively small amount of Hebrew we have, to compare with Arabic where we have tremendous numbers of volumes of material. Doubtless the people talked a great deal about things which never happened to get into the Bible, or that is that there wasn't particular occasion to refer to them in the Bible, and they may have been words that were used in a great frequency that we never have anywhere. Your subject matter is a little bit different from others.....11½...

WA: Would you say that Joel is poetry?

AAM: Parts of it at least.

WA: ....~~xxxx~~ reason for the rare words. Use a common word in a parallel, and then you want to use a different word.

AAM: That's right, so it gives you a reason to search for them, and too, in poetry rare words give a little quaintness, sort of an antique flavor with it. We are apt to use phrases in poetry, even aside from parallelism that we wouldn't use in ordinary language, so that would be one reason. Well, then...  
.....12..... There is the possibility that this means her young husband, the husband of her youth. Yes, that is we do find instances where a word is modified by a modifying word, and the pronoun which really goes with the whole phrase is put on the second one, the ~~xxxx~~ modifying word. There are such instances, and I think ~~xxx~~ "her young husband" is quite a possible rendering here.....12½.....

AAM: The thing that seems a little peculiar like a virgin, for a husband, but it may mean the one betrothed to be her husband. It may mean her..., like the man I knew in New York twenty years ago and he was ~~engaged~~, and they were going to be married on a certain day, and the day before his bride took sick and died. And there was no time to get word to anybody. They had to go ~~xxxxxx~~ to the church to meet the people, to the wedding and tell them that she had died, and those things don't happen often, but they do happen occasionally in all ~~situations~~ civilisations, and this would be an example of

poignant grief, to grieve when they are just in the midst of joy, and suddenly it has turned to grief. A virgin who was betrothed to be married. Well, I knew a girl here in Philadelphia, ten years ago who was engaged to a fellow, and he became sick one week before the wedding, and he had leukemia and died within four days, three days before the wedding. It does happen, and it is an example that he gives here to show their condition with the suddenness of this locust invasion, and this terrific loss. How about the next one?

....end of 0 4

0 5

Yes, I don't think there is any particular ~~mark~~ question there, is there? Is this mourn, or have mourned? They have fallen into mourning, they are mourning, going on....1... v.10?.....1.....

AAM: Yes, it is ...2....., it is imperfect. ~~Yes~~ The oil fails. It is not that this has happened, but that it is happening.

SH: That's a funny verb, isn't it? It is from amal (?) and BDB....2 $\frac{1}{4}$ ....  
.....

AAM: There's a reduplication of the final radical, sometimes occurs. And more apt to occur in weak verbs, like an ayin waw, <sup>like</sup> ~~and~~ the reduplication of an ~~ayin~~ ayin ayin. Here we do have a few cases of it, rather rare though. One ~~that~~ would almost suspect seeing a word like this, whether it might be a .....3..... rather than a reduplication, but the form.....part of the aleph in the first radical, of that reduplication is probably the best.

The farmes<sup>5</sup> are ashamed. That certainly is possible isn't it? .....3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ... Or the way the KJ takes it is an an imperative. I guess it could be either way equally well, couldn't it?.....3 3/4... Yes, how do we translated it there?.....4.....The pe waw and the ayin waw sometimes fall together. And certain to dry up would fit here, ....4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ...., and the two such similar words do have a good many times attract (?) one another. It certainly should be yabash as far as ~~form~~ form is concerned. But the meaning would seem to require both. So the idea of a mutual attraction is something which we do find. Especially with the words which have some similarity of meaning that

that these do. Let's see, you didn't finish the verse yet.....5.....

As to the farmers drying up (?) to explain how they put the two together. Dry~~u~~ up, O farmers, be ashamed, dry up. They are not really ashamed, any way.

SH: Unless ~~xxxxxx~~ somebody copied the wrong word here, on account of all these other ~~dry~~ drying ups.

AAM: Yes, I am just trying to think how could they? ~~What~~ Would the change of pointing make it be ashamed? It would ~~have~~ have to be hiphil, a change of pointing would make it hiphil, to be ashamed, but would that be a common usage? ...5 3/4... it is more apt to be qal than hiphil~~7~~. We hit so much vocabulary along here that I rather imagine that we ~~perhaps~~ perhaps slide over some of the uncommon words, unless you want to take time to go into them fully, that you will get some more of the forms for some interesting developments.....6 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....

Well, of course, words like that used for men, they are more or less figurative anyway, ~~and~~ and it varies from culture to culture, group to group. You say, Oh, dry up! .....7.....little different sense, little different times, and cultures, but it could very well have the sense of their drying up, and losing out.....7 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....an ayin lamedh, it seems to me to be used more or less interchangeably. There are good many times where they use aleph lamedh, where the sense requires...7 $\frac{1}{2}$ .... I don't think they keep those apart very much. I mean in Hebrew in general. ....end of class.

0 6

.....Oh, Joel is by Smith, and it is possible that you will find that it is somewhat like Moffat's translation. I don't know whether you will or not~~e~~, but in Moffat's translation, I mean in this ~~xxxx~~ regard. In Moffat's translation, I find every now and then some very I struggle over, I know what the meaning is, but how to get it in ~~English~~ English, and then I find that Moffat has got the meaning, and expressed~~xxxx~~ it, and just hit on the English word, and get that thing exactly, and then in the next verse he throws the Hebrew aside and pays no attention ~~withxxxx~~ and puts any old thing in. So, that, you can't just look at it and say that is nonsense.

It may be wonderful. You can't look at it and say it is wonderful, it may be nonsense. You have to study ~~it~~ it, but the few nuggets you get out of it are worth its use, but they are not worth its recommending it to anybody that can't thoroughly check everything in the Hebrew.

WA: .....

AAM: Yes, well, now, would you like to look at some particular one or two like that? WA:..... AAM: All right, you see, in our reading it is just a question of just how fast, or how slowly you think it is wise to go, because I want to get whatever will be of most value to you fellows, and we could spend, if we study all the grammatical features, and everything could be learned about the words, we could take one chapter and spend a year on it, but....2½.... v.17, yes, what does he say on that?.....2 3/4.....

AAM: Instead of the seed is rotten under their cloas, which after all sounds a bit strange. He says, the mules stand at their stalls. Now, do you know Latin at all? You don't? Well, now there is a phrase in Latin, .....3¼..... well, those words, ....., mea, can mean either my, or ...3½..... mater means mother, sus means pig, est can be either is or eats, and mala can be either bad or apples. So it could be either my mother, the pig is bad, or run mother, the pig is eathing the apples. And the same words exactly could mean both. And of course, I image there are cases in English too the same way, only we are so used to words, we hear.....4....., but does it mean this or that, and we don't realize how utterly different they are. Now, let's see, what was one I saw in a headline once? It was something like this. To produce potatoes, must produce potatoes in court, something like that. Well, now, I thought, goodness, what are they going to do, are they going to ~~grow~~ grow potatoes in court, produce potatoes in court. And then I realized that it meant to bring them present, and of course, the word court has so many meanings in it. It can be a court for justice, or a court of a king, or a courtyard of a house, there are so many senses, with so many of our English words that it is not strange that occasionally Hebrew ~~words~~ words have a multiplicity of possibilities.

WA:.... .the heifers have started thier.....5½.....

AAM: Oh, I see, well now, that is very interesting. Thank you. Well, that is fine because that probably means that the ... started, you say? Well, now that started and stomped would be the same, wouldn't it? Yes, that would be identical. But the mules or the seeds, under their clods. Clods is not a common idea, is it? Well, now, do you have any notes in your Kittel on it? ...Weare here in the situation we are often in when we have a word that we have little light on. WA:.....AAM: Oh, yes, now, a word about the method of it. Here we have a group of rather unfamiliar words. Rather uncommon ~~EXX~~ words. Our KJ version for this end of 2:8, "when they fall upon the sword they shall not be wounded." Smith says, "when they fall into a stream they shall not sink." Well, your word here isn't really sword. ~~REB~~ BDB suggest weapon, or missile. Is there another possibility of making it stream, or is there some word similar to it to make stream? Or do they just throw it aside and get stream. Well, the last part, it isn't actually be wounded, it is ....7... cut off, according to BDB. Be~~l~~ cut off? Now you see, it is active, isn't it? yisau, cut off, cut off, cut in pieces, break off, and it is peculiar, it is a very unusual way of saying be ~~WENDE~~ wounded. It sounds as if it should have an object, /doesn't it? Well, now that would suggests that maybe he finds a word, to sink, that is somewhat similar, rather than it is identical. He isn't following the LXX, I wouldn't think. Probably they would show it.

WA:.....if they fall on their weapons they shall <sup>not</sup>/be wounded.

AAM: ...Their weapons. They fall on their weapons,.....8¼... of course it is the question to see how much evidence there is for that break off, or cut off. Is it a common word, or is it quite uncommon.....8½.....does it say sink at all?.....8½.....

I haven't heard anything about him for a long time. My guess is if he is still living he is pretty old, but Dr. Allis wrote a review of that book, and he tore it to pieces, and showed alot of cases where he thought it was very inaccurate, and alot of cases where he felt there was real modernism

entered into it. He didn't like it at all. He wrote the review, and I think the Moody Monthly ran it, and the next month..., I guess maybe the Action reviewed it, I don't know, and then they got a letter, they got an article sent to them by Goodspeed, either Goodspeed, or Paulus (?) Smith. I think it was Goodspeed, and in this letter he said that they had seen the article that you had in the last issue about this, and they wanted to object to it, and they went ahead to tell what wonderful Christians Goodspeed and Smith were, and how each of them was the son of a Baptist deacon, and their two fathers as deacons had taken up the collections side by side, and they were brought up in this very fine religious atmosphere, and they were such splendid men, and now they were both professors in the U. of Chicago, the ~~hard~~ hardshell baptist institution, you know, (I heard Millikin, the great physicist call it that) and after he got through, Goodspeed, he wouldn't dignify Allis by calling him by name, or by referring to him as a scholar, he would say your correspondent.....10<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>.....what wonderful godly people this Goodspeed and Smith are, and how terrible it is for people to try to criticize them...10<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>..., but that was about 1930, 32, so my guess is he's not living at this time. But I haven't heard.

I think we are ready to start chapter 2, all right, Mr. Hayes, have you anything interesting in the first verse, suppose you read it to us.

SH: Well, how about in v.9 in the last chapter.

AAM: Well, what about that?

SH: Well, the hophal of qarab(?) masc. sing., and the first word following it is femining sing., .....ll.....and ....ll<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>... is masc. sing., but usually the verb agrees with the.....

AAM: I think that here in Joel 1:9 that minta (?) is taken as masc. in the usage, that is, Heb. doesn't use fem. a great deal. And they, it is often hard to tell what a word is, but of course that ending ah should be feminine. And he says fem., the way he would tell it is fem. is that it is treated as fem., but here if it has a masc. verb with it, why then it would seem in this case to be treated as masc. BDB has mincha, see minucha, under

nuach. Huh! Does he take mincha from nuach? That seems strange, doesn't it? To rest. I wouldn't think it would go under that.

SH: Under manach....

AAM: under manach? Oh, yes, what's the matter with me. Here it is. Right on the same page, manach, root of the following. Gift, tribute, offering, mincha, noun fem. It doesn't say anything about any masc.  $\frac{1}{4}$ ,....12  $\frac{3}{4}$  ..., and there are lots of usages, that's a very interesting point.

.....13.....

...that the disaster was terrific already, but with this great number of locusts right on them it will be three times as bad as ....13 $\frac{1}{4}$ .....

SH: Well, that reflects back on these perfects, if they are perfect, according to the pointing, in v.4, because they are all past. And according to this idea, some of those pasts are true pasts, and the others would be futures.

AAM Yes, well that could very well be. You see, the perfect doesn't express necessarily time, but a situation. It is eaten by these. This is eaten by this. What's left can be has been eaten, can be is being eaten, can be will be eaten, but it shows it as a completed event. You are not looking now in that verse at the worm eating, but at the stuff ~~is~~ disappearing because of the worm eating. So that what you are looking at is the result of the eating, rather than the activity of it, and that's why they  $\frac{1}{2}$  perfect.

WA:.....14.....

AAM: Yes, if everyting was eaten, there wouldn't be much gain in having....14 $\frac{1}{4}$ ... I would say a tremendous amount is eaten, but there will be three times as much more ....14 $\frac{1}{4}$ ... You can't begin to get rid of it, and then the Lord just drives them off, and thats the end of it.end of 0 6

0 7

.....the locust is such a terrible thing that you don't pay so much attention to the drought, but yet it is there in the heart of it, maybe not enough of a drought to be such a terrible disaster in itself, but a fair disaster.

SHZ: Of course things would sort of dry up.....9 $\frac{1}{4}$ ..... AAM: Yes, that's right.....9 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....

AAM: Yes, that's a very good point, the drought and the locust going together, the locust being the thing that is most conspicuous, but the ~~enough~~ drought being also a factor, as suggested by the fact that later on he promises the rains, particularly....19.... I imagine the pastures of the wilderness here means the common land.....10....Yes, land that, grazing land that is available to everybody, like out in the West they put out their cattle and their sheep.....~~19~~ 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ ..... 11..... (double recording here)....it is really building for these two kinds of people, that he does it for, and he comes back to them in order to ~~the~~ satisfy their longings and aspirations.

WA: You don't think that ....11... refers to little tabernacle. You think that refers to the kingdom of David, not to the literal tabernacle.

AAM: Oh, no, you think of David's kingdom is fallen apart into northern and ~~and~~ southern kingdoms, divided up....11 $\frac{1}{2}$ ....., and it is nothing compared to what David's kingdom was. Well, David's son is going to come back and reestablish the kingdom like it was before, the two parts will be ~~be~~ united, and of course, it will be more than that. It will cover the whole earth. He's not going into that now, he is just referring to it in passing to introduce the fact that when this happens there will be ~~to~~ kinds of people, not just one.

SH: .....11 3/4.....before the second coming? They ~~were~~ saved before the second coming...they are still on earth.

AAM: No, this doesn't say this happens after he comes. He is going to return and set ~~it~~ up, and the reason he returns and sets ~~it~~ up is in order to satisfy their aspirations, of these two kinds of people. And of course He satisfies them ~~by~~ associating themselves with Him in the doing of it. It is not a picture of step by step fulfillment. But a summary of it. ....12 3/4..... I don't see in any other view how it has anything in the world to do with circumcision.

SH:.....12 3/4.....

AAM: Yes, so you see they are just quoting something with no relation. For it does have a definite relation, and it seems to me from this viewpoint it does, and the fact that he introduced with the phrase, "to take out a people for his name," and then he goes on and leads up to show ~~me~~ where in the divine plan to show where the people for his name is still in existence. But he says from the Gentiles, not just to get the people to become Jews, and become Christians, ~~and then~~ but to establish what ~~will~~ be.....13 $\frac{1}{4}$ ..... which will still have an existence as a people who are not used, but ....13 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....when He returns.

WA: It seems to me to be the only way to take it. I couldn't see how...

AAM: But of course, we don't want to say it makes sense this way, unless it does. I don't see how it makes any other way. I believe it does this way, but we want to be sure it does, of course, and these questions....14...

SH:....., and he was confirming Peter's experience, and Paul's experience.....14.....Gentiles were ~~not~~ saved, and just as long as they were saved, then the obvious.....end of 0 7

0 8

.....AAM: Well, I think that is part of it all, but ~~it~~ it is not only ~~it~~ they don't .....1... anymore, they shouldn't .... anymore. Because later experience ~~it~~ shows they can be saved. But the Scripture shows that they will, even though they are saved, there will be those who are saved, but who haven't become Jews .....1..., so that they are saved now as Gentiles, but they don't become Jews.....1.....a people for His name.

SH: ~~based on the experience that they are saved,~~ based on the experience that they are saved, and therefore they don't.....1 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....

AAM: Well, of course, how can you tell? How can you tell they are saved? It looks as if they are saved.

SH: Well, Peter was pretty sure, I think. As a matter of fact.....1 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....

AAM: That they will possess the remnant of Edom. That would mean that the Gentiles are saved.

SH: Oh, no, I wasn't arguing that....2.....

AAM: It seems James talks, and then they come to an agreement on it. Then pleads with the apostles and the elders as a whole church to do ~~xxxx~~ something after he spoke, and his suggestion was they do this, the ground of it was, well, Peter has told us something from experience. Well, he doesn't say anything about Paul's argument....2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ... He mentions Peter, there's experience, but then he says, ~~xxxxxxx~~ "Unto this agree the words of the prophets," and that's what he puts his whole time on. He talks at considerable length. Therefore, known unto God are all His words from the beginning of the world. Therefore.....2 3/4....

SH:.....3.....

AAM: It seems when Acts bothers to give a quotation of much length, as introducing the conclusion of this it means, that this was the argument that convinced the people. His personality and his popularity might have a good bit to do with it, but his argument would seem to be ....4..., and of course we find it all through the N.T. that the vital thing is what does the Scripture teach? And it seem to me as if he says, Well, now, here's something/ I ~~xxxx~~ hadn't thought of before. We find them having an experience which seems very strange. That God is, what is God doing? Why, He is visiting the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name, He is not just making individuals Christians, but He is taking out a people for His name. Well, how are they going to be a people for His name if they all become Jews? So then, the strange thing we see happen is actually God working, whose works are known to Him from the beginning, and this is the way He is doing it, and the way ~~is~~ He is doing it is actually clearly suggested in Amos, though ~~xxxx~~ he hadn't realized it before, and it shows the we should just let it go on the way He is doing it, and not try to ...5... It is a very interesting passage, with ~~xxxxxxx~~ some very interesting problems from a good many different regards.

WA:.....5 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....

AAM: You see, the thing he is trying to bring out is there will be Gentiles upon whom the Lord....6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ... Whether you take it ....6 $\frac{1}{4}$ .....

Yes, the important one supports his particular argument.....7 6½.....  
 .....~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ if you take ..... as meaning converted, that would be true.

WA: You will actually have three classes. That's the reason you get three classes out of here. You have the kingdom established, which ....7... you will have the Gentiles who are unsaved, you will have Gentiles whom I think are born during the millennium who will come ....7... let us go with you to worship your God, and then you have the Gentile church coming back with the Lord.

AAM: Yes, Oh, and they would be the Gentiles upon whom my name is. That would be the Gentile portion of the church. Well, let's think about that some more.

WA: That treatment was the same thing that made me wonder about that ...7 3/4... the tabernacle, the millennial kingdom, the promise fulfilled to the Jews, and then Gentiles who are in the millennium who ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ say, Come, and let us seek to the House of the Lord.....8.....

AAM: Yes, but the ones here seeking are the church, here, not unbelievers ....8.... they are people already converted.

SH: Well, the idea that the church is going to be caught up in the ~~air~~ air, and then it is going to come back and return with Christ, and rule during the millennium.....8½.....what that word darash means, seek, or enquire of, that would be a little easier to enquire of.....8½.....

.....feel that in Joel 1 the locusts have definitely come, they are continuing to come....

SH: The tenses there, the imperfect, would that mean that they have almost come, but not quite, but also the phrase, the day of the Lord is near. Unless ~~you~~ you say that the Day of the Lord is not the ....9.... all these four waves of locusts come, but to gather a part of that general ....9½...., and I should think.....Day of the Lord is this whole period, when the four groups of locusts come in ....9½.....and the rain is withheld, and it all happens during a period of days or months.

AAM: You mean if ~~this word~~ <sup>this word</sup> ~~was~~ ~~at~~ ~~hand~~, then?

SH: qarob, that's one thing, and also the tenses in ch.2. ....9½...

AAM: ...Where the ~~king~~ KJ translates it as the Day of the Lord is at hand. The Greek is actually is present, now present. It is a common word used in the papyri for the present day. It is the very word which is there translated as at hand. It means that it is here. But of course that doesn't affect qarob. ~~That~~ is, as to whether to say the day of the Lord is at hand, would necessary mean we are not yet in the day of the Lord, but it is coming, or whether it should mean, well you are already in a situation where there is nothing you can do, it is in God's hands entirely. See if BDB has anything of interest ~~ed~~ there. He ~~translateds~~ qareb approaching, I notice. Qarob he translates near, imminent, ~~recently~~, light is near to darkness, ...10 3/4... from nearby.....11..... I don't think it .....11... the next relationship, I ~~think~~ don't think he throws ~~sufficient~~ sufficient light, at a glance. Your question now, here were first, the day of the Lord is at hand, and the destruction from the Almighty is come. I would incline to think the Day of the Lord in this general sense is the time when there is absolutely nothing you can do about it. Well, when exactly is that time here? You might say when you see there is nothing in the world you can do, it is here, but it is already here before you see it even. Here we are, and the locusts have covered 2/3 of our territory, they are spreading into the next. Well, we think we can clear them out, we can stop them, let's get busy and fight them hard, we can stop them. But somebody says, No, you can't stop them. You will soon become convinced you can't stop them at all, you will soon become convinced that you are absolutely at God's mercy, the Day of the Lord is at ~~my~~ hand. Well, actually you ought to recognize the fact right now, that you will soon come ~~back~~ to the place where have to recognize it. The Day ~~of~~ of the Lord is ~~at hand~~ hand, is near, or is already present. Would it make a big difference in the thought there because it is a progressive thing? It is getting worse, there is nothing you can do about it, because you ~~become~~ become more and more submissive.

WA: 2:11 seems to view the day of the Lord as present....12½...

AAM: v.11, yes, the Lord shall utter his voice because of his army, he is strong that executes his word, for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible, and who can abide it. I would think that would fit in with that. There ~~is~~ is nothing we can do, but it becomes more manifest though as time goes on. And so we realize more and more that it is the day of the Lord, but it already is. Yes?

WA: If it continues the way it is, it will mean absolute destruction.

~~AAMxxxY~~.....13 $\frac{1}{4}$ .....

AAM: Yes, that is very definite, it is only the Lord who can do it.

But then, the other question Mr. H. asked about the ~~xxxxxx~~ tenses I think it is important that we ~~things~~ think of the nature of the Hebrew imperfect and perfect. They are not ~~simpl~~ simply a future and a past, ~~xxxxxx~~ the perfect is a condition, usually as a result of a past situation....13  $\frac{3}{4}$ ... already there, but there is no necessary activity ....14... so it comes to be used....14... as well as when there isn't, and the imperfect shows an action occurred, it happens, and ordinarily ~~xxxxxx~~ it means it is going to happen, though it may be it is something that customarily happens, is regular ....14....you can be stating a general principle, that's what this man ordinarily does when he goes there, he .....14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ..... So he can be describing the events, you see what he does, .....14 $\frac{1}{2}$ .... Now, we very commonly translate it in the KJ in the future, but I don't think it really is a future, .....14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ...., and we ~~sk~~ have to tell from context well, even, whether the action took place in the past. But an action occurs, and the other is a condition which has come into existence. One is static, and the other is dynamic. I think that is the essential difference, although in the bulk of cases, you could tell, in the bulk of cases, that the simple past, or present, or future, will represent the idea, you have got an exact translation.....end of 0 8

Oh, which one was that, ~~xxxxxxx~~ in 2:1?.....

SH:.....

AAM: 2:1, I see, ~~xxxx~~ well, of course, right before it you have an imperative. Blow the trumpet, and sound an alarm...1  $\frac{1}{2}$ .....Those are just imperatives. Oh, yes, well, now, yes, I would ~~xx~~ incline to think that after that command, Blow the trumpets, sound an alarm, you could say, Why do you sound an alarm? Because all the ~~xxxx~~ inhabitants of the land are trembling. In that case, I would sort of expect an imperative, a participle describing the condition, or because they have demanded it. All the inhabitants of the land have demanded it. That is the perfect. Something that has ~~xx~~ already happened, and the reason for doing. Now, the ~~xxx~~ future, they will tremble. Blow the trumpets, they are all going to tremble. That doesn't make sense.

WA:.....

AAM: They are trembling, they do tremble. It ~~seems~~ as if the jussive is perhaps fits in with the context a little better, though I don't think the imperfect...3 $\frac{1}{4}$ .....The imperfect? Blow the trumpet, sound the alarm, all the inhabitants of the land will tremble, because the day of the Lord is coming. ~~xxxx~~...3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ..... Well, it could be a frequentative, and my feeling sort of it this, under the circumstances, that if you say blow the ~~grumpets~~ because of this, well all the people begin to tremble, should be in sympathy (?4)..... All the people begin ~~xxxx~~ to tremble, therefore blow the ~~xxx~~ trumpets. That would fit perfectly. Except the frequentative, I sort of felt that the participle would be more natural ~~xxxx~~ than the frequentative. In such a case, in this particular context. I may be wrong. It would be hard to prove. Well, that was the only problem in the verse, would be your....4 $\frac{1}{4}$ .....wasn't. To get the exact sense of it in the person, I think there is this to realize that forms, verb forms like words, are to some extent areas of meaning, rather than precise points. And I think that is true of our English language. ~~Will~~ We will, in an English sentence, or an English ~~xxx~~ paragraph, use a phrase which can be interpreted in either of

two ways, and they both fit the context perfectly, and it doesn't make any difference which way you take it, so we don't bother to make it fit, and there are other cases where we feel it is ~~sure~~ perfectly obvious which way to take it, but if we feel that something hangs upon it there, then we try to use a form which is ....5..... I think that is true in the Hebrew. There are areas, rather than points, and the areas, the adjoining areas, you try to fit together so that ....5<sup>1</sup>.....

Well, now, you are speaking of the ~~xxxx~~ tenses in general, the chapter, the 1st ~~xxx~~ chapter begins with describing what has happened, this is perfect, this is the situation which has occurred, and then you go on, and you describe what is right here, and they are called upon to weep and lament, etc. In view of that which is before them, which they have seen, and what is happening, and is continuing to happen, and probably will continue to happen, and that is the last part of one, and the first part of two. Then in ch.12 (2?) we have the Lord calling on them to seek His will, and turn to Him, and then we have in 15 and 16, and 17 we have the exhortation to call a solemn feast, and it seems to me there is an implication that they did call it. And then in v.18 we have the statement ~~xxxx~~ in the perfect what the result of the call was, that the Lord was jealous for His people, and pitied the people, and answered them.

SH:.....

AAM: Oh, I would think it was oral.

SH: From 1:1 to 2:17 you say would be, would you say that would be an unbroken discourse?

AAM: Well, I would think maybe to 14. I would think likely that 1:1 to 2:14 is an unbroken discourse, and then that 2:15 he calls on them to actually do something about it, and he has called them previously to groan and rend their hearts, and all these things which are rather general, ~~xxx~~ and now he calls on them to do something specific, call a ~~xxx~~ solemn assembly, and let the priests and the ministers of the Lord weep between ~~xxxx~~ the porch and the ~~xxx~~ altar, and do a specific action, and I think the implica-

tion is that they did it, because v.18 uses the narrative tense which seems to show something which follows, which occurs following what was just before.

SH: Yes, then 18 is narrative...8....

AAM: No, no, 18 I would say then is narrative, telling what happened. The Lord was jealous for his land and pitied his people, and He answered and said to his people, so and so. And then we have the Lord's promises. The Lord answers and gives some promises, and then looks forward to the last days, and gives them some .....8 $\frac{1}{4}$ .....

SH:.....that if 1:1 to 2:19 was one unbroken discourse, .... that would mean that the imperfect here would be something that would surely come to pass, but not come to pass yet.....8  $\frac{3}{4}$ .....

AAM: Yes, I would think so. I would think that in view of the tenses you were justified in that, but that makes the best sense out of it, as a whole. Well, then, does that cover that? All right, what would you say next, Mr. A., then?.....

AAM: A very good suggestion, the outcry of the people for .....9  $\frac{1}{4}$ ... and then in v.8.....9 $\frac{1}{2}$ -10.....

Generation after generation won't be like this 2:2 here, I think that is better than many generations. We don't know how long. We go on and on forever, or we go on and on for a while ~~xxxxxxx~~ and then eventually something like that...., we are just looking way ahead. We don't say how long. Many sort of implies that there will be after many. I don't think this implies there will, but I don't think it says it is internal. Well, it means a ~~xxxxxxx~~ long time, but it doesn't say whether it is forever. Yes?.....10 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....

Olam is a long stretch.

WA: ~~xxxxxxx~~ It can be used to refer to past time, or to future time, when it refers to past time it is ancient days.

AAM: Way back, so far that it is sort of disappears into obscurity. The parallel lines seem to meet

WA: I know the participle is very clear, but would it be possible to take

this ...11 $\frac{1}{4}$ ...people as the subject of the participle?.....11 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....

AAM: No, I am not sure it would be? ~~¶~~ I am not sure that that wouldn't be just as possible as the other. Read me the whole sentence~~¶~~ as you said it now. You said, A day of darkness and gloom

SH: A day of darkness and gloom, and day of clouds and cloudiness...

AAM: Like as the dawn spread out upon the mountains is a people great and mighty like him there has not come, there has not happened, from way way back and after him there will not be another until the years of generation after generation. I would think that would be just as good, maybe better.

WA:.....12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ..... it refers to the dawn being spread upon the mountains, and the .....13....spread like the dawn upon the mountains.

AAM: Yes, now you notice that Kittel puts that in one line~~¶~~, doesn't he? He says, like the dawn spread upon the mountains is a people great and mighty. Well, now, if that is a line like the dawn spread upon the mountains, is a people strong and mighty. Oh, anyway, like the dawn spread upon the mountains, what is like the dawn spread upon the mountains....13 $\frac{1}{2}$ .... I see, so there is an "is" anyway. Yes, then our English punctuation isn't very good, is it? In the KJ, A day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains. What is like the morning spread upon the mountains?.....14.... I don't see how it could be, while the great army of locusts is spread out like the dawn upon the mountains. Yes, I don't think it is any question, and if you think of this as the line, ~~or~~ Oh, I see it isn't.....14 $\frac{1}{4}$ .... in the middle of the verse. Yes, as the dawn spread out upon the mountains is the people mighty. Oh, the people is like a day of darkness. It isn't....14 $\frac{1}{2}$ .... It seems to me the metheg must be wrong there. What does the RSV do with that? It would be interesting to see that. ...

It seems to me that there we have the Masoretes thought it was like the dawn, while the word occurs much more frequently ...15..extreme dawn and extreme blackness, and that would be natural to take it that way, and it seems to me it makes good sense, like the dawn. <sup>Like</sup> ~~It makes~~ blackness spread upon the mountains. What does that mean?.....15....the dawn coming up begins

to spread over. It is black all right, but I would think that probably the figure...end of 0 9

0 10

Well, then, what is your next problem. That's interesting. Mr. A., v.3.

WA: Before him the fire devours, and after him the flames burn...1...the land is like the Garden of Eden, but after him ..... $1\frac{1}{4}$ ... neither is there deliverance ..... $1\frac{1}{2}$ .....

AAM: Is not, that's perfect, has not been. Deliverance has come.

WA:.....

AAM: Yes, I would think that would probably be better here. It could be its a perfect that certainly there can't be any deliverance, there won't be any deliverance, but they seem to just imagine that they have not deliverance. Any question Mr. H. or do you want to read 4?

SH: No, there's an imperfect here..... $2\frac{1}{2}$ .....why do you have an imperfect there, and what would be the best way to translate it? .... $2\frac{3}{4}$ ...

AAM: It is a frequentative there, it is what occurs.

SH:....either a participle or .....

AAM: Well, what kind of a participle would it be?

SH:.....3.....that's a strange thing to have a perfect here, and then to have an imperfect, and to have them both mean the same thing.

AAM: Well, before him a fire has burned, and after him a flame keeps on burning. Peculiar phrase. Before him and after him. On all sides of him. Before him a fire has burned, after him a flame keeps on burning. May before these there have been the previous ones like a fire, the waves, before them a fire has burned, and after him another fire will keep on burning. A series of waves. It is a possibility at least. Like the Garden of Eden was the land before him. And after him a desolate wilderness, and there is no escape, there has been no escape in relation to him. Wherever they have gone, wherever the various waves have come, one after another, there has just been no escape. Well, let's look at the next verse then.

SH: As the occurrence of forces is disappearing, and ....6.....

AAM: Yes, I would think frequentative makes it better, because it is not, it is something that is already here, something they have seen happen.  
v.5 Mr. A.?

WA: As the sound of chariots and the ~~7~~ // ...7.....fire devours the stubble as a powerful people ~~gather~~.....7 $\frac{1}{4}$ .....

AAM: So you have two verbs here, don't you? No, ~~if~~ you only have ~~one~~ one. They leap, I would think that would be frequentative. Mr. H?

SH: Before him a people rise, ~~gather~~ gather all/something or other, but I don't know what the something or other is.

AAM: Gather, how do you get gather?

SH: Well ....8 $\frac{1}{4}$ .....in a later verse it means gather.....8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ..... I don't know the meaning of qarur (?), and it is used only twice I guess, in 2:11 and 2:6, and I don't know what it is.

AAM: Yes, I notice the KJ translates it blackness. But I think particularly the tense there, isn't that perfect? You said future, I believe. Before him the people's rise. All the faces have gathered blackness. It is showing vividly a thing that happened, and it describes some things that have already occurred, some things that are occurring, the things that have already occurred/ are keeping on occurring, and the things that are going to occur ~~are~~ have already occurred, describing a process that is continual. It is not strictly past and future. Everything in it is both past and future. Just because it is happening right now, and he is describing it as it goes on, and it gives variety and beauty to the poetry to ....10.... especially when either one of them would be actually true. They have done that and they do do this.

WA: There are a lot of parallelism, aren't there?

AAM: Mr. A, the next

WA: As heroes, mighty warriors ....10....men of war, they ~~take~~ throw up a wall, and each in its way shall run, and those in his way.....10 $\frac{1}{4}$ .....

AAM: You ~~take~~ talk with anybody that you don't know very well, and you come along, and I have the ~~experience~~ experience every day, I mean somebody may

say a few words, and I wonder what they mean. You understand the words, but you don't know enough of the context. There are two or three possibilities. You walk along the street and you see somebody, and you say, they make some remark, of course, I asked a fellow last night. He told me he only comes into New York three days a week, he comes in and it is an hour and a half on the subway. He says he's at the Jewish Theological Seminary from 10 to 1, and then he goes home. Three days in the way, he says, I am never in the city except then. And I ~~xxxx~~ said, Oh, you have all your books at home to study. He says, Oh, yes. He's done a lot of work on the LXX, and I said, Oh, you have your own <sup>Homes(?)</sup>....11...Parsons (?) is suppose. Oh, yes, we bought ~~xxxx~~ our home last year, he says. We had an apartment before that. (laughter). No use trying to explain. I just let it go. But I meet somebody and make some remark.....11½.....well, I think just today, or yesterday someone I was speaking to on the street said something, and I thought, now I wonder exactly what they meant. You had the ~~xxxx~~ whole context, and you enquired into this word and that and say .....12.... very interesting idea there. You just don't have it, you don't have a chance. And language is a peculiar form. You take and you specialize language for specific purposes of giving exact sense, and but ordinary usages isn't that. ~~Ordinary~~ Ordinary usage is you are dealing with emotions, you are dealing with whole situations, you are making illusions the way we do everything is that way, and even when they write a constitution they try to be very very precise, specifically, and then along come some new issues nobody thought of before, and they start in trying to reinterpret the constitution to fit with it, and then the supreme court tells us exactly what it does mean. And then the Supreme Court fifty years later decides it meant something else. And of course the thing is that the man who wrote it knew very well what they were trying to say, the thing that was in their minds, but they didn't think of various other inferences which could be drawn, and we mean by verbal inspiration that we cannot legitimately draw inferences that are false, that we study it and try to find out exactly what these words really mean, and it is true, but it doesn't mean that it is absolutely obvious

at first sight, everything that it means. Well, next verse?

....Yes, I think it would be a very good idea. You could take the ba'ad and it wouldn't be hard in BDB, I mean in Youngs, I doubt if there are a great many, and get an idea. In fact you could take ....13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ....if you feel like it. Here is Englishman's , pg. 261, ba'ad, it says, "particle, look out at a window." Separation fits perfectly there. Gen. 26:8, made an atonement for your sins. Made an atonement in as far as your sin. Made an atonement, in separation from your sin. You might say either would fit there. ...14.. through the window. ....14 $\frac{1}{4}$ ...not as far as the window there. Separation fits there better. The fat closed upon the blade. I don't see any separation there. The fat closed away from the blade would be separation, but I certainly don't see separation there. The Lord had ~~xxxxxx~~ shut up the <sup>womb.</sup> ~~womb.~~ Had shut from her womb? Or as far as? Either would be possible there, I should think. Then by the side of the gate. That has no context to tell. I sam. 4:18. II Sam. 20:21, threw to thee over the wall, as far as the wall? or from the wall? Separation there isn't it?/ ~~xxxxxx~~ And, about his house, and about all. That's Job 1:10. Oh, thou hast thrown a protection about him, and about his house, and about all that is his. Now, that's not separation, unless is it a protection making a separation.....end of 0 10

0 11

Yes, that is very peculiar. Then, Prov. 6:26, for by means of a whorish woman. No separation at all there, and so on and so on, he says, and then with the prefix min, Oh, oh. It occurs also with pronominal suffixes. Oh, look, with the prefix mibba'ad, Songs 4:1, .....1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ..... no separation there, pomegranite withing thy locks, thy temples within thy locks. Also occurs with pron. suff., etc, etc. Gen. 2) 20:7 He ~~xxxx~~ shall pray for you. That's not separation. Ex. 8, intreat for men, that's not separation. Lev. 16, make an atonement for himself, that could be either, but it is not likely. He shut the door upon him, he shut the door separating him.....2.... there is no separation in that is there, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them. That's not separation. I pray the Lord for us. Well, it certainly

doesn't look to me as if that interpretation of BDB there is at all required, at least. It doesn't seem to fit alot of the cases.....2½.....

You've heard the story about the foreigner who came over here and was learning his English. He was standing in the hallway, ~~xx~~ and somebody hollered Look out. And he looks out the window and get hit. (laughter.) We have got alot of ...3... English....., and I guess you have in just about any language. Yes? Oh, .....3½.....

Well, this ba'ad now, ~~xxxx~~ it seems to me the thing is if possible to try to find one meaning to fit the use of the word. As far as you can, see what is the root of the meaning which is used, and~~x~~ then if you cannot find one, then consider the possibility that you have two separate roots. Now, in this case that possibility seems to be not at all unnatural, since you have a word ba'ad, which means separation, of which this could be a construct, and you also have got a preposition be, and a propositon 'ad, and you do have compound prepositions, so that under those circumstances it would seem to me that both would ~~g~~ be natural etymological possibilities~~xx~~, and to have both occur .....4½.... Some people assume that both won't occur. The RSV assumes that when it ~~xxxx~~ translates pit, instead of corruption. But they recognize it occuring in many other ~~xx~~ cases. It does occur...4½.....and so there are such cases, but we ordinarily we don't just assume it to solve a problem, we ~~xxxx~~ look for the meaning. ~~if~~ I was talking to a fellow in NY yesterday, who has evidently done a good bit of ~~xxxx~~ study in Chinese, and some in other languages too. I forget his name.....5½..... but he~~x~~ remarked for meanings of words trying to use a method of checking, what did he say?.....5½..... over an area..... Well, I suggested tohim the possibility of spot checking, the possibility that you take a word and it can be used a great many times in a certain context, and you will find in a certain age, in a certain group of people, in a certain situation that the word is used over and over and over, used hundreds of times, and then you will find many other offshoots, you might say, from that, and there are groups of people who don't have that particular situation....6....., but

they don't have that situation, but the word is retained, and the result is, you will have a word or an expression which is used in four or five different senses, one in one group of people, and another in another group of people, in different ~~xxx~~ places, or at different times. And they seem unrelated, and yet if you know the use in the place where it is used a great deal, and get the real root meaning from that, they could all just.....6½....., and with words that way you just can't ~~xxxxx~~ know the whole situation. We have got so many expressions that people use all the time, and they have completely forgotten the source. The men were at loggerheads. You know exactly what it means, but how many of us have ever seen a loggerhead. I suppose the loggerheads ~~were~~ when they were cutting timber, and bringing down the water....7... and the expression becomes a common expression, and you can see how that is, and we forget the origin...7... And there are so many other things. But this to have a ba'ad, and to have also ba'ad.....7¼.... But I don't see so far that either one of the ideas fits all of the cases. That would be just sort of interesting to take the RSV and take all the cases where ba'ad is sup, and see if there is any uniformity to the way they deal with it. I am a bit surprised though at BDB ....7½....., they have done a very good job.

WA:.....

AAM: It seems as if there were a great many words this doesn't fit at all. Well, what was our next verse?....8....the g German word fertig I think almost any German dictionary will tell you that fertig means ready. At least that's what I understood fertig meant, was ready. And then I got over there ~~xxxx~~ to Germany, and I found they constantly would say, Are you ready with the hammer? We would say, Are you through~~y~~ with the hammer? Now, what does our word through mean? Ready is more sense than through, ~~xxxx~~ isn't it? Are you through with the hammer? What do you mean, are you through with the hammer? That's as bad as ba'ad. I never thought of it before. Now, we say, Are you ready? We are thinking of the future.~~xxxx~~ Are you ready to go? But they say, are you ready, ~~xxx~~ meaning, have you finished the thing you are doing? That is they say, fertig, now maybe fertig isn't really

ready, but I understood that. Of course they have another word, bereit (?9) means prepared for something. Fertig is pretty close to our English through. Dr. Speiser says that this new German Dictionary Koehler's (?) he says it has got some new things in it, but on the whole it is not particularly good., German/Hebrew dictionary. But he says the worst of it is that they have got German and English. That is they give you the meaning of everything in German and English, and evidently a German prepared it/so that ~~they~~ <sup>who didn't know an awful lot</sup> it looked as if he took his German meanings that he gave for the words, and he may have put a lot of study on it, to give a good translation, and then he looked up in his English dictionary and gives you an English meaning for his German word, and often it doesn't fit the Hebrew at all. He says some of them are terrible.

SH: That's Koehler and Baumgartner?

AAM: Yes, Baumgartner did the Aramaic, Koehler the Hebrew. And I wouldn't think that would be true of Baumgartner, who is a very fine scholar. I don't know anything about Koehler. But Dr. Speiser was speaking about Koehler. It is interesting to take some ~~first~~ foreigner who has written something in English, and just look at it, and you would be amazed often with the difficulty of understanding what he means, and even where it is perfectly understandable it sounds so queer, and you stop and ask, why is it queer? Why is it right to do ~~it~~ it this other way instead of that way. It often is hard to think....10 $\frac{1}{2}$ .... Yes, it is a matter of custom. Language is a social activity. But it is an activity carried on by a great multitude of people, and there are little changes come in all the time, and gradually the whole ....10  $\frac{3}{4}$ .... And so as an instrument for precision....11., and the Bible did not take, make a new perfect language. It uses the language of people, ~~and~~ but uses the language in such a way that you can safely study it, carefully and say that whatever you find ~~is~~ definitely there is true, but not such that we can expect to find in it a precision beyond what human words mean. We can find a greater precision in what Hebrew words would have, because they fit together better, but you can find many places where it carries it thus far, and....11 $\frac{1}{2}$ ....sometimes you can tell from

~~in~~ context, sometimes it doesn't matter, they are both equally true, and sometimes we .....11½.....AAM: Well, it is written for all ages, not just for one time, and it would be very easy perhaps to use the idiom of one particular period, as would~~be~~ be clear to that particular period, but that would be far more obscure to people in other ~~parts~~ periods, and it is written to be most usable to people in all ages. There would be many things, and we can see how they would be better for our times, but if they were they might be just impossible for people in some other times.....12½..... No, he meant his own people to understand.....12½.....end of class...

Well, maybe it would be a good way, methodologically, then, since each of you has done some study on this, to have each of you ~~have~~ give us a brief summary of the results you have reached, just to get an idea of what you have come to, and where the difference is. And then we will see what particular points we need to stress in our consideration. Mr. A, suppose you give us a summary.

WA: Well, I don't have quite as many ~~feff~~ as Mr. H. has, I had only about thirty or so, because I wasn't here at school long enough to get them .....14.... but I thought the ones I had, the overall picture, the idea of the compound preposition, the idea is as far as, I thought I could seem to see that meaning in the cases. Now, maybe I am reading into it. Mr. H. says No. The trouble is the cases that are trouble for me, are the ones that are translated through, and I checked them in the Hebrew, and I checked those in the LXX, and it uses dia in all of the cases that I had, where it is translated through, uses ~~at~~ dia in the LXX, and the idea is very ~~clear~~ clearly through. ~~How~~ How to get that idea from ba'ad, I couldn't do it. Mr. H. has more serious objections than that.....end of 0 11

0 12

AAM: Mr. H. what did you find?

SH: Well, I followed BDB along, and he breaks it down very nicely into three different categories, .....1.....

AAM: First, do you take it is two prepositions, or as one word?

SH: As one word.....1.... It might come from three different roots, as far as I can see. Because in the first case he gave about 10 instances where it is more or less an idea of separation, <sup>whether</sup> /looking through a window, I suppose you could say away from a window, or whether some of these instances thrown over a wall, that is over, and away from, and at least, whether you would translate that through, or away from, the idea seems to be separation, and it seems to be a unified idea in it. And the second category given by BDB is the same word used ~~x~~ with ....1½..... like some people went into a town and they shut it ba'ad them. Does that mean around them?

AAM: There is certainly no separation there.

SH: Behind them? Well, there is an idea of separation all right, but the idea of separation seems to be in the verb, and not in the preposition, because what ever~~y~~ they touch separates them from something else. But as I say, it seems to be in the verb, and I don't suppose you could apply it to the ~~xxx~~ ....2½.....

AAM: All right, they shut it separating them.

SH: Now, that's a translation I would consider, the participle separating them...2½..., but I don't know if you could translate this by a participle. As a matter of fact, that would fit most of the cases, and it would fit much better than about,

AAM: About, where did you get about?

SH: Well, that's one of the translations BDB gives.

AAM: Is that the 3rd one?

SH: No, that's in the second paragraph.....3..... In Lam. it says he hedged me ba'ad me, and I shall not go out. But in some cases the same idea involves not a circle round about a person, but rather only a door which cuts a person off from the outside, around him. And you can't say that he put a door about him, because a door doesn't circle a person.

AAM: But the result is the same.

If there was only the door there, and nothing on the other side, the door would have no efficacy. The door makes the circle complete, and otherwise the circle is of no importance. You put a horse in a corral, but you don't have to ~~put~~ build the whole corral when you put the horse. When you close the entrance to the corral you corral the horse.

SH:.....to shut the door, and closingg the door would complete the circle. I don't see how you can say to shut the door about him, when you mean the house, because the door is the subject.....4½.....

AAM: Yes, well now, what's your~~z~~ third category?

SH: Well, in the 2nd category there is one here that Mr. A takes as the two prepositions. There's one here that I saw that could be taken that way. The fat closed ba'ad the blade of the sword, and the question there is, does that mean came around up till the sword? Or whether it is about the sword? Or whether it separated the sword from the air,....5....

SH:

~~MA~~: Could you translate that, the fat closed up until the blade~~s~~?, or the fat close round about the blade? Or the fat closed separating the blade from ~~fr~~ the air? And then the third category is translated on behalf of.

WA: The idea is something that concerns you, something that is related to you, it seems to me that that would be she same idea, I'd say that would be a specialized meaning, carrying the same idea. This is something that is related to you, use it in reference to ....6.... as far as. You don't use it in reference, you might say, a specialized meaning, ~~xxxxxy~~ the typical meaning is something that is related to, something that is close to you. <sup>ix</sup> Maybe I leaned over backwards, there, but I thought this could be that basic idea. And it would fit certainly better than the idea of separation. He made atonement on your behalf, he interceded on your behalf, as touching you, is the link that I made between the idea of ...6 3/4...

AAM: I notice BDB says substantive properly separation with the genitive, in separa~~o~~n from, in usage of preposition away from, behind, about, on ~~behind~~ on behalf of. Well, toget away from and on behalf of in one category is pretty difficult. Away from and on behalf of. That is pretty

hard to say as one. It does ~~xxxx~~ seem ~~w~~ as if a good many of them the idea of separation seems to be involved, but it seems as if in others the idea of as far as, which might be on behalf of, seems to be ~~xxxx~~ involved. Doesn't it? Now, that of course is Mr. Hayes's third category which he thought couldn't fall together with the others. He felt ~~is~~ must be separate. On behalf of, on account of, for the sake of. Wouldn't you think on behalf of could quite easily be derived from the idea? I can't help just about feeling we have two different roots here. And one of the roots the idea of separation is not so bad in. The other one the idea of as far as seems rather close, on behalf of, as far as? Can you get that from separation, Mn H?

~~AAMxxxx~~,

SH: No, I don't think it has anything to do with separation, and I doubt whether it has anything to do with in until.

AAM: Well, we'll say this then, they suggest the root ba'ad meaning, which is not otherwised evidenced, but the compare the Arabic ba'ada (?) to be remote, or distant. Now that doesn't prove there is such a root in Hebrew, but it suggests the possibility, and it being ide~~a~~ntical with an Arabic word in form, which means be remote, or distant, ~~xxx~~ it would suggest the possibility that a Hebrew preposition of separation could have that idea derived from a similar root, be remote, separation. An idea of something that closes you off from, and ~~m~~akes it impossible for the one to get at the other.

SH:.....9 3/4... fit with the idea of ~~away~~ from.....yes, would fit with the idea of about .....10.....

AAM: Yes, so that that would seem to be a good possibility for ~~xx~~ ...10.. Well, now, that doesn't seem to fit on behalf of at all, that seems to be a separate category...10~~xx~~.... It is pretty hard to see how to get on behalf of out of separate. Well, what are we going to get it out of? We seem to have on behalf of very definitely here. If we have on behalf of here, very definitely, what is it from? Well, can~~x~~ it be from a word meaning separate? Pretty hard to think it can. It must be from some other word. Well, another

word that occurs to us ~~is~~ is the possibility of two prepositions, in unto. Well, now, we might look up be, and look up 'ad, and see if there is any combination of meanings/<sup>which</sup>would seem to fit with on behalf of...ll... Now, if there is, if we think that that will make it, we say it is derived from that. If we don't think that will make it, well then we have to ~~posi~~ posit another root that is unknown to us.....ll..... There could be a root of which we have not cognate evidence entirely possible, and if you have nothing else to do you have to posit it.

WA: That only Lexicon I have is the one that Gesenius and ...ll $\frac{1}{2}$ .. he takes it as from the preposition be and 'ad. I didn't bring it with me, but he takes it.

AAM: Which Gesenius is that? Tregelles?

WA: Yes. Not Robinson. I'll bring it next time.

AAM: And this, of course, is an edition of Gesenius, but this is a later edition of Ges., and they have attempted to abandon that, having found this Arabic root ba'ada, they thought that was more like.

WA: Could it be a generalized preposition with the idea of with reference to.....l2....

AAM: Certainly

WA $\int$ : ....from the context, that would be the broadest idea that you could fit all these ideas into.

AAM: Oh, but can you fit all the ideas into that? With reference to? .....l2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ..... I wonder what Koehler does with it. I wonder where my Gesenius Buhl is. Here is Ges. Tregelles. That's the one you have? I have Ges. Buhl somewhere. It has a yellow cover.....l3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ... Tregelles does have it from ba'ad, not from two prepositions, but he says to be without, to be near, it seems $\int$  quite the opposite.

SH: The English ~~prep~~ preposition over and under.....l3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ....

AAM: It would all depend on the verb. You could say he superimposed it with reference to this, or you could say he superimposed it above it, and you could say he supposed, or what is the opposite of superimposed?

He did that with reference to it, but what I mean to say is if your place position is included in the verb, directly, or by implication, then a general word is quite sufficient, but if it isn't, then you seem to require more narrowing down. At least it is not instrumentality. It is not that, it is not by means of, and it is not in front of, or in back of.....end of 0 12

0 13

.....an idea, he ~~gxxxxx~~ gets the behalf of into the separate. He says the persons and things which protecting the ~~xxx~~ way to something which comes as a protection, protecting the way to something, therefore, ~~xxx~~ to pray for one. Oh, oh, but not here. Skin for skin will a man give for his soul. ....1 $\frac{1}{4}$ .....is that separation? Skin for skin.....1  $\frac{3}{4}$ ...Wilson (?) used to say the last thing you get in any language is prepositions, they are so idiomatic. You take our English "by." What on earth does our English "by/" mean? The house by the road. He was shot by a man. He was destroyed by fire. You wouldn't say he shot him by a revolver, he shot him with a revolver. The variation of meanings in our English prepositions is tremendous, and in the German.....2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ....doesn't correspond in the slightest bit. I was born to Calumet, instead of in Calumet. The German is zu. It is different. Our different meanings fall ~~xxx~~ together. But this one, skin for skin. Oh, skin on ~~xxxxx~~ behalf of. That isn't the idea. The idea of substitution .....3....Well, we don't seem to find anybody doing it ...3..... It must have been suggested some time, it is such a ~~xx~~ natural idea. But if they all feel that you have this ba'ada, and that that's a more natural thing, but it doesn't necessarily prove it is. You do have two prepositions together, I believe, otherwise. You certainly do in some Semitic languages. It seems to me you do in Hebrew. I don't think...3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ....

SH: This really isn't a preposition, is it?

AAM: Yes, but a great many prepositions are derived from substantives.

WA:.....4.....

AAM:.....I am inclined to take it that with the locusts there, and the food going, and the condition being reduced to a time of utter poverty here

in Joel 2:26, that if that ~~misery~~ had continued the people would be embarrassed forever. As long as they existed as a nation they would be embarrassed and in misery if they are a source amounting to anything in the world....4½...cut off by these locust destructions. And so they won't be embarrassed forever. That is, I would incline to put it with the embarrassed rather than with the not. Are we going to be embarrassed for ever? No, we won't be embarrassed forever. On the otherhand you see, you can take it I won't be embarrassed now, I won't be embarrassed any time ~~in~~ in the future. I don't think that's what this says. Won't be embarrassed in the future. I don't think it means that. I think it means we won't be embarrassed right along for a long while.

.....this particular thing is not going to be a perpetual state of ~~misery~~ misery....5¼.....

SH: In other words, this ~~just~~ relates to maybe the next fifty or a hundred years.

AAM: No, it stops it altogether. That is, the ~~misery~~ embarrassment from the locusts which is allowed to continue might be a matter for ten thousand years.

SH: So they will never be plagued with locusts again.

WA:.....5½....plagues will have an end, in other words. This plague is not eternal. This plague~~s~~ will have an end. This plague~~s~~ is not to be an eternal plague. This attack you have.

SH: But I thought the thing was already over, as far ....6....

AAM: Yes, it is, he is assuring them of it....6....promise for permanence~~s~~. You will~~s~~ eat in plenty, and be satisfied, and praise the name of the Lord your God, who has dealt wonderously with you. How has He dealt wonderously with you? Well, he has brought to an end and seemed to insure perpetual ....6¼..... You ~~lose~~ loose everything you have. There is no way you can possibly regain it. You are in a state of perpetual poverty. I bring your ~~perpetual~~ perpetual poverty to an end. That doesn't mean that you might not make another mistake and get yourself in the same

boat again. But it does say that this condition which was a condition of perpetual poverty is ended, and consequently that the Lord has worked wondrously with ~~in~~ you in bringing it to an end. That would seem to insure perpetual....6 3/4... Now, of course, the other meaning would be a possibility here. He says except that, yes, it would be a possibility, but that it would be something that would be new that we haven't yet ~~had~~ had. We have had no promises for the distant future as ~~yet~~ yet. We have been talking about the end of this situation, the Lord is going to restore that which ~~is~~ has now been lost, ~~the~~ the Lord is going to take an interest in His people, He is going to remedy their present situation, they will eat in plenty and be satisfied, and praise the name of the Lord who has dealt wondrously with them. And that would be a brand new idea ....7 1/2...., and the prosperity that you are now entering is going to last forever. Well, I think the same idea is that I am giving you this wonderful prosperity, and bringing to an end that which seems to make permanent ~~poor~~ poverty certain.....8....shall never be ashamed is going beyond anything that is here stated. It would be way of translating, or interpreting the verse, but I don't think it is necessary. I think this is equally possible. How does the Greek do with this, ~~you~~ do you know?.....8 1/2..... And what does the RSV do with it?.....8 1/2..... It doesn't say it will or won't here. Now, you might say that he saved a man from drowning, and the man didn't lose his life. Now that's not to say he may not fall in the water tomorrow. We will expect that he won't, but he doesn't say it. Here, this boy's not going to drown, he was rescued. So, if tomorrow he goes out and falls in again, .....8 3/4....., ~~is~~ of course, God could ~~xxx~~ ...9... if He chose, but I don't think He would choose it. Well, next Mr. A? . . .

AAM: God says I am giving you a material ~~xxx~~ deliverance. You are not to have ~~in~~ eternal poverty, you are rescued from it, and God is interested in people, in rescuing them from material things, but He is even more interested in the purpose for which He brought them into existence, to be His spiritual messengers. And while He is giving you this step forward materially

here, He is assuring you that the time is coming when He is going to give you a great step forward spiritually.

SH: And what reference does that have to them?

AAM: To them? Simply they know that God's favor continues with them.

SH: Well, can they take this verse and say this may not happen for five thousand~~s~~ years, but nevertheless it embodies a principle by which God can also deal with us in a lesser way? For instance, they might not have dreams, but in the ~~xxx~~ providence of God they might have guidance. And they might be enlightening<sup>ed</sup> their souls and yet not have ~~somethingxxx~~ such an outpouring of the Spirit as here. It seems that it would have to be something else, than that this is going to happen ~~then~~ ten thousand years from now. ~~xxxxxx~~ Because they would ask if they had any suspicion that it might be such a long time, well, so what. What does this mean to me? What do I care about this? ~~xxxxxx~~

AAM: It means that the nations~~s~~ which seems to be done for is not done for, but God has a glorious future for them.

WA: Could it be the idea even beyond this?.....lo $\frac{1}{2}$ .....

AAM: Yes, very good question, and I think we ought to look at the Englishman's and see if it throws any ~~ik~~ light on it. Of course, literally, the acher can be beyond in time, or in space.

SH: Could it be in mea~~s~~ure?

AAM: That's what I don't know. But I think we ought to see if there are any instances. Are there ~~are~~ a great many instances of the use of the word acher? If there are it might take a while looking to find if there are any, and on the other hand ~~if~~ there only are a few it might not be enough to prove that there weren't some like this.

.....perhaps suggests the possibility of it meaning in addition to this, beyond this sort of thing. Beyond such things, and in addition to such things, to these material blessings, there is wonderful spiritual blessing ahead for us. That is rather than cen (?ll 3/4.) indicating a place, or time, indicating a type, or a condition, that which we have just given. That's just a

thought that occurs to me. Of course, ~~ahcher~~ is to remain behind, delay, or tarry, and ahher is the hinder or following parts, of course, the idea here is acherith. He says, latter part, end, but I don't think so. I think it is that which follows. I think he is wrong on that. Now here, me-achere, from behind, after, it is position, very often. After that, now here is of time, of place behind, he says, and of time behind. Oh, acherey cen asher, afterwards when, cf. II Chron. Acherey cen, afterwards, Gen. 6:4. Oh. There are alot of them in Gen. Could you hand me the Englishman's? I think we could get those quickly there. Good, in Gen. 6:4, after that, doesn't mean time. After the naphalim were in the earth, it doesn't mean space, behind where they were, surely it means, after such things. Another sort of thing. In addition to that would be perfect there, for Gen. 6:4.....~~13~~<sup>13½</sup>.... seems to fit here, fairly well, doesn't it.

SH: But you wouldn't say it was fulfilled in that day, would you?

AAM: No, no, he continues his mercy with them in material ways, and even more than that in spiritual ways there is a great future. Well, we'll see you then next week?....end of 0 13

0 14

I hoped today in Minor Prophets that we'd spend a greater part of our time on v.4ff....<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>...., and then questions came up I thought were quite worthwhile, but we didn't get to where I thought we would start.....1.....

Yes, I know, that is based on that idea, that it has got to be a..., oh, you mean the LXX? Oh, that's good. that could be, ~~in~~ but that wouldn't prove as to which is correct. It would prove that the manuscript of the LXX had it so. It might have been. You see among the nations fits, doesn't it?.....<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>.....No, I think it means look among the nations. Yes, I would think that, because they weren't yet scattered. They were still in Jerusalem.

SH: What I meant was, is it addressed to heathen, or it is addressed to Gentiles?.....2.....

AAM:I think it was addressed to Jews. Of course, Paul was talking to Jews...2...., of course the same principle would apply to everyone, but it specifically applies to the Jews.....<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>.....and consequently

it is altogether possible that ~~the~~ it is possible the LXX saw ~~ga~~ bagad, instead of ....2½..... it could be.....2½.....

Oh, yes, the treacherous dealing ones. Act treacherously, and despise. We would have to get the exact shade of meaning. Those two could approach very closely, and they could be quite distinct.....3....., but that's what the LXX says, you despisers? Yes. Well, that would look like a change in the Hebrew, rather than in the ~~LXX~~ Greek. But it doesn't affect the thought of the passage. It fits perfectly, and is a good summary of what is in the previous three verses.

SH: ....could be a mistake.....and yet Paul doesn't base any ~~xxxxxxxif it is a mistake, it still~~ argument on it?

AAM: Paul bases ~~no~~ argument on it. If it is a mistake, it still presents the idea in the previous two verses, so that it is not a mistake which introduces error. It could be that. But it doesn't introduce any erroneous idea, and consequently there is ~~no~~ need of correcting it here. It is simply bringing out....3½....

AAM: No, that's not my recollect. Now, let's see that. That's Acts 13. That's not my recollection. Oh, Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you, which is spoken of in the prophet. You see?

SH: Oh, well that's only part of the verse.

AAM: Lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets. ~~That~~ The prophets said to the people of Judah, you are wicked despising ~~you~~ people, and God is going to bring the Chaldeans upon you. He says, beware lest that come upon you which came upon them.

SH: Well, does that indicate that Paul knew the LXX better than he knew the Hebrew? If so it would have been quite easy for .....4 3/4...

AAM: No, I don't think so, I think he was speaking to the people that were familiar with the LXX. And he didn't bother to change. I ~~think~~ think he knew the Hebrew well enough. I think that he ~~gt~~ figured...5.....Of course, it is not impossible that Luke might have been giving in Greek a talk that was given in Aramaic, might instead of translating the Aramaic word for word

have simply given the corresponding verse in the Greek translation they were familiar with, being the verse that Paul gave, and the variation not affecting the idea, it ~~exists~~ being impossible to give exactly the idea, to translate the Aramaic exactly into Greek anyway. The Aramaic might be slightly different from the Hebrew in a little different direction, and Luke might have simply quoted the verse that the readers of the Greek would be familiar with, in the place, the variation not affecting the thought at all that was present, but if anything, bringing out the thought better, because it summarized the thought of the previous three verses. That might be. I mean, we don't know.

SH: How come they ~~were~~ were more conversant with the LXX than they were with the Aramaic Scriptures?

AAM: I don't know whether they were or not, but Luke was written ....6...  
 ..... Well, now, what does the LXX say there?.....6½.....  
 Oh, well how about the ~~and perish~~ <sup>and perish</sup> ~~where does he get the~~ <sup>and perish</sup> ...6 3/4..  
 the N.T., does the LXX say, Behold ye despisers and wonder and perish? What does it say? In Acts 13:41 there that word, and perish, seems to be simply an addition, not in the LXX at all. I mean, not in the Hebrew at all. It is in the LXX, ~~and~~ .....7....., but what is your Greek N.T. word?

WA: Same word

AAM: Oh, the same word, banish, or perish. But that word is taken directly from the LXX, and it fits in with what's going to happen. He says, I am going to send the Chaldeans, you are going to perish. It is an introduction to what follows, but it is just not in the Hebrew. That's interesting, it is an addition, but I don't know how the LXX comes to get that addition. That would be an interesting ~~problem~~ problem regarding the LXX. I don't know whether in this particular class now you want to ~~take~~ take time on it. Mr. H. and I are working on similar passages at another time.....8....you mean that that's a pretty good explanation of how perish get's into the LXX? That you have this verb damah, ceases, cause to cease, cut off, or destroy? And ~~it~~ it seems to me that it is a very good ~~guess~~ guess that the LXX perhaps somebody

translated the LXX and took it for a, took the te for a de, maybe it was dictated, or by memory, so that you get the te and the de in sound confused, they don't look alike, but they sound alike, and so you get in mind the two ideas, wonder and perish, and then somebody else going over it notices that in the Hebrew it is wonder or wonder~~ing~~, and so ~~you~~ he inserts the word, a wondering, without noticing that you have already got that ~~is~~ word ~~misread~~ misread. He just notices that it is wonder and, and in the Hebrew is isn't wonder and, in the Hebrew it is wonder a wondering, so he just sticks in the word wonder, and that way you have got them both. I would ~~think~~ <sup>think</sup> that a very possible way in which that might have come into the LXX, from the confusion of the tamah, and the damah.

What verse are we in Joel? 3:2. Oh, that's interesting. Now you are getting into very interesting passages. All right, Mr. A, would you like to read us a bit there.

WA: And also.....9½...

AAM: Also here you say has a sense of ...9 3/4..., also upon menservants and maidservants. Even upon menservants. I would think so, yes. I think the German word also conveys that sense even pretty well. In English we don't usually use also in that sense. But, ~~it~~ there doesn't seem to be... it isn't just and. There's something more. They wouldn't say wegan, and also, it doesn't mean another one, because they haven't told us, so that it's ah...

WA:....., the context shows the great extent.....10½.....

AAM: Yes, I think that ~~is~~ probably the gan, or the German auch, would bring it out perfectly, but that in English our word also doesn't quite, and so perhaps even in English would get the idea across, that it is actually in the Hebrew, better than also. Very interesting point. Mr. Hayes next?

SH: These are all Jews, aren't they?

AAM: Which are Jews?

SH: All these people mentioned in v.1 and 2. upon whom the spirit has poured.....11....,

AAM: I think that the Jews are included in it, at least, but I don't

think it is necessarily ....11..... I don't think you could say it excludes the Jews, but whether~~y~~ you have to say it includes only Jews, I would question.

WA: Menservant, maidservants, and all flesh....11½....likely, he is showing the Jews that it is more than that, .....to the Jews he is speaking, but he is showing this outpouring idea upon all

SH: You mean the men servants and maidservants are not likely to be Jew?

AAM: Could be, I don't think you could be dogmatic about it. But you can say it includes Jews. I don't think you can say it only includes Jews. I don't think from this verse you can prove it does<sup>o'k</sup>, but I think perhaps it suggests it doesn't. All right, next...12....

This particular ~~xxx~~ verse I wouldn't be sure whether you would have to interpret it as an actual turning, or as an apparent turning, whether it means that the sun loses its light, and the moon appears like blood, or whether it actually means a change in those great heavenly bodies. I would incline to think of the one being the effect upon this earth would be just as likely ~~xx~~ as to mean an actual physical change in the sun and the moon.

WA: What I meant was a physical change from the viewpoint of the earth ....12½....

AAM: Yes, but it would seem to be, as I say, a definite physical change. That would certainly seem to me to be reasonable....13....

I am not sure here where malat, BDB says slip away, I am not sure that that is the basic meaning. The only thing that I can see that that is built upon is let me slip away to see my brethren, slip through or past into the house. I Sam. 20:29, II Sam. 4:6, but those are the only cases out of maybe 50 or 100 cases that seem to have that meaning. Of course, there is one that seems to be like that hiphil, to give birth to a male child, Is. 66:7, that's possible, but deliver, or be rescued, let escape, that is used in dozens of cases, but this slipping idea is comparatively infrequent. So whether you are justified in making it basic when it is so comparatively infrequent. At least, the other is so much more common, and would seem to me to be the one to be tried first, to be delivered, and to be rescued...14...Every one that

shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved, that seems to me a bad rendering here, ~~vasarivim~~ actually. I don't think you have to ~~say~~ say slip away. Because that is only used two or three times, and when there is only 2 or 3 I think we have a right to regard them with question. When we have 50 or 60 together.....14 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....it could very well be that you see this vasarivim<sup>7^</sup>, suppose you took it as levasarim, having a mem before it, instead of a daleth after it, you would have the regular piel participle, the preachers of the time....14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ..., but if you took it, let's see, without the piel before without the mem before, the form would have to have different vowels, but your daleth here makes it very definitely not this, as the Hebrew stands, but just the omitting the daleth, and you see the rivim, ~~vasarivim~~ daleth and resh are so often confused anyway, very interesting.....end of 0 14

0 15

.....~~vasarivim~~ easily see how the LXX gets that... $\frac{1}{2}$ ...., but which is correct, the thing is, that as the rendered it there, I think they rendered the beth twice, you see, among those to ~~whom~~ whom the tidings are preached, so the among ~~vasarivim~~ would seem to be rendered twice. That would suggest that the LXX there is a misunderstanding, a very easy misunderstanding to come...1... But I would incline to think that the Hebrew is probably correct....

In Jerusalem there will be a group of delivered people, as the Lord has said.

WA:....1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ...survivors, would be those whom the Lord has called.....

AAM: Yes, in the remnant, yes, now in the English translation it doesn't ~~seem~~ seem to make alot of sense, does it. And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call ~~on~~ upon the name of the Lord shall be delivered, that's fine so far, for in Zion, Mt. Zion, in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, according to the suggestion Keil makes which seems excellent there, shall be a delivered group, as the Lord has said, but then, and in the remnant, whom the Lord shall call. And in the remnant whom the Lord shall call. What does ~~mean~~ it mean?

WA: He puts the verb there, and in this group...

AAM: Yes, there shall be those whom the Lord will call. Yes, that seems quite sensible, doesn't it? Yes, and among this group, and in the remnant will be those whom the Lord will call.

~~AAM~~ Oh, in Mt. Zion will be deliverance, and in the remnant, will be whom the Lord shall call. That's quite reasonable. But I don't think any reader of the English Bible ever gets that idea. I wonder what ... $2\frac{1}{2}$ ....

That's very interesting, isn't it? And among those left will be those whom the Lord is calling.

WA:...in other words, you have physical deliverance in order to salvation ....3.....

AAM: Yes, it would seem so, wouldn't it? Before the .... $3\frac{1}{4}$ ..... In modern English we just say among the survivors, those whom the Lord will call, but perhaps in Old English whom along would ~~xxx~~ stand all right. ~~xxxx~~ ~~xx~~ Like who was it, they say, who steals my purse steals trash. .... $3\frac{1}{2}$ ..... somebody says that, who steals my purse steals trash. We wouldn't say that in Modern English. We would say, anyone who steals my purse steals trash. But that don't feel the need of an antecedent quite as much as we do. They are like the Hebrew, they can make the who stand for an antecedent. We can do that with whoever. ~~Who~~ Whoever steals my purse... And among the remnant, whoever the Lord shall call ~~xxxx~~ would be perfectly all right in English. But, among the remnant whom the Lord shall call, it just doesn't quite convey it in....4.... And they have got it correctly given there, that's good. They have got a lot of things correctly given in there, it is just a shame they had to spoil it with a lot of things that are incorrectly given. That's very interesting, isn't it, those who call on the name of the Lord shall be saved, and among the ones surviving will be those whom the Lord will call. It is calling both directions. That's very interesting. Yes. Those that love the Lord, who are the called, according to His purpose, and all they that are the called according to His purpose do call upon Him. It works both ways. That's excellent.

BDB here, pelāta, seems to be used of escape, or deliverance, in two cases. Gen. 45:7 and Jer. 25:35. Elsewhere he says probably always escaped remnant, those who have ~~ex~~ escaped. But that's pelāta, this is pelita. Now pelit, is an escaped one, or a fugitive. Oh, this is pelāta which is here, yes. Well, then, there are two instances where it is an escape, but in the most of the cases it is an escaped remnant. Well, that's an interesting passage.

.....brining again the captivity of Judah is absolutely certain, there is going to be a day and a time when it will happen, and those days, in that time it doesn't mean, the days and times necessarily just spoken of. Now I am basing that on the use of the phrase elsewhere, but I think there are many cases where it does not mean the one just spoken of. In some cases it may, but it looks to the future, rather than to the past, that is, it looks to what is about to be said, rather than to what has been said.

SH:....6....reason from the context above, the pouring out of the spirit..

AAM: ...the question is, to take the asher, in the days when I do this, that I will do so and so, the only question is whether in that case you would have the those, and that quite as positive as this. It doesn't seem quite to fit the feeling.....6½.....yes, behold that, and then again, I must ~~say~~ say there is something for that. Oh, now that's the way the KJ has it, the way you have it,...6½... In those days, and in that time when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem I will also gather. And I think there is alot to be said for it in that our English,will come to pass that, is an entirely different that from asher. Is asher ever used in that sense of that? Isn't asher definitely relative, when you say it will come to pass that, it is not a relative. So that looks very much like what you suggested just now. Very much like it. This is introductory to the next verse And that is the way the KJV takes it. It will come to pass in the days, in those days and in that time ~~when~~ which I bring again the captivity, it looks a little against it to have those and that quite as prominent, but after all, I think that is what asher ordinarily means. I don't think it ordinarily

result, like it has come to pass that. Behold that I will return, I don't think.....7½.....

WA: Asher is ~~an~~ awkward if you don't take it as a relative pronoun.

AAM: It is a most natural way to take it, as going with the days, introducing the next verse. Well, Mr. Hayes, have ~~xy~~ you a further question on this verse?..... Oh, you mean you would like to go on a little now. All right give us the next line.

SH: And I will gather all the nations....

AAM: I don't think there is any proof from the context whether this day of judgment is ~~whether~~ when the sun turns to darkness, and the moon to blood, or not. That is one thing predicted, this is another thing predicted, they might be the same time, they might be different. Well are those other things predicted, they might be the same time, they might be different.

SH: Well, are those ~~the~~ other things, the turning of the moon and so forth are they signs of judgments, or signs of something else? Do they have to be signs of the judgment?

AAM: I don't think necessarily signs of a judgment. They could be signs of God's power, or God's great mysterious acts. Perhaps judgment is the most natural thing, in connection with it, but not necessarily the only thing.

SH: It could be parallel to the pouring of the spirit, or something like that. ~~AAMxxxYes~~

AAM: Yes, I would think so. Now, it is ~~the~~ true that in, I was so surprised when I was in Germany, over herein America, we have a Thanksgiving day in the fall when we all eat ourselves sick, but in Germany I found that instead of a Thanksgiving day they had a repentance day, and in Germany when it came repentance day, why the sun ~~got~~ got so dark, and everything got so gloomy they had to turn on the street lights to see at noon, and the next spring the same way, everything was so dark and gloomy you could hardly see the sun, they had to have the street ~~light~~ lights on, and then Easter everything was bright and shining beautiful. It really fit, but it just struck me there, the darkness you speak of, the darkness didn't suggest judgment so much as

perhaps penitence, ~~perhaps~~ or perhaps a sense of the holiness of God. It could be used very well as darkness, but I am not sure it is necessary as that. That ....10....for a pillar is certainly interesting there, isn't it? A palm-like column. That's very interesting. Yes, a column of smoke...end of class..

....~~the thing that in Hebrews~~ the thing that in Hebrews that occasionally the adverbs have a special ending, but in most cases they are indistinguishable from the adjective or nouns. In English, ~~we~~ of course, we have separate words as a rule for adverbs, adjectives, and then we have an ending -ly that can be added to just about any adjective to make an adverb. But it is a distinction we have a job teaching children, to distinguish adverbs from adjectives, not one of the best recognized things in common parlance. I think we all recognize it pretty well, but I don't think it is one of the first things they learn....12½....

This use of gamul (?) as recompense is sort of, doesn't fit our present idea of it, at least here.....12 3/4....Ps. 94:2 there certainly would be retribution rather than reward. Reward then in the Old English maybe means simply a giving what is deserved. Well, it wouldn't mean that here. You Tyre and Sidon, do you think you will give God ~~what~~ what is deserved. He will return you what's deserved on your own head.

SH: Well, of course, if you take it as an action upon God's part first, and a reaction upon their part....looking for a sign, rather than explicitly stated.

AAM: Yes, but you mean in that case it would be definitely returning his deeds in this way.

SH: An action and a reaction more.... in order to make it recompense...

AAM: Yes, but how about in Psalms, forget not all his benefits. It isn't forget not all His rewards, all His recompenses.....13 3/4.... yes, forget not all his benefits. Recompense is very frequently used in a bad sense, like what the brothers did to Joseph, and while it is in a good sense like his benefits, yet it is used even more in a bad sense, and that

certainly would fit here. Do you think you are going to treat me this way? You are going to return all of my goodness to me? In this kind of action... end of 0 15.....

0 16

Asher is ~~using~~ mainly what they have done which ~~xxxx~~ he is going to return on his own head, so asher doesn't have to be considered an unusual use, because it is simply a relative to describe what the recompense is, or the recompenses. The retribution, the mistreatment of him, after all his good to them.

SH: It is still hard to say the asher in English.....1.....

AAM: Yes, it would seem to me it was a true relative. The difficulty in English is that our relatives usually come rather close to the antecedent. ....in English that makes it awkward, and we find that in a good many other languages, but in English it normally comes rather close to its antecedent. Or else the antecedent ~~it~~ is repeated. In other languages I think you do find it more ...1½...further away, like here. Very good. Next line? ....1 3/4... Misrayim is a true dual, Egypt, the two Egypts, upper and lower Egypts. But there is no two Jerusalems. Yerushalaim....2..., but actually it is written ayim, the dual. There are no two Jerusalems I know of. It would seem it is probably the way it was sounded originally. It is interesting you do have the two Jerusalems now, at least. All right then, the next? ....2½....in order that they might be far away from their territory in v.6, or so as to bring them far away. Is it result of ~~xxxx~~ purpose?

SH: Result.

AAM: Yes, so that. So that they are being taken far away from their territory. I think it is result, rather than necessarily specific purpose. All right, Mr. A?

...the same situation as we have before. I think the previous explanation would fit this one, wouldn't it? ....3..., the sons of Jerusalem is quite unusual. I don't recall....3..., but the sons of Judah as you say, is quite common. But I think it is the Jerusalemites, the Judeans, and the Jerusalemites.....3½...different peoples, ~~xxxxxx~~...3½....there were so many

peoples. Of course, we are getting more light all the time. There may be some ~~times~~ we'll never get light on, and other times, it is sometimes hard to put them together, because you have a word represented differently in different languages, and it is hard to be ~~sure~~ sure it is the same one you are speaking of. It is interesting how we have the word Georgian for people from ~~our~~ our state of Georgia, and the Georgian, Stalin was a Gev<sup>o</sup>gian. And it is the same term exactly. And there are many such. And then terms, sometimes the same term will change, as it is pronounced by people of different ~~languages~~ languages. They give it ~~in~~ in different ways, maybe the nearest they can get in their language. There are a lot of studies made on ~~it~~ these various things, but of course there is new light coming ~~on~~ on it, to overthrow a lot of the things...4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ..., and on the other hand it proves a lot of them true. But this Sheba here, what it is, it is exactly the same word as Sheba, of the queen of Sheba, except it has a Gentilic ending. Well, it could be the people from Sheba, or the people from that area, the desert...4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ... I have the impression it was used in Job. What is the word there, ~~Sheba~~ do you remember?.....4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ...it is the same word here exactly Sebians, as Sheba. Strange we render it ~~some~~ some times with an "s" and sometimes with a "shin" in English, isn't it? Sheba, and the Sebians? Of course, we do the same thing in our rendering of the Assyrian kings, we have Essar-haddon, Ashur-banipal, two ways of rendering the same God, Ashur. Well, we have it in the N.T., we have Elijah, and we have Elias, both in the NT. Such variations spring up fairly easily. I have a friend who was rather disgusted because when I made a trip through Germany and Czechoslovakia, to Budapest, one time with Dr. McCartney who was then pastor of the Arch St. church ~~here~~ here, and later became pastor of the First Church of Pittsburg, he came back, and he ~~wrote~~ wrote an article in the Presbyterian what he called, Crashing the Gates of Europe. And he was amused at the fact that the Germans could seem to figure my name, because it has a "c" followed by an "r." In German the "c" is always followed by a "k" at the end of a syllable, and I would always write MacRae, and they would write MacRal, or something, I mean, MacKal. Well, he didn't catch the "l" part, and he called me McKay, and in the beginning of his article he says

MacKay, as MacRae was called by all the Germans in Czecho..., and ~~xxxxxxx~~ then it struck him as so cute, the way they would all call me MacKay instead of MacRae, that all the rest of long article he must have referred to me 40 times, and every time I was MacKay, instead of MacRae. And this friend of mine was quite put out about it, and people won't realize it is you at all. ~~Th~~ But he explained it at the beginning of the article. But that's the way names can change.....6½.....Yes, that's very easy to happen, dissimilatbn.

.....three or four instances where qadash in the piel, and I only looked at ~~th~~ the piel imperative, you notice, oh, yes, here we are in the preterite, Micah 3:5, they even prepare war against him. Cursed are they that say peace, peace, but he that ~~putteth~~ putteth not into their mouths, they even prepare against him, and it is qadash again. Now, how can that mean sanctified.

WA: Well, it is ~~easy~~ easy to see how they got it from sanctified and ...7¼... because you can have all kinds of religious ceremonies to go through in order to prepare their armies for war.

AAM: It must be a word meaning to sanctify or consecrate in most cases, and that is its nearly almost invariable meaning, but in connecti<sup>c</sup>n with war it has derived the meaning of ~~perpare~~ prepare from the fact of the amount of religious ~~ceremonies~~ ceremonies with ~~which~~ which it was connected, in preparation for war. That's very interesting.

SH: Do you prefer that view to taking the view that it originally meant just to set apart, period, and then it became a rather technical term?

AAM: I don't think it ever means to set apart to anything except to God. I don't think that ~~David~~ David would set apart taxes that people gave him.

SH: Oh, you mean even in these references that ~~he~~ ~~and~~ read here, it still means prepare for God.

AAM: No, I think that in the cases with war it would seem to me that it means that ordinarily there were religious functions connected with war. And that consequently they came to say, prepare war, ~~and~~ they came to say sanctify war, because that was the way they did it. I would incline to think that it is a derived meaning...8½...in which the original meaning is actually forgotten.

You might say like in our last war, the everybody who was making ~~mix~~ munitions to kill~~e~~ the enemy, or who was making planes to drop bombs on the enemy, that he was in defense work. Not one of them ~~sax~~ said they were in war work, they were ~~ixn~~ in defense work. But on the other hand, the people who were making bandages to help those who were injured, none of them were in defense work, they were in war work. That's the way that defense and war have gotten exactly opposite meanings haven't they there, to what they are. And yet it was common to use, and so common~~g~~ that most people thought nothing of it~~/~~. I doubt if many people thought how ludicrous it was to say if they made ~~gand~~ bandages they were doing war work, if they ~~mxhx~~ made bombs they were doing defense work. And here qadash, it is easy to see how it could derive from it. I have heard, I don't know whether it is true, but I have heard that ~~te~~ word candidate means dressed in white. I have heard that in the Roman forum the people that were running for office would put on a special white clothes, so they would call them dressed in white, and therefore they would call them candid~~ates~~. I wonder. I don't know. I have never looked it up, but I have heard that statement, that candidates meant dressed in white. But it is the way we get terms. They get a meaning. The original meaning is lost, often, as it develops directly into something to~~w~~ which it came to be used. And that must be what this is, because these particular wars here they are preparing for, there is nothing holy about them. They are unholy wars. Very definitely...10 $\frac{1}{2}$ ..., that's the~~y~~ very interesting thing about them.

SH:.....telling them to carry out their religions functions...10 3/4...

AAM: No, it is just the term used. Well, for that matter~~/~~, in the O.T. you know, you have the term flesh used to mean cursed? They say, bless God and die? And he says he blessed me, by killing these people It is very definitely an ironic term. They didn't like to say curse, though~~/~~ they meant curse, so they said bless. And there are quite a few cases like that where a word comes to mean the opposite, by a derived meanin~~g~~, but it gets to be known. I~~/~~ think the English, the modern use of terrific is that way. I was shocked a ~~sax~~ couple of years ago when I suggested a subject I would speak on, at a

metting, and the fellow ~~was~~ said, that would be terrific. I thought ~~he~~ meant that would be frightful. It has nothing in the world to do with ~~terrify~~.

End of class.....11....end of 0 16

0 17

.....you mean sanctify in an actual sense here, but that it has come....Oh, yes, it could be a real sanctifying, but it is the derived sense, and it is very easy to see how a word could get derived. Of course, that's one thing that makes exegesis of anything complicated, are these derived senses that often we don't have proof of. And we find that in reading English that we know...1.. And here as you say it is in opposition to the Lord, and it must either be a heathen deity, or just a general term...1 $\frac{1}{4}$ ... I notice here in the version of the KJ I have here it says prepare war~~s~~, and there is a marginal note that suggests santtified. It doesn't add anything to clarify it, does it? One really would need a note on that, wouldn't you think, in the Bible?...1 $\frac{1}{2}$ .... of course, ~~it~~ would probably just be derived from~~s~~ the ceremony. It would be a little hard to see how the separation I guess could be in here, but that would be in the original. It is certainly not a holy word. Well, of course, an Israelite today ~~my~~ might say to the Arabs proclaim a holy war. Go ahead and proclaim a holy war. If it wasn't for the tanks, and plain directions we are giving you, you wouldn't get any place. Well, shall we go on...

That's kind of ironic, isn't it, for the weak one to say I am a hero?

WA: It isn't so much ironic, as it is the idea of everybody being stirred up for the war....2 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....every one, even the weak ones of the army ~~are~~ are going out and acting like a hero...2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ...

AAM: Build up your morale to the point where everybody is full of confidence. Next verse?

WA:.....3.....all the surrounding nations rise up and come in, and ~~gather~~ gather together there, and let your mighty ones come down .....3 $\frac{1}{4}$ .....That's a very difficult verse, in alot of ways....3 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....and this last phrase was a puzzle to me for a long time, and that's the only way I know to make good sense ~~out of it~~ out of it, let thy mighty ones come down...

AAM: Yes, it seems.....4.....of course, in Hebrew yarad is the ordinary word to come down. But in Aramaic nacha? is the ordinary word, to come down. And this is doubtless a related root, used occasionally, just like in Ps. 2 you have got bar used ~~ben~~ for son, which is the Aramaic word, instead of ben, the Hebrew word, but the two ~~people~~ people are so near they would easily take over lone words ~~from~~ from one another, particularly when the two languages are so closely related anyway. So that you would expect the common roots, even if the language specializes on either one, the other one might occasionally fit.....5.....Yes, and your hiphil here, you have the pathah on account of the guttural, don't you? Yes, the more usual would be hanchith, wouldn't it?.....5..... Of course, cause to descend, you said in Hebrew bow down.... more common....yes, prostrate here might even fit. It doesn't seem as if it is ready to call on the Lord to destroy them, overthrow them. It doesn't seem in place, because that would be jumping ahead in thought more. Of course, the word seems sort of place here. If it was nations bringing down the mighty ones. That would be quite natural, but we have just been told for them go go up, and yet that doesn't matter, go up and go down. Being ready and starting out, it could be either one. Both can be possible.....6..... ~~them~~ bring down the mighty ones, Oh, Lord, that's a very strange thing. I really don't know what suggestions have been made upon it. But of course, it could be that he is recognizing the Lord's working in all this, causing the wrath of men to ~~praise~~ praise Him. But there is not much introduction to it, to indicate it. Well, ~~what~~ shall ~~we~~ we go on then?.....6½....

....judge in the sense of making a decision, or judge in the sense of pouring out of punishment.

WA: It looks back to v.2, ....going to do justice with them, because .....7....., the punishment upon them because of them....7...his people.

AAM: Yes, it ~~is~~ more bring justice or punishment here, than it is actually solve the case. I think that is more the meaning of shaphat, ~~is~~ anyway, as a rule, the common one. Next.....7½....note how often shaphat means to decide a case, and how often it means punish.....to take that in this v.13 as perfect

or as imperative. The vats overflow, or make the vats overflow. It is just a matter of context, though, isn't it? And he says, do this because the pasture is full, because the vats overflow, seems the logical thing there, doesn't it, because their work in this is great. It all seems to fit together. And yet, get you down where the press is full. Make the vats overflow, where the wickedness is great.

WA: It depends on which you want to make parallel to which. If ~~you~~ you want to ~~make~~ make the two parallel statements as imperative, or if you want to make it the vats are full.....and the vats overflow, if you want to make that parallel.

AAM: Yes, that would make a much more ~~symmetrical~~ symmetrical verse. Put in the cycle, for the harvest is ripe, come get you down for the press is full. Make the vats overflow, for the wickedness is great

WA:.....9.....do something because.....

AAM: Yes, that would seem much more reasonable to, if all three were reason for it, to have four just with the first, and not with any of them, or to have it with the first, second, and third, or with the first and third, and not with the second, doesn't seem at all natural, so that it does make it strange.....9½.....well, it should be there in any case. But maybe there should be another one. They didn't put any here. And of course, the fact that they pointed it with the perfect, they couldn't make it anywhere else. Pointing it with the perfect, the first half of the verse....9½...there, and the last half here. But if you took it as the other way it would have to be three parallels instead of two. I don't see why you shouldn't have three parallels. Well, anyway they pointed it perfect, either way is possible. It doesn't make an awful lot of difference to sense. Of course, for him to make the vats overflow, that would be a new figure which we haven't had before. The vats are overflowing is quite a natural conclusion to the press is full. But, he should go down, he should put in the cycle, he should make the vats overflow is not at all impossible, but I just don't see a clear parallel to it.

Yes, send forth the cycle, make the vats overflow.....10½.....of course,

make the vats overflow, for their wickedness is great. That's taking the figure and combining it with the literal, isn't it? It would be a little more natural to say, Get you down for their wickedness is great, make the vats overflow for the press is full. You are sort of combining the two literal and the two figurative. I mean, one of each together. Yes, that's an interesting problem. I doubt if we can get much light on it though. You say the LXX takes it though as this way, well that doesn't prove a great deal.. At least it shows that it ~~looked~~ looked natural to that translator, it would seem to show that, yes, well, then, then next?

WA: Multitude...11 $\frac{1}{2}$ ...multitudes in the valley of decision.....11 $\frac{1}{2}$ ...

AAM: Confused multitudes, confused multitudes, confused multitudes, not a well organized ~~army~~ army, but confused multitudes...11 3/4... valley of judgment, and valley of decision because the day of the Lord is near. Now, what is this word, decision? .....12....had above with shaphat, I was wondering whether it was deciding a case, or punishment, of the guilty. It is the punishing here, not the deciding.....12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ...valley of decision, then decision doesn't seem like a very good translation if it is....oh, here, this edition of the KJ that I have here, not a very common edition of it, yet the translation it standard, but it has notes, and the note says / or concision, or threshing Well, threshing is clear, but I don't think concision means anything today. We have in the N.T., "Beware of the concision" for circumcision there. Here, or concision, or threshing. But at least it doesn't mean deciding. It is deciding in the sense of making clear the verdict, not of making the verdict. So decision isn't a very good translation here.....13....this word carath that they give here in Young's both are making judgment. Now, I shouldn't say that. It gives these two instances that we have here, but it gives them as, it says, decision, determination, which suggests that it is making a decision, but not necessarily. But then, the one right above it, to decide, carath, is I K 20:40, So shall thy judgment be, thyself hast decided it, ....13 3/4.. that's the case where the man says to the king, the prophet tells the king that somebody escaped out of his hands, and the king says, he says,

You must pay a talent of silver, or your life....14..., and the king says, that's the judgment you've decided on. And we usually think it means, you have weighed it out, but maybe in the light of this it means, you have shown what the punishment should be. I wonder. I'll see how carath is done elsewhere. Carath, Young says bestir self, 1, decide 1, decree 1, determine 1, name 1, move 1. Niphal participial, determine 5. Determine here, to be determined, niphal part, Isa. 10:23, shall make a consumption, even determined, upon the whole earth. Dan.9, the end of the war desolations are determined. It is decreed, it is not weighed out, decided.....end of 0 17

0 18

It would seem as if valley of judgment is the more correct idea here, and of course, decision can be judgment. That's where the decision ~~will be~~ will be made, meaning that's where we are going to win the victory, the valley of decision, but if we think of valley of decision, we are more apt to think valley of careful consideration. I ~~guess~~ guess in the context the other is certainly the right idea. This is the place where God shows His victory, the valley of decision. That's very interesting....

It certainly is strange in v.16 to take those two as verbs because they both have the mem before, unless you take them as ~~participle~~ a participle, yes, that might be....~~ix8/4xxxx~~ 1<sup>1</sup>.....Yes, the first could be a participle, couldn't it? If you think of it as hiphil, it would be a me.?.....1 3/4... I don't know any other stems it could be. This would seem to be a case where the LXX ~~xxxxxx~~ does not seem to be a good translation of the Hebrew, as it stands, and it is rather hard to think that had a Hebrew Before them with the mem missing, doesn't it? Rather strange. The difficulty with ~~mayim~~ <sup>Nahum</sup> (?) is this, that particular verse is a real problem verse, and the reason for it is that it is evidently a little corrupt, and when you, and we have found in Assyrian literature, the phrase which fits so excellently, and of course this is talking about Assyrians, the ~~destruction~~ destruction of Ninevah, the putting that idea, that Assyrian phrase in, that gives you a perfect sense in the verse which otherwise is just about impossible to interpret. Well, Now, I have no knowledge of other similar things in ~~mayim~~ <sup>Nahum</sup> (?) but if there are, it would

take a study of Assyriology to find it. Yes, well ~~ye~~ that's the reason I wouldn't think that was necessarily a proof. The rest of Nahum is somewhat like ~~that~~ the latter part of Joel, just about destruction ~~about~~ going out ...etc., there are not a great many particularly interesting things as far as I recall. It might be that when one would get into it a ways they would find it very interesting. But that one verse is extremely interesting. We well touch on that....end of class

Ø 16

(12 $\frac{1}{2}$ f)

The most common type of noun that has a mem preface, is the noun of place or instrument, but many scholars assume that it always must be place or instrument, and I think they are wrong in that. I think that some cases don't fit it. But those are the most common, place and instrument, these are very common. All right, Mr. Haryes?

....13..... you can't really translate exactly into English. I think, "shall not continue to," is perhaps as good an idiom .....13 $\frac{1}{4}$ ....., shall not continue to enter, pass over into it. And this doesn't certainly here mean pass away, that's very clear here. This would fit with the translation of ....13 $\frac{1}{2}$ .... that it will go through, rather than the idea that the nation will pass away. ....

That's the interesting thing about these genitives isn't it? Because of the violence (?) of the sons of Judah who have poured out blood in their land. .... Huh! There wouldn't seem to be any reason for making Egypt and Edom desolate, that Judah had been violent, unless God was going to let these violent people go ahead and conquer Egypt....14..... But it seems more likely that it is the violence shown toward them, rather than the violence exerted by them. You know, you can have a subjective genitive, an objective genitive, or a possessive genitive. There is quite a variety among those, pretty much left to context to decide that particular question, what kind of a genitive ....14 $\frac{1}{2}$ .....end of class.....end of Ø 16