

little by little. There are no two of us who speak exactly the same language. We have little differences in our understanding of words and expressions and gradually there are changes we take over from each other all the time and gradually the whole usage is given up for a new usage & succeeds in penetrating its way through a whole group of people, and today if you say "He made His grave with wicked, it wouldn't make any sense--that plural ending--you've got to get some way of doing it. Now, the way we would do it today, we would say with wicked people--with wicked ones. But in the old English with the wicked seemed to them less than a change than to say with wicked ones or with wicked people, and they felt it was getting the & idea across. Now in our English the wicked suggests an idea of all the wicked, and there is no idea of all inherit--it's the few. There is no reason ~~k~~ _____ to think it was all. Say you put the wicked over ~~h~~ here and the righteous here--well, you must mean that all of those who were involved in a certain group were wicked people here - right. & YOU couldn't put two people here and two here and say these are the wicked, these are righteous. Out of this group. It's the whole of something that is thought of as a definite group. And so they put in the the, and I don't think it is our idiom today. (Mr. Gregory). Like the rich. He made his grave with the rich. I could be with a rich man, but it seems to be a class rather than an individual in mind, so that the the in English gets that idea of a class into it. IN Psalm One it is just, in the way of sinners. It's not the way of the sinners. (Mr. Gregory). I think that would be quite reasonable. That is to say, it would be possible that what he means is that you get with a group of people who are foreigners (?). Here is another thing that is done by a group of people who are wicked people.