

modern, an adjective can be used as a noun, and a form of the adjective will determine whether it is singular or plural. Thus in Germany if a ~~smz~~ man with light hair and a man with dark hair came into the room, and I said, "The blond man is a friend of mine" the German would simply say "the blond" and the use of the singular masculine ending would indicate ~~x~~ that an individual man was involved. In modern English phrases like "the quick and the dead", "the good and the bad", etc. generally convey a plural idea. Yet the use of the term "the wicked" suggests a large group. The Hebrew is simply the plural form of the adjective "wicked" and would be best translated "with wicked men" since it obviously refers to human beings. There is no article used here in the Heb. nor in the next phrase in the verse.

The next phrase in ordinary English in most translations use a completely archaic English form. We do not say "the rich" meaning a rich man. If you pointed to two men and said something about one of them, you would not say, "Do you mean the tall or the short?" phrases might conceivably be used to represent a large number of tall men and a large number of short as he separated the tall from the short, but it would never be used in modern English of an individual. The Hebrew has no article anyway, but the word rich is in the singular, and a precise English rendering would be "with a rich man." Thus when the verse is translated precisely ~~it~~ it exactly corresponds to what happened in the case of Christ. His grave was assigned with wicked men, but He was with a rich man in His death.

^{Two} ~~Two~~ more points need to be mentioned. The/word translated "and" in English is a rather broad conjunction which is often translated "but" Here the contrast between wicked and one who expected to be treated like an ordinary malefactor but instead is buried in a rich man's tomb~~x~~ should be brought out by