niphal is used. Now, that's just another poassibility. Those are two pos-
sibilities in the study of forms, the study of grammar, etther of which I
would think would be quite interesting. Then there is this textual comparis-
on 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
BBble, 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 ...12½..
of all things, and it doesn't seem to make any sense.

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

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

AAM: Mingling, yes. And here?

SH: I think it is translated in the KJ as enfolding (?13) itxnxt 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 akrt 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 axxxxtxxxxxxxxxf combination of reflexive idea, and
the frequentative. Fire taking hold of itself.