

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?