

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 ... $\frac{1}{2}$ .....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