he meant hayah le rather than hayah, but actually my personal Mopinion is that the word hayah means to become, and a study of Genesis 1 seems to me to prove that, but that the le with it is like the in, when you say he walked in the room, or he entered, yes. Now,.... $2\frac{1}{2}$he walked in the room, he walked into the room. Or you might even zink make it somewhat like the eth, the xixxx sign of the accusative. It is not necessary. It makes it more precise, but you aan have exactly the same meaning without it. That is, I looked insixit into it fairly thoroughly, but it was fifteen mears ago, maybe twenty years ago, I don't have it right at my fingertipe, everything I looked at, but my very definite impression was, that my mp impression now of what I found then was very definite that I found instances where the meaning become without a le was absolutely certain, I mean, instances which were absoltuely identical to the casew with the le. And so I feel that it is something which can naturally be put in, it is involveng the idea, but it is not necessary ... Well, now, that is a recollection without the evidences right before me, and on further study of it somebody might possibly lead to change it. But I don't think so, because I believe I looked into at a fair amount at that time.

WA:....\$.4....

AAM: No, I think you can definitely say it is not...4..., because if you take Genesis/1. Did I mention this time/?....4..... Well, you noted that every one of those where the hayah is used in Gen. 1 leaving v.2 out of consideration, which is the subject of discussion, every one of them is ingressive. I don't remember a single one that was stateve, and there are just about as many more cases where the copula is used in English where it is stative whereaxtherexis, but in no one of them in Gen. 1 is the xx word hayah used. Now, I don't say that hayah cannot be used statively occasionally, but I would say that it is a later development somwhere, it is a derived meaning, the stative, that it is originally always ingressive. That is my very strong feelling on it, as a result of the evidence.

WA: ingressive.

AAM: Well, it depends on what you mean by ingressive. I wouldn't have