

word that occurs to us ~~is~~ is the possibility of two prepositions, in unto. Well, now, we might look up be, and look up 'ad, and see if there is any combination of meanings/<sup>which</sup>would seem to fit with on behalf of...ll... Now, if there is, if we think that that will make it, we say it is derived from that. If we don't think that will make it, well then we have to ~~posi~~ posit another root that is unknown to us.....ll..... There could be a root of which we have not cognate evidence entirely possible, and if you have nothing else to do you have to posit it.

WA: That only Lexicon I have is the one that Gesenius and ...ll $\frac{1}{2}$ .. he takes it as from the preposition be and 'ad. I didn't bring it with me, but he takes it.

AAM: Which Gesenius is that? Tregelles?

WA: Yes. Not Robinson. I'll bring it next time.

AAM: And this, of course, is an edition of Gesenius, but this is a later edition of Ges., and they have attempted to abandon that, having found this Arabic root ba'ada, they thought that was more like.

WA: Could it be a generalized preposition with the idea of with reference to.....l2....

AAM: Certainly

WA $\int$ : ....from the context, that would be the broadest idea that you could fit all these ideas into.

AAM: Oh, but can you fit all the ideas into that? With reference to? .....l2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ..... I wonder what Koehler does with it. I wonder where my Gesenius Buhl is. Here is Ges. Tregelles. That's the one you have? I have Ges. Buhl somewhere. It has a yellow cover.....l3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ... Tregelles does have it from ba'ad, not from two prepositions, but he says to be without, to be near, it seems $\int$  quite the opposite.

SH: The English ~~prep~~ preposition over and under.....l3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ....

AAM: It would all depend on the verb. You could say he superimposed it with reference to this, or you could say he superimposed it above it, and you could say he supposed, or what is the opposite of superimposed?