easy tax passage in grammar from usuig-the-using the strictly literal object in to the object of something related. It is very difficult to make a negative rule. I say that this could not be given as a ... if the context requires that this be ... but the context does not prove...and so this would not be a proof ... y we would say that we would normally say thatthe assurance thatyou can't tell that at a game glance. But I have found this , if you look at almost any Hebrew grammar, -including the g biggest and fulgelest, they would say that the **B** Hithpael-weuld be-such-as - is reflexive and reciprocal. I have looked at every Hithpael in the O.T. and I have found only we two words x that are used as reciprocal and I have found...so in that particular case ... now, in this case I am not ready to say ... but nok grammar will settle a matter like x this, and I would think that so for the present I would say that if we look at the verse, and as we look at the first two words we would say that He gave with wicked people, or He gave wicked people that ... against it being a sign of the object, we would had the fact that in both cases, box perhaps all, it is the ... so there is a definite evidence but not a conclusive evidencex of this not being the object. Wh the r...we can say more likely with the people, but we are not ready to make a true judgment untile we look a little further, and what is the next oxword, Miss Pickett.

... 73_

...as I say, I hope that one of you will come up with a better explanation...but then it goes in a very queer...and with a rich man...and then you hae hae thehave the word...either in or by...and then ...but this w has a pluar plural ending, and with the rivh rich man in his death. Now, the and could be very well taken ///...and this would mean that if it were so workked out ...that was what was expected, but in his grave was with the rich man, and that of course is examctly