

about the theory? I think that would be valuable. Of course, these theories as I understand it, are not so much a matter of a theory, as to how it is to be interpreted, as they are a theory as to how it came into existence. And at that point, ~~my~~ I personally am not quite so certain as a lot of people are that we can be sure that a lot of things came into existence. We find things, and very often we can see how one thing developed out of something else, but when you come to, I have heard Dr. Speiser spend hours telling how the hiphil began, and how the piel began, and he works up theories, and they are very interesting, and they may be true, but nobody every has any evidence that cases like that ever developed. So that it is theorizing more or less in a vacuum. And his theories are very excellent, but to me what I am most interested in is what do we have, rather than how does somebody guess it may have come, because it may have come an entirely different way, or God may simply have created it that way. But of course the interesting thing in this waw conversive business here is that it is a ~~development~~ development which is pretty much confined to Hebrew. There are many things in Hebrew which you will find in all the semitic languages, and there are some things in Hebrew you find in Babylonian, and some things you find in Hebrew you find in Arabic. But here is something which is not found to any extent at least in any of the other Semitic languages, and that makes it seem to be unique to Hebrew, as if there probably is a special source from which it came, some historical development, or some influence of some other nation, or something like that, but if it is a common source, and easily explained source from which it came, not the result of relationships with foreign nations, one might wonder why is it in Hebrew, and not in Aramaic? and not in Arabic?

WA: Arabic has a waw, doesn't it? At least that's.....4 3/4..., but this article lists the arabic waw as a sentence adverb, and gives....5... circumstantial clauses....5.....

AAM: But what I mean is, the what used to be called the waw conversive. Dr. Robert Dick Wilson was very insistent on keeping the conversive, tho most scholars had changed it ~~to~~ to ~~consecutive~~ consecutive, but a waw which has the