

quality of changing perfect into imperfect, or imperfect into perfect. Now some today say it doesn't change, but ~~that~~ the fact of the matter is that the waw with the imperfect is translated pretty much the same as the perfect would be without. And a waw with the perfect is translated pretty much the same, so if you don't say exactly, at least it is ~~enough~~ enough in that direction to constitute a phenomenon for which I know of no extensive parallel in any one of the other three ....5 3/4...

WA: These where the waw is used as a sentence adverb changes the sense of the verb and the sense of the sentence....6... they consider that as a parallel, but it is prefixed to the verb, as a sentence adverb, and changes the sense, not necessarily the time, modifies the whole ~~sentence~~ sentence in other words. The sentence without the waw would have a different meaning, than if you put the waw on that.

AAM: Is that common in Arabic?

WA: Well, he lists these five ways as used, and gives an example of each one.

AAM: In Arabic. Well, now, that would be very interesting to check into how common they are.....6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ... but of course, Arabic syntax is one of the most involved and extensive things in the world. You can find most anything in ~~it~~ it somewhere. But I believe I have Wright's Arabic Grammar, two big volumes, which is quite extensive. One could get a pretty good idea on a problem.

WA: I would like to take up the waw conjunctive or the waw cons., or I would like to study the niphal, either one.

AAM: Yes, I see, you feel you would rather do that than take a passage, and take everything as we come to it?

WA: That would be all right.

AAM: I see, in other words, you don't care which it is.

WA: Why no, I'll learn more Hebrew that way.

SHZ: ~~Why~~ What do you mean, to take a passage? These subjects you have mentioned here?