

used that word. I would have used dynamic, rather than ingressive.

~~AAM~~ WA: Well, dynamic. I can see that....5....something as your result of a process....but not describe the ~~perce~~ process.

AAM: You mean they don't all describe the process. Certainly some of them do.

WA: Well, I would say they describe the result rather than the process.

AAM: When God says Let there be light, you mean He is describing the result of a process, and implying a process, rather than<sup>to</sup> to describe the process?

WA: Well, he is saying, Let there ~~be~~ be light.

AAM: Yes, that means, let ~~light~~ light come into being, doesn't it? Well that's ingressive, definitely there~~d~~, isn't. Let this area which is without light become an area in which there is light.

WA: I don't quite see the idea~~d~~ of ingressive. It is a change. It has to be a change.

~~WA~~ AAM: Well, doesn't~~t~~ ingressive mean anything more than change?

WA: Well, I guess not.....

AAM: ...any case where there is a perfect, in Genesis, at least, that I would say ~~is~~ is stative. It is used, I believe, in Abraham had become an old man. Now that's ingressive. Some will translate it, And Abraham was an old man. But what it is doing is showing that a change has taken place between the previous chapter and this chapter. Abraham has now become an old man, and certain things happen. It is always showing a change from one phase to another phase. It is never simply describing the existence of a thing. Now, in late Hebrew, like in Chronicles, that may be a derived meaning, to come to mean so just a state, having been used to show a process of change into a state, it may then come to be used simply to show the result of a process. But it is my impression that in the overwhelming majority of cases where it is used, in fact I would say in practically all of them, except for very late Hebrew, that it shows a process rather than a statement, or it shows a process....the result, but there is always a process involved