

all that has to be done by the waters that come down. It starts the process and it can't return to heaven until this process has been fairly started. Now, this process may be interrupted before it is completed, it may be interrupted by a big storm that wrecks the whole thing, a big fire, many things could happen. There may be no seed there. There may ...but the water has a definite part to play, the rain will come down. That part they have to play before they return to heaven. They don't come down and then go up again. And their purpose in coming is not accomplished, but their purpose, as far as the analogy is concerned is to start a process. And then you take and see the process so that all these wonderful results follow following the coming of the rain ...and I would be inclined to think that all the waw conversives could and so that it will give seed to the sower and bread to the eater--seed to the one who is going to sow and bread to the one who is going to eat. That would express the way that it is going. the conjunctive has the idea of co-ordination. The conversive has the idea--Robert Dick Wilson, used to be very indignant when people called this the Waw --it is a conversive. It changes perfect to the imperfect--imperfect to the perfect. Now, whether it represents something following after the other --that is a matter of argument today. But the fact that no one can argue that it changes the imperfect to imperfect, and the perfect to imperfect ...and therefore he preferred to stick to the old terms ..If you take Driver's book on Hebrew tenses. The early editions always said Waw conversive. The later editions changed it to Waw consecutive (was waw following). the Waw that introduces something that follows. This is the term today that most grammars use. Well, I am inclined to say that actually consecutive isn't bad, because while it may be used in some cases where they want consecutive idea.