

have to be a separate sentence. However, we do not feel there is any reason why the presence of the shewa makes either possible. It does not prove one or the other. It is strange that the critics who would ~~set~~ <sup>throw</sup> aside all ~~vowel points~~ vowel points without hesitation at dozens of places as they have done in their ~~translation~~ translation of the Revised Standard Version without even a footnote to say that they ~~have~~ have abandoned the vowel points which they do not consider as carrying authority. ~~that they would~~ Yet, they would place so much stress on a particular vowel point to insist that this is a necessary interpretation of this verse. ~~When we find~~ <sup>When we find</sup> that all ancient versions took it as a separate sentence, it surely proves that we are justified in taking it that way ourselves, that is equally possible from the Hebrew syntax. Even as it stands, and of course we admit that there is always a possibility of an error in the preservation of the ~~vowel points~~ <sup>were handed down</sup> which ~~would be handed down by~~ on the words of the mouth by the word of mouth in to the fifth ~~century~~ <sup>century</sup> A.D., and not written down at that time. <sup>if</sup> But there should be an error involved ~~if~~ here, it seems that it would make it definite that it is a separate sentence, and would rule out the possibility of its being an introductory ~~clause~~ clause.

Now, just what does this first verse mean? The second verse speaks about the earth. There is no question ~~that~~ that it is this earth of which it is speaking. Then it goes on, after the second verse, in the fifth verse we read that God created the firmament and this firmament He called the heaven, and thus we have the ~~word~~ word heaven, in the third verse it is used for

something ~~which~~ <sup>which</sup> God, in the fourth verse for ~~something~~ <sup>something</sup> which God created on the second day, something which surrounded ~~this~~ <sup>this</sup> earth. <sup>1st</sup> Yet, the word already occurs in the ~~verse~~ <sup>verse</sup>. Unless the first ~~verse~~ <sup>verse</sup> is the summary/ <sup>assume</sup> of the whole of what follows, it would ~~be logical that~~ <sup>be logical that</sup> logically that this is not