

of our ~~xx~~ and ancient documents have a line in or indications between words and this idea of just writing letters with no space between words was not the ancient procedure. It was ~~one~~ done in some ...how much is done ~~xxx~~ in Greek. There is no evidence that in Hebrew was ~~transmitte-transmittee-~~ transmitted that way. There are undoubtedly some cases where a ~~lx~~ letter has become detached from ~~and-nd-~~ an end of a word, but that doesn't prove that ~~thzere~~ weren't word divisions. But there are a few. And so . in this case I don't know ...I don't see any evidence that it has been preserved as two words. But- Well, it is as a footnote here. So there are manuscripts that have a p and then a line, and then a ~~xx~~ -a-man. So you can read it p, and then ...there are the two ~~pls-~~ possibilities. Well, the ~~man~~ ancient versions ~~havex~~ most taken it as one word. And that is the way that our Massoretic ~~tesx~~ texts has it. Now, what ~~does-~~ difference does it make. We cannot ...of course this is true. The Yodh , being a ~~veewl-~~ vowel letter, often is a ~~lx~~ letter which is apt ~~x~~ to have a error in writing, than letter that...so it could be...but ~~lx~~ I don't think you would often have a ...with a ~~dyodh~~ getting in between. I would say that if it ~~is~~ Ki, it is for or because, ~~lx~~ and you have the choice ~~x~~ between the two. For ~~α~~ you can say, the waters of ..the for is a conjunction. Or you can say...And as it stands here , and I don't think actually it makes a great deal of difference. Well, read it both ways. There is a footnote here which says that there are many manuscripts which have it with a hyp~~x~~hen...That is a possibility. but there are also manuscripts ~~like-~~ that have it like it is up ~~he-~~ here and ~~lx~~ this is the ~~wyx~~ way that ;most of the versions have it. Syriac and the Targum and the Vulgate , they ~~have-~~ all have it like it is up here.