

would not cross ~~ex-er~~ over the earth again. In the days of Noah, now in the Hebrew he may like the days of, he may, like the days of, and the waters of... sound alike, and it seems to me that this was a literary device. These words ~~sound~~ sound alike but have a different meaning, I don't see how ~~we+ea~~ you have to get the two words to be identical, and it seems to me that the days of Noah makes more sense than the waters of Noah. He is not talking about the waters of Noah, he is talking about His promising that the waters of Noah will not come anymore. He is talking about the waters of Noah, ~~they~~ ~~wont come any more~~ He is talking about His promising ~~tht-thea~~ that the waters of Noah wont come anymore, so he is ~~tef~~ talking about the days of Noah, ~~thexdays~~ when Noah has been delivered from the flood, God said I am not going to send another flood. He ~~said-sidsaid~~ said, Now, I am delivering you from this, and I am similarly ~~going to~~ that I am certain things are not going to happen, so it is similar to the days of Noah rather than the water, and I don't see why you can't Now, if you want to take it as the waters of Noah, it is for... this is the waters of Noah to me. When I swore that the water of Noah would... not again come upon the earth. ~~This is the~~ Now, that makes ~~the~~ exactly the same sense, the idea is identical, ~~an-the~~ and it may be that that is ~~that-~~ the way that Isa. would have done it. The other way might have been more logical and since we have the... and the only way that you can get the other is to get ~~xx~~ rid of the... and the ~~eth~~ only way that you can get the other is to get rid of the... or else to assume to say for and then to ~~xx~~ assume... I prefer personally to take it exactly as it stands. Either way it is identical. To determine whether the variation determines the meaning, because the variations