

that this particular vowel point requires the interpretation/they give, though we do think that ~~it~~ it is possible. Personally I feel that since all the early versions translate, since all the ancient versions translate ~~the~~ the verse one as an independent sentence, we are entirely justified in translating ~~it~~ it ~~so~~ so, and in considering as a statemtn of God's original creation. If, however, people wish to translate the other, so that Genesis 1 deals ~~with~~ ~~xxx~~ only with our earth and assumes the universe and matter already in existence, I do not feel that it should cause a great lamentation. After all, we do not ~~it~~ build our belief that God is the Creator of the heaven and earth simply on the one verse. One verse states it clearly. And I feel that that is a good statement of it. But I believe that we must compare scripture ~~with~~ ^{taught} scripture, and that we will find all the important scriptural teachings ~~found~~ in more than one place. In this case, we turn to the book of Job and ~~to the book~~ to a section of Isaiah from chapter 40 on and we find many references to God's creative activity as the Originator of all that is in heaven and earth. It is a teaching abundantly and clearly taught in these other passages. I believe that Genesis 1:1 teaches it. If it did not, ~~that~~ it would not mean that the Bible is not teaching, since it is ~~not~~ clearly taught in those passages. Before lookaing at the question of the origin of the universe, let us take a few minutes on the question of the origin~~akx~~ of this particular galaxy. I know this particular ~~solar~~ solar system. I have a statement by an outstanding scientist building on the explosion theory of the origin of the universe in which he goes on to show how he feels that this solar system would have been established.

Here