rough -4 (8 $\pm$ )

equally factual.

The I don't quite like the way I worded the question; is it figurative? We cannot interpret a whole section as figurative. To do so would be to reduce it to nonsense. Figures of speech are scattered here and there throughout the Bible as throughout all literature. As a rule add to our understanding, rather than to detract from it. When we say the man was a lion in the fight everyone knows that we do not mean no one thinks that we mean that he chewed the enemy with his teeth or clawed them with his fingernails. It is obvious to everyone that we means he fought with bravery, with tenacity, with courage. It is just as clear as liter as clear as liter and possible make it - in fact, better tearer. Figures of speech do not necessarily bring obscurity. Used sparingly they, bring clarity not obscurity and Wellan beauty.

It is always possible in a passage of Scripture to raise the question whether certain expressions are meant as figurative or literal. Each such question must be examined on its merits. But melliceric with the could in these chapters with would not raise the question as to whether figuratige language is involved. The passage is about as factual and as literate as any section to be found anywhere through the Scripture.

4. We must realize the difference between source of information and results.

The question where Moses got the information he included in these chapters is an interesting one. Some would hold that God gave him a vision and that he describes what he saw in this vision. Others would believe that the vision came to Abraham or perhaps even to Adam, and Mut its content was passed on <u>our doctime</u> it is not particularly important to our doctrine of inspiration when the knowledge was received, or how it was received. The important thing is that Mases wrote the book of Genesis under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit who was keeping him from error. If Moses had erroneous ideas in his mind, the Spirit kept