(7) of the Bible

as established. I just brought one of these as a sample this morning: The Holy Scriptures - A Survey, by by the D partment mff of Christian Robert C. Denton (3. Education of the Protestant Episcopal Church. And it's only a sample; you'll yeu/find the same in practically aid in almost any other of our large denominations today. But I notice on page 32 of it, he said, "When we read the first chapters of Genesis with an open mind we disconver a curious fact: there are two accounts of the creation of man: one in chapter one and another in chapter two. The story in chapter one is from what is called the P document which is the latest of all, while the story in chapter two is from J which was the earliest of all." And he ways that when we read these stories and compare them with each other it will be seen very quickly that the story in chapter two is a much that. more primitive story than/the-story in chapter one. since it describes God as creating man by molding him with his hands out of clay, rather than simply pronouncing the word or conceiving the idea. Now that's what he says you find in Genesis 2. But now if you just look at Genesis 2. verse 7 xnexcented you'll read that the "the LORD God formed man 2 of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life: and man became a living soul." Does that sound to you as if He had said that God created man by molding him with his hands out of clay? It's nothing of the kind. God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a light soul. And he says this is a very primitive thing as compared with the exalted late teaching of chapter one. Chapter one says, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." Now why don't these two fit together perfectly? What's the contradiction in them? One magnet says God created man; the other says God formed may from the