people have much of an idea of the nature of those trees. Now, one of these trees which is stressed in these two Kchapters was the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. I have my own theory as to what that tree was, but there Sepress are those who get violently angry when I expoand my theory on it, and so I am not expecting to expound bn it. I am merely going to mention that on which all most should agree whatever the nature of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, this was a fact that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was a tree through which it could become evident whether man was- would choose certainly like myself αo good or bad, that is all that we can agree on. Whether we can any further in our understanding of what it was, or like many others go further in fine A direction that I think would lead up to othing foolish as that. In either case that we can agree on... that it is the tree by means of which God would know tore whether man would choose good or evil, and so this tree was in the midst of the garden and man was said, you are not to sat from this tree. But there were know hundreds of other trees and these other strees were available to him, and he had the tr- free use of all of them, but it is of sinful human nature, it is true that if there is onething we are not permitted to use, we begin to wonder about that thing. And that would seem to be use more allthe axyon a fault in sinful valuable than others. Well, It is false human nature whether Adam was subject to that particular fault for the fall, But- I doubt, but the Scripture also mentions another tree, the tree of life which was in the midst of the garden, and theoretocs sau- the erite- critics say that there was a confusion in the text. They say that it speaks of the tree of life and then it says about the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Of course, we have that have been twp- two different sources combined here, and there was actually only one