

omit about half of it, but even with it omitted it is much more than in the Bible. There is that repetition of telling somebody. It is said and said again as the person remembers it. It's very much less than you will find in many ancient writings.

Then another fact of great importance in that connection is that the amount of repetition has been tremendously exaggerated. For instance, it is said we have two stories of creation. This writing for the inerrancy conference that I wrote the response to, he referred to Gen. 1 as giving the idea of transcendence. You read it and you feel unhappy because God is so remote, you don't have the great interest in human life, etc. Then he said you read the other story of creation in ch. 2 and you have God with the people and you feel uncomfortable because there is no transcendence of God. He waxed eloquent about how uncomfortable you feel in both of these.

Of course actually both ~~ssssss~~ sides are true and both sides need a statement, but there are not two stories of creation. That is said over and over. People say, Do you believe the Biblical story of creation? Which do you believe? Gen 1 or Gen. 2? In Gen. 1 you have the story of the creation of the universe. In Gen. 2 you have the story of creation of man. When I went to seminary I was told it is like two maps of the U.S., and ~~was~~ a map of PA. There are two distinct things--one dealing with it from one view, the other from another. There is no contradiction.

I would enlarge that. I would say that is not a true picture. It is a map of the world, and ~~was~~ a map of PA. That is to say the overlapping is actually very very slight. The story of creation tells about the creation of light. There is no creation of light in ch. 2. It tells about the creation of the stars and the making of the firmament; it tells about the creation of the animals; about creation of vegetation. None of these are in ch. 2. Ch. 2 looks at a small part of what is included in the big view of Gen. 1.

Of course there are claimed to be contradictions between statements in Gen. 1 and 2. When you look at them closely I believe every single one of them disappears. In order to get the repetition they will say, Gen. 1 tells how God made ~~was~~ all the plants to grow, etc. Gen. 2 has the same thing. What does Gen. 2 say? God planted a garden. Creating vegetation and planting a garden are two quite distinct things. It says in one of our trans. "he planted" but it should be pluperfect. There is no pluperfect tense in Heb. as there is in Eng. but there are many cases where the common past tense has a pluperfect significance. If you don't recognize that you have God making man and woman, then he lays them aside to dry for a few dozen years while he causes to grow ~~xxxxxxx~~ a garden of trees, and a place to put them.

He had planted a garden. You are talking about creation of man and woman. You are told God prepared a place specifically for them to put them. Every-one of the alleged repetitions are not such a thing unless it is showing the place in the bigger picture which it has, or dealing with some aspect of the preparation. I wrote an article on that in JETS which == in which I went into that in considerable detail. That is such a common criticism of Gen. 1 and 2. As having repetitions.