is not satisfactory to me. ~~He says~~ He says, "The answer has to be <u>exegesis</u>.
In any theory we adopt about this or that biblical detail, we ought to be
firmly persuaded that it is part of the formulation of the text but <u>not</u> part
of its <u>teaching</u>, and be able to defend the view we take with a reasonable
exegetical argument."

This suggests to me a very vital point. I believe that we must say
that these men had a great many mistakes in their minds, but inspiration
means that God did not allow them to include ~~these mistakes~~ in the material
He intended ~~to have~~ should be part of Holy Scripture, the mistaken ideas
in their minds. Thus whatever they say about history, a about science, about
theology, about any field is accurate. And we have no right to say that an
assertion made by Peter, Paul, John or any one else is merely a hangover
of Rabbinic perspective or is the result of his upbringing. There were many
such things but God kept them out of what they wrote.

However, I believe we must realize that the Scripture was written for
all times, that it contains much that has validity at all times, but that
it contains much that applies to particular situations. All that it has
that applies to particular situations contains principles that relate to all
times, but the direct application may be included in a particular period.
Thus the Bible nowhere condemns slavery. In fact it orders slaves to obey
their masters. That does not mean that slavery is right. The Bible contains
the principles that would ultimately destroy slavery and change the institution
but the Bible does not attempt to build a perfect human ~~institution~~ situation. It ~~reprev~~
recognizes that among sinful men such a thing will never come ~~be~~ about.
The best way to improve human conditions is to make people Christians and then
let them use their own brains in considering how the situation should be changed.
Paul addressed the situation that he found. He could have given his life in
trying to destroy the institution of slavery, ~~but he~~ whether he would have accomplished