

Of course, I gave a fair amount ~~to~~ of time to archaeology, simply to the defense of the general historical accuracy of the OT. I feel that's very important. I feel that whatever I've done in that is very much worthwhile. But the thing I was really anxious to do, I can't say I have succeeded in doing. I have done it in particular areas of Daniel, Isaiah, etc. But even there I've tried to deal objectively with individual verses, and individual sections, and I believe there is a lot more of that to do and then to draw it together, and see the inter-relation. I don't feel I've more than made a start in that area but I don't see others carrying it further, which disappoints me greatly. But I still think that it is a === I think fundamentally my desire there was a right one ~~was~~ if the Lord carries and ~~is~~ one which I wish were really more looking into.

About Princeton, I thought I'd mention Dr. Loetcher. Loetcher == recently for many years there's been a professor Loetcher, of Church History at Princeton, but this was his father. His father had a great resounding voice. He was famous for his lecture on Calvin. He could go and give certain lectures which thrilled people. I was amazed to see the difference between his public lecture on Calvin, which was very moving, and his discussion of Calvin in class which was very dry. In class he simply went from one fact to another fact, to another fact of history. His classes were not the least bit inspiring. He had a very large class. But the one place where he really got excited was when he referred to premillennialism, and that he hated. He had a bitter hatred of premillennialism. I don't know why but he would refer to somebody as a sort of crazy fanatic who was a premillennialist. He was very down on premillennialism. In general the attitude there