

they had any real actual input. And on the whole he did an excellent job and he's got some marvellous summaries of Christian truth. I believe it's definitely Calvinistic, and it's certainly gospel centered and it certainly brings out in the OT on types and symbols looking toward Christ it goes to an extreme in that regard. But he did make a few very unfortunate statements.

Like when E. S. English invited us to join together to make it he said there are certain statements in ~~xx~~ it that are definitely unfortunate. Like it says in Gal.(?)(Exodus) when Israel rashly accepted the law. Well, he says, there's nothing rash at all in Israel's accepting the law. It's perfectly obvious when you look at Exodus 19 that God gave them the law. If they'd said, No, we won't keep it, it would have been rebellion. Nobody in the committee questioned that that was a mistake on Scofield's part. Dr. Buswell told me once, I rode with Dr. Chafer all the way from Dallas to Philadelphia on train--of course today that's a short plane trip, but then it took three whole days sitting on the train. He said, I talked to him all the time and I could not persuade him that he believes there is a different method of salvation in the OT! Chafer insisted there wasn't. But he might make statements that could be interpreted that way. And people taking what he gave might be misled by some statements and might take stands and make statements that he would never think of taking. So that was a very unfortunate thing.

But the way these fellows used the term -- Oh, I was saying that there were two reasons. One was the downplaying of the OT, and it is true than when Scofield got into the ~~NR~~ portion he occasionally makes statements that seem to downplay the OT. I think we got rid of most of those. We didn't have any problem about that.