

they are illogical! But I do feel that they do introduce methods of Scriptural interpretation by which you can get rid of anything. It's like Dean Alford said, In Rev. 20 if that does not predict two distinct resurrections then he says there is an end to all significance in language. Dr. Buswell wrote a series of 5 little books on the Lamb of God. The 5th one was on eschatology. I wrote a little note for him at the end in which I quoted from Alford and I quoted from Theodore Zahn, who was ~~xxx~~ one of the very greatest German scholars of the last century, and a very fine Christian, a godly man. Zahn in his commentary on Revelation which has not been ^{translated} ~~translation~~=== some of his others have been ~~xxx~~ translated and very highly thought of. But in his commentary on Revelation he has one long long sentence which I translated and broke up into three sentences in which he very clearly expresses a strong belief in premillennialism.

One day I said to John Murray before that came out I mentioned about Alford's Commentary and I said there is so much that is wonderful in that, it's too bad it's getting so old. Oh, he said, such wonderful work as Alford does never grows old! So he thought very highly of it. But when Dr. Buswell's commentary came out two days later I noticed that Alford's Commentary which used to be easily reached was now up on the top shelf where it wasn't very obvious. I can't say there was necessarily a relationship between those two but I felt as if there was. I felt as if he had been demoted because it was evident he was a premillennialist. Also as some have brought out a person can believe in the virgin birth and not believe in any thing else. I don't see how he can logically, but some do. A man who had a year at Yale Divinity School told me one of their professors believed thoroughly in the virgin birth but I was never able to find ~~xxx~~ evidence he believed in any other Christian doctrine.