

If DDr. Machen had lived, I don't see how I possibly could have broken with Westminster. If he'd lived. Well, Machen's attitude was not at all like the attitude of those from whom I borke, but he had that loyalty to his colleagues. If I'd been the one attacked, I think he would have been loyal to me. But I wasn't under attack. Some of them were under attack because of the strong stand they were making which was so directly contrary to the view of most Bible believers in America.

They came under attack. He felt they were under attack. He was defending them. If we had not had Harold Laird and some of these others, we never could have done what we've done in these past 30 years. So the Lord knows a lot of things we don't know. As I look at Payne and the things he might have done in the next 20 years, he could have done a tremendous lot of good. But as I look at the amount he has published, and the fine books he's published, etc. he certainly has gotten more in visible form than I have in 20 years longer than he did! So I think he did very good service, and we'll none of ~~x~~ us live to be 200 anyway so the Lord ~~x~~ takes us when He chooses.

As I also think how Payne fell and it took them 3 or 4 days to find him, I guess there have been places where it would take 2 or 3 weeks to find me if anything had happened but the Lord's mercies have taken care of me.

Neher: On fulfilled prophecy again. (Discussion on the volume of recorder). Would you recommend John Erchart's book such as it is since we don't have a more recent one. (Urquart is the spelling I believe).

I never read it. I imagine the things I am familiar with as such good evidences; I imagine they are in the book. Not sure. Actually I think I got them from a book by Pierson. A. T. Pierson. I was a little prejudiced against it because I was with these modernist professors in Germany and one of them referred to how widely Urquart's book was distributed in Germany. He said, I call it Urclotch which would be German for original nonsense! The book may be very good. I don't know. Never read it. Afraid it may be like Stoner's that along with some good stuff it had imaginary stuff. I have not really looked into it.

As a matter of fact I've not been what you'd call a wide reader in theology or Biblical studies. I have found that so often commentaries copy others mistakes and there is so much junk written. I have found that if you take the Bible and a good concordance and a good history book, and get to the original facts with a good grammar and lexicon I have found so many things come out that I just don't find in books I have seen. Then when I strike something I don't know what to do with, then I look at different commentaries and see what they ~~x~~ say about it.