

R 1

and we can't say--if the evidence says that all this has happened in one time, we must stand by it; if the evidence does not say that it happened at one time we must not assume either, but must look for evidence .
That's all I say.

R 2

that there is no, nothing which is, ~~makaxitaxprimaxfuxiexpositiox~~
you might say, the prime facia position, that it stands to reason it is one unless it is proven two, or it stands to reason it is two unless it is proven one. It doesn't stand to reason either way. You have to get the evidence for it. That's all I say. And I wonder what a second stage. This is the first of three which I think we should take in order. The first is this statement which I just made that I do not believe anybody / interpreting the Old Testament would be in a position to say positively there are two comings. I think the impression/^{you'd get}would be one coming. Now, you look at Chapter 14 of Zechariah, and you read, "The day of the Lord comes. I gather all nations to Jerusalem. Then will the Lord go forth and fight against those nations. 4--"And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in two parts." And v. 9, "The Lord shall be king over all the earth. In that day shall there be one Lord and His name one." Now as you read this passage, as somebody read it in the day of Christ, when Christ was here upon earth, in fact, even as the apostles read this before Christ had explained the Scripture to them, as they read this after His resurrection, and as they saw the Romans with their terrific hatred of the Jews and the way they treated the Jews in general, and as they saw the things that were gathering up to terrific convulsions of the earth, it surely would have seemed natural to the apostles to think that all of this describes what Christ is going to do in the near future, after His resurrection. It doesn't say He is going