

end to all certainty in language! The article, which appeared in the *Princeton Theological Review* in 1904, and was reprinted in the volume entitled "Biblical Doctrines," combines a splendid style and a powerful assurance of statement with an utter abandon of sound exegetical method. Destruction of enemies so that the birds eat their flesh is said to mean conversion! When Satan is bound "that he should deceive the nations no more," we are told that he actually is free to deceive the nations, but only bound as far as deceased Christians are concerned! When the Scripture says that one thing happens after another, Warfield says it means that they happen at the same time! Though it is six times stated that the condition endures a thousand years, he tells us that the expression has nothing to do with time at all! Numbers are juggled most fantastically, to make a thousand years a mere symbol for perfection! Seven plus three is ten, and ten cubed is a thousand, and therefore a thousand means perfection! In some wild book trying to interpret the Bible according to a forced numerical scheme such statements might be comprehensible. In an article under the name of Warfield they are strange indeed. One wonders whether the title has been changed by mistake, and one may really be reading "Alice in Wonderland." I am not exaggerating at all in this description. It is an unanswerable evidence of the pitfalls into which even a great scholar will fall, when he attempts to explain away the clear teachings of God's Word. The most charitable explanation is that given by a prominent educator: "One has the impression . . . that a very great mind, preoccupied with other things, is attempting to dismiss an unfamiliar subject with as little attention as possible."

Those who refuse to accept the plain statements of Revelation 20 have no agreement on any other interpretation. All sorts of interpretations are presented. They have this in common, that they make a clear break with the plain meaning of words, and use principles which can make anything mean anything. In my opinion the method is far worse even than the resulting removal of an important doctrine. For if the method were applied consistently elsewhere there would be an end of all clear teaching. Why should such methods be restricted to the Book of Revelation, or to the prophetic parts of the Old Testament? If applied to the Gospels they would go even beyond the method used by those modernists who say that the resurrection of Christ simply means "the great principle of permanence of personality." A consistent application of sound methods of interpretation to the Bible in-