

live, but the rest of the dead live not, until the thousand years are finished. This is the first resurrection. These who have come to life in this first resurrection reign with Christ a thousand years. After the end of the thousand years Satan is loosed for a little season. He gathers a great army and attacks the kingdom of Christ, but his attack is defeated and his army annihilated. Then the wicked dead are raised, judged according to their works, and sentenced. Finally, "death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." Thus we see the clear outline of the great events of the future, as God revealed it to John. There are details which are not revealed. But the outline is so plainly stated that one wonders how anyone who really considers the Bible to be authoritative can doubt that the millennial kingdom actually follows the return of Christ.

PREMILLENNIAL INTERPRETATION SUPPORTED BY HIGHEST SCHOLARSHIP

It is amazing to see attempts made to sweep aside the testimony of Revelation 20 as if it were of no moment. One is told that the book is a symbolic book, as if that justified making a clear statement mean anything or nothing, according to the fancy of the interpreter. The natural sense of the passage is clear. God has spoken. What right have we to brush aside clear teachings? The great interpreters of the New Testament have found no difficulty in the interpretation of the chapter. Probably no men of greater learning, more solid scholarship, or deeper spiritual insight, than Meyer, Alford, and Zahn, have ever written commentaries on any large portion of the New Testament. Meyer did not comment on the Revelation. Alford and Zahn find premillennialism clearly taught here. In fact Alford goes so far as to say that if one will not accept this plain interpretation, "then there is an end of all significance in language, and Scripture is wiped out as a definite testimony to anything." I do not feel that his words are too strong. If one comes to the Bible to see what it teaches, instead of trying to force a preconceived interpretation upon it, I do not believe that any other interpretation of this passage is possible.

Certainly if it were possible to find another satisfactory interpretation of Revelation 20, we would think that a man with the genius of Warfield could do so. The careful and scientific Biblical treatment which is characteristic of Warfield leads us to expect similar treatment of this passage. What is our amazement to find an article by him in which he interprets Revelation 20 according to principles which put an