strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers" (compare also verse 23). It is extremely important to determine the proper position between the two ortance extremes. Mr. Reese shows great heat at times in his opposition to those who believe that the title would indicate, and disappoints the hopes which its title arcuses. On that God has promised to snatch away his church before the coming of the Great Tribulation. On a point on which men of proven loyalty to the great Fundamentals are found on both ne takes an extreme position, and falls well short of proving his point. He insists sides, more restraint might seem in order. This is not meant to suggest that the greater question of premillennialism is them. To his mind both are parts of one event, with no appreciable interval between. one of little moment. As the days of our Lord's return draw nearer, it becomes the to prove this as presents arguments from many parts of the Scriptine. His work has/marit. increasingly clear that the vast majority of those who are ready to stand uncompromisingly of accepting to examine many interpreters of these passages. However, in case after for the great Fundamentals of the Christian Faith, and who are willing to suffer, if need be, for that stand, are holders of the premillennial view of the Lord's Return. This me first of these errors is that of assuming, because two events are mentioned question strikes near the heart of one's attitude toward the Word of God, for premillennial-together, that they necessarily cour similtaneously, or in extremely close provisity. ism is so clearly taught in it that one rejecting this doctrine must of necessity introduce ne quotes passage after passage from Old and New Testament to show that the Resurrection methods of interpretation which, consistently applied, would destroy all the essentials of the Sainte is mentioned in connection with the end of the age, or with the beginning of Christian Faith. This is even more true of so-called gmillennialism than of post-of the millennium. Involved arguments are given in connection with each passage. Yet millennialism. A wrong attitude at this point colors one's attitude toward Scripture as a whole. For this reason one regrets that Reese did not devote his entire book to this can be no interval between two events which are contioned together. It is as if one point, instead of only two pages (306-307). He says on page 306: "I have had to lay aside a plan dealing with the complete victory in modern February linking the following Christmas and New Year together, or connecting both with exegesis of the plain, literal interpretation of Rev. XX:1-6; even an abridgement of it has had to be omitted...Here one can but make the arbitrary statement that the post-The other error of logic which occurs frequently in the book is the assumption millennial interpretation of Origen, Jerome, Augustine, and the majority of the Church's of technical terms where cornace terms are used, as, for instance, assuming that the theologians ever since, is now as dead as Queen Anne, and just as honorably buried." connen word "end" must man a set time in the eschatological scheme without possible On page 307 he says: "Today's and tomorrow's debate, as in the third and fourth centuries, variation. An illustration of this fellacy from common life would be to may that the will be between the millenarians and the non-millenarians; between those who accept word "day" as we use it must always mean the same thing. However, we all use the sound Rev. XIX:11-XX: 1-6 as inspired Scripture, and, therefore, will be millenarians, and in at least two distinct senses, that of the twenty-four hour period (the calendar day) those who, if they cannot, like the Greek Fathers...keep the inconvenient Apocalypse and the period of light as contrasted to the night. It is an error into which it is easy out of the Canon, can undermine it by making it (in Zahn's tart phrase) 'an artificial to fell. But in interpreting Scripture each word must be interpreted in the light of patchwork of a seer who saw nothing '." Reese considers this to be the real debate-we the scheet, and we just not rashly assume that a word which refers to serve which is the wish he had thrown his weight into it, instead of raising so much strife over this lesser espect of an event in one passage will usessarily refer to the same precipe avait every 2

笞