

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 extremes. Mr. Reese shows great heat at times in his opposition to those who believe 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 sides, more restraint might seem in order.

This is not meant to suggest that the greater question of premillennialism is one of little moment. As the days of our Lord's return draw nearer, it becomes increasingly clear that the vast majority of those who are ready to stand uncompromisingly 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 question strikes near the heart of one's attitude toward the Word of God, for premillennialism is so clearly taught in it that one rejecting this doctrine must of necessity introduce methods of interpretation which, consistently applied, would destroy all the essentials of Christian Faith. This is even more true of so-called amillennialism than of post-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 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 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-

millennial interpretation of Origen, Jerome, Augustine, and the majority of the Church's theologians ever since, is now as dead as Queen Anne, and just as honorably buried." On page 307 he says: "Today's and tomorrow's debate, as in the third and fourth centuries, will be between the millenarians and the non-millenarians; between those who accept Rev. XIX:11-XX: 1-6 as inspired Scripture, and, therefore, will be millenarians, and 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 patchwork of a seer who saw nothing'." Reese considers this to be the real debate—we wish he had thrown his weight into it, instead of raising so much strife over this lesser aspect of an event in one passage will necessarily refer to the same precise event every