

It is very strange that the idea should have arisen that the pre-millennial interpretation of Revelation 20 is not in accord with the best scholarship. As a matter of fact not only have many of the most outstanding scholars of the New Testament been convinced that this is the correct interpretation of the passage, but some have even gone so far as to say that no other interpretation is possible. In fact such is the view of Dean Alford. In the history of New Testament interpretation few commentators, if any, have been more scholarly and penetrating in their exegesis than Dean Alford. His comment on Revelation 4.6 reads, in part, as follows:

"I cannot consent to distort words from their plain sense and chronological place in the prophecy, on account of any considerations of difficulty, or any risk of abuses which the doctrine of the millennium may bring with it. Those who lived next to the Apostles, and the whole Church for 300 years, understood them in the plain literal sense: and it is a strange sight in these days to see expositors who are among the first in reverence of antiquity, complacently casting aside the most cogent instance of consensus which primitive antiquity presents. As regards the text itself, no legitimate treatment of it will extort what is known as the spiritual interpretation now in fashion. If, in a passage where two resurrections are mentioned, where certain souls lived at the first, and the rest of the dead lived only at the end of a specified period after that first,-- if in such a passage the first resurrection may be understood to mean spiritual rising with Christ, while the second means literal rising from the grave;-- then there is an end of all significance in language, and Scripture is wiped out as a definite testimony to any thing. If the first re-