Sunday NightLife

West London Alliance Church

A Study of The Book of Revelation

#1. INTRODUCTION	September 10, 2000
• According to Revelation 1:3, <i>The Revelation</i> is	
a) meant to be	
b) meant to be	
c) meant to be	
Therefore, studying <i>The Book of Revelation</i> should	
Galatians 5:22	2,23; II Timothy 3:16,17
The obvious challenge in studying <i>The Revelation</i> is	
• The challenge is sometimes worded as a question:	
"Which parts are and which parts are Some interpreters say their policy is "	?"
Some interpreters say their policy is "	
But <i>e.g.</i> , Revelation 13:1,2	
• R.C. Sproul writes:	
"Conservative Christians historically are committed to a literal interpretation of Scriptur sensus literalis has been hopelessly confused. To interpret the Bible "literally", strictly s	1 1
according to how it is written. It allows, nay demands that symbols be treated as symbol	
indicative statements as indicative statements. The problem rests in correctly identifying	
What is then "literal" and what is "symbolic" or "imaginative" is ultimately a false disti	g the interary genie of the pussage.
What is ment menal and what is symbolic of imaginaritye is minimately a faise distri-	
	inction. Yet in the common
language of interpreters there abides the distinction between the "literal" and the "figura to the handling of prophet texts." ¹	inction. Yet in the common
language of interpreters there abides the distinction between the "literal" and the "figura to the handling of prophet texts." ¹	inction. Yet in the common ative." This is especially relevant
language of interpreters there abides the distinction between the "literal" and the "figura	inction. Yet in the common ative." This is especially relevant
 language of interpreters there abides the distinction between the "literal" and the "figura to the handling of prophet texts."¹ So the specific challenge is "	inction. Yet in the common ative." This is especially relevant
 language of interpreters there abides the distinction between the "literal" and the "figura to the handling of prophet texts."¹ So the specific challenge is "	inction. Yet in the common ative." This is especially relevant
 language of interpreters there abides the distinction between the "literal" and the "figura to the handling of prophet texts."¹ So the specific challenge is "	nction. Yet in the common ative." This is especially relevant ." 17:15; (9:16,18,19)
 language of interpreters there abides the distinction between the "literal" and the "figura to the handling of prophet texts."¹ So the specific challenge is "	nction. Yet in the common ative." This is especially relevant ." 17:15; (9:16,18,19)
 language of interpreters there abides the distinction between the "literal" and the "figura to the handling of prophet texts."¹ So the specific challenge is "	inction. Yet in the common ative." This is especially relevant ." ."
 language of interpreters there abides the distinction between the "literal" and the "figura to the handling of prophet texts."¹ So the specific challenge is "	inction. Yet in the common ative." This is especially relevant ." ."
 language of interpreters there abides the distinction between the "literal" and the "figura to the handling of prophet texts."¹ So the specific challenge is "	inction. Yet in the common ative." This is especially relevant ." ."
 language of interpreters there abides the distinction between the "literal" and the "figura to the handling of prophet texts."¹ So the specific challenge is "	inction. Yet in the common ative." This is especially relevant
 language of interpreters there abides the distinction between the "literal" and the "figurate to the handling of prophet texts."¹ So the specific challenge is "	inction. Yet in the common ative." This is especially relevant ." ."
 language of interpreters there abides the distinction between the "literal" and the "figuration the handling of prophet texts."¹ So the specific challenge is "	nction. Yet in the common ative." This is especially relevant

¹ Quoted from the Foreword to *Perilous Times: A Study in Eschatological Evil*, Kenneth L. Gentry, Jr., (Texarkana, AR; Covenant Media Press, 1999), page x.