

Back Page Letters

To the Editor:

Please subscribe to HISTORICISM for me for the issues of 1986. Enclosed is a check for \$5.00.

Would you kindly tell me who you are and what is your educational background?

Beatrice S. Neall, Ph.D.
Lincoln, NE

If you have no objection I'll respond to your letter in print, because the questions you raise are ones that other readers may have had.

By occupation I'm a computer analyst for the Chesapeake and Baltimore divisions of Winchester Homes, Inc.--a residential construction company owned by Weyerhaeuser. In terms of academic training I have a B.A. in theology from Union College (1969), a Ph.D. in linguistics from the University of New Mexico (1979), and an M.A. in Old Testament from Andrews University (1983). My doctoral dissertation was on the grammatical category of aspect in Navajo¹ and the masters thesis was on Dan 11.²

I thought it would be distracting to reference the dissertation in recent comments on Rev 4 (see "*w^onişdaq* in Dan 8:14, Part 2: The Context of Judgment" [*Historicism* No. 4/Oct 85], pp. 8-9; "Do Rev 4-5 and 19:1-10 Refer to the Judgment?" [this issue]), but the research in it heavily influenced my thinking. Anyone who has studied aspect extensively would immediately notice the cyclic nature of the praise offered in that chapter by the four living creatures and twenty-four elders. The dissertation will not always be so relevant as this, but the masters thesis looms in the background of perhaps a majority of papers (see the Editorial to No. 1/Jan 85). - FWH

¹"Navajo Aspectual Verb Stem Variation" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1979). See *Dissertation Abstracts International* 40 [February 1980]:4572-A; JDK80-03087.

²"An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11" (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1983). See *Masters Abstracts* 22 [March 1984]:83; MA1321021.

Comments

In *Historicism* No. 5/Jan 86, on p. 38, I made a statement that I now see could be misunderstood: "This is why the saints, who identified themselves with Christ while the great controversy was in progress, are given the kingdom now that it is over." The problem has to do with the word "now." By "now" I meant "at the same time as," and the timeframe referred to was the end of the judgment. Any sentence must be taken in the context of its paragraph. The judgment has not ended and I hasten to clarify that the great controversy is in fact not yet over.

The ease with which my statement could be misunderstood, which I thought was perfectly clear when I wrote it, gives me a feeling of empathy with those other earlier writers whose work I endeavor to interpret in the pages of this journal. Words always convey our intentions imperfectly and when the original flow of thought is behind us or otherwise unavailable, no longer carrying us along or informing us as to the words' original purpose, the words themselves are all that are left and they can usually be taken in more than one way. Understanding what I say is not so important, but God help us to rightly divide the word of truth.