

Back Page Errata

I would like to thank Dr. David Duffie for calling the following cluster of errors to my attention. In a paper entitled, "Historical Overview of Dan 11:29-35" (Historicism No.18/Apr89), I mislabeled bloc 3 of my outline (ibid., p.4, text exhibit 1) and then went on to repeat the mistake in two other places, listed below.

1. Bloc 3 in table 2 is an ABBA chiasm. I had labeled it "Nonchiastic."
2. The sentence beginning on p.6 and continuing onto p.7 should read:

I have suggested that Dan 11:29-35 has three main blocs of text – introduced with a prologue and followed by an epilogue, both of which have to do with time—and that the longer middle bloc (as shown in table 2) is surrounded by two shorter ones, i.e., the outer blocs form an inclusio around the inner bloc.

3. And also the fourth line of table 3 should be revised to read:

B' 33-34 Bloc 3 Chiastic Four clauses

Addendum

Seventh-day Adventists take at face value Paul's instruction to Timothy that, "All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness, so that the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work" (2 Tim 3:16-17). We apply this statement to the Old Testament as well as the New, and indeed this was Paul's context. Seventh-day Adventists believe that there has never been more than one means of salvation and that it is based on faith in Jesus Christ. This is why we lay such heavy emphasis on the sanctuary, because through its various types and shadows the worshiper's attention was directed to a coming Messiah who would eventually offer Himself as "the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world" (John 1:29). Thus, people living before the cross looked forward to Christ's sacrifice by faith just as people living now look back to Christ's sacrifice by that same faith.

By contrast, Evangelicals who hold dispensationalist views suggest that God has had different plans in different ages of history to save different groups of people. Thus, there is one plan for the Jews and another for the Gentiles. This is not an isolated doctrine but the wellspring of a prophetic worldview.

The Seventh-day Adventist concept that Scripture is a single unified body of inspiration makes a person open to interpretations based on a broad spectrum of comparative data. If there is only one Holy Spirit and if He is saying essentially the same thing to men in every age in ways that are only superficially different, it does not violate context to draw from what He says in other related passages. For example, take Rev 19:15, "Out of his mouth comes a sharp sword." This is a detail of the prophecy. John states that a sharp sword comes out of Christ's mouth. What does he mean? In my paper, "Ezekiel's Prophecy Against Gog" (above), I point out that Rev 19:15 must be compared with Heb 4:12-13 and 2Thes 2:8. When this is done it becomes clear that the "sword" in Christ's mouth is a figure representing His word of command. There is no literal sword. John's words do not teach that there is. The whole point in this case is that Christ does not need weapons to defend His saints. His word is sufficient to do anything He might wish to accomplish for them, as at the time of creation when He spoke and a world was formed (see Ps 33:9). This is one example.

Spiritual interpretations of key terms (such as "Israel") are characteristic of Seventh-day Adventist exegesis. If there is any connection between this fact and our proclivity toward seeing those elements that the Testaments hold in common, I venture to speculate that the same set of factors inclines us away from literalism. Thus, there is a natural connection between methods of study that are broadly comparative in nature and results that are spiritual. Dispensationalists are drawn to literalism because of their willingness to divide Scripture and history into discrete pieces.