

primitivamente cinéticas se convirtieron en tensiones de un sistema. La invención podría ser entonces considerada como un cambio de organización del sistema de las imágenes adultas que conducen la imagen mental, mediante un cambio de nivel, a un nuevo estado de imágenes libres que permiten recomenzar una génesis: la invención sería un renacimiento del ciclo de las imágenes, que permite abordar el medio con nuevas anticipaciones de donde saldrán adaptaciones que no habían sido posibles con las anticipaciones primitivas, y luego una nueva sistemática interna y simbólica. (p. 26)

Lic. Juan Manuel Heredia
Docente
Universidad de Buenos Aires

Quispe, Glúder. *The Apocalypse in Seventh-day Adventist Interpretation*. Lima, Peru. Universidad Peruana Unión, 2013. xii+354 pp. ISBN: 978-9972-604-28-7.

Glúder Quispe (PhD. Andrews University, USA), is professor of Adventist Studies and New Testament (Exegesis and Theology of the Apocalypse)¹ at Peruvian Union University since 2000. Since 2011 he heads the Ellen G. White Research Center–Peru.

This work, based on his doctoral dissertation, is divided the following way:

The first chapter, “Introduction,” presents the *principles of interpretation*, the historical application of the seven trumpets –as a text with different viewpoints– and the central theme of the Revelation, chapter 12 –as a text *essentially* in agreement (21)–.

The history of the SDA interpretation of Revelation, thinks Quispe, may be divided into three periods: [1] the *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation* (1862-1944); [2] the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* (1944-1970); and [3] *The multiple emphases* (1970-). Each period signals a particular emphasis: (1) the biblical-historical, the biblical-theological and the biblical-exegetical, respectively; each being represented by its major contributor: historical, by C. Mervyn Maxwell (1925-1999); theological, by Hans K. LaRondelle (1929-2011); and exegetical, by Jon K. Paulien (1949-). Also, in each period a definition is offered on the historicist method of prophetic interpretation (2, 20).

¹ Note: This critical book review uses both “Revelation” and “Apocalypse” to refer to the last book of the Bible.

The second chapter, “biblical-historical emphasis,” centers on the historical prophecy application, *keeping loyalty* to the historicist method used by the Reformers and the Adventist pioneers, including William Miller, Uriah Smith, later C. M. Maxwell and Alberto R. Treiher.

The third chapter, “biblical-theological emphasis,” tends to keep a Christ-centered perspective of prophetic interpretation. Quispe presents L. F. Were’s important role and influence on the *SDA Bible Commentary*, Hans K. LaRondelle and R. Naden. Within that period, historicism is *virtually* used in prophecy interpretation.

The fourth chapter, “biblical-exegetical emphasis,” focuses primarily on the first Revelation’s readers and the first century historical context. Historicism is *harshly disputed* by “new” philosophical focuses, especially by K. Strand (202). The 1974 Bible Conference, Desmond Ford, and the Daniel and Revelation Committee (DARCOM) are then stressed. Finally, Quispe discusses more intensely J. Paulien and R. Stefanovič contributions to Revelation’s Adventist interpretation. This last period remark opens the door for the use of *futurism*, *preterism*, *idealism* and *historicism* in interpreting Revelation, as alleged by Ford, Paulien and Stefanovič (231).

The fifth chapter, “Summary and conclusions,” confirms that for 150 years of SDA Apocalypse publications, Adventist perspectives developed progressively through an emphasis on history, theology, and later on exegesis. . . . “[Although] on the one hand, the historical emphasis tended to overlook some aspects of the biblical text, on the other, the theological and exegetical emphases have tended to overlook some aspects of the historical applications” (266).

Regarding the seven trumpets, the final comparison is based on Smith, the *SDA Bible Commentary*, Maxwell, LaRondelle and Paulien. The first three dare to date the prophetic periods, while the last two seem to lose the historical meaning, as they “spiritualize their conclusions” (268), disagreeing with the fifth and sixth trumpets periods’ interpretations (Rev 9:5, 10, 15).

As to Revelation 12, a general agreement in identifying the Woman, the Child, and the Great Red Dragon seems to exist. However, Paulien makes a slight difference regarding the woman’s identity, applying both to the true Church and also to other faithful people. Paulien believes that the Red Dragon not only represents Satan, but includes all his earthly followers (270). About the 1,260 years, Paulien and LaRondelle have diametrically different positions both as to the rest and even between themselves. To the

SDA Bible Commentary, LaRondelle and Paulien, the remnant is not identified solely with the SDA's, but also with members of other religions.

Although each of these different periods claims to use historicism in interpreting and understanding Revelation, they come at different conclusions. Why? Quispe answers giving nine suggestions. Number three should be underlined because it stresses the importance of outlining our methodology, i. e., historicism must be defined and systematized (273) through the “Methods of Bible Study” parameters, a document presented by the *Methods of Bible Study Committee*, approved by the 1986 Annual Council of the General Conference, which convened in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

The work also presents several inconsistencies:²

1. Paulien believes that “God’s remnant will have a message not just for Christians, but also for Jews, for Muslims, for Buddhists, and for Hindus—for all people” (*Seven Keys: Unlocking the Secrets of Revelation* [Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2009], 117). However, in table 12 of page 235, Quispe misinterprets Paulien signaling that the Remnant not only is limited to the SDA Church, but also included all the other religions. Actually, Paulien signals in his unpublished paper, “The Best Is Yet To Come: A Vision for the Eschatological Remnant,” that God’s historic Remnant is the SDA Church (“The Best Is Yet To Come,” 39-41). Therefore, Quispe’s interpretation is contradictory. Besides, the article “The Best Is Yet To Come: A Vision for the Eschatological Remnant” is not quoted in Quispe’s work. Similar observations and others can be found in Ekkehardt Müller, “The Apocalypse in Seventh-day Adventist Interpretation, by Gluder Quispe,” *Reflections: The BRI Newsletter* 45, January (2014): 10-12.

2. Although it is a fact that Quispe *prefers* the *biblical-historical emphasis* to interpret the Apocalypse (271, 274), the following statement seems confused:

“[. . .] the three views [emphasis] were not contradictory or even competing with each other, but rather are complementary, sharing basic presuppositions, and each making a distinct, unique, and essential contribution to the Adventist understanding of the multi-faceted message of the Apocalypse” (266).

² And also typos like “Boook” instead of “Book” (vi), “Valdals” instead of “Vandals” (54), “&c.” instead of “etc.” (60), “Stran” instead of “Strand” (78), “aracenes” instead of “Saracenes” (98), “Theile” instead of “Thiele” (three times, 172), “Rome Empire” instead of “Roman Empire” (174), “Gerard Pfandl” instead of “Gerhard Pfandl” (215), “Revelatio” instead of “Revelation” (222), etc.

If Quispe later on mentions that the *biblical-theological emphasis* “can also tend toward ‘spiritualizing’ the message of the Apocalypse, something like the idealistic approach” and the *biblical-exegetical emphasis* “can resemble the preterist approach” (270, 271), some readers might wonder in what sense they could be complementary and share presuppositions, taking into account that the preterist and idealist views are not compatible with the Scriptures, nor with Ellen G. White’s writings?³

3. In the Symposium on the Book of Revelation of the South American Division in Chile (2013), after Quispe’s presentation, this question was addressed him: “Why [in his doctoral dissertation] it was not studied or mentioned two current representatives, such as Ekkehardt Müller and Gerhard Pfandl, which are also taken as a reference,”? to which he replied [literally]:

. . . I think that the book by Dr. Ekkehardt Müller is one of the great contributions, but unfortunately it is published in German. We were talking with him about translating it [his book] but will be published in the *Seventh-day Adventist International Bible Commentary*, of which he is the official writer. I think his emphasis is still biblical, but that commentary, in my opinion, lacks history. It is difficult to complete everything in a book, right? But sometimes we have gone too far to the last part [biblical-exegetical emphasis], while we are forgetting the historical part [biblical-historical emphasis] Nevertheless, I think that, *I speak in my work of Dr. Müller*, as one who gets closest to the Adventist and biblical interpretation within the Church. (*emphasis added*).

In fact, both in the work under revision and in his doctoral dissertation, Quispe mentions Müller only 5 times (226, 266 and 272, excluding footnotes and bibliography: 143, 253, 256, 275, 276, 317). Although underscoring Müller’s work “that covers the biblical-exegetical and theological emphases,” (266) he says that “*Perhaps*, his commentary [by Müller] will have wide influence among Adventists when it is translated into other languages” (266; *emphasis added*).

However, it would have been a great contribution to present the work that Müller has done so far. While it is true that Müller doctoral dissertation presents a microstructure of Revelation (see *Microstructural Analysis of Revelation 4-11* [ThD dissertation, Andrews University, 1994]), his book, *Der Erste und der Letzte: Studien zum Buch der Offenbarung* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang,

³ See William H. Shea, “Historicism, the Best Way to Interpret Prophecy,” *Adventist Affirm* 17, n° 1 (2003): 22-34; Gerhard Pfandl and Ekkehardt Müller, “How do Seventh-day Adventist Interpret Daniel and Revelation,” ed. Gerhard Pfandl (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 2010), 79-89; Biblical Research Institute, “Ellen G. White and the Interpretation of Daniel and Revelation,” in <https://adventistbiblicalresearch.org/materials/prophesy/ellen-g-white-and-interpretation-daniel-and-revelation>

2011), which is divided into three parts –Einleitungsfragen und Methodik, Exegetische Studien, and Theologische Studien– presents methods and steps to interpret the Revelation (31-46); an analysis of the seven trumpets (175-208); and an analysis of the remnant in the end time (355-380), among many more; of which it would have been possible to identify the historical and symbolic fulfillments as Quispe did with the other scholars under study. Is it necessary just Müller's book to know his thought about the Apocalypse? What is found in the unpublished papers, articles and presentations in conferences, symposiums and seminaries of which Müller has participated, why they were not used in Quispe's work? It was necessary to utilize a verse-by-verse commentary by Paulien to know his thought on the Revelation?

Despite these errors and inconsistencies, this work has offered good inputs. For example, it shows that the *prolectic* and *apotelesmatic* terms (multiple fulfillments) were first used by George McCready Price in his unpublished commentary on Revelation, and not by D. Ford as thought (141, 142, 143, 171).

Quispe should be applauded for an excellent job in explore the history of historical-theological interpretation of the seven trumpets and symbols of Revelation 12 by through exhaustive analysis of the Adventist literature from the beginning of the SDAC to this day. Furthermore, the summaries presented in each of the tables, have allowed a quick comparison of the different viewpoints that Adventist scholars have taken in relation to the book of Revelation.

Those who want to know more about how the SDA Church interpreted and interprets the book of Revelation over 150 years (1862-2013) cannot skip reading this fascinating book that recommends itself as a necessary tool for anyone engaged in an earnest study of the Scriptures.

Joel Iparraquirre
Peruvian Union University
Lima, Peru

Martines, Carmelo. *El remanente fiel. Un debate contemporáneo*. Lib. San Martín, Entre Ríos: Editorial Universidad Adventista del Plata, 2013. Pp. viii + 249. ISBN 978-987-1378-30-2.

Carmelo Martines es actualmente docente de Teología Sistemática en la Universidad Adventista del Plata (UAP). Cursó sus estudios de grado y posgrado en la misma institución, obteniendo un Doctorado en Teología Sistemática. La presente obra es precisamente una adaptación de su tesis doctoral titulada “El concepto de remanente en la Iglesia Adventista del