

## Scriptures and Doctrine :: 10 Common Mistakes People Make When Reading Revelation

### 10 Common Mistakes People Make When Reading Revelation - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/10/27 8:43

I am generally not a big fan of "slide-show" type articles, but I thought this one was really good (probably because I agree with it!)

<https://www.crosswalk.com/slideshows/10-common-mistakes-people-make-when-reading-revelation.html>

### Re: Misunderstanding the Term "Last Days" - posted by docs (), on: 2018/10/28 18:07

/Christians today read about the "last days" and they get excited. They think in terms of Jenkins/LaHaye novels and Hollywood movies and immediately think "last days of the earth." Again, if you start in the Old Testament, you will understand that most of the references to the "last days" are also referred to as "latter days" (KJV and NASB), and "days to come" (ESV, NIV and NASB) are referring to the last days of the Old Covenant, not the last days of the world.

For example, in Acts 2:14-40, Peter starts his powerful sermon on the day the first Church was established by quoting Joel 2:28-32 in which he says "In the last days it shall be... That wouldn't exactly be a relevant sermon on Opening Day of the First Christian Church, if Peter was talking about the last days of the earth some 2,000 + years hence, would it? But when you realize that sermon is talking about the last days of the Old Covenant that God made with Israel, it suddenly makes sense that Peter would be letting the first Christians know that, indeed, the ending of the Old Covenant was finally upon them and the New Covenant was being ushered in. The New Covenant was with Jesus "the long-awaited Messiah" who had been killed and then raised from the dead and "God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you (remember the audience relevance?) crucified" (Acts 2:36). By the way, the term Old Testament and New Testament is another way of saying Old Covenant and New Covenant. Understand the meaning of the various uses of "last days" throughout the Bible and you'll better understand Revelation./

/For example, in Acts 2:14-40, Peter starts his powerful sermon on the day the first Church was established by quoting Joel 2:28-32 in which he says "In the last days it shall be... That wouldn't exactly be a relevant sermon on Opening Day of the First Christian Church, if Peter was talking about the last days of the earth some 2,000 + years hence, would it?/

What of the reality that Christ unexpectedly brought the powers of the age to come into this present evil age (Heb 6:4-5)? The Spirit was believed to be poured out at the end of this present age. Peter made note that the pouring out of the Spirit was happening NOW before this present evil age ended. Why couldn't some of the events forecast to occur in the last days begin to occur within this age also, even in Peter's lifetime?

Meanwhile, say someone is living 39 years before Christ's second coming or 22 years or 9 years before - what "days" would they be living in?

### Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/10/28 20:30

The days directly proceeding the 2d coming could rightly be called the last days, but that is not the last days scripture is talking about using language like "soon" and "shortly" and "quickly."

### Re: 10 Common Mistakes People Make When Reading Revelation - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2018/10/28 23:18

I love the book of Revelation, having read it through many times. What triggered my interest in it was when I took it in Bible School back in 1967. Bro. Plank told us things would happen like it says it will. Well! this concept flies in face of those who say it is all symbolic.

Fast forward. I am a grown adult now, some say old...maybe so.

One must understand John is sharing a vision he saw. I think people get confused, bewildered when they read it and think they need to interpret its meanings now. WRONG! I say read it to visualize what John saw. See the vision with him!! I'm so doing, what does this vision tell you about the nature of God? That is the most important point of it all.

Next, I say, study it using the Inductive Method of Bible study. I do fault the charts I find online that do not take this approach. It is all context, context, let it interpret itself, do not impose your opinions, let it shape yours.

Do I understand it all, know where, when these events will occur? Not at all. But am enjoying the mystery of it. Presently, it comforts knowing God is in control

I was surprised to find this post as I had been looking online for a study group discussing Revelation using the Inductive Method, but did not find one...given the nature of people likely won't...

The book is a blessing to study and read. Go for it! It will shape your concept of God, for sure. You will be blessed!

Sandra

**Re: 10 Common Mistakes People Make When Reading Revelation - posted by tonysmith (), on: 2018/11/3 7:55**

I read through those slideshows. My heart sank. They seem to be written by someone who views the bible as words for back then and not for today.

To water down the impact of the words in revelations for today's church is both dangerous and yet typical. You can't explain most of things in revelation in such a slap hazard way as those slide shows did.

1 Corinthians 2:14

14 The person without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the Spirit of God but considers them foolishness, and cannot understand them because they are discerned only through the Spirit.

If the slide shows state that this book was just meant for the churches back then and not today then that is deceptive and not the wisdom of God.

Whoever put these slide shows together comes under the category of those who add or take away from the words in the book.

Read it the way they suggest if you like, you can read the first chapter as if it doesn't apply to you too just like they suggest. The rest of the book will not touch your spirit if you start like that.

**Re: Inductive Method, - posted by dohzman (), on: 2018/11/3 20:16**

Inductive Method, Amen

**Re: Inductive Method - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/11/4 1:09**

I am not against the Inductive Method. I use it myself. BUT, the Inductive Method remains a human method and mighty Human Reason and Human Wisdom easily rise up to take charge in determining and analysing "context". And surely alarm bells are ringing when "context" is set high on a pedestal and is idolised and adored.

QUOTE:

"Reason must yield up its own hearing and life, and give itself up to God, that God may live in the understanding of man, else there is no finding in the divine wisdom. All that is taught and spoken concerning God, without the Spirit of God, is but Babel."

"Pray to God the Most High, that he would be pleased to open the door of knowledge"

John 14:26 "But the Helper, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said to you.

John 16:13 "But when He, the Spirit of truth, comes, He will guide you into all the truth; for He will not speak on His own initiative, but

whatever He hears, He will speak; and He will disclose to you what is to come.

James 1:5 â€

But if any of you lacks wisdom, let him ask of God, who gives to all generously and without reproach, and it will be given to him.

Without any human â€œmethodâ€œ, God can give the sudden understanding that floods the mind with light, fills the heart with joy and conviction, and, bring into real experience the sweet taste of the love and goodness of God.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/11/4 8:05**

//If the slide shows state that this book was just meant for the churches back then and not today then that is deceptive and not the wisdom of God.//

I didn't go back and read the whole thing again but that is not what it said at all. What it said was that the book was written to real persons/churches at a real time in history and those people/churches were under intense persecution. It was written to them and for them.

That is not to say that the principles in the book are not intended for us today. All scripture is intended for us today in some way.

What the article warned about was trying to force clearly apocalyptic and symbolic language to things happening 2000 years in the future.

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2018/11/4 9:41**

The book describes among other things, the rise of the AC, an intense persecution of Israel and the church by him and the eventual second coming of Christ. It's hard to see how it doesn't concern prophetic events still to occur. Time cannot dilute or nullify biblical prophecy.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/11/4 13:35**

//The book describes among other things, the rise of the AC, an intense persecution of Israel and the church by him//

That is how you have interpreted certain apocalyptic passages. Others interpret differently and no one has a monopoly on the truth as to how it should be interpreted. No where is the word â€œantichristâ€œ used in the book.

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2018/11/4 15:01**

/What the article warned about was trying to force clearly apocalyptic and symbolic language to things happening 2000 years in the future./

People who propose that the book has no meaning for us today also seem to say this is the "only" way the book can be viewed thus signifying their seeming monopoly on its interpretation. Then exegetical logic comes along and asks things such as,

What of the second coming of Christ that the book portrays? It has obviously been about 2,000 years in the future since the book was written. Is it out of bounds then to suggest that the events portrayed therein could very well possibly be the book describing events leading up to that second coming?

**Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2018/11/4 15:04**

I read and appreciated the article. It came across to me as coming from a "Partial Preterist" viewpoint, which viewpoint I currently lean heavily toward. I find it interesting that the author and her husband are part of a Calvary Chapel in Carlsbad CA., being that CCs as a whole are very much opposed to that viewpoint and are "officially" Dispensational. Maybe she's sort of a "closet Partial Preterist" there, who knows. Anyway, I thought I'd share the 2nd point and talk about it a bit. The author writes:

"We tend to read the book of Revelation as if it's written to Christians of 21st Century America so we can know what our future holds. Yet, the Revelation of Jesus Christ was a letter written to the seven churches that are in Asia ( Revelation 1:4) to provide for them comfort in the midst of the persecution they were enduring and to strengthen them, as well as give them hope for what was soon to come."

"So, every time you see the word "you" in a narrative, you must realize that "you" is not literally you. This letter written from prison to persecuted Christians in the First Century and delivered through the Roman Postal System used veiled language, at times (Revelation 13:18), that its direct recipients would fully understand. So, be a history buff. Brush up on what was happening in the First Century and why these words would be a comfort to them and why certain codes would be significant to them and quit trying to put yourself into the picture. There is room for application of God's Word after you have first looked at what the text says by its original author to its original audience. The basic model of hermeneutics is to first ask What does the text say? Secondly, ask What does it mean, in light of who it was written to and the time at which it was written? The third and final question to ask is What does this mean to me and how I should live? Application is important, but keep first things first. Remember to whom it was written and read it through the eyes of a First Century persecuted Christian."

The clear need for applying this principle comes to mind when considering certain portions of other NT books as well.

For example, in Romans 16:16 Paul wrote to the Roman Christians, "Greet one another with a holy kiss."

Does that mean we should take that command and literally apply it today no matter what? I think we'd all agree that we must consider the historical and cultural setting of that time. But in terms of application for us, we can deduce that we should be loving and hospitable toward one another when we gather together, and for us today that can manifest via a hug or hand shake.

And in Colossians 4:1 Paul exhorts, "Masters, provide your slaves with what is right and fair, because you know that you also have a Master in heaven."

Does that mean we can or should encourage the owning of slaves in our context today? Of course not. But those who have employees under them can apply the principle of treating their employees rightly and fairly.

It's the same when it comes to much of the book of Revelation. Much of it is DIRECTLY applicable to the first century churches, but we can still learn from and apply the principles deduced therein.

Yes, the literal, physical Second Coming of Christ is clearly taught in Revelation, especially in certain clear places such as chapter 20 where we read of the Great White Throne of Judgment and of the casting of multitudes into the lake of fire. But again, much of that awesome Bible book is DIRECTLY applicable to those first century Christians and "secondarily" applicable to us and our time.

Btw, Steve Gregg has an excellent free verse by verse series on Revelation. You can easily google his site and find it there or on his YouTube channel.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/11/4 15:05**

//Is it out of bounds then to suggest that the events portrayed therein could very well possibly be the book describing events leading up to that second coming?//

Not out of bounds at all. It might be describing those events. Then again, it might not.

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2018/11/4 15:10**

The Antichrist is known in Scripture by many more names than just the Antichrist. Revelation would not necessarily have to designate him by the name of Antichrist to be referring to him.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/11/4 17:03**

Agreed David.