

REVIEWS

M. Scott Bashoor. *Visual Outline Charts of the New Testament*. Nashville, TN: B&H Academic Digital, 2016. Available for WORDsearch Bible software. \$34.95.

Reviewed by Gregory H. Harris, Professor of Bible Exposition, The Master's Seminary.

M. Scott Bashoor is a long time Faculty Associate at The Master's Seminary, and since 1999 he has served as the pastor of Bible Church of Buena Park, CA. He is a graduate of Bob Jones University (B.A.) and The Master's Seminary (M.Div. 1994; Th.M. 2002) where he is currently pursuing a Ph.D. *Visual Outline Charts of the New Testament* (VOCNT) is his first book. VOCNT began as handouts Bashoor distributed to the adult Bible class at his church. Over time he significantly enhanced and expanded them for use in the seminary classroom. This makes these charts usable in a wide range of venues from the pastor's desk, to the classroom, to the individual Bible reader's personal study. While there are many books of Bible-related charts on the market, there is nothing quite like VOCNT. Those familiar with the brief charts in *Talk Thru the Bible* will see some similarities, but the level of detail in VOCNT far surpasses them.

VOCNT is currently available only as a digital title, and one must use WORDsearch Bible software to read it. Doubtless some readers will be hesitant to sign up for another book reading platform, but VOCNT will richly reward the user. All of the Scripture references are hyperlinked to whatever Bible translation has been chosen from the reader's library. The software is easy to obtain and use whether online, as a downloaded client, or in the apps for iOS, Android, or Kindle Fire. That said, VOCNT will be best read on a large-screen device such as a desktop, laptop, or larger tablet.

VOCNT consists of 70 full-color, full-page charts that display the structure and content of each New Testament book. Color gradations guide the eye, helping the reader follow the flow of thought of each book. It is difficult to describe in words what is intended to be a visual tool, so the reader might wish to request a free sample from the book's landing page (see the end of this review). The main chart for each NT book includes a purpose statement and a box with a limited amount of vital information such as author, date of writing, and recipients. Each book has at least one overview chart, and larger books have at least 2 focus charts which drill down into

details of structure and content. For instance, the first chart on the Gospel of Matthew surveys the whole book, but the next 6 charts focus in with detail of subsections throughout the gospel. Other larger books are similarly covered with multiple charts: Mark (4), Luke (9), John (6), Acts (6), Romans (3), First Corinthians (3), Second Corinthians (3), Hebrews (4), and Revelation (6). As one moves through the focus charts, the main headings for sections already covered and those to be covered later are collapsed, helping the reader see where he is in the book as a whole as he examines details.

The appendix contains three charts dealing with canonical and chronological matters. Chart 68 lays out the order of books in the NT canon as they have been arranged for the last millennium, showing how books are arranged by type, author, and word count. Chart 69 presents the books in chronological order and provides a brief summary of the circumstances surrounding each book's writing. Chart 70 provides a chronology of Paul's life and ministry, giving special attention to events surrounding the composition of his letters.

Some notable points of analysis include an early date for Matthew and its structure, alternating between discourses and narratives. Mark is dated close to or after Peter's martyrdom. Luke is explained as a prequel to Acts, which together are parts 1 and 2 of an authentication of Paul's gospel ministry to Gentiles. The natural two-part structure of John is exposed while still highlighting the special role of the 7 great signs. Romans is explained as a letter to mature Gentile and Jewish Christians who need to live in the common ground of the gospel. Galatians is dated early in AD 49 before the Jerusalem Council. The chronology of Paul's life is worked out to sustain Pauline authorship of the pastorals after Paul's first Roman imprisonment. The sophisticated structure of Hebrews is unveiled in a clear and compelling way. The author is described as "an unnamed associate of Paul's ministerial circle," a vague ascription that can allow for Pauline authorship but perhaps implies otherwise. James, a book whose structure continues to defy consensus, is said to develop around the three points of response to God's word in 1:19–21. The name "Babylon" in 1 Peter 5:13 is explained as a euphemism for "Rome." Revelation is dated near the end of the first century (not prior to 70 AD), and the book is outlined with the understanding that there are four great visions comprising the body of the book.

The shortcomings of the book are mostly countenanced in the author's introduction. Bashoor admits that the limited space that charts afford do not allow for much explanation of the interpretive decisions that are made. For instance, there is no space to explain his outline of Revelation, that the references to "in the Spirit" and "I saw" mark out major transitions. Also, while there are many interpretive approaches to the structure of Hebrews, VOCNT only presents one perspective. If one only reads VOCNT, one will be blind to the plethora of structural approaches. But if one views VOCNT as something short of the final word, much of this limitation can be overcome.

Most of the larger books are handled with sufficient detail, but there are a few places of unevenness. For instance, while the 3 charts on Romans adequately cover the whole of the book, sometimes a portion of a dozen verses is subsumed under a single sub-heading. As anyone who has studied Romans knows, Paul's arguments often develop verse-by-verse. It might be beneficial for the Romans section to be

supplemented with another focus chart. (One benefit of a digital title is that such revisions are relatively easy to make.) Nonetheless, the charts are still helpful in showing the reader the parts of the book in light of the whole.

Many will profit from this digital publication, and I highly commend it. It has garnered endorsements not only from Dr. MacArthur and our own faculty but also some notable faculty from other institutions. The landing page for the book provides more information about the work, including endorsements, FAQ, an interview, free samples, and ordering information. www.BiblePrism.com.

D. Jeffrey Bingham and Glenn R. Kreider, eds. *Eschatology: Biblical, Historical, and Practical Approaches; A Volume in Honor of Craig A. Blaising*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2016. 501 pp. \$36.99.

Reviewed by Mark A. Hassler, Associate Professor of Old Testament, Virginia Beach Theological Seminary.

In this festschrift, thirty contributors pay tribute to Craig Blaising on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday. Blaising serves at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary as the Executive Vice President and Provost, Professor of Theology, and Jesse Hendley Chair of Biblical Theology. As for the editors, Jeffrey Bingham functions as Associate Dean, Biblical and Theological Studies, and Professor of Theology at Wheaton College. Glenn Kreider is Professor of Theological Studies at Dallas Theological Seminary. The duo also coedited *Dispensationalism and the History of Redemption: A Developing and Diverse Tradition* (Moody, 2015).

The compilation divides into four parts: “The Doctrine of the Future and Its Foundations” (part 1), “The Doctrine of the Future in the Bible” (part 2), “The Doctrine of the Future in the History of Christian Thought” (part 3), and “The Doctrine of the Future and Christian Ministry” (part 4). In the foreword, Timothy George affirms the importance of biblical eschatology and tips his cap to Blaising. Subsequently, Steven James offers a biographical sketch of Blaising and lists highlights from Blaising’s curriculum vitae. In the preface, the editors explain that eschatology emerged as the obvious choice for the theme of the festschrift because of Blaising’s many contributions in that area. The back cover presents the book as an “introductory textbook,” but the absence of indexes cripples the academic usefulness.

The writers stress the value of eschatology to the Christian life. In the words of David Dockery, “Eschatology, rightly understood, leads not to division but to doxology” (455). Darrell Bock states, “How we see the future and respond to it now is a litmus test for our hearts before God. The future is that important. It motivates us to act in faith and engenders hope. It keeps us accountable” (204). Lanier Burns quotes Jürgen Moltmann as follows: “From first to last, and not merely in the epilogue, Christianity is eschatology, is hope, forward looking and forward moving, and therefore also revolutionizing and transforming the present. The eschatological is not one element of Christianity, but it is the medium of Christian faith” (416).

Bingham identifies dispensationalism as a hermeneutic (50). For many practitioners, however, dispensationalism—and for that matter, covenantalism—constitute a theological outcome, not a hermeneutical paradigm. That is, the interpreter uses a

grammatical-historical hermeneutic that yields a dispensational theology. If we metathesize hermeneutics and theology in the interpretive process, exegesis becomes an afterthought and our allegiance belongs to a theological system rather than to Scripture.

Stanley Toussaint surveys the biblical doctrine of eschatological hope. According to him, “The usual meaning of ‘salvation’ in Hebrews is eschatological” (65). Insightfully, he points out an *inclusio* in Hebrews 11:2 and verse 39 that frames the chapter (65). Whereas Toussaint equates the “law of liberty” in James 2:12 with the “righteousness of God” in 1:20 (66), other interpreters associate the “law of liberty” with the “perfect law” (James 1:25) or the “law of Christ” (Gal. 6:2). Toussaint devotes eleven pages to the NT but only three pages to the OT. He does not cite any journal articles, and he cites only one resource that was published within the last twenty years (a lexicon).

The shortest essay of the lot belongs to Charles Ryrie (“The Doctrine of the Future and the Weakening of Prophecy,” 71–76). Ryrie describes four ways in which Bible interpreters deny the existence or accuracy of distant eschatological predictions. One way involves the use of genre-dependent hermeneutics—hermeneutics, for instance, that allow for the special treatment of symbols and numbers in apocalyptic literature (74).

Mark Bailey contributes “The Doctrine of the Future and Dispensationalism.” He offers eleven supports for a pretribulation rapture, although the numbering system only lists ten because “Second” appears twice by mistake (397). Bailey also enumerates fourteen factors that favor the future existence of an actual and earthly millennium (403–5). He does not identify the dispensations.

As the reader might suspect in a festschrift for Blaising, some of the contributors advocate or assume progressive dispensationalism. Many of the definitions and descriptions of eschatology encompass the first advent as well as the second (e.g., Bock, 197–98; Edward Glenny, 229).

In dealing with the topic of predictive prophecy, John Laing and Stefana Laing use Daniel 2 to support the doctrine of inaugurated eschatology. They suggest that the fourth sequential empire of Daniel 2 denotes Rome. Since a Roman leader (Caesar Augustus) reigned when Jesus was born, Jesus must have inaugurated the kingdom amidst Roman rule (94–95). Not everyone agrees, however, that the fourth empire represents Rome, and the writers do not attempt to persuade those who believe otherwise. To strengthen their case, the authors could address common objections to their viewpoint. For instance, given that the fourth kingdom stands out as “different from all the other kingdoms” (Dan. 7:19, 23), in what significant way does Rome differ from the first three kingdoms of Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Greece?

In his piece, “The Doctrine of the Future in the Synoptic Gospels,” Bock claims that the Olivet Discourse uses typology to forecast the demise of the Temple in AD 70 *and* a remote eschatological scenario (205). He offers a three-page overview of this beloved and debated discourse, but he does not entertain the main objections.

Some essay titles are perhaps too broad or too narrow in scope. For example, Daniel Block’s title signals that he will treat Moses’ eschatology, but the essay deals only with Deuteronomy because “exploring the eschatology of the entire Pentateuch would require an entire volume” (107). David Turner’s title announces that he will

synthesize John's eschatology, but the work majors on John's Gospel rather than the Epistles or the Apocalypse (211). The book lacks an essay that focuses on the Apocalypse. In my opinion, a five-hundred-page volume devoted to eschatology and biblical theology should include an essay or two that expounds Revelation or some aspect of it. George Klein's study, "The Doctrine of the Future in the Psalms: Reflections on the Struggle of Waiting," consists of a word study on *יחל* (wait). Klein bypasses Psalm 89, one of the great kingdom psalms—a psalm that possesses eschatological implications and expresses the struggle of waiting (e.g., v. 46, "How long, O Yahweh?").

Nathan Holsteen writes a chapter on John Calvin's eschatology. One wonders why the book merits a chapter on Calvin's eschatology given "the relative paucity of material on the subject within Calvin's works" (319). As Holsteen notes, Calvin avoided subjects such as the nature of the future kingdom, the new heavens and new earth, and the rapture of the church (320).

Despite the shortcomings, this volume can be read with profit. It addresses a vital subject, and the contributors seek to bring clarity and accuracy to the interpretation and application of Scripture.

Kevin J. Vanhoozer. *Biblical Authority after Babel: Retrieving the Solas in a Spirit of Mere Protestant Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2016. 288 pp. (hardcover) \$21.99.

Reviewed by Paul Shirley, Pastor of Grace Community Church, Wilmington, DE.

As the five-hundredth anniversary of Luther's 95 Theses draws near, appreciation and acclaim for the Reformation may be at an all-time high. For some, however, there remains a dark cloud around the history, principles, and consequences of the Reformation. *Biblical Authority after Babel: Retrieving the Solas in a Spirit of Mere Protestant Christianity (BAB)* by Kevin J. Vanhoozer was written to address such concerns and propose a way for the church to move beyond these criticisms.

Vanhoozer (Ph.D., University of Cambridge) has established himself as one of the most influential and innovative theologians in the English-speaking world. He currently serves as Research Professor of Systematic Theology at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Deerfield, IL and has written numerous books, including *Is There a Meaning in This Text?* and *The Pastor as Public Theologian*. The material found in *BAB* was originally delivered at the Annual Moore College Lectures in 2015 and the recordings of these lectures can still be found online.

As Vanhoozer notes extensively, many scholarly historians have laid the blame for secularism, skepticism, and schism at the feet of the ecclesiastical events of the 16th century. The first Protestants—so it is said—taught their spiritual progeny to disdain any kind of hierarchy, to doubt all authority, and to divide at the drop of a hat. They apparently lit the first sparks of the raging inferno of modern individualism, and as proof the critics point to the thousands of disparate Protestant groups and denominations devoid of external unity. In this volume Vanhoozer seeks to assuage the

critics of the Reformation, at the same time setting the course for a unified “Mere Protestant Christianity.”

As the title of the book indicates, Vanhoozer deals with the Reformation as a “hermeneutical Babel” (155) and with Protestantism’s lack of visible unity as the post-Babel ecclesial world. For Vanhoozer, the Reformation resulted in “hermeneutical havoc” and “split churches,” but it didn’t have to be that way (xi) and could be different moving forward. In fact, if Protestantism will revisit and properly apply the five *solas* of the Reformation, these “accidental truths of European history” (xi) can be avoided and a “Mere Protestant Christianity” can be achieved (31–33).

Mere Protestant Christianity is an attempt to stop the bleeding: first, by retrieving the *solas* as guidelines and guardrails of biblical interpretation; and second; by retrieving the royal priesthood of all believers, which is to say, the place of the church in the pattern of theological authority—the place where *sola scriptura* gets lived out in embodied interpretive practices (32).

In other words, Vanhoozer’s goal is to bring increased visible unity to a fractured Protestant movement by using the *solas* of the Reformation to produce an authoritative hermeneutic all Christians can live under.

The burden of the present work is therefore to reclaim elements for a normative Protestantism from the ruins of present-day Protestantism by revisiting historical Protestantism (the Reformation *solas*). I argue that the *solas* provided not an alternative to orthodox tradition but rather a deeper insight into the one true gospel that undergirds that tradition (xi).

Vanhoozer’s hope is not to put an end to denominationalism, but to encourage denominations to appreciate and learn from the various interpretations of Scripture found within the Body of Christ—as long as they fall within the parameters of the *solas* as explained by Vanhoozer. Thus, the author is seeking to retrieve the catholic spirit he perceives to have been lost in the generations subsequent to the Reformation.

The main purpose of retrieval is the revitalization of biblical interpretation, theology, and the church today. To retrieve is to look back creatively in order to move forward faithfully. In particular, what needs to be retrieved is the Reformers’ vision for catholic unity under canonical authority, and also their strategy for making this vision visible through table talk: conciliar deliberation around not simply a conference table but a communion table (24).

In order to bring all Protestants back to the table, Vanhoozer proposes that we use the five *solas* (grace alone, faith alone, Scripture alone, Christ alone, and the glory of God alone) as the guidelines for how to interpret the Bible in a catholic manner. He uses “the *solas* not as doctrines in their own right as much as theological insights into various facets of the ontology, epistemology, and teleology of the gospel” (61). According to his proposal, viewing the slogans of the Reformation in this fashion, would provide the interpretive certainty and authority that would allow Protestants of differing convictions to co-exist under the banner of “Mere Protestant Christianity.”

In chapter 1 Vanhoozer explains “grace alone” as more than just a soteriological principle:

The crux of the argument will therefore be that *sola gratia* has ontological and not merely soteriological significance: first, by helping us better understand the freedom of God... second by helping us to see that the Bible, biblical interpretation, and biblical interpreters refer not to natural entities and process but to elements in an economy of grace. We are *not* to read the Bible like any other book... (50).

For Vanhoozer, a method of interpretation which seeks objective truth from a specific passage through interpretive methods does not measure up to hermeneutical implications of *sola gratia*. “To recognize Scripture as God’s gracious address is to view biblical interpretation less as a procedure that readers perform on the text than a process of spiritual formation that takes place in the readers” (65–66). This formation requires that interpreters “preserve the integrity of the story of salvation” without giving the “impression that second-order doctrines are of first-order importance” (63). Thus he can muse, “Could it be that the various Protestant traditions function similarly as witnesses who testify to the same Jesus from different situations and perspectives? Perhaps we can put it like this: each Protestant church seeks to be faithful to the gospel, but no one form of Protestantism exhausts the gospel’s meaning” (224). It is not totally clear how the concept of *sola gratia* leads to this implication, nor is it clear how one accurately identifies the story of salvation or distinguishes the doctrines of first-order importance. Historically, Protestants have contended that these questions can only be answered through an accurate interpretation of Scripture, but in Vanhoozer’s view it is not entirely clear if any of these issues can ever be resolved.

In chapter 2 Vanhoozer explains how “faith alone” functions as an epistemological principle that prevents the interpreter from overstepping the bounds of his own authority. “*Sola fide* thus refers to the way Christians come to know and appropriate the gift of Jesus Christ via the human words of Scripture” (74). Because we appropriate the gift of Christ found in Scripture through faith, we must be cautious about the authority of our own interpretations since “the claims to have absolute knowledge or even objective knowledge comes close to claiming that one knows as God knows” (82). Thus, “Mere Protestant Christians believe that faith enables a way of interpreting Scripture that refuses both absolute certainty (idols of the tower) and relativizing skepticism (idols of the maze)” (105). What lies between absolute certainty and relativizing skepticism is unclear, but Vanhoozer has previously expressed that “honesty forbids certainty” (*Is There a Meaning in this Text?*, 207). Interestingly, Vanhoozer uses a doctrine that has traditionally called sinners to believe in Christ with absolute certainty to argue for a hermeneutic that obfuscates absolute certainty.

In Chapter 3 Vanhoozer argues that Scripture alone is necessary but insufficient for interpretative authority. “Scripture *alone* is the supreme authority, but God in his grace decided that it is not good for Scripture to be alone. He thus authorized tradition, and Scripture” (144). Thus, God’s Word is supreme, but tradition, which is determined by the conciliar consensus of the church, is necessary in interpretation to

prevent disunity within the church. Vanhoozer does not mention where God has authorized the use of tradition in this way, but he does assert that tradition plays an “appointed role in the economy of salvation” (143). In fact, he states that “Christian tradition... is an external means that the Spirit uses” (141). Again, he does not specify from Scripture where the Spirit promised to use tradition in this manner nor what it means for tradition to be included in the economy of salvation.

In Chapter 4 readers will find a surprise in Vanhoozer’s explanation of *solus Christus*. Vanhoozer expands the concept of “Christ alone” to include the doctrine of the royal priesthood of believers. In fact, he argues “the royal priesthood is the sum of the *solas*—and a *summa* of mere Protestant Christianity” (156). To some it might seem strange to extrapolate the salvific concept of “Christ alone” to include the royal priesthood of believers, but Vanhoozer reminds his readers that “retrieving involves more than merely repeating” (160). This is a helpful principle to remember when reading Vanhoozer’s explanation of the priesthood of believers, since there are very few places where he merely repeats the historic definitions and explanations associated with this doctrine. For Vanhoozer, the royal priesthood of believers implies that the local church in conjunction with the communion of churches has been invested with the authority to interpret the meaning of Scripture. It would seem, then, that Vanhoozer would argue that an individual believer should accept a specific interpretation of a passage based on the church’s authoritative interpretation of that passage. Someone could easily read this explanation and wonder if Vanhoozer turned this doctrine on its head to argue against what the Reformers were arguing for.

In Chapter 5 Vanhoozer closes his exposition of the *solas* by looking at “the glory of God alone.” At this point, readers who have become accustomed to his interpretive expansions will not be surprised to learn that Vanhoozer has found an innovative application of *solus Deo gloria*. In generations past Christians were content to let this mantra communicate that God alone gets the glory for the salvation of a sinner, but this chapter reveals that *solus Deo gloria* is an ecumenical principle, since what most glorifies God is the external unity of the professing church. This is the goal that eluded the Reformers, no doubt because their retrieval of the gospel did not look back creatively enough in order to move forward faithfully. Vanhoozer, however, proposes that God’s glory alone should lead the church to arrive at external unity. Practically, he proposes that “Mere Protestant Christianity” can achieve this by prioritizing few core doctrines that are worth dividing over and employing theological conferences for extended dialogue about all the other disputed doctrines. Vanhoozer’s goal is to bring all segments of the church together around the communion table by using the principles of the Reformation to craft an authoritative hermeneutic. Ironically, the Reformers who first articulated these principles could not even agree on a view of communion. Readers seeking to apply Vanhoozer’s vision of Mere Protestant Christianity will again have to wrestle with the issue of how core doctrines and other disputed doctrines are identified.

No doubt, Vanhoozer is a compelling and creative writer. Regrettably, his creativity is not limited to his forward movement but also includes an innovative analysis of the history of the *solas* of the Reformation, which conveniently agrees with his hermeneutical proposals. He turns the *solas* of the Reformation into an opportunity to restate many of his previous conclusions from previous works. There are enough

insightful nuggets of theology, coupled with obfuscating formulations, to distract many people from discerning the unhelpful elevation of tradition embedded in his approach. Vanhoozer goes too far when he espouses a “pattern of theological authority by which the Spirit leads the church in the full measure of Scripture’s meaning by utilizing previous readings” (145) and ascribes “testimonial authority as to Scripture’s meaning” to the “corporate confessions of the church” (146). It seems as if he is saying that Scripture is authoritative but we only have to access the authoritative meaning of Scripture through the authoritative interpretation of the church (141–44; 212, 223, 233)—which is what the Reformers argued against. This, along with a startling addition of human tradition to the economy of salvation, would not have been welcomed by the Reformers. On this point Vanhoozer certainly departs from Luther’s view on biblical authority.

Biblical authority comes from demonstrating a truth from Scripture in such a way that it informs and persuades the conscience of a believer. The authority does not reside in the conciliar counsel of a church but in the clarity of Scripture. The church has been given the Spirit to recognize and submit to the authority of the Bible, not as a source of interpretive authority. To put it another way, the church possess a ministerial *function* in the interpretation of Scripture, not a magisterial *authority*. What Vanhoozer misses in his evaluation of the post-Reformation church is that the problem of authority in interpretation is not epistemological; it is hamartiological. The reality of original sin, remaining sin, and false professions make perfect unity among the professing church an impossibility until the return of Christ.

I suspect those who have experienced the scorn of scholars toward the Reformation will greatly appreciate this volume’s attempt to defend their academic credibility. Vanhoozer’s vision for Christianity appeals to the sensibilities of philosophical pluralism by providing a place at the table for every theological tradition, but it will add little to confessional Christianity. For the reader who appreciates a clear exposition of historical theology and as little innovation as possible in their systematic theology, this volume will not be as appealing. Students of the Reformation will find Vanhoozer’s articulation of the *solas* so creative that they are barely recognizable.

Thomas Ice. *The Case for Zionism: Why Christians Should Support Israel*. Green Forest, AR: New Leaf Press, 2017. 219 pp. (paper) \$14.99

Reviewed by Michael J. Vlach, Professor of Theology, The Master’s Seminary.

Thomas Ice is Executive Director of the Pre-Trib Research Center. Ice, who has devoted much of his career to issues related to Israel and the church, senses an increasing anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism, not only in the secular culture at large, but also within evangelicalism, which traditionally has been supportive of the Jewish people and the state of Israel. That is why he wrote *The Case for Zion: Why Christians Should Support Israel*. Ice offers a rationale, based in Scripture and in conversation with history, concerning why Christians should support Israel. Offering both broader and narrower definitions of “Zionism,” Ice makes clear that Zionism is support for the Jewish people and their right to live in the land of Israel.

Much of the world is opposed to Israel yet Ice documents a disturbing trend in evangelical theology against Israel. A growing number of Christian theologians are combining a theological “replacement theology” or “supersessionism” to the current situation in the Middle East against Israel and for Israel’s enemies. Appealing to the Abrahamic covenant (Gen. 12; 15) and New Testament passages such as Romans 11 and Revelation 12, Ice argues that the Bible explicitly teaches a future salvation and restoration of Israel. He also refutes replacement theology and explains that the current claim that there is no replacement theology, only fulfillment theology, is a sham. Those who argue for “fulfillment theology” are really using the same arguments found in replacement theology.

In recent years some replacement theologians and anti-Zionists have claimed that today’s Jews are not really true ethnic Jews with bloodline connections to Israel’s patriarchs. Ice notes that since 1976 this idea has taken the form of the Khazar Theory in which the Jewish progeny allegedly has been diluted through a great influx of Gentiles into Judaism connected with the medieval nation Khazaria (129). Ice debunks this theory with appeals to DNA evidence and history. Ice says, “We see that not only do recent DNA studies provide a scientific basis for verifying that modern Jewry really are descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, this view is also supported by biblical logic and the testimony of history” (145–46).

Ice also refutes the idea that support for Israel is mostly a result of dispensationalism and John Nelson Darby. Love for Israel, which should be the case for all Christians, has deep roots in church history, including Protestant England and Puritan influence associated with the founding of colonial America.

This book is highly recommended. It is a helpful mix of biblical arguments and historical insights that helps the reader understand the real issues concerning Israel and Israel’s relationship to the land of promise.

Richard A. Taylor. *Interpreting Apocalyptic Literature: An Exegetical Handbook*. Handbooks for Old Testament Exegesis. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2016. 201 pp. (paper) \$21.99.

Reviewed by Mark A. Hassler, Associate Professor of Old Testament, Virginia Beach Theological Seminary.

Richard Taylor serves as Senior Professor of Old Testament studies at Dallas Theological Seminary. He contributed the commentary on Haggai in the New American Commentary series.

Taylor’s work represents the fifth of six volumes to be published in the series, Handbooks for Old Testament Exegesis (HOTE). The volume concentrates on the book of Daniel, but it also deals with other biblical prophets and the extrabiblical texts. It shares some affinities with another HOTE volume, *Interpreting the Prophetic Books: An Exegetical Handbook*, by Gary Smith (2014). Similarly, Taylor’s book overlaps in some ways with Marvin Pate’s 2016 release, *Interpreting Revelation and Other Apocalyptic Literature: An Exegetical Handbook* (Handbooks for New Testament Exegesis).

Six chapters address various issues of apocalyptic literature, such as its nature, themes, interpretation, and proclamation. Bold typeface highlights terms that appear in the glossary. The end matter contains a twenty-one page appendix, "Antecedents of Apocalyptic Literature." The absence of indexes reduces the value of the handbook for the purposes of research and reference. Such an omission seems bizarre given that the series aims to reach an academic audience (13). The back matter excludes a bibliography, but the author reports that his private bibliography for the book of Daniel alone is approaching a staggering four thousand entries (15).

Instead of a bibliography at the end, recommended resources for exegesis appear interspersed throughout the book in the form of annotated bibliography entries. For instance, the author recommends Brent Sandy's *Plowshares and Pruning Hooks: Rethinking the Language of Biblical Prophecy and Apocalyptic* (InterVarsity Press, 2002). The annotation reads, "A perceptive examination of the way prophetic and apocalyptic language works" (97). In another place, Taylor recommends fourteen commentaries on the book of Daniel (166–68). To this reviewer's surprise, the list excludes the *Commentary on Daniel* by Leon Wood (Zondervan, 1973). The entry for Reinhard Wonneberger's *Understanding BHS: A Manual for the Users of Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* lists the second edition of 1990 rather than the third edition of 2001 (103).

Scholars dispute the definition of *apocalyptic* and related terms, therefore Taylor uses nearly ten pages to define the key terms. Ultimately, he adopts John J. Collins' definition of apocalypse: "a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial, insofar as it involves another, supernatural world" (31–33). Taylor also adopts the wording of Adela Yarbro Collins: an apocalypse is "intended to interpret present, earthly circumstances in light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the audience by means of divine authority" (32–33). Thus, in the OT, only Daniel 7–12 qualifies as an apocalypse; however, quasi-apocalyptic passages appear in books such as Isaiah, Ezekiel, Joel, and Zechariah, says Taylor (34).

The author offers helpful guidance for students of exegesis. He advocates the grammatical-historical method of interpretation and reminds the reader that this method "applies equally to biblical and extrabiblical literature" (119). Students learn that "All translations are, to some extent, mini-commentaries on the biblical text" (119). As a Bible reading tip, Taylor suggests that one read the entire book of Daniel in one sitting in order to grasp the full picture (136). And significantly, "The book of Daniel often provides interpretive guidance that is located right in the biblical text itself" (123).

Taylor warns the reader of the pitfalls concerning the interpretation of apocalyptic literature. "Perhaps the greatest temptation that confronts interpreters of apocalyptic literature is that of going beyond what the text actually says and indulging in reckless and harmful speculation" (97). More specifically, Bible readers should avoid "speculative theories equating contemporary events with biblical prophecy" (98). He notes that the scribe of the Leningrad Codex dated the manuscript in relation to Islam: "this is the year 399 of the reign of the little horn" (129).

Concerning the doctrine of the perspicuity of Scripture, the author says that “perspicuity does not apply equally to all parts of the Bible. . . . not everything in the Bible is so clear as to be easily grasped” (117). Other scholars articulate the doctrine differently. Namely, “clear” does not mean “easily grasped,” but that the reader *can* know the author’s intent.

Taylor reveals some of his conclusions concerning textual criticism. Regarding the book of Daniel, he states that “Theodotion provides a number of variant readings that are superior to the Masoretic text” (100). Later in the volume he evaluates Daniel 8:22, favoring Theodotion’s reading (“from his nation”) instead of the MT’s “from a nation” (159). Moreover, Taylor supposes that the translator of the Old Greek of Daniel used a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differed from the medieval Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts (100–01).

A little argumentation could have supported some interpretations of the biblical text in order to persuade some readers. For example, concerning the topic of angelology, Taylor supposes that an angel (rather than God the Son) rescued Daniel from the lions’ den and Daniel’s friends from the blazing kiln (75–76). Elsewhere, Genesis 11:4 exemplifies hyperbole: the tower will reach “into the heavens” (126). Or perhaps hyperbole is not involved, and the term simply refers to the “sky” (CSB).

The rubber meets the road in chapter six. Here the author seeks to apply “previously discussed principles” to a few sample texts: Daniel 8:1–27 and Joel 2:28–32 (153). In the treatment of Daniel 8, Taylor assumes that the little horn refers to the Seleucid tyrant Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but he does not address some of the glaring weaknesses of that identification (156–57, 160–61). Regarding Joel 2, the author claims that verses 28–32 received an initial fulfillment on the day of Pentecost (175, 177–78), but there were no “previously discussed principles” to prepare the reader to navigate the issues that accompany the NT use of the OT. Moreover, Taylor maintains that some circumstances of the book of Joel, such as the locust invasion, transpired within Joel’s lifetime (169–70). He does not, however, provide any historical or literary confirmation of a fulfillment within Joel’s lifetime. Furthermore, he argues for a past tense use of the verbs in 2:18 based on the presence of the *wayyiqtol* verb form (173). But the context, not the verb form, determines the tense of the verbs in biblical Hebrew (cf. Robert Chisholm, *From Exegesis to Exposition: A Practical Guide to Using Biblical Hebrew*, Baker Books, p. 86).

In a few instances, the list of abbreviations does not synchronize with the subsequent data. The list gives *DCH* as eight volumes and extending through the year 2012, but page 105 shows *DCH* as nine volumes and extending through 2016. The list of abbreviations has the year 1983 as the publication date for *BHS*, but on page 103 it has 1977.

The HOTE handbooks are “primarily intended to serve as textbooks for graduate-level exegesis courses that assume a basic knowledge of Hebrew” (13). Taylor’s volume might not fill that niche because it is too narrow in scope. The volume focuses on only six chapters of the Bible (Daniel 7–12), and exegesis of one of those chapters (chap. 7) presupposes at least a working knowledge of biblical Aramaic.

J. Daniel Hays. *The Temple and the Tabernacle: A Study of God's Dwelling Places from Genesis to Revelation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2016. 208 pp. (paper) \$19.99.

Reviewed by John W. Dube, Grace Bible Institute, Tempe, AZ

J. Daniel Hays is dean of the School of Christian Studies and Professor of Biblical Studies at Ouachita Baptist University in Arkadelphia, Arkansas. Hays is well known for his popular text book on hermeneutics *Grasping God's Word* (coauthored with his colleague J. Scott Duvall). In this well-written volume he tracks the story of the Bible through the lens of the temple and the tabernacle. The content of the book moves chronologically, "examining theologically how God's presence, power, and holiness engage with people through 'temples,' or 'temple-like' places" (11).

The author begins in the first chapter with a study of the Hebrew and Greek words used to refer to the tabernacle and temple. As a result of this study it is determined that the words used for the tabernacle and temple stress the presence, power, holiness, and worship of God (18). This preliminary lexical study is helpful as it lays the foundation for the chapters that follow.

Hays builds on this foundation by explaining how the Garden of Eden functioned much like a sanctuary or temple would, "a place where God's presence dwells in a special kind of way so that his people can be with him and worship him" (21). The author moves to prove this with nine convincing reasons (22–24). The eviction of Adam and Eve from God's garden temple proves the need for a new dwelling place for God's presence. And, it is the details of these dwelling places (both real and supposed) that the author explains in chapter 3–7 of the book.

Chapter 3 covers the tabernacle; chapter 4–5 Solomon's temple and the departure of Yahweh from the temple; chapter 6 the second temple; and chapter 7 deals with the temple of God in the New Testament. The author begins his discussion on the tabernacle in chapter 3 by explaining the major themes of deliverance and presence from the book of Exodus. The point is made throughout the book that as one draws closer to the presence of God, the intensity of holiness increases (34). This is the reason God's instruction to Moses concerning the tabernacle starts with the ark (Exod. 25:10–22), moves outward to the table (Exod. 25:23–30), and then the lampstand (Exod. 25:31–40). The author spends adequate time talking through the details of the ark (esp., materials used, design, decoration, and contents), table, golden lampstand, incense altar tabernacle proper, curtains, altar of burnt offering, basin for washing and courtyard. In nearly every case the author is well balanced in his conclusions regarding symbology or prophetic connections found in the tabernacle and its accoutrements. This reviewer was particularly impressed with the explanation and details regarding the golden lampstand. The author reminds us that the treelike appearance of the tabernacle lampstand "is quite different from the traditional seven-branched candelabrum that is the national symbol of Israel" (44). The author explains the unique details regarding the stone or clay "lamps" used on the lampstand, the metallurgical details of the lampstand, the method of its construction and its dimensions. Finally, the author draws a connection between the Garden of Eden (the garden dwelling place of God) and the tabernacle, saying, "A sacred or holy tree in the very presence of God is suggestive of the tree of life that was in the garden" (47–

48). Chapter 3 ends by addressing the symbolism in the tabernacle and its connection to Christ. Hays confronts the issue directly, “We do not have the liberty to let our imaginations run wild and dream up prophetic connections about every little detail of the tabernacle” (60). The author says rightly, “The primary and correct way to study Christ in the tabernacle is to observe how all the major theological themes in the tabernacle find their ultimate fulfillment and completion in Christ” (60). Therefore, the tabernacle’s limited access to the presence of God is overshadowed by Christ, who provides direct access to the presence of God through his atoning sacrifice. “The tabernacle was a shadow; Christ is the reality. This is the correct approach to understanding how Christ relates to the tabernacle” (61).

In chapter four the author undertakes the topic of Solomon’s temple. The strength of this chapter is *not* found in the author’s lucid explanation of the temple construction and its details, but in the comparison between that temple and the tabernacle. Hays builds on his article “To Praise Solomon or to Bury Him” (*JSOT* 28.2 [2003]: 149–74), suggesting that the narrative details concerning the temple construction are pejorative toward Solomon and his building of the temple. The author defends this claim on the following significant differences between the tabernacle and temple destruction in Exodus and 1 Kings respectively: (1) God’s role in the construction accounts, (2) Israel’s participation in the construction accounts, (3) the primary craftsmen’s identity and training, (4) the materials used, and (5) the time dedicated to their construction. The author summarizes his conclusions,

The physical temple that Solomon builds, the high point of his reign, is spectacular from a human point of view, but theologically it is clouded with numerous negative connotations from the beginning. It is not a step forward in Israel’s relationship with God, a supposed improvement on the tabernacle, but rather a step backward (87).

Yahweh’s departure from Solomon’s temple is covered in chapter 5. Hays applies clear and fluid exegesis throughout the chapter and makes very helpful observations regarding the cherubim attending to the presence of God and their involvement in Yahweh’s departure from Solomon’s temple. The author does such an excellent job of explaining who these divine attendants are, that pages 111–26 of this volume provide a better angelology than most monographs dedicated to the subject.

The second temple is the subject of the sixth chapter, which is replete with helpful background information relevant to second temple Israel. The author traces the history of Israel from Ezra to Herod, explains the rise of the synagogue, and explores the details of Herod’s temple and the various courtyards and gates surrounding it.

In chapter seven Hays moves from the Old Testament era to the New and addresses the “temple” issues as they reach their consummation in Jesus Christ. Hays rightly reminds the reader that the presence of God did not dwell in the second temple, “until Jesus Christ walks in through its gates” (167). Hays explains Jesus as the temple (John 2:19) and how “each Christian believer becomes a temple of God, since God does indeed dwell within each of them” (178). Hays explains Ezekiel’s temple vision in this chapter. He says Ezekiel’s vision is prophetic, “pointing figuratively and representatively to realities brought about by Jesus Christ in the New Testament

and probably realized in the new Jerusalem” (182). Hays does explain the literal view and is charitable towards it.

In addition to the great content offered by Hays, this volume offers many helpful images, tables, and graphs—all printed on high quality glossy paper. One such example is a map of the second temple with numbered locations and explanations from Acts (174–75). The book contains a bibliography and subject and Scripture index, which makes the book a helpful resource tool for the Bible student and exegete.

This reviewer recommends this book to anyone desiring to explore issues related to the temple and tabernacle. Additionally, this volume contributes to the subject of Old Testament theology as it functions as an Old Testament theology viewed through the lens of the temple and the tabernacle.