Herbert Bateman has condensed a wealth of data into 104 charts intended for “pastors, teachers, students and anyone wanting to study as well as teach the Book of Hebrews” (9). His aim was to compile the data in a user-friendly format for people to use in their own study of the book or as a pedagogical tool. The charts are grouped into four parts: introductory considerations (charts 1–29), Old Testament and Second Temple influences (30–55), theology (56–87), and exegetical matters (88–104). About fifteen pages of “Chart Comments” (239–53) follow, giving Bateman’s sources, as well as additional information and the rationale behind each chart or set of charts. There is a twelve-page bibliography, divided into the same groupings as the charts (leading to some duplication). The copyright page gives permission for the charts to be used freely in the classroom. They could be scanned and projected onto a screen, although I think they would be too small and crowded to be that useful. A CD with the charts in electronic format would have been a useful supplement.

Part 1 covers authorship (seven charts); destination, recipients, and dating (eight charts); genre and structure (eight charts); and canonicity (five charts). This material lends itself to this sort of presentation and will surely be useful for students. Chart 1 lists the first proponents of a variety of suggested authors. Chart 2 gives a chronological list of scholars who have proposed different authors, from Barnabas (Tertullian, ca. 150–200) to Luke (David Allen, 2010). Mary, the mother of Jesus, appears (Massyngberde Ford, 1976),...
along with many others, including “Unknown” (Origen, Westcott), and “Pseudepigraphic” (Wrede and Rothschild). Chart 3 conveniently lists the opinions of twenty-one commentators (significant commentaries omitted include Westcott, deSilva, Long, Thompson, and works in languages other than English). Charts 4-7 list debated issues around the suggested authorship of Barnabas, Paul, Luke, and Apollos. These four charts are a useful and readily accessible compilation, although I find some of the arguments odd. For example, one argument for the authorship of Barnabas is that it was accepted by the Western church; against this, the chart notes that the Eastern church rejected his authorship. Another argument for Barnabas is that Filaster (bishop of Brescia) proposed him as author in the fourth century, but this is set over against the dominant view at the time that Paul was the author. Such comparisons are not that useful.

Charts 8–15 list debated issues about the destination, recipients, and date, followed in each case by charts giving the conclusions of the same set of commentators. Chart 8 does not quite live up to its description. It claims to detail the debates around a variety of destinations; instead, it gives historical and geographical information about the cities in question (Rome, Jerusalem, Syrian Antioch, Colossae, and Cyrene). Given that none of the commentators listed refers to Jerusalem (proposed only by Buchanan, to my knowledge) or Cyrene, I am not sure why these cities are listed. Of the commentators listed in chart 9, sixteen (76 percent) opt for Rome, with the other options being “Unknown” (Moffatt, Bruce and Johnson), Syrian Antioch (Allen), and Colossae (Stedman).

Eighteen commentators (86 percent) think the recipients were Jewish Christians, with the other options being “Unknown” (Attridge), Gentile Christians (Moffatt), and Jewish/Gentile Christians (Koester, Wilson). Chart 12 gives the evidence that the recipients were regenerate (supplemented by a discussion on 240), although this detail might have been better included alongside the charts on the warning passages (charts 84–87). The date range (chart 13) is somewhere between 29–33 CE (the date of the death of Jesus) and 95–96 CE (the date of the citations in 1 Clement, although Bateman overlooks Attridge’s somewhat later date for Clement). He lists a series of “for and against” arguments surrounding the date, ultimately declining to make a call (although he does seem to prefer a post-70 date) and challenging the reader to do so instead. Chart 15 gives the date proposed for each New Testament book by the authors of several introductory works (with deSilva’s Introduction a significant omission).

The genre and structure charts include chart 16 listing external and internal evidence for whether Hebrews should be considered a “sermonic letter.” Carl Mosser has recently provided a valuable contribution to this discussion, although it was published after
Bateman’s *Charts.*¹ Chart 17 lists texts containing paraenetic, admonishing, encouraging (only 10:39 is listed, but I am sure there are more, e.g., 6:9–12), and consoling features in Hebrews. The other charts in this section present thematic, rhetorical, chiastic, and text-linguistic structural arrangements, with examples of each. Strangely, Vanhoye’s analysis appears twice (56, 57).

Five charts setting out the issues around the canonicity of Hebrews and its canonical placement conclude part 1. It is a rich repository of information. I note with interest from chart 26 that Hebrews’ present placement after Philemon depends on a few late manuscripts, with the main codices placing it prior to the Pastorals.

Part 2 (charts 30–55) contains charts on Old Testament quotations and allusions (five charts), discussions of the “Jewish” cultic system (six charts), details of the Jewish high priesthood from the return from the exile to the fall of the temple (seven charts), and a discussion of Second Temple messianic figures (eight charts).

Chart 30 lists thirty-six Old Testament quotations in Hebrews, and chart 31 analyzes thirty-four of these, omitting Deut 9:19 (Heb 12:21) and Hag 2:6 (Heb 12:26), with no explanation. Charts 32 and 33 do the same with twenty-eight allusions.² Chart 34 lists persons from the Old Testament mentioned in Hebrews, with brief commentary.

Charts 35–40 are described in the table of contents as dealing with the “Jewish Cultic System.” Charts 34–38 contain diagrams and plans of the tabernacle with relevant texts from the Old Testament and from Hebrews, chart 39 refers to eight Old Testament festivals in Hebrews (although five of these do not feature in Hebrews), and chart 40 compares the Day of Atonement in Lev 16 with relevant texts in Hebrews. Referring to this section as “Jewish” is somewhat anachronistic, since all the Old Testament references are from the Pentateuch. “Old Testament” would have been preferable.

There is a wealth of information in charts 41–47, and Bateman has done students a great service by compiling it in such an accessible format. High priests from the return of the exile to the fall of the temple are listed with dates and brief historical notes, along with references to the primary sources. The Hasmonean and Herodian family trees are included for good measure. The specific relevance of this material for Hebrews is
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¹. Carl Mosser, “Torah Instruction, Discussion, and Prophecy in First-Century Synagogues,” in *Christian Origins and Hellenistic Judaism: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament* [ed. Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts; Leiden: Brill, 2013], 523-51. This work has been online at least since 2011; see http://eastern.academia.edu/CarlMosser/Papers/115948/_Torah/Instruction/Discussion_and/Prophecy_in_First-Century_Synagogues, 115941-115920.
questionable, especially since most scholars argue that Hebrews has no interest in the contemporary priesthood. Nevertheless, it is valuable for New Testament studies as a whole.

The relevance for Hebrews of some of the charts in the next section is also questionable. Chart 48 lists anointed figures in the Old Testament (Elisha the prophet, Aaron the priest and his descendants, kings, and the heavenly figure in Daniel). An additional column lists Second Temple texts (mostly Dead Sea Scrolls) that refer to anointed prophets, priestly figures, kings, and heavenly figures. Chart 49 details messianic portraits in the Second Temple literature (again mostly from the Dead Sea Scrolls), and chart 50 lists messianic titles that appear in the Second Temple literature and in Hebrews. I question the inclusion of the term “Son of Man” in Heb 2:6 in this chart, especially given that it is placed over against the Enochic Son of Man. This is debated, to be sure, but “Son of Man” is almost certainly not a messianic title in Heb 2:6 (the same assumption appears in charts 65 and 66). Chart 51 considers Melchizedek in the Old Testament, 11QMelchizedek, Hebrews, Josephus, and Philo, and chart 52 compares statements about Melchizedek in Gen 14, Ps 110, 11QMelchizedek, and Heb 1–7. Chart 53 compares Old Testament regal priests with Jesus. I wonder about the claim that Jesus “quite literally resides and reigns in heaven with God” (100, emphasis added). The application of Ps 110 to Jesus invests an Old Testament metaphor with new significance, but I am not sure that it can be described as “quite literal.” I do not expect that there is a large chair in heaven on which God and Jesus are seated. Chart 54 portrays the position and character of Jesus the regal priest, and chart 55 considers the roles of divine beings in Jewish theology where Old Testament terms are invested with new significance.

Part 3 (charts 56–87) discusses theology in Hebrews. There are sections on the “Godhead” (eleven charts), theological themes in Hebrews (sixteen charts), and words of exhortation in Hebrews (five charts that are really on the warning passages).

Chart 56 contains several statements about God from Hebrews. Missing are 12:29 (“our God is a consuming fire”) and 13:20 (“the God of peace, who brought back from the dead our Lord Jesus”). I wonder why God’s judgment is considered to be “primarily future” in such texts as 4:12; 10:31; 12:23; and 13:4. Chart 57 does the same with statements about Jesus, and while the chart is technically correct, one would not realize from the data that Jesus is not mentioned by name until Heb 2:9. Chart 58 shows how activities and characteristics predicated of God in the Old Testament are applied to Jesus in the New Testament. Chart 59, prepared (presumably by Bateman) for a presentation at an ETS Seminar in 2009 (245) and imported from there, compares the treatment of the Holy Spirit in the Dead Sea Scrolls with that in Hebrews. This chart seems a bit out of context in the book, and I am not sure how the Hebrews texts listed relate to the Dead Sea Scrolls.
texts cited. Chart 60 examines the notion of Jesus as Wisdom, with references to Prov 8:27–30, Wisdom of Solomon, the New Testament in general, and Heb 1:2–3. Charts 61–64 cover the same material, with the texts referred to in chart 60 given in English and Greek alongside other New Testament parallels. Five charts on the topic may be excessive, since Wisdom Christology appears only in Heb 1:2–3 and is a minor theme in the book. Chart 65 usefully lists the titles ascribed to Jesus in Hebrews, in English and Greek. Chart 66 lists other places in the New Testament where the titles applied to Jesus in Hebrews appear. In comparing the title “God,” applied to Jesus in Heb 1:8, with John, Bateman cites only John 20:28. I also expected to see John 1:1, 18.

Chart 67 usefully lists the texts where “better” (κρείττων) appears in Hebrews. Chart 68 is about Jesus and angels, and charts 69–72 cover the theme of covenant in Hebrews (chart 69 refers to Heb 8:16 when 8:6 is meant). Chart 72 is a premillennial dispensational schematic diagram that dates the construction of the tabernacle precisely to 1446 BCE and anticipates a millennium when the now “not yet” kingdom of the Son will be consummated. I am not sure that the author of Hebrews had ever heard of the millennium, and I think this chart would have been better omitted, along with the explanation on 248. Chart 73 is a useful chart about “once for all” in Hebrews, and chart 74 considers the future inheritance in Hebrews. I question whether 10:19–20 can be relegated to the future, and I question the transfer of Abraham’s anticipation of a better country and a heavenly city in 11:10–16 to “us.”

Perfection is a significant concept in Hebrews, applied both to Jesus and to believers, and chart 75 usefully summarizes the data. Here Bateman reads τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους (“the sanctified ones”) in 10:14 as a process. Surely the expression is a substantive in this text (O’Brien, Hebrews, 257). Charts 76–78 cover other theological themes in Hebrews, and charts 79–82 analyze the content of Heb 11 in various ways.

Part 3 concludes with charts 83–87 centering on the warning passages. Bateman relies on *Four Views on the Warning Passages in Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2007), which he edited. This is a useful set of charts, clearly setting the issues out in an accessible manner. It will be an excellent resource for students.

Part 4 (charts 88–104) covers exegetical matters. There are charts on interpretive issues (88–93), text-critical issues (94–97), figures of speech (98–101), and important words (102–4). Charts 88–90 are really for a specialist. They list the Hebrew text, the LXX, and the Greek text of Hebrews for the Old Testament citations listed in chart 30. There is no English translation. The information will be useful only for a person with a grasp of both biblical languages, although this seems not to be the target audience for the book. Chart 91 gives examples of Jewish exegesis in Hebrews. This, too, is useful information. Charts
92 and 93 are examples of chiasm in Heb 1:1–4, 5–13, and 11:1–40. While Bateman has identified chiasms in these texts and set them out clearly, I am unsure that the structures he identifies are that helpful for exegesis. For Heb 1:5–13 I still prefer the structure proposed by James Thompson almost forty years ago.3

Charts 94–97 helpfully set out the manuscript evidence for Hebrews. Especially useful is chart 96, which gives brief descriptions of the provenance and dating of the various manuscripts. Chart 97 lists forty–two textual issues in Hebrews, giving the text and the variants from the apparatuses in NA27 and UBS4, with an explanation of the issues involved and Bateman’s preferred reading. I can see this material being really useful for people working with the Greek text.

Chart 98 relies on Bullinger’s Figures of Speech (1898), and I suspect it was compiled from Bullinger’s indexes.4 Charts 99–101 examine the texts referred to in chart 98 and explain the application of the figurative language. These charts might be a useful aid to exegesis, although Bullinger’s work does not really represent the status questionis on figurative language. A more recent discussion of such language in Hebrews appears in Spicq 1:361–66, although this, too, is now over sixty years old.5 Chart 102 list words used frequently in Hebrews, and the last two charts list almost two hundred words unique to Hebrews: chart 103 in alphabetical order and chart 104 in chapter and verse order, with both charts comparing the translations of these words in ten English translations. These are the most extensive charts in the book, each covering eighteen pages. It would have been helpful to see which of these words also appear in the LXX and their frequency. I suspect many do, and such additional detail would probably further highlight the author’s indebtedness to the LXX.6

This is certainly a useful compilation of information, most of it well-suited to the target audience but some more suited to the scholarly community. Some are more helpful than others. Those I think particularly valuable include charts 3, 9, 11, 14, and 18 listing the opinions of commentators on various aspects of Hebrews, as well as most of the charts in part 1; charts 30–34 on the Old Testament in Hebrews; 41–47 on the Second Temple high priests; and 94–97 on the manuscript evidence. Less useful are the charts on the theology of Hebrews, where there is more room for exegetical and theological debate. The format of the book precludes such discussion, and Bateman’s conclusions are usually presented

without acknowledgement that there may be alternative views. Nevertheless, this does not detract from the book’s overall value. It deserves a place in seminary libraries and probably also in pastors’ libraries. Students will love it when preparing term papers, and I am sure I will return to it often. The one enhancement I would like to see in a future edition is the placement of the comments on the charts in the main text alongside the charts they refer to rather than being hidden at the back. There they are easily missed, since this is a reference work to be mined from time to time rather than read from start to finish.