

## The NIV Zondervan Study Bible

The new NIV Zondervan Study Bible which appeared in August 2015 is a very high quality product. It has numerous color pictures, maps, and charts. If you buy the print edition, you also get access to the electronic edition. In production quality the only significant drawback is that in the standard version the type face is too small for some readers.

The preface stresses that this study Bible emphasizes theology. Instead of focusing primary attention on how the Bible as a whole addresses many questions (what some people mean by systematic theology) it tries to highlight the way various themes develop within the Bible across time. This is developed in twenty-eight articles on theology at the end of the volume.

The contributors are Evangelicals who accept the authority of the Bible as the Word of God. Trinity and Wheaton are two of the schools most represented among the contributors.

There is no doubt about the quality of this volume. The question is whether the theology presented in the notes is suitable for confessional Lutherans who are seeking guidance into an understanding of biblical doctrine and the interpretation of passages that have an application to doctrine and practice.

When one lets the notes speak for themselves, the following quotations demonstrate that the theology presented in the Zondervan Study Bible (ZSB) makes it unsuitable for confessional Lutherans or anyone wishing to simply understand what the Bible says. It does not guide into an understanding of biblical doctrine, and it incorrectly interprets passages that have an application to doctrine and practice. In the following examples, the ZSB quotes are indented.

On the days of creation a note on Genesis 1 says:

**first day.** Or “day one.” The term can be used interchangeably with “first” to denote the initial element in an assumed sequence, especially a sequence denoting days (e.g., Ezra 3:6; 10:16-17; Neh 8:2; Hag 1:1). The Hebrew word for “day” can refer to a 24-hour period or a larger period of time. For example, Gen 2:4 uses the same Hebrew word for “day” when it refers to the “account” of the heavens and the earth, that is, “on the day when they were created.” Thus, seven days become one day. On the other hand, the Hebrew word “day” often refers to a 24-hour period (e.g., 7:11,13; 8:4-5,14).

The introduction (p 20) says this on the Bible and Science:

The contemporary reader of Genesis should strive to read the text as it was originally intended to be read by the ancient reader--not to presume that one can carry into this ancient writing all the assumptions and questions that we might have today. This requires care and knowledge of the purpose for which Moses wrote the text. We should exercise care to read the Bible in a manner that remains sensitive to the literary clues and nuances that the writer intended. This approach is possible but requires study and the guidance of the Spirit of God.

The question of the age of the earth is not automatically resolved with the use of the seven days in 1:1-2:3. In 2:4, Moses uses the same Hebrew word for “day” to summarize all the work of creation: “In the day when God created the heavens and the earth.” Of

course, this does not mean that the term “day” cannot refer to a 24-hour day in the seven days of creation. But it may also serve other purposes. For one, the use of days builds up to the final climactic seventh day of Sabbath rest. This forms one of the major theological emphases of the creation account. The Sabbath rest is built into creation and forms the goal of world history from its beginning. Another reason for the seven days may be connected with “the account of” in 2:4. While this term often precedes the genealogical lines, it can also fall in the midst of longer accounts of individuals and their families. This is true in the case of the last mention of this in Genesis, in the account of Jacob’s family line (37:2). Much of the story has already been told. The same may be true of 2:4. How do the heaven and earth have a “family line”? There are no parents or children, only the beginning of the human race. Using a metaphor in which the sun and moon bring forth the earth would only confuse the reader in a strictly monotheistic world where these created things have no personhood and should not be worshiped. Instead, the author may have used the sequence of days to parallel the sequences of generations in the later family lines. Each day prepares for and gives way to the next day just as each generation prepares for and gives way to the next generation. This emphasizes the logical development of God’s creation more than it pinpoints the chronological development.

A second area concerns the expression “according to its/their kind(s).” ... It is sometimes taken to mean that the text must describe exact reproduction and cannot allow for the gradual development of various forms of species. However, in Ezek 47:10 this same phrase refers to fish “of many kinds.” If that is the case in Genesis, then it does not emphasize limitation of each life form to its specific species but emphasizes the diversity of each general life form: fish of many kinds, land creatures of many kinds, etc.

The role of Adam and Eve as the first human couple appears in chs. 2-4. While some may argue that these figures represent a symbolic or metaphoric story that has no relation to the early history of humanity, they must address the explicit presentation of the Hebrew text. The syntax of the text resembles that of later books such as 2 Kings, Ezra, and Nehemiah. All readers understand that the authors of these books intended readers to accept them as history. The same should be true of a text such as ch. 3. Indeed, this becomes the witness of the memories of Genesis in the later biblical text (see Introduction: Genesis and History; Genesis and the New Testament).

The article on creation at the end of the volume addresses the meaning of creation, more than the manner of creation.

The note on Genesis 3:15 says:

This promise anticipates Rev 12 (especially 12:9) and the victory in Rev 19-20 (especially 20:2), where the dragon, “that ancient serpent,” represents Satan, and the woman represents the mother of Jesus, who is her seed. Jesus’ death and resurrection secures the final victory over Satan and death. His victory begins with his coming into the world at the incarnation (John 1:1-14) and will culminate when he returns. In Christian history, v. 15 has been called the Protoevangelium, the first announcement of the gospel. At both the beginning and the end, the Bible pictures Satan as a snake or dragon at war with God for the dominion of the earth and the human race.

Genesis 6 says this about the sons of God and the daughters of men.

**6:2 sons of God.** Four options explain this phrase: (1) They are angels. This is what the phrase refers to elsewhere in the OT (see Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7 and NIV text notes; cf. Pss 29:1; 89:6) except for a related expression in Hos 1:10. Mark 12:25 may suggest that angels do not marry, but Mark 12 refers to angels who are in heaven fulfilling their roles, not in a fallen state. (Compare 2 Pet 2:4-5, Jude 5-6, and the tradition of these angels as “Watchers” in some strands of Judaism.) (2) They are sons of Cain. But given how ch. 4 describes them, it is surprising that they would be called “sons of God.” (3) They are sons of Seth. (4) They are otherwise unknown kings. But why call them “sons of God”? Some commentators combine two or more explanations

Concerning the nature of the Flood the notes on Genesis 7 say:

**7:19 all the high mountains . . . were covered.** If this includes Mount Ararat (in the Urartian mountain range in eastern Turkey), then the waters need to rise above 16,854 feet (5,137 meters). A natural reading suggests a global flood, and some find this in 2 Pet 2:5; 3:6. The reference may also imply a regional flood (nevertheless possessing tremendous severity) with impact affecting the whole human race, who may have remained in one area (Gen 11:1-9). In 41:57, “all the world” refers to the eastern Mediterranean lands, so in chs. 6-8 the flood may have covered only the part of the earth where people lived.

On the number of Israelites in the wilderness the introduction to Numbers says:

Ch. 1 and ch. 26—which occur roughly 40 years apart—both contain a census of the Israelites “twenty years old or more” (1:18; 26:2). The totals are 603,550 (1:46) and 601,730 (26:51), with the Levites not included in these totals (1:47; cf. 3:14-39; 26:57-62). How these numbers should be understood is widely debated. Four main approaches may be briefly noted.

1. *The numbers are literal.* This is perhaps the most traditional approach, although it creates a difficulty. The difficulty is not whether the Lord could do the miraculous in multiplying the people so quickly (the Lord can do anything he desires); the difficulty is that taking these numbers at face value creates tension with other passages. In Josh 4:13, e.g., Israel has 40,000 fighting men, a number far fewer than the 603,550 given in Num 1:46 (cf. also Josh 8:3). In addition, an army of over half a million men would make Israel’s army far larger than what we believe to have been true of other armies at the time, even though Israel is called “the fewest of all peoples” (Deut 7:7). This tension suggests finding a different approach.
2. *The numbers are symbolic.* This approach has two different versions. In the first, the symbolism may be unlocked using gematria, a system in which numbers correspond to letters of the alphabet and work as a code to spell out different words. In the second, the numbers are related to astronomical phenomena. For example, when Benjamin’s total of 35,400 (1:37) is divided by 100, the number is the same as the number of days in a short lunar year: 354. Very few scholars have adopted either of these approaches because they either fail to explain all the data or can explain it only by complex (and many would say arbitrary) calculations.

3. *There is a misunderstanding of the Hebrew word 'elep.* The Hebrew word 'elep usually means “1,000” and has traditionally been translated this way in chs. 1; 26. But it can also mean “family” or “clan,” and a word built on the same root can mean “tribal leader.” Some scholars have therefore suggested that the text originally referred to one of these other meanings. For example, Reuben’s total of 46,500 (1:21) represents 46 *families* (not 46 *thousand*) and these total 500 people. But such approaches either fail to explain the final totals in 1:46 and 26:51 (which understand 'elep to mean “1,000” throughout these chapters) or explain them by means of complicated and conjectural textual emendations.
4. *The numbers are deliberate hyperbole.* The final approach has the fewest problems and thus the most to commend it. It understands the numbers as being intentionally inflated. Some who adopt this approach suggest that the numbers were inflated by a factor of 10, though others suggest that it is no longer possible to identify the way in which the numbers were inflated. At first glance, this is the least attractive approach to many moderns, who tend to believe that if numbers are not reported with scientific accuracy, they are misleading. But such was not the case in the ancient Near East. There is clear evidence that numbers were often inflated, particularly in a military context (as demonstrated by examples from Ugaritic and Assyrian texts dating from the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BC, the same general time period in which Numbers was written). It was neither unusual nor extraordinary. Indeed, the people to whom Numbers was written would have immediately been able to recognize that the numbers were inflated (in keeping with convention). There is no reason to believe that the original readers would have seen this as deceptive. Indeed, they may have seen it as a way of emphasizing what was true: the Lord had indeed been faithful to his covenant promise to make Abraham into a numerous people (Gen 12:2; 15:5).

Despite the lack of an interpretive consensus among scholars concerning the numbers themselves, it is likely that the numbering of the people tribe by tribe would have served, at the very least, to remind the Israelites that the Lord had fulfilled his promise to make them into a numerous people. And since he had been faithful to that covenant promise, he could also be trusted to fulfill his covenant promise to give them a land. They could march into Canaan with full confidence in their covenant King.

On Joshua’s “the sun stood still” the notes on Joshua 10 say:

**10:12-13 stand still . . . stood still . . . stopped.** Although scholars have proposed a variety of interpretations for this miracle (an eclipse, an omen, literary imagery, etc.), the third verb (“stopped, stood” from Hebrew 'md) is the clearest in meaning. It suggests that the sun “stood” still. What followed was likely a prolonged day that enabled Israel to complete its victory over its enemies.

On Isaiah’s prophecy of the virgin the notes on Isaiah 7 say:

**7:14 virgin.** Hebrew 'almâ, which means “young woman of marriageable age.” In Israelite society a young woman of marriageable age would have been a virgin (as the Septuagint, the pre-Christian Greek translation of the OT, makes plain). Otherwise, she would have been a prostitute. But the Hebrew word is not the technical term meaning “virgin.” Isaiah uses this more ambiguous term because of the double reference of this sign. In its immediate reference the virginity of the mother is not the most significant

point. Rather, God is saying that before a child conceived at that time would reach age 12 or 13 (v. 16), the two nations of which Ahaz was so terrified would cease to exist. But in the long term, this sign, higher than heaven and deeper than hell (see note on vv. 10-17), referred to the coming of Jesus Christ, the true Immanuel (Matt 1:23), and the virginity of his mother was vitally important. This is why Isaiah did not use a simple word meaning “woman” or “young woman.

How do the notes deal with Messianic psalms? About the Anointed in Psalm 2 the notes say:

**anointed.** Israel’s kings, beginning with Saul and David, were anointed with oil when they assumed office. The reference here to the Lord’s anointed is more specialized, referring to any royal descendant of David. This recalls the promises God made to David about always having a descendant on the throne (2 Sam 7:11b-16), and it looks ahead to the fulfillment of these promises in Jesus Christ (see Matt 1:1;21:9; 22:42).

The son of man does not appear in the NIV translation of Psalm 8. Do the notes remedy the situation?

**8:4 mankind.** Here refers to humanity in its weak and frail existence (e.g., 9:20; 10:18; 90:3; 103:15). **human beings.** See NIV text note; “son of man” is a literal translation of a Hebrew phrase commonly used to refer to a human being, especially in contrast to God (80:17; 144:3; see note on Ezek 2:1 and NIV text note there). This phrase marks the exact center of the psalm (see note on 100:3), highlighting the importance of humanity in God’s eyes. It sets the stage for the soaring language about humanity’s place in creation in vv. 5-8.

Does Psalm 16 refer directly to Christ as Peter and Paul say it does?

**16:9-11** David ends by strongly affirming his security in the Lord, which extends even beyond death. The Psalms usually focus on this life, but not exclusively. Other references in the Psalms to life beyond the grave include 17:15; 49:15,19; 73:24-26. Texts elsewhere in the OT that point to life after death include 1 Sam 2:6; 2 Sam 12:22-23; Job 14:13-17; 19:25-27; Isa 26:19; Ezek 37; Dan 12:1-2; Hos 6:2; 13:14. Peter quoted vv. 8-11 of this psalm in his sermon on the day of Pentecost, applying it to Jesus’ resurrection from the dead (Acts 2:25-28), and Paul did the same with v. 10 in his speech at Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13:35).

How does Psalm 22 correspond to the life of David?

**Ps 22 My God, My God, Why Have You Forsaken Me?** ... The first part focuses on David as an individual experiencing unmatched suffering in his person. In the second part, David returns to his accustomed role as king, thanking God before the people and extending his vision to the nations. ... The language of suffering in the first part might fit some of David’s travails when he was fleeing from Saul (1 Sam 19-30) or Absalom (2 Sam 15-17), but the intensity and the specific details, especially in vv. 12-18, outstrip anything that David is recorded to have experienced. As in many psalms, he resorts to figurative language to express the depth of his distress. In the second part, his vision extends beyond any reality of his own day as he affirms that “all the families of the nations will bow down before” the Lord (v. 27). No Christian can read Ps 22 without

hearing resonances of this psalm as applied to the sufferings of Jesus.... What were figurative expressions of David's suffering became literal sufferings of Jesus. David prefigured Jesus in many ways as the great heir to the throne that God promised him (2 Sam 7:11b-16): he suffered great hardships before he was hailed as Israel's undisputed king. So too did Jesus undergo great suffering before he is exalted as the world's undisputed King. The apostle Paul affirms that all Christ-followers must also share in Christ's sufferings if they are to share in his glory (Rom 8:17-18).

Is Psalm 45 about the Messiah or is it hyperbole about Israel's king as the NIV note says?

**45:6 Your throne, O God.** The king, as God's representative, is addressed as God himself (see NIV text note), certainly a startling use of language at first glance. Yet it reflects the close relationship between any godly king and his God. God himself declared that any royal descendant of David would be his "son" (2 Sam 7:14). Thus, in this psalm, where the language is lavish throughout, to see the king-the "son" of God-being addressed simply as "God" should not be surprising. The king occupied God's throne (1 Chr 28:5), and a close relationship existed between God and king. There is no hint here or elsewhere, however, that the kings in Israel or Judah were actually considered divine (in the way that the Egyptians thought of their pharaohs); indeed, the very next verse refers to God as "your" God (i.e., the king's God). The king is not truly God; only God is.

Who is "my lord" in Psalm 110?

Ps 110 depicts a Messianic King-Priest who will ultimately and finally accomplish the deliverance that Pss 107-109 long for....Ps 110 has enjoyed a long history of Messianic interpretation for three primary reasons: (1) David has a vision of a figure whom he refers to as "my lord," and this figure accomplishes an ultimate victory over God's enemies that none of David's purely human offspring approached; (2) there is an affinity between Ps 110 and other Messianic psalms, such as Pss 2; 45; 72; 132; 144; and (3) the NT references Ps 110 more than any other psalm (see Acts 2:34-35; 1 Cor 15:25; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1; Heb 1:13; 7:17,21; 1 Pet 3:22).... It applies Ps 110 to Jesus as evidence of his Messianic nature (Matt 22:44; Heb 5:6). Ps 110 provides hope that the Lord has not abandoned his covenant with David: an heir of David will reign forever (89:4,36;2 Sam 7:16).

**110:1 lord.** Sovereign or superior (Hebrew 'ādôn; see note on 8:1). In the OT, this word most often refers to human masters ...and is thus not capitalized. It can, however, refer to God.... Jesus interprets it as a reference to himself, and so it is capitalized in the NT quotations of this passage (Matt 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42). Jesus presses his adversaries about this observation by pointing out that David saw this "lord" as his superior, making the point that he himself was David's "lord" (Matt 22:43-45). This is affirmed elsewhere in the NT (Acts 2:34-35).

The article on prophecy (p 2668-2669) does not have a clear focus on messianic prophecy.

Did Old Testament believers have a hope of life with God after death?

The OT writers clearly view the underworld negatively. Alongside this general picture there are rare glimpses of a more positive afterlife [such as Enoch and Elijah]....

However, these instances are unique; godly psalmists and prophets do not generally pray for a similar fate. A few OT passages envision some form of continued communion with God beyond death, but this is ill-defined and unlocated. (p 2670).

For Lutherans a concern in a study Bible is the treatment of the sacraments. Concerning baptism the note on 1 Peter 3:19 says:

**3:21 this water symbolizes baptism that now saves you.** Baptism saves only in the sense that it represents what Christ has achieved. The waters of the Noahic flood symbolize baptism, and baptism is the sign and seal of salvation “by the resurrection of Jesus Christ” (see Rom 6:4). **the pledge of a clear conscience.** Baptism is not merely a religious ritual that washes the body; it is one’s pledge to God to live righteously from that time on, which results in a clear conscience before him. Peter reminds his readers of the pledge of their baptism at a time when they are facing suffering because of Christ and are tempted to turn away from the Lord.

Acts 2:38

**Repent and be baptized.** Though Peter does not mention faith, he implies it in the terms “repent” and “be baptized.” Faith is often mentioned without repentance (16:31; John 3:16). Both are shorthand expressions that imply the other. **be baptized . . . for the forgiveness of your sins.** Does not mean that the waters of baptism save. We are saved by grace through faith (Eph 2:8-9). Yet Jesus commands baptism (Matt 28:19), and it outwardly professes the inward transformation that the Spirit accomplishes (1 Pet 3:21).

What about the Lord’s Supper? In 1 Corinthians 10: 16 participating in Christ’s blood is participating in “Jesus’ death.” Participating in Christ’s body is participating in “Jesus’ death.” What does it mean to discern or recognize Christ’s body?

**11:29 discerning the body of Christ.** Both the physical body of Jesus and the church as Christ’s body (12:13). When Christians celebrate the Lord’s Supper, which they did in Corinth in connection with meals, they must realize that the reason for being a Christian and for being the church (Christ’s body) is Jesus’ death. When well-to-do Christians take this connection seriously, they will not overlook the poorer believers but will care for them as Jesus cared for sinners by giving himself to death on the cross. **eat and drink judgment on themselves.** Probably a reference not to the final judgment but to present divine judgment, as in v. 30. Christians who show no regard for the poor in the church and who, more generally, do not stop sinful behavior will be judged by God.

What do the words of institution mean?

**Mt 26:26-28** When Jesus “took bread” (v. 26) and “took a cup” (v. 27) and declared, “This is my body . . . This is my blood” (vv. 26,28), he is adding rich symbolism to the already highly symbolic Passover meal (see notes on vv. 26,27,28).

The NIV aroused a lot of discussion over the implications of its gender inclusive language for the biblical teaching concerning the roles of men and women. Do the notes clarify this?

1 Cor 11:3 **head**. Figuratively, what is most prominent, preeminent. Every person has a relationship to another person who has a preeminent status: for men (and women) this is Jesus Christ; for wives it is their husband; for Christ it is God the Father. The first pair references only men because the following discussion (vv. 4-16) gives separate directions for men and women. Paul is concerned about the proper relationship between husbands and wives in the church, not between men and women more generally.

11:7 **but woman is the glory of man**. In the context of Gen 2:21-23, Paul focuses on the temporal sequence of the creation of Adam and Eve: the man was created first and reflects the glory of God; the woman was created second and reflects the glory of the man. This does not reduce the value of women. Paul is discussing here not the nature of males and females but the relationship between a husband and his wife.

1 Cor 14:34 **remain silent**. Evidently when others examine a spoken prophecy. Paul is not issuing a general command for women to be silent: they pray and prophesy in the assemblies of the church (11:5). Paul is addressing married women (v. 35) who might want to be involved in the evaluation of their husband's prophecy or who disrupt the service by speaking with their husbands. **in submission**. Married women are to honor their husbands and avoid any contribution in the worship service that brings disgrace upon their husbands, e.g., evaluating their husband's prophecy (which is the context of vv. 34-35) as false--a verdict that should be left to others to pronounce. **as the law says**. Paul seems to appeal in general terms to woman's creation from man in Gen 2.

1 Tim 2:11 **in quietness and full submission**. The disposition modeled by Lazarus's sister Mary (Luke 10:39). The reason for this reference to women is unclear--surely men (except for speaking leaders) were expected to listen and be receptive too (1 Cor 14:29-33,40). Were some, like Martha, "distracted by all the preparations that had to be made" (Luke 10:40)? This is certainly a possibility in the setting of house churches. Were some Ephesian women disruptive with whispering or inattention? Did some, not sharing their husbands' faith, verbally challenge Scripture reading or preaching? Paul's counsel stands even if we cannot pinpoint exactly what occasioned it.

**2:12 permit**. When the NT uses this word, it always refers to what a figure in authority allows (or prohibits). As an apostle (see v. 7), Paul fits this description. The first-person form ("I do not") makes sense as Paul pens these personal reminders to his younger associate. **teach . . . assume authority**. Teaching (Greek *didache*) and oversight (Greek *epitrope*, to exercise oversight) are two major domains of pastoral leadership (4:11; cf. 2 Tim 4:2; Col 1:28; 1 Thess 4:2; Heb 13:17; 1 Pet 5:2-3). Paul is not thinking of two separate, unrelated activities but of the worship setting in which the congregation's overseers (3:1-7) exercise leadership by what they teach and urge on God's people. In other settings women may very well play prominent roles (Acts 18:26; Rom 16:1-2). Paul is not addressing women's roles in every circumstance of daily church life or roles in other social settings like business or government or everyday life outside the church. **must be quiet**. Even in worship, Paul does not teach that women "must be quiet" at all times; 1 Cor 11:5 assumes that women prayed and prophesied in the assembly. (The Greek word translated "quiet" also occurs in v. 2, where it applies to the lives of men and women alike.) It is reasonable to assume women sang (Eph 5:19; Col 3:16; Jas 5:13). Yet there are no clear examples in the NT of women serving as overseers (3:1) in apostolic

churches. The counsel of this verse reflects that precedent and, as far as our evidence goes, the universal policy in early Christian generations and beyond.

In regard to Revelation 20 and the interpretations of Revelation as a whole this book gives options without choosing one (p 2584-2585, 2621). Will this Bible help clarify other issues around the millennium such as

### The Conversion of the Jews

**Romans 11:26 all Israel will be saved.** “All Israel” need not mean every single Israelite. The OT uses this expression for a significant or representative number of Israelites (e.g., Josh 7:25; 2 Sam 16:22; Dan 9:11; cf. also Mishnah Sanhedrin 10:1). There are three main ways to explain this promise about one of the important results of God’s providential work in history: (1) God saves all his elect people, both Jews and Gentiles, as they respond in faith to God’s grace throughout history. “Israel” would then refer to the church (see Gal 6:16 and note for this possibility). (2) God saves all elect Jews as they respond in faith to God’s grace throughout history. (3) God will save a significant number of Jews at the end of history. Whichever of these Paul has in mind, the salvation will be—as it always is since the coming of Christ into the world—through faith in Christ (10:9-13).

### The Antichrist in 2 Thessalonians 2

**2:3** Two events must precede the day of the Lord: (1) **the rebellion.** It is not Christians who rebel against God (Paul expects his readers to persevere in the faith to the end...) but the rest of humanity. This rebellion will be primarily religious in nature, but any rebellion against God will naturally also involve a revolt against the general laws and morals of society. (2) **the man of lawlessness is revealed.** He is not Satan, as v. 9 makes clear, but is typically identified with the antichrist (1 John 2:18,22; 4:3; 2 John 7). This figure’s description in vv. 3b-4 has striking similarities to OT texts (Isa 14:12-14; Ezek 28:2; Dan 6:7) and events from the Second Temple period (Antiochus IV desecrating the Jerusalem temple in 167 BC, Roman general Pompey entering the Jerusalem temple in 63 BC, and Roman emperor Caligula seeking to set up a statue of himself in the Jerusalem temple in AD 40). Paul employs a familiar theme to portray the supreme evil character of the coming lawless one.

**2:4 God’s temple.** Almost certainly the historic temple of Jerusalem (see Matt 24:15 and note), not the heavenly temple or the church. But Paul likely uses this sanctuary metaphorically by picking up the well-known theme of desecration by foreign kings. If so, this says more about the character of the man of lawlessness than where he will appear.

Will this study Bible help people grasp the important doctrine of objective justification—God has credited Christ’s complete payment for sin to all people. In 1 Timothy 4:10 what does it mean that God is the Savior of all people?

**God is the Savior of all people, and especially of those who believe.** ... God is provider and preserver (a meaning of “savior”) of all people (and animals too; e.g., Ps 36:6; Jonah 4:11). God gives sun and rain to all (Matt 5:45; Acts 14:17). He reveals his

being and grandeur to all (Rom 1:20). This does not mean that none are lost or condemned by God in the end; it means that God's mercy and kindness are made evident to all persons.

On other issues too this Bible gives options but does not take a clear stand.

THESE QUOTATIONS ARE PROVIDED ONLY FOR REVIEW PURPOSES. COMMENTS ARE VERY LIMITED, TO ALLOW REVIEWERS TO FORM THEIR OWN CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE VIEWPOINT OF THE NOTES.