The final third of this work contains the most complete bibliography of Adventist books, pamphlets, and periodicals currently available. Helpful notations indicate the location of periodicals not listed in the Union List of Serials.

One final note: The essays collected here were first presented as a series of lectures on the milieu from which Adventism emerged. Those who organized the series at the Loma Linda University church and had the vision to make the material available to a wider audience deserve a real vote of thanks. American social, cultural, and church historians are in their debt.

Andrews University

Richard Schwarz


This is the first full-fledged tome by a Roman Catholic scholar to deal with the subject of biblical theology. His style is lucid and he has used abundant space for his leisurely introduction to a highly complex and variegated subject. Although this is the third volume on the discipline of biblical theology within three years, it is most surprising that the author refers only once to the major work by H. J. Kraus, Die Biblische Theologie (1970) and virtually never touches on the significant contribution by B. S. Childs. Biblical Theology in Crisis (1970).

The survey of "the biblical theology of the OT" (pp. 19-113) touches briefly on the origin of biblical and OT theology and traces its history from Gabler to Davidson and beyond to the revival of OT theology in the post-World-War-I period. This is followed by a fair and adequate précis of four representative OT theologies, viz. those of W. Eichrodt, T. C. Vriezen, E. Jacob and G. von Rad. It may be said right here that this emphasis on some major names in OT (and NT) theology and the summary of their thoughts appear as the strongest part of Harrington's volume. While this is true, it should be noted that in his comparison and criticism, Harrington falls far short. He could have greatly benefited by R. B. Laurin, ed., Contemporary Old Testament Theologians (1970), an important volume which is not at all used.

The next section attempts to do for "the biblical theology of the NT" (pp. 114-259) the same as was done for that of the OT. The short history of NT theology is followed by a good précis of the NT theologies of R. Bultmann, A. Richardson, E. Stauffer, and M. Meinertz, as well as the recent studies by H. Conzelmann, O. Cullmann, and J. Jeremias. A great array of other names appears, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, but it seems strange that the NT theology of W. G. Kümmel (1969) and especially that of K. H. Schelkle (1968ff.) is touched upon so briefly.

The third chapter treats the subject of "the theology of the Bible" (pp. 260-348). Harrington discusses the matter of the unity of the Bible (pp. 260-273); the Christian interpretation of the OT (pp. 273-312), here siding with R. E. Brown and others in favor of the sensus plenior; the OT as a Christian book (pp. 313-329), a position now firmly rejected by J. L. McKenzie in A Theology of the OT (1974); and Bible dictionaries and commentaries.

The final chapter (pp. 349-396) is concerned with bringing together the
methods and scope of OT theology, NT theology, and biblical theology; and
it concludes with a section on the relationship of biblical theology to
dogmatic theology.

In his conclusion Harrington’s own position emerges. For OT theology he
opts for a “diachronic” method followed by an arrangement of themes and
structures against a “cross-section” method (see my Old Testament Theology:
Basic Issues in the Current Debate [1972], Chap. 1). Typology and the
promise-fulfillment scheme are appropriate. For the Christian theologian the
OT has a “Christ-centered dynamism” (p. 399). As regards NT theology a
“theological pluralism” is also recognized so that the distinctive contribution
of each NT writer comes to view. Since the OT is a “torso” and the NT
presupposes the OT, a theology of the Bible must emerge. The unity of the
Bible “must be understood in a realistic and elastic manner” (p. 401). Finally,
a “synthesis” of the individual theologies is to be worked out in a biblical
theology.

It is evident that Harrington has read widely. Unfortunately, he seems to
have been influenced too much in his assessment by reviewers and previous
critics. The author does not give the impression that he stands within the
biblical theology movement himself. He discusses books and other studies
about biblical theology but is unable to describe the trends and schools of
thought out of which the respective theologies emerged. J. Jeremias’s NT
theology can only be properly appreciated on the basis of his position in the
debate on the “new” quest of the historical Jesus. The OT theology of von
Rad stands within the history-of-traditions school and can be evaluated only
on the basis of that trend in twentieth-century OT scholarship. The “con-
siderable adverse criticism” (p. 75) of von Rad’s Old Testament Theology
(1962, 1965) must be balanced by the fact that he has stimulated OT theologi-
cal discussion to an extent that hardly anyone before him has done. But
Harrington’s reader will learn none of this. The nature of the post-von Rad
developments is not brought together and elaborated. The same applies to
the work of Bultmann and the post-Bultmann developments.

There are also glaring misrepresentations in the work under review: W.
Wrede is placed within the school of Heilsgeschichte. That his “essay is the
programme of the heilsgeschichtlich school” (p. 115) which was “fully devel-
oped by Cullmann” (p. 245) is a claim that is totally incomprehensible. Wrede
had nothing to do with that theological school of thought! The claim that
W. Pannenberg “fully endorses the typological exegesis of the Old Testament”
(p. 284) is not justified and can hardly be supported on the basis of that
scholar’s published writings. On the contrary, Pannenberg writes, “But they
[typological connections and structural agreements] can never be understood as
that which constitutes the connection between the Old and New Testaments”
(“Redemptive Event and History,” Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics, ed.
by C. Westermann [Richmond, Va., 1963], p. 329). This indicates his rejection
of typology as an exegetical method and link between the Testaments.

The lack of indexes makes it very difficult to use this work. It is therefore
virtually impossible to find the various discussions on such themes as the
center of the OT or NT, the problem of method, etc., or authors. However,
a bibliography of significant contributions provides much helpful material
for further study.

This book can be recommended primarily for its ability to summarize
major works, but it fails to fill the need of a beginner’s introduction to
biblical theology. It must be supplemented by contributions such as those mentioned in the review above. But it does make a distinct contribution to the subject by bringing together the various points of view of current Roman Catholic scholarship. For this we are all indebted to the author.

Anders University

GERHARD F. HASEL


The author presents a full systematic analysis of the interpretation of Ps 110 in the NT and early Christian writers to the fourth century. Part I provides background for his study with a history of the interpretation of this passage first in ancient Judaism and then in early Christianity. The Jews had interpreted Ps 110:1 messianically and with reference to this earth, but vs. 4 was rarely applied to the Messiah. In early Christianity, there seems to have been a dependence on some intermediary source—testimonies, confessions, or hymns—instead of the OT directly. Ps 110:1 was attractive from the point of view that it could easily relate to Jesus' post-resurrection glory.

With Justin Martyr the whole Psalm, not only vss. 1 and 4 as in the NT, was used and understood messianically and christologically. Hay does not deal here with the source for the writers beginning with Justin, as to whether this was the OT, the NT, the intermediary sources, or all three together.

In Part II, the author gives a detailed analysis of Christian interpretations up to the time of Justin to determine the meanings and functions they assigned to the Psalm. He concludes that there are four major categories of functions: "expressions of the idea that Jesus or Christians sit at God's right hand, the use of the psalm to support particular christological titles, its use to affirm the subjection of powers to Christ, and its employment regarding his heavenly intercession or priesthood" (p. 155). But there does not seem to be a simple chronological line of development. He finds many different patterns of interpretation going off in many directions. Obviously the similarities are due to the Christians' conviction that Jesus was the Messiah and that this Psalm expressed this fact for them. Beyond this, different passages could be used differently and no serious difficulty would be felt.

The author cites several reasons for the popularity of the Psalm: (1) the prior Jewish messianic interpretation; (2) its capacity to meet vital religious needs of Christians, such as providing a scriptural basis for priestly christology; (3) its affirmation of the supreme exaltation of Christ without calling into question the glory and sovereignty of God the Father; (4) the aura of definiteness of a right-hand session for early believers perplexed about the post-Easter location or precise dignity of their Lord; (5) the attractive vagueness in the session image which could accommodate a variety of meanings.

The author has done his work well with surgical precision in discriminating