

The Unity of the Bible

Gerhard F. Hasel

Introduction

Since the Biblical Research Committee's earlier inserts in the *Ministry* magazine have drawn favorable response, the committee is pleased to present this paper on "The Unity of the Bible," by Dr. Gerhard F. Hasel, professor of Old Testament Studies and chairman of that department at Andrews University.

This paper was presented to and recommended for publication by the Biblical Research Committee at its annual meeting of 1973 as a part of its investigation of Biblical hermeneutics—the science of Biblical interpretation.

How one looks at the Bible predisposes his methods of exegesis and the resultant interpretation. In the critical approach to Biblical studies there is little assumption of an essential unity, either within or between the Testaments, or, for that matter, within a single book or chapter of the Bible. Critical Biblical studies tend to see small segments of a book or chapter standing virtually in isolation and to study them in such a limited context.

Believing the Holy Spirit to be the Author of both Testaments, Seventh-day Adventists have always seen a strong link and continuity between the Testaments, and have based their interpretation of the Bible on that presupposition. Their *raison d'être*, as a people, is found in Bible prophecy with its recognition of the interdependence of the Testaments.

This paper by Dr. Hasel draws significant support for the unity of the Bible from standard theological literature, and therefore offers valuable endorsement for the posture of the church in a vital matter.

Gordon M. Hyde

The subject of the unity of the Bible is so vast that a limited investigation such as this article represents can hardly claim to treat the subject's great variety of aspects adequately. The literature on the subject of the unity of the Bible is voluminous.¹ Much consideration could be given to various aspects of the inner unity of both the Old Testament and the New Testament. Although diversity is to be expected within the OT, as well as within the NT (a diversity which is neither surprising nor to be denied), there are evidences of an equally undeniable unity within and between the Testaments of the Bible. Many scholars in the past have primarily stressed the diversity found within each of the Testaments. Now there is a great interest also in finding an inner unity in each of the Testaments and between the Testaments. This is a most significant trend in Biblical studies.²

The purpose of this article is to investigate the relationship between the two Testaments of the Bible in general and, in particular, to indicate what kind of unity there is between the OT and the NT. Each student of the Bible has to come to grips with the interconnection between the OT and the NT and "has to give an account of his understanding of the Bible as a whole, i.e., above

all of the theological problems that come of inquiring into the inner unity of the manifold testimony of the Bible.”³

To speak of the inner unity of the Bible in terms of the relationship between OT and NT raises questions of discontinuity and continuity, unity in diversity, antithesis and harmony, whether one reads solely from the OT to the NT or from the NT back to the OT, or reciprocally from OT to NT and from NT to OT. Since the question of the unity of the Bible is as old as the Christian church itself, it is not possible to present here a comprehensive sketch of the various positions taken during the past 1900 years. It is therefore mandatory that we limit ourselves to representative attempts that reflect major positions.

1. Patterns of Disunity and Discontinuity

There have always been Christians who have looked at the OT from the Christian perspective and have been struck by various differences. Indeed, there are evident and expected differences. Christians no longer sacrifice and engage in ritual worship. Christians do not belong to a literal theocratic nation, whereas the chosen ones in OT times belonged to the physical nation of Israel. On the basis of such reasoning there have been men through the centuries who have reached the conclusion that the OT is of no concern to or significance for the Christian believer. Some have even concluded that the OT has no rightful place in the Christian Bible. Others, unwilling to go that far and perhaps finding some value in the OT, would nevertheless place it on a lower level of importance and rank it second to the NT.

A. Inferiority of the Old Testament

The first heresy that arose in Christianity in the second century involved an attempt to get rid of the OT. Marcion, under the impact of Gnosticism,⁴ separated the two Testaments completely. To Marcion the God of the OT was another and inferior Being, the Demiurge-Creator, the vindictive God of the law, wholly opposed to the gracious God revealed in the gospel. The OT, therefore, has nothing to say about the Christian's God or about Christ. Marcion completely denied that the OT messianic prophecies refer in any sense to Jesus Christ. He held that the OT has no part in the Christian revelation and has no place within Christianity.

Marcionism was effectively rejected as a heresy and excluded from the mainstream of Christianity, which committed itself to the OT as a part of the scriptural canon.

A Marcionite approach with regard to the relationship between the two Testaments and their unity is represented in modern times by such men as Von Harnack, whose widely quoted sentence is worth citing because it sums up his major theme: “To have cast aside the Old Testament in the second century was an error which the Church rightly rejected: to have retained it in the sixteenth century was the fact which the Reformation was not yet able to avoid; but still to keep it after the nineteenth century as a canonical document within Protestantism results from a religious and ecclesiastical paralysis.”⁵

Other men reflecting the Marcionite strain are Friedrich Delitzsch⁶ and Emmanuel Hirsch.⁷ The latter sees an “antithetical tension”⁸ between OT religion and Christianity. Stress falls entirely upon the radical discontinuity between the two Testaments. For the Christian the OT has been superseded by the NT.

It has been said that R. Bultmann's negative stance with regard to the OT is also due to a Marcionite strain.⁹ It is true that the OT is not excluded from the Bible in Bultmann's thought, but is reduced to a document of subsidiary usefulness in the church. Is this not at least a modified form of Marcionism?

For Bultmann OT history is a history of failure. It is a “miscarriage” (*Scheitern*) of history, which only through this failure turns into a kind of promise.¹⁰ The application of the Lutheran law/gospel antithesis by Bultmann¹¹ has led to the view that there is an almost total discontinuity between the two Testaments. “Thus the Old Testament is the presupposition of the New”¹² and “is not theologically relevant at all.”¹³

Bultmann’s approach leads inevitably to an inferior place for the OT. Where the law/gospel antithesis is pushed to the virtual equating of the OT with “law,” where the discontinuity between the Testaments is stressed to the virtual exclusion of their continuity; where the OT is accorded an exclusively pedagogical function of preparing man for the hearing of the gospel of the NT, the OT is reduced to a position of secondary importance. W. Pannenberg rightly notes that the reason Bultmann finds no continuity between the Testaments “is certainly connected with the fact that he does not begin with the promises and their structure, which for Israel were the foundation of history, . . . promises which thus endure precisely in change.”¹⁴

As already noted, Bultmann’s emphasis on the discontinuity between the Testaments does not lead him to dispense with the OT completely. Although there is an element of truth in the claim that the OT has a pedagogical function, his stress on the radical difference of OT revelation from that of the NT leads to a dangerous reductionism that relegates the OT to an auxiliary and inferior position in the canon.

Baumgärtel shares with Bultmann the emphasis on discontinuity between the Testaments and separation of the OT from the NT.¹⁵ He refuses to separate the OT from the NT as “less authoritative,”¹⁶ but insists that it is really not essential for our faith. Although Baumgärtel shares the general emphasis on discontinuity, he does not view the relationship between the OT and the NT as one of complete discontinuity. He sees running through the OT the theme of an enduring “basic-promise” (*Grundverheissung*),¹⁷ which is summed up in the timeless sentence, “I am the Lord your God.”

Nevertheless, there are dangers in the approach of Baumgärtel. He repeatedly stresses the differences between the Testaments. In his view the OT contains a “witness of a religion outside the Gospel.”¹⁸ He maintains that “viewed historically it has another place than the Christian religion,”¹⁹ for the OT “is a witness out of a non-Christian religion.”²⁰ Baumgärtel also maintains that the historicity of Jesus Christ is not grounded in Messianic prophecies, which he believes must be completely abandoned, but solely in the Incarnation.²¹ These are serious limitations impinging on the use to be made of the OT. Its place in the scriptural canon is moved to a position of inferiority. It has been pointed out that Baumgärtel ultimately admits “that the church could also live without the Old Testament.”²² His concept of “basic-promise” is unhistorical and a “presumptuous encroachment”²³ that separates a single promise from the other promises and prophecies that were fulfilled in history. In Baumgärtel’s view it seems that the OT’s position of inferiority renders this part of the canon virtually unnecessary.

A number of other individuals could be mentioned. Among them J.A.T. Robinson and Paul van Buren.²⁴ F. Hesse elaborated the concept that the OT promises and prophecies have gone astray owing to the chastising hand of God that make the people of Israel harden their hearts (Isa. 6:8, 10; 2 Cor. 3:14; Rom. 9:11).²⁵ By turning God’s Word into its opposite, the Christian should read the OT as a warning directed against himself. In this way the OT can be a dialectical witness to God’s activity in Israel, which culminates in Christ’s cross.

There are some aspects in the above claims of disunity, discontinuity, and antithesis which have appeal, such as the idea that the OT cannot function theologically in the church without the NT. There are, however, serious objections to be brought against them. The principal objection to these claims of disunity, discontinuity, and antithesis is that the break in the relation between the

two Testaments is widened into such a gulf that the OT could be described as a record of a non-Christian religion that must either be discarded completely in Christianity or accepted with the “basic-promise” as the only line of connection between the Testaments, which are then so widely divergent that one can hardly speak any longer of a unity of faith.

The OT is authoritative in that it shares in the truth revealed in Jesus Christ, i.e., there is an essential relation between the message of the Testaments. For Christian theology the question is, Has OT revelation anything to do factually, historically, and spiritually with the NT gospel of Jesus Christ, and if so, to what extent? On the one hand, we must admit an organic, spiritual unity between them because the life of Jesus Christ rested on the foundations of the OT. The OT was the Bible of Jesus Christ and the early Christians.²⁶ There is a line that leads from it to Jesus Christ as He Himself explained to the disciples of Emmaus: “And beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself” (Luke 24:27, RSV).

There is no likelihood that the Adventist Church will reject the OT. Many members have never heard of Marcion or Hirsch, but is there not the temptation for Adventists to *neglect* the OT? Is it not true that most preaching is done from the NT? One can profess to believe that both Testaments are equally important and yet treat the OT as if it were scarcely a part of the Bible! Some of us preach only from certain parts of the OT, such as the book of Daniel and other prophecies or special sections. Sometimes the God of the OT is represented as a God of vindictive justice and wrath, in sharp contrast to the loving and merciful Father revealed in Jesus Christ. Under such treatment the OT is depicted in antithesis to the NT and may be reduced to a position of virtual inferiority.

There may be an incipient tendency to underrate the importance of the OT. In the training of the Adventist ministry today it fortunately receives the same hours of attention as the NT. But this is not true in many other denominations. Of course, the OT has 39 books to be covered, many of which are much longer than the 27 books of the NT. Therefore, on a quantitative basis, the NT actually receives considerably more attention!

Where the NT is concerned, Greek is insisted upon in the curriculum in order that the NT may be read in the original language. Certainly this is a must for every minister in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. With regard to the OT, however, there is a problem. Although it is agreed that some knowledge of Hebrew is necessary, it is felt that in view of all the other legitimate claims on the student's time, an adequate number of hours cannot be allotted to the study of Hebrew. It is widely agreed that to expect the average student to master Hebrew and then be able to proceed to the exegetical study of the OT would require an expenditure of time and energy that can hardly be justified. While this is not the place to engage in special pleading with regard to the value of Hebrew or for an equitable amount of time for the study of the OT, are we virtually saying that although a thorough knowledge of the NT is essential, a comparably thorough knowledge of the OT is not? Is not Marcion raising his head in our own ranks? In our own practice does not the OT then stand on a level of lesser importance?

We have indicated that the OT was authoritative Scripture for Jesus Himself. Jesus knew no Scripture save the OT and no God save His God, whom He addressed as Father. Never once did He suggest that in the light of His work the OT could be discarded or put on a level of inferior importance. On the contrary, He regarded the Scriptures as the key to the understanding of His person, emphasizing again and again that He is represented in the Scriptures, that they witness to Him and are fulfilled in Him. The very fact that the OT was normative Scripture to Jesus means that it must also be normative Scripture for us—unless one wishes to understand Jesus in some other way than He understood Himself or than the NT writers understood Him.

B. Superiority of the Old Testament

In direct contrast to the positions just described is that held by the Dutch dogmatist A. A. van Ruler.²⁷ He belongs to those scholars who have tried to ward off the danger of neglecting and disparaging the OT by making it all-important, theologically as well as historically. Van Ruler's fundamental tenet is that the OT is the Bible of the early Christian church and he attempts to give new support to the priority of the OT by demonstrating from its content its indispensability and superiority for Christian thought and for the teaching of the church. Van Ruler explains that "the Old Testament is and remains the true Bible."²⁸ This means that the OT has a broader and more elaborated theology than the NT. In other words, the NT is in fact much more limited in its scope. It only developed and elaborated one aspect of the theology of the Old Testament, namely its soteriology. According to Van Ruler the NT is but "its [OT's] explanatory glossary [*Worterverzeichnis*]."²⁹ This is not a sufficient basis, according to Van Ruler, for Christian theology to build on. If Christian theology is to give spiritual guidance to the modern world both the theocracy and creation theology of the OT are indispensable.

Van Ruler reduces the relationship between the OT and NT to the single spiritual denominator of the kingdom of God,³⁰ reading the NT very one-sidedly without recognizing the distinction between theocracy and eschatology.³¹

In view of the great emphasis on the OT by Van Ruler, it is appropriate to attempt to discover the heart of his argument. He addresses himself to the following question: Does the OT itself already see Christ? In dealing with this question Van Ruler is essentially critical in approach. Prominence is given to that which apparently separates or divides the Testaments. One of the main points is that in the OT the Messiah is a man; in the New, God Himself; hence the deity of Christ cannot be derived from the former.³² One of his key notions is summed up in the following statement: "If I may put it briefly and sharply, Jesus Christ is an emergency measure that God postponed as long as possible (cf. Matt. 21:33-46). Hence we must not try to find him fully in the Old Testament, even though as Christian theologians we investigate the Old Testament in orientation to God."³³

J. J. Stamm has pointed out that Van Ruler inaccurately and inappropriately relates the facts from the OT for the sake of contrast.³⁴ It is true that Van Ruler stresses the nature of the Israelite king at the expense of the authoritative position of his office. If one takes the authoritative nature of the office into consideration, as Stamm does, "then one can certainly only say that in the OT and NT the Messiah is divine, there, *per adoptionem*, here, *ex origine*."³⁵ We must repudiate the negative emphasis that Van Ruler gives to the NT to such a degree that he can call Jesus merely "an emergency measure of God," Such a negative stance is not supported by either Testament.

Another systematic theologian who has the tendency to make the OT all-important is K. H. Miskotte.³⁶ He contrasts the OT with the NT by such schemata as law/gospel, shadow/reality, and promise/fulfillment and maintains that the OT contains a "surplus" as compared with the NT. Its "surplus" comes to expression in four points on which the NT is practically silent: skepticism, revolt, erotics, and politics. Although OT piety and ethics contain elements of the joy of living, of appreciation of earthly goods that seem most attractive to modern man, Christian ethics that would simply set up the various aspects of marriage customs of the OT as the standard to which the modern world or the church would have to conform, without first confronting both with the cross of Christ, would fail signally in its duty. We can agree with the assessment of Th. C. Vriezen that "the Cross is not merely an element of the Biblical message, but a source of light in the centre which casts its grace over all the other elements."³⁷

The claim of the superiority of the OT is just as dangerous as the claim of the superiority of the NT. The canonicity of Scripture makes the whole Bible *one* book. The Christian church has in

general refused to follow the method of making one part of the canon, either the OT or the NT, superior to the other. This stance toward the problem of the relationship between the Testaments is one that needs to be maintained.

The Reformed Biblical scholar W. Vischer stands out among Biblical theologians for his adoption of a thoroughgoing Christological approach to the OT.³⁸ He claims that the Bible, including the OT, must be interpreted in the light of its true intention, its true theme. That true theme is Christ: "The Bible is the Holy Scripture only insofar as it speaks of Christ Jesus."³⁹ Christ is made the theme of the whole Bible. Vischer, therefore, reads the OT for its witness to Christ. He finds that it testifies everywhere of Christ—not in the sense, to be sure, that He is directly to be found in the NT, but in the sense that in all its parts it points to Him and His crucifixion. He explains that the OT tells us *what* Christ is, and the NT *who* He is.⁴⁰ If we do not understand *what* the Christ of the OT is, we shall never recognize and confess Jesus as the Christ.⁴¹

On the basis of these principles Vischer provides interpretations of the OT that are fully Christological. He claims that, as a whole, it not only points to Christ and testifies of Christ, but in each detail the Christian eye may see some witness to Him. "We do not understand a single word in the whole Bible if we do not find Jesus Christ in this world."⁴² Some examples may illustrate what Vischer means. The command, "Let there be light" (Gen. 1:3), speaks to us about the "glory of God in the face of Christ."⁴³ The mark of Cain (Gen. 4:15) points to the cross, and is renewed in the sign of the cross.⁴⁴ Enoch is a sign and a witness of the resurrection.⁴⁵ The prophecy that Japheth would "dwell in the tents of Shem" pictures the church, which includes both Gentiles and Jews.⁴⁶ Speaking of the midnight Presence with whom Jacob wrestled at the Jabbok (Genesis 32), Vischer asks who this Person was and answers that it was Jesus Christ.⁴⁷ The Christological meaning of all of these is not entirely clear.

It is not surprising that many have found this Christological interpretation of the OT disturbing. Vischer has therefore been the target of a great deal of criticism, even unjust and scornful criticism. He feels that purely historical exegesis of the OT is not enough, for that would leave it a document of an ancient religion with little apparent relevance for the Christian. It should be pointed out that Vischer does not completely disregard grammatical-historical principles of exegesis. Vischer is known as an extremely competent scholar who insists upon a historical and philological approach to the Bible.⁴⁸

There is much in Vischer's approach that is of great value and should not be rejected out of hand. At the same time Vischer gives the impression that he has overlooked some vital considerations in his approach. He writes, "The life story of all these men [of the OT] is part of His [Jesus'] life story. Therefore, they are written with so little biographical interest for the individual persons. What is written about them is actually written as a part of the biography of the One through whom and toward whom they live."⁴⁹ We must ask whether Vischer would feel in a position to reconstruct a biography of Jesus from the OT. If this were the intention of the OT, it is difficult to perceive why the OT speaks in the first place about Abraham, Moses, et cetera. Why does it not speak right away about Jesus? Would it speak of Him only in such mysterious form? Vischer not only reads the OT from the perspective of a thoroughgoing Christology but he even goes beyond what the inspired NT writers affirm. Furthermore, there is a current of life flowing from the OT to the NT, not just one flowing from the NT to the OT. Nevertheless, we can agree with John Bright that "Vischer certainly deserves thanks for being among the first to remind us that we cannot rest content with a purely historical understanding of the OT but must press on to see it in its Christian significance."⁵⁰ At the same time we must guard ourselves against falling into the trap of allegory. The OT is Christological but not filled with Christological allegory.⁵¹

II. Patterns of Unity and Continuity

A. Unity in Diversity

The NT clearly recognizes that there is unity in diversity. The unity that joins both Testaments and the diversity found in both are strongly stated in the opening section of the letter to the Hebrews: "In many and various ways God spoke of the old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son, whom he appointed the heir of all things through whom also he created the world" (Heb. 1:1, 2, RSV). Unity and continuity are manifested because both Testaments are the work of the triune God. Formerly God spoke to the fathers and to the prophets; now He has spoken through His Son. It is the same Father who has spoken through the prophets and through His Son, i.e., it is the same God who has communicated His thoughts and His will to man in both Testaments. In this sense the revelation of the NT is a continuation, fulfillment, and completion of the prior revelation given in the OT.

All students of the Bible recognize that in the Biblical revelation of both Testaments there is diversity. God spoke in past times to different individuals in successive stages. The different writers who wrote historical books in many instances go over the same history from different perspectives (see *Selected Messages*, book 1, 21, 22). The inspired thoughts (*ibid.*, 21) were given to minds of different education and background. Each inspired writer expressed these divine thoughts in human language. Since "the Scriptures were given to men, not in a continuous chain of unbroken utterances, but piece by piece through successive generations, as God in His providence saw a fitting opportunity to impress man at sundry times and divers places" (*ibid.*, 19, 20), there is a diversity to be expected as different aspects of truth are unfolded.

We rightly recognize the individuality of the various inspired writers and their contributions to the total revelation in both Testaments. But this individuality should not close our eyes to the overall unity. There is unity in diversity. Ellen G. White has spoken of unity in diversity, and emphasizes that "this diversity broadens and deepens the knowledge that is brought out to meet the necessities of varied minds" (*ibid.*, 22).

F. C. Grant has written with regard to the NT that the "Pauline statement of the doctrine of unity in diversity (1 Cor. 12:4-6) ought to be inscribed as a motto over all our study of the NT"⁵² and, we may add, over the study of the whole Bible. Another NT scholar, C. H. Dodd, has written that "the unity of the New Testament is original, underlying the diversity of the individual writings."⁵³ The OT critic H. H. Rowley also emphasizes unity in diversity: "The diversity of the Bible must be recognized fully and clearly, even though we see a more profoundly significant unity running through it all."⁵⁴ Diversity does not rule out unity. Unity exists in diversity.

B. Reciprocity Between the Testaments

At the beginning of our discussion we raised the question of whether we ought to read solely from the OT to the NT or from the NT back to the OT, or reciprocally from the OT to the NT and from the NT to the OT. A number of well-known theologians have addressed themselves to this question. One example is the late H. H. Rowley, who reminds us that "the Old Testament continually looks forward to something beyond itself; the New Testament continually looks back to the Old."⁵⁵ Two of the most famous Old Testament theologians of this century have maintained that both Testaments shed light upon each other in their mutual relations. W. Eichrodt declares, "In addition to this historical movement from the Old Testament to the New there is a current of life flowing in reverse direction from the New Testament to the Old. This reverse relationship also

elucidates the full significance of the realm of Old Testament thought.”⁵⁶ In similar vein G. von Rad emphasizes that the larger context of the OT is the NT and vice versa,⁵⁷ while H. W. Wolff suggests that “the total meaning of the Old Testament” is “revealed in the New Testament.”⁵⁸

Statements of this kind could be multiplied many times but we shall quote only one more: “There is a fundamental unity, so that with all their diversity they [the Testaments] belong so intimately together that the New Testament cannot be understood without the Old, and *neither can the Old Testament be fully understood without the New.*”⁵⁹ It is clear that the emphasis of these theologians is placed upon the internal keys that unlock both Testaments. The OT presents a torsolike appearance without the NT and the NT has no foundation without the OT.

It seems in order, now, to investigate Ellen G. White’s position on the relationship between the Testaments. It may be surprising to some that essentially the same idea is found in Ellen G. White as in the statements just quoted. In her view “the doors of the New Testament are unlocked with the key of the Old Testament: (*Evangelism*, 579). This statement must not be construed to mean that there is only a one-way movement from the OT to the NT because she clearly states the value of the NT for the OT, affirming that “the New Testament explains the Old” (*The Acts of the Apostles*, 381; cf. *Evangelism*, 578). Thus Ellen G. White belongs with those who maintain the reciprocal relationship of the Testaments: “The Old Testament sheds light upon the New, and the New upon the Old. . . . Both Old and New present truths that will continually reveal new depths of meaning” (*Counsels to Parents and Teachers*, 462-63.)

Both Testaments are seen to form an inseparable unity. “The Old and the New Testament are inseparable, for both are the teachings of Christ” (*The SDA Bible Commentary*, Ellen G. White Comments, on Matt. 13:52, p. 1094. They are an inseparable whole, each shedding light upon the other. “But the minister of the gospel, who follows the teachings of Christ, will gain a thorough knowledge of both the Old and New Testaments, that he may present them in their true light to the people an inseparable whole—the one depending upon and illuminating the other” (*The Spirit of Prophecy*, 2:255). Reciprocal dependence and illumination make it possible to gain a thorough understanding of both Testaments, each of which is the gospel. “The Old Testament is as verily the gospel in types and shadows as the New Testament is in its unfolding power. . . . The Old Testament does not represent a religion to be superseded by the New. The New Testament is only the advancement and unfolding of the Old” (*That I May Know Him*, 208).

Only where this reciprocal relationship between the Testaments is recognized and maintained, where the OT and the NT are seen as an inseparable whole, where the OT is not relegated to an inferior position of a dispensable antecedent to the NT, where the latter unlocks the doors of the former and the former of the latter, both forming a historical and theological unity of equal importance and standing—only here can all the depths of meaning contained in the whole Bible be conceived and grasped. With all the recognized diversity within each Testament and between the Testaments, there is nevertheless parity and equality between them. Each is essential for the understanding of the other; both provide the totality of the gospel of the whole Bible.

C. Patterns of Unity

There are legitimate lines of connection between the Testaments that may be divided into two major categories: (1) historical connections; and (2) theological connections. Among the latter are (a) scriptural references, (b) themes, (c) vocabulary, (d) typology, (e) promise/prediction-fulfillment, and (f) unity of perspective. Space necessitates a limited treatment here of each, and this precludes a full development of all aspects of these various lines of connection and patterns of unity.

1. Historical Connections Between the Testaments

Among more prominent attempts to come to grips with the question of the unity between both Testaments is the historical nature of the essential story of the Bible. The common mark of both OT and NT is the continuous history of God's people. The OT is viewed as the historical preparation of the NT. History is prominent in the Bible. The primary interest in the Bible is God's action in behalf of the redemption of His people and the nations. Thus the unity between the Testaments results from the fact that the Bible is concerned "throughout with God and with His dealings with mankind"⁶⁰ by one and the same triune God who is present and active in the history of ancient Israel, in Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit-led life and witness of the NT church.

For ancient Israel her history is her encounter with her God. "The very idea that history is a process with beginning, middle, and end is original with Israel."⁶¹ It is the purpose and will of God that unifies the historical process. The historical career of Israel is directed by the will of the triune God to fulfill His designs. These designs are ever more clearly unfolded during OT and NT times. Spiritual Israel stands in direct line of continuity with literal Israel in that the former is connected with the latter and shares in the same aims and goals.

2. Theological Connections Between the Testaments

a. Scriptural References. One of the theological connections between the OT and NT is found in the quotations and references in the NT from OT passages. Various theologians refer to this connection as scriptural proof.⁶² Recently it has been emphasized that "the idea of proof is of importance because the quotations are placed in the context of an argument and referred to as part of the promulgation of the Gospel."⁶³ The fact and number of these quotations can easily be assessed by turning to the pages of Nestle-Aland's Greek NT, which marks 257 passages as being explicit citations.⁶⁴

From the modern historical-critical point of view some of these quotations are not in accordance with a seemingly obvious meaning of the OT texts. This has been raised as a serious objection against seeing a legitimate line of connection between the Testaments in the NT references to the OT. Certainly the NT quotations of and references to the OT call for careful investigation. We cannot agree with the idea of attributing an arbitrary scriptural connection between two passages just for the sake of obtaining material for illustrations.⁶⁵ We also find ourselves in disagreement with Bultmann who claims that the use of the OT can best be explained as a projection of the convictions of the NT writers.⁶⁶ The solution which claims that the NT's use of the OT can be explained in terms of accommodation to the technique and method of contemporary, rabbinical methods of exegesis is helpful only to a limited degree.⁶⁷ This point of view does not distinguish between the aim and scope of the rabbinical and Qumran exegesis on the one hand,⁶⁸ and the unique perspective of the NT usage of the OT on the other hand. P. A. Verhoef has recently pointed out that "over and against critical views we maintain that the New Testament in citing the Old Testament nowhere presupposes a fundamental breach between the Testaments."⁶⁹ This is in full correspondence with the acceptance of the canon of both Testaments in the Christian church. It is true that the references to the OT were not developed in a systematic matter, but this does not diminish the significance of an extensive procedure of quotation, as well as references other than direct quotations.

b. Themes. It seems undeniable that the theological structure of the Testaments is essentially the same. Bright has assessed the unity of basic theological themes of the OT and the NT in the following way: "Each of the major themes of the Old has its correspondent in the New, and

is in some way résuméd and answered there."⁷⁰ By virtue of this fact a hermeneutical bridge is built between the Testaments, which gives us access to each of the OT's texts and defines for us the procedure that we must follow in attempting to interpret them in their Christian significance.

It is a misunderstanding to consider the themes of the NT as if they had no origin and growth in the OT from which the NT writers themselves took their point of departure. When Jesus spoke of His Father, He meant the God known by all Jews, whose encounter with Israel is related in the OT. He could speak to them of God as One who was revealed to them in their history. He expounded for them the fullness of the revelation of God, but it was not necessary for them to accept the Father of whom He spoke as a totally unfamiliar Being. The character of God, His attributes, His providence, and His government of history could be recognized in the proclamation of Jesus.

The theme of divine grace runs throughout the whole Bible. When God preserved a family from the Flood, it was an act of His grace. When God was willing to preserve a few when some cities were destroyed, He did so because He is a God of grace. When God brings Israel out of Egypt, the initiative is wholly His and the power is wholly His. When God sends prophets to turn Israel back to Him, His grace is active again. It is a constant of the prophetic teaching that while the initiative is ever with God in sending His prophets to recall Israel to the path of wisdom, that initiative is frustrated until men freely respond in obedience and faith.

The theme of election is as old as the patriarchs (Gen. 12:1-3). The initiative in election is with God. When God elected and chose Israel there was nothing in her to justify it (Deut. 7:7, 8). The cause of election was to be solved, not in men, but in God. Just as God was faithful to His election promises in the OT (Num. 23:19) so He is faithful to them in the NT (2 Tim. 2:13). The NT presents the idea of election in a variety of ways. The complete theological development of the idea of election is found in the letters of Paul (Rom. 8:28-11:36; Eph. 1:3-13; 1 Thess. 1:2-10; 2 Thess. 2:13, 14; 2 Tim. 1:9, 10).

The covenant theme which begins with the first promise (Gen. 3:15) and reappears with the covenant made with Noah (chap. 9:1-17), Abraham (chaps. 12:1-4; 15; 17), Isaac and Jacob (Ex. 6:4; Ps. 105:8-11; 1 Chron. 16:15-18) among the patriarchs finds its grand climax in the covenant with Israel made on Sinai (Ex. 19:5; 23:32; 24:7, 8; 31:16; 34:10, 12, 15, 27, 28). God makes a covenant with David (2 Sam. 7:11, 16, 25; 1 Kings 8:20, 24, 25; 2 Sam. 23:5; Ps. 89:4, 29, 35, 40; 132:11, 12) and his progeny (2 Chron. 13:5). The prophet Jeremiah speaks of a "new covenant" (Jer. 31:31-34). The NT takes up and continues the OT covenant theology. It speaks of the everlasting covenant (Heb. 13:20; 12:24) and maintains the continuity of covenant history (Gal. 3:15-22). Paul reflects on some of the special benefits ministered by the new covenant (2 Cor. 3:16-18). The covenant theme unites both Testaments, because in them God's gracious covenants with men are always sovereign administrations of grace and promise that form the crown and goal of redemptive accomplishments.

The idea of the remnant is found throughout the Bible. In the story of the Flood God graciously saves a remnant (Genesis 6-9). Sometimes there is the thought of a righteous remnant, whose righteousness causes the whole community to be spared (chap. 18:16ff.). Sometimes there is the thought of the righteous remnant itself escaping from the destruction it is powerless to avert (Isa. 4:3). Sometimes a remnant is spared not for its own righteousness, but because of divine mercy in order that it may transmit to another generation the heritage it does not value for itself (Amos 4:11). Though all Israel would not rise to the full glory of the remnant's high calling and fulfill the purpose of her vocation, it was perceived that the election might be narrowed to the remnant, who alone should inherit the promises and who alone should bring true loyalty to the tasks of the election. At times the remnant is thought of as itself loyal, spared because it is the

true heir of the covenant (1 Kings 19:18).⁷¹ In the NT the idea of the remnant plays an important role in Paul's discussion of the course of God's salvation (Romans 9-11). The book of Revelation knows of the remnant as the last community of believers before Christ establishes His kingdom when He comes in glory.

Virtually all major themes of the OT are taken up in the NT and further developed. "Throughout the period covered by the Old Testament a thread of unity can be found, and much in the thought of the Old Testament is continued in the New."⁷²

c. *Vocabulary.* Another line of connection between the Testaments is found in the vocabulary or words of the Bible. Jesus and the apostles used familiar terms. To put it another way, the theological language that Jesus and the apostles used was the language available to them and to their listeners. The creation of such a theological language was not the work of a day. Without a background of the OT and Israelite faith, the message of Jesus would have been almost unintelligible.

It is widely recognized that "almost every key theological word of the NT is derived from some Hebrew word that had a long history of use and development in the OT."⁷³

Scholarship has given much attention to the study of the theological vocabulary of the NT and its roots in the OT.⁷⁴ Of course, this does not imply that these terms did not undergo any development during their OT history and in the NT. When we speak of unity we do not mean uniformity (*Selected Messages*, book 1, 22). There is scarcely any key theological word that is not common to both Testaments, and there is likewise scarcely any key theme that is not common to both Testaments. While we are aware that "different meanings are expressed by the same word; [and that] there is not one word for each distinct idea" (ibid., 20), we must at the same time discern God's will and purpose in the words of the inspired writers of Scripture. In doing so we will surely be able to comprehend the connecting line between "Greek words and their Hebrew meanings,"⁷⁵ i.e., between OT and NT.

d. *Typology.* Another way of coming to grips with the unity between the Testaments is to study persons, institutions, and events of the OT with their typological counterparts in the NT.⁷⁶ It is not possible to touch on all the questions raised in connection with the subject of typology.

There is no questioning the fact that the typological approach to relating the two Testaments to each other has been misused. The typological method should not be arbitrarily applied or overrated⁷⁷ as the only method of relating the Testaments to each other.⁷⁸ At the same time we do not agree with the concept that there is a history of tradition present in the OT, with its analogies and prefigurations, for which new interpretations are to be substituted. In other words it is an essential presupposition for the typological approach that the historical character of the Biblical revelation be recognized.⁷⁹

It is hardly possible to deny the relevance of the typological approach within the scheme of salvation history as a legitimate link between the Testaments. As a matter of fact the term "type" is derived from the Greek word *tupos*, which occurs fourteen times in the NT.⁸⁰ In order to discover the theological idea underlying this term, which is variously translated into English, we need to consider its meaning in Romans 5:14. Here Adam is called "a type of the one who was to come" (RSV). Paul stresses the likeness or correspondence in the relationship between Christ and His followers (Rom. 3:21—5:11) and between Christ and Adam (chap. 5:12-18). The correspondence between Adam and Christ is that both are totally representative, the one of all humanity and the other of all believers. According to this passage the "type" can be defined only in terms of an essential correspondence between two historical persons (institutions and events) within the broad outline of the history of revelation, in such a way that the "lesser" one points forward to the "greater" one who is to come. Thus type and antitype are on two different levels of

time, and only when the antitype appears does the typical sense become apparent. The type is always an imperfect portrayal of the antitype.

The full extent of the typological meaning of the OT can only be appreciated when it is viewed in the light of the samples given in the NT. This safeguard will defuse most of the objections brought against typological relationships between the Testaments. Without such a guide there is the tendency for human ingenuity to run riot in detecting types. For instance, the Fathers of the church went beyond the identity of Melchizedek as a type of Christ (as identified clearly in Heb. 7:1-3), and identified Melchizedek's presentation of bread and wine in Genesis 14:18 as a type of the eucharistic sacrifice.

In the OT one finds a form of typology that portrays a relationship between beginning and end. Isaiah speaks of the eschatological return to Paradise (Isa. 11:6-8; 65:17-25). Hosea looks back to the congregation of Israel in the wilderness and sees in it the type of restored Israel (Hosea 2:16, 17). In the NT, Stephen pointed to Moses as the type of Jesus Christ, the "Redeemer" (Acts 7:20-40). In 1 Corinthians 10:1-13, Paul develops a typology built upon the Exodus. All the history of Israel in the Exodus is a type (verse 11). Paul declares that God, the Master of history and the One who inspired the Biblical writers, has willed that the history of the OT should serve for the instruction, admonition, and profit of spiritual Israel, the new people of God who would live in the last days, which precede the glorious coming of the Lord Jesus Christ to complete His work. Paul brings out the deeper meaning behind OT history.

The Paschal lamb is a type of Christ (John 19:36). The bronze serpent raised on the pole in the wilderness is a type of the crucified Christ (chap. 3:14). The Exodus is a type of baptism (1 Cor. 10:2). Jonah's stay in the belly of the fish is a type of Jesus' stay in the grave (Matt. 12:14). The earthly tabernacle built by Moses in the wilderness is a type of the heavenly one (Acts 7:44). On the basis of a study of OT citations and allusions in the Gospel of Matthew, Gundry sees Jesus as the greater Moses, the greater Son of David, the representative Prophet, the representative Israelite, and the representative righteous Sufferer rejected by men.⁸¹

It is certainly true that when the antitype appears, the typical sense becomes clearly apparent. The antitype then brings out the fuller import and deeper meaning of what was contained in the type. This means that the deeper meaning expressed in typology is found on the basis of the larger context of inspired Scripture. One seems to go astray in the assumption that the typological connection is purely a later one. We have to allow for the fact that God as the Author of Scripture established it from the very outset, so that the text containing the type may be treated as an indication for an earlier, divinely given prefiguration of that which is later identified as the antitype. The different aspects of the "types" must enter so plainly into the scheme of salvation history that their prefigurative meaning is clear beyond doubt. Within the scope of these considerations, we shall have to consider the typological approach as a legitimate link that connects the OT with the NT.

e. Promise/Prediction and Fulfillment. A most significant pattern of relating the OT to the NT is found in terms of the formula—promise/prediction and fulfillment. The pattern of promise/prediction and fulfillment, which throws much light on the relationship between the Testaments and helps to express their unity, has again been greatly emphasized within recent years.⁸² This pattern is used not only in the relationship between the Testaments but also within the OT itself, as we shall briefly note.

Anyone who studies the OT finds that throughout there is a colorful and purposive movement.⁸³ "Throughout the Old Testament there is a forward look."⁸⁴ This forward moving thrust, which reaches its goal under all the circumstances in history by virtue of the fact that the Lord's Word is not "vain" (Deut. 32:47), is the very essence of OT truth. The theme of promise/predic-

tion and fulfillment is explicitly visible from the promise given to Abraham (Gen. 12:1-4) and the fulfillment in the birth and preservation of Isaac, the guidance of Jacob, the preservation of Joseph and his brothers (chap. 45:5), and finally the birth of Jesus Christ, through whom all nations find a blessing.

It is indeed true that “when we survey the entire Old Testament, we find ourselves involved in a great history of movement from promise toward fulfillment.”⁸⁵ In the OT there is a definite correspondence between God’s word and His action that follows the pattern of promise/prediction and fulfillment. The history of the people of Israel according to the book of Exodus is an act in terms of the fulfillment of a promise (Ex. 3:7, 8). On the basis of the strength of the word that promises deliverance the people set out from Egypt and are delivered from mortal danger by their God. He fulfills what He promised them. The believing community responds to the fulfillment of the promises and predictions in a unique public confession (chap. 15:1-21; Joshua 21:43-45; 23:14).

There are a great number of prophetic predictions noted in various parts of the OT, the fulfillments of which were exactly noted in historical events as recorded in 1 and 2 Kings.⁸⁶ Aside from this all-prevailing correspondence between the divine word of prediction spoken by the prophets and the historical events of their fulfillment, there are many other instances in the OT in which the pattern of promise/prediction and fulfillment is found. In Isaiah 7:7 the prediction is made that the two enemy kings from the north “shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass.” This threat to Jerusalem by the Syro-Ephraimitic league was crushed as had been predicted. The prediction by Jeremiah that the Lord would place an iron yoke on the neck of Israel (Jer. 28:14) was fulfilled just as the predicted death of Hananiah came about (verses 15-17). It is thus obvious that the OT history moves between promise/prediction and fulfillment. “The story of Israel’s origins from the call of Abraham, through the exodus deliverance, to the entry into the land of Canaan, is cast in a framework of promises and fulfillment. Israel’s history of the Promised Land—her exile from it and her ultimate return to it—is understood as a history guided by God’s sovereign will, subject to the stipulations of His covenant, and interpreted through His prophetic word of signs and warning, judgment and promise.”⁸⁷ The OT then does indeed tell of a salvation history (*Heilsgeschichte*) that moves toward a predicated fulfillment.

But there is something lacking in that salvation history. It is an unfinished history of salvation. Down to the end of OT times, hope still lay over the horizon. On its last pages Israel still is in a posture of expectation and hope, which is looking for its complete fulfillment. The OT announces a long history of promise, of hope, and also of disappointment, until the “fulness of time” would come and the One predicted would appear. In this sense the OT has a torsolike character; it is an unfinished story that receives its further fulfillment in the NT. There is the promise of a leader who will be servant of God’s people (Isa. 52:13; 53:12; Eze. 37:24-28), of a new covenant to be written on men’s hearts (Jer. 31:31-34), and the gift of God’s Spirit to give the power of new life to His people (Joel 2:28-32).

The NT picks up the note of the coming fulfillment of God’s promises and presents in its gospel message the fulfillment of what has been promised in the OT. NT writers repeat the refrain that Scriptures were fulfilled.⁸⁸

The many citations of and allusions to the OT in NT writings are in accord with the comprehensiveness of the “promise.” While this is attested in the OT itself (Joshua 21:45; 23:14; Ps. 105:9-11; et cetera), the scope of the promise is especially evident in the light of the NT. It finds there its most complete exposition. The promise links up with the history of Abraham and his descendants (Acts 7:17; Rom. 4:13), rests on grace (Rom. 4:16), is a special and essential aspect of Israel’s spiritual inheritance (chap. 9:4, 5). It includes all believers, even those from the

Gentiles (chap. 15:9), and has a perspective on new heavens and a new earth (2 Peter 3:13), and on eternal life (1 John 2:25). The OT promises to Israel (which was graciously elected by God) are fulfilled in spiritual Israel (Rom. 9:6-13). "All the promises of God," including the Messianic prophecies and predictions, "find their Yes in him" (2 Cor. 1:20, RSV). We must rightly maintain that there are many forms of expectation and promise in the OT that move on to their realization in the NT and beyond.⁸⁹ Thus we see that the comprehensiveness of the promise has its corollary in the comprehensiveness of the fulfillment.

The Greek words *plēroun* (used 86 times), *telein* (used 28 times), *teleioun* (used 23 times), and *plethein* (used 24 times) in the NT, designating fulfillment and fulfilling have a significant meaning.⁹⁰ Through the fulfillment of the OT promises and predictions in the NT, the OT attains its purpose and reveals its total function. In the reality of fulfillment the NT becomes an integral part of the totality of Scripture, even when the fulfillment still points toward the final consummation, the coming *Pleroma* of God.

Some have rejected the pattern of promise and fulfillment as not doing justice to either of the two Testaments.⁹¹ The feeling is at times expressed that the pattern of promise and fulfillment is inadequate and unsatisfactory. It should be pointed out that with respect to the fulfillment there is a misapprehension that virtually results in the abandonment of the OT altogether. According to this position, the promise becomes obsolete in the fulfillment. It has been observed that "this is obviously incorrect, because it is a misrepresentation of the category of fulfillment in the New Testament."⁹² When we speak of fulfillment we must keep in mind that there are already aspects of fulfillment in the OT⁹³ itself as shown above. Furthermore, we agree with Th. C. Vriezen who writes, "Fulfillment does not mean here a replacement of the Old Testament message by something else; it does not mean that the law is made superfluous by the gospel and the promise by reality, but it means that the law and the prophets are given a new meaning by Jesus."⁹⁴ Though it is to be maintained that all the realities of fulfillment are focused in one way or another on Jesus Christ, i.e., He is the hinge of all fulfillments in the Bible, there are nevertheless aspects of fulfillment that are taken up in the NT and point forward to a complete fulfillment in the return of Jesus Christ. The NT has promises and a hope of things yet to come.

Some would like to restrict the term "promise" in decisive ways. It is limited by F. Baumgärtel and F. Hesse to the "basic-promise" [*Grundverheissung*], which was expressed in the well-known dictum: "I am the Lord, your God." Both of these scholars distinguish between "promise" and "prediction." It is maintained that only this "basic-promise" is in reality "an abstraction from the concrete historicity of the Old Testament. The idea that we are permitted to do this must be rejected on the basis of the Old Testament from the perspective gained in Christ, then he only accepts the creed of the church of Christ; he accepts the place wherein he hears the Old Testament."⁹⁵ The question must be asked of Baumgärtel and Hesse whether one can indeed abstractly crystalize a single promise out of the many promises. It has also been rightly objected that the concept of "prediction," which is elaborated in contradistinction to "promise," misses the point of prophecy.⁹⁶ Indeed, the distinction between "prediction" and "promise" does not seem to aid in the discussion.⁹⁷ We feel that this is an arbitrary distinction that cannot be maintained on the basis of the Biblical witness. It is also an unacceptable reductionism of the OT message.⁹⁸

The idea of promise is restricted by other scholars in a different way. Some attempt to limit this term to messianic prophecies.⁹⁹ In some instances it is even limited to some explicit messianic prophecies, the number of which is still more restricted by scholars.¹⁰⁰ It has also been objected that the pattern of promise and fulfillment leads to "a rigorous search for Christ in the Old Testament."¹⁰¹ Over against these restrictive approaches one must recognize that the NT writers refer to the concept of promise and fulfillment in terms of the whole OT in the broad scope

of the history of redemption. The NT then does not limit the pattern of promise and fulfillment to some explicit messianic prophecies. Indeed, the relationship in the context of promise and fulfillment is extensive and comprehensive.¹⁰²

The importance of the pattern of promise/prediction and fulfillment can hardly be overstressed, especially when viewed in light of the comprehensiveness as it is, still needs to be supplemented by other aspects indicating the unity between the Testaments.

f. Unity of Perspective. Many eminent scholars agree that there is a common eschatological perspective that unites the Testaments. Th. C. Vriezen puts it this way: "The true heart of both Old Testament and New Testament is, therefore, the eschatological perspective."¹⁰³ H. H. Rowley adds: "The full consummation of the hopes of the Old Testament lies still in the distant future. . . . Nor does the New Testament fail to perceive this. . . . It still placed the final glory in the future."¹⁰⁴ Just as the believer in the OT stood under an arc of tension between promise and fulfillment, so the believer in Christ "comes to stand in a new way under an arc of tension between promise and fulfillment."¹⁰⁵ All supplication for fulfillment in the congregation of the new covenant merges in the single plea, "Come, Lord Jesus" (Rev. 22:20; 1 Cor. 16:22). Thus, within the arc of promise and fulfillment, God's redemptive purpose, His salvation history, unfolds itself from the OT to the NT and beyond to the end of time when the Lord of lords and King of kings comes in the clouds of heaven to take His own home.

The OT does relate a history of salvation. But in many respects it is an unusual one, since it is a truncated history of salvation. The expected Messiah did not come during OT times. In this sense the OT is a book that is incomplete, pointing beyond itself and ending in a posture of waiting. Down to its very last page it speaks of a fulfillment of the promise in the future tense. The God who acted in Creation, in Exodus, and conquest, guiding His people, will act again one day. The completion of this incomplete history of salvation is a primary concern of the NT. The turning point of all history is the first advent of Jesus Christ. The God who acted in Israel's history by this event acted decisively in human history. This is the center of the NT's message. It completes the OT's incompleteness and yet moves beyond, to the final *eschaton*.

From the OT to the NT and beyond we have one continuous movement in the direction of the final *eschaton*, the coming of the day of the Lord. Indeed the entire history of revelation is one pilgrimage, looking forward to the city "whose builder and maker is God" (Heb. 11:10). On this pilgrimage there are many stops with many initial fulfillments but each of them a point of departure until all promises will be fulfilled at the end of time. It has been pointed out rightly that NT eschatology, the predictions concerning the last days in the Synoptic Gospels and the other writings of the NT, continue the expectation of the OT.¹⁰⁶

The unity between the Testaments is also a unity of their common perspective, plan, and purpose for men, angels, and God's whole universe.¹⁰⁷ The OT tells the history of Israel in terms of salvation history and prepares for and leads up to the coming of Jesus as the Christ of Israel and the Saviour of all men. It is certainly to be admitted that not everything in the OT can be subsumed under the rubric of salvation history,¹⁰⁸ because it was a history that both led on to Christ and also to His rejection. For the sake of clarification it needs to be pointed out that in the Bible we have not only the revelation of God but also the reaction of men. We must recognize that the reaction of men is not normative and does not figure in the whole scheme of the relationship between the Testaments. The history of the reaction of Israel and Judaism that led to the rejection of Christ could not have been a part of the history of salvation.¹⁰⁹ Despite man's repeated frustrations of God's plan and purpose, God still saw to it that His plan and purpose was realized in Jesus Christ and is seeing to it that the outstanding promises will yet be realized through Him in the future. The whole Bible then drives forward to the consummation of all things

in heaven and on earth. "This is the pervasive theme of both Old and New Testaments."¹¹⁰ The work of Christ is continued in the work of the Holy Spirit and will find its completion at the Second Advent.

The relationship between the OT and the NT is varied and complex. It is not possible to define it by a single definition. Many patterns and lines of connection are to be recognized and delineated in an attempt to do justice to the great variety of relationships between the Testaments which explicate, in turn, inner unity between them. The grand theme of the whole Bible is the activity of the triune God who has acted, is acting, and will continue to act in behalf of man's salvation, and who will bring the whole history of the world to a cataclysmic end through Jesus Christ's glorious appearance for which all men must prepare themselves. The challenge of this Biblical message is uniquely the mission of God's remnant church.

Abbreviations:

CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
JBR	<i>Journal of Bible and Religion</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
EvTh	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
TPQ	<i>Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift</i>
ATANT	<i>Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments (zürich)</i>
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
RThPh	<i>Revue de Thèol. et de phil.</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitsch, für Theol. und Kirche</i>

1. The following studies are representative of the subject under discussion and provide additional bibliography: A. M. Hunter, *The Unity of the New Testament* (1943); H. H. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible* (2nd ed., 1968); E. F. Scott, *The Varieties of New Testament Religion* (1947); C. H. Dodd, *The Present Task in New Testament Studies* (1936) Dodd, *The Old Testament in the New* (1952); M. E. Lyman, "The Unity of the Bible," *JBR* 14 (1946): 5ff.; J. Coppens, *Vom christlichen Verstandnis des Alten Testaments* (1952); F. Baumgärtel, *Verheissung* (1952); R. C. Dentan, "The Unity of the Old Testament," *Interpretation* 5 (1951): 153ff.; P. E. Davies, "Unity and Variety in the New Testament," *Interpretation* 5 (1951): 174ff.; F. V. Filson, "The Unity of the Old and the New Testaments," *Interpretation* 5 (1951): 134ff.; G. E. Wright, "The Unity of the Bible," *Interpretation* 5 (1951): 131ff.; S. Amsler, *L'AT dans, l'église* (1960); P. Grelot, *Sens chretien de l'AT* (1962); R. E. Murphy, "The Relationship Between the Testaments," *CBQ* 26 (1964): 349ff.; Murphy, "Christian Understanding of the Old Testament," *Theology Digest* 18 (1970): 321ff.; K. Schwarzwaller, *Das AT in Christus* (1966); P. Benoit and R. E. Murphy, eds., *How Does the Christian Confront the Old Testament?* (1967); N. Lofink, *The Christian Meaning of the Old Testament* (1968); B. W. Anderson, ed., *The Old Testament and Christian Faith* (1963), hereinafter cited as *OFCF*; C. Westermann, ed., *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics* (1963), hereinafter cited as *EOTH*; Westermann, *The Old Testament and Jesus Christ* (1970); F. F. Bruce, *The NT Development of OT Themes* (1969); A. van Ruler, *The Christian Church and the Old Testament* (1971); G. F. Hasel, *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* (1972), 65-80; John W. Wenham, *Christ and the Bible* (1972).

2. The following essays in recent periodical literature indicate the variety of attempts to deal with the relationship between the Testaments: N.W. Porteous, "A Question of Perspectives," *ATANT* 59 (1970): 117-31; A. H. van Zyl, "The Relation Between Old and New Testament," *Hermeneutica* (1970), 9-22; F.R. McCurley, Jr., "The Christian and the OT Promise," *Lutheran Quarterly* 24 (1970): 401-10; J. Barr, "Themes From the OT for the Elucidation of the New Creation," *Encounter* 31 (1970), 25-30; U. Mauser, "Image of God and Incarnation," *Interpretation* 24 (1970): 336-56; B. Noack, "Die Relevanz der alttestamentlichen Verheissung für Glauben and Verkündigung des Urchristentums,"

Hoffnung ohne Illusion, ed. by H. Zeddies (Berlin, 1970), 75-87; F. C. Fensham, "The Covenant as Giving Expression to the Relationship Between Old and New Testament," *Tyndale Bulletin* 22 (1971): 82-94; S. Siedl, "Das Alte and das Neue Testament. Ihre Verschiedenheit und Einheit," *TPQ* 119 (1971): 314-24; M. P. Miller, "Targum, Midrash, and the Use of the OT in the NT," *JSJ* 2 (1971): 29-82; H. Schmid, "Die christlich-jüdische Auseinandersetzung um das AT in hermeneutischer Sicht," *Schriften zur Judentumskunde* 1 (1971): 5-55.

3. E. Ebeling, "The Meaning of 'Biblical Theology,'" *Word and Faith* (Philadelphia, 1963), 79.
4. The definitive treatment on Marcion is that of A. von Harnack, *Marcion das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (2nd ed.; 1924); J. Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament* (1942); E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (1948).
5. A. von Harnack, *Marcion*, 221-22. So comes the "voice of Marcion in modern speech," says J. Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament* (1967), 65.
6. F. Delitzsch, *Die grosse Täuschung* (1920-1921), 2 vols.
7. E. Hirsch, *Das Alte Testament und die Predigt des Evangeliums* (1936).
8. *Ibid.*, 27, 29, 83.
9. See John Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, 69-72; E. Voegelin, "History and Gnosis," *OTCF*, 64-89, who calls Bultmann a gnostic thinker, C. Michalson, "Is the Old Testament the Propaedeutic to Christian Faith?" *OTCF*, 64-89, warmly defends Bultmann against such a charge.
10. Bultmann, "Prophecy and Fulfillment," *EOTH*, 73. Cf. J. Barr, "The Old Testament and the New Crisis of Biblical Authority," *Interpretation* 25 (1971): 30-32.
11. Bultmann, "The Significance of the Old Testament for the Christian Faith," *OFCF*, 22-30.
12. Bultmann, *OTCF*, 14.
13. *OTCF*, 13. Cf. C. Westermann's critique in "Remarks on the Theses of Bultmann and Baumgärtel," *EOTH*, 124-228 Wright, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, 69-72.
14. W. Pannenberg, "Redemptive Event and History," *EOTH*, 325-26.
15. F. Baumgärtel, *Verheissung*, 92.
16. F. Baumgärtel, "The Hermeneutical Problem of the Old Testament," *EOTH*, 139; Baumgärtel, *Verheissung*, 144-48, where he specifically rejects Hirsch's understanding of the Old Testament as the antithesis of the New.
17. Baumgärtel, *EOTH*, 151.
18. *Ibid.*, 156.
19. *Ibid.*, 135.
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Ibid.*, 156.
22. Westermann, *EOTH*, 133.
23. G. von Rad, "Verheissung," *EvTh*, 13 (1953), 410. Incisive criticisms against Baumgärtel's position have been advanced by A.H.J. Gunneweg, "Über die Prädikabilität alttestamentlicher Texte," *ZTK* 65 (1968), 398-400.
24. H. J. Kraus, "Der lebendige Gott," *EvTh* 27 (1967), 169-200, reproaches these for not taking the Old Testament into consideration.
25. F. Hesse, *Das Alte Testament als Buch der Kirche* (1966); Hesse, "The Evaluation and Authority of the Old Testament Texts," *EOTH*, 308-13. Cf. Hasel, *Old Testament Theology*, 69-70, and others.
26. See especially R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* (1971), and Wenham, *Christ and the Bible*, 11-81.
27. A. A. van Ruler, *The Christian Church and the Old Testament* (1970).
28. *Ibid.*, 72.
29. *Ibid.*, 74, n. 45.
30. *Ibid.*, 75-98.
31. See the critique of Van Ruler's position on this point by Th. C. Vriezen, "Theocracy and Soteriology," *EOTH*, 221-23.
32. *Ibid.*, 51, 52.
33. *Ibid.*, 69.
34. J. J. Stamm, "Jesus Christ in the Old Testament," *EOTH*, 200-210.
35. *Ibid.*, 208.
36. K. H. Miskotte, *When the Gods Are Silent* (1967).
37. Th. C. Vriezen, *An Outline of the Old Testament Theology* (2d ed.; 1970), 98.
38. W. Vischer, *Das Christuszeugnis des Alten Testaments* (7th ed.; 1946), 2 vols. The English translation, *The Witness of the Old Testament of Christ* (1949) comes from the 3d ed. of 1936. Citations are taken from the English translation.
39. *Ibid.*, 1:14.
40. *Ibid.*, 1:7.
41. *Ibid.*, 1:12, 26.

42. Vischer as cited by H. W. Hertzberg, *TLZ* 4 (1949): 221.
43. Vischer, *The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ*, 1:44.
44. *Ibid.*, 1:75, 76.
45. *Ibid.*, 1:87, 88.
46. *Ibid.*, 1:104-5.
47. *Ibid.*, 1:153.
48. Vischer's exegetical methodology is recently set forth very clearly in his "La methode de l'exegese biblique," *RThPh* 10 (1960): 109-23.
49. W. Vischer, *Die Dedeutung des AT für das Christliche Leben* (1947), 5.
50. Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, 88.
51. For an approach that recognizes the fuller import and deeper meaning of Scripture, see Gerhard F. Hasel in *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*, G. M Hyde, ed. (1974), 184-91.
52. F. C. Grant, *An Introduction to the New Testament Thought* (1950), 29.
53. C. H. Dodd, *The Present Task in New Testament Studies* (1936), 32.
54. H. H. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible*, 3.
55. *Ibid.*, 95.
56. W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (1961), 1:26.
57. G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (1965), 2:369: "The larger context into which we have to set the Old Testament phenomena if they are to be meaningfully appreciated is not, however, a general system of religious and ideal values, but the compass of a specific history, which was set in motion by God's words and deeds and which, as the New Testament sees it, finds its goal in the coming of Christ. Only in this event is there any point in looking for what is analogous and comparable. And it is only in this way of looking at the Old and the New Testaments that the correspondences and analogies between the two appear in their proper light."
58. H. W. Wolff, "The Hermeneutics of the Old Testament," *EOTH*, 181.
59. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible*, 94 (italics his).
60. F. V. Filson, "The Unity Between the Testaments," *The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary on the Bible* (1971), 992.
61. J. L. McKenzie, "Aspects of Old Testament Thought," *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, R. E. Brown, J. A. Fitzmyer, and R. E. Murphy, eds. (1968), 755.
62. On the whole, see R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* (1971).
63. P. A. Verhoef, "The Relationship Between the Old and the New Testaments," *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, J. B. Payne, ed. (1970), 282.
64. R. Nicole, "New Testament Views of the Old Testament," *Revelation and the Bible*, C.F.H. Henry, ed. (1958), 137, counts at least 295 separate references, of which 224 are direct citations introduced by a certain definite formula. K. Grobel, "Quotations," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (1962), 3:977, writes that the OT "is explicitly quoted some 150 times and tacitly quoted some 1,100 additional times."
65. F. Hesse, *Das Alte Testament als Buch der Kirche* (1966), 38.
66. R. Bultmann, "Prophecy and Fulfillment," *EOTH*, 50-75, which has been criticized by C. Westermann, *EOTH*, 124-28.
67. E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (1967), 143: "Pauline exegesis employs a great deal of methodology found in rabbinical and other literature," On the rabbinic methods of interpretation, see S. H. Horn, "Jewish Interpretation in the Apostolic Age," in *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*, 17-26.
68. F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids, Mich, 1959), 66-77; R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden, 1967). J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran and in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 (1960-1961): 297-333.
69. Verhoef, *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, 284; G. C. Berkouwer, *De Heilige Schrift* (1967), 2:175.
70. J. Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, 211.
71. See G. F. Hasel, *The Remnant* (2d ed.; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews Univ. Press, 1974).
72. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible*, 89.
73. McKenzie, *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, 767.
74. G. R. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (1962-1973), 8 vols.; L. Coenen, et al., eds., *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament* (3d ed.; 1972); G. Botterweck and H. Ringgren, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, 1974ff.
75. D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms* (1967); J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (1961); Barr, *Biblical Words for Time* (1962).
76. The recent literature on the topic of typology is very extensive and continues to grow. For its history, see L. Goppelt, *Typos: Die Typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments* (1939); G.W.H. Lampe and J. J. Woollcombe, *Essays on*

Typology (1975); P. Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture* (n.d.); W. Eichrodt, "Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?" *EOTH*, 224-45; G. von Rad, "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament," *EOTH*, 17-39; von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* 2, 364-74. A cautious approach to typology is accepted by Van Ruler, *The Christian Church and the Old Testament*, 57-74. Typology is totally rejected by Barr, *Old and New Interpretation* (1966), 103-48, who fails to distinguish between typology and allegory.

77. Warnings are sounded by a number of scholars, see J. D. Smart, *The Interpretation of Scripture* (1961), 129-33.
78. Hasel, *Old Testament Theology*, 73-74.
79. Verhoef, *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, 285.
80. John 20:25; Acts 7:43, 44; 23:26; Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 10:6, 11; Phil. 3:17; 1 Thess. 1:7; 3:9; 1 Tim. 4:12; Titus 2:7; Heb. 8:5; 1 Peter 5:3. Cf. L. Goppelt, *τυπος*, *TDNT* (1972), 8:246-59.
81. R. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, 209-10.
82. Among examples of this general approach (with variations) are G. von Rad, "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament," *EOTH*, 17-39; Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 2:317-429; H. W. Wolff, "The Old Testament in Controversy: Interpretative Principles and Illustration," *Interpretation* 12 (1948): 281-91; Wolff, "The Hermeneutics of the Old Testament," *EOTH*, 160-99; W. Zimmerli, "Promise and Fulfillment," *EOTH*, 89-122; C. Westermann, "The Way of the Promise Through the Old Testament," *OCTF*, 200-224; Westermann, *Jesus Christ and Old Testament* (1971); Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, 192ff.; Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible*, 90-121; K. Frör, *Biblische Hermeneutik* (3d ed., 1967), 146; Hasel, *Old Testament Theology*, 75-76.
83. H. D. Preuss, *Jahweglaube und Zukunftserwartung* (1968), shows that one can speak of the Old Testament faith as "future expectation" (205ff.).
84. H. H. Rowley, *The Faith of Israel* (1956), 177.
85. Zimmerli, *EOTH*, 111.
86. 2 Sam. 7:13-1 Kings 8:20; 1 Kings 11:29-1 Kings 12:51b; 1 Kings 13-2 Kings 23:16-18; 1 Kings 14:6-1 Kings 15:29; 1 Kings 16:1-1 Kings 16:12; Joshua 6:26-1 Kings 16:34; 1 Kings 22:17-1 Kings 22:35, 36; 1 Kings 21:21, 22-1 Kings 21:27-29; 2 Kings 1:6-2 Kings 1:17; 2 Kings 21:10-2 Kings 24:2; 2 Kings 22:15-2 Kings 23:30.
87. Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, 198.
88. Matt. 26:56; 27:9; Mark 14:49; Luke 4:21; 21:22; John 13:18; 17:12; 19:24; Acts 1:16; James 2:23; and many others.
89. On this point see the pertinent remarks by Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible*, 108ff.; Zimmerli, *EOTH*, 113-22; W. Schweitzer, *Schrift und Dogma in der Okumene* (1953), 261-62; Verhoef, *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, 291.
90. Cf. C.F.D. Moule, "Fulfillment-Words in the New Testament; Use and Abuse," *NTS* 14 (1968): 293-320.
91. F. C. Fensham, "Covenant, Promise and Expectation in the Bible," *TLZ* 23 (1967): 305ff.; McKenzie, *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, 767; and others.
92. Verhoef, *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, 291; cf. Moule, *NTS* 14 (1968): 293ff.
93. See also Filson, *Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary* (1971), 992.
94. Vriezen, *An Outline of Old Testament Theology* (2d ed.; 1970), 123.
95. Westermann, *EOTH*, 133.
96. Zimmerli, as quoted by Westermann, *EOTH*, 132.
97. Vriezen, *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*, 124, n. 1.
98. Verhoef, *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, 290.
99. Bultmann, "Prophecy and Fulfillment," *EOTH*, 50ff.
100. See especially G. Fohrer, *Theologische Grundstrukturen des Alten Testaments* (1972), 18ff., who accepts only eleven messianic predictions in the OT.
101. Fensham, *TLZ* 23 (1967): 304-5.
102. Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, 198; Verhoef, *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, 290-91.
103. Vriezen, *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*, 123.
104. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible*, 109-10.
105. Zimmerli, *EOTH*, 114.
106. Verhoef, *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, 293.
107. Filson, *The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary*, 992.
108. Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, 196.
109. M. Meinertz, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (1950), 1:54.
110. Verhoef, *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, 293.