

The Legacy of Gerhard Hasel’s *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* Revealed in Old Testament Scholarship of the Last Four Decades

Richard M. Davidson
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
Andrews University

Introduction: A Description of Hasel’s *Old Testament Theology*

The first edition of Gerhard Hasel’s book *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* was published by Eerdmans Publishing House in 1972. It dealt with four major questions in the debate, each comprising a chapter: (1) methodology, (2) history, history of tradition, and salvation history, (3) the center of the OT and OT theology, and (4) the relationship between the Testaments. A fifth chapter provided Hasel’s own “multiplex” proposal for doing OT theology.

Hasel’s multiplex method involves seven basic proposals: (1) biblical theology must be a historical-theological discipline (not separating “what it meant” from “what it means”), and yet doing a work distinct from but complementary with the systematic theologian; (2) it must be both historical and theological from the starting point, allowing for the inbreaking of God into history (vs. the closed continuum of the historical-critical method); (3) OT theology “questions the various books or blocks of writings of the OT as to their theology” involving “a summary interpretation of OT writings or blocks of writings”¹; (4) the theologies of the OT books or blocks of writings should follow the

¹ Gerhard F. Hasel, *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 89-90 (4th ed., 1991, 202-203). Hereafter cited as *OTT: Basic Issues* (with citation of the first edition unless otherwise noted).

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

chronological and not canonical sequence; (5) OT theology should “attempt to draw together and present the major themes of the OT”²; (6) “the final aim of OT theology is to demonstrate whether or not there is an inner unity that binds together the various theologies and longitudinal themes, concepts, and motifs,”³ although this should not be done hastily nor prematurely nor should one make book or group of books the norm for what constitutes OT theology; and (7), an OT theology “must demonstrate its basic relationship to the NT or to NT theology.”⁴

Hasel’s book *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues*, went through four editions, the 2nd revised edition appearing in 1975, the 3rd revised and expanded edition in 1982, reprinted in 1985, and the 4th revised, expanded and enlarged edition, in 1991. The fourth edition had grown from a slim volume of less than 100 pages (minus the indexes), with a two-page bibliography in 1972, to 208 pages of text and a forty-two page bibliography 1991. Along the way an initial chapter was added (chap. 1) tracing the beginnings and development of OT theology, and the discussion of each of the four major questions was expanded and updated. Hasel’s book was translated into several languages, including Korean (1984), Portuguese (1987), and Indonesian (1986).

I personally cut my scholarly theological teeth on Hasel’s book upon entering my doctoral studies in 1976, and have regularly used his work as a textbook when teaching Old Testament theology as a professor of OT interpretation at Andrews University Theological Seminary for the last 35 years.

For a number of years Gerhard Hasel’s book was being utilized by over ninety different seminaries and graduate schools in USA and beyond. Because of the popularity and success of this volume on OT theology, and because Gerhard had studied both OT and NT at Vanderbilt U., Mr. Eerdmans himself, from Eerdmans Publishing Company, came from Grand Rapids, MI to visit Dr. Hasel in his office at Andrews University, and asked him to write a companion volume, *New Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*, and this appeared in 1978. The volume on NTT has also been translated into Korean (1982) and Portuguese (1988).

² Ibid., 91 (4th ed., 204).

³ Ibid., 93 (4th ed., 205).

⁴ Ibid., 95 (4th ed., 207).

DAVIDSON: LEGACY OF GERHARD HASEL'S OT THEOLOGY

Reviews of Hasel's *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*

The reviews of Hasel's *OTT: Basic Issues* appeared in the major scholarly journals of biblical studies. The ATLA index lists some twenty reviews, about half for the first (1972) edition, and the other half for later editions.

As might be expected, some reviews by critical scholars were mixed. For example, J. L. McKenzie writes in the *Anglican Theological Review* in 1977: "The first edition of Hasel's work, published in 1972, was an attempt to put some order into that biblical discipline which is least structured and least fettered by an established traditional approach and method. I did not find the first edition successful in what Hasel set out to do." But then, McKenzie immediately adds, "The second edition, I believe, is more definite in proposing how biblical theology should be done. I should like to see Hasel implement these proposals."⁵

The strongest criticism by critical scholars is leveled against Hasel's veiled but nonetheless emphatic rejection of the presuppositions of the historical-critical method. His subtle hints were not lost on the perceptive critical mind. For example, McKenzie remarks about Hasel's attempt to uphold the historicity of the biblical text:

If I am going to do the theology of the Old Testament, I must study the theology which created the narratives of the patriarchs and of the exodus. To me, being historical in these books is being critical. Hasel leaves me in doubt how he will be historical and theological in his treatment of the exodus, certainly a basic theme in the Old Testament.⁶

Millar Burrows' review in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1973) likewise takes issue with Hasel's insistence on linking faith and history. He writes:

Hasel is thoroughly infected with the prevalent skepticism concerning scholarly objectivity. The most thorough historical and philological research can "never reach the heart of the matter unless one yields to the basic experience out of which the Biblical writers speak, namely

⁵ John L. McKenzie, review of Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, *Anglican Theological Review* 59/2 (1977): 225.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 226.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

faith” (p. 88). How far must one give in? How far can it be done honestly? May not identification even prevent a correct understanding? There is much in the faith of ancient Israel that an interpreter committed to accept whatever he finds will be unable to see.⁷

However, Burrows is forced to admit that “He [Hasel] has made a serious, independent, and stimulating contribution to the discussion. Something like his multiplex approach may well be needed, though the validity and importance of the particular principles he selects are open to debate. His insistence on the rich variety of the OT and his repudiation of any attempt to compress it into a system are to be heartily commended.”⁸ As another sample, Lee Gallman, in his review of Hasel’s 1972 edition in *Review and Expositor*, takes issue with some of Hasel’s points, but nonetheless acknowledges that “This is a first class presentation whether one agrees with the author’s posture or not.”⁹

James Barr writes a review of Hasel’s book (first edition) in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, in which he compliments Hasel’s depth of knowledge: “He has a good knowledge of the literature and of the issues and his book is helpful for its references alone. . . . He presents the main issues in the discussion quite well, in quite a catholic way and without serious bias.”¹⁰ At the same time Barr expresses his suspicions about Hasel’s own conservative position:

His own position seems to be a rather conservative one: he is especially worried by the idea that any theologically neutral, descriptive work might be carried out, and he waxes angry at people who think that history is a closed continuum in which there is no room for transcendence (e.g. pp. 84f.). Why are such people wrong? Because they are stuffed full of dogmatism and philosophical presuppositions. Well, that is an easy way of getting rid of them. It would be better to give some reasons. At points like this, instead of giving reasons, Hasel has a tendency simply to insist, to say that it “must be stressed” that what he thinks is right. He has to learn, as many theologians have, that

⁷ Millar Burrows, review of Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, *JBL* 92/4 (1973): 588.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Lee Gallman, review of Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, *Review and Expositor* 70/2 (1973): 241.

¹⁰ James Barr, review of Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, *JTS* 25/1 (1974): 182-183.

DAVIDSON: LEGACY OF GERHARD HASEL'S OT THEOLOGY

calling an opinion “positivist” (e.g., p. 33) does not in the slightest contribute to demonstrating that it is wrong.¹¹

Barr ends the review on a positive note: “All in all, however, Hasel has given quite a good quick summary of the discussion for someone who has already done some groundwork in the subject.”¹²

Toward the end of his career, however, in defending himself against charges concerning his opposition to biblical theology, Barr lashed out in attack of those who had critiqued him, in his *The Concept of Biblical Theology* (1999): “I have never in fact thought or uttered some of the negative expressions I have found ascribed to me.” Hasel does not escape his claims of being misrepresented: “nor did I ever think most of the things that are ascribed to me by another late friend, Gerhard Hasel, in his widely-used survey *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*, 94-98: almost everything he says in these pages is wrong.”¹³

Despite differing presuppositions than Hasel, some critical scholars had nothing but praise for his work. As an example, in the review of Hasel’s book R. E. Clements (1973) writes in the *Scottish Journal of Theology*:

The task of writing an Old Testament theology has become a major area of concern in recent years, and what appeared even twenty years ago to be a well defined and straightforward task has become increasingly fraught with controversy. . . . Certainly this short volume from Professor Hasel of Andrews University, Michigan, is an excellent primer to the subject. It surveys with great clarity and with detailed references to current literature some of the main problem areas. . . The volume is a most useful one, which is lucid in its presentation and well able to show where and why the going has been difficult.¹⁴

Turning to evangelical reviewers, Hasel’s book received high marks in most reviews. So, for example, Elmer Flack, in his long review of

¹¹ Ibid., 183.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Barr, 235. See *ibid.*, 666, n. 35, where Barr lists the areas where he rejects Hasel’s depictions of himself.

¹⁴ Ronald E. Clements, review of Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, *Scottish Journal of Theology* 26/4 (1973): 500.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Hasel's book in *Lutheran Quarterly* (1973), concludes: "Professor Hasel's conclusions appear to be clear and convincing. With masterful technique, he has digested the materials of the leading scholars in the field and has analyzed the basic strengths and weaknesses of their respective approaches, all the while pointing out the vast complexity and confusion in present-day thinking. His book merits wide reading."¹⁵

In the opening sentences of his review of the first edition of Hasel's book in *JETS*, Walter Kaiser waxes eloquent about the value of Hasel's book:

This book had to be written! With the future of the whole discipline of Biblical Theology at stake and the obviously pessimistic mood of current Old Testament theologians, it was time for a succinct reassessment of where the discipline had been and where it was headed. While the novice to the field may be slightly bewildered by the apparent plethora of names, positions, and intertwined issues, all others must admire the positive benefits which can be derived from this shrewd, terse and at times brilliant analysis of some extremely complicated matters.¹⁶

At the beginning of his review in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Bruce Waltke uses a string of complimentary adjectives to introduce the value of Hasel's book: "To show the comprehensive, digestive, critical, orthodox,

¹⁵ Elmer Flack, review of Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, *Lutheran Quarterly* 25/1 (1973):93.

¹⁶ Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., review of Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, *JETS* 16 (1973): 110-111. As an aside, I was an MDiv student in Hasel's Old Testament theology class when he invited Walter Kaiser to his class at Andrews University, and they publically "debated" (in kind fashion) their respective points of view regarding *Die Mitte* of Scripture. It is with regard to Hasel's view on the "center" of the Old Testament that Kaiser takes issue. He writes: "Is there an inner unity that binds together the various themes, concepts and motifs of the Old Testament? After all, isn't it the final aim of Old Testament Theology to demonstrate such an inner unity? Precisely so! Here is the heart of the whole matter, but sadly Hasel fails on the brink of success. He concludes that this search must be abandoned immediately. The Old Testament Theologian 'cannot' and 'must not use a concept, fundamental idea, or formula as a principle for the systematic ordering and arranging of the Old Testament. . . ' (p. 62). Rather, he should take a 'multiplex approach with the multi-track treatment of longitudinal themes' (p. 93). However, this approach is also doomed from the start, for it too will fail 'to demonstrate whether or not there is an inner unity that binds together the various theologies and longitudinal themes, concepts and motifs (p. 93)." (ibid., 111). Kaiser suggests the promise theme as the most appropriate *Mitte* of the OT, and develops it in his OT theology.

DAVIDSON: LEGACY OF GERHARD HASEL'S OT THEOLOGY

accurate, and contemporary nature of the book the reviewer will summarize the content of the book.”¹⁷ After an unusually long review by the journal's standards, agreeing with Hasel on almost every point, Waltke concludes with further words of appreciation and also of anticipation: “If Gerhard Hasel can now pursue his own method he should produce an exceedingly exceptional theology of the Old Testament. This reviewer anticipates his future works with great anticipation. The length of this review, which is very disproportionate to the length of the book, indicates the importance of the work.”

The Legacy of Gerhard Hasel's *Old Testament Theology*

Waltke's words of appreciation and anticipation provide an opportunity for expressing regret that Gerhard Hasel's life was cut short so that he was not able to produce the comprehensive OT theology toward which his book pointed. However, he did point the way for others to follow.

Hasel's Own Further Contributions

Gerhard himself contributed toward a further understanding of Old Testament theology, beyond his book *OTT: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*, in numerous other articles/chapters on the subject. The published bibliography of his works compiled by his son Michael¹⁸ includes at least a dozen articles related to the nature of Old Testament and Biblical theology published before his death in 1994, and three more published posthumously:

1. “The Problem of History in Old Testament Theology,” *AUSS* 8 (1970):23-50.
2. “Methodology as a Major Problem in the Current Crisis in Old Testament Theology,” *BTB* (1972): 177-198.
3. “The Problem of the Center in the OT Theology Debate,” *ZAW* 86 (1974): 65-82.
4. “Whole Bible or a ‘Canon within a Canon?’” *The Channel* (April, 1978): 25-50.

¹⁷ Bruce K. Waltke, review of Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, *BibSac* 130/518 (1973): 178.

¹⁸ Michael G. Hasel, “A Bibliography of the Writings of Gerhard Franz Hasel,” *AUSS* 34/2 (1996):169-186.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

5. "The Future of Biblical Theology," in *Perspectives on Evangelical Theology*, ed. K. S. Kantzer and S. N. Gundry (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1979), 179-194.
6. "A Decade of Old Testament Theology: Retrospect and Prospect," *ZAW* 93(1980):165-184.
7. "Biblical Theology: Then, Now, and Tomorrow," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 4/1 (1982):61-93.
8. "Recent Contributions to Biblical Theology," *Catalyst*, April 1983, 1-4.
9. "The Relationship between Biblical Theology and Systematic Theology," *TJ* 5 (1984): 113-127.
10. "The Biblical Theology Movement," *Evangelical Theological Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1984), 149-152.
11. "Old Testament Theology from 1978-1987," *AUSS* 26 (1988):133-157.
12. "Biblical Theology: Current Issues and Future Prospects," *Catalyst*, 16 (1990):6-8.
13. "The Nature of Biblical Theology: Recent Trends and Issues," *AUSS* 32/3 (1994):203-215.
14. "Recent Models of Biblical Theology: Three Major Perspectives," *AUSS* 33/1-2 (1995):55-75.
15. "Proposals for a Canonical Biblical Theology," *AUSS* 34/1 (1996): 23-33.

Hasel also presented numerous scholarly papers on the nature of OT and biblical theology at SBL, ETS, ATS, and at major universities and seminaries in various countries of the world. His bibliography is replete with book reviews of the major OT and biblical theologies and related books.

Furthermore, Gerhard contributed six chapters to the book which he co-edited with Ben Ollenburger and Elmer Martens, *The Flowering of Old Testament Theology: A Reader in Twentieth-Century Old Testament Theology: 1930-1990*,¹⁹ including especially his major chapter in the book, "The Future of Old Testament Theology: Prospects and Trends."²⁰

¹⁹ Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992, 373-383.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 373-83.

DAVIDSON: LEGACY OF GERHARD HASEL'S OT THEOLOGY

As far as actually “carrying out” his proposals for a “biblical theology,” Hasel himself gave samples of what an OT/biblical theology would look like. Hasel consistently summarized the basic task of OT theology as two-fold: a synchronic “book-by-book” (and block-by-block) approach, and a diachronic “thematic” approach. His final article on the subject, published posthumously, succinctly states the task this way: “A ‘canonical biblical theology’ has the dual task of (1) providing summary interpretations of the final form of the individual biblical documents or groups of writings and (2) presenting the longitudinal themes, motifs, and concepts that emerge from the biblical materials.”²¹

Hasel points the way in both of these basic tasks. Starting with the thematic task, his doctoral dissertation, published under the title of *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah*,²² gives stellar example of tracing a theme (or “idea” as he calls it) throughout the biblical canon. Hasel became the “expert” on the remnant theme in the Bible, and wrote major articles on this theme in *Wordbooks* and *Theological/Bible Dictionaries*.²³ From personal conversation with Gerhard, I learned that for his dissertation he originally planned on tracing this remnant theme throughout the entire Bible, but constraints of space and issues with his major professor over historical-critical dating of Isaiah caused him to close his endeavors with Isaiah of Jerusalem. In the ensuing years since Gerhard Hasel published his dissertation on the remnant theme from Genesis to Isaiah, various dissertations, written mostly by his students or students of his students, have taken up this remnant theme and traced it through other parts of Scripture.²⁴

²¹ Hasel, “Proposals for a Canonical Biblical Theology,” 29.

²² Gerhard F. Hasel, *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1972; 2nd ed., 1974; 3rd rev. ed., 1980).

²³ See, e.g., “Remnant,” *IDBSup* (1976), 735-736; idem, “Remnant,” *ISBE* 4 (1988):130-134.

²⁴ See, e.g., Edgar A. Johnson, “Aspects of the Remnant Concept in the Gospel of Matthew” (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1984); Kenneth Mulzac, “The Remnant Motif in the Context of Judgment and Salvation in the Book of Jeremiah” (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1995); Leslie Pollard, “The Function of *Loipos* in Contexts of Judgment and Salvation in the Book of Revelation” (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 2007).

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Hasel's scholarly works also tackled other themes of the Old Testament, with seminal articles or monographs on the Sabbath,²⁵ covenant,²⁶ divine judgment,²⁷ creation/Flood/origins,²⁸ and resurrection,²⁹ to name a few.

Hasel also showed the way in writing the theology of a biblical book. His first book published after the release of the first edition of *OTT: Basic Issues* (1972) was a commentary on the book of Jonah, which includes a theology of Jonah.³⁰ Here he gives an example of what constitutes "a summary interpretation" of a biblical book. He engages in the full sweep of what he sees involved in (exegetical-) theological analysis, including arguments for the historicity of the book, an examination of the literary structure (a block parallelism) of the book, a synthesis of the book's major themes, and its intertextual relationship with the NT.

²⁵ See, e.g., "The Sabbath and the Pentateuch," in *The Sabbath in Scripture and History* (ed. Kenneth Strand; Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1982), 21-43; "The Sabbath in the Prophetic and Historical Literature of the Old Testament," in *The Sabbath in Scripture and History* (ed. Kenneth Strand; Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1982), 44-56; idem, "The Origin of the Biblical Sabbath and the Historical-Critical Method: A Methodological Test Case," *JATS* 4 (1993): 17-46; and "The Sabbath," *ABD* (1992) 5:849-856.

²⁶ Gerhard F. Hasel, *Covenant in Blood* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1982).

²⁷ See, e.g., "The Theology of Divine Judgment in the Bible," in *Panorama of Prophecy* (ed. Man Bok Kwon and Pyung Duk Chun; Seoul: Korean Publishing House, 1984), 339-372.

²⁸ See, e.g., "Recent Translations of Genesis 1:1: A Critical Look," *BT* 22 (1971): 1534-167; idem, "The Significance of the Cosmology in Genesis 1 in Relation to Near Eastern Parallels," *AUSS* 10 (1972): 1-20; idem, "The Polemic Nature of the Genesis Cosmology," *EvQ* 46 (1974): 81-102; idem, "The Fountains of the Great Deep," *Origins* 1 (1974): 67-72; idem, "The Biblical View of the Extent of the Flood," *Origins* 2 (1975): 77-95; idem, "The Genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11 and Their Alleged Babylonian Background," *AUSS* 16 (1978): 361-374; idem, "Some Issues Regarding the Nature and Universality of the Genesis Flood Narrative," *Origins* 5 (1978): 83-98; idem, "Genesis 5 and 11: Chronogenealogy in the Biblical History of Beginnings," *Origins* 7 (1980): 23-37; idem, "The Meaning of the Chronogenealogies of Genesis 5 and 11," *Origins* 7 (1980): 53-70; and idem, "The 'Days' of Creation in Genesis 1: Literal or Figurative 'Periods/EPOCHS' of Time?" *Origins* 21 (1994): 5-38.

²⁹ See "Resurrection in the Old Testament Apocalyptic," *Society of Biblical Literature Abstracts* (1976), 24; and "The Resurrection of Jesus: Myth or Historical Reality?" *JATS* 6 (1995): 3-57.

³⁰ Gerhard F. Hasel, *Jonah: Messenger of the Eleventh Hour* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1976).

DAVIDSON: LEGACY OF GERHARD HASEL'S OT THEOLOGY

Hasel was commissioned by Eerdmans to write the prestigious NICOT commentaries on the books of Hosea and Amos, where he no doubt would have set forth what he considered to be the theology of these books, but unfortunately his life was cut short before he could accomplish these objectives.³¹

Hasel's Impact on Old Testament Theologies since 1975

Hasel is freely quoted in many of the OT theologies written in the last forty years since his *OTT: Basic Issues* first appeared. Walter Kaiser's OTT (1978), for example, cites him in numerous footnotes, and states of Hasel, "to whom I am indebted in several places in this section for his fine analysis."³²

In his 2006 OTT, Eugene Merrill cites Hasel's articles for further study on various issues of OT theology,³³ appreciating, for example, his "helpful distinctions" regarding biblical and systematic theology in his opening footnote of the book.³⁴ Likewise, Elmer Marten's OTT favorably cites Hasel several times, especially in his section on "Doing Biblical Theology."³⁵

I had the privilege of researching for this article at the Tyndale House in Cambridge, England, where one has a wonderful library in Biblical Studies right at one's fingertips. I spent a whole day going through their vast collection in the area of Old Testament and Biblical theology, and was delighted to see how many works cite Hasel as an authority, providing the "standard literature" on the history of research in Old Testament theology, and how many cite him favorably as pointing the way forward toward doing Old Testament theology. Several works credit Hasel for coining the expression "golden age of Old Testament theology" to refer to the period starting with Eichrodt's OTT in the early

³¹ He did, however, publish *Understanding the Book of Amos: Basic Issues in Current Interpretations* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1991).

³² Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., *Toward an Old Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978), 26, n. 16.

³³ Eugene H. Merrill, *Everlasting Dominion: A Theology of the Old Testament* (Nashville: B & H, 2006), 1, 5, 8, 9, 27.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.

³⁵ Elmer A. Martens, *God's Design: A Focus on Old Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1981), 293, 294, 297, 299.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

1930's.³⁶ A search of relevant journal articles on the subject of Old Testament theology has revealed the same basic results as the overview of books and monographs on the subject. Hasel is cited frequently as a standard in his synthesis of basic issues in the current debate over OTT. Even in very recent articles, there are references to projections Hasel made years before.

I will use one more example. Bruce Waltke's Old Testament Theology cites Hasel numerous times. In his section "The Task of Old Testament Theology," Hasel's definition of the task of OTT is used to summarize Waltke's own position:

The late Gerhard Hasel rightly argued that "the task of biblical theology is to provide summary explanations and interpretation to the final form of these blocks of writing, with a view to letting their various themes emerge, to indicate their dynamic interrelationship, including their continuities and discontinuities with one another, and to expose the progressive revelation of divine matters."³⁷

This full citation is given again, in its entirety, in Waltke's summary of the task of OTT later in the book (p. 143). Returning to the section on the task of OTT, as he criticizes the history of religion approach, Waltke remarks, "the historians of religion have not heard Hasel's complaint: 'What needs to be emphatically stressed is that there is a transcendent or divine dimension in biblical history which the historical-critical method is unable to deal with.'"³⁸ Hasel's work lives on as he has shaped the definition and task of OTT/BT in works on this subject that have been written, even though he never lived to write his own.

More subtle than explicit references to Hasel's book and articles on OTT, the impact of his legacy is felt in the various OT scholars who have written OT theologies or articles about OTT since the early 1970's, many of whom have given attention to issues he raised, and (more or less

³⁶ Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues* (1991), 26: "The 'golden age' of OT theology began in the 1930's and continues to the present." For scholars crediting Hasel with this appellation, see, e.g., William H. Bellenger, "A Shape for Old Testament Theology: A Lost Cause?" *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 34/ 3 (2007): 288.

³⁷ Bruce K. Waltke and Charles Yu, *Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007), 61, citing Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, 112.

³⁸ Waltke, *Old Testament Theology*, 66, citing Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, 173, 198.

DAVIDSON: LEGACY OF GERHARD HASEL'S OT THEOLOGY

consciously) followed one or more of his suggested procedures. I look here particularly at the two-fold task Hasel outlined, of synchronic (book-by-book) and diachronic (thematic) approaches. Examples of Old Testament theologies paying particular attention to the book-by-book approach, include those by Paul House (1998),³⁹ Bruce Waltke (2007).⁴⁰ House not only follows the book-by-book approach, but like Hasel, sees “God” (“monotheism, the existence and worship of one true God”) as the dynamic unifying center. Unlike what Hasel might have approved of, House uses this theme of God to be the “grid” of his discourse on each biblical book, inquiring of each book what constitutes its unique message about God.

Old Testament theologies paying particular attention to tracing the themes of OT include, for examples, the works of William Dyrness,⁴¹ *Themes in Old Testament Theology* (1979), who traces fourteen themes, and B.S. Childs,⁴² who examines twenty themes. Here we can also include other scholarly works, too many to document, which trace single themes throughout the Hebrew Bible.

Under this category we also may put other OT theologies which have a single theme or complex of themes as the chosen center of their work, even though Hasel did not agree that a single theme, concept, or motif was capable of encompassing the breadth of the OT material. If we look at these theologies together as contributing toward demonstrating the flow of various themes throughout the material, then the ultimate purpose of Hasel’s vision may be seen to be advanced. I have catalogued 28 different centers proposed by OT theologians since the appearance of Hasel’s *OTT: Basic Issues* in 1972, and have proposed my own multiplex center, not as an organizing grid, but as the “orientation point” of an OT theology.⁴³

³⁹ Paul R. House, *Old Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998).

⁴⁰ Waltke and Yu, *Old Testament Theology*.

⁴¹ William Dyrness, *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989).

⁴² Brevard S. Childs, *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989).

⁴³ See Richard M. Davidson, “Back to the Beginning: Genesis 1-3 and the Theological Center of Scripture,” in *Christ, Salvation, and the Eschaton: Essays in Honor of Hans K. LaRondelle* (ed. Jifi Moskala; Berrien Springs, MI: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2009), 5-29.

The Legacy of Hasel's *Old Testament Theology* Carried Out by His Students and Their Students

As we have already noted above, several OT scholars, reviewing Hasel's proposed method for doing Old Testament theology, spoke favorably of his basic multiplex approach, but wondered whether he could actually pull it off. For example, Christopher Mitchel, in reviewing the 4th edition of Hasel's *OTT: Basic Issues*, states the following:

Previous editions of this work have served admirably as a remarkably comprehensive textbook that surveys the vast and diverse landscape of the field of OT theology. . . . Like many of the works authored by faculty members of the Andrews University Theological Seminary, it has gained acceptance among OT theologians across denominational lines.

In theory his proposal [for a multiplex approach to OT theology] is laudable for taking into consideration all the different types of approaches and synthesizing them. However, it remains to be seen whether anyone will be able to carry it out. . . .⁴⁴

Gerhard was not able to live long enough to have opportunity to produce the comprehensive OT theology toward which his book pointed. We cannot say whether he alone would have been able to accomplish the task he set forth. But his vision of such a task did not die with him. At his funeral service, in which I had the honor and privilege to deliver the homily (one of the most difficult sermons I have ever preached), I focused on the phrase from David's lament in 2 Sam 1, "How have the mighty fallen!" and along with others who gave eulogies, I developed the imagery of the "mighty oak which had fallen," expressing the hope that the acorns from the fallen oak that took root under his branches, might grow up to carry on the work for which he gave his life.⁴⁵ Many of us determined at Gerhard's funeral that our mentor and Doktorvater should not have died in vain, that we would carry forward his dream of a comprehensive multiplex Old Testament theology.

⁴⁴ Christopher W. Mitchell, review of Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, *Hebrew Studies* 33 (1992): 135-136.

⁴⁵ Richard M. Davidson, "Funeral Sermon," *JATS* 6/1 (Spring 1995): 77-86.

DAVIDSON: LEGACY OF GERHARD HASEL'S OT THEOLOGY

So in the last part of this article, I wish to highlight in particular the work of Hasel's students (and the students of his students), who have contributed and are continuing to contribute to the task of producing an Old Testament theology along the general lines of Hasel's multiplex approach. I look at each of the seven facets of his proposal, and point to work already done in each area toward the furthering of Hasel's vision.

(1) **Biblical theology vis-à-vis systematic theology.** At Andrews University Theological Seminary during the past few years a new interest has been aroused in inter-disciplinary work between biblical theologians and systematic theologians, with several doctoral students being trained in both systematic and biblical theology and their dissertations proceeding in an inter-disciplinary dialogue with both disciplines. We have several faculty members in systematic theology who have been trained in OT as well, and vice versa, and the fertile cross-pollination of thought between the two disciplines is very stimulating.⁴⁶

(2) **The inseparability of history and theology.** Several of these same students and their faculty mentors are examining the macro-hermeneutical presuppositions of Scripture at the level of fundamental theology, building on the ground-breaking work of systematician Fernando Canale,⁴⁷ (who, though in systematic theology, took classes under Gerhard Hasel), and applying these insights to biblical studies, in an attempt to critique the historical-critical approach to Scripture, and to ensure that the enterprise of both OTT and systematic theology is both historical and theological from the starting point, allowing for the inbreaking of God into history (vs. the closed continuum of the historical-critical method).⁴⁸

(3) **Synchronic theology of OT books or blocks of books.** Several of Hasel's former students (or their students) have written dissertations, articles, or monographs setting forth the theology of a given OT book or

⁴⁶ See, for example, John Peckham, "The Concept of Divine Love in the Context of the God-World Relationship" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2012).

⁴⁷ Fernando Canale, "Toward a Criticism of Theological Reason: Time and Timelessness as Primordial Presuppositions," Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1983 (published by Andrews University Press, 1987); see his many other subsequent books and articles.

⁴⁸ See, e.g., Tiago Arrais, "Hermeneutical Presuppositions in Biblical Interpretation: A Phenomenological Analysis of the Ontology of the God-World Relationship in the Book of Exodus" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2015).

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

block of books. This includes the Pentateuch as a whole (Davidson, 2000),⁴⁹ and the individual books of Genesis (Ferch, 1985),⁵⁰ Joshua (Davidson, 1995),⁵¹ Esther (Rodriguez, 1995),⁵² Song of Songs (Davidson, 1989, 2007, 2010),⁵³ Ezekiel (Davidson, 2010),⁵⁴ Daniel (Doukhan, 1987, 2000),⁵⁵ and Zephaniah (King, 1996),⁵⁶ among many others.⁵⁷ Still other scholarly works by Hasel's students (or their students) have examined one more prominent themes/motifs in a given book, including, among others, the resurrection motif in Hosea (Price, 1988),⁵⁸ the last days in Daniel (Pfandl, 1990),⁵⁹ *nasa* "forgiveness" in the Pentateuch (Olafsson 1992),⁶⁰ the name Israel in Hosea and Amos

⁴⁹ Richard M. Davidson, "The Eschatological Literary Structure of the Old Testament," in *Creation, Life and Hope: Essays in Honor of Jacques B. Doukhan*, ed. Jiří Moskala (Berrien Springs, MI: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2000), 349-366.

⁵⁰ Arthur J. Ferch, *Genesis: In the Beginning* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1985).

⁵¹ Richard M. Davidson, *In the Footsteps of Joshua* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1995).

⁵² Angel Manuel Rodriguez, *Esther: A Theological Approach* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1995).

⁵³ Richard M. Davidson, "Theology of Sexuality in the Song of Songs: Return to Eden," *AUSS* 27, no. 1 (1989): 1-19; "Song of Songs: Introduction and Study Notes," in *Andrews Study Bible*, ed. Jon Dybdahl. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2010.

⁵⁴ Richard M. Davidson, "Ezekiel: Introduction and Study Notes," in *Andrews Study Bible*, ed. Jon Dybdahl. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2010.

⁵⁵ Jacques B. Doukhan, *Daniel: The Vision of the End* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1987); idem, *Secrets of Daniel* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2000).

⁵⁶ Greg A. King, "The Theological Coherence of the Book of Zephaniah" (PhD dissertation, Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, 1996).

⁵⁷ Most of the contributors to the *Andrews Study Bible* were students of Gerhard Hasel (or students of his students), as are many of the contributors to the forthcoming one-volume *Andrews Bible Commentary* (Andrews University Press) and the multi-volume *Seventh-day Adventist International Bible Commentary* (Pacific Press).

⁵⁸ Bertrand C. Price, "The Resurrection Motif in Hosea 5:8-6:6, an Exegetical Study" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1988).

⁵⁹ Gerhard Pfandl, "The Latter Days and the Time of the End in the Book of Daniel" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1990).

⁶⁰ Gudmundur Olafsson, "The use of *Nasa* ' in the Pentateuch and its Contribution to the Concept of Forgiveness" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1992).

DAVIDSON: LEGACY OF GERHARD HASEL'S OT THEOLOGY

(Diop, 1995);⁶¹ remnant in Jeremiah (Mulzac, 1995),⁶² creation in the Psalms (Gnanamuthu, 1996);⁶³ the Michael figure in Daniel (Anderson, 1996);⁶⁴ covenant in Amos (Siqueira, 1996);⁶⁵ resurrection in Daniel (Stele, 1996);⁶⁶ laying on of hands on Joshua (Mattingly, 1997);⁶⁷ conquest in Joshua (Merling 1997),⁶⁸ prayers in Daniel (Petersen, 1999);⁶⁹ the cultus in Daniel (Vogel, 1999),⁷⁰ creation in Isaiah (2001);⁷¹ judgment in the Flood narrative (Park, 2005);⁷² cultic allusions in the Servant Songs (Ha, 2009);⁷³ the Sabbath in the Pentateuch (Frey, 2010);⁷⁴ theodicy in Ezekiel (Wahonya, 2011);⁷⁵ and the theology of the Servant Songs (Beaulieu, 2014).⁷⁶

⁶¹ Ganoune Diop, "The Name 'Israel' and Related Expressions in the Books of Amos and Hosea" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1995).

⁶² Kenneth D. Mulzac, "The Remnant Motif in the Context of Judgment and Salvation in the Book of Jeremiah" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1995).

⁶³ Gnanamuthu S. Wilson, "A Descriptive Analysis of Creation Concepts and Themes in the Book of Psalms" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1996).

⁶⁴ Lewis O. Anderson, "The Michael Figure in the Book of Daniel" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1996).

⁶⁵ Reinaldo W. Siqueira, "The Presence of the Covenant Motif in Amos 1:2_2:16" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1996).

⁶⁶ Artur A. Stele, "Resurrection in Daniel 12 and its Contribution to the Theology of the Book of Daniel" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1996).

⁶⁷ Keith Mattingly, "The Laying on Hands of Joshua: An Exegetical Study of Numbers 27:12-13 and Deuteronomy 34:9" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1997).

⁶⁸ P. David Merling, "The Book of Joshua: Its Theme and Use in Discussions of the Israelite Conquest and Settlement and the Relationship of Archaeology and the Bible" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1995).

⁶⁹ Paul Birch Petersen, "The Theology and the Function of the Prayers in the Book of Daniel" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1999).

⁷⁰ Winfried Vogel, "The Cultic Motif in Space and Time in the Book of Daniel" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1999).

⁷¹ Wann Fanwar, "Creation in Isaiah" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2001).

⁷² Chun Sik Park, "Theology of Judgement in Genesis 6-9" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2005).

⁷³ Kye Sang Ha, "Cultic Allusions in the Suffering Servant Poem (Isaiah 52:13-53:12)" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2009).

⁷⁴ Mathilde Frey, "The Sabbath in the Pentateuch: An Exegetical and Theological Study" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2010).

⁷⁵ Paul Wahonya, "Ezekiel 5:5-17 and Theodicy: A Theological Investigation of the Character of God" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2011).

⁷⁶ Stefane Beaulieu, "The Identity and Role of the Servant in Isaiah 42:1-0: An Exegetical and Theological Study" (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2014).

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Last, but not least, in this area of book theologies, the OT theology course that has been taught for many years by Gerhard Hasel and some his colleagues at Andrews University Theological Seminary, both during his lifetime and after, has regularly followed the practice of having students write a theology of an OT book of their choice. I have personally archived hundreds of the best of these papers, covering all the books of the OT, and we are currently scanning them and publishing them on line for the benefit of others.

(4) **Chronological, not canonical, ordering of the theologies of books and blocks of writings.** Following in the tradition of Hasel, his students (and their students) generally adhere to the *sola-tota Scriptura* principle, and accept the “plain reading” of what the biblical authors claim for the date, authorship, and *Sitz im Leben* of the book without hypothetical reconstruction. However, with the rise of the new literary criticism and the canonical approach of B.S. Childs, many students writing their dissertations in areas of OTT at Andrews University have chosen to follow the canonical order in its final form (and bracket out questions of introduction).

(5) **Diachronic thematic approach.** According to Hasel’s proposal, OT theology should “attempt to draw together and present the major themes of the OT.”⁷⁷ Various dissertations, articles, and monographs have furthered this work among students of Gerhard Hasel. It was Dr. Hasel who first encouraged me to write a theology of sexuality in the Old Testament, and it finally ignited into publication as *Flame of Yahweh* (2007).⁷⁸ Other themes have been traced throughout the Hebrew Bible by Hasel’s students (and their students): substitution (Rodriguez 1979);⁷⁹ desecration and defilement (Amorin, 1985);⁸⁰ throne of God (Nam,

⁷⁷ Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, 91 (4th ed., 204).

⁷⁸ Richard M. Davidson, *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007).

⁷⁹ Angel M. Rodriguez, “Substitution in the Hebrew Cultus and in Cultic-related Texts” (ThD dissertation, Andrews University, 1979; published under the same title, Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1982).

⁸⁰ Nilton D. Amorim, “Desecration and Defilement in the Old Testament” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1985).

DAVIDSON: LEGACY OF GERHARD HASEL'S OT THEOLOGY

1989);⁸¹ the horn motif (Suring, 1980);⁸² fatherhood of God (Tasker, 2001);⁸³ the “seed” motif (Ojewole, 2002);⁸⁴ Sheol (Galenieks, 2004);⁸⁵ the heavenly sanctuary/temple (de Souza, 2005);⁸⁶ warrior Messiah motif (Kim, 2008);⁸⁷ blindness (McAllister, 2010);⁸⁸ the origin and causation of death (Castang, 2011);⁸⁹ and the love of God (Peckham, 2012).⁹⁰

(6) **Inner unity of the OT theologies.** Hasel argued that “the final aim of OT theology is to demonstrate whether or not there is an inner unity that binds together the various theologies and longitudinal themes, concepts, and motifs.”⁹¹ There has been fruitful ongoing research among students of Hasel (and their students) in examining the literary macrostructures of the Hebrew Bible that demonstrate a unity within the individual books, blocks of books, and the entire canon of what we call the OT. Dissertations at AU focusing upon, or providing a helpful unifying literary structure, deal with, for example, Gen 1-2 (Doukhan,

⁸¹ Daegeuk Nam, “The ‘Throne of God’ Motif in the Hebrew Bible” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1989).

⁸² Margit Suring, “Horn-Motifs in the Hebrew Bible and Related Ancient Near Eastern Literature and Iconography” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1980).

⁸³ David Tasker, “The Fatherhood of God: An Exegetical Study from the Hebrew Scriptures” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2001).

⁸⁴ Afolarin Ojewole, “The Seed in Genesis 3:15: An Exegetical and Intertextual Study” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2002; published under the same title, Berrien Springs, MI: ATSP, 2002).

⁸⁵ Eriks Galenieks, “The Nature, Function, and Purpose of the Term Sheol in the Torah, Prophets and Writings” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2004; published under the same title, Berrien Springs, MI: ATSP, 2005).

⁸⁶ Elias Brasil de Souza, “The Heavenly Sanctuary/Temple Motif in the Hebrew/Bible: Function and Relationship to the Earthly Counterparts” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2005; published under the same title, Berrien Springs, MI: ATSP, 2005).

⁸⁷ Sookyoung Kim, “The Trajectory of the ‘Warrior Messiah’ Motif in Scripture and Intertestamental Writings” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2008).

⁸⁸ Raymond McAlister, “Theology of Blindness in the Hebrew Scriptures” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2010).

⁸⁹ Lazarus Castang, “A Comparative Analysis of The Origin and Divine Causation of Death in Ancient Near Eastern Literature and in The Old Testament” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2011).

⁹⁰ Peckham, “The Concept of Divine Love.”

⁹¹ Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, 93 (4th ed., 205).

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

1978);⁹² Judges (DeWitt, 1986);⁹³ Leviticus (Warning, 1997);⁹⁴ and Job (Cristo, 1992).⁹⁵ Almost all OT dissertations in OT biblical studies at Andrews University have examined the literary structure of a passage as part of their exegetical-theological work.

Building on the work of John Sailhamer, I have examined the literary macrostructure of the OT revealed in the Pentateuch in its alternations between long blocks of narratives followed by a concluding poetic block, and a chiasmic structure (Leviticus) in the middle, and in the other parts of the HB by the seams that bind the parts of the canon together.⁹⁶ As mentioned above, I have also suggested a metanarrative or conceptual “orientation point” of all Scripture set forth in some seven different themes at the canonical introduction of Scripture (Gen 1-3), and confirmed in the chronological introduction of Scripture (Job) and its canonical conclusion (Rev 20-22).⁹⁷

The unity of the various parts of the Hebrew Bible has also been demonstrated by various intertextual studies, including, e.g., the allusions to the tower of Babel narrative in the book of Daniel (Baez, 2012),⁹⁸ and many others already referred to above. Inter-textual work linking the various parts of the Hebrew Bible together is a regular procedure in the exegetical-theological dissertations at Andrews University Theological Seminary.

(7) Relationship to the NT. Finally, in Hasel’s vision, an OT theology “must demonstrate its basic relationship to the NT or to NT

⁹² Jacques B. Doukhan, “The Literary Structure of the Genesis Creation Story” (ThD dissertation, Andrews University, 1978; published by Andrews University Press, 1978).

⁹³ Dale S. DeWitt, “The Jephthah Traditions: A Rhetorical and Literary Study in the Deuteronomistic History” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1986).

⁹⁴ Wilfried Warning, “The Contribution of Terminology Patterns to the Literary Structure of Leviticus” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1997; published as *Literary Artistry in Leviticus* [Leiden: Brill, 1999]).

⁹⁵ Gordon G. Cristo, “The Eschatological Judgment in Job 19:21-29; and Exegetical Study” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1992).

⁹⁶ Richard M. Davidson, “The Eschatological Literary Structure of the Old Testament,” in *Creation, Life and Hope: Essays in Honor of Jacques B. Doukhan*, ed. Jiří Moskala (Berrien Springs, MI: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2000), 349-366.

⁹⁷ Davidson, “Back to the Beginning,” 5-29.

⁹⁸ Enrique Baez, “Allusions to Genesis 11:1-9 in the Book of Daniel: An Exegetical and Intertextual Study” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2012).

DAVIDSON: LEGACY OF GERHARD HASEL'S OT THEOLOGY

theology.”⁹⁹ There have been several studies done by Hasel’s students focusing on the relationship between the Testaments. Again, under Hasel’s guidance and encouragement, I wrote my dissertation which was published under the title *Typology in Scripture* (1981).¹⁰⁰ Since then I have continued to wrestle with the relationship between the Testaments, in various articles.¹⁰¹ Several of my students have tackled this issue, including, e.g., Pentateuchal sacred times and indicators of their continuing validity (Cole, 1996);¹⁰² the law of clean and unclean foods (Lev 11) and indicators of its continuing validity (Moskala, 1998);¹⁰³ indicators of typology within the OT itself, using the Exodus motif as a case study (Ninow, 1999);¹⁰⁴ and creation-related (sexual, dietary, Sabbath) Pentateuchal laws and indicators of their continuing validity (Breja, 2011).¹⁰⁵

New Testament dissertations have examined the relations between the Testaments by looking at allusions to OT materials, including, e.g., allusions to the OT trumpets in Revelation (Paulien, 1987),¹⁰⁶ and

⁹⁹ Hasel, *OTT: Basic Issues*, 95 (4th ed., 207).

¹⁰⁰ Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Τύπος Structures*, Andrews University Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary Dissertation Series, 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981).

¹⁰¹ See, e.g., Richard M. Davidson, “The Eschatological Hermeneutic of Biblical Typology,” *TheoRhēma* 6, no. 2 (2011): 5–48; idem, “New Testament Use of the Old Testament,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 5, no. 1 (1994): 14–39.

¹⁰² H. Ross Cole, “The Sacred Times Prescribed in the Pentateuch: Old Testament Indicators of the Extent of Their Applicability” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1996).

¹⁰³ Jiří Moskala, “The Laws of Clean and Unclean Animals of Leviticus 11: Their Nature, Theology, and Rationality (an Intertextual Study)” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1998; published under the same title, Berrien Springs, MI: ATSP, 2002).

¹⁰⁴ Friedbert Ninow, “Indicators of Typology Within the Old Testament: The Exodus Motif” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1999; published under the same title, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2001).

¹⁰⁵ Alexandru Breja, “Law and Creation: A Study of Some Biblical Laws Related to Creation-The Sexual, Dietary, and Sabbath Laws of the Pentateuch-and Their Relatedness” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2011).

¹⁰⁶ Jon Paulien, “Allusion, Exegetical Method, and the Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1987; published as *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Literary Allusions and Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12* [Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1988]).

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

allusions to Sodom/Egypt/Babylon in Revelation (Reynolds, 1992);¹⁰⁷ allusions to Daniel in the Synoptic Gospels (Vetne, 2011).¹⁰⁸

Still other dissertations have shown the unity of the Testaments by tracing a single theme throughout both the OT and NT: e.g., the “divine Warrior motif” (Kim, 2008);¹⁰⁹ the love of God (Peckham, 2012, see above); and divine integrity (Tchumba, 2012).¹¹⁰

Conclusion

Based upon this brief literature review, I can confidently conclude that Hasel’s *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*, was not written in vain. His analysis of the issues in OTT served for many years as a standard in understanding the development of this discipline and the many challenges involved in doing OT/biblical theology. Furthermore, Hasel’s proposals for actually doing OT theology, illustrated already by Hasel during his lifetime, have been taken seriously by many OT theologians, as they have carried out their theological enterprise in harmony with one or more of his proposals. Finally, the students of Gerhard Hasel, and the students they have mentored, are continuing the brobdingnagian task of producing the multiplex OT/biblical theology that Hasel envisioned. The legacy of Hasel’s *OTT: Basic Issues*, lives on, and its true extent will only be fully known in the hereafter, to the glory of God!

¹⁰⁷ Edwin E. Reynolds, “The Sodom/ Egypt/ Babylon Motif in the Book of Revelation” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1992).

¹⁰⁸ Reimar Vetne, “The Influence and Use of Daniel in the Synoptic Gospels” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2011).

¹⁰⁹ Kim, “The ‘Warrior Messiah’ Motif in Scripture.”

¹¹⁰ Augustine Tchamba, “God and Integrity: A Case Study of Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. and Norman L. Geisler” (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2012).

DAVIDSON: LEGACY OF GERHARD HASEL'S OT THEOLOGY

Richard M. Davidson is J. N. Andrews Professor of Old Testament Interpretation at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. He has been with the Andrews seminary faculty since 1979. Davidson received his PhD in Biblical Studies/Old Testament at Andrews in 1981, writing a doctoral dissertation under the mentorship of Gerhard Hasel, entitled "Typological Structures in the Old and New Testaments." He has published six books and numerous articles for refereed journals and chapters in scholarly books. These published articles and the full CV may be viewed on his website: [www.andrews.academia.edu/Richard Davidson](http://www.andrews.academia.edu/RichardDavidson).