



Journal of the EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

William Henry Green and the Authorship of the Pentateuch: Some Historical Considerations	385
Peter Enns	
The Historical Jesus According to John Dominic Crossan's First Strata Sources: A Critical Comment.	405
Dennis Ingolfsland	
On the Renewal of Interest in the Doctrine of Sanctification: A Methodological Reminder.	415
Steven L. Porter	
"Re-imagining" the Princeton Mind: Postconservative Evangelicalism, Old Princeton, and the Rise of Neo-Fundamentalism	427
Paul Kjoss Helseth	
From Wheaton to Rome: Why Evangelicals Become Roman Catholic . .	451
Scot McKnight	
Perspectives on Biblical Interpretation: A Review Article	473
E. Earle Ellis	
Perspectives on Homosexuality: A Review Article	497
Guenther Haas	
Book Reviews	513
Collected Essays	565
Index of Book Reviews	575

The King-Priest of Psalm 110 in Hebrews. By David R. Anderson. Studies in Biblical Literature 21. New York: Peter Lang, 2001, 342 pp., \$65.95.

Although it is never stated, *The King-Priest of Psalm 110 in Hebrews* was originally presented to Dallas Theological Seminary in 1998 as a dissertation entitled "The Royal and Priestly contribution of Psalm 110 to the Book of Hebrews." Other than the title, differences between the two documents are virtually undetectable. Like the dissertation, *The King-Priest of Psalm 110 in Hebrews* consists of seven chapters (and bibliography) to examine the use of Ps 110:1 and 4 in the book of Hebrews as a means to "delineate the present ministry of Christ" (p. 4).

After his introduction (chap. 1), Anderson offers a presentation of "Sacral Kingship" (chap. 2) in the ancient Near East whereby he resolves that "the history of pre-exilic Israel is begging for any clear evidence that any of the Israelite kings was also a king-priest" (p. 27, cf. pp. 279-80). This separation of king from priest becomes a driving force for Anderson in his subsequent analysis of "Psalm 110" (chap. 3). In summarizing the historical background for Psalm 110, he argues that sometime during David's reign David addresses the psalm to the Messiah about the Messiah's ultimate victory, and thereby Anderson determines the psalm to be directly messianic (pp. 61, 280-82).

Moving from OT historical and literary contexts, Anderson overviews Ps 110:1 in the NT (chap. 4), namely, the Synoptics (Matt 22:41-46, 26:62-65; Mark 12:35-37, 14:62-64a; Luke 20:41-44, 22:66-71), Acts (2:32-36, 5:31-32, 7:55-56) and the epistles (Rom 8:34-35a, 1 Cor 15:25, Eph 1:20-23, Col 3:1, 1 Pet 3:22). Not surprisingly, he muses that "the understanding of both the religious community in Jerusalem and the early church was that the primary referent of Psalm 110 was the Messiah" (p. 113). Thus the epistles identify the Messiah of this directly messianic psalm to be Jesus whose authority and power is "already, not yet" (pp. 282-85).

The preliminaries completed, Anderson attends to the royal contribution (chap. 5) and priestly contribution (chap. 6) of Ps 110:1 and 4 in the book of Hebrews. Ps 110:1 in Heb 1:3d and 13 identifies Jesus as the Son promised to David, who has inaugurated the Davidic Kingdom (pp. 173, 291; cf. pp. 285-88), and Ps 110:4 in Heb 5:6-7:28 identifies Jesus as Melchizedekian Priest (pp. 236, 291; cf. pp. 288-90). These two separate offices are thereby joined together in one person, Jesus, the Son (pp. 231-36). Thus Psalm 110 primarily serves to identify the Son as both a king and a priest. The present ministry of Jesus, the Son, is that of a *king-priest who actively exercises his authority and power while awaiting the future consummation of his kingdom*.

In conclusion (chap. 7), Anderson summarizes each chapter (pp. 277-90), identifies various inductive, deductive, and unwarranted conclusions (pp. 290-96), and suggests some theological implications and areas for future study (pp. 296-97).

Evangelicals will have mixed reactions to Anderson's book. In general, the book's lack of indexes limits its usefulness as a resource for further reference. More significantly, disappointment exists in the overdependence on secondary sources, particularly when addressing sacral kingship. Primary sources warrant excavation and citation to substantiate more clearly his resolve for separating king from priest in preexilic Israel. For instance, based upon secondary sources Anderson says, "on one aspect of Hittite kingship there is a distinct consensus of scholarship: the king was the High Priest" (p. 17). Granted, the OT Davidite was not the "high" priest; nevertheless, interaction between the petitions of Hittite kings on behalf of and as a representative of their people (*KUB*, xiv, 8; xxiv, 1; op. cit., Pritchard, *ANET*, 394, 397) and the similar petition of King David (2 Sam 24:10-17) warrant discussion.

Although differences may exist between the king-priests of the ancient Near East and Israel, the OT Davidic king executes priestly functions, though they were not *primary* activities of the Davidite. (David offered sacrifices [2 Sam 6:13, 17-18; 2 Sam 24:18-25; 1 Chr 21:18-28], David exercised authority over the priesthood [2 Samuel 6], and David's sons were called priests [2 Sam 8:18].) Neglecting firsthand interaction with the OT priestly activities of the royal Davidite and the absence of any comparative study with ancient Near Eastern texts concerning priesthood issues weaken Anderson's perspective of sacral kingship.

Dependence on secondary material also permeates Anderson's exposition of Hebrews 1. His dependence on J. P. Meier's ring structure, however, reveals solid examination of the text (pp. 139-76). Nevertheless, Meier's twentieth-century structural analysis could afford firsthand interaction with first-century Jewish literature, theology, and exegesis. In addition, a disproportionate amount of time is spent in Hebrews 1 for

the psalm's two occurrences (64 pp.) in comparison with the psalm's nine other allusions and direct quotations in the rest of Hebrews (72 pp.).

Evangelicals who view OT passages in the NT as "this = that" will applaud Anderson's directly prophetic approach. His argument for Psalm 110, however, loses significant force in his evaluation of my article "The Use of Psalm 110:1 in the New Testament" (*BSac* 149 [1992] 438-53). Although he says differently, the very point I make concerning the use of "the Lord" and "my lord" in Ps 110:1 is the one Anderson argues. "The Jews of David's time and the Jews of Jesus' time did not have any . . . concept of a 'divine messianic Lord'" (p. 39). I have argued that David spoke of a human messiah of his day, Solomon. The Jews of Jesus' time were expecting a human messiah figure as well, but instead God sent a greater messiah figure, one who was both human and divine. Unlike Anderson, however, I suggest that Psalm 110 is typico-prophetic (like Bock and others) and *not* directly messianic.

Despite his initial claim that Psalm 110 is directly prophetic, Anderson sends mixed signals about his position (pp. 47-48, 114), but none more clearly than when he concludes, "Psalm 110 is a messianic psalm, if not directly then in a typico-prophetic sense" (p. 290). As a result, he lessens the impact of the historical and revelatory progress concerning the Davidic king-priest evident in Hebrews, namely, the escalation of the Davidite as divine (1:1-14) as well as the escalation of his present function as "high" priest (5:1-7:28) in the order of Melchizedek.

Evangelicals, particularly progressive dispensationalists who view Christ Jesus actively ruling as Davidic king-priest, will applaud Anderson's detailed interaction with Robert and Mark Saucy. Some might conclude that this is the book's greatest contribution. Anderson devotes a great deal of attention to refuting the Saucys' perspective that Jesus exercises a passive rule, which is in keeping with the purpose of the book, "to delineate the present ministry of Christ."

Anderson's work is recommended as a secondary read to James Kurian's *Jesus Our High Priest: Ps 110, 4 As the Substructure of Heb 5, 1-7, 28* (European University Studies; New York: Peter Lang, 2000), which evidences better interaction with primary and secondary sources.

Herbert W. Bateman IV
Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, IN