

supplement each other and need complement ... on the way to a new, complete picture of Lukan theology' (W. Wiefel, *ThLZ* 114, 1989, 273)? The answer to these questions depends on how compelling one considers Pokorny's analysis and on how one assesses themes of Lukan theology which Pokorny treats less extensively, e.g. pneumatology, the providence and plan of God, appropriation of salvation. However, perhaps with the exception of pneumatology, Pokorny's valuation and emphasis correspond to that of Luke and his intentions. Pokorny's emphasis on and interpretation of soteriology (with the above proviso) as the centre of Lukan theology (so already, I.H. Marshall, see above) and the amalgamation of soteriology with other theological themes earn undiminished recognition. Further research on Lukan theology and on New Testament theology cannot afford to miss this volume for orientation and also for stimulation.

On the themes of Lukan theology treated by Pokorny and other themes one will compare with great gain the contributions (from an evangelical perspective) of the recent collection of essays *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I.H. Marshall, D. Peterson (Grand Rapids, Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 1998); for methodological considerations compare mainly Marshall's introductory essay 'How does one write on the Theology of Acts', pp. 3-16.

Rev. Dr Christoph Stenschke
Stralsund, Germany

spät datierten synoptischen Evangelien. Berger sieht eine 'ökumenische Komplementarität' anstelle von literarischer Abhängigkeit. Leider ist das Buch hastig und teilweise auch polemisch geschrieben (weniger wäre mehr!) und verliert dadurch an Überzeugungskraft. Insgesamt eine interessante Ergänzung zu J.A.T. Robinson (Johannes - Das Evangelium der Ursprünge: Aktualisierte Ausgabe herausgegeben von H.-J. Schulz, TVG Bibelwissenschaftliche Monographien 4; Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1999), aber gewiß kein Ersatz! Vgl. die Besprechung von A. Baum in Bibel und Gemeinde 98, 1998, 315-317.

RÉSUMÉ

Berger défend une datation haute pour l'Évangile de Jean, dans les années 67 à 70. Il apporte de nombreuses perspectives sur les questions d'introduction, parmi lesquelles certaines sont nouvelles, d'autres curieuses (p. ex. André est considéré comme le « disciple que Jésus aimait »). Il étudie aussi divers thèmes théologiques, toujours en défendant l'ancienneté de la tradition johannique et son indépendance par rapport aux évangiles synoptiques, auxquels il attribue généralement une date tardive. Berger affirme une complémentarité œcuménique entre le quatrième évangile et les synoptiques, plutôt qu'une dépendance littéraire. Malheureusement, le livre a été écrit à la hâte, et en partie de façon polémique: il en perd en force de persuasion. Il vient comme un complément utile à l'ouvrage de J.A.T. Robinson (John), sans le remplacer.

In his *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* W.G. Kümmel writes on the date of John's Gospel: 'Die Annahme ist darum heute fast Allgemeingut, daß das Johannesevangelium etwa im letzten Jahrzehnt des 1. Jahrhunderts geschrieben worden ist' (21 ed.; Berlin: EVA, 1989, p. 211). Rare for issues of dating, this *Allgemeingut* is shared by conservative and liberal scholars alike, as J.A.T. Robinson observed in his magisterial study *Wann entstand das Neue Testament?* (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 1986, 265):

daß die Gelehrten ...hinsichtlich der Datierung der johanneischen Literatur zu einer bemerkenswerten Übereinstimmung gelangen, die fast jede sonstige Verschiedenheit übersteigt. Diejenigen, die der Überzeugung sind, daß alle fünf Bücher - Offenbarung, Evangelium und die drei Briefe von einem einzigen Verfasser stammen - und dieser Mann ist

EuroJTh (2000) 9:2, 192-198

0960-2720

Im Anfang war Johannes: Datierung und Theologie des vierten Evangeliums

Klaus Berger

Stuttgart: Quell, 1997, 312 pp., DM 48, -
cloth, ISBN 3-7918-1434-6

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Im vorliegenden Band datiert Berger das Johannesevangelium in die Jahre 67-70 n. Chr. Neben vielen, teils sowohl neuen wie auch kursorischen Perspektiven zu den Einleitungsfragen (z.B. Andreas als der Lieblingsjünger), untersucht Berger verschiedene theologische Themen des JohEv und vertritt durchweg ein hohes Alter der johanneischen Traditionen und die Unabhängigkeit von den in der Regel

der Apostel Johannes -, und diejenigen, die die Behauptung aufstellen, daß keine einzige Schrift von ihm stamme, oder die sich an jede nur mögliche Verschiedenheit klammern, finden alle zusammen Gründe, um die Offenbarung, das Evangelium und die Briefe in die Jahre \pm 90-100 zu setzen.

What then are the reasons for this remarkable consensus? Let us again turn to a standard New Testament introduction, this time U. Schnelle's *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (UTB: Theologie 1830; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994, 537):

Die andere Art der Darstellung, die eigenständige Theologie, die zahlreichen Sonderüberlieferungen und die explizit an der nachösterlichen Perspektive orientierte Denkwelt lassen darauf schließen, daß nicht ein Augenzeuge des Lebens Jesu das 4. Evangelium verfaßte. Es war ein Theologe der *späteren* Zeit, der auf der Basis umfangreicher Traditionen das Leben Jesu in besonderer Weise bedachte, interpretierte und darstellte.

In addition, John's Gospel is often considered to be the result of a reading process by its author of other New Testament books, such as the Synoptic Gospels and – certainly to a lesser degree – of Paul (cf. the surveys in Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 563–70; Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 166–70 and D.A. Carson, D.J. Moo, L. Morris, *An Introduction to the New Testament*; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992, 160–66). Due to its late date (required by the author's supposed knowledge of the Synoptic tradition, if not the Gospels) and its developed theological/christological perspective (often assumed to have been influenced by some form of Gnosticism; cf. G.E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*; rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993, 273–89), John's Gospel was often regarded with suspicion and considered historically less reliable than the Synoptic Gospels, if not useless as a historical record of the life and teaching of Jesus (cf. the survey in D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 3 ed.; London: Tyndale, 1970, 323–28).

Time and again, efforts have been made by liberal and conservative scholars alike to question this scholarly consensus and to 'rehabilitate' John's Gospel. Some sought to demonstrate and defend its historicity (cf. e.g. C.H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge: CUP, 1963; cf. the works mentioned by Carson, Moo, Morris, 173, n. 97). Others have argued for an early date and/or apostolic origin (e.g. H.-J. Schulz, *Die*

apostolische Herkunft der Evangelien, 2 ed., QD 145; Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1995, 291–391; cf. *NT* 38, 1996, 298f; Guthrie, *Introduction*, 241–71, 282–87; cf. the excellent survey in Robinson, *Wann entstand?*, 318f, n. 218). Among the more recent, most exhaustive and best known of these challenges is J.A.T. Robinson's *The Priority of John* (ed. J.F. Coakley; London: SCM, 1985). In addition to such challenges, the last two decades of research on John's Gospel have demonstrated that the sands are shifting in many ways. It became clear that a number of the charges and suspicions levelled against John's Gospel were based more on false assumptions and misunderstandings of the author's intention, genre and theology than upon careful scrutiny.

In the present volume, Dr Klaus Berger, Professor at the University of Heidelberg, a well known and prolific New Testament scholar, addresses a number of these issues. He argues that the Fourth Gospel was written towards the end of the sixties of the first century. John's Gospel contains not only some older material (which is usually conceded by the advocates of a late date), rather in its entirety it is to be dated early. Berger tackles the questions of date and theology of the Fourth Gospel in four parts.

In the *introductory part* (11–53) Berger presents a survey of research on the various arguments for a late date. Since the doubts raised by D.F. Strauss (1835) and F.C. Baur, scholarship has been accustomed to a late date (cf. W.G. Kümmel, *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems*, NTLI; London: SCM, 1973, 124–26 and Index, s.v. 'John, Gospel of' and S. Neill's well-known *The Interpretation of the New Testament*). Other students focused on the Gospel's 'high' Christology (cf. A.M. Hunter, *Interpreting the New Testament 1900–1950*, 2 ed.; London: SCM, 1958, 78–92). Brief surveys of the respective positions are followed by excellent discussion and – occasionally amusing – refutation. On the background of John's Gospel Berger writes: 'Das religionsgeschichtliche Milieu, dem es entstammt, ist nicht als "Gnosis" oder gar Mandäismus zu bestimmen, wie man es von F.C. Baur bis R. Bultmann annahm, sondern wird durch Qumranfunde und alexandrinische Philosophie (Philo) recht vollständig erhellt' (16). Repeatedly, Berger succeeds in showing that the arguments and evidence in favour of a late date have either been superseded or were based on convictions which required them ('Die aus dialektischer Notwendigkeit geborene These F.C. Baur's,

das JohEv habe alle anderen Evangelien zur Vorraussetzung, beherrscht auch heute noch einen guten Teil der Evangelienforschung', 17). For both reasons, these arguments should be re-examined.

Berger notes on allusions to the Synoptics and/or the OT:

Dies gilt dann als Beweis dafür, daß das JohEv nicht nur 'spät' datiert werden müsse, sondern überdies ein höchst artifizielles, ja surrealistisches Konglomerat von offenen oder verdeckten Anspielungen sei, die der Leser - bewaffnet mit elektronischer Konkordanz - erst richtig goutieren kann, wenn er Zug um Zug die geheimen Vernetzungen aufdeckt. Wahrhaft ein detektivisches Spielchen, das dem so mit Bildung ausgestatteten Leser immer wieder aufs neue seine Spürnase bestätigt (18).

This sweeping criticism is followed by a succinct methodological discussion.

Next, Berger discusses the question of the unity and genre of John's Gospel (21–29) and concludes from the character of the whole book: 'Zwölf Kapitel handeln von Jesu Wirken vor seinem Ende, neun Kapitel sind "Abschiedshandlungen". Das JohEv ist damit auf einzigartige Weise zu einer Hilfe in der Zeit von Jesu Abwesenheit geworden. Das kann nur auf eine Zeit weisen, in der dieses Problem virulent war, das heißt auf eine relativ frühe Zeit' (25).

Berger then turns to the meaning of the notion 'early date'. By examining the criteria applied for determining the age of traditions in John and the Synoptics, he raises methodological issues concerning authenticity. The Synoptics strive for authenticity through their reference to tradition, but John strives to reach the same goal through the notion of Jesus as a faithful ambassador and of the Paraclete as a faithful preserver. Berger describes the relationship between John and the Synoptics as one of 'ecumenical complementation' ('ökumenische Komplementarität'): though both are essentially different, each also contains and possesses specific elements of the other. The Synoptics exhibit typically Johannine elements, as also John exhibits typically Synoptic features. Common material is often interpreted differently in John and the Synoptics. Behind apparent differences, common features are discernible (37; cf. his discussion in part 4).

This part closes with a succinct discussion and critique of traditional and more recent cri-

teria for assessing the authenticity and trustworthiness of the words of Jesus (37–47), of trends in studying Christology and of the significance and misuse of Christology in assigning age to traditions. Berger offers a valuable assessment of the methodological sections of G. Theißen and A. Merz (*Der historische Jesus: Ein Lehrbuch*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), the latest German textbook. Throughout, this first part is helpful and could serve as an introduction to Johannine studies. For this reviewer's taste it could have been much longer!

The *second part* (55–127) addresses various questions of introduction. Initially, Berger argues that the author of John's Gospel was an Alexandrian by origin who made contact with Christianity in Palestine, perhaps in Damascus. There he met the early Paul. Perhaps he also had contact with Ephesus (54). The urban character of the Gospel, Jesus' self introductions with the 'I am' formula, the logos concept, the understanding of the cosmos, the Johannine dualism, the relationship to the *Corpus Hermeticum*, the derision of Carabas and other analogies to Philo's *In Flaccum*, the relationship to Apollos, Jesus' faithfulness to his divine mission (the notion of 'remaining in') and the Diaspora situation are taken to point to Alexandria. Not all of these old and new observations and arguments of this rather mixed bag will appeal equally. Noteworthy in the light of the recent debate is the link which Berger draws to Paul, a connection argued in more detail in part 4 (259–82).

The plurality of people whom this Gospel seeks to address is likewise a mixed bag (64–76): disciples of John the Baptist, Christian Pharisees (Nicodemus being the first – his address of Jesus as 'Rabbi' [John 3:2] is wrongly taken to be a Christian confession; cf. Acts 15:5, Lk 9:20 parr.), Christian Samaritans, Jewish Christians who follow Peter, Jewish Christians who are close to those who transmitted the infancy narratives of Matthew and Luke and who have a strong national-Jewish understanding of the Messiah and finally – an all too modern politically correct – Palestinian group, which took its orientation from the testimony of faith of the great Christian women of the early days (Mary and Martha, Mary Magdalene). Berger argues that the evangelist tries to integrate various groups through his Gospel. Otherwise, we have only rudimentary knowledge of these groups and only in John's Gospel do they become discernible as groups still to be integrated. The state in which the author found and described all these groups

corresponds to an early stage (none of them still existed by the later date proposed by other scholars) and excludes a late formation of the Gospel. On this suggestion of addressees, R.J. Bauckham's (ed.) challenging volume *The Gospels for all Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) should be compared. The *opponents* are non-Christian Pharisees (76–78).

Berger takes up further criteria used in dating John. These include the Gospel's alleged *Anti-Judaism* (79–83). He persuasively refutes this notion and shows its origins in the uneasiness of liberal exegesis with certain absolute statements of Jesus, the authenticity of which can hardly be denied ('Mit "Antijudaismus" ist abgestempelt, was man selbst gerne los wäre: die Konfrontation mit dem Anspruch Jesu bzw. für Jesus, der Heiland zu sein'). Berger argues that the statements, often taken as indication of such a stance (e.g. John 8:37–47), point to an early stage, in which the separation between church and synagogue was caused by the latter. All of John's Gospel can be understood as a single endeavour to integrate those who have lost their spiritual home in this process. Only in the early years could the separation from Judaism have been so painfully perceived as it is reflected in John's Gospel.

Another criterion for dating is John's references to Jerusalem (84–90). Are there any clues as to whether the *destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple* has occurred at the time of writing? Are clear references to the destruction to be expected if it has occurred? Berger discusses John 2:19f; 4:20–23 and 11:48 and concludes that a pre-destruction date of composition is the best explanation for the fact that '... the temple and the city are mentioned time and again in John's Gospel without the slightest hint to their destruction' (84); cf. the similar conclusion of Robinson (*Wann entstand?*, 287–90) who adduces further proof from John 5:2 and the diverging interpretation of this evidence by Carson, Moo, Morris, 150f, 166–68.

Berger then turns to the *death of Peter and the fate of the beloved disciple* (John 21:18f,22). John is taken to presuppose the death of both disciples. Since Peter died between 64 and 67 AD, and since John does not presuppose the destruction of Jerusalem, the Gospel of John should be dated between 67 and 70 AD. Likewise, the lack of reference to church structure is better explained by an early date rather than with a situation of persecution and/or with the lack of contact with other early Christians.

In his thirteenth chapter Berger unveils the mystery of the identity of the so-called '*beloved disciple*' (96–106). He starts with a suggestion by H. Thyen ('Im Sinne des Verfassers dürfte dieser [sc. der Lieblingsjünger] der absichtsvoll anonym bleibende Jünger sein, der aufgrund des Täuferzeugnisses zuerst zu Jesus kam ... Damit erscheint er schon hier ebenso vor und neben Petrus wie ...'; 'Johannesevangelium', *TRE* 17, 211). Berger argues that Andrew, the disciple first called in John's Gospel (1:35–42), is called 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' in the later farewell discourse chapters (13:23–25) and beyond (18:15f?; 19:25–27; 20:2–8, 21:20). For this – to my knowledge – new proposal Berger adduces ten rather different reasons, for example: (1) Andrew as also the beloved disciple have the decisive Christological insight first and before Peter (1:41; 20:4f; 21:7). (2) There is a correspondence between the first and last chapter of the Gospel:

Nach Joh 1:35–39 läßt der Evangelist zwei namenlose Jünger am Anfang des Evangeliums stehen, entsprechend sind es in Joh 21.2 in der Liste zwei namenlose Jünger, die den Schluß der Liste bilden. In Joh 1 wird einer der beiden zunächst Namenlosen dann als Andreas identifiziert (1.40), in Joh 21 wird einer der beiden Namenlosen dann als Lieblingsjünger enttarnt (21.7). In Joh 1 gibt Andreas den entscheidenden Hinweis: Es ist der Messias, in Joh 21.7 sagt der Lieblingsjünger: Es ist der Herr. Die Erzählungen folgen im Aufbau derselben Struktur. Wieder entspricht Andreas dem Lieblingsjünger (97f).

The fourth reason is: 'Within the framework of Jewish and early Christian theology as the first called disciple Andrew is the best candidate for the predicate "whom the Lord loved". ... As the first called disciple Andrew is the "beloved disciple"' (99).

However, even a brief glance at John 1:35–42 reminds us that there were two first-called *disciples* (vs. 35,37, etc.), a fact which Berger notes but quickly brushes aside (98). In v. 40 one of the two disciples is identified as Andrew, the brother of Simon Peter. The other disciple is not identified. This is all the more noteworthy, as Andrew (V. 40), Simon Peter (V. 40f), Philippus (V. 43) and Nathanael (V. 45) are all introduced with their names. Thus what Berger argues for the relationship of Andrew, the first-called and beloved disciple in relationship to Peter (1) and regarding the naturally

superior position of the first-called disciple (4) would just as well apply to John, the traditional beloved disciple and *as much a first-called disciple* as Andrew! This applies also to Berger's tenth argument:

Dadurch, daß der Erstberufene und Intim-Zeuge Andreas Täuferschüler war, wird erklärbar, warum die Überlieferungen zu Johannes dem Täufer im JohEv einen besonderen Stellenwert haben. In seiner Person stellt Andreas einen besonderen Brückenkopf zur täuferischen Tradition dar. (105)

Why is Andrew only identified as the beloved disciple more than half-way through the Gospel (cf. Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 202)? Again Berger: 'Er wird erst im Abschiedsteil des JohEv so genannt, weil Jesus erst hier systematisch an die Jünger das weitergibt, was er selbst empfangen hat: Liebe' (99). One may question Berger's notion of 'systematisch' and 'erst hier' and wonder – if this should be the explanation for the beginning of the references to the 'beloved disciple' – why the title is limited to one disciple. Would not this explanation require rather beloved disciples? Jesus' love is certainly not limited to one beloved disciple; cf. e.g. 13:34: καὶ ὁὖν; ἡγάπησα ὑμᾶς?; 15:9: ὑμᾶς? ἡγάπησα, 12: ἡγάπησα ὑμᾶς?! Thus while Berger rightly points to the role which Andrew plays in John's Gospel (Andrew brings Peter to Jesus, 1:40–42; draws Jesus' attention to the boy with five loaves and two fishes, 6:8f; and together with Philippus announces to the master the Greeks' desire to see Jesus, 12:21f), his identification of Andrew as the beloved disciple is dubious. The identification of John, the son of Zebedee, as the beloved disciple (and the author of John's Gospel) has more to commend it. The '... traditional view squares most easily with the evidence and offers least tortuous explanations of difficulties that all of the relevant hypotheses must face' (Carson, Moo, Morris, 150; cf. their detailed argument, 138–51 and Kümmel's discussion of the identity of the beloved disciple, 200–04). In addition to our brief observations, there is no external evidence whatsoever for this identification (cf. Carson, Moo, Morris, 139–43). While Andrew features in a number of early apocryphal works, nowhere, not even in the 'Acts of Andrew', is he credited with the writing of a Gospel (cf. C.M. Kerr, 'Andrew', *ISBE* I, 122f; J.M. Prieur, W. Schneemelcher, 'Andreasakten', *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* II: *Apostolisches, Apokalypsen*

und Verwandtes, ed. W. Schneemelcher, 5 ed.; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1989, 93–137). The curious reference to Andrew in the Muratorian Canon (101–03) clearly addresses questions of authorship, not of the identity of the beloved disciple. According to this source it was revealed to Andrew that John should write the Gospel in his own name and that all other apostles should check it! Two further chapters of the second part are devoted to the role of the inner circle of disciples (the trio from Bethsaida: Andrew, Peter, Philip) and the significance of the references to Simon Peter ('Das JohEv hat eine Reihe altentümlicher Züge über Petrus bewahrt, die jedenfalls nicht durch Rückbildung der Ansagen anderer Evangelien zu erklären sind', 118).

Berger's *third part* (128–258) sets out with an examination of a variety of the theological themes of John's Gospel: 'Word of God' and 'Word of Jesus', the Spirit, pre-existence, John the Baptist (John contains a plethora of ancient traditions about John that cannot be traced back to the Synoptics), the Son of Man according to John (John's Gospel offers an independent interpretation of the Son of Man concept in the framework of the notion of a prophetic emissary according to Ezekiel), miracles (indicating a prophetic Christology), demonology, concealed and open speech (explaining the absence of parables), eschatology, open proclamation and present judgement.

This is followed by various Johannine christological issues: God's presence in Jesus, blasphemy and ditheism (the unity of Jesus with the Father), the 'I am' sayings (they do not as such indicate a high and late Christology), the vine (on the sociology of John's Gospel), metaphors in John 10 (arguing for the improbability of the use of other Gospels as written sources), Lazarus (independent of Luke 16), the Last Supper (independence of John 6 from the Synoptic and Pauline tradition), the washing of feet, the passion tradition (John's version of the trial of Jesus is historically more probable than the Synoptic account), the understanding of the death on the cross, Jesus' exaltation (John's notion of exaltation is earlier than that of Phil. 2), resurrection (John presents a much less highly developed Christology than Matthew and is therefore older) and glorification and the motive of descending and ascending (John's own frame of reference for his presentation of the whole ministry and presence of Jesus on the earth). For all of these issues Berger argues – with varying degree of persuasiveness – that

Johannine theology reflects early tradition and an early stage in the development of early Christian theology (which is, however, in itself a highly questionable model to employ!). These theological themes indicate that John is not dependent upon the Synoptic Gospels as written sources. Time and again, Berger's discussion indicates how the traditional questions of introduction are and have to be combined with examination of the theology.

In the fourth part, 'The position of John in its theological environment' (259–302), Berger compares various aspects of the theology of John with that of other NT writers. On the significance of the shared features between John and Paul Berger notes that in its formal features as also in a large measure of its content John becomes discernible as the link between the epistolary and gospel genre. Concerning content, this means that in John's Gospel, Jesus is presented as saying what the Apostles tried to convey through their letters, namely that they intended to give Christianity an application for the present of the respective church. Berger concludes:

John's Gospel emphasises the point of departure from the crucifixion of Jesus, Paul emphasises the destination of the resurrection. Between both positions is the picture of the necessary death of the grain of wheat as the precondition of salvation for all Christians. Paul and John complement each other in their own ways. The material which they have in common, was completely absorbed by each author into his theology. Thus it is certainly impossible to call the picture in John's Gospel a result of the reception of Pauline theology. Rather, both authors use very old tradition that arose long before them. (277)

Berger then examines John's close relationship with Colossians and Hebrews. On the former, he concludes that the similarities are only explicable by an intensive exchange of the authors (compare the discussion of various explanations of this evidence in Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 569–71; cf. Guthrie, *Introduction*, 319ff on similarities with Paul, with reference to E.F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology*, 2 ed., 1908). Berger argues that common theological material between early Christian writings is usually to be explained not through literary dependence, but through joined phases of limited collegial co-operation and communication between the authors. This suggestion moves beyond D. Guthrie, who spoke of 'several co-lateral streams, of which

Paul, Hebrews and John represent contemporary manifestations, developed at an early stage' (*Introduction*, 319). Concerning Matthew, Berger concludes that John cannot be dependent on Matthew. The similarities between John and the Synoptic tradition are due to the use of common, widespread tradition (cf. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 563–70; Guthrie, *Introduction*, 287–300; A. Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics*, BETL 101; Leuven, 1992 and the studies mentioned by Schnelle on p. 565, n. 174). They do not indicate literary dependence and therefore a late date for John's Gospel. The validity of the late date assigned to the Synoptic Gospels by the majority of scholars is not examined. The observation that John's Gospel must be early and that it shares many common features with the Synoptics would invite reflection on their date! A short bibliography and an index of biblical references round off the volume (303–12).

What consequences does Berger draw from his thesis? John's Gospel, as a whole, is to be treated as of equal rank with the Synoptics, namely as an independent projection next to others. What has so far been dismissed as Johannine and – therefore – late could turn out to be a variant of early Christian tradition that historically needs to be taken seriously. These are conclusions most conservative Johannine scholars would fully agree with. Berger briefly addresses the areas that such reassessment would need to include: the identity of the churches John tries to address, Christology, miracles, Wisdom and miracles, the death of Jesus, the Gospel's stance towards Judaism, questions of genre, dualism and apocalypticism. If John, as a whole, is much earlier than is usually assumed, the current understanding of the historical Jesus should no longer be based almost exclusively on the Synoptic Gospels: '... die gesamte Jesusüberlieferung steht in neuem Licht' (292). The Johannine Jesus needs to be taken far more seriously than hitherto (cf. the conclusions of M. Hengel, 'Das Johannesevangelium das Quelle für die Geschichte des antiken Judentums', *Judaica, Hellenistica et Christiana: Kleine Schriften* II, WUNT 109; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1999, 293–334).

Berger's thesis will have to stand up to careful assessment of its proposals in all four areas of examination. Few of Berger's arguments and results come as a surprise to the reader familiar with conservative and evangelical studies of John's Gospel (cf. the references in Carson/Moo/Morris, 135–79 and Robinson, *Wann entstand?*, 265–322) and principles of ex-

egesis. While some new persuasive arguments can be gleaned from Berger's treatment and many stimulating suggestions can be found ('Dennoch ist es notwendig, Hypothesen zu bilden, weil Wissenschaft sonst steril wird', 54; Berger offers plenty of them!), some will have to be dismissed. What is new in this volume are often creative, bold arguments that upon closer scrutiny may not support Berger's case. The value and strength of this volume lies in its trenchant critique of many aspects of earlier and more recent historical critical study of Jesus and John's Gospel. However, despite this sharp criticism, detailed, careful and thus persuasive refutation of opposing views is unfortunately often lacking. Rhetoric, however powerful, and polemics do not replace sound argument. Evangelicals would agree with much of this criticism. However, the alternatives proposed by Berger are less compelling. As a whole, this book ought to support and reinforce some evangelical convictions concerning John. Hopefully other readers will allow themselves to be challenged by Berger to reconsider a questionable consensus that has been building up for over 150 years. In this process, Berger's advantage may be that he is not suspected of having a conservative axe to grind.

Unfortunately, both groups of readers will note with regret that this book suffers from the fact that it was written with a red-hot pen. What Berger entrusts the reader with in the preface is all too evident throughout the whole volume: 'Viele Kapitel dieses Buches entstanden auf den langen Bahnfahrten von und zu Vorträgen vor einer breiteren Öffentlichkeit'. The whole argument could be much strengthened and made more coherent. Had the material been composed and revised more carefully, it would have been all the more persuasive (cf. the comments on Berger's *Theologiegeschichte des Urchristentums* by M. Hengel, A.M. Schwemer, *Paul Between Damascus and Antioch*; London: SCM, 1997, 491f). While Berger interacts with some recent, mainly German-language studies and mentions several interesting recent PhD theses from German universities, much older and recent literature of importance is simply missed. For example, there is but *one* reference to Robinson's *The Priority of John*. The important essay of F.L. Cribbs, 'A Reassessment of the Date of Origin and the Gospel of John' (*JBL* 89, 1970, 38–55) and the 100-page discussion of H.J. Schulz (*Apostolische Herkunft*, 291–391) is not even mentioned. Such omissions mar the whole undertaking. In such

contributions, Berger would not only have found opponents but also much carefully argued material to strengthen his own case. Berger comments on his own agenda (12): 'Daß es für viele Menschen nur die Alternative zwischen klassischer liberaler und fundamentalistischer Exegese gibt, ist ebenso bekannt wie bedauerlich. Der Versuch, das zu ändern, dauert bei mir schon lebenslang'. It is unfortunate that this present attempt suffers from such severe limitations that might put members of both camps off.

If asked for advice on which stimulating books to read on the date of the Fourth Gospel, I would recommend the studies of Robinson, the NT introduction by Carson, Moo and Morris (138–51) and the introduction of R.E. Brown's commentary *The Gospel According to John* (i–xii; AncB 29; Garden City: Doubleday, 1966; LXVII–CXXVIII, on Brown cf. Carson, Moo, Morris, 145–47). For theology, turn to S. Smalley, *John – Evangelist and Interpreter* (2 ed.; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998, cf. the review of R. Behrens in *EuroJTh* 8, 1999, 108f) and Ladd, *Theology*, 249–344. Those restricted to German should start with Robinson (cf. the German revised edition with an epilogue: *Johannes – Das Evangelium der Ursprünge*: Aktualisierte Ausgabe herausgegeben von H.-J. Schulz, TVG Bibelwissenschaftliche Monographien 4; Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1999), then turn to Schulz (*Apostolische Herkunft*), note the dated, though thorough discussion of T. Zahn (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 3 ed.; Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1906; I, 452–575) and then check Berger's volume. The glue binding of this hard-cased volume is very poor.

Rev. Dr Christoph Stenschke
Stralsund, Germany

EuroJTh (2000) 9:2, 198–200

0960–2720

God Will Be All in All: The Eschatology of Jürgen Moltmann
Richard Bauckham, Editor

Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999, xv + 295 pp., £14.95, pb., ISBN 0-567-086631

RÉSUMÉ

Cet ensemble d'essais est une réponse à l'eschatologie de Jürgen Moltmann, à l'occasion de la parution de son ouvrage important intitulé La venue de Dieu: l'eschatologie chrétienne. Richard Bauckham, Trevor Hart, Timothy Gorringer (de l'université de St Andrews en Écosse), et Miroslav Volf (de l'université de