

the Conversation" identifies the author, readers, adversaries, purpose, and general date. The second part, "Messages from a Victorious Martyr," summarizes the essential themes the evangelist wanted to communicate, e.g., peace, glory, and mission.

The purpose of the Gospel, Minear proposes, was to equip believers for their task of mission to others and to overcome their fear in the face of persecution. "John thinks of Jesus as a martyr whose martyrdom forced followers to accept that fate for themselves" (p. 112). Jesus is presented as the "primary witness" whose witness cost him his life and provided a "prophetic anticipation of the vocation of his disciples" (p. xiii). In the technical sense, then, the Gospel is a martyrology. Jesus' love of his enemies (the "world" in 3:16) is one of the main themes of the narrative; the theme has the purpose of preparing the Christians to practice the same sort of love in their mission to the world.

The document was written before 66 C.E. and within the context of a Jewish Christian community concerned over the death of eyewitnesses to the historical Jesus. Jewish opponents were threatening the first readers with death. That threat of martyrdom, Minear insists, figures more prominently in the Gospel than does the exclusion from the synagogue (16:1-3). Hence, John should be read as "an insider's book."

The evangelist and the community were charismatic in nature, the author rightly argues. But there is evidence, Minear claims, of a tension among differing charismatic leaders in the Johannine community. Some parts of the Gospel are directed toward other of the leaders and some toward the general body of believers.

Minear's method can best be characterized as eclectic. It is strongly influenced by literary criticism and gives considerable attention to structure in an attempt to discern meaning. It is carefully argued with exclusive attention to the contents of the Gospel itself.

Intriguing as it is, the thesis of the book is vulnerable. The centrality of Jesus' role as martyr is not convincingly established. The distinction between believers and disciples in the narrative is not as persuasive as it must be to bear the weight of Minear's interpretation. (In fact the evidence points in precisely the opposite direction, namely, toward an identity of the disciples with believers in general.) The supposition that portions of the Gospel are directed to general believers, while others are intended for charismatic leaders of the community, is difficult to show with any clarity. Furthermore, the pre-70 date, while advocated by others, misuses the evidence, in my view. Finally, the theory that the threat of martyrdom and the call to mission are the seminal ingredients of the setting and purpose overlooks what seems to be a more important emphasis upon community solidarity and identity.

Notwithstanding these serious reservations, Minear has given us a thoughtful treatment of the Gospel worthy of careful reading and reflection.

Robert Kysar
848 Lehigh Street, Reading, PA 19601

Revelation Taught: The Paraclete in the Gospel of John, by Eskil Franck. ConBNT 14. Lund: Gleerup, 1985. Pp. 168. N.P. (paper).

This work was successfully submitted as a doctoral dissertation to the Faculty of Theology at Uppsala. Franck begins his study by adopting two controlling positions:

first, he argues that, whatever the antecedent sources to John 14–16, the text can be usefully interpreted as it stands, since the Paraclete sayings “are so well assimilated in their context and are marked by such a stylistic and linguistic unity that it is reasonable to work with them in their present form”; and second, that each of the various *religionsgeschichtliche* backgrounds proposed for the Paraclete is demonstrably reductionistic. Franck’s thesis is that there must be a “multidimensional” model drawn from a variety of backgrounds, and deduced not by focusing on the word *παράκλητος* but by studying the function of the Paraclete within the context of the Gospel of John. Accordingly, he examines in turn the forensic dimensions of the Paraclete’s role, those bound up with the theme of “farewell-discourse,” and those bound up with teaching (“the didactic dimension”). The fairly brief exegesis of the Paraclete passages in John 14–16 is undertaken with this multidimensional model in view; and Franck concludes that his exegesis validates the model he has proposed. The three dimensions are not found in every Paraclete passage, he admits, but all three recur in the Paraclete passages taken as a whole. The “farewell-discourse” dimension is least visible, apparently “due to the fact that it indicates a *situation* rather than a function.” The forensic dimension is “more noticeable” but never dominant: it serves as “the background against which the descriptions of the other functions are pictured.” But this background must remain background, so that it does not usurp the central role, which is occupied by the didactic function.

In the second half of the book, Franck builds on his thesis by postulating a “triadic” structure in the didactic authority of the Gospel of John, i.e., a certain interrelation among Jesus, the Paraclete, and the Beloved Disciple. The absent Jesus is represented by the Paraclete, who, in turn, is embodied in the Beloved Disciple and legitimates him. Thus the Fourth Gospel itself is the fruit of the initial work of the Paraclete. When Franck asks what background might explain this “didactic activity” of the Paraclete, he focuses upon the “midrashic attitude” of scriptural exposition in the synagogue service, and suggests that the teaching activity of the Methurgeman serves as the concrete background for the presentation of the personal, didactic role of the Paraclete in John.

The thesis that occupies Franck’s attention in the first half of the book is plausible enough: reductionistic approaches to questions of background rarely enjoy long runs in scholarly consensus, and a more synthetic approach obviously has its attractions. Some of the categories he introduces appear a trifle forced: it is not entirely obvious what features in the three “dimensions” that Franck discusses enable him to decide that one is “background” and another is “central,” for instance. Moreover, the force of the argument is severely reduced by his almost total reliance on secondary sources. Franck advocates or rejects positions by introducing still more positions; scholars refute scholars. As a result the book is a useful compendium of recent treatments of the Paraclete, a thoughtful introduction to the literature, but it does not reflect a thoughtful and creative weighing of the primary sources.

The second part of the book, culminating in the proposal that the Methurgeman was the concrete model the evangelist adopted for his structuring of the didactic role of the Paraclete, is more problematic. The line of connection seems to be the “midrashic attitude” adopted both in the targumic exposition of Scripture in the synagogue, and in the Gospel of John. But “midrashic attitude” is an immensely slippery category that is here being applied to two activities that display as many

discontinuities as continuities. If the category is meant to conjure up the creative exposition of earlier tradition, it is too broad: one could as well choose an OT prophet or a NT apostle as the Methurgeman. If it is meant to conjure up something narrower, such as a certain kind of hermeneutical approach to antecedent tradition allegedly shared by John and the synagogue service, that "something" is not specified, and probably could not be specified without noting the discontinuities. What is remarkable is that after eschewing *religionsgeschichtliche* reductionism in favor of a multidimensional model for the Paraclete, Franck adopts some reductionism of his own when he analyzes the didactic component of that model.

The work is marred by awkward English style that makes for difficult reading, and by an astonishing number of misspellings and misprints.

D. A. Carson

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL 60015

Baptisés dans l'Esprit: Baptême et Esprit Saint dans les Actes des Apôtres, by Michel Quesnel. LD 120. Paris: Cerf, 1985. Pp. 225. 128 F. (paper).

The confusion in the references to baptism in the Acts of the Apostles has given occasion to much ecclesiastical polemic and (especially with the History of Religion school) some scholarly debate. Quesnel, a French Roman Catholic scholar, eschews the former and advances the latter, using the methods of tradition and redaction criticism.

Two basic types of baptism are identified in Acts. The first type, associated with the apostle Peter, is a baptism in water performed in (*en* or *epi*) the name of Jesus Christ (*Iēsou Christou*) (Acts 2:38; 10:48). It is accompanied with repentance and effects remission of sins, and preceding it or following it the candidate receives the gift of the Holy Spirit. The second type of baptismal rite is that associated in Acts with Philip the Evangelist and Paul (8:15; 19:5, cf. 9:17-18). In these cases there is no mention of repentance or of remission of sins. It is baptism *into* the name of the Lord Jesus (*eis to onoma Iēsou Kyriou*). Here the Spirit is conveyed by a distinct act, the imposition of hands. The last of these factors, viz., the difference in the way the Spirit is conferred, has been frequently noticed and is the source of much variation in ecclesiastical practice. It is to the author's credit to have called attention to the other two differences which have been largely neglected, the use of *en* or *epi* + dative and *eis* + accusative, and the differences of christological title, *Christos* and *Kyrios*. The rest of this book is devoted to explaining these two differences and reconstructing the history of baptism in the early church on the basis of them.

The *en/epi to onoma* formula is of Semitic origin. It is used in the LXX to translate *lē* or *bē* with *šēm*, and connotes the personal authority which stands behind an action. Significantly, *eis to onoma* never occurs in the LXX. These conclusions are borne out by a study of intertestamental literature, both Semitic and Greek.

On the other hand, *eis to onoma* is found only in the Greek papyri, where it is used in commercial texts and denotes the person to whom something is made over (as in the payment of accounts). This suggests that in the baptismal contexts in Acts *eis* denotes the end and goal of the rite, rather than, like *en* or *epi*, the authority under which the act is performed. The same use of *eis* occurs in the Pauline corpus, e.g.,



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.