failing to confront sufficiently squarely and fully the major issue which patristic exegesis of these passages raises: the relation between exegesis and dogmatic theology. He recognizes that the Fathers' dogmatic concerns often led them to interpretations which modern historical exegesis cannot sustain. They had to eliminate, for example, all trinitarian subordinationism from the Fourth Gospel, and they found in the Paraclete passages definitions of the immanent, as well as the economic, trinitarian relations. But it is not enough to see this as the illegitimate imposition of later theology on the text of the Gospel. This kind of interpretation of the Fourth Gospel helped to form the trinitarian dogma of the fourth and fifth centuries, as well as reflecting it. Furthermore, the methodological issue is not simply that of relating individual texts to dogmatic theology. Modern exegetical approaches oblige us to understand the Paraclete passages (as Casurella does) in the first place within the context of Johannine theology. But the Fathers made no real distinctions between Johannine theology, biblical theology and their own dogmatic theology, and it is the lack of such distinctions which gives rise to much of what we find unacceptable in their exegesis. In this sense, the Fathers' understanding of the nature of the Fourth Gospel (as verbatim reports of sheer divinecommunication by the incarnate Logos) affects their exegesis more than Casurella allows. But an assessment of their exegesis which merely rejects everything other than strictly historical exegesis, in our sense, seems to me inadequate. Do we not need to acknowledge, as legitimate, the Fathers' concern to relate exegesis to theology, but to find ways of fulfilling that concern which do not offend our more historical approach to exegesis? This is only to say that I could have wished Casurella to do more than he has done. But what he has done is a very useful contribution, based on painstaking research in a large body of patristic literature. An appendix, which will be useful to textual critics, assembles the evidence of variant readings in these passages of the Fourth Gospel, as attested by the Greek Fathers.

The Gospel of John
by F. F. Bruce
(Basingstoke: Pickering and Inglis, 1983. 425 pp. pb. £6.95)

Reminiscent of his earlier expositions of Ephesians (1961) and the Epistles of John (1975), this book is intended for the Christian reader interested in serious Bible study, but not for the professional student. It began its life thirty years ago as a series of expository articles which were interrupted and delayed in various ways until they were completed in the December 1982 issue of Harvester. This piecemeal and protracted production Prof. Bruce has well hidden by skilful editing of the final draft. The result reads smoothly, as one might expect of anything from
his pen. It focuses scant attention on the Johannine community or on other modern preoccupations, but settles down to straightforward exposition of the text as it stands. The relatively few notes are invariably apposite and helpful.

The exposition is characterized by sane judgment and mature reflection. Inevitably there are places where one might opt for a different interpretation. For instance, despite Prof. Bruce’s sure touch in following the line of thought in John 6, it is doubtful if his interpretation of 6:37 is the most natural: H. Thyen has argued, rather convincingly, that this verse is a litotes that affirms not Jesus’ willingness to welcome would-be disciples, but his determination to preserve those who are his.

If this book does not push back the frontiers, it is nevertheless exactly the sort of work one likes to put into the hands of ordinary Christians who want to know their Bibles better.
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