

others, Does such a clustering of sayings bring to expression a notion that each of these units standing independently does not have, a fallout of new meaning, as it were? Further, do these combinations disclose the concerns and interests of a particular *Sitz im Leben* at that early period when the sayings were joined together? Interestingly, W. feels that, of the two sayings which were brought together in a given instance to elucidate the situation under discussion, each kept its shape for the reason that it was perceived as authentic, which is to say, it was perceived as deriving from Jesus. This study is an elaboration of an article which appeared in *BZ* 24 (1980) 208-33. Anyone wanting to make a quick and precise penetration of W.'s thesis could well resort to the *BZ* article. W.'s study is finely reasoned and compelling. His conclusions are at once challenging and refreshing.

*James C. Turro, Darlington Seminary, Mahwah, NJ 07430*

HUGO ZORILLA C., *La fiesta de liberación de los oprimidos: Relectura de Jn. 7.1-20.21* (San José, Costa Rica: SEBILA, 1981). Pp. 318. Paper N.P.

The present volume is a doctoral dissertation submitted to the theological faculty of the Pontifical University of Salamanca. The work may best be described in terms of three major theological currents or standpoints.

The first two of these are exegetical in nature and represent variations of certain basic positions and approaches within Johannine scholarship. First of all, Zorilla subscribes to a redactional view of the composition of the Gospel, viz., the position that the present Gospel has gone through a series of developments and redactions which reflect different stages of the history of the Johannine community. Secondly, Z. also subscribes to the view that Samaritan influence and theology were central to the beginnings and subsequent developments of this history and thus of the community's Gospel as well. The third current reflects, as the very title of the work indicates, a very prominent and widespread contemporary orientation within systematic theology, viz., the theology of liberation developed within certain sectors of different Latin American churches.

Furthermore, these three theological currents or standpoints are all closely and directly interrelated. This mutual relationship becomes immediately evident in a delineation of the first exegetical position, viz., Z.'s reconstruction of the history of the Johannine community. Four basic stages are posited therein: (1) Before A.D. 30. After a long ministry by Jesus in Galilee and Samaria, a group consisting of disciples from the Baptist, Galileans, pious Jews, and, above all, Samaritans reacted against the Jerusalem authorities. Samaritan theology strongly influenced the group's thinking: anti-temple; anti-pharisaic; Jesus as the Mosaic prophet. (2) A.D. 30 to A.D. 60. Diaspora Jews and Jewish Christians expelled from Jerusalem joined the steadily growing group of Samaritan Christians. Jesus was seen as one greater than Moses, the Messiah. (3) A.D. 60 to A.D. 90. With the destruction of Jerusalem and subsequent expulsions from the synagogue, Jewish and Gentile Christians joined the group. A first edition of the Gospel was written: a signs-gospel. Many Samaritan Christians

leave to form their own sectarian groups. (4) After A.D. 90. In the community now located in Asia Minor, Gentile Christians and Jewish Christians of apostolic origin were welcomed. A second edition of the Gospel was written along with 1 John. Both works revealed the stance of the community: anti-pharisaic; universalistic; anti-Gnostic; Jesus as God.

The second standpoint, viz., the centrality of Samaritan influence, was most evident in the first two stages, where Samaritan Christians were said to constitute a large majority within the group; however, Z. sees Samaritan theology as continuing to influence the group's thinking well into the fourth stage.

The third standpoint, viz., the influence of liberation theology, may be seen in Z.'s analysis of all four stages. In the first stage, Jesus is said to ally himself with the despised, the outcast, and the heterodox (Galileans and Samaritans) against the forces of injustice and oppression (the religious authorities of Jerusalem); then, in the second through the fourth stages, this socio-political group, liberated by Jesus, continues to meet with active opposition from the Jewish authorities.

Although many elements of the reconstruction are certainly subject to debate and discussion, it is Z.'s methodology that I find most problematic. On the one hand, the proposed reconstruction (including its central Samaritan factor) cannot be said to flow primarily from the Johannine text. It is rather based largely on information derived from Acts or other gospel material. Similarly, although an interesting structuralist exegesis of John 7:10-10:21 is provided, information from this unit is used rather uncritically to shed light on all four stages of the reconstruction. Most revealing in this regard is the fact that the exegesis proper of the unit does not begin until after the reconstruction of the community's history has been detailed and is thus never really fully integrated into the work.

Finally, some basic questions must be addressed before the community's history can be read in terms of the proposed pattern of liberation and oppression, e.g., the general rejection by the Galileans in John 6; the reference to "the Jews" and not just the authorities as those who reject; the community's own sectarian tendencies.

*Fernando F. Segovia, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI 53233*



#### 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.