hope for to introduce students to these matters, and it should be standard reading for those interested in later Pauline writing and thought.

Bonnie Thurston, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, PA 15206


In this book, originally his *Habilitationsschrift* presented in 1997 at the University of Erlangen-Nürnberg, Theo K. Heckel “fragt nach der historischen Herkunft des Vier­evangelienkanons und nach seiner theologischen Bedeutung” (p. 2). In his first chapter, H. discusses many methodological difficulties inherent in writing the history of an emerging canon.

The remainder of H.’s study proceeds more or less diachronically and inductively, beginning with the Gospel of Mark and culminating with the four-gospel canon extolled by Irenaeus. In between Mark and Irenaeus, H. examines in chaps. 2–4 Matthew, Luke, the Fourth Gospel, John 21, and Papias as possible witnesses to an emerging “collection” (but, correctly, not necessarily a fixed “canon”) of written gospels. The fifth and final chapter opens with a critical evaluation of H. von Campenhausen’s arguments on the history of the canon and H. Koester’s insistence on the importance of extracanonical gospels in the second century. In the remainder of chap. 5, H. surveys briefly what Mark’s “shorter” ending (it?), Mark’s “longer” ending (Mark 16:9-20), the Gospel of Peter, the fragmentary gospel of Papyrus Egerton 2, the Epistula Apostolorum, Justin Martyr, Marcion, Melito of Sardis, Celsus, the Muratorian Canon, and Irenaeus reveal about the “NT” gospels in the second century. The book includes a bibliography listing ancient sources, NT commentaries, and other secondary studies, and indexes of ancient texts, modern persons, and subjects.

The lion’s share of H.’s work is devoted to the “NT” gospels, John 21, and Papias. H.’s analyses of the Synoptics in chap. 2 and of the Fourth Gospel in chap. 3 marshal the mostly negative, but nonetheless credible, argument for the independence of these works. Since each of these four gospels was intended to be read individually rather than alongside others, none of them can account for a *collection* of different gospels. In this initial section, neither H.’s literary-critical approach to Mark’s conclusion at Mark 16:8 nor his analysis of Matthew 28 is of direct relevance to the aforementioned thesis, but both are, nonetheless, well researched and thought-provoking.

Most of H.’s third chapter is concerned with John 21. Despite the secondary character of this appendix to the Fourth Gospel, H. concurs with G. Strecker and U. Schnelle that its author “gehört ... zur johanneischen Schule” (p. 217; cf. John 21:24b). More significantly, H. argues that the author of John 21 knew the four NT gospels and combined Johannine with Synoptic elements in the appendix to the Gospel of John. H. dates John 21 to 110–120 C.E. (against W. Schmithals’s later date of 160–180)—after both the Fourth Gospel (90–100) and 1 John (100–110) but before Papias (around 120 C.E.). H.’s conclusion that John 21 witnesses, prior to Marcion’s canon of (edited versions of) Luke and ten Pauline letters, to a four-gospel collection is offered as an explicit challenge to the thesis of von Campenhausen (followed by Koester) that Marcion’s canon represented the first Christian “Scripture.”
Heckel’s study offers numerous insights into the disparate materials he examines. His most ambitious undertaking is to search for the beginnings of a four-gospel collection before Marcion’s canon. Independently of H., this reviewer has argued that Mark 16:9-20 (ca. 120–140 C.E.) presupposes the four “NT” gospels (Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark [WUNT 2/112; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2000] 123-56). Marcion can thus be viewed as reacting to some earlier standard for written authority, quite possibly like that (those?) esteemed by the authors of John 21 and Mark 16:9-20.

Nonetheless, two problems and one major flaw in H.’s larger argument deserve mention here. First, H. does not argue persuasively for the chronological priority of John 21 to other second-century witnesses to gospel collections (e.g., Epistula Apostolorum, Mark 16:9-20, Papias). In particular, the grounds for dating John 21 before Papias—who in chap. 4 is unconvincingly associated with the Johannine school and the Fourth Gospel, including John 21—are doubtful. Second, H.’s study neglects the possible witness of writings such as 2 Clement, the Didache, and Ignatius’s letters to collections of “NT” (and other) gospel materials. An investigation of these and possibly other witnesses could strengthen H.’s argument for an early-second-century terminus a quo for the earliest gospel collection(s).

Finally, concerning John 21 and the Synoptics, the acquaintance of the author of the former with special Lucan material (e.g., Luke 5:1-11) is both clear and intriguing in that it favors the existence of at least a two-gospel collection. More cautiously, H. acknowledges that the author’s use of Matt 16:17-19 is “only... probable” (p. 166). Yet, even this level of probability is strained in the case of both Matt 16:17-19 and Mark 9:1 || Matt 16:28 || Luke 9:27. Here, H.’s analysis is most vulnerable, for his inference of a four-gospel collection stands or falls with his all too brief arguments for the literary dependence of John 21 upon these Synoptic passages (or some pre-Synoptic written sources). Thus, H.’s creative approach to the gospels in the second century makes numerous contributions, but his central arguments concerning the literary dependencies and chronological placement of John 21 need further examination.

James A. Kelhoffer, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO 63108

JUAN CARLOS INOSTROZA LANAS, Moisés e Israel en el desierto: El Miraís paulino de 1 Cor 10, 1-13 (Plenitudo Temporis 6; Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia, 2000). Pp. 245. Paper 2,600 ptas.

In this published version of his doctoral thesis completed in 1999, Juan Carlos Inostroza Lanas examines the exodus-desert tradition of Moses and Israel as it is employed by Paul in 1 Cor 10:1-13, searching for what this tradition says about the Apostle and his relationship with the Corinthian community. The work consists of five chapters and a conclusion. In the first chapter, I. L. addresses preliminary issues, including the previous scholarship on this passage that addresses Paul’s use of the OT; what the passage reveals about the Corinthian community; and whether 1 Cor 10:1-13 is an original part of the letter. I. L. notes that some minor studies have examined Paul’s midrash for its technical or hermeneutical qualities, but few have expressed interest in the role of Moses. After discussing the letter as an “occasional” one, a factor that will direct his methodology, I. L.