

2007

Lioy's "The Search for Ultimate Reality: Intertextuality between the Genesis and Johannine Prologues" - Book Review

Paul N. Anderson

George Fox University, panderso@georgefox.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/ccs>



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Previously published in *Religious Studies Review*, 2007, 33(3), pp. 237-238 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1748-0922.2007.00203_36.x/full

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Theology at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications - George Fox School of Theology by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

THE SEARCH FOR ULTIMATE REALITY: INTERTEXTUALITY BETWEEN THE GENESIS AND JOHANNINE PROLOGUES. By Dan Lioy. Studies in Biblical Literature, 93. New York: Peter Lang, 2005. Pp. 223. \$65.95, ISBN 978-0-8204-8121-0.

In a rare combination of interdisciplinary approaches, Lioy analyzes the prologues of Genesis and John in the light of the search for ultimate reality. Beginning with critiques of approaches to ultimate reality, Lioy engages his task in an "analytical, integrative, and thematic fashion." An analysis of Gen 1:1-2:3 exposes a polemical diatribe against the pagan creation myths of Moses's day in favor of a "God-centered view of creation." An analysis of John 1:1-18 reveals an emphasis on Jesus' pre-existent divinity to combat "heretical notions of the person and work of the Messiah." Finally, Lioy seeks to demonstrate how intertextuality functioned between these two prologues in ways that helped readers understand and appropriate meaningfully five central features of Johannine Christology. While the goal of this book is commendable, not all of it holds together equally well. In addition to Babylonian creation mythologies, Lioy sees the primary target as Egyptian cosmology during the time of Moses, inferring Mosaic authorship. While the Jewish and Hellenistic backgrounds of the Johannine prologue are suitable, Lioy's Reformed tendency to cast John's Christology in Trinitarian and dual-nature terms comes across as anachronistic. In seeking to combine precritical views of authorship with history of religions and new literary-critical theories, the book's approach does not fit into standard categories of interpretation. That is its strength and also its weakness.

Paul N. Anderson
George Fox University