

2007

Waetjen's "The Gospel of the Beloved Disciple: A Work in Two Editions" - Book Review

Paul N. Anderson

George Fox University, panderso@georgefox.edu

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



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Previously published in *Religious Studies Review*, 2007, 33(3), p. 238 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1748-0922.2007.00203_37.x/full

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Christian Studies at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications - College of Christian Studies by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University.

THE GOSPEL OF THE BELOVED DISCIPLE: A WORK IN TWO EDITIONS. By Herman C. Waetjen. New York/London: T & T Clark, 2005. Pp. xx + 468. \$39.95, ISBN 0-567-02781-3.

This new commentary seeks to make sense of the Fourth Gospel's enigmas on the basis of analyzing its points of view from the perspective of its first edition and its final edition. On text-critical grounds, Waetjen plausibly infers that the first edition of John (chapters one through twenty) appears to have had an evangelistic function, while the final edition had a community maintenance function. Less plausible is his inference that the first edition must have been produced in Alexandria, with Lazarus serving as the Beloved Disciple. Building on J. L. Martyn's two-level reading of the Johannine text, Waetjen infers a similar set of Jewish-Christian dialogues that may have been the case in a cosmopolitan city such as Alexandria. While the Logos connection does not require an Alexandrian context, the Philonic references are interesting and profitable, as are many of Waetjen's theological interpretations. Waetjen, however, apparently fails to consider seriously other additions to an earlier edition, such as the Prologue, John 6, and chapters fifteen through seventeen, as argued by Lindars and Ashton. Having done so would have improved his approach.

Paul N. Anderson

George Fox University