

*Die apostolische Herkunft der Evangelien.* By Hans-Joachim Schulz. 2d ed. QD 145. Freiburg: Herder, 1995, 411 pp., n.p.\*

Has the apostolicity of the gospels been unmasked as fiction by historical-critical exegesis? Have recent interpreters been successful in recasting apostolicity in terms of *Urkirchlichkeit*? And what are the implications for canonicity and inspiration of a rejection of the gospels' apostolic authorship? The present author challenges the notion, postulated by the form criticism pioneered by Schmidt, Dibelius and Bultmann, that the gospels are the product of anonymous community members from a time in which reminiscences of the "historical Jesus" had already begun to fade and the Pauline *kērygma* had largely been submerged under Hellenistic syncretism. This separation between the gospels' content and apostolic teaching, Schulz contends, could not even be overcome by redaction criticism's subsequent emphasis on the theological contribution of the gospel's final editor.

According to Schulz, historical criticism, owing to its rationalistic presuppositions, is not truly historical. He urges a return to a "biblical-liturgical hermeneutic." From his critique of form and redaction criticism he envisages the emergence of a true tradition and genre criticism of the gospels, based, not on literary models that are historically unrealistic, but on the actual kerygmatic, catechetical and liturgical processes in the canonical life of the early Church. Specifically, Schulz finds that ancient attribution places the origin of the gospels in relation to the apostolic proclamation and the Church's expansion through the apostolic mission. This stands in contrast to the tenets of form criticism, which considers the gospels to be late collections of small heterogeneous units of which only the oldest are of apostolic origin.

As Schulz argues, the constancy of traditions of small integrated units presupposes an early process of large-scale integration and hence an early formation of the gospels. He suggests the following dates of composition for the four gospels: the early 60s AD for Mark (Peter's departure from Jerusalem in AD 42 caused John Mark to record the liturgical and kerygmatic legacy of the first Jerusalem stage of Peter's ministry); AD 66–70 for Matthew; after AD 61–62 for Luke; and between 62 (John's move to Ephesus) and 66 (shortly after Peter's martyrdom) for John (with the gospel's final publication in AD 99, shortly after John's death). These conclusions are densely argued, and brief summaries cannot do justice to the author's cogency and grasp of the original sources.

The author is equally conversant with ancient Biblical and patristic sources and recent Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox and Protestant scholarship. It is unfortunate that this work will almost certainly never be translated into English and thus fail to exert the influence its strength of argument would deserve. While many will part company with some of Schulz' more idiosyncratic "biblical-liturgical" reconstructions, such as his contention that the Johannine discourses represent a meditation of Passover Haggadah and an interpretation of the exodus events in the light of Christ, the true Passover, Schulz' work represents a serious challenge to historical criticism's marginalization of the gospels' apostolic content and origin. It is hoped that English-speaking works on the subject will take up some of Schulz' legitimate findings and incorporate them into a responsible reassessment of the apostolic authorship of the four canonical gospels.

Andreas J. Köstenberger  
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary  
Wake Forest, NC

\*This review first appeared in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 41 (1998): 476–77 and is posted with permission.