Scripture Within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations of the Gospel of John. By Bruce G. Schuchard. SBLDS 133. Atlanta: Scholars, 1992, xvii + 174 pp., $24.95 paper.

This book sets out to examine every explicit quotation of the OT in the gospel of John, and in particular to identify the OT source of each quotation and the textual version from which it is drawn and to establish the function of each quotation in its Johannine context. The first thirteen chapters work through the quotations Schuchard finds (1:23 [Isa 40:3]; 2:17 [Ps 69(68):10a]; 6:30–31 [Ps 77:24]; 6:45a [Isa 54:13]; 10:34 [Ps 81:6]; 12:15 [Zech 9:9]; 12:38 [Isa 53:1]; 12:40 [Isa 6:10]; 13:18 [Ps 41(40):10]; 15:25 [source uncertain]; 19:24b [Ps 21:19]; 19:36 [Exod 12:10 or 12:46 or both]; 19:37 [Zech 12:10]). The last chapter provides his "concluding observations" (pp. 151–156). There is a bibliography, but there are no indices.

The work is well done, the central conclusions suitably cautious. For instance, at 2:13; 19:37 Schuchard will venture no more than that the gospel passage "recalls" the specified OT passage. His conclusions are essentially twofold: (1) In most instances it

is quite certain that John's OT quotations come from only one textual tradition, the OG; (2) the various changes that John introduces into the quotations—shortening, deploying a synonym, adding material (usually drawn from the same OT context, for which John displays considerable respect)—are part of John's commitment to show how the entire OT testifies to Jesus. There may be good reason for supposing that John thought in Aramaic and knew Hebrew, but he wrote in Greek and was doubtless in contact with one or more synagogues in the Diaspora.

Although the work is circumscribed and suitably cautious, it is for the same reasons so restrained that it is of only specialist interest. Schuchard offers no useful comments on the extraordinary pattern of the introductory formulae in John and makes no attempt to integrate his findings with the very considerable number of OT allusions in John—not even such pivotal ones as 1:51; 3:14; 7:38–39. Yes, John presents Jesus as the One to whom the OT testifies, but there is very little reflection on the ways in which this witness operates—for example, in fulfillment? typological fulfillment? replacement? prediction? What are John's hermeneutical axioms? And the theory that John is in dialogue with a Diaspora synagogue, though certainly dominant in the scholarly literature, plays no determinative role in the exegesis, nor is it particularly supported by it. One could as easily infer that John's interests are evangelistic, aimed at Jews and proselytes in the Diaspora.

In short, the book is competent and useful within its rather narrow, self-imposed limitations.

D. A. Carson
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL