

lario empleado propio de la semiótica, que viene en gran parte aclarado al no especialista en las notas y los *repères*; sino a que sumerge de tal forma al lector en la interpretación minuciosa de cada breve perícopa que le cuesta mantener la visión del conjunto del desarrollo del libro y aún de las unidades literarias mayores. Se agradecerían algunos “balances” más de los ya existentes.

Gonzalo Aranda Pérez – Miguel Astráin 16, 9º D – E-31006 Pamplona

Jan DOCHHORN, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie. Der eschatologische Teufelsfall in Apc Joh 12 und seine Bedeutung für das Verständnis der Johannesoffenbarung* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 268; Mohr Siebeck; Tübingen, 2010). xv + 478 pp. ISBN: 978-3-16-150608-6. € 114,00

This book consists of seven chapters. The first is the Introduction, and the seventh contains a summary of the conclusions and a list of contributions to research. The second chapter involves preliminary studies of the book of Revelation as a whole. The third is a discussion of Revelation 12 in its literary context, and the fourth treats the manuscripts attesting the work and its textual transmission. Chapter five is a description of the “surface” of Revelation 12, and chapter six is an analysis of its “deep structures.”

The author agrees with recent studies arguing that there was no extensive, centrally planned persecution of Christians at the time John wrote (5, 52). He does not, however, agree with those who argue that the book falls into two main parts, the first coming to an end with the account of the seventh trumpet in 11:15-19. On the contrary, he argues that chapter 12 is part of the results of the last trumpet and thus that Revelation 12 refers to the future. Similarly, he takes Revelation 13 as a real prophecy (not a *vaticinium ex eventu*) of the coming of Nero Redivivus. This chapter also belongs to the time of the seventh trumpet.

Most controversially, the author disputes the consensus that Revelation 12 is an adaptation of one or more pagan myths or motifs. He doubts that John was knowledgeable about such pagan traditions and that his audience would have appreciated a transformation of such traditions. He agrees, however, that John knew about and gives clear signals to the Nero legend. He finds it credible that John would use pagan tradition to describe an eschatological villain like Nero but not a hero like Christ as the Messiah.

In support of these views, he argues that it is not the dragon that is set free in Rev 20:7 but Satan. Since, however, the dragon is explicitly identified in 20:2 with the

ancient serpent who is also Satan, it is presumably the dragon who is set free, who is also Satan. (The same identification is made in 12:9.) Nevertheless, the author argues that the dragon plays a role only in Revelation 12-19 because in that passage “the church finds itself in the situation of the Exodus, in which its enemy plays the role of the Egyptian dragon of Ezekiel 29 and 32” (13-14).

The author’s reading strategy is to reconstruct the process of understanding that John intended for his “reader” (18). He rightly takes the position that the book of Revelation is not pseudepigraphic: its author wrote in his own name, John (18, 50-52). But then he draws the extraordinary conclusion that the visionary narratives in Rev 4:1-22:5 are thus genuine prophecies and not *vaticinia ex eventu*. Furthermore, he infers from this conclusion that the sequence of events corresponds to the sequence of the visions, and we therefore have to do with a primarily linear organization of time (18). He must, however, grant that there are six exceptions to this rule, at least one of which (7:9-17) is a rather major exception (58-60).

In keeping with his position that the visions constitute a linear sequence, the author rejects the recapitulation theory. Yet he argues that Rev 12:13-18 narrates twice the same events described in 13:1-19:21, once in 12:13-16 and once in 12:17-18. In his view, Revelation 12 proleptically thematizes the second half of the last year-week before the thousand-year reign.

He concludes that the woman of Revelation 12 is “Frau Zion,” and that she appears in various forms throughout the book. One of these forms is the Jerusalem that comes down from heaven. He does not discuss the problematic result: that Zion is portrayed both as the mother and the bride of Christ. Another problem is that he claims that the Cross is central in Revelation 12, whereas narratively speaking it is barely implied.

According to Dochhorn, John’s prophecies prophesy the fulfillments of past prophecies. John is a prophetic exegete of the biblical prophets. This claim certainly captures an aspect of the book of Revelation. His thesis is unwarranted, however, that “schriftgelehrte Prophetie” is a Gattung. If “prophecy” is not a Gattung, then neither can learned, exegetical prophecy be a Gattung. “Prophecy” is a mode of expression that includes many forms and genres, such as the prophetic oracle. One can say that Revelation is a prophetic book, as is Daniel, but such a statement is general and imprecise.

The most important contribution of this book is the argument that the origin of the notion of a primordial fall of Satan from heaven is later than the composition of Revelation, not a tradition that John transformed into an eschatological one. The author argues instead that John drew upon an eschatological tradition of the devil’s fall. The main texts he draws upon as evidence are the Jewish texts 1 QM 17:5-8, the Assumption [or Testament] of Moses 10, the Apocalypse of Moses (a text concerning Adam and Eve) 39:1b-3 and the early Christian texts John 12:31, Luke 10:18, the Freer Logion in Mark 16:14, Rom 8:31-39 and 16:20a. I grant his main point, but he overemphasizes the similarities between these texts and Revelation 12 and minimizes their differences. For example, Belial in 1 QM has a degree of rule or dominion. There is no implication that the dragon in Revelation 12 has such. He has a throne on earth (2:13), but in heaven he played the traditional role of the Accuser (12:10). In both

1 QM 17 and Revelation 12 there is a battle in heaven, but the plot is different. Belial is defeated by Michael in heaven and the enemies of Israel are defeated on earth. But Belial is not cast out of heaven down to earth.

The most serious problem with the book is its exclusive focus on the allusions to Scripture as the key to its meaning and reception by the intended audiences. It seems unlikely that most of those who heard Revelation read were as learned in the scriptures as John was. Doehorn claims that neither John nor his audiences were learned in the ancient Mesopotamian or Canaanite myths to which he supposedly refers. He overlooks the fact, however, that those who take an iconographical and mythic approach to Revelation 12 can show that Greek and Roman stories similar to the more ancient ones were widespread in the cultural contexts of the seven cities. For example, the scene of Leto fleeing Python was represented in sculpture and on coins in western Asia Minor.

Adela Yarbro Collins – Yale University Divinity School – 409 Prospect Street – New Haven, CT 06437

Obras colectivas y misceláneas

Eberhard BONS – Thierry LEGRAND (dirs.), *Le monothéisme biblique. Évolution, contextes et perspectives* (Lectio Divina 244; Éditions du Cerf, Paris 2011). 465pp. ISBN: 978-2-204-09311-8. € 34,00

“Avant-propos” (7-8).

Le monothéisme en débat

Th. LEGRAND – E. BONS, “Introduction” (11-23). Frédéric ROGNON, “Penser le Dieu un: remarques sur le débat autour du monothéisme” (25-47). Ekkehard W. STEGEMANN, “Wieder einmal Unbehagen am Monotheismus” (49-65 [Résumé en français: 65-68]).

Ancien Testament et société israélite

Françoise LAURENT, “De l’incomparable, de l’unique: «C’est le Seigneur qui est Dieu», Dt 4,1-40” (71-90). Jan JOOSTEN, “Deutéronome 32,8-9 et les commencements de la religion d’Israël” (91-108). Erik EYNIKEL, “Les païens peuvent-ils participer au culte de Yahvé? Des questions et des réponses dans le livre de Jonas” (109-128). E. BONS, “Le Dieu et les dieux dans le Psautier de la Septante” (129-143).