

Joseph LE MINH THÔNG, *Qui est « le disciple que Jésus aimait »?* (Lire la Bible, 195), préface de Luc DEVILLERS. Paris, Cerf, 2019, 13,5 × 21,5 cm, 160 p., ISBN 978-2-204-13070-7

John S. Adimula

Volume 74, numéro 1, janvier–avril 2022

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1084601ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Collège universitaire dominicain, Ottawa

ISSN

0316-5345 (imprimé)

2562-9905 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

Adimula, J. S. (2022). Compte rendu de [Joseph LE MINH THÔNG, *Qui est « le disciple que Jésus aimait »?* (Lire la Bible, 195), préface de Luc DEVILLERS. Paris, Cerf, 2019, 13,5 × 21,5 cm, 160 p., ISBN 978-2-204-13070-7]. *Science et Esprit*, 74(1), 149–152.

faces a lamentable failure because her trick is discovered by the one whom she misleads without her knowing it (p. 188-189).

Concerning the structure of the book, Kipasa follows Gn 37-39 one chapter after another. In each part, he does a narrative reading of the text in its global vision and then talks about the role of discourse in relation to violence. The book ends with a systematic review of research results in order to show how a statement is used to provoke or to block violence; to generate conflict or to create peace (p. 197-253). For Kipasa, violence is caused by a word seeking to make others suffer. This word can be used to transform jealousy and cupidity into an act of violence as Joseph's brothers enacted against him. This word can be aggressive and calumnious like the accusation of Potiphar's wife against Joseph. On the other hand, a word can also be used to neutralize violence and thus put an end to injustice as Judah did for his daughter-in-law (Gn 38:26). It is the intention with which one uses the word that makes a difference.

One of the weak points in this book is the choice and the organization of the narrative devices. In his analysis, Kipasa has recourse to several aspects of narratology (narration time and narrative time, temporality and narrative mode, knowledge and irony, point of view and focalization, repetition and the narrator's judgments) without developing any of them. It would have been more profitable if he had focused on one device for one chapter from the chosen corpus. That choice would have prevented repetition in some places in the book.

Despite that flaw, this book offers a pertinent observation on the links between the word and violence. By providing a biblical anthropology of the word (how a discourse plays its role in human relationships throughout Gn 37-39) and an ethical reflection on its usage (how a statement is used in different conflicts), the monograph presents the reader with insightful ways of understanding the multifaced violence that disfigures humanity. Far from showing the biblical characters as models of behavior, Kipasa helps the reader to see how human violence is born, develops and manipulates. This knowledge, however, does not encourage the reader to avoid violence. Quite the opposite; it prompts him or her to face violence, by using word and ruse with good intention, in order to transform it into an energy for life. Thus, violence, instrument of destruction and division, can become the source of life and healing. It is up to the reader to handle it with cunning!

Chi Ai NGUYEN

*Assumption University
Worcester, MA*

Joseph LE MINH THÔNG, **Qui est «le disciple que Jésus aimait»?** (Lire la Bible, 195), préface de Luc DEVILLERS. Paris, Cerf, 2019, 13,5 × 21,5 cm, 160 p., ISBN 978-2-204-13070-7.

The author of this book aims at interpreting the personality of the appellation "the disciple whom Jesus loved" with a particular study on the Fourth Gospel while extending the research to the 2nd-4th centuries studies. The question is who was the

disciple whom Jesus loved? He begins with some of the interpretations that have been proffered to this personality right from the second century. The names that have been identified with this personality include John, the son of Zebedee; John the Presbyter; John the apostle. These names have also been linked to the author of the Fourth Gospel. Other names include the anonymous disciple (1:37-40), Philip, the other disciple (18:15-16), Thomas and Lazarus. The author argues that these identifications of names are not tenable and in fact negative (p. 16).

The book is divided into five parts, namely, 1) the author of the Gospel from 2nd-4th centuries: here, Joseph Thông investigates four different appellations: John, the disciple whom Jesus loved; John, one of the disciples; John the Presbyter, and John the Priest. 2) The sons of Zebedee and the anonymous disciples in the Fourth Gospel: here, he tries to examine the personality of the apostle John in the synoptics, that of the disciple whom Jesus loved and the anonymous disciples in the Fourth Gospel. He maintains that the term "beloved disciple" is not appropriate because it does not conform to the text of the Gospel rather the appropriate text reads "the disciple whom Jesus loved." 3) In the third part, he examines some propositions that identify some of the Twelve (John, Andrew, Nathanael – Bartholomew) and some other New Testament figures (Lazarus, John Mark, the rich young man) with the "disciple whom Jesus loved." He also goes further to identify other hypotheses that relate some functions (such as the Palestinian, Jerusalem Priest, the Sadducee), literary figure (like the figure of Benjamin, Joseph, the son of Jacob) and a literary fictive personality to the "disciple whom Jesus loved." 4) The disciple whom Jesus loved in John's Gospel: he points out some passages where this disciple is mentioned and examines his role in relation to that of Jesus and the other disciples. 5) The formation of the Fourth Gospel and the process of rereading and intertextuality.

The author holds that the "disciple whom Jesus loved" becomes a figure for all the disciples both the first generation and the future ones. That is, the love of Jesus for this disciple is a symbol of Jesus' love and friendship for all the believers.

In his investigation of the documents from the 2nd-4th centuries on John and the author of the Fourth Gospel (Papyrus P⁵², P⁶⁶ and P⁷⁵: 2nd-3rd centuries; Codex Sinaiticus and Vaticanus: 4th century), Joseph Thông identifies some of the submissions of some church Fathers as regards the subject matter. He concludes that there are several traditions with legendary elements in their submissions concerning the author of the Fourth Gospel and the "disciple whom Jesus loved"; and that the question on the identity of this disciple is not clear. He submits, therefore, that one cannot hold to the authors of the 2nd-4th centuries to clearly identify the author of the Fourth Gospel with the apostle John, John the son of Zebedee and the "disciple whom Jesus loved." On the contrary, it could be argued that the documents and their authors in those centuries used these names with only one personality without a difference.

Joseph Thông rejects the hypothesis that the "disciple whom Jesus loved" is the apostle John because the latter had some reproaches from Jesus and was confronted with human weakness; while the former was always responding appropriately to Jesus and was an example par excellence. His characteristics are fidelity, intimacy with Jesus, faith, promptitude to know his master and authority of his witness. "Il

n'y a aucun malentendu et aucune incompréhension entre Jésus et le disciple qu'il aimait. Ce n'est pas le cas de l'apôtre Jean dans les synoptiques" (p. 60). This reason does not appear strong and sufficient to dismiss the proposition that the apostle John could have been the "disciple whom Jesus loved." In fact, that the apostle John was reproached by Jesus at certain times for lack of understanding or that he was corrected could show the love that Jesus had for him. If really this disciple whom Jesus loved is not the apostle John, and he is accorded so much importance and intimacy with Jesus more than the Twelve and the other disciples (as maintained by Joseph Thông), one might have expected him to be at the transfiguration and Gethsemane – these are the events which the author of this book employs to buttress his argument (cf. p. 59).

It could also be said that the events employed to make comparison in the attitudes between the apostle John and the "disciple whom Jesus loved" in the synoptics and the Fourth Gospel by Joseph Thông are not the same. The actions are not the same, so equal or same reactions should not also be expected. The experience of the disciples with Jesus was a gradual discovery of knowledge and the mystery of Christ. So, at a point in time, a disciple may not understand a certain event but at later time come to understand, and in fact that is what happened in the development of the Christian faith.

The author believes that the fact that the "disciple whom Jesus loved" is sometimes associated with Peter in the Fourth Gospel (13:23-26; 20:3-10; 21:1-23) and Peter with the apostle John often in the synoptics, is not enough reason to identify the "disciple whom Jesus loved" with John the apostle. This claim is left for this author to expatiate; for it appears not convincingly demonstrated in the book.

He tries to link possibly the "disciple whom Jesus loved" to one of the two other disciples mentioned in 21:2 and avoids linking him to one of the two sons of Zebedee. In this passage, the appellation "sons of Zebedee" was mentioned in addition to the other disciples mentioned by their names. There is no specific mention of the "disciple whom Jesus loved" in the list (v. 2). Hence, it could also be argued that this disciple whom Jesus loved is one of the sons of Zebedee, since within the same event (v. 7) the "disciple whom Jesus loved" is mentioned, and refers logically to one of those listed in the previous verse.

On the identity of the "disciple whom Jesus loved," Joseph Thông submits that it is better to maintain his anonymity and see in him a historical personality with a symbolic figure rather than giving him any of the names of the Twelve or the known disciples.

On the formation of the Fourth Gospel (the last chapter of the book), he distinguishes three personalities that were involved at each stage of formation, namely, 1) the disciple whom Jesus loved who is also the head of the Johannine school, an eyewitness to the truth of the death and the resurrection of Jesus and who put to writing his witness; 2) the evangelist who wrote the first conclusion in 20:30-31; and 3) the redactor who composed chapter 21 and gave the Gospel its final form. This arrangement and the personalities involved seem plausible.

The book challenges the old and traditional view that the author of the Fourth Gospel is John the apostle and that he is also the disciple whom Jesus loved. It is an

interesting input and the research awakens one's views and belief to settle for what previous authors on this subject have come up with as regards this discussion. The book is valuable for lovers of facts and those who seek for what the text actually says.

John S. ADIMULA

*Graduate Studies - Faculty of Theology
Dominican University College
Ottawa*

Marie-Anne VANNIER (dir.), **Maître Eckhart, lecteur des Pères latins** (Mystiques chrétiens d'Orient et d'Occident). Paris, Beauchesne, 2020, 15,5 × 24 cm, 291 p., ISBN 978-2-7010-2315-1.

Marie-Anne VANNIER (dir.), **Maître Eckhart, lecteur des Pères grecs** (Mystiques chrétiens d'Orient et d'Occident). Paris, Beauchesne, 2020, 15,5 × 24 cm, 233 p., ISBN 978-2-7010-2326-7.

Maître Eckhart, lecteur des Pères latins se situe dans le cadre d'un projet intitulé «ANR - 17 - FRAL – 0002 TEAPREA (*Teaching and Preaching with Patristic auctoritates. Meister Eckhart in France and Germany, past and present*)». Dans sa brève Présentation, l'éditrice écrit : «Nous menons cette recherche, de manière systématique, en réalisant un index des citations patristiques dans l'œuvre d'Eckhart.» Or cet index ne fait que signaler les pages où *les contributeurs* de ce volume mentionnent les Pères; un index des écrits *des Pères* rapportés par Eckhart aurait été également utile.

Dans son texte suivant, un texte général sur la place des Pères dans l'œuvre d'Eckhart, Vannier nous dit d'ailleurs : «Si certaines sources patristiques d'Eckhart sont identifiées dans l'édition Kohlhammer [*Die deutschen und lateinischen Werke*], d'autres demandent encore à l'être.» Elle ajoute que c'est là justement le projet ANR; cependant, à en juger par ce volume-ci et par un suivant, qui portera, annonce-t-elle, sur les sources patristiques grecques d'Eckhart, il semble qu'un index des écrits des Pères cités par Eckhart ne soit pas une priorité immédiate pour les directeurs de ce projet.

Les Pères latins discutés ici sont : Ambroise, Hilaire de Poitiers, Isidore de Séville, Jean Cassien, Jérôme, Vincent de Lérins et Augustin. Ce dernier est le Père le plus cité par Eckhart (généralement sans donner le nom, évidemment, comme les autres médiévaux le faisaient) et est donc l'objet de nombreuses études dans ce volume. Comme Vannier le note, Augustin et Eckhart étaient tous deux grands lecteurs de l'Écriture.

Comme je le faisais remarquer dans des recensions antérieures d'autres ouvrages de Vannier, cette édition-ci comporte certains jugements faux, par exemple : nier, comme elle le fait, que Eckhart était néoplatonicien (p. 9), n'est-ce pas nier également qu'Augustin était néoplatonicien? (Comme on se le rappellera, Augustin avait absorbé de bonnes doses de platonisme à travers Cicéron et Victorinus, ce dernier