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made to Abraham that all nations would be blessed in him, shows that the
eschatological age has been inaugurated through the death and resurrec-
tion of Jesus. Gentiles are now included in God's people. In addition, the
gift of the Spirit in human hearts empowers recipients to faithfully follow
the ways of God. But Paul understands such faithful service apart from
following the Jewish Law, for that Law now belongs to the former age.
M. makes a good case for interpreting "the curse of the Law" (3:12) as
referring primarily to death—not to the Law itself or to the exile—that
resulted from Israel's failure to obey the Law. Thus, what the Spirit bestows
is eschatological life.

M.'s reading of Galatians 3-4 is largely well argued. However, it was
disappointing that M. gives only one paragraph to Paul's famous statement
that Christ "became a curse for us" (Gal 3:13) and offers no comment on
the biblical passage in connection with it ("Cursed be everyone who hangs
on a tree"; see Deut 21:23). Not all will be convinced by M. that the
referent to "our hearts" in Galatians 4:6—where Paul writes, "God has
sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts"—refers specifically to Jewish
Christians rather than to all Christians, including the (Gentile) Galatians.

M.'s best exegetical work is found in chapter 5, his analysis of Galatians
5-6. There he succeeds in demonstrating how Paul's exhortations depend
on the eschatological groundwork of the earlier argument. For instance, the
nine manifestations of the fruit of the Spirit listed in Galatians 5:22-23
align well with the eschatological hopes expressed in prophetic and Second
Temple texts. M. convincingly argues that, in this exhortative section, Paul
uses the term "flesh" (sarx) interchangeably with the Jewish Law, both
of which belong to the old age. In the new age, the appropriate way for
Spirit-filled believers—including the Gentile Galatians—to manifest their
possession of eschatological life is by participating in Christ's self-sacrificial
love (2:20; 5:14; 6:2), not by attempting to observe the Jewish Law, which,
Paul concluded, could not give the life it promised (3:21).

While readers may quibble with various exegetical details, M.'s survey
of the religious and cultural background of Paul's references to the Spirit
in Galatians is a worthy contribution to Pauline scholarship.
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**NEUE STUDIEN ZU DEN JOHANNEISCHEN SCHRIFFTEN.** By Johannes Beutler,
S.J. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 167. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht,

Beutler is a major figure in Johannine studies in Europe, but he is
perhaps less well known in the United States. This is unfortunate, because
he is a scholar with careful judgment and a remarkable grasp of the field of Johannine studies as well as other aspects of New Testament theology. His range of expertise is reflected in this collection of essays written since 2000. The majority of the essays were originally published in German, but five were published in English, two in Italian, and one in Spanish. This alone suggests remarkable erudition. (In the present collection 15 are in German and five are in English.)

A survey of the topics covered is another indicator of the range of B.'s interests and competence: Law and commandment in the Gospel and Letters* (* indicates article in German); the authorship and purpose of the Johannine writings*; the Johannine school*; the hermeneutic of the book of Revelation*; the identity of “the Jews” in the Gospel; Jesus' conflict with Jewish institutions reflected in chapters 5–12; the influence of the Synoptics on the Last Discourses in John; faith and confession in the Gospel; the “glory” of God and of humans*; the use of Psalm 82:6 in John 10:34–36*; the meaning of John 14:31*; Jesus' dialogue with Martha in John 11:20–27*; relecture in John 6*; new approach to John 21*; resurrection and forgiveness in John 21; on John 1:5*; on the prologue in general*; on the introduction to the last discourses*; on John 21:20–25*; and on John 11:16*.

B. is judicious and careful in his analysis. His discussion of the interpretation of Psalm 82 through the Septuagint, the NT, the Peschitta, and the rabbis is thorough and displays an obvious comfort with such wide-ranging literature. That same comfort and skill is evident in the way he confidently traverses the wide-ranging issues of the meaning of the verb kateabben through the various textual and translational traditions. It is not lip-service; it is genuine engagement. In terms of methods, B. makes use of relecture developed by Jean Zumstein, and is convinced that the Gospel has been influenced by the Synoptics. Both impact his interpretation.

Over the years, B. has devoted considerable effort to the study of the attitudes in the Gospel toward Judaism. (He published a book on the topic in 2006 and has been regularly involved in ecumenical discussions on the topic in both Germany and Israel.) In his current essay, B. makes use of narrative criticism’s helpful distinction between the “real reader” and the “implied reader.” He also calls attention to the necessary distinction between reading the Gospel as an isolated document and reading it in the canonical context of the remainder of the NT. B. suggests that it was very possible that the use of “the Jews” to refer to an authoritative subgroup within Judaism was still clear when the Gospel was read alone; but when read in a canonical context, the distinction would have been lost. I find this a helpful distinction and would completely agree.

One statement, however, puzzles me. B. comments that the “implied author is accessible to us, and we may suspect that he was already filled
with hate against ‘the Jews,’ even if he left us a work where a distinction between the Jewish people as a whole and the decisive group of its leaders could still be observed” (75). To use “hate” here seems to imply an attitude of extreme and undeserved negative emotion. I do not see that in the Gospel. Rather it seems to me that the attitude of the author is one of utter bafflement that the authoritative Jewish view could be one of rejection. The reader must also take into account John 16:2–3 (“But an hour is coming in which those who kill you will think they are giving worship to God. And they will do these things because they did not know the Father or me”). Such an attitude would be in keeping with the repeated assertions in the Jewish canon itself that Israel did not “know” Yahweh (e.g., Isa 1:2–4 says: “The ox knows its owner, and the donkey its master’s crib; but Israel does not know, my people do not understand”).

B. goes on to wrestle with the question of how to handle the ambiguous texts within the church today. However, B. (in my mind, rightly) insists that, while misinterpretation is all too easy, the text of the Gospel itself in its original meaning is not at fault, and the Gospel cannot be excluded from either the canon or from usage. Rather it must be explained properly as it would have been understood by the original reader and as intended by the original author in his historical context.

This review reflects just a sampling of B.’s contributions in the volume. If there is a shortcoming, it is that because some of the articles were written for dictionaries, we are not supplied with the depth of discussion or documentation that we might like and that we find in his the other studies. Also, it is an unfortunate reality that, because so many articles are in German, the appeal to some readers, at least among a more general readership, will be limited.
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Muriel Porter does not write from a disinterested point of view. Indeed, she clearly has an ax to grind, and even confesses that she is “obviously not able to report on Sydney objectively and even-handedly” (xv). Though a professional academic of the University of Melbourne, she has also for many years represented the Diocese of Melbourne on the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia and its Standing Committee (which transacts the business of the national Church between Synod settings). Given that this book traces the recent history of the engagement of the other 22 dioceses of the Australian Church with the Diocese of Sydney,