

combine to inform the “portrayal of the main protagonist Jerusalem: a gendered, personified city who *feels*.”

To offer some words on *future directions* is entirely in keeping with the subject matter and theoretical orientation of Mylonas’ book. It is also a requirement of my task as reviewer. To avoid any sense that such inputs be construed as criticism, I will limit myself to the following observations. Mylonas is correct to identify the personified city with the exiled Judahites. However, in interrogating how the suggestive, salacious, and often crude metaphors are deployed within the text, the weight of analysis is decidedly on how the personified Jerusalem feels rather than how any Judahite is required to feel about it. The distinction is no casuistic sleight of hand for within the narrative world of Ezekiel 16 the various “thick descriptions” are purposefully designed to elicit emotive responses and related acts of reflection and conversion on the part of an attentive audience. In this *fourth space* where concepts of place and time are intersecting productivities, the narrative of Ezekiel 16 forces contemplation as to which of the possible conceived and/or lived spaces can constitute “home.” An appreciation of the necessarily incomplete character of narrative presentation raises a question around the logic of Mylonas’s appeal to Mary Douglas’s fundamentally binary logic of clean::unclean and/or wholeness::holiness. Mylonas’s adoption of Douglas is both measured and circumspect. However, the central premise she chooses to leverage, that of the body as a “symbol of society,” partially resurrects the discredited thesis of Durkheim and Mauss that symbolic systems mirror social realities. What is more, it serves to prioritise and privilege the validity of one theological/anthropological outlook; one where notions of boundary represent the point at which something should stop, and not, as Heidegger once opined, the point from which something might begin. Critical spatiality, and the opportunities it affords to explore and affirm alterity risk collapse in the face of a binary choice and a singular future.

This is a book I thoroughly enjoyed, and which I wholeheartedly recommend. It evidences a critical engagement with a complex series of fields communicated in an accessible manner. It is rich in its analysis, rigorous in its findings, and reflective on its own conclusions: a welcome blend in an emerging scholar. I commend the author on bringing the volume to publication and look forward to further opportunities to engage with her work.

DERMOT A NESTOR  
Australian Catholic University

MARY L. COLOE, *John 1–10*, Wisdom Commentary 44A (Collegeville, MN.: Liturgical Press, 2021). Pp. lxxx + 304. Hardcover. US\$49.99.

---

Part one of a two-part commentary in the Wisdom Series from Liturgical Press, this is a lifetime’s work crystallised into one perfect moment. As with her earlier work (*God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* [2001]),

also with Liturgical Press, Coloe makes use of the narrative critical form of interpretation to decode the layers of Johannine symbolism. In this gambit she is aided with her extensive knowledge of the literary structure of GJn (Gospel of John) and cross references the Wisdom Literature of the intertestamental period, especially Sirach and Wisdom. Coloe assumes the existence of a community of believers, at one and the same time, tied to and resisting its own Jewish background. She provides a balanced and learned view on Jewish festivals and traditions that form the backdrop for the ministry of Jesus and the reactions to him that his ministry prompts from the crowds who follow him at first.

One of Coloe's main interlocutors is Ruth Sheridan and her work on the scriptures in GJn delving into the concept of anti-Judaism in the FG (Fourth Gospel; see Ruth Sheridan, *Retelling Scripture: "The Jews" and the Scriptural Citations in John 1:19–12:15*. BIS 110 [Leiden: Brill, 2012]). Her commentary makes use of the NRSV translation with her own helpful translation notes included and many helpful supplements from other noted Johannine scholars, such as Sandra Schneiders on "Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel" and Dorothy Lee on "Abiding in the Fourth Gospel."

Ever a feminist, Coloe focuses on the final form on John, avoiding the pitfalls of previous commentaries, without neglecting the complexity of the compositional history of GJn. The incarnate *Logos*, is presented as embodied *Sophia*, pitching his tent among humanity (John 1:1, 14). Indeed, Coloe's benevolence to GJn is marked in her response to Adele Rhinehartz's work—*Cast out of the Covenant: Jews and Anti-Judaism in John* (Lanham MD: Lexington, 2018)—Coloe proposes that rather than responding to a division in the community, the writer of the FG is forcing a division in the community (see especially 226 and 245). Further, when GJn is used for harm, Coloe contends that this is due the inadequate readings of the text. She explores and questions the "dominant male language for God and Jesus in ways that open new possibilities for egalitarian practice" (xlx). In this way, the gendered elements of the Gospel are interrogated, and careful consideration is given to characterisation of the Johannine women (the named, unnamed, and assumed—see especially 134–35 on the assumed mother of 4:43–54).

At the beginning of each chapter Coloe provides Wisdom texts that echo within the chapter of John and she keeps the reader attuned to the Wisdom motif of the commentary by calling Jesus "Sophia" or "Jesus/Sophia" throughout. In her opinion, the FG conceals the gendered binary of male and female. There is never any doubt about Jesus being male, but as Sophia "the incarnation destroys dualistic views of spirit/matter, male/female" (13). The very fact of the incarnation is evidence of God's own character which explains the unconditional positive regard the FG writers has for his female characters. However, Coloe uses binary terms male/female interchangeably with masculine/feminine leaving no room for those who cannot embrace this binary. Assertions that "all" includes women and men do little and risks continued isolation for the slaves and children

in the Gospel. Post-colonial and childist studies on the FG are few enough and Coloe could have given them a voice. Further, in gender studies male/female are used to refer to biological sex and masculine/feminine are gendered performance and presentation. One can be biological male and perceived by others as female. This would open a discussion of Jesus' characterisation by GJn as Sophia challenging genderised norms irrespective of his biological sex. Yet, is this perhaps too harsh? Her presentation of Jesus/Sophia is, itself, non-binary and encourages the reader to broaden their horizon.

The commentary is accessible without being a “dumbed-down” text. As a teacher with over 30 years' experience, Coloe's commentary will ably facilitate the work of both undergraduate and postgraduate learners and is a welcome addition to the ever-expanding world of Johannine studies.

DEBRA SNODDY

Catholic Institute of Sydney, Sydney College of Divinity

MARY L. COLOE, *John 11–21*, Wisdom Commentary 44B (Collegeville, MN.: Liturgical Press, 2021). Pp. 313–600. Hardcover. US\$49.95.

---

In the second volume of her commentary on the Gospel of John, Coloe continues as an authoritative interpreter using the wealth of the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period to guide the reader through the final stages of the Johannine journey. She explains the parallels between the Johannine text and the Wisdom literature, how John 13:1–3 (the prologue to Jesus's hour) echoes Proverbs 9:1 (Sophia's banquet); how in John 14 we hear Jesus speaking the words of Sophia (Wisdom 9:9–10). In John 15 the figurative language and images of Sophia lie behind Jesus's house and friends. As Woman Wisdom (Wisdom 7:27) Jesus prays for those who come to believe through him and how this brings them into friendship with God.

Coloe investigates the chiasmic structures of the farewell/final discourse and her summaries of the historical context of cultural elements such as the foot-washing are learned without being burdensome. Gems of intertextuality are used to highlight what the Johannine author received from the Wisdom texts—in John 14 she notes that, “Sophia describes herself as a terebinth and a vine” (418) an allusion to Sirach 24:16–17 and to the wider context of the OT where Israel was the vineyard of the LORD. She differentiates between *oikos* (house) *oikia* (household) and the relation to the temple, no doubt making use of her earlier esteemed volume *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN.: Liturgical, 2001).

One detail more than any other, forced me to rethink my own understanding of Golgotha. Her detailed discussion of the use of gardens in the Hour of Jesus highlighting the placement of the cross “in the middle” of the garden is transformative for narrative interpretation. Coloe highlights its relation to the second