JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVES ON THE JEWISHNESS OF JESUS


This book brings together a cohort of Jewish and Christian scholars with a view to exploring what the study of the Jewishness of Jesus can contribute to the complexities of 'Jewishness,' sensitive to the ideological bent of the biblical texts and their modern interpreters, and genuinely concerned for the promotion of mutual understanding and harmonious relationships between Jews and Christians.

The contributors are well aware of the socio-religious complexities of 'Jewishness,' sensitive to the ideological bent of the biblical texts and their modern interpreters, and genuinely concerned for the promotion of mutual understanding and harmonious relationships between Jews and Christians. Bayer shows how certain aspects of Hamann's thought and his desire to reclaim a theology of reason and Mendelsohn's sociology. Chapters eleven and twelve see Bayer elucidate Hamann's theories on marriage and sex and his theory of created time.

This work and its translation are celebrated because Bayer lucidly presents the infamously and nearly inaccessible thought of Hamann for a much wider audience. Although Bayer's work is a splendid introduction to the life and thought of Hamann it is not for all readers as a thorough knowledge of Enlightenment philosophy is required to navigate the terminology and argumentative references. Hence, it is a good upper-level undergraduate text and a potential starting-point for further in-depth research. Its chief strength lies in Bayer's exegesis of Hamann's chief writings as they relate to his contemporary interlocutors, especially how Bayer interprets Hamann's intellectual affluence to the Bible and other contemporary publications. Of special interest is where Bayer shows how certain aspects of Hamann's Lutheranism influence his thought across a variety of subjects. A few minor weaknesses are that the translator's epilogue would be better suited as a prologue to provide even more socio-historical-intellectual information about Hamann and his context, and that a subject index would be appreciated for ease of study.
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Jewishness of Jesus and highlight the differences that have emerged between the two religious traditions. Though they willingly recognize the various points of contact and family resemblances that exist between the two communities. All in all, a stimulating account of the significance of Jesus' Jewishness and how to negotiate a way passed a history of Christian anti-Semitism that has shaped readings of biblical texts.
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THE NON-CANONICAL GOSPELS AND JOHN

J. Andrew Dooley, What was Mark for Matthew? An Examination of Matthew's Relationship and Attitude to his Primary Source WUNT 2.344 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013. €60.00. pp. xvi + 221. ISBN: 978-3-16-152536-0).

The question of Matthew's relationship to his sources is one that has occupied scholarship on the first gospel for well over a century. Frequently portrayed as 'the most Jewish of the gospels' Mark has struck many as an enigma. It is to these perennial issues that Doole turns his attention in this monograph.

In his thesis statement, Dooley articulates his desire to demonstrate 'the proximity and loyalty of Matthew to Mark' (p. 10), and that 'Mark's Gospel was Matthew's gospel,' and consequently that 'Matthew thus succeeds Mark and confirms it as the central text in the growing Christian movement' (p. 12). Chapter 2, dealing with Matthew's sources, Doole makes the undetailed statement that 'Mark is without doubt Matthew's principle source' (p. 15). If by this he simply means his largest or most extensive source, then his statement is correct. However, perhaps in a more fundamental way the Q source should be viewed as Matthew's principle source. There are reasons to believe that Matthew and his community had lived with, and absorbed the traditions in the sayings source over a longer period of time. If this were the case, then the Q document might be correctly regarded as Matthew's principle source. Doole himself sees that Matthew rearranges the ordering of some Q material under the influence of (p. 32), which perhaps suggests a complex relationship between the two major sources for the first evangelist. However, Doole's purpose is to rebut suggestions that Q exerted a greater gravitational pull on Matthew than Mark.

To this end he first seeks to show the proximity of Matthew to Mark. For Doole, Q is incorporated into the Markan framework because 'it provides a first-hand record of Jesus' teaching' (p. 79). Second, Matthew is seen as creating a new edition of Mark. Primarily this is seen as being exhibited through the retention of the majority of Markan traditions and the fact that his 'rearrangement of Mark is minimal' (p. 128). In the fifth chapter Matthew is portrayed as a conventional scribe. Matthew's reliance and faithfulness to Mark are seen as indicative of the fact that Q remained within the Markan tradition as a conventional editor of this central Christian text' (p. 174). In the end, answering the research question 'what was Mark for Matthew?', Dooley views Mark as being seen by the first evangelist as 'the only authoritative account worthy of study and one fast becoming a central religious text' (p. 194).

While Doole is certainly correct that Mark was a work of central importance for Matthew, and a text that presented Matthew with a rich theological resource, the very process of integrating other source material into the Markan narrative perhaps means that Mark is a more radical enterprise than this study suggests. Moreover, the basic supposition that Mark was Matthew's principle source may only be true at one level. At a deeper level the Q material may have had a longer pedigree for Matthew and his community. If so, Matthew may be affirming the new perspectives of Mark, and yet not wishing to dispense with the old treasures of the repository of Jesus traditions that he and his community treasured. Doole presents an interesting proposal, but in the end it does not appear fully attuned to the complexities of Matthean compositional practices, and perhaps is driven too strongly by the desire to make Matthew a good Mark Christian.