

Georg Hamann at the University of Tübingen presented to its various faculties; and with this translation the English-speaking world now has an accessible entryway into Hamann's thought and life. Bayer structures the work topically with the majority of the work demonstrating how Hamann critically interacted with his contemporaries, which serves Bayer's central thesis that Hamann was a 'radical enlightener.'

The introduction and chapters one through four set out Hamann's life situation, which emphasizes his intellectual milieu of Königsberg at the height of the Enlightenment, the form and style of his writings, the influence of Lutheranism (especially the *communicatio idiomatum*) on Hamann's thought and his desire to reclaim a theology of nature as a necessary part of his enterprise of reparative reasoning. Chapters five through ten see Bayer exposit Hamann's intellectual interactions with and criticisms of Herder's anthropology and political ideology (including the policies of Frederick the Great of Prussia), Kant's philosophy of reason and language, Lessing's historicizing 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 indirect allusions 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.

BRADLEY M. PENNER  
School of Divinity, University of Edinburgh

### JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVES ON THE JEWISHNESS OF JESUS

Bruce Chilton, Anthony Le Donne, and Jacob Neusner (eds), *Soundings in the Religion of Jesus: Perspectives and Methods in Jewish and Christian Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012. \$32.99. pp. xix + 268. ISBN: 978-0-8006-9801-1).

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 inter-religious dialogue between Jew and Christians. The volume proceeds in four sections including: (1) The New Testament Jesus and Exclusionary Boundaries; (2) Early Jewish and Gentile Perspectives on Jesus; and (3) Jesus Research before and after German National Socialism; and (4) Jesus in Jewish-Christian Dialogue.

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. In some instances, the literary and historical analysis of the texts, like Michael Cook's treatment of Mark's portrayal of the Jewish leaders and Eyal Regev's denial that Jesus was a messianic claimant, look a little skewed towards a particular view more conducive to positive inter-faith relations. However, several chapters stand out for their summation of technical issues and suggestions for future directions, such as Leonard Greenspoon's chapter on the pros and cons of translating 'Jesus' and 'the Jews' in modern Bibles and the trio of essays by Anthony Le Donne, Dagmar Winter, and Gerd Theissen on ideological perspectives in modern Jesus research. Responses to the essays are offered by James Dunn and Amy-Jill Levine respectively, who weigh the merits of each particular contribution. Finally, in the conclusion, Bruce Chilton and Jacob Neusner press beyond the

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.

MICHAEL F. BIRD  
Ridley Theological College, Melbourne

### THE NON-CANONICAL GOSPELS AND JOHN

J. Andrew Doole, *What was Mark for Matthew? An Examination of Matthew's Relationship and Attitude to his Primary Source* WUNT 2.344 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013. €69,00. 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' Matthew's use of what is seen as pro-Gentile Mark has struck many as being an enigma. It is to these perennial issues that Doole turns his attention in this monograph.

In his thesis statement, Doole 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). In chapter 2, dealing with Matthew's sources, Doole makes the undefended 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 Markan material under the influence of Q (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 he 'remains 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?', Doole 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 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.

PAUL FOSTER  
School of Divinity, University of Edinburgh