discusses friendship with God and neighbour, and forbearance. All belong in the same family of virtues but his claim is that tolerance belongs to justice, with friendship and forbearance belonging to charity. And here is the core of the book. It is about participation in democratic societies. Bowlin's move is to resist any improper confusion of the foundational virtues of justice and love, implying that boundaries – albeit permeable – must be heeded. Thus the formal distinction between tolerance and forbearance arises when we consider the different ends their acts are ordered to achieve (p. 214).

Like the modern discourse on rights that finds no exact parallel in the ancient world in terms of rights that inhere in individual human beings qua human beings, the virtue of tolerance is not identical to classical theological treatments of friendship, forbearance or, we might add, magnanimity. Neither, of course, are our socio-economic and political contexts the same as classical or medieval contexts. Bowlin is concerned about not shutting down democratic debate (p. 203). The challenge, of course, is that democratic freedom is 'just another word for cockfighting' (p. 243). Bowlin's response is to ask whether or when an injustice is committed if certain freedoms are denied, and what pertains to the common good. The issue at the heart of the book is the relation between justice and love in the divinely created natural order. Readers are invited to accept that, in modern democratic societies, tolerance should be regarded as a portion of love's political work, not to be confused with prodigality of the loves of friendship and patient endurance beyond the proximate ends of citizenship (p. 249).

This is one of the few books during the course of reading which I changed my mind. Having started where the book starts, with problems associated with tolerance, I came to accept that the virtue of magnanimity (which is how many of the patristic writers would have tackled such issues) does not suffice today. Bowlin's claim is innovative and *Tolerance among the Virtues* sustains the ends of love and justice in a healthy tension – and with a writing style of uncommon élan. The demands of justice in modern, pluralistic, democratic societies require ventures such as this.

Esther D. Reed
University of Exeter, Amory Building, Exeter EX4 4RJ
E.D.Reed@exeter.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0036930617000448

Akiva Cohen: *Matthew and the Mishnah* (Tübingen: Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe 418, 2016), pp. xix + 636. €119.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0036930617000448 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The aim of this book is not to shed light upon Matthew or special Matthean pericopes from the Mishnah or the other way round. It tackles a more general research question: how did Matthew, on the one hand, and the Mishnah on the other – two sources representing Jewish groups that postdate the Second Temple era – react to the destruction of the temple in Jerushalem, the cultic and religious centre of ancient Judaism? The author's answer to this question is somewhat predictable (which is not a disadvantage): Matthew identified the new centre of Israel's religion in the death and resurrection of Jesus, the Mishnah in a narrative cosmos of remembrance pertaining, among other things, to the temple cult (cf. pp. 491–531).

Not every researcher will share Cohen's view that the Gospel of Matthew primarily represents a Jewish group; however, it is not atypical in recent research, and he is careful to situate his own thesis within the recent debate, demonstrating familiarity with far more than merely the English literature (pp. 32–222). He dismisses a dating of Matthew before 70 (Hagner) and tends to share Sim's view, who places Matthew at the beginning of the second century (pp. 40–59). Contra Bauckham, who casts doubt upon the common view that the Gospels were adressed to special communities and regards them as directed to a catholic audience, Cohen defends the concept of a distinct Matthean group as the original context of the Gospel of Matthew (pp. 89–99). He labels this community 'the Mattheans' and defines them as a Pharisaic faction that had begun to separate itself from mainstream Pharisaism because of its distinctive view that Yeshua ben David was the decisive event of the history of Israel. Although later absorbed into mainstream gentile Christianity, the Mattheans were originally a specific variety of Judaism – not Jewish Christianism (a term which would presuppose Christianity as genus and Judaism as species) (pp. 100–23).

Concerning the Mishnah, Cohen follows new tendencies in research to relativise the influence of the rabbinic movement in early Judaism and to separate it more clearly from Pharisaism and the synagogues than does the traditional view. The history of its legal traditions is discussed, as well as its history of redaction, but Cohen is mainly interested in the ideology of its final redaction which he – following the *opinio communis* – associates with Jehuda Ha-Nasi (cf. pp. 328–76).

Among the strengths of this book are the author's detailed discussions of recent research debates; what sometimes comes up short is his own view. This pertains, for example, to the ten Matthean passages he analyses (pp. 223–316), including the pericope about the three temptations of Jesus (Matt 4:1–11) where the temple is mentioned in the second temptation (Matt 4:6). Here he follows without any debate the majority view that Matthew presents the original order of events (Luke has the temple scene

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0036930617000448 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as the last temptation: Luke 4:9–13) (cf. p. 227). What about the option that Matthew has changed the sequence of temptations? Claiming Matthew to be the more traditional author in this case would possibly imply that he did not have the temptation associated with the temple very much in his focus but merely took it over.

I would also have liked to read more about why Cohen's Mattheans are necessarily Pharisees. Where does the author/redactor of the Gospel (let us call him 'Matthew') label himself or something like his group as Pharisees? Perhaps he regards himself as a scribe (cf. Matt 13:52; 23:34), but is a scribe necessarily a Pharisee?

Research tends to ascribe to 'Matthew' quite specific historical contexts, sometimes locating him in regions which are not well known to have been inhabited by Christians in antiquity (e.g. Galilee; cf. the discussion on pp. 83–6), sometimes contextualising him in a 'community' marked by a fairly distinct theological profile and, nowadays, increasingly, labelling him as 'Jewish' rather than 'Christian'. Yet, are these theories probable with regard to what would soon become the standard Gospel of diverse Jesus believers all over the world? Among its first readers may have been, as Cohen himself states (p. 57), Ignatius, who already differentiates Ἰουδαισμός and Χριστιανισμός (Mg 10:3; Phld 6:1); no miracle, I would assume – already Paul could take over an *extra muros* perspective pertaining to a non-Jesus-believing Jewish majority (1 Thess 2:14–16). Perhaps there existed something like Christianity in antiquity, an identifiable international, quasi-ethnic entity, more separate from the Jewish mainstream than postmodernity allows (if it allows Judaism at all) and sometimes – astonishingly – prone to agree on something (e.g. reading the Gospel of Matthew)? I am not sure; I could be misled by some ancient texts (nothing of major relevance compared to the huge research debate). Wherever the Gospel of Matthew originated, it apparantly has taken over sources of different regional origins and displays an international perspective, at least at its very end. Should we label it a catholic Gospel?

Jan Dochhorn
Durham University, Abbey House, Palace Green, Durham DH1 3RS
jan.dochhorn@durham.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S003693061700045X

David Grumett, *Material Eucharist* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. xi + 322. £75.00.

The cover of David Grumett's book immediately captures the viewer's attention: Christ's emaciated body on a cross-shaped winepress, head bent

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0036930617000448 Published online by Cambridge University Press