

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 apparently 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](https://doi.org/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

down, half-opened eyes watching blood pouring from his hands into the vessel beneath. The crimson blood then saturates the bottom half of the book cover, where the title is announced: *Material Eucharist*. Before even opening the book, we know that this monograph will take seriously three things: the centrality of Christ, the messy material stuff of life and the integral relationship between the two.

Grumett follows through admirably on the promise of the cover, offering a wide-ranging constructive theological investigation of the eucharist rooted in attention to materiality, an oddly neglected theme in contemporary eucharistic theology. To begin, he attends closely to the materiality of bread and wine: to the natural and cultural processes that shape these material products used in eucharistic rituals. Even in natural and human cultural processes, Grumett argues that the presence of Christ is already at work. There is no corner of creation that is not always already animated by the living Christ. He rejects any secular materialism that presents 'matter and its products as self-sufficient and self-sustaining' (p. 4). His exploration of 'material elements' is not biological or anthropological, but relies primarily on patristic and medieval interpretations of grain, salt, oil, water, leaven, grape and vine, drawing out layers of symbolic interpretation of these ingredients. Thus does Grumett evoke the 'transformative, spiritual, and sacramental character of all natural objects', a universal character of the created order which is fulfilled in the eucharist (p. 70).

Chapter 2 turns to embodied liturgical actions. Like many liturgical theologians of the past few decades, Grumett argues that we need to pay more attention to actions, not just texts, to appreciate the fullness of the eucharist. Notable in this chapter is his appeal to allegorical interpretation of the liturgy (from his ample use of patristic and medieval writings). Despite critiques from theologians like Alexander Schmemmann, who derided the Western tendency toward excessive allegory, Grumett argues for the power of allegory to nurture materialist appreciation for the presence of Christ in the eucharistic elements. As liturgical actions become symbols for events in the life of Christ, or for events in the heavenly realm, worshippers are drawn to participate in both the earthly life of Jesus and eternal worship in heaven.

Following these opening chapters, Grumett goes on to describe a fully trinitarian vision of the eucharist as a primary site where Christ is at work drawing all things to himself. He explores, in turn, creation and preservation (in which Christ is the 'bond of creation'), incarnation and reconciliation (in which Christ is substantially present in the eucharistic elements, but also overflows those elements to be present in the entire world), and resurrection

by the power of the Spirit (by which each communicant receives the risen Christ and is received into the body of Christ). The epilogue presents this concise summary of the project: 'In the Eucharist, the bread and the wine are transformed into [Christ's] flesh and blood, and taken into the material flesh and blood of believers, who are in turn assimilated into the flesh and blood of the Christ whom they consume. By means of physical proximity and assimilation, whether at the altar or in the wider social world, this flesh and this blood thereby draw believers, whether living, departing, or at rest, into the life of Christ' (p. 299).

A self-identified 'Anglican with Roman Catholic leanings', Grumett relies heavily on patristic and medieval sources as well as liturgical practices from Christian traditions that have set texts and rubrics. His command of such liturgical sources is impressive: Catholic, Anglican and Lutheran, and wide varieties of Orthodox and other Eastern churches from early centuries to the present. Even so, for readers from traditions with more freedom in liturgical expression, the lack of attention to such contemporary eucharistic practices feels restrictive, with little attention to Presbyterian and Reformed practices until the final chapter, no mention of Baptists and virtually no engagement of Pentecostalism. Having said this, as a Reformed theologian I celebrate that when Grumett does turn attention to Calvin's eucharistic theology, he presents a lucid and helpful account that shows how Calvin's strong eucharistic pneumatology might enrich both Catholic and Lutheran interpretations.

This volume offers a compelling vision of the whole creation, in all its fleshly mess, dynamically drawn into the risen body of Christ, singing out in glory to God. In this way, Grumett resonates with Gerard Manley Hopkins' radiant vision in 'As Kingfishers Catch Fire':

. . . Each mortal thing does one thing and the same:
Deals out that being indoors each one dwells;
Selves – goes itself; myself it speaks and spells,
Crying *What I do is me: for that I came.*
I say more: the just man justices;
Keeps grace: that keeps all his goings graces;
Acts in God's eye what in God's eye he is –
Christ – for Christ plays in ten thousand places . . .

As for Hopkins, so too for Grumett, 'each mortal thing' attests not only to itself, to its own individual materiality, but (by the Spirit) to the Christ who creates, sustains and animates the whole material cosmos. For a world so often bereft of any sense of sacramentality, it is a hopeful vision indeed.

Martha Moore-Keish

Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, GA 30030

Moore-KeishM@ctsnet.edu

doi:[10.1017/S0036930617000461](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0036930617000461)

Lydia Schumacher, *Theological Philosophy: Rethinking the Rationality of Christian Faith* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), pp. xi + 210. £60.00.

The meanings of ‘quest for certainty’ and ‘Cartesian anxiety’ (Richard Bernstein) are both familiar and thoroughly outdated. Recognition that the rationalities and confidences sustaining modern moral vocabularies/convictions are in ruins, presciently unveiled by Alasdair MacIntyre, now reflects common opinion. Today avant-garde French intellectuals appeal to St Paul and quest after ethical universals. Alive to the spiritual poverty of modern Western rationality, self-proclaimed atheists are writing *Religion without God* (Ronald Dworkin), *The Faith of the Faithless* (Simon Critchely) and *Waking Up: Spirituality without Religion* (Sam Harris).

The very meaning of rationality is currently an open question. The modern background consensus that made appeal to ontological, teleological and cosmological proofs interesting and accusations of ‘fideism’ devastating has collapsed. Insofar as mainstream modern Western rationality is intrinsically hostile to faith as reasonable, the collapse of the modern consensus is societally fraught – emotivism, stereotyping, special pleading and enthusiasm (intolerance) are widespread even in universities – even as it provides an opening and makes clear the serious need for rigorous specifications of reasonable faith. Dismissals of faith remain common among intellectual elites, but they are now rooted in caricature and moral offence (which itself remains ungrounded), and while they remain socio-politically powerful they are conceptually anaemic. The upshot is a revolutionary context for ‘rethinking the rationality of Christian faith’, to which Schumacher’s *Theological Philosophy* makes a creative and significant contribution. (Note: *Theological Philosophy* builds upon Schumacher’s *Rationality as Virtue: Towards a Theological Philosophy* (Ashgate, 2015) and anticipates a ‘Trinitarian philosophy’.)

Accepting virtue epistemology’s recognition that even modern rationality, purportedly disengaged, dispassionate and value-free, surreptitiously depends upon the virtuousness of inquirers and communities of inquiry, and building upon Reformed epistemology’s insistence that certain theological concepts are properly basic, Schumacher appropriates Thomas Aquinas, whose pre-modern thought is in these respects congruent with virtue ethics and Reformed epistemology, and formulates a powerful apology for faith