

section on liturgical theology. Embedded in the historical sections of the book, but also given its own separate chapter (chapter 12) is the topic of women and prayer. Chapter 13 lists the literature comparing early Jewish with early Christian liturgy. Compared to the earlier chapters, these chapters are relatively short, and appear at the end of the book—no necessary reflection of the author's personal perspective, but a sign of the historical perception of the field as “a subset of the study of rabbinic Judaism” (1) in general.

Clear and comprehensive summaries, annotations, and, where necessary, critiques accompany the mere listing of the books and articles.

This welcome volume is published primarily for a Christian readership interested in gaining a broad overview of Jewish liturgy. But it is a fruitful contribution for a variety of additional audiences as well: students and young scholars of rabbinic Judaism and Jewish liturgy, Jewish adult learning, and even autodidactic attempts to enter the academic field of Jewish prayer guided by an expert of the field who is uniquely able to balance scholarship with lucidity; someone also whose mastery of the various Jewish academic and religious perspectives is supplemented with familiarity with Christian liturgy too.

Moreover, as a bibliography reflecting up-to-date liturgical research, this book is a worthy addition not just for beginners and for Christians entering the field, but for Jewish scholars, too. First of all, the bibliography testifies to the rapid growth of the field. Second, the realignment of structure relative to Tabory's bibliography of the 1990s expresses an overall trend to expand the field in new and holistic ways. Jewish liturgy is coming of age as a focus in Jewish research; Langer is among the very few experts who are making it so; and her book is a guide to where the field is going.

Sonja K. Pilz  
Hebrew Union College, New York

*Christ's Gift, Our Response: Martin Luther and Louis-Marie Chauvet on the Connection between Sacraments and Ethics.* By Benjamin M. Durham. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2015. Pp. xviii + 162. \$24.95.

In his introduction, Durham says he wants “to build a new bridge across the Tiber (or at least to refurbish a neglected one) for theology in sacraments and ethics” (xi). Nor is the ecumenical bridge the only one crossed in this book; sacraments and ethics themselves still need stronger theological integration, and D. proves a nimble guide. The most significant outcome of D.'s volume is his demonstration that when sacraments and ethics are linked, dialogue between Lutherans and Roman Catholics can relativize disputed topics such as forensic justification and *ex opere operato* causality. This leads, in his last chapter, not only to important advances on the common ground of the theologians chosen to represent each tradition, but to nuancing, correcting, and enriching the theological contribution of each.

One difficulty with the project is the significant time and authority gap between the interpreters of each tradition. D. addresses this (and, some might argue, gives the game away) by approaching Martin Luther through the Finnish School of interpretation (xv). His care in explaining these distinctions, and in occasionally introducing other schools for comparison, allows a Roman Catholic reader such as myself to come away with a much stronger understanding of intra-Lutheran distinctions and the authority of Luther within the Lutheran churches.

Some Roman Catholic readers might also object to allowing Louis-Marie Chauvet to stand in for their tradition, but Chauvet's juxtaposition of sacraments and ethics has been influential in the thirty years since the publication of *Symbole et sacrement*. Like D.'s treatment of Lutheran theology, his treatment of Roman Catholic theology is nuanced and attentive to differences in method and content: he points for example to recent developments in Roman Catholic theology that are relevant to Luther's critiques, and he is similarly aware of debates about Chauvet's work.

D.'s strength is his ability to avoid overstating the overlap between these theological patterns, even while he points out paths to consensus and mutual strengthening. The first chapter contextualizes his work with respect to important developments in liturgy and ethics in the 20th century, and chapters 2 and 3 are then laser-focused on sacraments and ethics in Luther and Chauvet, respectively. In these two chapters, he carefully interprets these authors, holding as much as possible to the author's own purpose, although in Luther's case attending also to modern interpretations. He attends to the historical and pastoral purpose and context of Luther's theological work, which allows this Roman Catholic reader to appreciate its austerity. To match Luther's absolute passivity of the human person in the reception of grace, D. pulls out Chauvet's consent to the mediation of the body and of the church, while noting critiques.

In the final chapter, D. argues that it is both more faithful to these thinkers and more useful to see them as constructive critiques: alternate models that arrive at some of the same conclusions on sacraments and ethics despite widely divergent theological anthropologies. In the end, passivity and consent should not be harmonized; rather, the strengths and weaknesses of each should be balanced against ecclesial and personal considerations.

There are two especially important theological moves in this chapter. The first, which should be noted by readers of Chauvet whether they are interested in Luther and Chauvet's theological ethics or not, is a significant critique of Chauvet's anthropology. In his antipathy to individualism, D. argues, Chauvet inadvertently leaves out any definition of the subject that could allow for resistance to institutional corruption or myopia. The second is D.'s insight that both Luther and Chauvet offer their sacramental theology as a pastoral response to particular failings, and so their models for Christian ethics may be more judicious or less based on the scrupulosity of their audience (132–34). In both cases, D. argues that conversation between these theological models keeps either from becoming unbalanced.

D. makes an important contribution to the ongoing discussion about the relationship between liturgy and ethics, and provides us with a worthy exemplar of the

receptivity of ecumenical efforts that strain beyond consensus. D.'s care in introducing his conversation partners makes the book accessible to readers, undergraduate and up, new to sacramental theology, liturgy, ethics, or ecumenism, but it is a must-read for those interested in these fields.

Kimberly Hope Belcher  
University of Notre Dame

*Prophecy without Contempt: Religious Discourse in the Public Square.* By Cathleen Kaveny. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2016. Pp. viii + 451 \$49.95.

This is a path-breaking book about religious discourse, especially in the form of prophetic indictment—its legitimacy and proper role or abuse in political and religious discourse. Kaveny reviews the work of Alasdair MacIntyre, John Rawls, Stephen Carter, and John Murray Cuddihy on civil or political discourse and moral deliberation. MacIntyre argued that deliberative discourse demanded a well-functioning moral tradition with an account of human nature as it is and a case for the role of virtue. He claimed it was impossible to justify moral precepts based solely on the passions, reason alone, or the will. Most modern moral deliberative discourse relies on a rights-based approach or arguments from utility. K. notes that MacIntyre does not have any role for prophetic indictment as having a legitimate, if limited, role in political discourse and moral deliberation.

Rawls presents a liberal account of justice and public reason, an argument for justice as fairness. Rawls tended to assume that all accounts, even those stemming from a religious base, must use “public reason” in their deliberations of the public forum. This demand can stifle real views and reasons of why people act (they may, in fact, really act for religious and not secular reasons). Rawls’s account could involve a kind of discrimination against religion. Like MacIntyre, Rawls does not give any account of prophetic or moral indictment. Some arguments in the public sphere about abortion, euthanasia and earlier about the abolition of slavery do or did use religious or prophetic arguments, in forms that were rhetorically uncivil. Carter and Cuddihy look to the constraints of civility in public deliberations. But, in fact, their concern for civility can act as a distraction from genuine truth-telling.

K. takes up the long tradition in America of prophetic discourse, found among the Puritans in the so-called American jeremiad. MacIntyre, Rawls, Carter, and Cuddihy seemed to assume that all public moral claims are based solely on moral argument and deliberation, or that substance could be separated from form so that any moral claim can be reframed in a civil respectful manner. But the jeremiad was not a moral “argument” as such. It was a kind of indictment. Initially, the jeremiad depended on a covenant theology which described God’s freely chosen pattern of behavior toward the New England Puritans who identified with Israel. Jeremiads indicted those who failed the covenant on what was, at that time, a widely acknowledged law which all should recognize. The jeremiad is a stylized complaint for breaches of the covenant. Most