

*Liturgy & Theology: Economy and Reality.* By Nathan G. Jennings. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2017. xii + 150 pp. \$21.00 (pb).

Nathan Jennings has written a demanding work of liturgical theology that is immensely satisfying. He stands in what Michael B. Aune called “the Schmemmann-Kavanagh-Fagerberg-Lathrop line of liturgical theology,” and yet manages to make a trailblazing contribution to the next generation, all while in dialogue with the critics of the Schmemmann line (Aune, Paul Bradshaw, and Maxwell Johnson). And the results are brilliant.

In the dense introduction, Jennings argues that liturgy is *theo-logical*, but not in the ways we have come to describe it. “The earliest economic contexts of this word, *liturgy*, is [*sic*] a boon to liturgical theology, for God the Father offers the sacrifice of his Son on the altar of the earth as the ‘public service’ that benefits the city of God” (p. 21). The focus is entirely on the *Theos* of theology, on the *object* of worship and not the worshipers. Liturgical theology is an “economic anagogy, where liturgy is taken as an example of human economic behavior” and “theology is defined as anagogy, a particular kind of analogical discourse” (p. 1). The latter claim stands in the long tradition that assumes the vast otherness of God whereby Aquinas begins, “Since we cannot know what God is like. . . .” Because of this ontological distance, we must speak by way of “pattern recognition.” This means that while our speech about God is metaphorical, it is not *merely* that. Analogical speech is “not imagined, or invented” but discovered. Thus, “analogical discourse is metaphor that discloses ontology,” which makes it apocalyptic and revelatory (p. 4).

Jennings goes further than Chauvet in his appropriation of gift economy. Theologically, “God is a gift to God’s self in the life of the Holy Trinity,” while “our existence as creatures is a donation of being from God” that we, in turn, return to God as a “living sacrifice” (Rom. 12:1–5). Liturgy is “nested” within these prior realities by analogy, a distinct and yet ontologically participatory cultic act that participates in and expresses these two prior levels (p. 16). Thus, “each level of reality can be concrete, isolable, and possessed of its own divine granted integrity,” while each simultaneously shares in the other (p. 17). His claim is that liturgy is “an organic analogue of reality,” a particular “economic anagogy” (p. 22) that actually makes possible participation in the economy of God, and most especially that of God in Christ, the “*leitorgos* in the sanctuary and the true tent” (Heb. 8:2).

Jennings then spins out this thesis in four chapters: each takes a particular definition of theology and combines it with “a particular liturgical economy” in order to construct a richly textured and theologically verdant liturgical theology. Chapter 1 takes theology as the Triune God and describes “liturgy as the cosmic economy of God,” that is, liturgy as the house of God. In chapter 2, theology as the Incarnate Word “describes liturgy as

the sacrifice of Jesus, providing a liturgical soteriology.” In chapter 3, theology as contemplation of mystery allows us to see liturgy as “mystical initiation” into the divine economy. In chapter 4, theology is figural interpretation of Scripture where liturgy “figures” the participants: “The sacrifice of Isaac ritually enacts [that is, *anticipates*] the paschal mystery before the Mosaic covenant will provide a temple-sacrificial system of substitution to do so for the corporate body of Israel,” while the rites of the new covenant *recall* the paschal mystery. The rites of both covenants, he argues, “participate, equally and fully.” This is what Jesus means when he says, “Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see My day, and he saw it and was glad” (John 8:56 NASB). The chapters are organized according to the object (chapters 1–2), method (3), and principle source (4) of theology.

One might ask, which liturgy? Can and should “liturgy” be abstracted from the particulars, whether kinds of rites (eucharistic, divine office, burial) or ritual families? This has been an issue with the Schmemann strain, which Bradshaw and Aune have noted. But what distinguishes Jennings is that there is a particularity to his conclusions in each chapter that make its application to specific liturgies quite natural. It also has the added strength of being able to identify the theological weakness of particular rites. For example, if he applied this to the communion rite in the 1552 BCP, it would be clear that it intentionally lacks characteristics that would allow it to be an anagogue of divine reality.

This is a book to be contemplated. Its audience inclines toward the graduate school classroom and those with theological and liturgical proficiency. But given the Reality of which liturgy is an anagogue, this is not a criticism. Jennings has positioned himself as one of the key voices in the next generation of liturgical scholarship and he deserves a wide readership.

MATTHEW S. C. OLVER

*Nashotah House Theological Seminary*  
*Nashotah, Wisconsin*

*God's Two Words: Law and Gospel in the Lutheran and Reformed Traditions.* Edited by Jonathan A. Linebaugh. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018. xii + 260 pp. \$35.00 (pb).

This is the first book I read in 2019, and it will undoubtedly be one I consult time and again. The volume derives from a 2016 conference that brought Lutherans and Reformed into fresh dialogue on a topic of no little contention. The gathering of these seminal expressions of Protestantism, as