
As an ethnographic project in practical theology, Dunlap’s book provides valuable insight into the religious experiences, beliefs, and practices of people she encountered through her ministry and work at Urban Ministries of Durham (UMD), a public homeless shelter in North Carolina. In this book rooted in the specificity of the UMD community, Dunlap allows the tensions between theology as taught in seminaries and as expressed by people experiencing the most extreme poverty to generate important questions for ministry and practical theology.

The book is divided into five chapters, with the first laying the historical and methodological groundwork and the rest centering on four core elements of the practical theologies she uncovers: liturgical practices, lived beliefs, narratives, and functioning theological doctrines. In the first chapter, she does the important work of grounding the ethnography in both place and time. She gives an overview of Durham’s own history with respect to race, class, and urban development. She moves between the meso-level view of Durham as a city to a macro-level view of poverty in the US that helps readers understand the extremity of the kind of poverty the UMD community members may be experiencing.

The second chapter centers on her experiences facilitating a weekly prayer service for clients and residents at UMD. This chapter serves as a particularly effective examination of the tensions between her expectations as professional minister and ritual practices that seemed to offer some sense of grace to clients. Her breakdown of the genre of speech prayer service participants employ, especially the role of orality over literacy (50–51) demonstrates thoughtful reflexivity about her own theology and social location in conversation with what her informants offer. This thread is continued through the third chapter, where she maps out the most common functioning beliefs among members of the shelter. In the last part of this chapter Dunlap issues the most direct challenge to pastoral caregivers who might be too quick to dismiss some of these beliefs (like attributing addiction to the Devil), without understanding what grace the clients are actually seeking in professing said beliefs (92–93).

The fourth chapter is structured around the narratives UMD clients tell regarding their own lives. They raise interesting questions about how informants understand their own agency in relationship to God, others, and the many structural obstacles to their own flourishing they encounter. These narratives lay important groundwork for the final chapter, where Dunlap distills the functioning theological doctrines
she has encountered in her field work but does so at a step removed from informants’ stories, in order to preserve their privacy. Here, too, she devotes significant and necessary space to identifying ways sins like neoliberal capitalism and white supremacy have sunk in at the root of white, privileged Christianity. This is her clearest challenge to Christian communities, that they must do the work of disentangling such idols from their ministry and religious practices.

Dunlap does not openly claim to be writing a liberation theology, although she engages several liberationist thinkers and traditions in her footnotes, particularly those arising out of Black Church traditions in North America. To some degree, she lacks the doctrinal, deconstructive elements common in much of that work (although the aforementioned discussion of white supremacy does some of this). Rather, she understands her task to primarily reside in providing an honest reflection on the religiosity of the participants, without instrumentalizing their experiences solely for the correction of more privileged communities. This is an excellent text for students in pastoral formation, especially those who anticipate work among economically marginalized communities. It is also accessible for undergraduate students and could be useful in religious ethics courses addressing poverty and race.
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Most of us know very little about the institutions we rely on for our health care; for example, who owns them, whether they are non- or for-profit, or what their policies might be on a wide range of ethical issues, from the use of personal data in research to the disposition of fetal remains following a miscarriage. Most of this information is irrelevant, it might be argued, provided we get the care we need and/or want. In any case, while the names and logos on the outside of the buildings might differ, from the inside, few of us would be able to say what distinguishes one health care facility from another. Many are surprised, then, to learn just how large and expansive Catholic health care is in the United States. Among all non-profit providers, only the federal government-run Veterans Administration system is larger. According to American Hospital Association data (2021), approximately one in seven patients is cared for every day in a Catholic hospital.

Does this matter? To be more precise, does a hospital’s Catholic identity make any difference in how it serves its patients and surrounding