

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

Puritan preaching was not in the form of a jeremiad but it was used for the various fast days, days of thanksgiving or humiliation, and sometimes for election-day sermons. The theme of the jeremiads dealt with a decline from religious fervor and the moral probity of the founding generations and called for renewing the covenant. As indictments, jeremiads evoked a law beyond question seen as valid and as one which should be known as such. Prophetic indictments are not forms of ordinary moral deliberation. They leave little room for discussion or debate about the condemned behavior. They do not invite or succor further moral discussion.

After the breakdown of Puritan New England, the country lost the consensus based on covenant theology. Yet it continued to engage in prophetic indictments which, lacking consensus about the clear law, can lead to fractious and frustrating discussions. The basis of prophetic indictments is that one's opponents are morally or intellectually benighted. After the American revolution, the jeremiad became no longer an instrument of social cohesion but of division. The abolitionists did not want to engage in further moral deliberation about the justification of slavery.

In an important chapter on prophetic indictment and practical deliberation, K. reminds us that some issues are too fundamental to allow the ordinary rules of civil and social discourse to prevail. There is a tension between prophetic and deliberative discourse. The prophet speaks to the heart and not just the head. He or she demonstrates, tells rather than argues. On its part, deliberative discourse assumes (1) a view of human flourishing, individually and in community; (2) a description of the virtues and habits that actually lead to human flourishing; and (3) rules and principles that highlight the behaviors commanded, commended, discouraged, or prohibited. Prophets see themselves in a position of authority over the ones they indict. Prophets and those engaged in deliberative discourse clash on the priority of issues and about the character of those who engage in what they consider morally troubling practices (prophets have difficulty imagining a good but mistaken person who understandably follows a false but sincerely held conscience). Prophets tend to demand an immediate and total response of society to their issue. They are also not likely to do casuistry or engage in nuance. Those who prefer moral deliberation often see such prophets as intellectually crude. At times, as in elements of the torture debate, people whose basis for decision is prophetic engage spuriously in what seems to be moral deliberation. At other times, moral deliberators, unable to win their case (e.g., about stem cell use) on deliberative grounds may turn to prophetic indictment.

K. argues that prophetic indictment is like moral chemotherapy. It may be necessary at times but it also can be terribly divisive or destructive. Prophetic indictment should only be evoked in radical situations. It should not be used to target less serious violations. It can be necessary to combat entrenched social evils in the community; to shake persons out of indifference; to direct scarce resources of attention and concern toward fundamental social issues rather than towards other matters. But absent some agreement on what should count as the law, such indictments can easily divide society and make for contempt. In a brilliant final chapter, K. argues that prophesy needs irony and humility. She appeals to Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address and to the prophet Jonah as examples of irony—humility in a form of prophecy without contempt. K.

peppers her argument with analysis of American public arguments about torture, abortion, race, and stem cell research. Her precise prose and careful analysis can enlighten us about the special care with which we should engage prophetic indictment rather than the more usual moral deliberation in our public discourse.

John A. Coleman, SJ
St. Ignatius Church, San Francisco

The Preaching Church: The Poor as Sacra Praedicatio. By Vincent J. Pastro. Eugene, OR: Resource, 2016. Pp. xv + 165. \$41; \$23.

Most books on preaching focus on the method, the “how.” This work by Father and Doctor Vincent Pastro of the Archdiocese of Seattle focuses instead on the “who.” As someone who has worked with and among Mexican immigrant communities for many years, he exhorts the reader to pay attention to the voice of the Spirit, particularly present in the church’s poor communities. Having assembled an impressive theological apparatus which includes insights gleaned from renown and lesser-known theologians throughout the centuries as the church’s “Fathers and Mothers,” Dominican preachers such as St. Dominic of Guzman and Antonio de Montesinos, the defender of indigenous peoples in the new world, Jesuits Karl Rahner and Jon Sobrino, as well as the distinguished German Lutheran theologian, pastor, preacher, and martyr, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, P. draws from an impressive geographical diversity, as in his inclusion of Latin Americanists Gustavo Gutiérrez, Ivone Gebara, and Victor Codina as well as the more European-Asian perspectives of Raimon Panikkar. This notable range of viewpoints or perspectival windows, a concept he borrows from Panikkar, does not exclude the church’s many teachers and pastors, women and men such as Archbishop Romero of El Salvador; the promoters of *comunidades de base*, (ecclesial base communities), Fr. José Marins and Sr. Teolide María Trevisan; and Teresa Montes Lara, OP, who directs the Instituto Hispano, a program in Spanish for the theological formation of lay leaders at the Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University, and who penned the book’s foreword. These persons serve as examples of those who have listened to the voice of the Spirit present in the community, particularly those who have suffered greatly.

P. not only draws from his rich knowledge of these writers and leaders but also from his own vast pastoral experience among Mexican immigrants in the US Northwest. His fertile examples of how he learned to keep his ear close to the Trinity’s conversation by staying close to these people are very thought-provoking. Now and then, given that few of us are as gifted with such an ability to bring together so well the academic and the pastoral, it would have been helpful to hear even more of these inspiring anecdotes.

Upon reading the work, one walks away with the question and challenge of, “What if we preached today as if theology and preaching itself, really mattered?” “What if we really took seriously the ‘real presence’ of Christ in the poor?” Having tackled such