

families” (PCP II, par. 419) and the family as “a basis for basic ecclesial communities” (PCP II, par. 421). Additionally, kinship and the significance of the ordinary, which B. explores, are familiar themes in many liberation and feminist theologies, particularly Latino/a (or Hispanic) theologies where kinship and a communal identity as well as the ordinary struggles of life (*lo cotidiano*) deeply shape these theologies. It would have been interesting to see this theme developed in dialogue with these other theologies including the place of popular religiosity in ecclesiological reflections, which interestingly is not mentioned at all.

A new angle to a *familia Dei* ecclesiology might have been provided by the experience itself of homelessness, and how one accounts for that in new theological reflections of family and church. The three themes that grounded ecclesiology of the FECH—family, cultural values of shame and honor, and the supernatural world—could generally be applied to Philippine culture and not just to the FECH. B. moves toward a recognition of the value of considering the experience of homelessness in his description of a homeless Jesus and the radical call to the margins. How the homeless Jesus translates into a homeless *familia Dei* ecclesiology remains unclear, but it is the development of this image that may bear great fruit in the construction of an inclusive urban ecclesiology where everyone truly is invited to the table.

Karen B. Enriquez  
Xavier University, Cincinnati

*Flourishing: Why We Need Religion in a Globalized World.* Miroslav Volf. New Haven, CT: Yale University, 2015. Pp. xviii + 280. \$28.

Volf is a highly distinguished theologian who has spent decades working on issues of justice, peace, and reconciliation. In this volume he offers a constructive argument for the necessity of religions in an age of globalization. It addresses a broad audience, one constantly bombarded with the message that religion is irrational and tribalistic and therefore inherently prone to fanaticism, conflict, and violence.

Not shying away from his own Christian faith, V. grounds his own version of religious humanism in the core belief that God unconditionally loves human beings and calls on us to love one another. He invites adherents of other religious traditions, as well as secularists of good will, to consider ways in which their own convictions might resonate with the account of human flourishing sketched here. Careful not to assume that all religions share a common core that could be distilled into a set of universal religious convictions, V. does suggest that for all their distinctiveness, major world religions share certain “structural affinities” and “basic principles that guide human interaction,” such as the virtues of truthfulness, justice, and compassion.

Religions at their best object to the grinding poverty imposed on over a billion people on the planet as well as to reducing human flourishing to prosperity, health, longevity, and fertility. They remind us that economic progress and freedom are for the sake of enabling people to lead good lives rather than the other way around. One does not have to be a Christian to recognize that “life is more than food” (Luke 12:23).

V. underscores the ambivalence of globalization. It has helped millions get out of poverty, but it has marginalized millions of others. Globalization can refer to market-driven values that, when acted upon, can either help or hurt people. It can also refer to the spread of technologies that can either connect us to or make us fear refugees halfway around the world.

Globalization needs a rich and more comprehensive understanding of the key features of human flourishing. Rather than focusing on isolated individuals, prominent figures in many religions share an appreciation of the common good. They see the value of “ordinary life” (health, security, family, and the like) but place it within a wider transcendent framework. They share a view of life as bearing a purpose that transcends the merely quotidian tasks and mundane satisfactions.

The human drive for God is not an “add-on” to humanity but rather what makes us distinctively human. When rightly ordered, the desire for God is necessarily complemented by the love of neighbor; when disordered, it becomes an idolatry that not only disappoints but also damages self and others. A proper orientation to human transcendence grounds an affirmation of the goodness and dignity of every human life and an ethic of responsibility to one another.

V. gives special attention to the question of freedom of religion in a globalizing world. Each of us is responsible for responding to the call of transcendence in our own particular contexts. One cannot exercise this responsibility if coerced by either a fanatical religious authority or a repressive state. Most religions have made the mistake of religious intolerance, but they do best when they understand that respect for every person implies respect for his or her right to embrace the way of life that they find most persuasive and appealing. V. thus resonates with the accounts of the dignity of every person, freedom of religion, and the separation of church and state found in Jonathan Sacks, Charles Taylor, and the Second Vatican Council. He makes an especially strong argument that people with firm religious convictions often are, and ought to be, strong defenders of political pluralism. The final chapter offers a concise summary of V.’s well-conceived account of post-conflict forgiveness and reconciliation. Though often a source of conflict, “religions are also the primary drivers of reconciliation among people” (193).

V. will come under fire from academic specialists who argue that the particular religious tradition they study does not support his account of transcendent humanism, or aggressive secularists who only want to denounce (and can only see) the dark side of faith, or readers convinced that appeals to transcendence are always the enemy of progress. Yet even skeptical readers will profit from considering how religion at its best might bring us together rather than set us against one another.

V. provides a clear, persuasive, and balanced appraisal of the contribution that religions can make to the common good. It ought to be read by anyone interested in religion, human well-being, and peace. He is to be congratulated and thanked for having the courage to write a book that offers a sweeping vision of how religion at its best can humanize all of us.

*Stephen J. Pope*  
*Boston College*