

This informative study will be a resource for students and academics, especially those new to the discipline of anthropology. It is well researched and comprehensive in coverage. L. explores the major works of each anthropologist, together with commentaries and secondary sources. A comparative analysis of each scholar's work is provided, linking and contrasting diverse topics. L.'s narrative also uncovers inconsistencies within each anthropologist's work. He is perhaps overly critical of Edith Turner's work, including her method and her research on healing. Readers might well consider that we are too close to Edith Turner's oeuvre to fully recognize the important legacy she left to the discipline of anthropology, especially in regard to religious experience. L.'s book is a groundbreaking and meticulously developed project that demonstrates the relevance of personal faith and religious experience within anthropological research and discourse.

Deborah Ross
Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University

Language for God in Patristic Tradition: Wrestling with Biblical Anthropomorphism.
By Mark Sheridan. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2015. Pp. 254. \$26.

A reader of this useful book should not be misled by the title. There is nothing here about patristic terminology for God such as Trinity, person, hypostasis, perichoresis, communion, or the like. Nor, until the appendix, does the book try to give a general introduction to patristic exegesis. As the subtitle indicates, Sheridan shows how the Fathers dealt with a specific class of problematic biblical texts, those that might lead someone to be scandalized by words, commands, or actions that appear unworthy of God. A key to the discussion is shared by pagans, Jews, and Christians: the idea of what is worthy of God (*theoprepes*). What led Greeks to find allegories in Homer and Philo to reread Scripture as full of hidden messages, also led Origen and many other Church Fathers to seek deeper and more worthy lessons in Scripture. The Fathers found some precedent in the NT for their own practice; in chapter 4, S., with his examples, goes well outside the field of passages where what is worthy of God is at issue. The brief chapter 5 surveys various writers, East and West, showing how widespread this practice was. Chapter 6 deals with "Three Classic Cases": the creation and fall narratives in Genesis 1–4; the story of Sarah and Hagar in Genesis 16, where the sacred text seems to endorse Abraham's immoral conduct; and the injunctions in Deuteronomy and Joshua to exterminate the occupants of Canaan. Chapter 7 deals with "The Special Problems of the Psalms," and a final chapter compares how modern interpreters treat this sort of issue with the way the Fathers handle it. The volume closes with an appendix on patristic exegetical techniques, a guide to the writers involved, a select bibliography of translations of ancient texts, and three indexes.

The most notable and useful characteristic of this book is its extensive and apposite use of quotations from many of the Fathers, especially Origen. These are usually full paragraphs of text, so that a student who has not read exegesis of this type before can get a real feel for how it works. That is a noteworthy asset, because the book appears to be aimed at college and seminary students who have been exposed only to modern

exegesis, evangelical or historical-critical, and who may find it hard to adjust to anything so different. S. chooses the best way, leading students through scores of examples accompanied by explanations. Occasionally he errs on a point, as when he says that Tertullian assures the impassibility of God by dividing the burden between Father and Son (121); S. supports this point by a reference to Herbert Frohnhofen, but Frohnhofen wrote that Tertullian made the division between the divinity and humanity of the Son, not between Father and Son (*Apatheia tou Theou* [1987] 227).

Theologically, the most interesting issue is the very notion of what is (or is not) worthy of or fitting for God, which, as S. says, antedates Christianity. Where do we get such insight into divine behavior, and can it be trusted to do all the work it was made to do? What in the early days offered a way to read Scripture without demeaning God developed into the argument that if God could do it, and it was fitting, then God did it (*potuit, deuit, ergo fecit*)—an argument used to support doctrines for which direct scriptural foundation was lacking. But fittingness was not the early exegetes' only criterion for discerning divine behavior; finding what was useful to us in the Scripture text was also important, as S. mentions early on (20) and explains more fully in the appendix (226–29). Examples of exegesis for usefulness are understandably less frequent in this book devoted to the concern about fittingness. It is itself a useful book, however, and should do a great deal of good.

Michael Slusser
Duquesne University (Emeritus)

The Entangled Trinity: Quantum Physics and Theology. By Ernest L. Simmons.
Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2014. Pp. x, 205. \$39.

The notion of panentheism has become quite popular among Christian systematic theologians in recent years. It represents a middle position between pantheism and classical theism. Yet how the material world can exist “in” God and still retain its own finite identity and specific mode of operation remains a matter of debate. Simmons proposes two major concepts out of contemporary quantum physics, namely, entanglement or relational holism and superposition or complementarity. These can serve as guiding metaphors for understanding a “perichoretic” relation between God and the world. S. divides his book into three parts. First, he discusses how systematic theology is based on both faith and reason. He then reviews the history of trinitarian theology from its biblical beginnings to the Council of Nicaea (325 CE), and from Constantinople I to the Reformation. Finally, the third part extends the historical review into the 20th century, covering the works of Karl Barth, Karl Rahner, Jürgen Moltmann, and Wolfhart Pannenberg. Only then does S. take up the challenge of explaining in general terms (with multiple concrete illustrations drawn from ordinary human experience) the complicated notions of entanglement and superposition, first as they are understood in quantum physics, and then as they can be applied to the notion of trinitarian panentheism.