

space and distribute power relations in the modern world.” That religion sometimes is used for this purpose is undeniable, but to suggest that religion is *only* about such social power and control might seem to some readers as being rather myopic. Indeed, in a somewhat ironic sense, this study of stereotypes about religion sometimes appears to be mired in a stereotype of its own—namely the stereotype that religion can be reduced to nothing more than a means of exercising social power.

George Adams, Susquehanna University

Pantheologies: Gods, Worlds, Monsters. Mary-Jane Rubenstein. Columbia University Press, 2018. 294 pages. \$35.00 cloth; ebook available.

Mary-Jane Rubenstein’s book, *Pantheologies*, is an essential addition to any science and religion class or graduate studies class in philosophy of religion or theology. It gives a solid overview of Baruch Spinoza, Giordano Bruno, and Albert Einstein, introduces many new animist viewpoints, and examines the metaphysics of numerous indigenous religions.

At the outset, Rubenstein correctly points out that all too often, narratives about pantheism have been a back and forth between classical theism and atheism. She proposes a new dialogue partner—pluralistic pantheism—rather than a monistic version of pantheism. The remainder of her work is a deep examination and, to a certain extent, rehabilitation of the many varieties of pantheism that are possible. Ultimately, she favors a pluralistic pantheism somewhat akin to that proposed by William James or, more recently, the work of Donna Haraway’s tireless chthonic ones (135). It is a pantheism characterized by the chthonic realm, by bacteria and symbiogenesis: a multiplicity that comes together to make and destroy worlds.

Rubenstein notes that pantheism has been deemed problematic because if it is accepted in the mainstream, it will destroy the classic Western philosophical categories and it will bring us into a Chinese or Indian viewpoint (7–10). It would break down mind and body dualisms, gender differences, racial differences, and hierarchies. Worse yet, it is atheism in disguise, and may lead to the moral breakdown of society. To these unfounded claims, Rubenstein asserts that quite the opposite might be true. To explore this alternative hypothesis, the book moves through four chapters: “Pan,” “Hyle,” “Cosmos,” and “Theos.” One of the most enlightening threads running throughout is the manner in which some Amerindian groups reconceive relationships and construct their languages and reality from a radically different vantage point than any Western societies. Far from backwards or simple, these paradigms are ripe with possibility for guiding our globalized, fast-paced world towards a brighter future.

It would have been nice to see a chapter on panentheism versus pantheism, since it is addressed very briefly in the introduction, but never in a sustained fashion (4). Rubenstein rightly notes that panentheism has many perceived advantages not only over classical theism, but also over pantheism (4). However, at no point are these benefits explored in contrast to pantheism. She states that pantheism and panentheism are “dangerously close cousins”, which seems inaccurate or at least worthy of further clarification (19). Nevertheless, she is undoubtedly correct that pantheologies may find their place in the coming years with millennials or perhaps Generation Z.

Instead of ending her final chapter, “Theos,” with a discussion contrasting pantheism and panentheism, Rubenstein opts for a turn to theoretical physics by pointing out that Einstein’s physics were in sharp contrast to his metaphysics. Once again, she makes it clear that the pantheism inherent in Spinoza and Einstein is notably different from what she is calling for because they insist on order, hierarchies and, supposedly, reason. Instead, she summarizes her position as, “Divinity thus conceived would therefore be immanent, self-exceeding, relational, changing, and multiply perspectival, to such an extent that the pantheism in question would collide with a certain kind of polytheism” (173).

One final concern that arises for me is the role of ethics on this view, and essentially no great answer is provided. At least with panentheism we can retain some hope of a deity operating persuasively among interrelated agents; this deity would aim at issuing in novelty of ever-increasing complexity, or maximizing importance in different domains like art, religion, and philosophy. With pantheistic pluralism, however, we would be on our own, ethically speaking.

Darren Iammarino, Independent Scholar

Non-Humans in Amerindian South America: Ethnographies of Indigenous Cosmologies, Rituals and Songs. Edited by Juan Javier Rivera Andia. Berghahn Books, 2019. 396 pages. \$140.00 cloth; ebook available.

Since the ontological turn within anthropology, the relationships between humans and non-humans has been of increasing interest and hotly debated. This is particularly true concerning the ways in which Amerindians in South America construct and maintain relations with non-humans, such as spirits, substances, animals, plants, and places in the context of the Age of the Anthropocene. *Non-Humans in Amerindian South America*, published in association with the European Association of Social Anthropology, critically engages and uncovers the fraught nature of indigenous “ontodiversity” and “cosmopolitics” in the field of anthropology. It simultaneously argues for a return to details in fieldwork,