

substantial to contribute today? Or, in Bultmann's terms, is only the 'that' of Pannenberg's defense of theology's scientificity important, or also the 'what'? If the latter, what are his lasting contributions to the defense of theology's scientificity? Can his 'epistemology and public implications deduced from his perceived universality remain effectively unchallenged' (p. 225), as Gülden Le Maire suggests? Frankly, I was hoping for more answers from the author.

There are also a few minor points of correction. First, although *Bundespräsident* (German Federal President) Gustav Heinemann was a one-time member of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU), as Gülden Le Maire states (p. 56, n. 185), he eventually joined the Social Democratic Party (SPD) and became *Bundespräsident* as a member of that party. Omission of the fact is misleading.

Similarly misleading is the discussion of Karl Barth's evaluation of the phenomenon of religion. Gülden Le Maire rightly states that Barth was highly critical of religion as a human phenomenon and of Schleiermacher's use of the concept of religion for theological purposes; but she goes on to claim that 'Barth and proponents of dialectic theology went as far as to reject the idea of Christianity as a religion at all' (p. 106). But already in *Die christliche Dogmatik im Entwurf* (1927), §18.3 ('Gott und die Religion'), and again in §17 of *Church Dogmatics*, Barth acknowledges that Christianity is a religion and, as such, falls under the same negative verdict as all human religions. Only because God uses Christianity as a vehicle of divine self-revelation (and thus justifies and sanctifies what in and of itself is an expression of human sin) does Christianity differ from other religions. More clarity would be helpful here so as to not misrepresent the complexity of Barth's thought on this point.

Finally, Gülden Le Maire claims that Ian Barbour, '[w]hilst influenced by A. Whitehead and process theology...differed from both in denying *creatio ex nihilo*' (p. 94). The implicit suggestion that Whitehead embraced creation out of nothing is peculiar. In the second volume of his *Systematische Theologie* (pp. 29–30, n. 46), Pannenberg himself quotes several statements from Whitehead's *Process and Reality* (1929) to the contrary.

These problems notwithstanding, the book offers a helpful contextualisation of Pannenberg's defense of the scientificity of theology.

doi:10.1017/S0036930623000480

Emilio Alvarez, *Pentecostal Orthodoxy: Toward an Ecumenism of the Spirit*

(Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2022), pp. xiv + 174. \$24.00.

Patrick Oden

Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, USA (patrickoden@fuller.edu)

During Spring semester of 1996, I had the opportunity to take historical theology with Robert Webber. To hear him speak of the richness of the Orthodox tradition inspired me and began what has now been a quarter century of being enthralled with Orthodox

history and spirituality, but never quite leaving my Wesleyan/Pentecostal tradition to walk that road myself. I continue to be intrigued if not yet convinced!

Emilio Alvarez has walked that road, which over the last years has led a burgeoning movement in Afro-Latino Pentecostalism that embraces the great tradition of Eastern Orthodoxy. In contrast with those like Peter Gillquist, who left their tradition behind to embrace Orthodoxy, Alvarez seeks the ancient without letting go the genuine richness of Pentecostal contributions.

He seeks (and in this book exhorts others to seek) a restored unity that comes from both directions: a new embrace of ancient practices by Pentecostals on the one hand, and an openness to the diversity of peoples and emphases by Orthodox and Catholics on the other. In holding onto Pentecostal distinctiveness while being formed by the great tradition in liturgy and other practices, Alvarez is explicitly linking with the broader paleo-orthodoxy movement, seeing this connection as being oriented by an ecumenism of the Holy Spirit that invites diversity within a wide, recovered unity.

In Pentecostal Orthodoxy, he begins by discussing paleo-orthodoxy in more depth, especially the contributions of Thomas Oden (no relation) and Robert Webber. Alvarez rightly sees this embrace of ancient links as a renewal movement within Protestantism, yet notes how narrow this movement has been in terms of overall diversity.

The question of diversity is the emphasis of his second chapter, showing how an integration of Pentecostalism and Orthodoxy provides a substantive liturgical, expressive eclesiality that emphasises right passions (orthopathy) alongside doctrines and practices, while expanding its overall diversity. As this is a personal journey that feeds into his call for a movement, Alvarez shares his own embrace of Orthodox traditions in the third chapter, adding briefer biographies of a few fellow travellers on this road to show how his path may be still rare but definitely not unique.

Expanding on this in his fourth chapter, he succinctly shares the history of an organised movement of Afro-Latino Orthodox over the last century, moving from Azusa Street towards an ecumenical recovery of consensual exegesis, historic liturgy and sacramental spirituality. In this, he explains the complications of such an embrace by those within Pentecostalism and, on the other side, provides some strong critiques of misplaced appropriation of liturgical aspects that co-opts rather than fully appreciates their source and meaning.

In his last chapter, he shows how despite such complications, the work of the Holy Spirit provides an interpretive and enacted ecumenism distinct from twentieth-century approaches in emphasising unity 'from below' rather than organisational and political uniformity. As Alvarez writes, 'Ecumenism of the Spirit is the intentional work of the Spirit at a grassroots level producing ecclesiological developments that bring cause for a greater manifestation of visible unity' (p. 141). In this, Pentecostals become renewed in the historic work of the Spirit in liturgy and sacrament while they contribute to the wider church's recovery of spiritual manifestations and emphasis on dynamic transformative experience of Christ. It is, as Alvarez argues, 'Spirit-led, grassroots, nonhierarchical, and grounded on ancient ecumenical teachings' (p. 142).

Alvarez is not idealistic in his hopes, showing strong awareness of the barriers – both conceptual and organisational – of true mutual recognition and communion between Pentecostal and Orthodox traditions. Yet he invites those on both sides to better understand each other and no longer be constrained by differences or disagreements. In this way, he seems to share a Spirit-oriented mission similar to that which led those such as Eusebius Stephanou to reach out to Pentecostals from the side of Eastern Orthodoxy.

The challenge for me, even early on, was coming to terms with the primary audience for this text. As an invitation to Afro-Latino Pentecostals, it clearly lacks a strong inviting description of Orthodoxy – assuming the reader already is familiar with it – as well as tending to be more sympathetic to Orthodox weaknesses while strongly critical of Pentecostal misappropriations. I was likewise surprised to see how much Alvarez made use of conventional ecumenical perspectives and to avoid a deeper exploration of the Wesleyan/Holiness and Pentecostal resources as reflected in the history of these movements and the scholarship from recent decades. Likewise, while he does highlight in parts the Afro-Latino perspective he is bringing, the discussion seems curiously de-contextualised through much of the book.

As I reflected on my frustration about this, I realised his audience – understandably – really seems to be those most likely to engage this theme through a book published by IVP Academic. Thus, although it includes the Pentecostal perspective, it is primarily addressing the concerns of the Orthodox, Catholics and other ecumenical influencers. As such, it is indeed a very worthwhile introduction and invitation to further discussions that may lead to a form of unity that invites recognition of the Spirit's wider work among diverse peoples throughout history and throughout the world.

doi:10.1017/S0036930623000455

Todd R. Hains, *Martin Luther and the Rule of Faith: Reading God's Word for God's People*

(Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2022), pp. xx + 217. \$40.00.

William M. Marsh

Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH, USA (wmarsh@cedarville.edu)

In Todd Hains' recent study, *Martin Luther and the Rule of Faith*, the fundamental struggle for a right reading and usage of Scripture consists of how the Bible is meant for God's people. Historians and biographers commonly acknowledge the various identifiers through which the life of the sixteenth-century Augustinian friar Martin Luther can be observed, including as monk, professor and pastor. Although Luther held many of these roles simultaneously, Hains emphasises that fundamentally, 'Whether in life or death, the ministry of the word was Luther's vocation' (p. 1). The fulfillment of this office entailed that Luther could neither escape the everyday pastoral care of souls nor the battle against God and the enemies of God's people. These enemies (e.g. the Church of Rome, the *Schwärmer*), as it turned out, also wielded the same 'sword' of Scripture, and so Hains highlights Luther's notion of the ongoing fight of 'Scripture against Scripture' that characterised his three decades of service in the ministerial office. The answer against both fronts for the right interpretation and handling of Scripture was reading it according to 'the analogy of faith' (p. 3).

Claims about what the *analogia fidei* is about, so Hains wisely grounds his investigation upon Luther's sermons on Romans 12:6, a *locus classicus* for grasping the concept. Overall, Hains prioritises Luther's preaching for his source material, supplementing it with other writings (and genres) from Luther's corpus. This method provides a fair