

Nimi Wariboko and Amos Yong, eds., *Paul Tillich and Pentecostal Theology: Spiritual Presence & Power* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2015). ix + 251 pp. \$30.00 Paperback; \$22.70 Hardcover; \$7.99 Kindle.

Does Tillichian theology have anything in common with Pentecostal theology? Surprisingly, yes. Nimi Wariboko, Walter G. Muelder Professor of Social Ethics at Boston University School of Theology, and Amos Yong, Professor of Theology and Mission at Fuller Theological Seminary, bring into startling focus the pneumatologically inspired dialectic of both Tillichian theology and Pentecostal theology in this book. The two editors, recognizing the need for a critical conversation between Paul Tillich and Pentecostal theology, organized scholars from both the Tillichian tradition and the Pentecostal tradition to contribute to various aspects of this dialogue. The contributors of this book include Pentecostal scholars, Wolfgang Vondey, Frank Macchia, Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, Lisa Stephenson, Rhys Kuzmic, Steve Studebaker, Terry L. Cross, Andreas Nordlander, Tony Richie, David Bradnick, Peter Althouse, and Pamela Homes. Two Tillichian scholars, Mark Lewis Taylor and John J. Thatamanil, gave their response to the entire treatise with critical essays at the end of the book. Altogether, these scholars accentuate the potentials of a discourse between Tillich's theological legacy and the growing Pentecostal tradition.

The overall premise of the book is the conviction that a wider theological discussion on both pneumatology and pneumatological theologies can result from a productive and critical dialogue between Tillichian theology and Pentecostal theology (3). Paul Tillich was a Lutheran existentialist, whose substantial discourse on the Holy Spirit in the third volume of his *Systematic Theology* became a harbinger of a Protestant correlational theology between the immanent presence of a transcendent God and the realities and questions of humanity amid history (4). On the other end, Pentecostal theology, founded from a Christo-centric spirituality, has been steadily contributing answers to human questions on the work, authority, and guidance of the Holy Spirit in the community and in human history (7). Put in its proper perspective then, Tillichian theology has something in common with Pentecostal theology in that they both have recognition of God's divine spiritual presence and his ongoing conversation with humanity (8). With this commonality (albeit interacting with inherent contrasts), these two traditions can provide mutually fulfilling critical conversations on the revelatory presence of God in human history.

To elucidate the worthwhileness of this dialogue, the book proceeds in an engaging manner starting from Amos Yong's introductory

contribution highlighting the convergences and divergences between the two traditions (11). It is then supplemented by Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen's discussion of Tillich's possible position in the extensive milieu of evolving contemporary pneumatologies (19). Yong's methodological exposition and Kärkkäinen's pneumatological mapping lay the groundwork for the next chapters. Firstly, the chapters are composed of how Pentecostal pneumatology, in its varied aspects, can build a more concrete theological expression from the matrices laid out by Tillich's philosophical and trinitarian theology, while supplementing or augmenting the latter's theology with its own perspective. Secondly, the essays bring Tillich's theme of sacramentality into conversation with various dialectics, like theology of creation, feminism and Pentecostal spirituality, Pentecostal political theology, and others. The essay by Pamela Holmes argues, from a historical and philosophical standpoint, the necessity of a conversation between Tillichians and Pentecostal theologians (197). Holmes identifies the strengths and weaknesses of both traditions and explains how both can benefit from a critical and productive dialogue. Finally, two essays form the counter-response of Tillichian scholars. These two scholars respectfully engaged, counter-quested, and gave an apology to the previous Pentecostal thinkers. The most interesting argument was made by Thatamanil who pointed out that Tillich's anti-supernaturalism is in contrast with Pentecostal's supernaturalism. Thatamanil recognized the incommensurability between Tillich and Pentecostal views about spirits, demonic, etc. (230). In the end, though common ground exists between the two traditions, incommensurable areas exist too.

Personally, I think the presence of both commonality and incommensurability make the discussion of Tillichian theology and Pentecostal theology more interesting and worthwhile. The willingness of both camps to wrestle with the tensions, while recognizing areas of mutual input, can contribute to a wider understanding of the Spirit in the world. I like Tillich's view of the Spirit of God as universalizing and primordial. This does reverberate with Pentecostal thought on the Spirit's presence and power in the world. However, there is a line drawn between the Spirit of God as God versus the Spirit as a universal spirit concretized as a human or otherworldly spirit. Tillich's warnings against confusing spiritual presence with human ecstasy or psychological excitement, as well as against pantheistic and supranaturalistic pitfalls, are something to which all Pentecostals should seriously adhere. Moreover, Tillich's correlational theological method, which is essentially composed of "the dialectical relationship between the questions of human existence and the answers of God" (3), is is

something from which Pentecostals can learn a lot. In fact, it's a good framework for theologizing.

On the other end, Pentecostal theology, informed by a revivalist spirituality, may just be what Tillich needs to fully articulate a theology of Spiritual Presence. Tillich, in my estimation, falls short of truly understanding the immanence of the transcendent God when he refuses to see spiritual charismata and miracles as part and parcel of a self-transcending religion. Indeed, Pentecostals agree with Tillich in that Jesus is the concrete expression of the divine Godhead. However, this does not mean that the Holy Spirit does not work in economic subordination in both the natural and supernatural realms, and that other spirits and demons do exist. For Pentecostals, there is a thin, almost non-existent, line between the natural and supernatural. The Spirit of God and other spirits move in both arenas. This is why I think Pentecostal theology, with its acceptance of spiritual gifts, power encounters, and miracles, can articulate a better theology of Spiritual Presence in Jesus, in the church, and in the world.

More can be said about Tillichian theology vis-à-vis Pentecostal theology. Fortunately, the multivocal volume provides a lively discussion of both. All its chapters are noteworthy and highly recommendable. It displays the maturity of Pentecostal thought in engaging other theological traditions. Pentecostalism, once thought of as an anti-intellectual, enthusiastic, and experiential-based tradition, has reached a point in history where its thinkers can now ecumenically dialogue and theologically contribute to a wider audience. Indeed, a critical dialogue like this can help contribute to an engaging and fruitful theological discussion on pneumatology and pneumatological theologies. In this regard, the book has succeeded in its overall purpose.

Reviewed by Lora Angeline Timenia