
William Kay and Anne Dyer have co-edited a wonderful collection of 15 articles on European Pentecostalism. Anne Dyer, Secretary of the European Theological Association, has written the introduction, while William Kay, Chairman of EPTA, concludes the book with an article on the social perspective of Pentecostalism in Europe. Sandwiched in between are ten chapters on the geographical areas of Europe followed by three theological articles dealing with the relationship of Pentecostalism to Protestantism, Catholicism and Communism and an article on the Future(s) of Pentecostalism in Europe by Raymond Pfister.

In her introductory chapter (1) Anne Dyer defines “Pentecostal” — using a well accepted three-part definition:

1. Classical Pentecostals — groups that contain reference to Pentecostal phenomena in their founding documents, like the Assemblies of God and the Church of God,
2. Charismatic Renewal Movements — groups within the mainline Christian churches, and
3. Neo-Pentecostals — groups that date from the 1970s, usually avoiding founding documents but accepting Spirit-baptism, spiritual gifts and a revised ecclesiology.

Her statistical information she gleans from Barrett/Johnson (2-3), quoting 523 million Pentecostal, Charismatic and Neo-Charismatic believers (2001) and that the “Pentecostals and Charismatics are found in 9,000 ethnic and linguistic groups speaking 8,000 languages and covering 95% of the world’s population.” On a European scale she considers “the statistics (as) varied and not always validated (4).” This is very true for the Charismatic Renewal Movements and the Neo-Pentecostal groups, as evidenced by the statistics used in the appendix (Jacobsen). The statistics for the Classical Pentecostals in Europe have been, however, carefully computed by the members of the Pentecostal European Federation (PEF) (cf. Paul Schmidgall, *From Oslo to Berlin! European Pentecostalism* (Erzhausen: Leuchter 2003).

The division into four historical phases (7): 1906-14, 1918-39, 1945-1979, 1980-2010 is well taken, however, the 1960s and 1970s could also be considered as an additional and separate period, since it marked the time of the interaction of Pentecostalism with the Charismatic Renewal (cf. Chapter 12: William Kay, Kees Slijkerman, Raymond Pfister, Cornelius van der Laan), which eventually led European Pentecostals to work more closely together in the European Pentecostal Fellowship (1966) and the European Pentecostal Conference (1969).

Also the geographical grouping of the countries (V-VI) into regions is helpful:

1. Scandinavia (Jan-Ake Alvarsson)
2. Great Britain (Neil Hudson)
3. German-speaking (Carl Simpson), Dutch-speaking (Cornelius van der Laan), French-speaking (Raymond Pfister) countries, i.e. (Western) Central Europe
4. Iberia (Manuel Martin-Arroyo and Paulo Branco), Italy (Carmine Napolitano), i.e. South-Western Europe
5. South-Eastern Europe (Driton Krasniqi)
6. (Eastern) Central Europe (Tim Case, Mark Kaminski, Cipiran Balaban, Daniela Augustine, Czaba Tenkely, Jozef Brenkus)
7. Russia, Ukraine (Pavel Mozor and Oleg Bornovolokov), i.e. Eastern Europe

In the theological section Jean-Daniel Plüss reminds us of our important Protestant heritage marked by *sola scriptura, sola fide, sola gratia, solus Christus* and *soli Deo gloria*. In addition to these five, I would like to add (though forgotten at times even by Lutheran theologians) also *sola experientia* (*facit theologum*) (*WA TR* 1,16,13) as a precursor to Pentecostal spirituality, reflected in *oratio, meditatio and tentatio* (*WA* 657-661). It is Peter Kusmic who describes in his chapter on Pentecostalism in Communist Europe the *tentatio* that our fellow-believers had to go through. He recapitulates three modes of survival to which the church under pressure would resort: resignation, resistance and accommodation. Miroslav Volf has also addressed this challenging question in his known *Exclusion and Embrace*, (Abingdon Press, 1996). Nevertheless, there is still much room for additional research and work to be done on this issue. How did Pentecostal leaders withstand the pressures and trials of *tentatio*? How did Pentecostal believers in Germany cope with the pressures of the Nazi regime? How did they withstand the *tentatio* in Eastern Germany, Poland, Romania, Russia, Ukraine, and other Eastern European countries during the time of Communism?

In the sociological section, William Kay looks back into the past and identifies “the two world-wars and state-sponsored communism as the major factors which disrupted European Pentecostalism in the 20th century (389).” This is well taken, even if we must not forget, on the other hand that, Pentecostalism has also experienced tremendous growth under communist persecution and right after the two world-wars. Raymond Pfister who points us into the future emphasizes the need that “Pentecostalism in Europe needs to become European Pentecostalism” by acquiring a true European identity and defining a real European agenda for its constituency (357). He admonishes the main European Pentecostal organizations like the Pentecostal European Fellowship (PEF), the Pentecostal European Conference (PEC), the European Pentecostal Theological Association (EPTA) and the European Pentecostal-Charismatic Research Association (EPCRA) to develop a theology of reconciliation and to participate more deliberately in the Conference of European Churches (CEC). Since “Europe is in need of citizens who are aware of the issues facing Europe, such as for example integrating East and West, environmental problems, nationalism and racism, justice and solidarity” the “church needs to create a safe space for an intercultural experience which is truly transformative. For this reason it needs to develop a concept of interculturality that allows for an active engagement among the various European cultures (372).” Eventually, he comes to the conclusion that “a reconciled Europe is a society in which European Pentecostalism is part of the solution (contributing answers) rather than part of the problem (only raising questions): there is hope when the *promise of difference* is displayed more than the *problem of difference* (379).”