

---

# Review of Theological Journals: 1987—1988

---

## *The Editor*

---

New Testament studies continue to receive a reasonable amount of attention in theological journals. The Themelios issues for 1987 reflect this trend and provide some interesting, useful material. For example, the January 1987 issue (vol 12, no 2) included a detailed, nine-page article on recent methodological developments and debates concerning Synoptic Studies (pp 38-46). The article is written by Craig L Blomberg who, incidentally, has authored a recent and useful IVP publication, **Gospel Truth? Are The Gospels Reliable History?**

Dr Blomberg's opening remarks illustrate the liveliness and dominance of contemporary New Testament studies. 'New Testament Scholarship', he observes, 'continues to overwhelm the student who would keep abreast of its developments, as it deluges him with massive quantities of literature and a bewildering array of methods and tools. Nowhere is this problem so pressing as in the study of the synoptic gospels' (p 38). In his article, Blomberg surveys six popular yet 'often misunderstood modern methodologies and a sampling of the most significant, recent literature in each area'. The six methodologies are Source Criticism, Form Criticism, Redaction Criticism, Midrash Criticism, Social-Scientific methods and, finally, other literary criticisms.

Concerning Source Criticism, Dr Blomberg observes that 'the field is wide open for much further study in synoptic source criticism' (p 39) and regarding Form Criticism it is welcome news that the overdue replacement for Bultmann's book, **The History of the Synoptic Tradition**, may have at last appeared in Klaus Berger's **Formgeschichte Des Neuen Testaments**. More welcome news is that 'the arguments supporting the trustworthiness of the gospel tradition continue to be rehearsed, along with the weaknesses of the critical reconstructions of its tradition history...the "guarded tradition" hypothesis of Riesenfeld and Gerhardsson, which proposed that Jesus taught his disciples in rabbinic fashion to memorize many of his teachings and narratives of his deeds, which were in turn carefully passed along to specifically designated students in the early Christian community, remains more defensible' (p 39). While the value of this rabbinic analogy is weakened by the reliance on post-AD 70 parallels and the failure to explain Jesus' uniqueness and the differences remaining among the synoptic parallels, Blomberg reports on the significance of recent research in Germany by P G Müller, A F Zimmermann and Rainer Riesner. These three all agree it is 'virtually inconceivable' that the Lord Jesus would not have taught his disciples to memorise large chunks of his teaching. Riesner's research is particularly valuable. While he establishes the rote nature of elementary education required of all first-century Jewish boys, he also provides five other

key reasons why the teaching of, and about, Jesus would most likely have been preserved quite carefully. These key reasons are:

'(1) Jesus followed the practice of the Old Testament prophets by proclaiming the Word of the Lord with the kind of authority that would have commanded respect and concern to safeguard that which was perceived as revelation from God. (2) Jesus' presentation of himself as Messiah, even if in a sometimes veiled way, would reinforce his followers' concern to preserve his words... (3) The gospels depict Jesus as a teacher of wisdom and phrase over 90% of his sayings in forms which would have been easy to remember, using figures and styles of speech much like those found in Hebrew poetry. (4) There are numerous hints and a few concrete examples in the gospels of Jesus commanding the twelve to "learn" specific lessons and to transmit what they learned to others, even before the end of his earthly ministry. (5) Almost all teachers in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman worlds of that day gathered disciples around them in order to perpetuate their teachings...Jesus...probably resembled them in this respect' (p 40).

Redaction Criticism is 'the most thriving discipline in recent years and, despite excesses, remains 'a valuable tool'.

Blomberg's conclusion to this article is interesting: 'If there is one lesson to be learned from recent criticism, it is that today's assured results do not remain assured for very long, and that specific methods stay in fashion scarcely longer than styles of clothing' (p 43). In this same issue D F Wright reviews J D Crossan's recent book, **Four Other Gospels** (Winston Press: Minneapolis, Chicago, 1985, 208 pp, £13.95) which deals with the increasingly popular subject of non-canonical gospel traditions. Wright reports that 'Crossan's conclusions fall in with the growing tendency, particularly among American scholars, to regard non-canonical gospel traditions like those embodied in his four as basically independent of the canonical four. He writes for the general reader as well as for the specialist...and cannot avoid resting a good deal of weight on more substantial studies by other writers...' (pp 56-57).

In vol 13, no 1 there are another two articles dealing with New Testament Studies. The first article, written by Richard N Longenecker, is entitled, '**Who is the prophet talking about? Some reflections on the New Testament's use of the Old**' (pp 4-8). Melvin Tinker authored the second and lengthier article on **The Priority of Jesus: A Look at the Place of Jesus' Teaching and Example in Christian Ethics** (pp 9-18). Both articles are worth reading.

Turning to the **Evangelical Quarterly**, I was interested in what Nico S L Fryer wrote concerning **The Meaning and Translation of *hilasterion* in Romans 3:25** which he rightly claims 'remains a crux for the interpreter', (vol LIX, no 2, April 1987, p 99). After comparing as many as eighteen translations of the word, Fry shows that the word *hilasterion* 'confronts us with at least three basic problems', namely (a) the grammatical form of the word. Should it be taken as an adjective (NAB) or a substantive (AV, RSV, NEB etc.)? (b) the theological overtones included. Does it include the idea of propitiation or expiation or both? and (c) the translation of the word. Fryer concentrates on

the first question but I am unhappy with some of his reasoning and conclusions, especially when he says that the translation in Romans 3:25 of 'propitiatory' or 'expiatory' or 'atoning sacrifice' is no more than 'a remote conjectural possibility' (p 113). Fryer suggests that the word *hilasterion* is 'most probably a neuter accusative substantive, employed as a nomen loci. Despite arguments to the contrary the typical interpretation where the Apostle ascribes to Christ-on-the-cross certain properties of the *kapporet* still seems to offer the most natural and most satisfactory solution.' At least, the article is thought-provoking and challenges us to do our homework well!

About ten publications bearing on New Testament studies are reviewed in this same issue of EQ including Don Carson's **From Triumphalism to Maturity: An Exposition of 2 Corinthians: 10—13**. The reviewer, Stephen Travis, describes it as 'a fine exposition which gets to the roots of Paul's vigorous argument and applies it tellingly to today's church...this book shows superbly why the study of Paul takes us to the heart of the gospel' (pp 174-5). Another of Carson's books reviewed here by Travis is **Exegetical Fallacies** (Baker, 1984, p 153). Although I have not yet read the book, the review has made me put this book on order for priority reading over the next months. Carson discusses forty-eight kinds of fallacies, 'organised into four groups: word-study, grammatical, logical, and presuppositional and historical fallacies...the range and accessibility of examples here make it a very welcome guide-book. He points out things about the aorist tense...He notes fallacies in discussions of several crucial doctrinal passages in the New Testament, eg, in treatments of the verb 'to be' in the phrase 'this is my body' and in John 1:1. He notes several logical fallacies in the WCC statement on **Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry**. Perhaps this book should be essential and regular reading for all preachers! Carson's main aim in writing the book is that 'the Bible may be used more honestly and powerfully in preaching and writing...'

At this point I want to refer to RTJ, that is, the **Reformed Theological Journal** published by the Reformed Theological College of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland. In the November 1987 issue there is a useful exegesis of Matthew 4:1-11 by Professor Edward Donnelly and several other helpful articles and reviews. For example, Professor Douglas Macmillan (one of our own Associate Editors!) has an historical article on **John Knox, Preacher of the Word**. Other articles are entitled **Karl Barth, Evangelicals and Revelation**, **Preaching from the Song of Solomon**, **Contextualization and the Integrity of the Gospel**.

But we are not yet finished with the subject of New Testament Studies. I refer again to **Evangelical Quarterly** (this time vol LIX, no 1, Jan 1987) where there are two more articles which merit careful reading and appraisal. The first article is by Linda L Belleville and entitled, **Continuity or Discontinuity: A Fresh Look at I Corinthians in the Light of First-Century Epistolary Forms and Conventions** (pp 15-37). Mrs Belleville's conclusion deserves to be quoted in full here if only to stimulate us to read the article: '...definite structural, thematic, and formal lines of continuity can be traced in 1 Corinthians. The

overall impression is one of deliberate structuring and organisation. An analysis of epistolary formulae indicates that the opening and closing *parakalo* formulae set forth Paul's main reason for writing and place this letter in the classification of the Hellenistic non-literary petition. The single other point of significant epistolary weight, the *peri de/vocative/disclosure* formula in 12:1ff, sets forth the theological basis on which the *parakalo* depend. The major problem which confronts Paul in this letter is the problem of spiritual arrogance and licence which manifests itself in the speech divisions in chs. 1-4, the question of immorality in chs 5-6, the issue of idolatry in chs 8-10, the disorder and social/charismatic divisions in worship in chs 11-14 and in the contention that there is no resurrection in ch 15. Paul's approach in chs 1-4 and 16:15-18 is one of request, while his approach in chs 5:1-16; 14 is one of command. This results in a basic request — command — request structure for the letter into which Paul integrates his responses to the Corinthian letter' (pp 36-37) and shows it to be 'unique among the Pauline letters'.

The second article by Alan Padgett is much more controversial as you can probably guess from the title: **The Pauline Rationale for Submission: Biblical Feminism and the Hina Clauses of Titus 2:1-10**. Arguing for the equality of men and women in home and church, Padgett thinks that the 'rationales of the *hina* clauses of Titus 2 demonstrate...that Paul's concern was not to lay down a law for all time, but to give temporary marching orders for the church, so that the gospel could go forth to all peoples' (p 52). I am unhappy with his assumptions, exegesis and conclusion.

**Theological News** continues to provide informative, thought-provoking material concerning theological work and teaching by Evangelicals worldwide. **TN** is an invaluable help to those of us who want to keep abreast of developments on the Evangelical theological world-scene. Vol 20, no 1 (January-March 1988) is no exception either. It contains up-to-date news of the World Evangelical Fellowship, Theological Conferences and Consultations, news and concerns from different countries as well as theological colleges.

Two Consultations met, for example, in Singapore in November 1987 with 145 theologians and theology teachers participating. One was the Asia Theological Association Consultation which met to discuss '**Theological Education for Urban Ministry in Asia**'. The other was the Pan-Asian Consultation on Theological Education, with its theme '**The Urban Church, Called to Ministry**'.

News reported in this issue of **TN** included the Bible Society of India under attack, the Islamicization in Malaysia which now worries the neighbouring governments of Singapore and Indonesia. 'Islamicization in Asia is a growing threat because of the growing influence of Iran in Asian Muslim countries, and the economic support of the petrodollar' (p 7). Other disturbing news concerns a feminist theologian, Elga Sorge of Kassel, West Germany, who claims that 'women need a goddess, not the masculine God of the Bible...I need this goddess because I am her. I need her because I need myself.' The Ten

Commandments, she claimed, were written only for men, since in Jewish culture only men were allowed to participate in religious/spiritual activities. In the place of the Ten Commandments, Elga Sorge proposed ten 'permits' including 'you may commit adultery because you cannot help it...But you may also be faithful'. Thankfully, the General Secretary of the German YMCA, the Rev Ulrich Parzany, spoke for the other evangelicals in describing Sorge's ideas as 'utter paganism'.

**The Evangelical Review of Theology** has also now established itself as a worthwhile and satisfying journal which is not afraid to face contemporary issues from a thoroughly biblical perspective. I look forward to reading each issue and also find them extremely useful for reference purposes. Three issues particularly in the last year deserve mention in this review.

Vol 11, no 1 (Jan 1987) dealt with the basic question, why do theology? Klaus Bockmuehl wrote about **Three Horizons for Theology** (pp 5-20) which he pinpoints as being the church, humanity and God.

Concerning the church, Bockmuehl stresses that 'theology is to serve the church, to help towards the edification of the 'Temple of God' which is made up of human beings. Theology serves to expand and constantly to restore that building, the church.' Bockmuehl then expresses the need of 'a new dedication and commitment' to the church which applies in two ways. One, that we distinguish between the 'macro' and the 'micro' aspect of the church. We must learn to concern ourselves both with the present and with the prospects of the whole of Christianity, the macro-aspect, and with the welfare of our immediate fellow-Christian or our own congregation, the micro-aspect. Secondly, commitment to the life of the church may mean that we put its welfare and prosperity before all other considerations. If we all now apply ourselves to social ethics: to the poor, to race relations, and to the problems of peace, who will make the well-being of the "vineyard" his overarching purpose?' (p 7).

But Christian theology has a commitment also to humanity as a second horizon and this is seen in three directions. First of all in the 'basic work of sustaining people in times of material need'. Secondly, the task of 'teaching and maintaining God's creational ordinances and commandments and so helping to fulfil God's cultural commission to sustain human life. Without this ongoing work, nations will sink into Godlessness, anarchy and self-destruction...' (p 8). Thirdly, another contribution of theology towards the preservation of culture and human existence lies 'in the practical presentation of regenerate men and women who have a distinct and regenerating effect on the life of society also'. The final horizon of theology is God. Not only is God the object of theology but theology must be 'divine service, service of God' (p 10).

Another helpful article, **The Justification of Theology with a Special Application to Contemporary Christology**, was authored by Robert L Reymond. The burden of this article is summarised in the conclusion: 'our task as theologians is simply to listen to, to seek to understand and to explicate

what we hear in the holy scriptures in their entirety for the health and benefit of the church and in order to enhance the faithful propagation of the true gospel. With a humble spirit and the best use of grammatical/historical tools of exegesis we should draw out of Scripture, always being sensitive to all of its well-balanced nuances, the truth of God revealed therein.

If we are to imitate our Lord, his Apostles, and the New Testament Church, that and that alone is our task. As we do so, we are to wage a tireless war against any and every effort of the many hostile existentialistic and humanistic philosophies which abound about us to influence the results of our labours' (p 36).

I found three other articles in this issue of **ERT** absorbing and informative. One was **The Evolution of Evangelical Mission Theology since World War II**. The author, Arthur F Glasser, traces the major phases in the development of Evangelical Missiology over the last few decades.

Some of the shifts in thought and emphasis which Glasser thinks have characterised the evangelical debate on mission theology since 1947 include the affirming of the Great Commission (eg, individual responses to 'the call' and the challenge of Matthew 28:18-20 by students etc in the late 1940s and early 1950s as well as the stress on discipleship, eg, Dawson Trotman and the Navigators), discovering Church Growth (Donald McGavran and his epochal work in 1955, **The Bridges of God**, who argued that 'the key to worldwide evangelisation was the multiplication of churches, not the multiplication of evangelists', p 56), the challenge from Ecumenists ( eg, the radicalization of the World Council of Churches in the 1960s, Vatican II 1962-1965) and the struggle for an Holistic Gospel (eg, 'which came first, evangelism or social responsibility? Then came...1974 Lausanne...the International Congress on World Evangelisation...which affirmed the validity of both mandates in its Covenant...but evangelicals almost immediately thereafter began to divide over the issue of priorities', p 60), also listening to the 'Third Force' of Pentecostals/Charismatics... Part of Glasser's conclusion is 'that evangelicals have no alternative but to enter the arena of public debate on the mission of the church in our day. They must listen as well as speak. They must expose their insights to the scrutiny of others. Only thereby will they make any significant contribution to the maturity of the church in our day' (p 63). There are aspects of Glasser's survey and conclusions which I am unhappy with but the article is nevertheless a valuable one.

Another similar and provocative article deals with **Evangelical Theology in the Two Thirds World** and the author is Orlando E Costas. His basic argument is that while the western theological development was shaped almost exclusively by the formal principle of the Reformation (the Sola Scriptura), the corrective from the Two Thirds World is to use also the material principle of Reformation, namely, salvation by grace through faith. 'The ultimate test of any theological discourse,' concludes Costas, 'is not erudite precision but transformative power' (p 77) yet he concedes that Evangelical Theology in the Two Thirds World is represented by 'many voices with divergent views...it has

a long way to go, and in the process it will have a lot to learn from its counterpart in the One Third World.'

The other article which merits mention concerns an **Evangelical Perspective on Roman Catholicism**. This is the second of the two parts of the 38-page document prepared by the task force of the Theological Commission which was asked to study Roman Catholicism. The document was adopted by the World Evangelical Fellowship General Assembly when it met at Singapore in June 1986.

Seeking to avoid compromise on foundational, biblical doctrines, the task force honestly acknowledges, 'We have encountered obstacles in Roman Catholicism as it manifests itself today, which seriously impede fellowship and co-operation between Evangelicals and Roman Catholics and are unsurmountable as long as there is no fundamental reformation according to the Word of God in the Church of Rome. It is our fervent prayer that such a reformation may take place. Unity and co-operation among Christians is highly desirable, but not at the expense of the fundamental evangelical truths...there is only one way...the road that beckons is not 'come back to Rome', nor 'come across to Wittenburg or Geneva', but 'come together in Jerusalem', the historical-redemptive anchor point of the Christian faith' (p 93).

This is an historical as well as a significant document which deserves wide and detailed attention by churches and pastors.

Missiology, as we should expect, dominates **ERT** and another issue — vol 11, no 4, October 1987 — is devoted to the theme, **Mission of the Future**. Some of the articles make for compelling reading.

The resurgence of other world religions raises the question of the relationship of other religions to Christianity and this, writes Ajith Fernando in his article **Truth in Other Religions**, 'remains the crucial issue of mission of the future' (p 292). From his commitment to general and special revelation, Fernando emphasises that we must 'approach the issue of truth and goodness in other faiths from the basis of our belief in the uniqueness of Christ...The good points in a religion that have their base in general revelation, may be used by the Christian evangelist as points of contact and stepping stones in preaching the gospel' (p 299). However, Fernando also warns 'that these same good features in a religion can also lead people astray' (p 300).

Are there common causes in which we can co-operate? Fernando answers with a cautious yes but warns 'that such co-operation is fraught with numerous pitfalls...We must remember that our supreme task, evangelism with conversion in view is repulsive to most non-Christians. Co-operation with non-Christians must not result in a blunting of our evangelistic emphasis. Sometimes evangelistic organisations downplay their evangelistic emphasis in order to get assistance from the government or a non-Christian foundation for some social venture. This practice can be very dangerous. We must make know the fact that along with our social concern is an evangelistic concern which we will not drop in order to get funds' (p 300).

Fernando then illustrates the extent of co-operation with regard to his own experience. 'Following the recent racial riots in Sri Lanka', he writes, 'I participated happily in a neighbourhood peace committee chaired by a Buddhist and of which most of the members were Buddhists. I found that what I did in that committee did not conflict with my Christian principles. But I could not participate in some ventures organised by some Christians, such as an ecumenical rally at which the chief speaker was a Buddhist chief priest; I felt I could not take part because true Christian ecumenicity cannot extend to other religions. I also could not participate in many united services of prayer for peace...held all over the land in Christian church buildings...These ecumenical rallies and united prayer services were hailed as great steps forward in the quest for interreligious understanding and harmony. But a biblical Christian, in his search for harmony with others, cannot surrender the scriptural teaching about Christ's uniqueness' (eg, I Timothy 2:1-8; p 300). Would that many more would read but also heed Fernando's warning!

In the most recent issue of **ERT** (vol 12, no 1, January 1988) I especially enjoyed Gerald Bray's article, **Recent Trends in Christology** (pp 52-63).

Before I leave the subject of mission, **Christian Arena** devoted four articles to the subject in its December 1987 issue (vol 40, no 4). Basil Scott in his article, **Fruit for Export: The Church's Responsibility** seeks to remind churches of their responsibility for mission. 'Each church', he writes, 'is like a pebble dropped in a pond sending out ripples to the farthest bank. It is impossible to confine mission to your own backyard. The Spirit knows no geographical limits' (p 6) but mission begins at home. 'The world is here as well as overseas.'

Basil Scott then considers the practical question of stimulating interest in mission among our churches. One important place to start is with the pastor for 'he is the key person. Without his enthusiasm and commitment it will be difficult for any church to fulfil its role as an active sending body.' The advice is clear: 'if your Pastor has never been abroad, send him! He could visit missionaries from your church or those your church is linked with. If he has Bible teaching gifts he may be able to use these and, as well as learning much himself, be a blessing in return' (p 7). Churches, what about following this advice?

An important issue of **Christianity Today** during 1987 was — for me at least — vol 31, no 5, March 20, which included a special feature on **universalism and annihilationism**.

Roger Nicole begins the feature with a useful historical survey and biblical summary of universalism. Clark Pinnock of McMaster University in Toronto examines the teaching of annihilationism (pp 40-41). It is obvious where Pinnock's sympathies lie. 'The traditional understanding of hell', he says, 'is unspcakably horrible...the popular tradition concerning the nature of punishment that some of the wicked will have to suffer is morally and scripturally flawed, and is accelerating the move towards universalism...If the only options are everlasting torment and universalism, then I would expect



large numbers of sensitive Christians to choose universalism.’ Pinnock then takes comfort in a third option, namely that the ‘fire’ of God’s judgement consumes the lost so that extinction is the second death. He thinks this view is biblical and morally more acceptable. As to be expected, Pinnock attributes the more traditional view to the influence of ancient Greek philosophy.

‘Is this belief of mine heretical?’ asks Pinnock. His answer seems to be based on four basic facts. First of all, some Christians regard annihilationism as being heretical and Pinnock acknowledges this fact but reluctantly. Secondly, Pinnock goes on to the offensive by talking of the ‘moral horror and exegetical flimsiness of the traditional view of hell; I am not surprised’, he adds, ‘that some would rather not reopen a question for which they have few answers’ (p 41). Thirdly, Pinnock refers to British evangelicals like John Wenham, Frank Guillebaud and Basil Atkinson who have all espoused the view of annihilation. His interpretation, therefore, he feels ‘is not altogether outside orthodox Christianity’. Finally, as the pace quickens ‘toward accepting the error of universal salvation’, Pinnock feels that his alternative view ought not to be regarded as heretical.

David F Wells of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary offers a more satisfying and orthodox position. Professor Wells exposes the weakness of Pinnock’s case by a detailed look at Matthew 26:46. ‘In this text, the existence of believers and that of unbelievers are set in parallel. Both forms of existence are said to be ‘eternal’, the same word — *aionion* — being used in both instances. Pinnock arbitrarily claims that in the case of believers, the text is talking of eternal *effects*, but in the case of unbelievers, only of eternal *actions*. In their case, the judgement is eternal only in God’s mind and not in their experience since they do not exist; in the case of believers, ‘eternal’ means the experience of endless life. This produces two, competing meanings, of ‘eternal’ — all in the same verse!’ (p 41).

Furthermore, he claims that ‘by direct assertion and by implication, unbelievers are described as being “eternal” and the same language is used of them as is used of believers: see, eg, 2 Thess 1:9 and 2:16; Heb 5:9 and 6:2; Mark 3:29; Matt 18:8; Rev 14:11, cf 20:10.’

When discussing the charge of some that everlasting punishment is disproportionate to the offence of unbelievers, Professor Wells concludes that annihilation proponents have ‘a diminished view of sin, a modified notion of divine righteousness, a restructured Atonement...it is a gospel that has lost its nerve because it has lost its majesty. Pinnock has tried to revive the old argument that the judgement of God raises moral problems. I assert the opposite: God’s judgement *settles* all moral problems!’ How refreshing to find a competent evangelical theologian advocating so strongly the traditional, orthodox doctrine of everlasting punishment. Thank you, Professor Wells.

The final article in this special feature is by Kenneth S Kantzer and deals with **Troublesome Questions** concerning the whole debate. His article is brief but firm. Quoting from Matthew 25:31f, Kantzer writes: ‘Other parts of Scripture convey the same solemn message. Christ is the eternal judge who will burn up

the chaff with unquenchable fire. Gehenna, hell, is described as everlasting punishment, everlasting fire, the fire that shall never be quenched, everlasting flames, eternal fire, etc. That awful word appears 12 times in the New Testament: 11 of those references come from the lips of our Saviour...Those who acknowledge Jesus Christ as Lord cannot escape the clear, unambiguous language with which he warns of the awful truth of eternal punishment. No universalism, no annihilationism, no probation in the hereafter satisfies his word. The awful stark destiny of man is this: the soul that rebels against God and chooses to remain unrepentant throughout this life will separate himself from the kingdom of God' (p 45).

May God enable us to preach faithfully and zealously His glorious gospel which alone is able to save men and women from everlasting punishment.

## **Details of Journals**

**Themelios (TSF) and Christian Arena**

38 De Montfort Street, Leicester LE1 7GP

**Evangelical Quarterly, Evangelical Review of Theology and Theological News (World Evangelical Fellowship)**

Paternoster Press, 3 Mount Radford Crescent, Exeter EX2 4JW

**Christianity Today**

MasterPlan Publishing, Thames House, 63-67 Kingston Road, New Malden, Surrey KT3 3PB

---

# **New Dictionary of Theology**

---

## *The Editor*

---

**An article reviewing the New Dictionary of Theology**

**Editors: Sinclair B Ferguson and David F Wright**

**Consulting Editor: J I Packer**

**IVP, pp 738, 1988, £17.95**

The appearance of a competent, theological dictionary is a rare event for it involves a great deal of preliminary planning, supervision, work and expense over several years. We are grateful, therefore, to IVP for their vision and initiative in providing us with this theological dictionary which now complements their **New Bible Commentary** and the **New Bible Dictionary**.

All the contributions are concise, although varying in length, but they usually provide a competent, comprehensive outline of a subject/person from both an