

Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*

by Frederic E. Blume

The name "Kittel" has for a good many years been closely associated with Biblical studies both in the Old and in the New Testaments. On the one hand, "Kittel" designates the universally used critical edition of the Hebrew Old Testament—now Kittel-Kahle—originally edited by Rudolf Kittel. On the other hand, for almost two-score years, "Kittel" has also meant the *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, even now not yet completed, which gets its name from the son of the Old Testament scholar, its first editor, Gerhard Kittel. As far back as November 1928 he began the preliminary work on the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (TDNT). He did the organizational work necessary for such a project and was the Dictionary's first editor. The first volume appeared April 1, 1932. The following volumes then came in steady succession until the outbreak of World War II. After its close Gerhard Kittel planned to take up his work again but died in the midst of these plans, on July 11, 1948. However, he and his co-workers had been able to bring out Volume IV in August 1942 during the course of World War II. We can see how much the scope of the work had been expanded beyond what was first projected when we remember that Gerhard Kittel with the co-operation of fifteen colleagues had thought at first to complete the whole work within three years.

In the meantime the Dictionary was receiving recognition for the scholarship and completeness of its articles. The language of this work (abbreviated to TWNT after its title in the original German) was quite far beyond the German capabilities of many students and of quite a few pastors and teachers who would otherwise have been happy for the chance to use it. To answer the needs of the latter the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company of Grand Rapids, Michigan, set about to provide an edition in English. Dr. Geoffrey W. Bromiley was named translator and editor, and the objective aimed at was to put out in English page for page precisely what the original contained, even at the cost of a few Germanisms slipping in. This method produced a work that is a marvel of painstaking care. So far as it could be done, the pagination and the foot-notes in the translation have remained what and where they were in the original. The price of the translation has been listed at \$22.50 for each volume. These run in size up to a thousand or eleven hundred pages each. The dimensions of the page have been somewhat reduced from that of the original, though each volume, laden as it is with the many mechanics of research scholarship, presents to the reader a text that is pleasing to the eye and very easy to handle. The font of type used for the English text, as well as those used for the Greek, Hebrew, and rabbinical quotations, is clear and clean.

Though it is called a "theological" work, "Kittel" (being edited in Germany by G. Friedrich) avoids the pitfall of trying to be a book of dogmatics in alphabetical form. On the other hand, it does not usurp the place of a dictionary or commentary. Rather it aims to take each important concept of the Greek New Testament in alphabetical order and trace its meaning and usage through classical Greek, the Old Testament Hebrew, the Greek Old Testament (the Septuagint), Judaism, the rabbinical literature, the New Testament, the Apocryphal New Testament, and Christian writers of the time immediately following the apostolic age.

An outstanding feature are the bibliographies at the head of each article. They aim to list all the publications in all languages that have to do with each concept. Quite unlike customary dictionary style, all words that come under one concept are listed together according to the alphabetical order in which the basic word comes in the Greek alphabet. All the related words thus listed are thoroughly discussed, and the material carefully documented, in the body of the work. Under the concept of the Greek word for "word" and "speech," for example, thirteen words are listed and discussed for a total of 124 pages. We shall attempt to describe here Volumes IV and V of the English edition.

In Volume IV the article under λόγος, "word," discusses synonyms ranging all the way in meaning from "say" to "election" and "reason"; that the reader may have some idea of the scope of the TDNT, the following subdivisions under this one entry are listed, and the same thoroughness is in evidence throughout the Dictionary:

The Words λέγω, λόγος, ῥῆμα, λαλέω in the Greek World
 The Logos in the Greek and Hellenistic World
 The Development of the λόγος Concept in the Greek World
 The λόγος in Hellenism
 The λόγοι of Philo of Alexandria
 Hellenistic Logos Speculation and the New Testament
 The Word of God in the Old Testament
 The General use of רַב־דָּבָר as a Rendering of λόγος and ῥημα
 The רַב־דָּבָר of Prophetic Revelation
 The Divine Word of Creation
 The Word in Poetry
 Word and Speech in the New Testament
 The Sayings of Jesus
 The Old Testament Word in the New Testament
 The Special Word of God to Individuals in the New Testament
 The Early Christian Message as the Word of God
 The Word in the Synoptic Account of Jesus
 The Word in the Synoptic Sayings of Jesus
 Jesus Christ as the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ
 The Distinctiveness of the λόγος Saying in Jn. 1:1

Several minor divisions have been omitted in this listing, but those given should convey some indication of the breadth of scholarship exhibited in the TDNT.

G. Kittel is named as editor of Volume IV; thirty-three scholars are named as contributors. Volume V gives Gerhard Friedrich as editor; with: him, 38 contributors. These lists look like a “Who’s Who” of German university Biblical scholarship. As must be expected, the several articles will not all be of equal value, and there has been no effort by the editor or the translator to reconcile the internal disagreements, as regards basic presuppositions, historical assumptions, and specific interpretations. As we may expect, we find in these volumes the attitudes and approach that have for the past generation been the pulse-beat of New Testament scholarship at the great European universities, an approach that has assumed the validity of all “assured results of criticism.” As we look back, we shall have to agree that the 1950’s were the Era of Karl Barth and the 1960’s the Epoch of Rudolf Bultmann, the former “reformed” in his theological loyalties, the latter a declared “Lutheran.” Whatever may be the final thrust of the post-Bultmannianism as we have it in Bultmann’s pupils in Europe today or whatever may be the final result of the studies of the men who think that there must be a synthesis effected between the tenets of Bultmann and the expressions of Barth (and that along the lines of Heidegger’s existential philosophy!), the Theothanatology of Cox, Altizer, and Hamilton can be clearly seen as the direct issue of the presuppositions and the methods of many of the contributors to the two volumes here under review.

On the one hand we gratefully acknowledge our indebtedness to many of the critical Bible scholars of the past. The age of liberalism believed that the books of Scripture had come into being as the result of a perfectly understandable human process. They denied that there were either prophets or apostles through whom God had given us His Revelation. The Bible had come into being, they said, because a number of utterly natural factors, influences, or even written documents, had come together in one place, had been arranged more or less skillfully by someone who then put out a book under the name of some character of Bible history.

In their scholarly work, however, these liberal critics did leave much that is of value for us by way of historical, textual, grammatical, literary, and semantic information in our Wausatosa-Mequon approach to theology. We need mention, for example, only the work in papyrology and its influence on New Testament lexicography and textual and syntactical studies.

By way of contradiction to our method, these men asserted that the only correct way to understand any Biblical book was to trace it to the ultimate sources whence the component parts of the text studied came. They argued that the words of Scripture must be understood in terms of what they meant when they first came into being, whether that was something being passed about from mouth to mouth, or whether there was in existence a written document of sorts that was being reworked. In other words, liberal Bible critics of all times have in some way or other tried to *get behind* the consciousness of the divinely inspired prophet or apostle in order to find out “what really happened.” We rather believe the very words of canonical Scripture and accept them as God’s revelation to us, for we believe that in the Bible we have “Moses and the prophets,” that is, the divinely inspired Scripture that we are to “hear.” To those who went out to proclaim His Gospel, our Lord said: “He that heareth you, heareth me” (Luke 10:16). Whatever stands *written in Scripture*, that is God speaking to us, nothing else. I cannot, and I ought not even try to, penetrate behind the inspired self-consciousness of the Biblical writer.

During the past half-century there has been quite a number of allegedly “scholarly” approaches to the Bible, in agreement with this liberal approach, a number of different ways of understanding what the Bible really is. Corresponding to each of these was developed a special way of reading and interpreting Scripture, for what one holds the Bible to be, that will determine how he will go about interpreting it.

We are happy to have been able to use the TDNT in both its original and in the currently appearing English-language version. But we shall continue to refuse to be *used by* it; that is to say, we shall refuse to follow as a reliable guide anyone who rejects the very words of Scripture as God’s revelation to us and who thinks he can arrive at ultimate truth by *digging through* to whatever may lie behind the prophet or apostle rather than accepting as from God Himself the inspired words He has to say.

These theologians are quite ready to accept the Bible as a *witness* to revelation that is occurring elsewhere, but they just as stoutly declare that the Bible *is not* that *revelation*.

In the German original (abbreviated TWNT) and in the translation, the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (the TDNT) must be used with a great deal of critical discernment. The latest modern approaches of the time when each volume appeared, the then “assured results of criticism,” are not argued: they are simply assumed. While the writer has not found any of that magisterial patronizing posture with which higher critics usually look down upon us who cling to the confessional orthodoxy of the Lutheran Reformation, the fact that the majority of the contributors to TDNT support the stance of modern higher criticism is evident on every hand. The mere mention of the names of some of the contributors to the Dictionary will already point the direction from which its theological wind is blowing: Günther Bornkamm of Heidelberg, Rudolf Bultmann of Marburg, Karl Georg Kuhn of Göttingen, Gerhard von Rad of Heidelberg, and Karl Ludwig Schmidt of Basel. These men, to name but a few, have all contributed to the evolution of “The New Hermeneutic” as it developed after its birthday on October 20, 1953, when Ernst Käsemann of Tübingen read his now famous essay, “The Problem of the Historical Jesus,” at a reunion of *alte Marburger* held at that time in Jugenheim. From this side of the water the *alte Marburger* look very much like a society of Bultmannian alumni, who have gathered together to recall the name and revere the fame of their learned mentor, Rudolf Bultmann. In his essay Ernst Käsemann suggested that it might not be precisely as Bultmann had been teaching over the years, namely, that the single item of scientific historical value to be gathered about the life of our Lord out of the Gospels was its *dass*, the mere *fact* that there had once been a Jesus of Nazareth. Käsemann argued that the one truly reliable historical fact that we could gather out of the Gospels concerning the “historical Jesus” was “only along the line of the connection and tension between the preaching of Jesus and that of his community.” All other things found in the Gospels concerning Him had been contributed, or at least strongly edited, by the primitive, worshipping Christian community.

Since Volume V of the Dictionary appeared in 1954, none of the items that have been characteristic of the “Post-Bultmannian” era had been worked out in the kind of onrushing flood that has characterized German New Testament scholarship of the 1960’s. Yet the basic elements of the “New Hermeneutic,” its application of *Formgeschichte* and *Traditionsgeschichte* to the text, its tacit acceptance of *Religionsgeschichte*, and its

espousal of a secular existential philosophy as a safe guide for the interpreter of the New Testament are all present in the two volumes here under review, present if not in elaborated detail, then at least in embryo.

Though the *Tendenz* of these volumes is definitely in the direction of the anti-confessional thinking and method of the German universities where the Enlightenment made its earliest enduring conquests, the Dictionary if properly used can be a store-house of valuable information for persons with a wide range of interests: students of the Old and New Testaments, linguists, students of the classics, historians, theologians, and students of the comparative study of religion. One could hardly recommend it for the “general reader” though such a one might find what he is looking for if he had a little help with the classical and New Testament Greek quotations and the Hebrew of the Old Testament and of the scholars of Judaism. In many cases, just because the careful reader finds something basically wrong with the material studied, he will no doubt be led time and again to some solutions of his own, which he would probably not have arrived at had he not for some time been weighing the pro’s and con’s concerning the understanding of some entries in this Dictionary.

Even otherwise quite “conservative” scholars who have made their contribution to the TDNT would for the most part not find themselves in agreement with the doctrine of a verbally inspired inerrant Scripture. So far as this doctrine goes, the TDNT and *This We Believe* simply could not stand side by side on the same shelf. It could therefore be helpful to review some of the shibboleths of German university scholarship and to point out how during the past generation this Dictionary has for the most part assumed that the reader would understand the presuppositions and methods of what passed for *wissenschaftliche Exegese* (“scholarly interpretation”) at the time the article was written and first printed. The great rallying points of the higher criticism are generally taken for granted, and it is on the basis of these that the New Testament is interpreted. There are, however, some contributors who disagree with some of the presuppositions here set forth and with the methods here used. They have been allowed to state their case as they saw fit.

In the articles of the Dictionary the well-known documentary source theories are often taken as the points of departure in the study of both Testaments. In an exhaustive study of the concept “Word of Jehovah” in Volume IV, page 96, the writer operated with the alleged Deuteronomic source and voices the opinion that the formula “and the word of Jehovah came” could have originally been found in the source-document “D” or have been included by a “redactor,” the person who gathered the many diverse documents together, edited them, and then put them out as from the pen of Isaiah. On the same page (IV 96) he makes of Isaiah chapters 2 to 6 “Isaiah’s oldest writing,” though a few lines farther on he declares it “probable” that the book opened with Isaiah chapter 6, just because for him things fit better that way. For him there is no doubt about it that Isaiah chapters 40–66 are from some “Deutero-Isaiah” and that these chapters must be treated as something entirely apart from chapters 1 to 39. On page 96 he also gives a hint of what he understands by “revelation”: “the prophetic view of history ... regards the prophet as an agent of revelation who perceives the secret plan and will of God at work in history.” At first such a statement may not seem to be as negative critically as it really is. Actually we are here dealing with the concept of *Heilsgeschichte*, “Salvation History.” In this still very much alive approach to the Bible God’s mighty acts here on earth, like the Exodus or the Resurrection, are seen as God’s revelation of Himself. Not the inspired individual but the events of history are the means of God’s self-revelation. The next step in *Heilsgeschichte* is that someone reacts to these events and puts them down in some kind of literary form so that by this bit of literature the *same impression* is conveyed as was the impression made upon this observer by the great events in history which he has experienced. Notice what is to be conveyed: some *general impression*, and not at all a proposition, a thought expressed in words that could be stated as a confessional doctrine.

Under these assumptions there can be no other understanding of the Bible than that it *contains* revelation but *is not* that revelation. How different what we speak of as revelation. On the basis of God’s self-revelation in Scripture we hold to this: in His providence God took His spokesmen into His service, filled them with His Holy Spirit, guided them in the work they did, even in the choice of the words they used, so that what then became canonical Scripture was nothing other than God-speaking-to-us through His chosen spokesmen. We cannot, yes, we dare not try to dig behind the inspired self-consciousness of this writer. He may use “sources,” as St. Luke describes them Luke 1:1–4; he may well have done reading and carried on research and consulted

eye-witnesses; and in other respects the Lord left him what he had been, in his personality, in his style of speech and writing, in the plainness or elegance of his style (compare the Books of Amos and Ezechiel), and in the intended scope of his work (here compare the Gospel and First Epistle of John with the Writing to the Hebrews). Only the Lord did not leave him in the sinful errors of his human nature. Rather, the Holy Spirit prompted and guided him so that even in matters that have to do entirely with men's existence here on earth, his writing is verbally inspired and totally without error or mistake. Revelation comes to us by way of these divinely chosen spokesmen of God. God's mighty acts in history are there to remind us that the control of all things lies in His hand, so that His purposes of grace may be fulfilled, even to the falling in death of a sparrow from its roof-top. But the thought of my damnableness as a sinner and of my salvation as it is in Christ—these thoughts come only from God whose holy men spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

At IV 125 of the Dictionary we find this statement: "At the head of the train of thought sketched by the term λόγος there stands, not a concept, but the event which has taken place, and in which God declares Himself, causing His Word to be enacted."

Again we find IV 127: "The Word is not just the revelation mediated through the speaking and teaching Jesus. It is *the fact of Christ as such*."

Parallel to the contention of the Salvation-Historians that revelation comes through the great events of history, especially through the greatest of them all, *the fact of Christ as such*, we find the demand that not the separate words, sentences, and books of Scripture should be used in establishing doctrine but rather *the totality of Scripture, das Schriftganze*. Professor Adolf Hoenecke in his *Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik* (I 311ff.) treats the aberration of *Heilsgeschichte* at length and points out that when the demand was made by its greatest exponent, J. C. K. von Hofmann, that the totality of the theological system be derived from the totality of Scripture and not from the separate words, sentences, chapters, and books of the Bible, the result was a false doctrine of the Atonement. In Schleiermacher as well as in von Hofmann the doctrine of the Vicarious Atonement of Christ has been displaced by a doctrine of sanctification. The Vicarious Atonement simply has no place in their theological systems. Also in this matter we must be very grateful for God's gift to our Synod in the person of its first great theologian. Dr. Hoenecke knew the philosopher-theologians of the nineteenth century for what they were; in his *Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik* he analyzes their systems of thought and in every case points to the spot where the beginnings of their aberrations lay. Von Hofmann died in 1877. His works on New Testament interpretation are still with us today, and their influence has penetrated deeply into the TDNT.

Another supposedly "scholarly" approach to the Bible that is still very much in evidence is that of *Formgeschichte*. All suggested translations of the term have proved to be inadequate; so we shall treat it as though it were English. In America *Formgeschichte* came in just when the era of Liberalism had begun to wane. In the study of the Gospels liberal New Testament scholars had been following quite closely a documentary-source hypothesis. Positing Mark, or something that looked tremendously like Mark, as the earliest of the first three Gospels, it was generally accepted as the ultimate in exegetical wisdom if one could find how the "author"- "editor" of "Matthew" or "Luke" had added to the framework of Mark various statements, quotations from a volume of collected sayings of Jesus (the hypothetical "Q"), and other materials, and how then the product grew to be the first and third of our Gospels. The Biblical persons Matthew and Luke, it is alleged, had nothing to do with the production of the Gospels that among us bear their names. Who precisely did the work on these books, *Formgeschichte* does not pretend to know. Neither is that matter important. What is important about this process is that by comparing the Gospels, the one with the other, verse for verse, the scholar can allegedly determine just which parts came from the ancient traditions of the church (and therefore have a smattering of truth about them), and what was contributed by the early Christian community and was therefore for the most part interesting fabrication. The *Formgeschichtler* think of the *pericopes* (the smaller sections into which the Gospel was originally divided, each dealing with a separate matter) as being circulated from one early Christian church to another. In the process, and in either oral or written form, the pericopes were altered so that the account of the life and teachings of Jesus was pointed to meet the immediate needs of the day. The result was that the Gospels as we have them are in the estimate of *Formgeschichte* of quite questionable value for the age *about* which they treat, the life, work, passion, and resurrection of our Lord but rather are first-rate

historical sources for the age in which they were finally solidified into a definite form. This is not the place to go into a thorough discussion of the method of Formgeschichte. It is rather our purpose here to show how the contributors to TDNT, in their exegesis of Gospel material, proceed on the assumption that the method of Formgeschichte is valid. To their way of thinking it is not the inspired evangelist whom we are to listen to and from whom we are to hear the “words of everlasting life.” They call upon us rather to look upon the faceless entity called the “primitive worshiping community” and to distinguish thereby just what it was that the community produced and added to the “gospel tradition” and what may have been the conditions and interests that prompted certain changes to develop in the Gospels. By means of such an atomizing procedure we will gain, says Formgeschichte, a deep insight into the mind and heart of the early Christian churches, and it will depend upon the preferences of the particular scholar you are reading just how much will be left for a portrait of “the historical Jesus.”

Several samples should suffice: In his discussion (IV 121) of the “word of God” in the passages Luke 8:21, Mark 3:35, Matthew 12:50, and Luke 11:28 the writer gives a good example of the method of Formgeschichte. He says: “The fact that the parallels to the first Lucan saying had ‘do the will of God’ rather than ‘hear and do the Word of God’ is a warning against drawing far-reaching conclusions from the Lucan passages. There is no serious reason to doubt the historical authenticity of the sayings, but it must also be said that the *tradition gives us no certainty* [emphasis ours] that in both cases Jesus really used the Aramaic term for the Word of God and not one which might imply the will of God... It is hardly possible, then, to draw from the Lucan passages the historical conclusion that Jesus Himself actually used the word and applied it to His own preaching.”—It would seem as if the writer was himself drawing some “far-reaching conclusions.”

At V 182 the relation between the pronouncements on swearing in James 5:12 and Matthew 5:34—37 is compared. Rather than making the effort to bring out what Jesus and Matthew meant, considerable space is given to an attempt to dig up the “sources” of the two writers. James is not regarded to be what he was: the brother of our Lord, who did not believe in Jesus before the crucifixion and resurrection, but shortly thereafter became a leader of the Christian-Jewish church at Jerusalem. His epistle reveals him as a man who shows a great deal of pastoral tact in the advice concerning their sanctification which he gives his readers. To the writer in the Dictionary, “James” and “Matthew” are but names attached quite late to the writings that bear their names. He feels that the interpreter’s first responsibility is to isolate the sources that went into the making of these books. With apparent agreement he quotes one commentator who regarded James 5:12 as a dominical saying (one ascribed to Jesus in the tradition) or a saying of “Christian origin.” He guesses that the saying in the Matthew passage is one of the sayings which Matthew added to the “source” he was using from the treasure of proverbial Jewish wisdom.

Time and again in the volumes of the Dictionary the position is taken that the ultimate source of the materials used is the corporate self-consciousness of the Christian (or Israelite) communities. (“Communities,” not “churches,” is the name these writers insist upon for the groups of people whom they believe to be the ultimate source of much of the material in both the Old and the New Testaments.) The words of I Thessalonians 1:10 are labeled as “probably” a *community formula*.

There are, happily, oases in the broad expanses of this Dictionary where we find writers who challenge the basic suppositions of Formgeschichte and who show it to be wrong in both method and principle. Such a one is Albrecht Oepke, then of Leipzig. In speaking of the activities ascribed to the primitive Christian communities and on which the foundations of Formgeschichte have been erected, Professor Oepke makes the following forthright statement (IV 622):

The common conjecture that the primitive community, on the basis of its faith, created the image of Jesus portrayed in the Gospels, is shattered already by the simple but masterly portrayal, which could only correspond to the actuality, and also by the shortness of the time available. In Buddhism and Islam centuries were needed to make demi-gods out of the human founders of religion. In the faith of the primitive community as we may see it quite well in Acts and Paul there lives on from the very first the Lord who by the resurrection is exalted to heavenly glory

and whose coming again to establish the rule of God is awaited with longing. The rise of Christianity would be quite inexplicable if the early life of Jesus were fundamentally different from that of a favourite teacher or prophet, and if the primitive community itself had attributed to Him saving and mediatorial significance.

Oepke has touched the heart of the matter, and we can but repeat about the Dictionary what we said at the outset: there is many a kernel of grain to be found under the chaff.

Another tack that Biblical criticism has taken in this century is that of *Religionsgeschichte*, the comparative study of religion, sometimes called simply “comparative religion” or “history of religion.”

The basic assumption of the comparative religionists is that all religions, Christianity included, are the products of a people’s spirit, as are its songs, its poetry, its art, and its laws. So it is claimed that as the Greek had a special genius for the aesthetic and the Romans for law and government, so the Israelites for religion. The religions of the nations are seen as cross-fertilizing one another, and features of any cult may migrate and take up residence in some other region.

In the article on “word” and kindred concepts the writer discusses “The Divine Word of Creation.” In his discussion of the world’s origin in the divine Word he comments:

It is usually thought that this story is the refashioning of an older account, the word which God does being replaced by the word which he speaks. This spiritualizing of the work of creation may be traced back to a spiritualizing of priestly thinking, though it is not impossible that some influence was exerted by Accadian ideas of the creative power of the word, which are well attested. There can certainly be no doubt that the concept of creation by the Word was pre-exilic, for Ezekiel is independent of P and he is acquainted with the creative power of the *דְבַר* and is followed in this regard by Deutero-Isaiah.

This quotation from the Dictionary is quite representative of this that several critical presuppositions and methods may be at work all at once: here these are the Documentary Source Theory and the matter of *Religionsgeschichte*.

We shall look at one more area in which the TDNT reflects the negative, liberal, modern stance of much of the theological world of our time. This is the area in which theologians have insisted on absolute “freedom,” a sort of “academic liberty” to follow whithersoever *Wissenschaft* may lead. The thought that the Bible says what it means receives little attention, and the thought that the Bible means what it says is ignored. At IV 234 the identification of Levi the tax collector with Matthew the publican is apparently claimed as of no historical worth but is ascribed to a bit of “editorial” hanky-panky on the part of the “editor” of Matthew.

In the article on “Moses” the contributor expresses the opinion that the account in Matthew chapter 2 is a literary fabrication, not sober history. His words are (IV 870):

In Matthew the main influence of the typology is to be seen in the fact that the infancy story in Matt. 2 follows at many points the model of the Moses legend [*sic!*]. And on the following page he allows for “the possibility that Matthew sees in the mountain of the Sermon on the Mount a counterpart to the Mount of God on which Moses received the Law, for in Matt. 5:17, 21f Jesus is contrasted with Moses as the One who declares the true will of God, and it is thus highly probable that Matthew had this comparison in view *in the composition of the whole of the Sermon on the Mount* (emphasis ours).

As so often in critical modernism the Sermon on the Mount is held to be the creation of the “editor” who patterned his writing after something in the Old Testament.

At V 24 it becomes quite clear that the writer puts the Pastoral Epistles into the same time as second century Christian literature, thus denying that they are Pauline; page 39 the First Epistle of Peter (dated by most

moderns at least as late as the last decade of the first century and therefore pseudonymous) is found to be “under Pauline influence.” That Peter preaches the same doctrine as did Paul can be as readily seen as it was joyously acknowledged by Martin Luther. But when twentieth century critics speak of Paul’s influence on Peter, they regularly mean the influence of the collected church letters of Paul or the influence of some follower of or enthusiast for Paul as this was exerted upon the pseudonymous First Peter.

V 868 the Pastoral Epistles and the Writing to the Hebrews are classed as “Deutero-Pauline.”

We have found Albrecht Oepke to be an ally when it came to the rejection of the principles and method of Formgeschichte. At V 870, however, we find him talking like an advocate of *Heilsgeschichte* when he says: “The *parousia*, in which history is anchored, is not a historical event, nor does it merely give history its goal and meaning, It is rather *the point where history is mastered by God’s eternal rule*” (emphasis ours).

We firmly believe that even at \$22.50 a volume these books of upwards of a thousand pages apiece are a tremendous bargain. Nowhere else that we know of is so much offered at that rate. Anyone, however, who wants to use the TDNT, and not be *used by* it, should be considerably well-informed as to what the theological trends and language of German New Testament scholarship have been over the last fifty years. To such a one this Dictionary could become a great boon and a *multum in parvo*.

We are grateful likewise to the American publishers (Eerdmans of Grand Rapids, Michigan) for taking this project in hand.