

# Concordia Theological Monthly



M A R C H

• 1 9 5 0

A NEW GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON  
OF THE NEW TESTAMENT \*

Students of the New Testament in the English-speaking world have long been conscious of the need for a new Greek-English dictionary of the New Testament. J. H. Thayer's lexicon, published in 1886, and in a corrected edition in 1889, was a monumental work in its day, but much of it has now been suspended.

About 1935 an attempt was made to secure permission to translate Walter Bauer's excellent *Woerterbuch* in England, but nothing came of it. Several years later, the University of Chicago Press became interested in the production of a dictionary of New Testament Greek, but progress was slow. After the end of World War II interest was revived.

In the meantime, independently of the Press or any other agency, the Lutheran Academy for Scholarship of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod decided that the best service it could render to Biblical scholarship was to encourage the preparation of a translation of Bauer's third edition of 1937. The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod made funds available for this purpose. Upon learning of the plans of the University of Chicago Press, the Church began negotiations which ended November 30, 1949, with the signing of a contract between the Press and the Church for the production of a new Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament within a period estimated at about four years.

The plan is no longer simply to make a translation of Bauer's lexicon, but to use it as a base and to introduce whatever changes seem to be desirable in form and content, and to make whatever additions are necessary. Permission for such use of Bauer's dictionary was gained by the University of Chicago Press in 1947.

It is perhaps not generally known in this country that Professor Bauer is now working on a fourth revised and augmented edition of his dictionary. He retired from his position at Goettingen at the end of 1945 because of a chronic infection of the iris of the eye, brought on by malnutrition. Although it is still troublesome, this condition has

---

\* This paper was prepared and read by Professor F. W. Gingrich at the meeting of The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis at the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, December 30, 1949. We are grateful to Professor Gingrich for granting us permission to publish it. — ED. COM.

improved enough to permit him to work at least part of the time. Despite the many frustrations and delays to which he has been subjected, he has brought the book nearly to completion. At the present time he has read and corrected more than half the final page proof, and the first fascicle, which will include about one third of the work, is expected to come off the press very soon. In a letter dated December 11, Frau Bauer informed me that the last of many obstacles had been overcome when the paper was finally delivered to the printer in Leipzig. These achievements are the more remarkable when we realize that Dr. Bauer was 72 years old last August 8.

The changes and additions made by Dr. Bauer to this edition are the fruit of ten years' systematic reading of Greek authors from the fourth century B. C. to Byzantine times, which he carried on between 1937 and 1947. It is this fourth edition upon which the forthcoming Greek-English lexicon will be based.

The direction of the new project is in the hands of Dr. William Arndt, professor of New Testament at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., who has been relieved of half his teaching load to work on it at St. Louis. The present writer is working on it full time at the University of Chicago Press, having been granted a leave of absence for the purpose from Albright College. In editing the lexicon we will have the advice of Dr. M. M. Mathews, head of the dictionary department of the University of Chicago Press, who is an expert on lexicographic procedure. At the present time we are engaged in examining current literature for treatments of New Testament Greek words.

The editors and all others connected with the making of this lexicon are anxious that it should be truly representative of the best scholarship in the English-speaking world on the subject. To this end they invite suggestions as to the form and content of it. Dr. Arndt may be addressed at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis 5, Mo., and the writer at The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill. Let me present briefly a number of questions which might profitably be considered.

First, as to form. Should we follow Bauer in his frequent use of abbreviations? Would it be possible to relegate certain things in the treatment of a word to smaller type? Would it be more convenient for the reader if each new category were brought back to the left-hand margin of the column? Would it be well to let each entry word "overhang," that is, project a space or two beyond the left-hand margin? Could improvements be made in the order in which the meanings are arranged? Does anyone feel that Bauer gives too many references to contemporary treatments of the word in question? Would it be well

to indicate the meaning of a word in classical Greek when it differs significantly from the Koine meaning?

On the content of the dictionary, the editors would appreciate a statement from interested persons concerning important treatments of New Testament words, and their judgment as to the validity which they may possess. Results of the work of seminar courses would be appreciated.

The following brief list of items may suggest some possible questions. There was a tremendous amount of work done on the word ἀγάπη, as revealed in H. Riesenfeld's *Etude Bibliographique Sur la Notion Biblique d' ΑΓΑΠΗ*, 1941. Which do you consider the most significant trends in the study of this word? Prof. Albert Debrunner has suggested that ἀπ' ἄσπι in Rev. 14:13 should really be ἀπαρτί, a closely related form, which means "certainly, exactly." If he is right, and I think he is, we shall have to make a new entry in the New Testament vocabulary. (Coniectanea NT XI, 1947, 45—49.) Does ἀπλῶς in James 1:5 mean "simply" or "liberally"? Riesenfeld (Coniectanea NT, 1944) points out that when the word is combined with πᾶς, it means "without exception" and then "without reserve."

Do you agree with Dr. Wikgren in the 1942 JBL that ἀρχή means "essentials" or "elements" in the title to Mark's Gospel? Can you add anything important to the discussion whether δικαιοῦ means "to make just" or "to declare just"? Is H. Sahlin right in saying in "Zwei Lukasstellen" (1945) that ἕκαστος in Luke 6:44 means "both" rather than "every"? This meaning is not found in Bauer's third edition.

Who can tell us just where Emmaus was? Does ἐντὸς ὑμῶν in Luke 17:21 mean "inter vos" or "intra vos"? Just what is the symbolic meaning of the sounding brass and of the mirror in 1 Corinthians 13? Which of the many possible translations of παράκλητος is best? Is the παρθένος of 1 Cor. 7:38 the daughter or the fiancée of the man involved? Just how many sanhedrins were there, and what were they like? When does συνείδησις mean "conscience," and when simply "consciousness"? These are a few of the many which come to mind. We shall appreciate any word which you may have concerning them.

Chicago, Ill.

F. W. GINGRICH

### "THOU ART MAD"

A college roommate and I once discovered, rather to our surprise, that Webster's Dictionary makes very good continuous reading of a sort, and we spent a good many odd moments, profitably I believe, at that strange sport. It was renewal of youth, therefore, to discover that the

solid, the reliable, the indispensable, the scholarly Kittel (*Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament*) could afford a kindred pleasure; he makes excellent browsing. It all began with the fourth volume, which opened at the unpromising word *μαίνομαι*. The survey of the classical material, with which the article opens, was a return to my salad days with Homer and Sophocles, a little nostalgic anthology of half-forgotten Greek, as fresh and dewy as the day I first met it in classroom or solitary study. It bore some theological fruit, too; the citations from the *Bacchae* of Euripides brought into view the idea which is the dominant one of the article: belief and unbelief confront each other with "Thou art mad!" The same idea recurs in some of the Septuagint material; the martyr's devotion of Eleazar and his sons is madness in the eyes of Antiochus Epiphanes. In the New Testament itself the word occurs but five times. But all four of the contexts in which it occurs are significant and characteristic. In the Gospel of St. John 10:19 ff. those Jews who cannot understand Jesus and will not admit His claim and His authority have but one reason for their contumacy: "He hath a devil and is mad." For unbelief, the unheard-of, the unparalleled, is madness. In Acts 12:15 the message of the maid Rhoda that Peter is standing at the door is greeted with, "Thou art mad." The incredible miracle of God is madness. In Acts 26 the impassioned proclamation of St. Paul all but casts its spell upon the Roman procurator also; he shakes off the spell with "Paul, thou art beside thyself; much learning doth make thee mad." The "words of truth and soberness" are, to unbelief, the fruit of madness. And the Spirit-inspired speaking with tongues of the Corinthian church — if the cool rationalism of unbelief confronts it, "will they not say that ye are mad?" To unbelief the redemptive action of God in any of its aspects looks like madness.

A little word like *μαίνομαι* may open up long vistas. It is perhaps not necessary to draw an explicit moral; the fruit is there for the plucking. From within, to the eyes of faith, the length and breadth and height and depth of the temple of God have a sweetly reasonable symmetry. But from without, to the eyes of unbelief, the building looks all askew, built on non-existent foundations and compounded of weakness and delusion. Apologetics has severe limitations. The Church must remember that what it has and what it says is madness, that being possessed of God has been from of old viewed with wary suspicion in the cool light of day. The Gospel is foolishness, a divine foolishness, which is wiser than the wisdom of men; but we must let God prove its

wisdom to men. We can only preach it, in season and out, in the teeth of the undying refrain, "Thou art mad."

But it is the "Thou art mad" of Festus that lingers particularly in our mind; for the Order of Festus, whose watchword is "Much learning doth make thee mad," has flourishing chapters within the Church, is represented at most conferences and at all seminaries by well-intentioned "practical" men and "practical-minded" students who in their short zeal for quick results do not see the danger of impoverishment and, ultimately, of perversion that threatens all severely "practical" theology. We shall do well to remind ourselves often that "practical" is derived from the Greek that loyal Festians are inclined to belittle, from a verb, *πράττω*, signifying "to do"; that the only force that *does* in the Church is the Word of God, the Gospel. And then we shall do well to recall the long wisdom of that most practical man, Martin Luther, who saith thus:

Denn das koennen wir nicht leugnen, dasz, wiewohl das Evangelium durch den Heiligen Geist ist gekommen und taeglich kommt, so ist's doch durch Mittel der Sprachen gekommen, und hat auch dadurch zugenommen, *muß auch dadurch behalten werden*. . . . So lieb nun also uns das Evangelium ist, so hart lasset uns ueber den Sprachen halten. . . . Und lasset uns das gesagt sein, dasz wir das Evangelium nicht wohl werden erhalten ohne die Sprachen. Die Sprachen sind die Scheide, darin dies Messer des Geistes steckt; sie sind der Schrein, darin man dies Kleinod traegt; sie sind das Gefaesz, darin man diesen Trank fasset; sie sind die Kemnot, darin diese Speise liegt; und, wie das Evangelium selbst zeigt, sie sind die Koerbe, darin man dies Brod und Fische und Brocken behaelt. Ja, so wir's versehen, dasz wir, da Gott vor sei, die Sprachen fahren lassen, so werden wir nicht allein das Evangelium verlieren, sondern wird auch endlich dahin gerathen, dasz wir weder lateinisch noch deutsch recht reden oder schreiben koennen. . . . Darum ist's gewisz, *wo nicht die Sprachen bleiben, da muß zuletzt das Evangelium untergehen*.

The Order of Festus is an ancient and a sensible, though hardly an honorable, order. To American Lutheranism, despite its sound theological heritage, it has a very special appeal—we are practical men and we have democracy's suspicion of the expert. One senses that the Missouri Synod, too, is beginning to be enthralled by it. But if we allow ourselves to be enrolled in it, our zeal for doing, for the practical, will, ultimately, leave the Church's real work undone and prove our undoing. As Christians, we are mad by definition; let us be mad in the grand manner, thoroughly, painstakingly, polyglottally mad. St. Paul, the mad, being dead, yet speaketh; Festus owes his little shred of immortality to the fact that he called St. Paul mad.

M. H. FRANZMANN

## THE COMMUNION ISSUE IN EKD

The *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, published at Munich and edited by Dr. Ernst Kinder, is the official organ of the Lutheran Church of Germany (VELKD). In its number of November 15 it contained an article on "The Issue of Altar Fellowship in the EKD," by Walter Zimmermann, who writes under instructions from the Board of Directors of the VELKD in reply to certain proposals touching the question of altar fellowship in the EKD. The more immediate occasion was a letter, directed to the official delegates of EKD by Pastor v. d. Gablentz, in which the salient passage read: "The dissensions among the Confessions and the organized groups can only disappear when complete altar fellowship is established and, above all, when it is practiced by the convention itself" — and it is proposed that a joint Communion service be held at the opening of the next convention of EKD (the "Confessions" referred to are, of course, the Lutheran, the Reformed, and the Union Church, federated since the summer of 1948 in the *Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland* — EKD). The reply made by Pastor Zimmermann announces a definitely negative stand of the Lutheran Church of Germany regarding the establishment of altar fellowship. Zimmermann asks: "At a time such as this, when there is certainly no lack of explosives in EKD, is it advisable to make an issue of this matter, especially since some of us are only with some self-control viewing conditions in EKD, especially since there is a little understanding of our conscientious scruples about this matter?" Next Rev. Zimmermann addresses himself to the notion that existing tensions might disappear through the establishment of altar fellowship. "This," is his comment, "is mistaking cause and effect. These tensions are the very reason why there is no room for altar fellowship. If two people differ in the fundamental concepts of married life, it will hardly make sense to tell them to enter into matrimony as a solution of their problems. Even so urging altar fellowship may very soon end in a *divorce*." Continuing his argument, Rev. Zimmermann points out that confessional differences during the epoch of liberalism — which the author evidently views as a dead issue — have been regarded as pointless or as theological quarrels. But, he says, we have, since the new insights gained more recently and since the "shackles of state-churchism have dropped away, become more serious and even excited about confessional questions today than ever since the days of the Reformation. We have learned, for one thing, that the Confessions have a decisive meaning in the question of Holy Communion. It is also an error to assume that only the question of altar fellowship still

separates the churches of Germany." Then, as regards the present situation, Rev. Zimmermann reminds his readers that "what is demanded by love in the hour of necessity must not be made a principle for normal practice. It was the principle of charity that was brought into play for the admission of refugees to our altars, and it must not be argued that by making this concession we have sacrificed our position that the differences in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper are indeed divisive of fellowship." There is a final warning not to try to maneuver the Lutherans into a unionistic position also in view of the "high explosives" in EKD, in view of which Zimmermann earnestly pleads that no effort be made in the direction of a joint Communion service when EKD next meets in synodical convention.

When the Lutherans, Reformed, and Union Church (the latter an insignificant minority party) met in Eisenach in 1948 for the organization of the Federation of Protestant forces, there were also voices in the Lutheran Church which urged the formation of a Church and not of a federation only and for this reason had in the original proposals a paragraph establishing altar fellowship between Reformed and Lutherans. This matter was debated for two days, and the paragraph finally adopted, while not establishing altar fellowship, recognized the difficulties of pastoral ministrations caused by the invasion of millions of refugees from the East settling down in the Lutheran parishes of Western Germany. Dr. Eugene Gerstenmaier, home on business in Stuttgart during the sessions, informed us regarding the progress of the debate and gave as an instance the presence of refugees from the Silesian Union Church, now temporarily settled in a parish of the Bavarian State Church, which is Lutheran. How is a pastor to handle such cases? At a session in Bad Boll, June 17, 1949, Dr. Ernst Kinder, discussing German church affairs, also mentioned this problem of admission to the Lord's Table and altar fellowship. "There is no altar fellowship in principle and effective for the entire body of EKD. Wherever others are admitted to the Lord's Table, it is due to special difficulties in which the minister finds himself when dealing with individual souls. We are determined that such cases in casuistry do not become the normal procedure and that we gradually work our way out of this situation, a thing," he added, "in which we are even now making good progress."

The difficulties which are today besetting the German parish overwhelmed with thousands of refugees, without money, largely without household goods, and without employment, violently torn out of homes, jobs, and every social tie, completely disheartened and often in utter



despair, but seeking the consolations of the Gospel, create for the conscientious pastor difficulties not altogether unlike those for which our own pastors in the United States had to find a solution when a parish of two or three hundred souls found itself in the seething turmoil of a village of a few thousand mushrooming into a city of fifty thousand within a few months through the growth of war industries, with hundreds, and sometimes thousands of Lutherans moving into such parishes, yet knowing that their sojourn would last but a year or two until the war would be over. We do not find that the distinction made in our welfare work ("city mission") from its beginning, of (temporary, provisional, or emergency) *admission* to the Lord's Table, and *communicant membership* in the church, or the manner in which our pastors in defense areas or chaplains in Army and Navy met similar situations, has led to a decay of soundly Lutheran practice. No one is able to predict the outcome of this issue in the Lutheran Church of Germany. When in 1948 the Missouri Synod commissioners to Bad Boll expressed their misgivings regarding the formation of EKD and pointed out particularly the danger of an *Abendmahlszulassung* developing into an *Abendmahlsgemeinschaft*, they had in view the strongly unionistic trend of the Reformed and *Unionskirchen* element, also of not so small a contingent of weak Lutherans, who would seek to change an emergency status into something permanent and official, the "open Communion" policy which we know so well in America. It is clear that so far as the guiding councils of the VELKD are concerned, they are willing to be held responsible for a breakup of EKD if the price for union is to be paid by yielding the confessional principle. — The article by Pastor Zimmermann has since been mailed in separate reprint to the Lutheran clergy of Germany.

TH. GRAEBNER

### THE WITNESSES OF CHRIST'S RESURRECTION

In listing the witnesses of the risen Christ in 1 Cor. 15:5 ff. St. Paul makes no reference to the several women who played such a prominent role on Easter Day. This does indeed seem rather strange. However, it must be kept in mind that St. Paul in this chapter is determined to present Christ's resurrection not only as an object of faith, but primarily as an absolutely and indisputably established fact. According to Jewish law, women were not admitted as material witnesses in a judicial process, and the omission of the women as witnesses to Christ's resurrection is therefore fully in accord with Paul's intention in this chapter, namely, to set forth that any human court must recognize the evidence for the Resurrection as an undeniable historical event. F. E. M.