

Introductory

This text finds a close parallel in Mark (7: 24-30). This text is appointed to be read on The Second Sunday in Lent in the TLH one-year lectionary. In LW, it is the appointed text to be read for Pentecost 13A in the three-year series. The Mark text is not appointed to be read in the TLH or LW lectionary, but it is (optional) for proper 18B in LSB.

Jesus has been lately operating in Galilee, at the northern end of the Sea of Galilee, also known as the Sea (or Lake) of Tiberius or Lake Gennesaret. In Matthew 14: 34 we find that Jesus and the rest, after the walking on water event, landed at Gennesaret, a city that is no longer there, but that was then located on the northwest side of this body of water.

At the beginning of chapter 15, Matthew tells us that “Pharisees and scribes” came up to that place from Jerusalem. That trip would have been of some distance, and we find that the purpose of their journeying to Jesus was to pick a fight with Him about His disciples’ neglect of ceremonial laws about hand-washing. Jesus calls them out for their hypocrisy.

Then He quotes from Isaiah, and then “called the people to Him” and preached a sermon about ceremonial law, noting that what comes out of the mouth is important, what is in the heart is important because what is in the heart results in concrete acts, either good or bad, and eating with hands unwashed is in the scheme of things not really a big deal.

Now we move on to this encounter with this woman. The woman’s persistence is the focus of most commentaries and I suspect of many sermons also. She comes to Jesus not on her own behalf, but pleading instead for her daughter, who is possessed by a demon. We can relate to the woman’s desperation, the frustration, and yes, to her persistence.

Especially parents with children who have had health or spiritual problems can relate to the woman’s dilemma. In preaching this text, we can use examples and anecdotes to create pathos in the person of the hearer and help them to better relate to the woman. It’s a good thing to create pathos in the hearer; to make them feel things during the sermon.

Having noted those things about the woman, and having noted that a lot of people spend a lot of time writing and talking about the woman, the focus here is, and the focus in preaching always should be, on Jesus, not the woman. At the end of the day the woman, as we have noted, is a lot like us. She has a child, the child is ill, and she wants healing.

No great shakes there, and while we can relate to her, she can’t do anything to help us. Jesus can, and Jesus does. He finds Himself in a conversation with the woman. He uses

the situation as an opportunity to teach her and anybody who is listening about theological matters. When all is said and done, He healed the woman's daughter.

When we talk about demon-possession, there will be some listeners who are skeptical that such things actually happened then or more to the point that they actually happen now. It's not that people have studied the topic or have known people with the problem. It's just that their only contact with this sort of thing may well be *The Exorcist* or the like.

It would be a simple matter to reference the movie and point out that it was based on a true story. It would be more work to give anecdotal evidence from people who have seen demon-possession first-hand, which occurs a lot more in pagan areas than it does in Christian. We also need to assure our hearers that they have nothing to fear from them.

Textual Notes

21. Matthew tells us that after the hand-washing incident, “ἐξελθὼν ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος – leaving there, Jesus withdrew into the region of Tyre and Sidon,” to the north and west of the Sea of Galilee. The construction of the phrase leaves open the possibility that there was a time gap between the two verbs.

The second verb, ἀναχωρέω, indicates movement, but not just movement. It means movement with a deliberate purpose, often to escape danger. Here Jesus' purpose clearly seems to be to put some distance between Himself and His religious leaders, and we can allow for the possibility that He took some time to think about where He would go next.

The verb is used fourteen times, including four times in quick succession in the second chapter of Matthew, in the context of the flight to Egypt. Perusing the other occurrences, we see – as we've seen before with this verb – that it means movement to get away from perceived danger. This does not make the doer a chicken, but it does make him prudent.

Both Tyre and Sidon are located along the eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea. Sidon is located to the north and Tyre to the south. The distance between the Sea of Galilee and Tyre looks to be about 40 miles. Google Maps tells us that the driving distance from Tyre to Sidon is about 40 miles, about 35 miles as the crow would have flown in that day.

Tyre (not an English tire) is still there and the fourth largest (WIK) city in Lebanon, with a population of something around 100,000. It is and has since ancient times been one of the few natural harbors on that end of the Mediterranean Sea. Sidon (“fishery”) is also still there and the third-largest city in Lebanon, with a population around about 200,000.

Tyre is also a port city and famous in Bible times for its production of purple dye. You already know that this area was, in ancient times, famous for being the home of the

Phoenicians, who traded all around the Mediterranean Sea. That being the case, the population would have been very heterogeneous, with people from all over the world.

We have noted over the years, beginning with our ten day stay in Seattle in 1984, that you're generally going to get a lot of diversity – ethnic and otherwise – in a port city. It's what Paul got in ancient Corinth and Athens, and if you think about it, Paul hit a lot of seaports during his journeys. It's what Jesus got here in the region of Tyre and Sidon.

When you have people with differing ethnicities, bringing many different cultures to the table, you will almost always find that those people have different ideas about religion, as well as about other things. Like the woman that He meets here, for example. Mark (7:26) calls the woman “Ἑλληνίς, Συροφοινίκισσα – a Greek, a Syro-Phoenecian by birth.”

Matthew calls her a “Χαναanaία – Canaanite,” a hapax - the only time the word appears in the NT. America is a nation of immigrants, and we all have our story, and my story has my ancestors hailing from Sweden, Germany, Belgium, and England by way of Hillbilly. If you ask most Americans, they will tell you the same, as would have this woman.

As far as the specific location of this incident, if Matthew had wanted to say that they went to either or both of those cities, he could have said that. He does not say that. He says that they went to the “μέρη – region,” a term used to express general geographical area of those two grand and ancient cities. It's like saying “out east” or “The Mid West.”

That ethnic urban mix would have been mitigated as you got away from the seaport cities, much like the ethnic urban mix of cities like Seattle and Chicago decrease with distance from the city. We in Mercer County are different from Chicago. But also like those cities, the influence of Tyre and Sidon would have been felt even in the rural areas.

22. Unlike in the Woman at the Well (John 4) incident, Matthew does not here tell us the circumstances of this woman coming into contact with Jesus, except that it was she who sought Him out. Matthew says, “ἰδοὺ γυνὴ Χαναanaία ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων ἐκείνων ἐξεληθοῦσα ἔκραξεν – behold, a Canaanite woman from that region came to Him, crying out.”

When we talk about location names in bible times, the exact definition of areas is often not really definite, and it is often fluid. The area in which this incident takes place, as mentioned above, is properly ancient Phoenicia, and if you move to the east just a little bit then you are getting into Syria. The area was certainly much more pagan than Jewish.

We tend to think of “Canaan” as corresponding almost exactly to “Israel,” the Promised Land conquered (though not completely) by the Hebrews in the time of Joshua and after. However, “Canaan” as a geographical term encompasses a very large area, an area that would have included somebody who is said to have been born “Syro-Phoenecian.”

When meeting people in other countries who ask me where I'm from, I will probably start off with I'm an American. If they want to know more specifically, I may say that

I'm from "the Midwest," or Illinois, or maybe "near Chicago." If they are familiar with the geography, I will tell them that I'm from where I-80 crosses the Mississippi River.

If they were to ask me ethnic origins, which they almost never do, I would say Swedish, German, Belgian, and Hillbilly. Nobody ever says, "so, which is it? Are you from the Midwest or Chicago? I thought you said you lived in Mercer County. One man in Ireland, when he learned I was from Illinois, asked if I knew his cousin in Chicago. No.

Knowing what we know about the area where this incident takes place, my best guess is that the woman's father was an ethnic Greek trader or businessman who lived in the region of Tyre and Sidon or in one of those cities, and whose children were born there, and those children still, considered themselves Greek, but after a few generations...

The woman cries out, the imperfect verb form indicating a continual act – she kept it up – and saying "Ἐλέησόν με, Κύριε υἱὸς Δαυεὶδ· ἡ θυγάτηρ μου κακῶς δαιμονίζεται – have mercy on me, son of David, my daughter is badly demon possessed." The cry for mercy is one familiar to Christians, and it is a good posture to take when dealing with God.

Then she calls Jesus "Κύριε υἱὸς Δαυεὶδ – Lord, Son of David," indications of not only a knowledge of Who Jesus is, but a confession that she believes those things about Him. Mark tells us that she had "heard of Him" and that she worshipped Him. She is notably not an ethnic Jew, but she recognizes Him to be descended from David and Messiah.

She presents her problem to Him, and she seems to think He can help. Her daughter is demon-possessed, and she adds that the condition is bad. Nobody ever talks about a "good" demon possession, and we could say the adjective κακῶς is redundant; of course it was bad, but we talk that way all the time, so let's allow that woman to talk that way.

In actuality, the woman is clearly and understandably distressed. The adverb "κακῶς" is a comparative, not a superlative, and not all demon possession is the same. There was the boy thrown into the fire, the men who met Jesus at Gennesaret. Now this woman whose child is demon-possessed. But the symptoms of that possession are not described.

23. Every translation that I'm looking at wrongly has the response of Jesus as "He did not answer her a word," or something like that. The text says that "οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῇ λόγον – He did not answer *her* word." It's a subtle distinction. She told Him what she told Him, using words, to which Jesus did not respond, and that makes us uncomfortable.

Add to that what follows, especially His apparent refusal to allow her a crumb from the table, and we have identified the elephant in the middle of the room. Taken at face value, this whole thing does not make Him look good. One guy on the Internet looks at this incident and concludes that Jesus is a Jewish racist, Who discriminates against non-Jews.

One clergyperson calls Jesus a "jerk." He is neither. I think it's okay that Jesus did not immediately respond to the woman's request that He help her daughter. Do you always

reply quickly to requests or commands from your wife, your children, or parishioners? How about requests or commands made to you by people who you just met?

To be sure, we will usually respond pretty quickly to requests or commands like that, but on the occasions when you do not respond to them immediately, why don't you? Maybe you want to think about it for a nanosecond or a day or a week. Maybe there's a lot going on and you just have to take a moment to clear your head. She was a stranger.

Maybe you have been caught off guard by a request from a stranger. Maybe there's something going on here of which we are unaware. God has not here, or anywhere else, bound Himself to respond to us quickly when we talk to Him. When we pray, God answers, "yes, no, or wait awhile." By His silence, Jesus is answering with "wait awhile."

I think the "Jesus is a jerk because He ignored the woman," et al is a relatively recent development, perhaps brought on by the Bible Scholars' understanding of Jesus as pretty much just another guy and certainly not God and therefore not perfect. Atheists, following the lead of these misguided Christians, have been only too happy to pile on.

If you go to this verse at www.biblos.com and click on the "comments" tab, the old school commentators, the Real Bible Scholars, the ones who did incredible useful and insightful scholarly work in the Bible, have several perfectly good possibilities explaining why Jesus would hesitate as He did, and none of them have Him being a jerk.

The disciples, always helpful, at some point intervene with a request or a command of their own; "οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἠρώτουν αὐτὸν λέγοντες Ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν, ὅτι κράζει ὀπισθεν ἡμῶν – the disciples of Him came to Him saying, 'send her away,' because she cries out after us," likely because she didn't want to wait for Jesus and was bugging them.

The sending verb is ἀπόλυσον, the aorist active imperative form ἀπολύω. You may recognize that verb in that form from such places as Matthew 14:15, where the disciples, upon seeing that evening is coming and the multitude is going to want to be fed, request or command Jesus to "send them away" into the villages to buy food for themselves.

In that very recent incident, they perceived that the people were hungry, and that they had only enough for themselves. Here, they want Jesus to send the woman away because she has been talking to them about her problem and that's annoying them. The crying out verb is a present active indicative – she's still doing it, Jesus, still bugging us all.

24. You may want to review FGG, p. 281 E. Questions Introduced by οὐκ or μή, where the author talks about questions that consist of "a genuine inquiry" and other questions that expect "a positive or negative answer." In expecting a positive or a negative answer, such questions may or may not be the figure of speech known as the Rhetorical Question.

You may also recall that punctuation is not found in the original NT manuscripts, which were written in all caps with no spaces, mostly to save space. For the same reason,

punctuation marks are not included, but added later by translators. Which punctuation mark to use and where to put that mark are things generally easily seen, but not always.

The translations from KJV on have Jesus making a statement that goes something like this, “I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.” The sentence includes the phrase “ἐἰ μή.” You may remember that short phrase from such places as the “exception clause” when Jesus talks about the causes (other than one man, one woman) for divorce.

The effect of the phrase here is to emphasize the exclusivity of His coming for the lost sheep of The House of Israel and them alone and not for anybody else. That doesn’t sound like something Jesus would say. Put a question mark at the end of the sentence beginning with οὐκ; it expects an affirmative response, and it makes a lot more sense.

We note that at this point Jesus is not speaking to the woman – He has yet to respond to her – but He is still speaking to the disciples, who have commanded/requested Him to send the woman away. They want to send her away, but Jesus answers that, rhetorically asking them, “Was I not sent *especially* to the lost sheep of the house of Israel?”

It is generally thought that the woman in question was not a Christian or even religious. But if you look at the woman’s actions, she sure looks like a Christian. We noted earlier how she asked Jesus for “mercy,” and called Him “Lord,” and “Son of David,” both terms with which one would address Messiah, and here she asks Him for help.

We are about to see her kneel before Him as one would kneel before God, and again call Him “Lord,” and then again two verses later. The pericope ends with Jesus proclaiming the woman to have “great faith,” which stands in stark contrast to that of Peter and others. Last week He called Peter’s faith “little.” Yes, this woman sounds like a Christian to me.

In referring to the “lost sheep of the House of Israel” in this rhetorical question, He was referring to people *exactly like this woman*, who is a very close descendent of the original “lost sheep of the House of Israel,” the “Ten Lost Tribes.” They are also, by the way, just the sort of people to whom Jesus had sent these same men when He had sent them.

In Matthew 10: 5, He instructs them to “go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no town of the Samaritans, but go rather to the *lost sheep of the House of Israel*.” Exactly who are these “lost sheep of the House of Israel?” They are clearly not “Gentiles,” and they are not Samaritans, those who dwelt in Samaria, located to the south of Galilee.

It is noteworthy that Jesus talks here about “Israel” – the original Twelve Tribes – and not about Judah, who still exist. The House of Israel is a commonly used phrase in the OT, and it is used six times in the NT. In the OT, it refers to the ten tribes of the Northern Kingdom as distinct from the two tribes of the southern Kingdom, Judah and Benjamin.

In the OT, but especially in the NT, the term “House of Israel” has strong negative connotations. The restoration of the Ten Tribes is a common theme when the term is

used. In one of the NT occurrences, the writer of Hebrews (8:8) quotes the very quotable Jeremiah 31: 31, speaking of the “covenant I that I will make with the house of Israel.”

Yes, Jesus has been sent, and He has already sent these same men to people *just like* this Greek Syro-Phoenecian Canaanite woman. How ironic that they now want to “send her away.” She is one of the “House of Israel,” people who are not ethnically Jewish (of the tribe of Judah), but who are a part of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel.

By this time, seven centuries after their genocide through the Assyrian policy of forced intermarriage and integration, descendants of those tribes were literally everywhere. Far from rejecting this woman because she is not part of the “House of Israel,” Jesus welcomes her because she is a part of that group, and it is a very large group.

25. Her response to Jesus’ declaration that He had come to help the likes of her is “ἐλθοῦσα προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγουσα Κύριε, βοήθει μοι – coming to Him, she bent the knee, saying, ‘Lord, help me.’” The verb that has her asking for help is in the imperative mode; she is not ordering, but emphatically asking, like we do in the Lord’s Prayer.

The verb translated “help” is βοηθέω, one of several Greek verbs translated “help,” a word that occurs only eight times in the NT. It is used to indicate great need, and to describe the action of a subordinate to petition a superior, like we do in the Lord’s Prayer, yet another indication of the woman’s belief that Jesus is who He is; She is a Christian.

26. Her humble request for help is answered with something translated like, “It is not fair to take the children’s bread and throw it to the dogs” (RSV), and if you thought Jesus was a jerk earlier in the story, then how much more now. It makes it sound like Jesus is calling this human a dog, but more like a puppy dog, as if that makes it okay.

Since this sentence is also introduced with “οὐκ,” let’s do like they do on Jeopardy and put it in the form of a question, one that would read something like this; “Is it not fair to take the children’s bread and throw it to the dogs?” A question introduced by “οὐκ” expects an affirmative answer, and looking ahead (27), the woman does respond “yes.”

First of all, let us check our understanding of “dog” at the door. If you don’t know how Americans feel about dogs, just ask Michael Vick, the NFL player who spent well over a year doing hard time for running a particularly brutal – is there any other kind? – dog fighting ring. Many Americans think Vick got off easy. We love our dogs!

Others seemed even prepared to suspend their opposition to capital punishment just this one time for Michael Vick. The man has long ago done his time, and he has been accepted back into our society by most of us, but some will never forgive him. That’s how highly we Americans value the dog, and for many Americans it’s very personal.

Not so much in the time of Jesus. The commentators can talk all they want about how “κυνάρσις” is a word for “little dog,” and is really a term of endearment, and the

translators can translate the word “puppies” (well, only one – ISV - does that) until the dogs come home, but a dog is still a dog, and dogs were viewed differently then.

A dog is still a dog, and in the OT and for NT Jews it is a term of severe contempt, not of endearment. To call somebody a “dog” was among the worst of all insults imaginable. Besides that, the dog is ceremonially unclean, so you wonder how many Jews actually had cute little puppies for house pets. Having said all that, this woman is not Jewish.

All of which is not to say that the Jews of Jesus’ day did not know about the dog. It’s one thing to have a dog, which is unclean, in the house as a pet. It’s quite another to have a working dog, and a lot of dogs work. A dog could work out in the pasture, and a dog could go with you out on the road. Mostly a dog could be an alarm, like out at the farm.

Fifteen years ago, we built a house in the middle of a cow pasture. The dog was with us, but then he died, and we found out all the work he had been doing for all those years, unbeknownst to us. Wild animals had gradually disappeared from our property. When the dog died the front yard began to look like we’re in the opening scene of *Bambi*.

Over there is Thumper and look at all the relatives and they seem to multiply like rabbits, and the dog must have kept them in check. Never saw one ground squirrel, then the dog died, and they act like they own the place. Deer didn’t keep their distance anymore, and that Opossum hiding in the bushes in front of the house waiting to kill a Guinea Fowl...

Well, that would never have happened if the dog had been at work, and I would not have had to empty the 9mm into the Opossum on a Sunday morning like I did. Man’s best friend, indeed. Nat Geo, in the program *And Man Created Dog*, has taught us that the relationship between us and them began as a symbiotic relationship, and it still is.

In the earliest days the dog found man’s garbage to be good eats, and so dogs hung around man. For his part, man found the dog’s bark to be an early warning to the approach of intruders and possible enemies. Jack London, in *To Build a Fire*, brought into sharp focus how dog sees man; The dog sees his master as a provider of food.

And anybody who lives in the country in a place where law enforcement response times are long, and even some city dwellers, knows about dog as alarm. Add that excursus to the excursuses on such things as darkness and locks, and we note that at the time of Jesus nighttime was rightly seen as a dangerous time, and that’s where the dog comes in.

The dog was not only the best, but the only home alarm system available at the time. It is in that context that Jesus rhetorically asks “Οὐκ ἔστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ βαλεῖν τοῖς κυναρίοις – isn’t it good to take the food from the children to throw to the dogs?” Yes, of course it is. If you don’t feed the dog, he won’t stay around.

The adjective καλόν has nothing to do with “fairness,” but with the intrinsic goodness of a thing or an act; to feed the dog with food from the family table. At the time of this

incident, the invention of dog food was almost two millennia away, and so what would we expect the dog, which is needed for security, to eat, if not scraps from the table?

If you don't feed the dog, then it will go and find its own food, become one of those dogs, and probably not come back to be your security system. The feeding of the dog from the family table is the way that you make sure the security system stays put and sounds the alarm, or even takes action to protect its food source, the house with the family inside.

Let us make this clear; Jesus is not encouraging the taking of food out of the mouths of children to be fed to the security system. And the only reason people would think that He's saying that is because preachers have been preaching that because the commentators and atheists have been saying that Jesus wants the children to go hungry.

One could even make an argument that Jesus was quoting a popular axiom or even a saying, but it would be an argument from silence. We have no record of which I am aware that has that axiom. Gundry thinks that "Jesus' saying sounds like a maxim, for which some extrabiblical evidence exists (see J.D.M. Derret...), but nothing conclusive.

If a maxim, Gundry says, it probably means something like "'Charity begins at home' and did not contain slurring reference to Gentiles..." (p. 314), but that doesn't sound like what Jesus is saying. The thing about the argument from silence is that it can't be proved, at least until some archeologist digs up a scroll or an inscription with this maxim on it.

27. As expected by the words used to ask it, the woman responds in the affirmative. She agrees, and maybe affirms what sounds like an axiomatic saying, "Ναί, κύριε· καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιγίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν – yes, Lord, and the dogs eat from the scraps falling from the table of their masters."

28. And now He responds by saying to and of her, "ὦ γύναι, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις – O woman, great is your faith." Do you suppose those whose faith He had called small heard this? What do you suppose they thought when they heard Him say that to her? Just what is it about that statement that causes such a strong positive reaction from Jesus?

Well, in that statement she calls Him "Lord" twice, but she's been doing that since they first met. Along with those things, and particularly it seems to be her understanding about the dogs eating the crumbs from the Lord's table that reveals to Jesus her "great faith." The key is found in the term "the Lord's Table," which occurs twice in the OT,

They occur both times and close together in the first chapter of Malachi, in connection with the defilement of the Altar because the priests offered shoddy sacrifices on it. God (7) answers those posing the question, "How have we despised your name?" by saying, "By offering polluted food upon my altar. And you say, 'How have we polluted it?'"

And God says, "By thinking that *The Lord's Table* may be despised. When you offer blind animals in sacrifice, is that not evil..." He asks rhetorically, and (12) He says that

they “profane” His name “when you say that *the Lord’s Table* is polluted, and the food for it may be despised.”

What is noteworthy here, and in the context of the Matthew text, is that those words of condemnation recorded in Malachi are spoken in reference to the priests of Edom, the tribes that have not existed as a people for almost seven hundred years. We find those words in the mouth of this woman, and then Jesus commends her for her faith.

Clearly the woman is happy to be the recipient of the good things that Jesus had to give, but there seems to be more going on here. It’s like one of those conversations where we feel like we get it, but on some level, we don’t get it. Was the woman here confessing her understanding that her ancestors had defiled the Altar of God, The Lord’s Table?

Was she further noting the OT teaching that Messiah would come for “The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel,” of which she was a part? Noting “The Lord’s Table” in the NT as sacramental, is there some sacramental connection going on here? And then He healed the woman’s daughter, and that miracle seems to have been done remotely.

Law/Gospel

Not Chosen/Chosen – Most Americans are of a mixed ethnic makeup, and one that does not include any Jewish blood, and most are certainly not of purely Jewish makeup. That in spite of our mixed makeup we are counted among the chosen is good news. Unlike in OT times, when Gentiles could become believers but would never be seen as fully Jewish, we Gentiles, as well as the Jews, have full and complete access to the Triune God. That is an idea that we don’t think about, but maybe we should.

Demon-possessed/Spirit-possessed – This sermon would preach better if you use Luther’s exorcism at the beginning of Holy Baptism. Life for humans is an either/or. Either your life is run by Satan or by God. The non-Christian may not have the signs of demon-possession (few of them do), but if you are not being ruled by the Holy Spirit, and all that such ruling entails, then...

Sermon Titles

The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel?

The Likes of Her

Hymns

Jesus Has Come and Brings Pleasure – LSB 533

Lift High the Cross – LSB 837

A Mighty Fortress Is Our God – LSB 657

The Son of God Goes Forth to War – LSB 661

O Little Flock, Fear Not the Foe – LSB 666

Rev. Steven L. Anderson
Pastor, Immanuel Lutheran Church
Grand Mound, Iowa

Resources

ACC – Manlio Simonetti, *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture (Matthew)*.
Intervarsity Press, 2002

BAG – Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Translated by
William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, University of Chicago Press, 1979

BCLY – William Barclay, *The Gospel of Luke*. The Westminster Press, 1975

FGG – James W. Voelz, *Fundamental Greek Grammar*. Concordia Publishing House,
1993

GBS – Jeffrey Gibbs, *Concordia Commentary, Matthew*, CPH, 2006

GND – Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*,
Eerdmans, 1982

MGM – W.F. Moulton, A.S. Geden, H.K. Moulton, *A Concordance to the Greek
Testament*. T & T Clark LTD., 1978

MM – James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek
Testament*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1982

ODCC – F.L. Cross, Editor, *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. Oxford
University Press, 1978

RNK – Fritz Rienecker, *A Linguistic Key to the Greek New Testament*, Zondervan, 1976

RSV – Revised Standard Version of the Bible. Zondervan Publishing House, 1965

SCR – David Scaer, *Discourses in Matthew: Jesus Teaches the Church*, CPH, 2004

UBD – Merrill F. Unger, *Unger's Bible Dictionary*, Moody Press, 1977.

WP – A.T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, Baker, 1930

VINE – W.E.Vine, Merrill F. Unger, William White, Jr., *An Expository Dictionary of Biblical Words*, Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1984

WIK – www.wikipedia.com

BIB – www.biblos.com

GBO – www.greekbible.com

Digital Classics Library - www.perseus.tufts.edu

Internet Classics Library – www.classics.mit.edu

Christian Classics Ethereal Library - www.ccel.org

Project Wittenberg - www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/wittenberg-home.html