

Introductory

This material is exclusive to John. In the TLH one-year lectionary, John 3:1-15 is the text to be read on Trinity Sunday. In LW and LSB, John 3:14-21 is appointed for Lent 4B. In LSB, but not in LW, this text is appointed for Lent 2A as well as for Trinity Sunday, and in both LW and LSB other texts are appointed for Trinity Sunday in Series A and C.

That means that LSB gives us a dose of The Gospel in a Nutshell two times in three years, two-thirds as much as TLH and twice as much as LW did. That is one example of many examples of the three-year lectionary covering much more territory than the one-year lectionary. When it comes to the Bible, more territory covered is better than less.

In the first chapter of John, we are introduced to the origins of Jesus, told of His coming into His creation, introduced to John, and then told of His going to be baptized by John the Baptizer. He gathers around him men who would later be known as Apostles, and then goes over to Cana and changes water into wine. After that He went back to Capernaum.

Then, and immediately before this, to Jerusalem for the cleansing of the Temple, and after that the evening visit of Nicodemus. Nicodemus was a Pharisee. The word “Pharisee” means “set apart,” or “the separated ones,” and that’s how they viewed themselves and how others viewed them. They further saw and were seen as being a cut above the rest.

The word has come into the vernacular with negative connotations, and the Pharisees are generally seen in a negative light by Christians, and we know why; Jesus generally doesn’t seem to like them, and they don’t like Him. We know this because the words exchanged between them and Jesus are generally not warm and fuzzy, but often hot and cutting.

They started it. As the message and mission of Jesus became clear, the opposition of the Pharisees increased. They would often ask Him questions to “test” or “tempt” (the word is the same in the Greek) Him. They called Him “Beelzebub,” which means “lord of the dung hill,” and proclaimed that they were not “born of fornication,” implying that He was.

John the Baptizer started it. When he was out in the wilderness preaching a baptism of repentance, the Pharisees were among those who came to him for baptism, and that was a good and somewhat surprising thing. Their coming was an incredible occurrence, and he greets them with a “brood of vipers” blast, and then he said some other unkind words.

Nobody started it. By token of their very theologically conservative nature the Pharisees were going to oppose anything new and different, and in and of itself that is not a bad trait. They saw Jesus as both new and different, and their response to Him spanned the range from envy to hatred to anger et al. Jesus was who He is, and that was not going to change.

However, there are some exceptions. In Acts 15:5 we note that there are Pharisees at the Christian Council of Jerusalem. They are the leaders of the Judaizers, to be sure, but Christians all the same, and since we are not told otherwise, they must have abided by the decision of the Council. The most notable of Pharisees who became Christians is Paul.

And then there was Nicodemus, who is included in the “many” who “believed” in Jesus, and who we see today wanted to do an evening of theological reflection with Jesus. The subject is about how one gets to heaven, a pretty important subject. One gets to heaven not by tweaking a pretty good life by adding God, but by becoming an entirely new person.

The Christian does not know *why*, but we are very thankful that God *has* in Holy Baptism given him that new life, and that God sustains that new life through Word and Sacrament in His Church. Yes, Nicodemus is a Christian, but a Christian with a lot to learn about his religion. But you can say the same about a lot of Christians. Most Christians. All of us.

Textual Notes

1. John has just told us that “many believed in His name when they saw the signs He did” (2:23). Nicodemus was apparently one of those who believed, and who was what we would call a “Christian,” but one who is still trying to fill in some of the blanks, “no one can do these signs that you do, unless God is with him (3:2).” He stops short of calling Jesus God.

Nicodemus is identified here in two ways; he is said to be “ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων – a man of the Pharisees,” and he is called “ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων – a ruler of the Jews.” To be a Pharisee was to be a member of an exclusive club. Barclay and Josephus say that there were “never more than 6,000” of them at any given time, and it was not just about religion.

The noun “ruler” is a very general term indicating power, and people like Nicodemus had power on several levels. They were educated, they had money, they owned the land and other assets, they wrote the laws and saw to their enforcement, and they ran the judiciary. Nicodemus was also he was also a member of the very exclusive club of only seventy.

The Sanhedrin were the ruling council of the seventy wisest men in all Judaism. John relates (7:40ff.) how there was a “division” among the people about Jesus. Some likes what He had to say, but others wanted to go so far as to arrest Him, but when the cops went to get Him, they were unable. Why not, asked their bosses; “Why did you not bring Him?”

You should hear that guy talk, they said; “No man ever spoke like this man.” Their bosses, the Pharisees, accuse them of following the masses, and declare to them that only losers believe in Jesus, not rulers and Pharisees like us – who are the same people. The Council were not talking about ideas but demanding that those men toe the line they had drawn.

Nicodemus was there, and we find out something about his character – he was not afraid to buck that trend. He does not make an apology for Jesus, but he does appeal to process, what we might call giving the man a fair hearing. Hear Him out, Nicodemus says, before you judge Him to be harmful or evil. They responded by asking him if he was one of them?

This was the first time we find Nicodemus and Jesus together. The second time, recorded by John (19: 39), at the death of Jesus Nicodemus brought “a mixture of myrrh and aloes about a hundred pounds weight,” indicating a certain degree of wealth. Some actual Bible scholars think he is Nicodemus Ben Gurion, and this man sounds like that man.

2. Nicodemus “οὗτος ἦλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς – came to Him at night.” It is generally thought that this was so that nobody would see him talking to Jesus. John tells us in another place that another man, Joseph of Arimathea, the one who donated the burial plot for Jesus, was a disciple “but secretly.” That’s not necessarily the case here with Nicodemus.

Barclay notes several other possible reasons for Nicodemus coming at night, some of them quite plausible; rabbis thought that night was a good time to study “when a man was undisturbed.” Jesus was a busy guy that everybody wanted to talk to during the day. Nicodemus himself wanted undisturbed as well as private time to talk theology with Jesus.

He says to Jesus, “Ραββεί, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας διδάσκαλος – Rabbi, we know that you come from God, a teacher.” He begins by calling Him “Rabbi” and “teacher” and states that “we” know Jesus to come (present tense) from God. The first person plural “we” indicates that other people also share those sentiments about Him with Nicodemus, no duh!

As is the case today, there were a lot of people teaching, and lot of them were teaching theology, and a lot of them were teaching correct things. The Pharisees, for example, were teaching correctly about God. They just had a hard time putting it into action, lacking what we call “acts of mercy.” His saying what he says about Jesus means more than just that.

Expositors says,

We need not see in the words anything either patronising or flattering, but merely the natural first utterance of a man wishing to show the state of his mind. He was convinced that Jesus was a divinely commissioned teacher. He came to hear what He had to teach. His teaching, in the judgment of Nicodemus, was divinely authenticated by the miracles; but to Nicodemus at any rate the teaching was that for which the miracles existed.

Something we don't talk about much is that Jesus was an exceptional preacher. He does the things that make preaching and teaching – they're the same thing – good, as opposed to poor preaching. We have already noted the effect of His preaching on those who were sent to arrest Him, and unbelievers as well as Christians recognize that in Him.

But besides that, the miracles Jesus did were for Nicodemus an authenticator for His being sent by the Father. Not everybody ran around doing miracles in those days, no more than is the case today. Nobody ever did miracles like Jesus did miracles. Today, in the same way, the miracles of the Sacraments authenticate the presence of Jesus among His people.

It does not hurt that Jesus was connected at the hip to John the Baptist, who was also recognized to be a prophet sent from God, a case of credibility by association. He further recognizes that “οὐδεὶς γὰρ δύναται ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖν ἢ σὺ ποιεῖς, ἐὰν μὴ ἢ ὁ Θεὸς μετ’ – for nobody has power to do these miracles that you do except God (is) with Him.”

Not everybody was so charitable. Those who saw Jesus with the eyes of unbelief saw the power of Satan or a magician. Nicodemus and others who saw Jesus with the eyes of belief saw the power of God in those same miracles. The only specific sign recorded by John so far, “the first sign” (2:11), was the changing of the water into wine at the wedding in Cana.

The term “first sign” indicates more to come, and there already had been. After He cleanses the Temple, John tells us that “many believed in His name when they saw the signs He did” (2:22). Of all the writers, John is most bold to speak of those miracles as not only authenticators, but in some way the cause for people to believe, sort of like the Sacraments.

These were nice things for Nicodemus to say to Jesus, and the response of Jesus seems very abrupt, almost rude. Perhaps there was small talk before this, left out by John. At any rate, we note that throughout the coming dialogue Jesus is very pointed with Nicodemus. He isn't like that with everybody, but we note that He *is* like that with Nicodemus, a big boy.

He is, after all, talking to a very learned theologian, a leader of Judaism, not to one of the hoi polloi, to whom He is consistently much kinder, much gentler. Pastors could learn from His example. It's the difference between the way I talk to other pastors at a Winkel and the way that I talk to Grandma Schmidt, who is on her last legs in the nursing home.

As for leaving things out, if you read through the entire conversation as recorded by John here, it has a running time of about a minute and a half. That's not very much time. I cannot imagine that Nicodemus would arrange for a meeting with Jesus to talk theology, and then that meeting between those two theologians lasting for that short amount of time.

When John later says, “there are also many other things that Jesus did; were every one of them to be written, I suppose that the world itself could not contain the books that would be written,” he is talking about summarizing, like probably here. We do that all the time, and we will do that this Sunday with this text, when we preach on it for twenty-two minutes.

We will edit for content and for length, packing the most punch into the words we use, selecting only the best word every time; that's called "prose." Like us, writers of the Bible do that all the time. John's summarizing, composing under the tutelage of the Holy Spirit, may also account for some of the apparent abruptness of the words of Jesus to Nicodemus.

3. Nicodemus wants to talk about signs. As He often does, Jesus turns the conversation to more weighty issues of life than that; He wants to talk about eternal life, "Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ - truly, truly, I say to you, if anybody is not born from above, he is not able to see the Kingdom of God."

Though he doesn't seem to have a clue, the concept of "new birth" was not a new idea, and it would have been familiar to Nicodemus and other learned Jews of his time. The Talmud states that, "the proselyte is like a newborn child." (Babylonian Talmud, Yevamot 22a), and that the typical proselyte convert would have received the standard proselyte baptism.

Actually, Nicodemus does have a clue, if by that we mean that he knew exactly what Jesus was talking about. What we see developing here between Jesus and Nicodemus is a thing called a conversation or dialogue. Many Americans are unfamiliar with the concept, and we have lost something as we have lost even the ability for face to face dialogue.

Nicodemus was familiar with the concept of baptism, and what it symbolized, just not as it applied to him. Baptism was for other people, not for somebody like him, and especially not for a ruler of the people like him. As was the case with Baptism, so the "new birth" was for dirty Gentiles who came over to Judaism, not for a died-in-the-wool Jew like him.

Not so much for us, and the "new birth" terminology and imagery have become an integral part of Christian theology, so much so we rarely give a second thought to how profoundly new and particularly repugnant such things were to Jesus' fellow Jews, who were very conscious of and adamant about their own chosen-ness and everybody else's lack of it.

We note that while Jesus could have chosen any of a number of metaphors, He chooses the "new birth" metaphor to speak of how one becomes a citizen of the Kingdom. The obvious still apparently has to be noted; nobody "decides" to be born, and nobody "decides" to become a Christian. I'm speaking again about and against the synergists among us.

I have not read it, but judging from the title, Billy Graham's *How to Be Born Again* has to be one of the most ridiculous books ever written. His radio program was called *Hour of Decision*, and his magazine was called *Decision*, and he used to trek the globe telling people to make a "decision for Christ." Who decides to be "born," the metaphor He chose?

Being born is not something any of us decided to do. Being born is something that happens passively to every person who is born. The spiritual birth of which Jesus speaks is also

passively received. There is no “how to.” There’s nothing we can do to make it happen, and that drives Americans in particular – who like to have and make choices – crazy.

Synergism may have begun in Holland with Jacob Arminius, but America is the place where it has really taken hold, and it has for the most part won the day in our country. Worldwide it is not really a very common idea, and in some places virtually unknown. The faithful pastor speaks out against the false teaching to which his flock is being exposed.

Oh, and dead people (Ephesians 2) don’t decide to come alive. Oh, and beware that if you mention Billy Graham by name – he’s dead now – you may get some flack. Maybe talk about stuff without naming names and let them connect the dots. Eventually somebody will verbalize, “Hey, that sounds like...” and you can shake your head and move on.

The adverb that modifies “born” is translated with English words; “from above, anew, again” et al. To it’s credit, biblehub.com correctly translates it “from above.” Looking at the thirteen occurrences (especially 3:31, which comes right on the heels of this) that is the primary meaning, and “again” is a secondary or even tertiary or even obscure rendering.

You wonder why almost all the English translations have “again” and few have “from above.” I don’t. Part of it is LBT; the KJV uses it, and the Lazy Bible Translator just goes with that. More to the point, it’s about selling Bibles to Americans, who are always up for a new translation, and who will not buy a Bible that does not include their alpha proof text.

4. Nicodemus asks the obvious, “Πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος γεννηθῆναι γέρων ὄν – How can a man be born being old?” This appears at first flush to be a very obvious and good question. More likely it’s a humorous attempt by Nicodemus to gather his wits about him as he tries to get his head around the idea that *he* has to be born from above to get to heaven.

Actually, it’s more of that dialogue going on. We have noted before that you learn more by listening than you ever do by talking, and we note here that asking questions can be a means to learning new things. The commentators like to talk about the “rabbinical” style of asking questions like this to clarify, teach, and learn, but it’s not limited to the rabbis.

What we observe here and in other places in the Bible is Classical Rhetoric and it was used by all people. It was used more and better by educated people, who discussed, debated, and argues in the courts and in the making of laws. But unlike the followers of pagan religion, who have nothing to talk about, the Jews used it when they were talking religion.

With paganism, they had their gods, and the holy men did their thing at their holy place and you went there to mostly observe, sometimes participate. It’s not a thinking man’s religion. The Hebrews wrote it down, and they had by this time been transitioning from the People of the Temple to the People of the Book, and they talked a lot about that Book.

5. Jesus plows ahead, clarifying, “ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ Πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ – if anyone should not be born of water and the spirit, he is not able to enter into the Kingdom of God.” The exception clause means that this is the only way to get to heaven, and the subjunctive means that not everybody does.

He is here clearly talking about Christian Baptism, and it is at the same time humorous and troubling to read what the Anabaptists say about the meaning of “water and the Spirit” here. The person in the pew often thinks that it’s a matter of this or that interpretation, and he’s looking at a translation that says, “born again.” Clearly, it’s not, but it is crystal clear.

6. To point out that earthly things produce earthly offspring and spiritual things spawn spiritual is not to say that one is necessarily better than another. They are different. To be born physically is one thing, and it’s a good thing, an essential part of God’s creation, making it sustainable. To be born spiritually is also from God, and different from that.

7. He goes on to make clear what Nicodemus should have known; that He is speaking about a spiritual birth, and then tells Nicodemus that he “μὴ θαυμάσης ὅτι εἶπόν σοι Δεῖ ὑμᾶς γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν – should not marvel that I have said to it is necessary for you (pl) to be born from above. Throughout the conversation Jesus eschews the word “decide.”

8. The first word in v. 8, “τό πνεῦμα,” is especially interesting, because since from at least the time of the KJV it has been mostly translated by English language Bibles as “wind,” and what does that mean? My Classical Greek scholar says that the word πνεῦμα “is very frequently used for ‘wind’ in extra-biblical literature,” but in the NT not so much.

But at least one person thinks that it should maybe be translated “spirit” and not “wind.” But it’s a pretty important one. E.W. Bullinger points out that “the word ‘πνεῦμα’, spirit, occurs 385 times in the New Testament, and is never translated “wind,” except here. There is a proper word for “wind – ἀνέμος.” It occurs 31 times and is always translated *wind*.

So that it would have been much clearer to have used this word (ἀνέμος), if wind had really been meant.” (*Figures of Speech in the Bible*, Baker, 1968, p. 248). That’s the beginning of what is solid argument for translating that verse “the Spirit (not “the wind”) moves where it wills...” and looking at the text, you wonder how “wind” ever got involved here.

I suppose wind *does* move, but not so fast. He says that the Spirit has a “voice” (the word there can also mean “sound”), and He points out that the Spirit actually does *will* (θέλει) things, and you can’t really say that about the wind. He points out that, contrary to what Jesus says here, we actually *do* know where wind has been because it blows stuff around.

Those comments on John 3:8 are made in the context of his chapter on *EPANADIPLOIS*; or, *ENCIRCLING*, a figure of speech in which “the same word is repeated both at the beginning and at the end of a sentence” (p. 244). Like if you begin and end a sentence with πνεῦμα, for example? Maybe that’s why John has Jesus calling the wind πνεῦμα here?

9 - 10. Seeking further clarification for this new old idea, Nicodemus asks “Πῶς δύναται ταῦτα γενέσθαι – how can these things be” or “how are these things able to happen?” Jesus again seems to speak rather harshly and in an almost scolding manner to this man, pointing out that he is supposed to be a teacher, and yet he does not understand that familiar concept?

We note here the difference between a person’s knowing factual information and the person actually comprehending that information. Nicodemus may have the first, but he maybe does not yet possess the second. And rather than harsh, could it be that Jesus is having some fun with it, ribbing Nicodemus, “busting his balls,” more than scolding him.

Would it be okay for Jesus to bust somebody like that? Whereas Nicodemus had called Jesus “Rabbi” as well as “teacher,” Jesus here calls Nicodemus a “διδάσκαλος – teacher.” Διδάσκαλος is the basic word for teacher, and Jesus calls Himself and His disciples that, and the Apostles are called that, but He tells His disciples not to seek to be Rabbi.

Rabbi is a term of honor and respect that is reserved for *some* teachers, and it is not given to just anybody but must be earned. Like the tag “confessional,” it’s something others say about you, not what you say about yourself. One cannot gloss oneself “Rabbi.” In our day terms of honor and respect are more closely tied to educational level, like Reverend.

11. Not necessarily frustrated, Jesus tells Nicodemus that we can tell you what we know, and we can tell you what we see, but they can’t make him “λαμβάνετε – grasp” it, to understand or to believe it. You can lead a horse to water, but you can’t make it drink, and if you are a pastor, you know the feeling. You also know the feeling if you aren’t.

It’s interesting that Jesus uses the first person plural “we” when He speaks of their telling. We know that John the Baptizer was saying things, and we assume that at least some of His disciples (followers) were too. The Apostles, likewise, may well have been telling what they knew and bearing witness to the things they had seen – like the miracles of Jesus.

12. There’s a problem here, “εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς ἐὰν εἴπω ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια πιστεύσετε – if the earthly things I have told you and you don’t believe, how, if I tell you heavenly things will you believe?” The commentators expend many words struggling mightily with the meaning of this saying, and most of them mostly fail.

This is basic stuff. I understand being born from above in Baptism and so do you. We understand metaphor. We hear and understand it all the time, and we use it without even thinking about it. The birth metaphor ought to help Nicodemus to understand, but instead he asks just how would that work, a grown man going through the birth canal in reverse?

As this conversation plays out, Jesus is getting increasingly annoyed at this learned theologian’s seeming inability to grasp simple truths. It’s the sort of annoyance that comes

from having a pupil whose problem is not that he *can't* learn, but that he *won't* learn. I especially get annoyed at other theologians when they behave like Nicodemus did here.

13. In spite of his opening flattery, we have to think that when Nicodemus came to Jesus, he came to Him as to a peer, just two theologians talking theology. If there were an alpha male in this conversation, Nicodemus would have identified himself as it. But Jesus knows better, and as this conversation moves on, it becomes clear that the alpha is in fact Jesus.

With His statement about freely moving between earth and heaven, He places Himself into a different category. Thinking of people like Enoch and Elijah - who have “ascended” to heaven, and who have seen what’s up there, have not come back to tell people what they have seen, but Jesus has been there, and has descended, and He can tell you all about it.

In saying that, after He has pointed out the inability of Nicodemus to understand either heavenly or earthly things, Jesus is essentially pointing out to Nicodemus that He knows about both. This is not a peer on peer conversation, but there is the One who is the Teacher, and there is the one who is the learner, and school is in session, so listen up!

14. School is in session, and Jesus uses a pedagogical method I learned at CTCRF to be “association.” He points Nicodemus to familiar territory, to Moses, to the wilderness, to the serpent that was raised up on the pole in the wilderness and for what purpose. He then builds the familiar and creates yet another analogy in the minds and emotions of His hearer,

He proclaims Himself to be the fulfillment of that OT incident which He will in fact become. Keep and enlarge upon, but do not remove this type from the text when preaching on the antitype. Review the incident, explain “type/anti-type” and give some examples, so that the next time they run into the snake in the wilderness they will think of its meaning.

15. To the question of why Jesus would ever want to be like that ugly snake, “ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον – so that all believing in Him should possess eternal life.” That’s a purpose clause, and it’s the reason why Jesus went to that tree of the cross. He went there so that anyone who believes in Him will have a firm hold on eternal life.

16. KJV has the very familiar vv. 16ff. in red, meaning that they think that Jesus spoke those words. RSV ends the quotation marks with v. 15, meaning that they think that John is not quoting, but John is instead writing commentary. It’s one or the other, but either way the words written here by the Holy Spirit are from God, and they are great words.

John likes his irony, and we note here again the irony when it comes to God and the World, “Οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν Υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν – for indeed God loved the World, so that He gave His only begotten Son.” God’s love for the World is here said to be the reason why He sent His son into it, in order to save it.

The resultative clause, “ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ’ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον – so that all believing in Him, not die, but hold everlasting life.” The emphatic “ἀλλ – but” is there to indicate that the upshot of either/or of believing or not and the great chasm that will separate those two categories of people for eternity. It’s either hell or it’s heaven.

Law/Gospel

No Life/Yes Life – Until our conception we did not exist. And then we were born. God the Father works in Mother church to conceive children. And then we are born anew.

Unbelief/Belief – Unbelief condemns, and belief saves. According to Ephesians 2: 8, even “faith” is a gift of God.

Condemnation/Salvation – Sin brings with it everlasting death. The work of Christ, applied to a person in Baptism, brings salvation.

Silence/Witness – Nicodemus was trying to figure it out, but there was nobody to tell him. Jesus comes to “bear witness,” somebody to tell Him how things are. Nicodemus struggles, as do we all.

Sermon Titles

One of These Pharisees

Snake on a Stick

Opening the Mind

Understanding God

Conversation With The Rabbi

Hymns

God Loved the World, So that He Gave – LSB 571

Jesus Loves Me – LSB 588 – Sing songs sometimes that the little ones know, and the adults will like it too. It will help the children to understand that church is for them too.

Anything from the *Baptism* section

Anything from the *Lent* section

Rubric: only one or fewer hard songs per Sunday.

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