

# LUTHER'S WORKS

COMPANION VOLUME

## LUTHER THE EXPOSITOR

*Introduction to the Reformer's  
Exegetical Writings*

By

JAROSLAV PELIKAN

---

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE • SAINT LOUIS

ISBN 0-570-06431-7



9 780570 064312

Biblical Studies / Commentaries

**15-1741**

Copyright 1959 by  
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE  
St. Louis, Missouri

*Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 55-9893*

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17

13 12 11 10 09 08 07 06 05 04

# Contents

<i>Publisher's Preface</i>	vii
<i>Introduction</i>	ix

## PART ONE

### *The Principles of Luther's Exegesis*

CHAPTER ONE Exegesis and the History of Theology	5
CHAPTER TWO Luther as a Biblical Theologian	32
CHAPTER THREE The Bible and the Word of God	48
CHAPTER FOUR Scripture and Tradition	71
CHAPTER FIVE The History of the People of God	89
CHAPTER SIX Commentary and Controversy	109

## PART TWO

### *The Practice of Luther's Exegesis: A Case Study*

CHAPTER SEVEN "This Is My Body" (Matt. 26:26)	137
CHAPTER EIGHT "For the Forgiveness of Sins" (Matt. 26:28)	157
CHAPTER NINE "If Anyone Eats of This Bread, He Will Live Forever" (John 6:51)	174
CHAPTER TEN "Participation in the Body of Christ" (1 Cor. 10:16)	191
CHAPTER ELEVEN "Do This in Remembrance of Me" (1 Cor. 11:24)	205
CHAPTER TWELVE "You Proclaim the Lord's Death" (1 Cor. 11:26)	219
CHAPTER THIRTEEN "Once for All the Sacrifice of Himself" (Heb. 9:26)	237
<i>Conclusion</i>	255
<i>Indexes</i>	263

## *Publisher's Preface*

**S**INCE the first thirty volumes of the American edition of *Luther's Works* are devoted to exegetical writings from the pen of the Reformer, the publisher has considered it helpful to issue a work dealing specifically with Luther's skill and significance as an expositor of Holy Writ. Although each of the volumes has a brief introduction giving pertinent information as to the historical setting of its contents, a thorough understanding of the Reformer's role and achievements in the important field of exegesis requires an acquaintance with the principles that guided the great doctor of theology when he expounded the words of the Bible.

In *Luther the Expositor* Jaroslav Pelikan provides the reader and student with some of the tools that are needed for a proper appreciation of Luther's exegetical writings. This companion volume shows conclusively that "in his exegesis — as in his doctrine, piety, and ethic — the Reformer" was "a son of the church" and "a witness to the Word of God revealed in Jesus Christ and documented in the Sacred Scriptures."

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE

## *Introduction*

**T**HIS volume is an introduction to Luther's exegetical works and a study of Luther as an expositor of the Scriptures. The exegetical works of Luther, which constitute the first thirty volumes of this American edition, cover much of the Old and the New Testament. The dates of their composition span the entire third-century of Luther's theological career. Some of these exegetical works were delivered in the form of sermons; others were lectures from Luther's classroom; still others were the product of Luther's literary labors. The individual introductions to the various volumes of the exegetical works seek to describe the circumstances in which they were composed, to untangle the oftentimes complex problems of dating the works, to determine the role of Luther's editors in the compilation of the commentaries, and to settle similar issues of a literary and historical nature. Thus the separate historical introductions to the exegetical works deliberately confine themselves to the immediate historical setting of the works.

Yet these historical introductions do not exhaust the information to which the reader is entitled if he is to read the exegetical works of Luther intelligently. For while the proper introduction to Luther's *Bondage of the Will* is a rehearsal of the controversy between him and Erasmus, the only adequate way to introduce the reader to a commentary on Genesis or St. John is to recite the principles that guided Luther in the composition of such Biblical commentaries. Without a knowledge of these principles the reader is at

a loss to recognize what is at stake in Luther's exegetical works; both the contrasts and the continuities in those works will elude him. It would, of course, be repetitious to attach a discussion of Luther's exegetical principles to each of the exegetical works. Instead, we have reserved that discussion for this companion volume.

This volume is intended, therefore, to provide the reader and student of Luther's works with some of the tools he needs for an appreciation of Luther's exegesis. These tools should enable him to identify Luther's procedures in these commentaries on the Scriptures. When Luther discovered the doctrine of the Trinity in a psalm or in Isaiah; when he took a passage in the Sermon on the Mount as an occasion to strike out at the Anabaptists; when he devoted meticulous attention to the grammar or the metaphorical language of a text in St. Paul; when he interpreted the struggles of the patriarchs as though they had been Martin Luther fighting the papacy — when Luther proceeded in these and similar ways, he was not simply playing by ear in his exegesis, even though it sometimes seems that way. He was enunciating and illustrating fundamental principles of Biblical interpretation. It is clear that relatively few interpreters of the Bible today would be willing to follow him in all these principles, much less in his practice of them. But it is even clearer that no interpreter of Luther today is in a position to make up his mind whether he can follow Luther's exegetical principles or not unless he can see them at work.

It is not an editor's prerogative to prejudge the issue of how much in Luther's exegesis is acceptable to the church of the twentieth century, but it is an editor's obligation to introduce the reader of Luther to this issue and to make possible an informed judgment upon it. Such a judgment about Luther's exegesis necessarily involves a consideration of both the principles and the practice of Luther's exegetical

work. Part One of this volume discusses the principles. It opens by setting the study of Luther's exegetical works into the context of the history of exegesis, which is currently enjoying a great revival of interest. Chapter one thus seeks to show that the examination of the history of exegesis is an important and neglected resource for the study of the history of Christian thought. Chapter two applies this judgment to the exegetical works of Luther, pointing out how the renewed attention to the works contained in these volumes promises to revise and to amplify the understanding of his theology. The next four chapters review some of the basic formal principles at work in the exegetical volumes of *Luther's Works*: the authority of the Word of God in the Bible, the role of the dogmatic tradition, the Bible as the history of the people of God, and the importance of controversy for the determination of what the Scriptures meant. In the interaction between these principles lies much of the dynamic of Luther's method as a Biblical expositor; for a study of the exegetical works presented in this set will show that all these principles were at work throughout Luther's exegesis, even though in one or another commentary some of these principles appear to have predominated.

Part One is based, therefore, directly on the exegetical works; it attempts to isolate the principles and presuppositions underlying those works. Yet Luther acted as an expositor also when he was not preaching or teaching on the basis of a Biblical text. This introduction to his exegetical works may not content itself with the principles of his teaching and preaching. It must also examine how his exegesis worked itself out in his theology as a whole. For, as chapter six points out, there was a subtle connection between polemics and exegesis in Luther, as there has been in other theologians. Almost every commentary in the following volumes contains a vast amount of polemics, as chapter five illustrates

from Luther's *Lectures on Genesis*. On the other hand, Luther's polemics deals with exegetical issues. The exegetical import of his polemics belongs in a volume on Luther the expositor.

In Part Two the exegesis of texts on the Lord's Supper is employed as a case study of his work as an expositor. This was one of the few issues on which Luther contended with both his Roman Catholic and his Protestant opponents. That conflict compelled Luther to think through his exegesis of the Bible as no other controversy in his career managed to do. The exegesis of eucharistic texts is the prime instance of Luther the expositor in action. It is at the same time the prime instance of the hiatus between Reformation exegesis and present-day trends in Biblical interpretation. Even the current debates over the meaning of justification in the New Testament as contrasted with its meaning in the exegesis of the reformers are not as far-reaching in their import as are the discussions on the exegetical foundation for the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Confessional theology, whether on the Roman Catholic or the Reformed or the Lutheran side, dare not ignore the implications of what New Testament exegetes of all confessions have to say about the primitive meaning of the passages on the Lord's Supper. Nor dare the exegetes proceed as though they were free of confessional bias or as though the exegesis in the confessional traditions were irrelevant to the exegetical assignment of the twentieth century.

Such considerations as these have suggested the choice of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as a case study for the consideration of Luther the expositor. The titles of the chapters in Part Two indicate several texts that have figured prominently in the history of exegesis. Each of these texts occupied Luther as an expositor and as a controversialist. Taken together, they provide a neat summary of how Luther

the expositor applied the principles of his exegesis to the actual practice of expounding the New Testament. The conclusion of the volume is a brief consideration of the present relevance of Luther's exegetical works.

During the five years since this volume was begun, various of its chapters have been delivered as lectures. Chapter five was a paper before the First International Congress on Luther Research at Aarhus, Denmark, in 1956. Other chapters were presented at Concordia, Luther, Northwestern, and Wartburg theological seminaries (at this last as the Reu Memorial Lectures), and at the Harvard Divinity School. Still others were given before conventions or pastoral conferences of the Atlantic, Central, English, Michigan, Minnesota, Northern Illinois, Southeastern, and Western districts of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod.

# LUTHER THE EXPOSITOR

Introduction to the Reformer's  
Exegetical Writings

*by*

JAROSLAV PELIKAN

## CHAPTER ONE

### *Exegesis and the History of Theology*

THE history of theology is the record of how the church has interpreted the Scriptures. In fact, as Gerhard Ebeling has suggested, not only the history of Christian theology but the entire history of the Christian Church could be read as the account of its efforts to find and to articulate the meaning of the Scriptures among the manifold changes of its historical development.<sup>1</sup> Thus, for example, the history of monasticism is a lengthy commentary on the statement of Peter in Matt. 19:27: "We have left everything and followed You."<sup>2</sup> The history of papal claims to supremacy over the church, on the other hand, is a lengthy commentary on the statement to Peter in Matt. 16:18: "You are Peter, and on this rock I will build My church."<sup>3</sup> In this way it would be possible to interpret many aspects of the church's history in the light of the Biblical imperative to which they have sought to give expression. The history of theology is, of course, the most obvious aspect of Christian history in which the interpretation of the Scriptures has figured very prominently — especially if the history of theology includes, as it should, the history of Christian preaching.

<sup>1</sup> Gerhard Ebeling, *Kirchengeschichte als Geschichte der Auslegung der Heiligen Schrift* (Tübingen, 1947).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. St. Maximus the Confessor, *The Ascetic Life*, tr. by Polycarp Sherwood, *Ancient Christian Writers*, henceforth abbreviated as ACW, 21, 105.

<sup>3</sup> Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism* (Nashville, 1959), pp. 77–93, with bibliography on the history of the interpretation of this passage.

As an interpretation of what has actually happened in the development of the church and of its thought this generalization is true, and it is not true. It is true that the history of theology has been dominated by themes and issues set down in the Scriptures, and that the theologians of the church have repeatedly found it necessary to reappropriate these Scriptural themes and issues. At the same time this generalization as it stands seems to assign to other phases and factors of theological and ecclesiastical history only an ancillary function in relation to the exegesis of the Scriptures.<sup>4</sup> One may or may not wish that it were accurate to describe the history of Christian thought and institutions as the record of its exegesis. But it remains true that any such interpretation would fail to account for the variety of motifs and movements in the history of the Christian community.

This much, however, seems sure: the interpretation of the Scriptures *has* played a role of greater import and influence in the history of theology than it does in the histories of theology composed by many modern historians and theologians. Entire histories have been written — histories of a whole section of the church, of an era in church history, or of a major theological problem — which do not seriously consider the possibility that at least one of the decisive elements in the thought and action of a Christian man or group may have been the way they interpreted the Bible.<sup>5</sup> And

<sup>4</sup> As H. Richard Niebuhr comments, "Opinions as to church polity, varying from denomination to denomination, have been based in theory on New Testament reports of primitive church organization. The episcopal, the presbyterian, and the congregational forms have each been set forth as representing the original and ideal constitution of the Christian church. Yet the relationship of these forms to the political experience and desire of various groups is considerably more pertinent than is their relationship to the New Testament." *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (New York, 1929), pp. 14–15.

<sup>5</sup> See the astute discussion by Werner Elert, *Der Ausgang der altkirchlichen Christologie* (Berlin, 1957), pp. 313–333, on *Die Kirche und ihre Dogmengeschichte*.

this in the face of the fact that these men and groups frequently made the claim that they were speaking and acting as expounders of the Sacred Scriptures. Historians have sought to assess the influence of everything from the theologian's vanity to the theologian's viscera upon the formulation of theological doctrines, meanwhile regarding as naive and uninformed the suggestion that the Bible may be a source of these doctrines. Influenced by recent trends in systematic theology and influencing them in turn, church history and the history of theology have begun to reappraise the significance of exegesis for the development of Christian thought. This reappraisal is one of the principal shifts in the study of the history of theology during recent decades.

One area of theological study which will benefit greatly from this reappraisal is the history of dogma, the narrative of how the official creeds and confessions of the church have come into being. The study of the history of Christian thought as a separate theological field began in the period of the Enlightenment as the history of dogma.<sup>6</sup> Its aim was to show the historical setting and, therefore, the relativity of dogmas which Protestant orthodoxy regarded as absolute and binding. Eventually the historians of dogma came to defend this preoccupation with dogma on other grounds, some of them sound and others specious.<sup>7</sup> During the twentieth century historical theology has been broadened to include the whole development of Christian faith and doctrine rather than merely the record of the official creeds and confessions.<sup>8</sup> Yet the concerns and methods of the history of

<sup>6</sup> Reinhold Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (4th ed.; Basel, 1953), I, 20-26.

<sup>7</sup> Gustav Krüger, *Was heisst und zu welchem Ende studiert man Dogmengeschichte?* (Leipzig, 1895).

<sup>8</sup> Walther Köhler has discussed this change in his *Dogmengeschichte als Geschichte des christlichen Selbstbewusstseins* (2d ed.; Zürich, 1943), pp. 1-6.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### *The History of the People of God*

ONE of the most obvious ways in which Luther diverged from the tradition of the church in his exegesis was his abandonment of allegorical interpretation.<sup>1</sup> "Beware of allegories"<sup>2</sup> was the motto of many of his lectures to his students. Gerhard Ebeling has documented in great detail the story of Luther's break with allegory, and there is no point in recounting the story here.<sup>3</sup> Yet it is important to see that a third component of Luther's exegesis, alongside his doctrine of the Word and his view of tradition, was his desire to read the Scriptures as history. Over and over he criticized both the fathers and the more recent expositors for their inability or refusal to recognize that the writers of the Scriptures intended to present history, not allegory, in their narratives.<sup>4</sup>

At the same time the history which Luther read in the Biblical narratives was not just any history; it was a special and particular history, the history of the church as the people of God. This qualifies and revises the interpretation of Luther's exegesis one often meets in secondary works, according to which Luther substituted a literalistic historical

<sup>1</sup> In an earlier form this chapter appeared as *Die Kirche nach Luthers Genesisvorlesung* in Vilmos Vajta (ed.), *Lutherforschung heute* (Berlin, 1958), pp. 102-110.

<sup>2</sup> *Lectures on Isaiah* (1527-30), W, XXXI-II, 243.

<sup>3</sup> Gerhard Ebeling, *Evangelische Evangelienauslegung* (Munich, 1942), pp. 44-89.

<sup>4</sup> "This is toying with ill-timed allegories (for Moses is relating history); it is not interpreting Scripture." *Lectures on Genesis* (1535-45), W, XLII, 15-16; *Luther's Works*, 1, 19.

exegesis for the earlier "spiritual" exegesis of the fathers.<sup>5</sup> The principle that Biblical history was always church history enabled Luther to attach the label "historical" to an exegesis of the Scriptures which seems to modern eyes allegorical or at least typological. Instead of developing this principle theoretically on the basis of Luther's own statements, as we have the principles expounded in the preceding two chapters, this chapter will analyze the principles on the basis of Luther's *Lectures on Genesis*.<sup>6</sup> It will examine the exegetical techniques and methods he employed to define and defend his doctrine of the church against several sets of opponents. Thus it will also prepare for the discussion in chapter six of the interrelations between commentary and controversy in Luther's exegesis.

Ever since the pioneering work of Erich Seeberg and particularly of Peter Meinhold any scholar who has undertaken an investigation of Luther's *Genesis* has found almost irresistible the temptation to engage in source analysis.<sup>7</sup> Such

<sup>5</sup> "It would appear," writes C. S. Lewis, "that all allegories whatever are likely to seem Catholic to the general reader, and this phenomenon is worth investigation. In part, no doubt, it is to be explained by the fact that the visible and tangible aspects of Catholicism are medieval, and therefore steeped in literary suggestion. But is this all? Do Protestant allegorists continue as in a dream to use imagery so likely to mislead their readers without noticing the danger or without better motive than laziness for incurring it? By no means. The truth is not that allegory is Catholic, but that Catholicism is allegorical. Allegory consists in giving an imagined body to the immaterial; but if, in each case, Catholicism claims already to have given it a material body, then the allegorist's symbol will naturally resemble that material body." *The Allegory of Love. A Study in Mediaeval Tradition* (Oxford, 1951), p. 322.

<sup>6</sup> Because of the many quotations from the *Lectures on Genesis* (1535 to 1545), W, XLII-XLIV, I have not repeated the title in each note but have given only the reference to the Weimar edition.

<sup>7</sup> Erich Seeberg, *Studien zu Luthers Genesisvorlesung* (Gütersloh, 1932); Peter Meinhold, *Die Genesisvorlesung Luthers und ihre Herausgeber* (Stuttgart, 1936).

# **PART TWO**

**The Practice of Luther's Exegesis: A Case Study**

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### *"This Is My Body" (Matt. 26:26)*

**I**N chapter six we have examined some of the exegetical and hermeneutical issues at stake in the controversy over the Lord's Supper between Luther and Zwingli. Decisive among these issues was the meaning of "This is My body" in the words of institution. What did "body" mean in these words, and how was its meaning related to other patterns of Biblical speech? Luther's exegesis of this text, as he developed it in both his polemical and his constructive writings, was an effort to distinguish the sacramental meaning of "body of Christ" from the other connotations attached to the phrase in the Scriptures. Yet at the same time his exegesis recognized that the usage of the Scriptures did suggest affinities and analogies between the sacramental and the nonsacramental meanings of the phrase.<sup>1</sup>

To interpret any exegesis, one must examine not only the Biblical answers which an exegete has set forth and defended but also the theological questions which have driven him to his exegesis. This is doubly true when the exegesis under study is one that was formulated while the exegete was engaged in theological controversy, for here it is essential to go beyond the questions raised by the exegete himself and by his text to the questions and problems that were raised for him by his opponent. To a considerable extent such questions and problems dominate practically any theology, and they dominated Luther's theology more than most.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 112, note 12.

It was Luther's method of authorship to answer an opponent's treatise point by point rather than to present an answer of his own, built around the structure of his own thought. Hence the point of view of his opponent determined Luther's own discussion to a considerable – and sometimes to a lamentable – extent.<sup>2</sup>

During the controversy about the exegesis of the words "This is My body," for example, Luther's opponents brought up many objections to his interpretation of the text. Some of these objections were material, but others represented a diversionary tactic. At times Luther recognized this difference and labeled certain objections as the tricks that they were.<sup>3</sup> One such tactic of diversion was the introduction into the debate of speculation about the location of Christ's physical body since His ascension. The text could not mean that the body of Christ was present in the bread, Luther's opponents objected, because that would conflict with the texts which said that Christ had ascended into heaven and was seated at the right hand of God.<sup>4</sup> Underlying this objection was an exegesis of Biblical phrases like "heaven" and "the right hand of God" which pictured them as a specific location where Christ was sitting and waiting for the Last Judgment.<sup>5</sup> Luther ridiculed this exegesis with the sarcasm for which he had such a gift, accusing Zwingli of painting a child-

<sup>2</sup> Heinrich Bornkamm, *Probleme der Lutherbiographie*, in Vilmos Vajta (ed.), *Lutherforschung heute* (Berlin, 1958), pp. 22–23, makes some telling comments on this characteristic of Luther's authorship.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 121, notes 52–55.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Walther Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1924–53), I, 497–498.

<sup>5</sup> It was in response to this that Luther stated his own view of what the omnipresence of God meant: "God is smaller than anything small, bigger than anything big, shorter than anything short, longer than anything long, broader than anything broad, slimmer than anything slim, and so on. He is an inexpressible being, above and beyond all that one can name or think." *Confession on the Lord's Supper* (1528), W, XXVI, 339–340, as translated in Wilhelm Pauck, *The Heritage of the Reformation*, p. 18.

## CHAPTER ELEVEN

### *"Do This in Remembrance of Me" (1 Cor. 11:24)*

LUTHER'S exegetical method was obliged to consider, not only passages of the New Testament like "This is My body," which appeared to support his interpretation of the Eucharist, but also those passages which figured prominently in the interpretations of the Eucharist that were being set forth by his opponents. No passage was more prominent in the eucharistic exegesis of Luther's "Reformed" opponents than "Do this in remembrance of Me."<sup>1</sup> As a result, this exegesis was putting a heavier accent upon time and history than had much of medieval exegesis. For while the exegesis of "This is My body" had necessitated the use of spatial language, with all its possibilities for misunderstanding, the exegesis of "Do this in remembrance of Me" necessitated the use of temporal language, which had its own special possibilities for misunderstanding.<sup>2</sup> In the exegetical material summarized in chapter nine temporal language was important as well.<sup>3</sup> Yet the exegesis of "Do this in remembrance of Me," whether it was Luther's exegesis or that of his opponents, had to concentrate on the problem of "Christ and time."<sup>4</sup>

Among the many passages of Scripture that comprised the exegetical basis for Luther's interpretation of the Lord's

<sup>1</sup> Sasse, *This Is My Body*, pp. 375–382.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 140.

<sup>3</sup> See pp. 177–181.

<sup>4</sup> Oscar Cullmann's *Christ and Time*, tr. by Floyd Filson (Philadelphia, 1950), is an influential study of this issue in the New Testament.

Supper, "Do this in remembrance of Me" had its place. But most discussions of his exegesis have concentrated on his interpretation of passages which seemed to require the language of space rather than the language of time.<sup>5</sup> Now Luther's exegesis, like the Scriptures with which it operated, spoke about the Lord's Supper both in the language of space and in the language of time. Indeed, Luther's word for "present," like its English counterpart, could mean both "here" (a term drawn from the language of space) and "now" (a term drawn from the language of time).<sup>6</sup> Both ways of speaking would appear to be legitimate; both have also proved to be inadequate, but inadequate in different ways. For this reason a consideration of the view of time in Luther's exegesis may help to clarify many aspects of his exegetical works, including his exegesis of "remembrance."

Luther's exegesis interpreted Jesus Christ as the church's past, as the church's present, and as the church's future. He was the church's past, because Luther always maintained that the church was constituted by what Christ had been and said and done.<sup>7</sup> He was the church's present, because Luther interpreted the center of the church's life and worship as His presence with the church "even to the consummation of the age" (Matt. 28:20).<sup>8</sup> And He was the church's future, because Luther expounded the church's hope on the basis of the apostolic statement: "Beloved, we are God's children now; it does not yet appear what we shall be, but

<sup>5</sup> On the relation of spatial and temporal language cf. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, I (Chicago, 1951), 274-278; also his *Theology of Culture* (New York, 1959), pp. 30-39.

<sup>6</sup> Philipp Dietz, *Wörterbuch zu Dr. Martin Luthers deutschen Schriften* (Leipzig, 1870 ff.), II, 40.

<sup>7</sup> *Sermons on the Gospel of St. John: Chapters 1-4* (1537-40), W, XLVI, 649-657; *Luther's Works* 22, 130-138.

<sup>8</sup> *This Is My Body* (1527), W, XXIII, 149-153.

## INDEX TO SCRIPTURE PASSAGES

<b>Exodus</b>	<b>Luke</b>	10:16-17 — 151 fn.
3:14 — 24, 26	24:26 — 129	11:23 — 178
33 — 56		11:24 — 205
<b>Leviticus</b>	<b>John</b>	11:26 — 207, 219
26:36 — 163	1:1-3 — 17	<b>2 Corinthians</b>
<b>Deuteronomy</b>	5:19 — 111, 113, 114	4:6 — 51 fn.
18:15 — 59	6:33 — 187	<b>Ephesians</b>
<b>Psalms</b>	6:51 — 174, 175	2:3 — 12
135:6 — 160 fn.	6:52 — 147 fn.	2:3-5 — 11
<b>Proverbs</b>	6:55 ff. — 145 fn.	<b>Colossians</b>
8 — 16, 17, 18	6:63 — 122, 124, 131	4:6 — 11
8:22-31 — 14	15:1 — 132	<b>1 Timothy</b>
<b>Habakkuk</b>	17:11 — 139 fn.	3:16 — 123
3:2 — 58	17:21 — 198	<b>Hebrews</b>
<b>Matthew</b>	<b>Acts</b>	8:3 — 242
5:23-24 — 194, 195	13:22 — 12	9:26 — 237
16:18 — 5, 113,	<b>Romans</b>	<b>1 John</b>
114 fn., 115	1:22 — 57 fn.	3:2 — 207
19:13-15 — 201 fn.	6:4 — 185	<b>Revelation</b>
19:27 — 5	6:5 — 207	3:14 — 18 fn.
26:26 — 137	9 — 93	13:8 — 242
26:28 — 157	<b>1 Corinthians</b>	
28:20 — 206	3:11 — 114	
	10:4 — 132	
	10:16 — 191	