

THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN THEOLOGY AND ETHICS
IN THE LETTER TO THE EPHESIANS

ROY ROGER JEAL

SUBMITTED TO
THE UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD
FOR THE DEGREE
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL STUDIES
JANUARY 1990

THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN THEOLOGY AND ETHICS
IN THE LETTER TO THE EPHESIANS

ROY R. JEAL

SUMMARY

The Letter to the Ephesians is comprised of two distinct parts that can be labelled "theology" (Ephesians 1-3) and "ethics" (Ephesians 4-6). These sections are, however, difficult to reconcile with each other. The moral exhortations of the paraenesis are not directly and argumentatively derived from the theological narrative.

Although Ephesians is a letter, epistolary analysis does not lead to an explanation of how the "theological" and "ethical" sections can be integrated. A rhetorical critical examination, however, provides a new angle of interpretation that shows a way through the difficulties of explaining how the two halves of the letter are related to each other. Ephesians is a document that can be designated as "sermon". As a "sermon" it is a combination of epideictic and deliberative rhetorical genres that does not address a specific issue or controversy. It speaks to a Christian audience that is not expected to make critical decisions based on argumentation within the "sermon," but rather is reminded of, impressed with, and identifies with certain theological concepts. A frame of mind is thereby developed among the audience members that makes them receptive to the moral exhortations contained in the paraenesis.

An analysis of the "theological" section of Ephesians reveals that a frame of mind receptive to moral exhortation is developed through the rhetorical presentation of theological notions with which the audience would be in agreement. The "ethical" section or paraenesis is not directly founded on these theological notions, but presents its own, self-contained argumentation for proper conduct to an audience that has become susceptible to such behavioral appeals.

It is concluded that theology and ethics in Ephesians are related by the rhetorical use of the language of what is defined as "sermon".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE		INTRODUCTION: THE ISSUE	
1.	Introduction		1
1.1	Scholarly Discussion Regarding Theology and Ethics in the Pauline Corpus		1
1.1.1	Indicative and Imperative		3
1.2	Theology and Ethics in Ephesians		5
	Notes		11
CHAPTER TWO		A RHETORICAL CRITICAL APPROACH TO EPHESIANS	
2.	Introduction		16
2.1	What Sort of Document is Ephesians?		16
2.2	The Epistolary Format of Ephesians		17
2.2.1	The Nature of Letters		17
2.2.2	Basic Epistolary Structure		18
2.2.3	Identifying the Letter Elements		19
2.2.4	Letter Elements and Epistolary Classification		20
2.2.5	An Epistolary Analysis of Ephesians		23
2.2.6	The Shortcomings of the Epistolary Analysis of Ephesians		27
2.3	The Homiletical Nature of Ephesians		29
2.3.1	An Approach through Rhetorical Criticism		31
2.3.2	The Methodology of Rhetorical Criticism		33
2.3.3	Kennedy's Model for NT Interpretation		35
2.3.4	Black's Methodology for Rhetorical Criticism		36
2.4	A Synthesis of Methodologies		39
2.4.1	The Rhetorical Unit		41
2.4.2	The Genre of Ephesians		42
2.4.3	The Sermon Genre		44
2.4.4	Ephesians as Sermon		50
2.4.5	The Rhetorical Situation		51
2.4.6	The Audience		51
2.4.7	Purpose of Writing		53
2.4.8	The Rhetorical Arrangement		63
2.4.9	Rhetoric and Audience Identification		69
2.5	Summary and Conclusions		72
	Notes		75
CHAPTER THREE		RHETORICAL ANALYSIS: THE <i>EXORDIUM/NARRATIO</i> 1:3-3:21	
3.	Introduction		91
3.1	The Combined <i>Exordium/Narratio</i> 1:3-3:21		92
3.2	The <i>Exordium</i>		93
3.2.1	The Introductory Eulogy 1:3-14		94
3.2.2	The Debate Over the Nature and Structure of the Eulogy		94
3.2.3	Rhetorical Analysis: The Eulogy 1:3-14		99
3.2.4	Summary		112
3.2.5	Rhetorical Analysis: Thanksgiving and Prayer 1:15-19a		113
3.2.6	Summary		120
3.2.7	Rhetorical Analysis: The Prayer 3:1,14-19		121
3.2.8	Summary		136
3.2.9	Rhetorical Analysis: The Doxology 3:20-21		137
3.2.10	Summary		141

3.3	The <i>Narratio</i>	141
3.3.1	The <i>Narratio</i> in Ephesians	142
3.3.2	Rhetorical Analysis 1:19b-23	144
3.3.3	Summary	152
3.3.4	Rhetorical Analysis 2:1-10	153
3.3.5	Summary	168
3.3.6	Rhetorical Analysis 2:11-22	169
3.3.7	Summary	186
3.3.8	The <i>Digressio</i> 3:2-13	187
3.3.9	Rhetorical Analysis: The <i>Digressio</i> 3:2-13	188
3.3.10	Summary	198
	Notes	200
CHAPTER FOUR THE PARAENESIS 4:1-6:20		
4	The Paraenesis 4:1-6:20	238
4.1	The <i>Exhortatio</i> 4:1-6:9	240
4.1.1	Ephesians 4:4-6	240
4.1.2	Ephesians 4:7-11	241
4.1.3	Ephesians 4:20-21	242
4.1.4	Ephesians 4:25-5:2	243
4.1.5	Ephesians 5:3-14	245
4.1.6	Ephesians 5:15-21	249
4.1.7	The <u>Hauptafel</u> : Ephesians 5:22-6:9	251
4.1.7.1	Wives and Husbands: Ephesians 5:22-33	252
4.1.7.2	Children and Fathers: Ephesians 6:1-4	254
4.1.7.3	Slaves and Masters: Ephesians 6:5-9	255
4.2	The <i>Peroratio</i> 6:10-20	256
4.3	Summary	259
	Notes	260
CHAPTER FIVE CONCLUSION		269
	Notes	273
BIBLIOGRAPHY		274

PREFACE

My thanks are due to Dr. Andrew Lincoln for his expert supervision of my work. His criticisms and suggestions have been invaluable. I am grateful for his kindness.

I am thankful for the stimulation and support provided by many friends. To those who have (anonymously) provided financial support I express my appreciation.

To Jackie, Rachel, Nathan, and Bethany I am deeply thankful. Their willingness to move from one country to another, from one house to another, from one school to another, to bear the strain imposed by limited finances, and to bear the deeper strain of being separated from good friends, deserves my deepest appreciation.

Bibliographical references in the endnotes are given according to author's name, year of publication and page numbers. Commonly used abbreviations for periodicals, reference works, and serials are employed in the bibliography.

IN MEMORIAM
HAROLD ROGER JEAL
1922-1987

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION: THE ISSUE

1. Introduction

The question of how theology and ethics are related is already an old one. On what basis or bases did the NT writers expect their audiences to conduct their lives? It may be relatively easy to describe how early Christians were to behave, but much more difficult to identify what motivated them to behave in a "Christian" manner.¹ How is the ancient context of ethical discourse to be explained?² In the narrower yet still vast area of Pauline studies questions concerning the nature of the connection between Paul's doctrinal and moral teachings are the subject of perennial discussion.³ When attention is focused on the letter to the Ephesians the specific difficulties of integrating theology and ethics within that document elicit attention and require interpretation.⁴

1.1 Scholarly Discussion Regarding Theology and Ethics in the
Pauline Corpus

The theological foundations of Pauline moral exhortation have been sought diligently, even if consensus has not been achieved.⁵ Schweitzer examined the "mysticism" of Paul, concluding that ethics are derived from the notion of "being in Christ," i.e., the doctrine of dying and rising with Christ.⁶ Variations of this understanding have been held by

many others. Enslin wrote that "It is through the mystical union of the believer with Christ that the new life is revealed and made possible...for him [Paul]."7 Tannehill similarly sees dying and rising with Christ as the foundation of Paul's ethics, claiming that "...the transfer from the old dominion to the new which takes place through dying with Christ will manifest itself in the actions of the believer."⁸ Verhey, in a more recent study that attempts to see Paul's moral exhortations in the light of the gospel and the local situations addressed in the epistles,⁹ also points to the role of "participation in Christ's cross and resurrection"¹⁰ as a factor that leads to obedience to ethical directives.

Exhortations to good behaviour in Paul are frequently given in view of approaching judgment or the expectation of the parousia (e.g., Rom. 2:11-16; 14:1-12; 1Cor. 3:10-15; 4:1-5; 2Cor. 5:10; 1Thess. 1:4-12). Salvation is regarded as being conditional on obedience and "continuing in the faith" (e.g., Rom. 11:22; 1Cor. 9:27; 10:1-13; 15:2; Gal. 5:4; Col. 1:23; cf. 1Tim. 4:1). Sanders has emphasized that the imminence of the parousia and of the judgment motivates Christian conduct.¹¹ Although believers are spoken of as being justified, judgment is nevertheless to be expected and should spur Christians to obedient ethical activity.¹² Disobedience of moral requirements leads to expulsion from Christianity and to condemnation.¹³ This understanding has been termed "covenantal nomism" by Sanders,¹⁴ who suggests that such a

religious view was pervasive in Palestine prior to 70 C.E. and was consequently known to Paul.¹⁵ Sanders, however, does not find Paul to be consistent in maintaining covenantal nomism, because the apostle also employs participationist categories where believers become one with Christ and are free from the power of sin. Their behaviour is to be determined by their new existence in Christ.¹⁶

Some scholars, pre-eminently Bultmann, have understood Pauline ethics to be grounded in the doctrine of justification by faith.¹⁷ The fact that believers have been justified or made righteous is said to demand that they behave obediently, in accord with righteousness.¹⁸ In a recent article Betz has argued that ethics have their foundation in the righteousness of God.¹⁹

There is a miscellany of other views that attempt to explain the basis of Paul's ethics. These include christology,²⁰ baptism,²¹ love,²² and pneumatology.²³

1.1.1 Indicative and Imperative

The tension between "indicative and imperative" is the factor that scholars generally agree is fundamental to the structure of Pauline ethics, even if they have not come to a common understanding of how the indicative/imperative structure functions.²⁴ Perhaps the absence of a common understanding of

its function is due to the fact that, despite its frequent employment, it is nowhere clearly and fully explicated in Paul.

The tension lies in the fact that the reality of the new life in Christ is frequently expressed in the indicative, that is, as a God-given and present existence, while also placed in the imperative, that is, as a way of life that believers are required to lead. Indicatives and imperatives appear side-by-side in the same statement (e.g., 1Cor.5:7; Gal.5:25; cf. Col.3:3ff), in close proximity to each other (e.g., Rom.6:6-11→6:12;), or emerge from a comparative study of the letters (e.g., Gal.3:27→Rom. 13:14). It was primarily Bultmann who advanced the examination of indicative and imperative in scholarly discussion.²⁵ Despite the differing views of its function,²⁶ it seems clear that the indicative/imperative relationship is an expression of the redemptive-historical two age structure where the new age of salvation in Christ has broken in on the old age of sin.²⁷ Salvation and the new life have arrived (cf. 1Cor.10:11), although the old age has not been removed and sin and its effects still exist. The two ages run in parallel with each other. Consequently, while new life can be spoken of as a present reality, it exists, as does all of salvation, in faith, and the imperatives given in moral exhortations occur in the light of the continuing existence of the old age of sin.²⁸

1.2 Theology and Ethics in Ephesians

Eph. is often omitted from discussion in examinations of issues in the Pauline corpus,²⁹ or relegated to a separate chapter.³⁰ Consequently some of its particular issues and interests are sometimes overlooked or remain only at the periphery of study. One such issue of very substantial importance that has been neglected is that of the relationship between theology and ethics in Eph.

In the past it was commonly thought and frequently stated that at least some of the Pauline epistles are comprised of two sections, the first being theology or kerygma, and the second ethics or didachē.³¹ One of the most recent assertions that such a pattern is followed occurs in Schrage's New Testament Ethics.³² In reality, however, the letters of the Pauline corpus cannot be so easily analyzed because they have a general pastoral sense about them and contain ethical exhortations and behavioral concerns in the so-called theological sections.³³ It is only Eph. that actually falls into two clearly and fully separated parts that may be labelled "theology" (chapters 1-3) and "ethics" (chapters 4-6). The two parts of Eph. are, however, very difficult to reconcile with each other.

The disparity between the two halves of Eph. is evident on several grounds.

1. There is no direct moral exhortation in the "theological" section of Eph. In other Pauline epistles there are clear exhortations and explicit behavioral concerns outside the paraenetical sections (e.g., Rom.6:12-23;³⁴ Col.1:10,21-23,28; 2:6-7,8,16-23; 1Thess.2:11-12). Eph., however, employs the language of worship and prayer (chapters 1 and 3), and of contrast between the pre-Christian past and the Christian present (2:1-22) without any behavioral directives. Although there is an emphasis on christology (1:19b-23) and the reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles in Christ (especially 2:14-18), these factors are given no clear paraenetical application.³⁵ Christian behaviour is mentioned in 2:10, but the good works referred to have been prepared in advance by God. No exhortation to practice them is included in the verse, although the expectation that good works will be practiced is explicit.³⁶ There is no clear connection of 2:10 to the paraenesis of chapters 4-6. There is, consequently, no direct paraenetical concern apparent in Eph. 1-3.³⁷

2. Eph. makes no reference to the parousia or to the future judgment of Christians. The conditional view is absent from the discussion and thus no clear sense of covenantal nomism is apparent.³⁸ The statements of 5:5-6 refer, as 5:7-12 make clear, only to the judgment of non-Christians who are not "now light in the Lord". Sanders laments the absence of reference to the parousia in Eph., and claims that "The loss of the Pauline expectation of the Parousia has solved the Pauline ethical problem only by dissolving it".³⁹ The possibility of

future judgment does not serve as a motivation for Christian behaviour in Eph.

3. The highly realized eschatology of Eph. 1-3 speaks of a fully accomplished salvation that does not allow for humanly provided good works.⁴⁰ In 2:1-10 all of salvation, including resurrection and session of believers with Christ in heaven (2:6) is described as already accomplished, with even the preparation of the good works of believers being attributed to the action of God (2:10). Christians are simply to practice the behaviour that God has already provided for them. While Paul relates the presence of salvation and the practice of proper behaviour to the idea of dying and rising with Christ (Rom.6; Col.2:20-3:5), and behaviour is pointedly demanded because believers have died with Christ (Rom.6:6-11; Col.3:5), Eph. makes no mention of dying with Christ. Rather, it emphasizes resurrection and session with him in heaven (2:4-6), not arguing for Christian morals on the basis of dying and rising with Christ, but simply stating that God has provided the good works (2:10). The language of 2:10 smacks of some kind of moral determinism in which Christians function only as practitioners of good works supplied to them, and are not to provide behaviour of their own. By contrast, 4:20-24 encourages Christians to "put off the old person" and "put on the new person" as if salvation and God-provided good works were not so "realized" after all. Eph. is thus difficult to interpret since it attributes salvation and proper behaviour to God, yet demands that believers supply the proper behaviour

themselves. In 2:5-6 believers are described as having been raised with Christ while in 5:14 the unsaved are exhorted to rouse and raise themselves. The imperatives do not describe what believers already are, but paradoxically require Christians to make themselves the new people that God has already fashioned according to 2:4-10. The paraenesis of Col. would here appear to align more closely with the theology of Eph. than of Eph. itself, for Col. 3:9-10 speaks of the removal of the old person and application of the new person as completed events, not as functions yet to be performed. It may be asked, then, why Eph. contains any paraenesis at all, or, conversely, why Eph. employs the highly realized language it does in view of the fact that believers, as they are described in chapters 4-6, are able to practice unethical behaviour.

4. Closely related to the two previous points is the straining of the indicative/imperative relationship in Eph. The "already"/"not yet" tension based on the concept of the coming age breaking in on and running in parallel with the present age has for practical purposes disappeared in Eph. 1-3. Certainly "this age and the coming" are mentioned in 1:21, but this two age understanding is not carried through into the theological views expressed elsewhere, particularly in 2:4-10.⁴¹ The theological accent is clearly on the "already" nature of salvation and on the gracious work of God. A future view is explicit in the paraenesis at 4:30; 5:6; and 6:13,⁴² and implicit in the ongoing "walk" through life that

Christians are directed to practice. The imperatives of the paraenesis, however, have no immediately clear connection with the way in which the salvific concepts of Eph. 1-3 are presented. The emphasis on the "already" aspects of salvation presented in chapters 1-3 seems to have been ignored in the paraenesis. There is no indication that the indicatives of chapters 1-3 are conditional on the practice of the imperatives of chapters 4-6 (cf. Col.1:21-23). The relationship between life in heaven (1-3) and life on earth (4-6) is not clear.⁴³ The indicative/imperative relationship is strained because there is no clear sense of perspective (vis-à-vis the parallelism of present and coming ages) between the theology of the first three chapters and the paraenesis of the last three chapters of Eph. It is this straining of indicative and imperative that has led Ulrich Luz to suggest that the question of how the paraenesis is integrated into Eph. is the most fundamental problem of interpretation in the epistle.⁴⁴

5. There is no clear and directly logical dependence of the paraenesis on the theology of Eph. 1-3.⁴⁵ There are, of course, definite thematic links that bind the two parts of Eph. together (e.g., forgiveness of sins, 1:7; 4:32; concern for Christian maturity, 1:16-19a; 3:14-19; 4:11-16; "calling," 1:18; 4:1,4; contrast of the pre-Christian past with the Christian present, 2:1-10,11-22; 5:8-14; Christ/Spirit-produced reconciliation and unity, 2:14-18; 4:3-6; body imagery, 1:22-23; 2:16; 3:6; 4:4,12,15-16,25; 5:29-30). These

connections, however, are only thematic, demonstrating continuity of thought. They do not indicate logical dependence of chapters 4-6 on chapters 1-3. While the connecting particle $\text{o}\acute{\text{v}}$ in 4:1 indicates that the author perceived a logical progression from the theological notions of Eph. 1-3 to the paraenesis, the exhortations do not argue for behaviour on the basis of what has preceded them in chapters 1-3.⁴⁶ The way in which the two halves of Eph. are tied to each other is simply not explicated.

Is it the case that the apparent disparity between the theological section and the paraenesis of Eph. is so profound that they cannot be integrated? Is there no substantive connection between the two sections, despite the use of $\text{o}\acute{\text{v}}$ at 4:1 and the thematic links? Does the paraenesis exist only because exhortation was standard procedure in epistolary and sermonic forms?⁴⁷ If a connection between theology and ethics can be identified, the coherence of this "...sublime yet elusive document"⁴⁸ may be more clearly established.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Cf. Verhey, 1984:1, who points out that early Christians similarly asked about the motivation for behaviour: "They asked, of course, not only about what they ought to do, but why..." "Concrete moral questions led inevitably to reasoning and reason-hearing."
- 2 Cf. Deidun, 1981:1; Perkins, 1984:321; Meeks, 1986:4-11.
- 3 See e.g. Furnish, 1968:8: "What is the essential character and structure of the Pauline ethic? In particular, what are the theological presuppositions, if any, of Paul's ethic and the ethical implications, if any, of his theology?" p.11: "What is to be regarded as the touchstone of his ethic?"
- 4 Eph. is part of the Pauline corpus of letters, although the majority of scholars believe the epistle is from a deutero-Pauline author. The present study will employ the term "the author" throughout as a neutral designation.
- 5 Perhaps Furnish, 1989:321, quoting Paul Schubert, has only slightly overstated the case by writing, "What P. Schubert wrote a generation ago is just about as true today: 'As regards Paul and his letters there is no notable agreement on any major issue'."
- 6 Schweitzer, 1953:220f; 295.
- 7 Enslin, 1957:107. Later, however, (p.119) Enslin has the strange remark: "Sharply defined rules for conduct were essential. Logically, of course, they were unnecessary. He [sic.] who was in Christ would have supplied by the Spirit all necessary insight and help, but logic in Paul always gave way to the practical needs of morality."
- 8 Tannehill, 1967:81; see also pp. 75,77-83.
- 9 Verhey, 1984:103.
- 10 Verhey, 1984:105.
- 11 Sanders, 1975:49,54-61; cf. 69-80. Sanders claims that without a sense of the imminence of the eschaton Christian ethics have no sound basis: "But the problems of maintaining the language of imminent eschatology after the eschatology had ceased to be imminent only led...into an impossible ethical situation" (p.149).
- 12 Cf. Dodd, 1936:15-19; Moule, 1936:389-406; Styler, 1973:175-187; Donfried, 1976:90-110 (with extensive bibliography in fn3); Hooker, 1982:47-56; Lincoln, 1983:629-630.

- 13 Cf. Sanders, 1977:452,513.
- 14 Sanders, 1975,511-515, cf. 516,517.
- 15 Sanders, 1977:426.
- 16 Sanders, 1977:549. Sanders' term is "participationist eschatology"; cf. p.484, "If the death and resurrection of Christ provide salvation and receiving the Spirit is the guarantee of salvation, all other means are excluded by definition." With this compare the views of Schweitzer, Tannehill, and Verhey, noted above. See Hooker, 1982:47-56 for an attempt at binding covenantal nomism and participationist eschatology together.
- 17 Bultmann, 1967 [1924]:71, "...Paul bases the [ethical] imperatives on the fact of justification, deriving them from the indicatives." Bultmann, 1952 I:332, "Therefore the imperative 'walk according to the Spirit,' not only does not contradict the indicative of justification (the believer is rightwised) but results from it..." Cf. Bultmann, 1952 I:176.
- 18 Cf. also Merk, 1968:247-248.
- 19 Betz, 1988:199-218.
- 20 Cf. Merk, 1968:237-239; Schrage, 1988:172-174.
- 21 See especially Halter, 1977:*passim*.
- 22 Nieder, 1956:143-145 claims that the main motive in Paul is the love of God received through Christ.
- 23 For a useful survey of these bases see Schrage, 1988:167-186. Schrage is careful to note (p.172) that they should not be absolutized in a claim that Paul's ethics are based entirely on one or another foundation. See also the survey in Nieder, 1956:103-145.
- 24 Ridderbos, 1975:253-258; Parsons, 1988:99; Schrage, 1988:167. Parsons (pp.99-113) has a good survey of the ways scholars have understood the indicative/imperative tension.
- 25 Bultmann, 1967 [1924]:7-32, although Bultmann acknowledges the earlier work of Wernle, 1897. Cf. also Bultmann, 1952 I:332-333; Oden, 1964:94-115.
- 26 See note 24 above.
- 27 Merk, 1967:37; Tannehill, 1967:78; Braaten, 1974:117; Ladd, 1974:479-480; Sanders, 1975:53-57; Verhey, 1984:104-105 ("The juxtaposition of indicative and imperative is possible, then--and indeed indispensable--precisely because of the present co-

existence of the old age and the age to come" p.105); Schrage, 1988:169-170; cf. the discussion in Lincoln, 1981:170-174.

28 Ridderbos, 1975:256 states, "The explanation of this relationship [indicative/imperative] lies in the fact that the reality described by the indicative, however much to be appreciated as the gift of God and the new creation, yet exists in the way of faith; while, conversely, the execution of the imperative is not in the power of man himself [*sic.*], but is no less a matter of faith. Indicative and imperative are both the object of faith, on the one hand in its receptivity, on the other in its activity."

29 The rationale of many authors for excluding Eph. (and Col.) from consideration is based on the view that it is deutero-Pauline. Sanders, 1977:431-432 writes, "They [Eph. and Col.] are unquestionably substantially influenced by Paul's thought, to the point of quoting his letters extensively; but using them as sources for Paul seems to lead to confusion and inaccuracies, to imprecisions which should be avoided if they can be. The soundest approach is to deal with the letters which Paul can reliably be supposed to have written."

30 E.g. Sanders, 1975:67-81.

31 See, for example, Dodd, 1936:1-74, especially pp.3-4; Dodd, 1963:66-67. For discussion of the meanings of and relationship between kerygma and didachē in the NT see McDonald, 1980.

32 Schrage, 1988:167. Styler, 1973:75 records an amusing anecdote: "The relation of theology and ethics has long been and still remains a subject of debate among scholars. It is also one that is frequently included in examination papers for students. It was once set in the form, 'How close is the link between theology and ethics in the epistles of Paul?'; and one over-pedantic answer came back saying that it was *not* very close, since the theology was often presented in the first half of an epistle and the ethics in the second half."

33 Cf. Furnish, 1968:94-111; see also Styler, 1973:175; Stowers, 1986:22-23.

34 Cf. Sanders, 1975:57 regarding Romans.

35 Bjerkelund, 1967:183.

36 The expectation that the good works prepared in advance by God will be practiced is clear in 2:10 where believers are described as having been "created...for good works" (κτισθέντες...ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς) in which they will "walk" (ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν). See section 3.3.4 below on 2:1-10.

37 Tachau, 1972:141-142, noting the behavioral concern evident in the "then"/"now" contrast of Col.1:21-23; 3:7-8 says that the same sort of paraenetical linkage does not occur in Eph.: "Ein Zusammenhang mit dem paränetischen Teil des Epheserbriefes ist nicht wahrnehmbar."

38 Lincoln, 1983:629; cf. Sanders, 1975:76. The following study, however, will indicate that there is an indirect paraenetical concern in chapters 1-3.

39 Sanders, 1975:80. Sanders claims, much too strongly, that the result in Col. and Eph. is that the ethical appeals have no real Christian basis or content. He writes, "As we have seen, the ethical particulars are, upon scrutiny, reduced to zero. The attempt to make Christians different from others and like heavenly citizens is in reality an attempt to make Christians simply good people. The attempt is self-defeating" (p.80).

40 Sanders, 1975:76 claims that "salvation already" is "...a concept that is logically inconsistent with ethical demands, which now must be sought, not within the implications of Pauline theology, but in the environment."

41 Dahl, 1978:137, attempting to ameliorate this strain in Eph. writes, "When Christians are said to have already been given a seat in the heavenly places (Eph.2:6), the author is nonetheless aware that they are still living on earth and have to fight spiritual powers." This, of course, is obvious when Eph. is taken as a whole. It does not, however, explain why such language is used, why the indicative/imperative tension is strained, nor how such language is to be integrated with the paraenesis.

42 Of these verses only 6:13 clearly points to the possibility of Christians being unable to "stand" in the face of evil if they fail to heed the exhortation to attire themselves with the "panoply of God". The imperative of 6:13, however, is given in the light of the fight against the devil and the powers described in 6:11-12; it is not anchored in the indicative description of Christian status in Eph. 1-3.

43 See Sanders, 1975:73 who observes that Eph. (and Col.) does not give an explicated answer to this issue: "...I must understand myself as having an existence in two places at once, heaven and earth, and must strive to bring my earthly existence into line with my heavenly existence. Why I must do that is developed in neither Colossians or Ephesians; that I must do so is inherited Pauline deposit."

44 Luz, 1976:374: "Ob die Verbindung zwischen Heilsergebnis und Ethik dem Eph nicht nur intentionell sondern auch theologisch-konzeptuell gelungen ist, mag man allerdings fragen. Mir scheint jedenfalls eine gewisse Spannung zwischen

indikativischen und paränetischen Teil, die sich z.B. in jeverschieden akzentuierten eschatologischen Vorstellungen hier und dort äußert, zu bleiben. Die Frage, ob es theologisch gelingt, die Paränese in eine Interpretation des Eph wirklich zu integrieren, ist m.E. das Grundproblem einer Interpretation dieses Briefes. An ihr entscheidet sich, ob das Zurücktreten der Eschatologie im Epheserbrief nicht *eo ipso* die Verankerung des Imperativs im Indikativ gefährdet."

45 Barth, 1974:426 speaks of "...the logical dependence of ethical advice upon the preceding doctrinal statements" indicated by the particle οὖν at 4:1. What this "logical dependence" consists of is not clear in the text nor does Barth offer an explanation of it. He does say, however, that in Paul "Moral exhortation...appears to be derived from dogmatic doctrine. However, the content of Ephesians 1-3 is doxological rather than dogmatic. The direct connection of the ethical chapters 4-6 with the praise of God rather than with a doctrine of God is a specific feature of Ephesians." Cf. Bjerkelund, 1967:183. Verhey, 1984:123-126 has suggested that the concept of "peace" between Jewish and Gentile Christians connects Eph. 1-3 with 4:1-16. He bases this view on his understanding that Eph. addresses "...the antipathy between Jew and Gentile surrounding the Jewish rebellion of A.D. 66" (p.123). While many scholars have understood Eph. to be dealing with tensions between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, or between Jews and Gentiles more generally, the text itself does not explicate such problems. See the discussion in the sections on purpose (2.4.7), Eph.1:3-14 (3.2.2) and Eph.2:11-22 (3.3.5) below. Verhey (p.125) sees the rest of the paraenesis (4:17-6:20) as simply traditional, and based on the Colossians paraenesis (thus without direct connection to the rest of Eph.). Halter, 1977, argues that ethics are sacramentally based in baptism. He claims that baptism is in view in Eph. 1:3-14; 2:1-10; 4:1-16,17-24; 4:25-5:2; 5:3-14; 5:25-27, that the baptized have been sacramentally purified, and that their baptism motivates proper behaviour. Even if Halter can construe allusions to baptism in all the passages he cites, the claim that they indicate a baptismal motivation and foundation for ethics is of doubtful exegetical basis. See the discussion in section 3.2.3, note 95 below.

46 Bjerkelund, 1967:183 suggests that although the thematic connections exist, the transition to paraenesis at 4:1 is "difficult" ("schwer").

47 Cf. Johnston, 1967:17.

48 Dahl, 1986:38.

CHAPTER TWO A RHETORICAL CRITICAL APPROACH TO EPHESIANS

Although a formal paraenesis begins with the words παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς at Eph. 4:1, following the doxology of 3:20-21⁴, the move from theological narrative to ethical appeal is not clearly described. The theology and ethics of Eph. are not integrated by detailed statements within the text of the document itself.

2.1. What Sort of Document is Ephesians?

Attempting to explain the nature of the connection between theology and ethics, involves far more than simply looking for grammatical links between chapters 1-3 and 4-6, but has to do with how the epistle coheres as a single unit comprised of two distinct parts. It demands an examination of the whole of Eph. What sort of document is Eph? What is its purpose? Why was it written? How was it intended to affect its audience? Why is there such a lengthy paraenesis? These critical questions have attracted, along with many others (particularly the authorship question), a good deal of interest, with the resultant scholarly print. Final and definitive answers to such questions have not yet been given, although they are particularly relevant for the discussion of how the two parts of Eph. are related to each other.

2.2 The Epistolary Format of Ephesians

Eph. is *prima facie* an epistle, ostensibly written by Paul (1:1; 3:1), and addressed to ἄγιοι (1:1). Proper attention is necessary, therefore, to the epistolary form of the document and any interpretive significance that may be attached to that form.

2.2.1 The Nature of Letters

In practical terms, a letter in the ancient Mediterranean world, as also in the modern world, was a written message, conveyed because of the spatial separation of the correspondents.² The letter thus acted as a substitute for oral communication (cf. Cicero, Ad Att. 8.14.1; 9.10.1; 12.53; Seneca, Epis. 75.1)³ which would presumably have taken place if author and recipients were physically present with each other. The letter was regarded by some ancient rhetorical theorists as half of a dialogue or a surrogate for dialogue (e.g., Pseudo-Demetrius, On Style 223; Seneca, Epis. 40.1; Cicero, Ad Fam. 12.30.1).⁴ While speech was the preferred medium of communication, physical presence was obviously not always possible, and the letter was considered to be the second best medium,⁵ serving as the written means of keeping the lines of oral communication open. Writers of letters made use of rhetorical genres,⁶ and adapted various rules of rhetoric for use in letters.⁷ By adapting oratory to the

written form of the letter an extended audience for the speech form could be gained.⁸

2.2.2 Basic Epistolary Structure

Standard letter form consisted of a tripartite structure of prescript (or opening formula), body, and postscript (or closing formula).⁹ Koskenniemi compared this structure to a personal meeting, with the prescript and postscript corresponding to greeting and farewell respectively, and the body corresponding to the substance of discussion between the parties.¹⁰ The letter body was the section where the concerns of the author were explicated, and was, in the letters of the Pauline corpus, the section "...in which Paul dealt with issues most directly and at length."¹¹ The purpose of both prescript and postscript was to maintain the relationship existing between author and recipient.¹²

White, Sanders, Doty, and Funk (along with others) do not include such features as thanksgiving, prayer of supplication, doxology and paraenesis in the body of the letter.¹³ White, for example, claims that "The various prayers of supplication and thanksgiving function, for their part, as a means of extending or nuancing the opening wish/prayer for health."¹⁴ He explicitly states that "The opening section of the body is established...by determining the close of the thanksgiving."¹⁵ This understanding makes the identification of the letter

body in the case of Eph. extremely difficult, since much of the first three chapters is comprised of both thanksgiving and supplication (1:3-14; 1:15-23; 3:1, 13-21), while the last three chapters are comprised of paraenesis.¹⁶ Some have indeed suggested that Eph. does not have a letter body as such at all.¹⁷

2.2.3 Identifying the Letter Elements

In contrast to White, Sanders, Doty and Funk, Mullins has cogently demonstrated that such features as greetings, thanksgiving, and prayer of supplication can and do occur at various points in the ancient letter form, and are not restricted to the opening formula.¹⁸ Mullins concluded that these epistolary forms "...constitute a social gesture, not a thematic ploy. They show the writer's attitude toward the audience to which he is writing, not his attitude toward the material he is presenting."¹⁹ While the opening and closing sections of letters are convenient "clustering places"²⁰ for features such as thanksgiving and prayer of supplication, those features are not necessarily found only in the opening and closing sections and thus cannot be labelled categorically as introductory or concluding formulae.²¹ White regards the thanksgiving and supplication as surrogates for the health wish found at the opening of some Hellenistic letters,²² and he examines them in conjunction with the letter opening "...since they serve the same keeping in touch purpose."²³ This

appears to be a decision made on insufficient grounds. White holds this view despite the fact that he recognizes that other scholars include thanksgiving and supplication in the letter body.²⁴

Adding fuel to the debate over the divisions of the Pauline letter form is the view of Koester, who draws a distinction between prescript and proem (in which he includes the thanksgiving), and states that the proem (by definition an introductory section equivalent to the exordium in rhetorical theory, Quint.Inst.4.1.1²⁵) "...may occupy a major portion of the letter, as is the case in 1 Thessalonians (1 Thess.1:2-3:13)..."²⁶ Koester further states that "The body proper of the Pauline letter form is the parenesis..."²⁷ This remarkable statement is not expanded or discussed, and we can only presume that Koester believes that paraenesis is the primary concern in the Pauline epistles. Schnider and Stenger actually suggest that in the singular case of Eph. the expansive paraenesis is the letter body.²⁸ Another view again is that of Berger, who places teaching and paraenesis together in the letter body, but excludes thanksgiving and benediction.²⁹

2.2.4 Letter Elements and Epistolary Classification

The form critical analyses of some scholars, while generally helpful, have not produced absolutely conclusive results in their attempts at providing definitions of the elements of

ancient letters. However, an examination of letter elements in the light of ancient epistolary classifications proves helpful in delimiting the letter body. Ancient epistolary theorists classified letter types according to the content of the letter body.³⁰ Most of these letter types reflect epideictic oratory (cf. Quintilian, Inst.3.4.3),³¹ and the classical hortatory discourses (λογοὶ προτρεπτικοί) of e.g., Isocrates (see Isocrates, To Demonicus 3-5).³² For the purpose of classifying letter types the formal opening and closing elements were ignored, and attention given only to the letter body.³³ Type classification was made by determining the function of the essential message that the author wished to convey to the recipients.

Based on a study of the ancient epistolary theorists, Stowers has proposed six letter types that are classified according to function:³⁴ 1) letters of friendship; 2) family letters; 3) letters of praise and blame; 4) letters of exhortation and advice; 5) letters of mediation; 6) accusing, apologetic and accounting letters. Aune suggests that Stowers' proposal is not comprehensive enough because it does not include some other important letter types, e.g., official (i.e., government) letters, business letters, philosophical letters, novelistic letters, imaginative (entertaining) letters, letter essays, letters of instruction, and letters embedded within other documents for documentary or dramatic reasons.³⁵ Nevertheless, both the ancient epistolary theorists and

Stowers point to letter function as the determining factor in the classification of letter types.

Johanson has, similarly, demonstrated the value of considering a pragmatic approach to delimiting the letter body by means of an examination of letter function.³⁶ Johanson suggests that the functional interaction of the sections of NT letters that occur between the literary prescripts and postscripts, as they work together to achieve the aims of writing, should be the indicator of the dimensions of the letter body, as over against purely formal indicators.³⁷

The value of a functional approach to the epistolary format as ancient theorists, Stowers, and Johanson practice it, is that it emphasizes the message that an author is attempting to communicate through the medium of the whole letter, rather than employing what may at times be an *a priori* subtraction of features such as thanksgiving, prayer of supplication and paraenesis in an attempt to find the message by isolating it.³⁸ Since the purpose of letters is to convey a message between separated parties, the message itself must transcend the formal boundaries that are attributed to letters. It is possible that the essential message of a letter has to do with thanksgiving, supplication or paraenesis.³⁹

Decisions about how letter components fit into a document, then, should not be made solely on formal grounds, but should

take into account the pragmatic function of the text of an epistle. In the epistolary communication process it is the author's concern for conveying a message to the audience and influencing the audience, that should be of paramount interest. The presupposition that certain formal elements of letters are to be set aside in order to isolate the message in the letter body should be avoided. That is, the fundamental concern is not how the author views the written material, but how the author views the audience and how the author wishes the audience to be affected by the message of the letter. There is a relationship between letter type and the dimensions of the letter body in that both can be determined by means of an identification of letter function.

2.2.5 An Epistolary Analysis of Ephesians

The prescript (1:1-2) and postscript (6:21-24) of Eph. are sufficiently obvious that they can be immediately isolated from the rest of the letter. However, having removed those sections, the question of the location of, or even the existence of a formal letter body must be investigated.⁴⁰ If indeed there is no part of Eph. that is to be labelled "body," then the paraenesis stands as an independent and, apart from thematic links, almost unrelated section following a long introductory period.⁴¹ On the ground of the purely formal epistolary views held by some scholars⁴² who would subtract thanksgiving, supplication and paraenesis from the body, Eph.

must have either no body at all, or the body (unusually, when compared with many other letters) is to be found somewhere between the first thanksgiving and supplication section (1:15-23) and the second supplication and doxology section (3:1,14-21).⁴³ On the other hand, if, as Koester suggests, the body of the letter is the paraenesis, then it is easily identified as 4:1-6:20.

Transitional conventions and markers can be easily identified in Eph.⁴⁴ The majority of commentators have divided Eph. into the two most obvious sections: chapters 1-3 and chapters 4-6. The doxology closing with ἀμήν (3:20-21), followed by the words παρακαλῶ⁴⁵ οὖν ὑμᾶς introducing the paraenesis (4:1), indicates a clear transition point, substantiated by the change in content from the "theological" material of chapters 1-3 to the "ethical" material of chapters 4-6.⁴⁶ Other major transitional markers are found at 1:3 (εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ...); 1:15 (διὰ τοῦτο κἀγώ); 2:11 (διὸ μνημονεύετε); 3:1 (τούτου χάριν ἐγὼ Παῦλος); 3:2 (εἴ γε ἠκούσατε); 3:14 (τουτοῦ χάριν κάμπτω); 3:20 (τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ); 4:17 (τοῦτο οὖν λέγω καὶ μαρτύρομαι ἐν κυρίῳ); and 6:10 (τοῦ λοιποῦ). These transitions indicate changes of thought in Eph., serving, as Mullins suggests, to punctuate the author's thoughts.⁴⁷ They do not, however, unambiguously identify the letter body and, hence, the main thought of Eph.⁴⁸

The essential message that the author of Eph. wished to convey to the audience is difficult to define. While the letter contains a number of messages, the purpose of writing is not clear on formal epistolary grounds.⁴⁹ Aune labels Eph. a "general letter," i.e., a letter between "indirectly and loosely connected" parties, that deals with issues that "...tend to transcend specific historical situations and...emphasize values widely shared by Christians."⁵⁰ The general letter, according to Aune, resists epistolary classification⁵¹ thus making epistolary analysis difficult. Eph. contains expressions of praise, thanksgiving, petition, anamnesis, concepts of salvation and reconciliation, thoughts concerning Paul's understanding of the mystery of Christ and his consequent ministry to Gentiles, and ethical exhortation. Epistolary analysis indicates that all of these factors occur in Eph., but has been unable to isolate the letter body and, therefore, the essential message and purpose of the letter. The nature of Eph. is such that it seems to cross over the lines of ancient epistolary classifications, bearing characteristics of the praising (ἐπαινετικός, 1:3-14;3:20-21), supplicatory (ἄξιωματικός, 1:16-23;3:14-19), thankful (ἄπευχαριστικός, 1:15-16), and advisory (συμβουλευτικός, 4:1-6:20) letter types.⁵²

From a pragmatic point of view, however, the letter body may be defined as the whole of the letter, apart from the prescript and postscript (thus 1:3-6:20). The two major

sections of Eph., viz. 1:3-3:21 and 4:1-6:20, are clearly distinguishable. Individually, both sections show continuity of thought within themselves. This continuity is demonstrated in 1:3-3:21 by the transitional markers that are used to connect thoughts together (διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐγώ, 1:15; καὶ ὑμᾶς, 2:1; διὸ μνημονεύετε, 2:11; τούτου χάριν ἐγώ, 3:1,14; εἶ γε ἠκούσατε, 3:2). At 1:15-19a the author expresses his desires for the audience in the light of the blessings that have been received by believers mentioned in 1:3-14 (cf. Col.1:9).⁵³ The words καὶ ὑμᾶς at 2:1 also indicate a thought movement in the author's mind, although the linking with 1:19b-23 is clear syntactically, as are the thematic parallels existing between 1:19b-23 and 2:1-10.⁵⁴ At 2:11 the words διὸ μνημονεύετε call the recipients to remember their past and present vis-à-vis Israel, with the "then"/"now" (ποτέ/νῦν) schema of 2:11-22 moving in parallel with the "then"/"now" discussion of salvation in the preceding sentence (2:1-10).⁵⁵ At 3:1,14 the author's thought moves to reverent intercession on behalf of the audience, linked by the phrase τούτου χάριν ἐγώ to the thoughts of salvation and reconciliation of 2:1-22, and, possibly, to the intercession found in 1:15-19a.⁵⁶ At 3:2 the words εἶ γε ἠκούσατε guide the recipients by indicating that a clarification of the preceding words in 3:1 in the form of a digression is to be made.⁵⁷ Transitional markers separating the two major sections of Eph. are obvious, with the word ἀμήν closing the doxology of 3:20-21 and the words παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς which introduce the paraenesis. In 4:1-6:20 continuity is

demonstrated by the paraenetical content of the entire section. While it is difficult to classify the letter type precisely on the basis of function in Eph., the two halves of the letter nevertheless act as functional sections in which the author's concerns are presented. Consequently, the letter body of Eph. may be defined as 1:3-6:20.

2.2.6 The Shortcomings of the Epistolary Analysis of Eph.

Epistolary analysis assists in the identification of the structure of Eph. For practical purposes, the body of the letter, i.e., the part of Eph. that conveys the author's concerns to the recipients, can be identified (1:3-6:20) and distinguished from the prescript and the postscript. Additionally, epistolary analysis helps to identify transitional markers, where progression of thought and changes of thought take place, particularly the change from the "theology" of chapters 1-3 to the "ethics" of chapters 4-6. In short, epistolary analysis is useful for delimiting the contents of Eph. in a descriptive way.

The inadequacy of epistolary analysis becomes apparent just at this point, however, because while it helps to describe the framework of Eph., it is incapable of providing an interpretation that explains the relationship between theology and ethics.⁵⁸ The letter format serves, as letters are intended to serve,⁵⁹ as a communicative medium. Epistolary

analysis is useful for describing how a document in letter form is actually structured, but in the case of Eph., where definition of the letter body on epistolary grounds is so tenuous, and where the relationship between chapters 1-3 and chapters 4-6 is not explicated, it has no mechanism for explaining the roles of theological narrative and paraenesis in relationship to each other. As a kind of form criticism, then, it cannot be used as a final and determining, interpretive tool.⁶⁰ Epistolary analysis does not, in itself, lead to an explanation of what the author of Eph. wanted to accomplish by writing.

The ancient epistolary theorists, followed by Stowers and Johanson,⁶¹ by stressing the role of letter function, in fact move the focus away from formal epistolary analysis to a consideration of the argumentation of letters. In so doing they point to the rhetorical use of letters, that is, the manner in which letter conventions were used to frame a message intended to affect an audience. It was, as already noted,⁶² the affinities between letters and speech that encouraged rhetoricians to take note of the letter form and develop epistolary theory.

2.3 The Homiletical Nature of Ephesians

It has frequently been noted of Eph. that, as Schlier puts it, "...trotzdem ist er doch noch etwas anderes und etwas mehr als ein Brief."⁶³ The epistolary format seems to some to be quite superficial,⁶⁴ and if the prescript (1:1-2) and postscript (6:21-24) were removed the body of the letter could with few alterations stand very nicely on its own, or be integrated with some other introduction and conclusion.⁶⁵ Mitton and Fischer have suggested that Eph. is actually a theological pamphlet or tract,⁶⁶ while Gnilka calls it a "liturgische Homilie".⁶⁷ Kirby thinks that Eph. is "...not a letter at all, but a prayer and a discourse thrown into the form of a letter,"⁶⁸ and that its "solemn and sonorous style"⁶⁹ shows that it was composed to be spoken aloud. Schlier speaks of the "'liturgischen' Charakter von Sprache und Stil"⁷⁰ of the epistle and refers to it as a "Weisheitsrede" and a "Sophiarede".⁷¹ Lincoln suggests that Eph. was to be read in the worship assemblies of the churches of Asia Minor during which people were to be baptized.⁷² Almost every sort of written material could be communicated by means of the epistolary format, and letters could "...substitute for oral communication and could function in almost as many ways as a speech."⁷³ Eph. gives the distinct impression of being a written sermon⁷⁴ that was composed with the knowledge that it would be read aloud to its first audiences.⁷⁵ More than being a letter, Eph. is like a specialized piece of sermonic

oratory, that is, like a discourse that speaks to its recipients in a positive, encouraging way about their salvation, and exhorts them to practice proper behaviour. The difficulty lies in determining how this "sermon," if it may be so labelled, was intended to function (and in fact how it actually does function).

Calling Eph a "sermon" is not an especially new idea, but a methodological examination of it as a speech is an interpretive angle that has not been employed in recent literature. Dahl has suggested that learning to "listen" properly to Eph. may lead to insights about which interpreters have hitherto been unaware.⁷⁶ Listening to Eph. as a speech or sermon may give some clues as to how theology and exhortation are linked together. Dahl, who sees the epistle as being a letter of "...congratulation for and a reminder of the sum total of what has been given to us,"⁷⁷ submits that as such it may affect its audiences by eliciting a sense of gratitude for salvation and reconciliation, and a sense of humility in that it may encourage the recipients to recognize their failure to live up to God's calling to salvation and reconciliation. Dahl does not develop these thoughts further, but his suggestion leads one to think that if the epistle can indeed have such an effect on its audience, then such a sense of gratitude and humility could spur the audience on to accept and practice the exhortations of Eph. 4-6. This would mean that as a speech or sermon, Eph. functions not as an abstract

essay about ecclesiology and unity, but is intended to have a rhetorical effect upon its audiences, leading them to a desired response or action.

The following discussion will attempt to listen to Eph. as a speech, sermon, or homily, i.e., to understand Eph. as a rhetorical discourse, using this understanding as a hermeneutical tool to aid in determining how the theology and ethics of the document are related to each other. The discussion will indicate why and how Eph. fits into what may be called the category or genre of "hortatory discourse" or "sermon," and how an approach through "rhetorical criticism" assists in understanding both the nature of Eph. and how the seemingly disparate halves of the epistle can be seen to mesh together.

2.3.1 An Approach through Rhetorical Criticism⁷⁸

Recent studies have shown that theories of classical rhetoric and, consequently, the methodology of "rhetorical criticism" can be used to analyze NT documents. For example, Betz on Gal. and 2 Cor. 8-9,⁷⁹ Jewett⁸⁰ and Johanson⁸¹ on 1 Thess., and Hughes⁸² on 2 Thess. have shown the value of examining those Pauline letters by employing classical (along with some modern) theories of rhetoric. Watson has contributed a rhetorical critical study of Jude and 2 Peter.⁸³ Wuellner has discussed and demonstrated the use of rhetorical criticism in

a number of articles.⁸⁴ Kinneavy has attempted to show a connection between Greek rhetoric and the Christian concept of faith.⁸⁵ Kennedy has written a monograph on the methodology of rhetorical criticism that is oriented specifically toward NT studies,⁸⁶ and Aune has produced a comprehensive and helpful volume describing the literary environment of the NT.⁸⁷ On a scale broader than NT studies, Perelman has demonstrated the great value of the "new rhetoric" that breaks with Cartesian concepts of reasoning prevalent for the past 300 years, and shows that claims to rationality frequently stand on verbal, rhetorical features that many have regarded as purely stylistic.⁸⁸

Justification for the use of rhetorical criticism in the examination of Eph. (and other NT documents) can be easily provided. Rhetorical language is a feature that appears to be fundamental to humankind and is used universally. Kennedy provides examples of its use in many human societies.⁸⁹ The development of rhetorical theory in a formal way had reached high levels by the first century CE, as evidenced particularly by the work of the Roman rhetorician Quintilian.⁹⁰ There is every reason to assume that the author of Eph., being a child of the times, had been educated in rhetorical theory and had some level of competency in it.⁹² Rhetoric was held in high esteem in the Greco-Roman world, and played a significant role in education.⁹¹ Certainly the documents within the Pauline corpus show a concern for rhetorical features and effect.⁹³

Pre-twentieth century interpreters were interested in the rhetoric of the Pauline corpus and of the Bible in general.⁹⁴ The NT letters have an "oral quality" to them, and, as noted above, would frequently have been heard by their audiences rather than read by every individual.⁹⁵ The authors, being conscious that their letters would be read aloud, would tend to convey their messages in written speech form. Even though rhetorical theory had primarily to do with spoken delivery it did as noted earlier, widely affect ancient literature, including the letter form.⁹⁶ Since Eph. contains traditional material derived from both Jewish and Greco-Roman sources⁹⁷ it is logical to assume that the author would have employed a methodology that reflected the written and spoken conventions current at that time. Finally, the sermonic tone of Eph. which was noted above (and about which more will be said later) makes an approach through rhetorical criticism appropriate.⁹⁸

2.3.2 The Methodology of Rhetorical Criticism

Rhetorical criticism has its foundation in the works of the classical rhetoricians, most notably Aristotle's Art of Rhetoric, the Rhetorica ad Herennium, and Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria.⁹⁹ Rhetoric itself may be defined, if narrowly, as the use of language so as to persuade an audience to follow a speaker's (or author's) views or directions.¹⁰⁰ Aristotle (Rhet 1.2.1) defines rhetoric as "...the faculty of

discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever." Rhet ad Her 1.2.2 states that "The task of the public speaker is to discuss capably those matters which law and custom have fixed for the uses of citizenship, and to secure as far as possible the agreement of his hearers." Rhetorical criticism will follow, in one way or another, whether closely or loosely, the foundation provided by the classical theories of rhetoric. Rhetorical criticism of the NT seeks to understand how the kinds of rhetorical language used in the Greco-Roman world were used in the NT and how such language may have affected its audience.¹⁰¹ Language, according to Pound, is charged with meaning in three fundamental, rhetorical ways:¹⁰² *melopoeia*, musical or sound orchestration that directs the flow of meaning by the appeal of sound; *phanopoeia*, "the casting of images upon the visual imagination;" and *logopoeia*, the implicit meanings or allusions of words. Rhetorical critical analysis will attempt to identify and explain the effect of these and other features of language. A fundamental advantage of the rhetorical critical approach is that it emphasizes both the text being examined and the situation that gave rise to its composition, rather than some supposed earlier sources, forms or editions of the text as is done when using some other critical methodologies. It does not exclude the historical dimension of the text as is the tendency in some other literary approaches.¹⁰³

2.3.3 Kennedy's Model for NT Interpretation

Kennedy's recent monograph, New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism, presents a model for using rhetorical criticism in the study of the NT.¹⁰⁴ His model is extracted largely from the methods of oratory found in the manuals of classical rhetoric and employs several "stages". The first stage is to determine the boundaries of the "rhetorical unit," i.e., of some persuasive unit of text that has a "beginning," a "middle" and an "end." Second, the "rhetorical situation" must be identified by determining the circumstances or "exigence" that encouraged the composition of the text, at least insofar as such a determination is possible. Understanding the situation that gave rise to a text is crucial in rhetorical criticism because it touches upon the author's intention and motives, on the purpose for writing, the genre of the text, and the goal that the text is intended to achieve through its appeal and persuasiveness. Third, the "arrangement" of the material within the unit must be examined. This task deals with the various subdivisions of the text, and how those subdivisions function as persuasive factors in meeting the needs of the rhetorical situation. A detailed examination of the text can be useful here, looking at the stylistic and rhetorical devices that are used to draw the audience along to agreement with the author, and to any actions required. Lastly, Kennedy suggests a review of the procedure to see if the analysis is consistent, and to see if

its results satisfy the situation that impelled composition of the text.

Kennedy's model is comprehensive enough to include all of classical rhetorical theory. Overlap of the "stages" in the procedure is allowed for rather than isolating them from each other. The model seeks to find the basis of appeal and persuasion in the rhetorical unit, and it takes seriously the view that a NT document or pericope is not merely offering information about Christian doctrine, but actually attempts to lead its audience toward a goal. While Kennedy's model attempts to be flexible enough to allow for the idiosyncratic features of NT texts, its shortcoming is its failure to deal with kinds of rhetoric that do not fit within classical theory, but do, nevertheless, exist.¹⁰⁵

2.3.4 Edwin Black's Methodology for Rhetorical Criticism

The methodology for rhetorical criticism proposed by Black¹⁰⁶ although not concerned with the NT, also carries some helpful ideas for the examination of Eph. in light of its sermonic tone and the absence of specific argument connecting the theology and ethics of the letter. Black argues that Aristotle's theory of oratory, followed by other rhetoricians such as Quintilian, is not broad enough to be applied to all possible genres of speech and literature. Classical rhetoric categorized the genres of discourse into three types: judicial

(forensic, δικάνικόν), deliberative (συμβουλευτικόν), and epideictic (ἐπιδεικτικόν).¹⁰⁷ There are genres, however, that do not fit neatly into the three categories, one of which is the genre of "hortatory discourse" or what will here be called "sermon". Scholars have been conscious of this shortcoming in the categories of genre for a long time.¹⁰⁸ Quintilian (Inst.3.4.1-16; cf. also Rhet ad Her.3.4.7) in fact discusses whether there are more than three genres, but follows the "majority" (Inst.3.4.12) in accepting only three, but still points out that there is overlap among the three genres, "...for all three kinds rely on the mutual assistance of the other" (Inst.3.4.16).

The three genres fail to be comprehensive enough, according to Black, when it is recognized that not every rhetorical unit leads its audience to make a forensic (judicial) decision, to act or not act (deliberative), or to approve or to disapprove (epideictic¹⁰⁹) of the subject of the discourse based upon logic and specific argumentation founded on stated facts. Classical rhetoric, following Aristotle, was used to describe and argue about a situation which, if accepted as true by the audience, led to a course of action derived from the argumentation.¹¹⁰ It makes no provision for a description from which action is not directly and explicitly derived but is rather founded on recognition, impression, or on some extralinguistic identification intended by the speaker/writer and understood by the audience but not explicit in the

speech/text.¹¹¹ Clear argumentation and homiletical dynamics are not the sole means by which a response may be evoked in an audience or by which an accounting for such a response can be made. Response can be evoked and accounted for on the basis of commitment to a conviction,¹¹² where a speaker/writer "...is seeking to impress rather than to convince, and to use...other weapons besides logic."¹¹³ Classical rhetoric conceived of audiences that would follow rational arguments and always behave with rational consistency. Thus, if true and properly argued, a speech would direct an audience to the place intended by the speaker. In fact, however, people are frequently moved and consequently exhibit behaviour on the basis of information from which such behaviour is not directly derived, but with which the audience nevertheless identifies.¹¹⁴ The three rhetorical genres of judicial, deliberative and epideictic are not individually sufficient within themselves to encompass this additional kind of language.

Black refers to the kind of speech/text with which he is concerned as "exhortative discourse,"¹¹⁵ essentially having in mind the sermon form¹¹⁶ that was unknown to Aristotle and his classical progeny.¹¹⁷ He proposes a critical methodology that investigates the "rhetorical transaction"¹¹⁸ where the rhetorical language, the rhetorical situation and the audience response interact with each other in a discourse that works to achieve the aims of the speaker/writer. By determining the

effect language has upon an audience, the role of the language used to approach the rhetorical situation and indeed the situation itself can be evaluated.

The value of Black's proposal is that it allows room for a document like Eph. which does not explicate the connections between its theological and paraenetical parts, and contains both deliberative and epideictic kinds of language. It goes beyond Kennedy's acceptance of the universal nature of the three classical genres of speech¹¹⁹ and allows for genres that may have developed in an historical setting unknown to the classical rhetors.¹²⁰

2.4 A Synthesis of Methodologies

A careful combination of the methodological suggestions of both Kennedy and Black will be useful in examining Eph. because the combination will lead to a determination of the situation that may have given rise to the composition of Eph. and how the document is arranged rhetorically, as well as allowing for the existence of rhetorical genres not included among those of classical rhetoric. Allowing for other genres will leave room for examining how the recipients could have identified with concepts that the author intended them to understand, yet did not expound, thus not showing a clear, logical connection between them and the course of action desired for the recipients.

A rhetorical critical methodology for the present study investigating the relationship between theology and ethics in Eph. will need to bear in mind the religious connections of the epistle. Eph. and its rhetoric are connected to the Christian faith, a faith which involves the whole person. Such important themes as praise and worship (e.g., 1:3-14; 3:4-21), salvation in the heavenlies (2:4-10), and the reconciliation in one body of Jew and Gentile (2:11-22), appeal not just to the mind, but also to experience and to the emotions. The author is not concerned with persuading the audience to come to a decision and employ a course of action based upon a discourse that rehearses bare facts or that is separated from any personal religious or ethical stand, nor is he addressing an indifferent audience.¹²¹ On the contrary, the text of Eph. is bound up with concerns that have to do with the Christian experience, convictions, and emotions of both author and audience.

Since the scope of rhetorical genres extends beyond the three classical kinds of judicial, deliberative and epideictic, and since the view that Eph. has a sermonic tone has been noted, a closer investigation into the genre of the epistle as a "sermon" will play a significant part in this study. What in fact is a sermon as seen within the context of the NT and early Christianity? While the idea of "sermon" suggests a speech or text of a didactic or hortatory nature, the definition of a NT "sermon" is not yet clear,¹²² particularly

in the light of the fact that no NT documents specifically label themselves as such,¹²³ and texts such as Eph. stand formally in an epistolary framework.

The methodological procedure will consist of the following steps: first, the rhetorical unit will be delimited; second, the genre of Eph. as what will be termed "sermon" will be discussed and defined; third, the rhetorical situation will be examined, including identifying both the audience and purpose of Eph. as closely as possible from the contents of the text; fourth, the general rhetorical arrangement of Eph. will be explored; and fifth, the role of audience identification in the rhetoric of Eph. will be investigated briefly. Through following these steps some insights into the epistle will be presented that will, it is hoped, lead to an understanding and clarification of how theology and ethics are integrated.

2.4.1 The Rhetorical Unit

Since the purpose of this study is to investigate and explain the relationship between theology and ethics in Eph. it involves, at least on the surface level, an attempt at integrating the two halves of the letter, i.e., chapters 1-3 and chapters 4-6. Individual pericopes and themes within these chapters are significant for the investigation, but the nature of the study, that is, the essential integration of the two most obvious sections of Eph., demands that the whole of

the letter be examined.¹²⁴ The rhetorical unit is therefore to be defined as the whole of the epistle to the Ephesians.

2.4.2 The Genre of Ephesians

Determining the genre of Eph is one of the crucial factors in the rhetorical analysis. An identification of the kind of language being used, or, at the very least, presenting a reasonable hypothesis as to the kind of language being used, will indicate the general purpose of Eph., thus giving some hint as to the more specific purpose (or purposes) of the letter. The three classical genres have three purposes, respectively. The judicial genre¹²⁵ is used in a setting (frequently the law courts) where the intention is either to accuse or defend (Arist. Rhet. 1.3.1-3), and where the addressees are judges (κρίται).¹²⁶ Judicial rhetoric refers to things that have occurred in the past, since it has to do with the judgment of an accusation or defence of some past action (Arist. Rhet. 1.3.4). Deliberative rhetoric¹²⁷ is intended to be either hortatory or dissuasive, and is also addressed to κρίται who are expected to decide upon a particular course of action (Arist. Rhet. 1.3.1-3). The deliberative genre usually refers to future events since it aims to affect the future behaviour of the κρίται (Arist. Rhet. 1.3.4), although it may also properly refer to present events (Arist. Rhet. 1.6.1; 1.8.7). The epideictic genre¹²⁸ has its purpose in either the praise or blame of its subject

(Arist. Rhet.1.3.3) and deals with the present, existing condition of its subject (Arist. Rhet.1.3.4). Epideictic oratory addresses θεῶποι (Arist. Rhet.1.3.1-3) who, rather than acting as judges (κρίται) who make conscious decisions about some issue, question, or practice on the basis of argumentation founded on past, present or future events, as in judicial and deliberative oratory, act as "critics"¹²⁹ who contemplate a speech as observers or spectators.¹³⁰ The θεῶποι are not convinced by proofs, since they are not judges, but have ideas impressed upon them, even if they are not conscious of them.¹³¹ It has already been noted, however, that the three classical genres are not sufficient within themselves to encompass every type of rhetoric conceivable, and Eph. does not fit neatly into one or another of the classical genres. Certainly the genres were not rigid categories, and overlap among the genres and combination genres was permitted and expected by classical rhetoricians (cf. Quint. Inst.3.4.16)¹³². The question here is that of defining how Eph. should be classified. Eph. bears characteristics of epideictic since it clearly offers praise of God in chapters 1-3. It also bears characteristics of deliberative by calling for specific behaviour in the paraenesis of chapters 4-6. It seems to fit, therefore, in what may be defined as a combination of epideictic and deliberative genres that, for our purposes, may be termed "sermon."¹³³ The following discussion attempts to clarify what is meant here by "sermon".

2.4.3 The Sermon Genre

The classification "sermon" is not a recognized literary genre within the NT, as Aune has pointed out.¹³⁴ While NT scholars frequently use the term "sermon" as if it was a well-accepted genre, the classical rhetors did not conceive of it,¹³⁵ and both ancient and modern¹³⁶ handbooks of rhetoric say nothing of sermon as a formal category or genre. Nevertheless, an argument for its existence can be made.

In Judaism, sermon form was in common use both in Palestine and in the Diaspora by the end of the Second Temple Period,¹³⁷ serving as "...the chief means of instructing all the people--peasants, women and children--and imparting to all and sundry at least an elementary knowledge of the Torah..." and providing "...the sages with a means of guiding the people, strengthening their faith, and refuting heretical views."¹³⁸ It is likely that the earliest Christian sermons adopted some of the features of sermons used in synagogue services. Similar homiletical features are found in the NT and later Jewish sermons collected in the Tanchuma.¹³⁹ Care was taken in sermon preparation and rhetorical devices were employed,¹⁴⁰ sometimes including an opening formula using a benediction that praised God for choosing Israel and for giving Torah, then moving on to the primary theme to be discussed.¹⁴¹ These benedictions opened with ׀׀׀ (or a cognate form of ׀׀׀), sometimes praising God for his miracles, wisdom, or merciful

activity.¹⁴² (e.g., "Blessed be the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, who gave us the Torah and the commandments by the hand of Moses our teacher to instruct His people, the House of Israel" [Sheeltot de Rab Abhai Ga'an]; "Blessed be the name of the King of the king of the kings, the Holy One, blessed be He, who chose Israel from among the seventy nations...and gave us the Torah [Tanchuma, Noah 3]).¹⁴³ The form of Eph. 1:3-14 (though obviously oriented toward the Christian gospel rather than to Israel and Torah), is striking in its resemblance to this kind of Jewish sermon introduction. These sermons frequently closed with a prayer for understanding of the Torah, or for redemption followed by "amen".¹⁴⁴ The prayer and doxology of Eph. 3:14-21 has a strong resemblance to this practice since it requests Christian growth and understanding for the audience and terminates with the word "amen". The most plausible explanation of the similarities is that Eph. is to be included in the claim that the sermons "...of John, Paul, and Philo--and the later rabbinic sermons--all made use of a traditional Jewish pattern which Jewish preachers used for hundreds of years".¹⁴⁵ Thyen¹⁴⁶ claims that Paul's letter bodies were strongly influenced by the Jewish-Hellenistic homilies of the Diaspora. He argues that paraenesis came at the end of such homilies, just as it does in some of the Pauline letters, and that Paul changed only the content of the Jewish-Hellenistic homily in his letters, not the general style. If a connection between the Jewish sermon or homily and the style of Eph. has

not been completely proven, the resemblance of each to the other is remarkable.

In dealing with classical literature, Hinks uses the term "sermon" to describe some of the discourses or speeches (λόγοι) of Isocrates.¹⁴⁷ These discourses go beyond the usual categories of deliberative and epideictic speeches to a combination of language that was hortatory, and thus deliberative, but directed to an audience of θεῶποι, i.e., the audience of an epideictic speech, rather than to χριταί, the usual audience of a deliberative speech. A major distinctive of this type of speech, despite its hortatory nature and the call for behaviour of one kind or another, is the absence of a specific issue of controversy or ἄγων.¹⁴⁸ There is no specific problem or question to be handled by either speaker/author or recipients. What occurs is that the speaker/author addresses an audience with the intention or hope of eliciting a behavioral response, but does so not by specific, explicit argumentation that relates to questions, problems, controversies, or other issues that may be at hand, but rather by impressing the audience with the inherent (as seen by the speaker/author) value of the ideas being presented. This is the kind of language Black has in mind when he uses the term "exhortative discourse".¹⁴⁹ In Eph. the absence of specific controversy such as the circumcision issue seen elsewhere in the Pauline corpus has been frequently noted.¹⁵⁰ As a whole it is neither clearly deliberative nor

clearly epideictic. Certainly Eph. is hortatory in that it calls for proper Christian behaviour, but at the same time it bears an epideictic tone in some sections (e.g., 1:3-14; 3:14-21), and seems to address *θεωποί* who are directed to "remember" rather than to judge or decide (2:11-22; cf. 1:13-14; 2:1-10). These factors strongly suggest that Eph. should be placed within this "sermon" category.

Berger writes of "Predigt" as one of the categories of what he calls "Vorliterarische Gattungen".¹⁵¹ He notes that in the "sermon" form the duties or behaviour of the audience are not a secondary feature, but an integral concern of the message throughout. He suggests that the source of the notion of "sermon" comes from the concern for the priority of the worship of God above all other duties, to which the ethical concern is closely attached.¹⁵² This view of "sermon" aligns with the concept that the sermon genre is hortatory and delivered to an audience of *θεωποί*, that is, that there is an ethical concern integral to the message that the audience is hearing, but the need for a certain sort of behaviour is impressed upon the audience members through stressing their relationship to God and his actions rather than by direct argumentation. Berger finds this sort of effect occurring in the "sermon" of Acts 17:22-34, where the call for behavioral change (i.e., repentance, 17:30, changing from idolatrous worship to the worship of "the God who made the world," 17:24) is based upon the duty of people to worship God.¹⁵³

Among the ancient rhetors perhaps Menander the Rhetorician, although from a period later than the NT¹⁵⁴ gives a description of the sermon form, when he deals with "The Talk" (λαλιά, Men.Rhet. 388.17-394.30).¹⁵⁵ Menander's "Talk" is both deliberative and epideictic since it can praise or blame as well as give advice (Men.Rhet. 388.18-20). It does not demand an orderly arrangement of material, but allows the speaker freedom from rules of order, provided that points are made at proper times and expedient places (Men.Rhet. 392.9-14).¹⁵⁶ The "Talk" was a speech made not for a specific occasion¹⁵⁷ and so usually was not an address occasioned by a controversy or problem (ἄγῶν), but it nevertheless sought to exhort an audience to a fitting course of action.

There appears to be sufficient reason to designate a rhetorical genre which may be called "sermon". The sermon, as we are defining it here, is a speech/text that is not intended to deal with controversies or problematic issues nor to answer questions, but is directed to an audience of θεῶποι who, rather than acting as κριταί who make a decision on the basis of the argument presented to them, are encouraged to think and behave in accord with the speaker's/author's leading and persuasion. The speaker/author is concerned to stimulate the thoughts and sentiments of the audience rather than argue critically, so as to persuade the audience to take the course of action seen to be appropriate.¹⁵⁸

Perhaps the nomenclature "sermon" is not precise enough to define a genre of rhetoric to the full satisfaction of NT scholarship. The word "sermon" has an absence of clarity due to the variety of connotations that surround it. Use of the term "sermon" here should not be taken to imply that it is thought that all sermons have a hortatory intention, nor that all sermons, whether they are contained in the Bible or not, bypass problems, issues, or questions, address only θεωροί in distinction to χριτάι, and impress thoughts on an audience rather than present explicated argument. Sermons could, conceivably, fit precisely into either judicial, deliberative, or epideictic categories. Sermons may be purely informative or descriptive. The term "hortatory discourse"¹⁵⁹ corresponds to the NT term λόγος παρακλήσεως used at Acts 13:15 and Heb. 13:22, but it, too, may be as imprecise as "sermon". The term "written discourse"¹⁶⁰ is likewise too broad to describe the genre clearly. The word "sermon," on the other hand, is well enough known to include the kind of language with which we are concerned, although it could conceivably include much more. The word "sermon" will thus be used in this study specifically to refer to that genre of rhetoric that has been described above.

2.4.4 Ephesians as Sermon

It was noted earlier that many scholars believe that Eph. is a sermon or homily placed in a written, epistolary format. The nature of Eph. allows it to be placed within the genre designated above as "sermon". In favour of this placement within the "sermon" genre are the ways in which Eph. corresponds with "sermon" by having a distinct paraenetic concern in chapters 4-6, yet without explaining the relationship between the behaviour it calls for and the theological conceptions that it contains in chapters 1-3. In other words, it does not require its audience to be $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota$ but simply to be $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\acute{o}\iota$. The epistle has affinities with both the Jewish sermon tradition and the Greco-Roman discourses that were hortatory and aimed at $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\acute{o}\iota$. Eph. was written to Christians who would have been gathered together to hear a message from which they might learn and be directed in their Christian lives. No specific issue ($\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$) is clearly delineated in the letter. The author, as Dahl has suggested,¹⁶¹ may have been seeking to elicit gratitude and humility or some other sensibility that would lead the audience to action. Eph. appears to be a discourse that was intended to appeal for its ethical concerns not by direct connection to its theological conceptions, but by developing an appreciation of and identification with the Christian message and by illustrating the value of salvation. The document thus fits the genre of "sermon".¹⁶²

2.4.5 The Rhetorical Situation

Determining the rhetorical situation involves seeking for the conditions or situations that encouraged the composition of the sermon. Kennedy writes of seeking the "exigence" that invited an utterance to be made.¹⁶³ It will be important here to make an investigation into the nature of the audience, and the purposes, goals and intentions of the author that led to the selection of the genre and the composition of the text. Together, these factors will illuminate the situation giving rise to Eph. and assist in clarifying how the author sought to convey his concerns to the audience. This investigation will restrict itself to the actual text of Eph. to see how the writer assessed the audience situation and developed the Eph. sermon to approach it. No presuppositions regarding historical settings and reconstructions are in mind other than those that can be inferred from the text of Eph.¹⁶⁴

2.4.6 The Audience

An investigation of the identity of the audience of Eph. will begin by noting, in the light of the well-known textual anomaly, the likelihood that the addressees were not actually residents of Ephesus.¹⁶⁵ They are in fact not identified with any specific city or community. The text does, however, provide some significant facts concerning the audience.

1. The audience is composed of Gentiles, described as such in contrast to Jews (1:11-14; 2:11-13,17-19; 3:1;4:17-19; 5:8).
2. They are included among the ἄγιοι (1:1,15; 2:19; 3:18; 6:18), and are possibly relatively new converts to Christianity,¹⁶⁶ evidenced by the frequent references to their arrival at faith, and the change from their former existence in sin to the present saved existence (e.g., 1:13-14; 2:1-3,4-6,11-13,17,19; 4:17,20-24,30; 5:8).
3. They have been sealed with the Holy Spirit (1:13-14) and possess the qualities of faith and love (1:15).
4. They are people who have been aware of their past and present situations in regard to salvation, even if they need to be reminded of those situations, as shown by the frequent anamneses in the text (e.g., 2:1-6,11-22; 4:17ff; 5:8; cf. 1:13-14), As well, they are said to have, or are at least presumed to have, some awareness of Paul (3:1,2-13) and he of them, even if only by reputation rather than first hand knowledge (1:15).
5. They are apparently in agreement with the author about various concepts having to do with salvation (1:13-14; 4:4-6). The christological, soteriological and ecclesiological material presented in 1:3-14 and 1:19b-2:22 do not seem to stand against controversy or false teaching, but simply as statements with which the audience would agree.
6. The audience is considered by the author to be in need of growth and maturity (1:17-19a; 2:22; 3:16-19; 4:11-16). Also the author wishes the recipients to be involved in

maintaining unity (4:1-3), and to be adequately armed for the battle against cosmic forces (6:10-17).

2.4.7 Purpose of Writing

Identifying the purpose is one of the perennial critical issues about which students of the epistle have failed to achieve consensus. The text does not reveal specific historical circumstances nor give any explicit references to crises or problems that may have occasioned its composition.¹⁶⁷ The scope of theories of the purpose of Eph. proposed by NT interpreters ranges from the extremely speculative¹⁶⁸ to the view that purpose cannot be known with certainty.¹⁶⁹ If the purpose of writing could be identified, then the centre of thought might be more easily understood, and, consequently, the cohesive interpretation of the document well served.

Perhaps a major stumbling-block to attaining a satisfactory understanding of the purpose of Eph. has been that most exegetes have attempted an historical reconstruction of the circumstances of the audience rather than examining only what the text itself says about what it is intended to achieve, however little and hidden that may be. Fischer's Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes carries the stated goal of forming a hypothetical reconstruction of the historical time of Eph.¹⁷⁰ Fischer,¹⁷¹ with most others,¹⁷² finds no heresy,

crisis or problem explicit in Eph., but suggests that Gentile Christians had withdrawn from Jewish Christians in the church, with the result that unity is the main idea addressed in the epistle.¹⁷³ Schrage finds that "Ephesians seeks to mediate an ecclesiastical and theological crisis and deals primarily with the doctrine of the church".¹⁷⁴ Chadwick proposes that Eph. was written to deal with embarrassment on the part of Gentile Christians over the supposed late arrival of the Christian message.¹⁷⁵ If the church is the God-given society of unity, then why was it so late to arrive since "...in der Antiken Welt ist es eine allgemein anerkannte Wahrheit, daß nichts Neues wahr sein kann"?¹⁷⁶ Eph. supposedly answers this sense of embarrassment by explaining the continuity of the church with Judaism, by emphasizing the universality of the church, and by indicating that the church belongs more to heaven than to earth, being thus a metaphysical body that encompasses all generations.¹⁷⁷ Kirby finds the purpose in recalling the audience's baptism and what God has done for believers in order to encourage them to continue to put on the new man (cf. 4:20-24).¹⁷⁸ Lincoln has submitted that Eph. is intended to ward off the "infiltration of syncretism" in the church.¹⁷⁹ To those who might have been seeking enhanced knowledge and insight thought to exist in some syncretistic cults Eph. provides assurances that such knowledge and insight is available and properly to be sought within the Christian faith. Lincoln has suggested more recently, specifically in a reconstruction of the setting of Eph. 2,¹⁸⁰ that the Gentile

audience of the letter may have had a deficient understanding of the meaning both of church membership and of the church's origins and its place in history. Eph. was thus intended to "...reinforce these Christians' identity as the church and to underline their distinctive role in the world."¹⁸¹ Presumably such an effect would also serve to steer Christians away from syncretistic tendencies since it would solidify their connection with the Christian message. A number of authors think that Eph. was written to combat a sense of alienation that Gentile Christians felt from Jewish Christians and the Jewish roots of Christianity.¹⁸² This distancing of Jewish and Gentile Christians is supposedly combated by reminders of Jewish and Gentile Christian solidarity in one body (2:11-22), and by the appeal for the maintenance of unity in 4:1-16. Mitton¹⁸³ claims that Eph. was intended to be a restatement of the gospel preached by Paul as distinct from addressing any local difficulties. In his recent treatment of Eph. and its possible relationship to conceptions of "powers" and to magical practices that were current in western Asia Minor at the time of composition, Arnold suggests that Eph. was written to address the needs of Christians "...who perceived themselves as oppressed by the demonic realm".¹⁸⁴

The approach taken here, rather than attempting a reconstruction of the circumstances that may have occasioned the composition of the Eph. sermon, finds in the following pericopes some allusions that seem to bear most directly on

the purpose of writing.¹⁸⁵ The fundamental assumption of this approach is that the author intended that the Eph. sermon be of benefit to the audience. Accordingly, the criterion for the selection of the following passages is that they seem to indicate what the author desired for the benefit of the audience more clearly than other passages in the epistle.

1. 1:17-19a. Having completed the introductory eulogy of 1:3-14 and the thanksgiving of 1:15-16, the author proceeds to indicate his request to God on behalf of the audience. The specific request is that God would give the audience πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ, πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας [ὑμῶν] εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, καὶ τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας.¹⁸⁶ While the author is obviously aware that the audience is at some level of Christian understanding and practice as is indicated in 1:15 (i.e., their faith and love to all the saints), the concern is that they will reach a greater knowledge (noun ἐπίγνωσις, 1:17; verb οἶδα, 1:18), than they have at the time of writing.¹⁸⁷ This greater knowledge is particularized in the three τίς clauses (1:18b-19a) where an enhanced appreciation of the salvation that has been in view from 1:3 onward is expressed in terms of the hope of God's calling, the riches of the glory of God's inheritance among the saints, and the greatness of God's power among believers. Absent from this concern for knowledge is any ἄγῶν. The only issue, if it may

be called such, is the concern of the author for a deeper understanding of the greatness of the blessings given to believers.

2. 2:19-22. The "anamnesis" of 2:11-22 has frequently, especially when connected with 4:1-16, been seen as an indication that division of some kind between Jewish and Gentile Christians had occurred, or as an argument for the unity of disparate peoples who have been reconciled by the blood of Christ, or as a clarification of the place of Gentiles in salvation history. Analysis shows, however, that the pericope presents a comparison of the Gentile audience's past vis-à-vis the blessings enjoyed by Israel, with their present existence in the church and its concomitant blessings, so that the audience will have a deeper appreciation of the value of their salvation.¹⁸⁸ The "before" and "after" or "then"/"now" (ποτέ/νῦν) contrast of 2:1-10 is continued in 2:11-22, reminding the Gentile audience that they now possess salvation and continuity with Judaism on the basis of the reconciling work of Christ (cf. 2:14-18). The comparison of "then" with "now" leads to the conclusion that the audience members, who are now συμπολιταὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἴκετοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ (1:19), are moving together toward maturity as the new temple of God (2:21-22).¹⁸⁹

If the above assessment of 2:11-22 is accepted, then it would seem that 2:19-22 has directly to do with the purpose of writing within the mind of the author, that is, that the

audience is addressed as a "building" (οἰκοδομή) that is growing εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν κυρίῳ (2:21). The author is at pains to emphasize that the Gentile Christians who receive the Eph. sermon are growing toward a higher level (i.e., according to the imagery used, a "building," "dwelling" that grows into a holy temple) of Christian maturity.¹⁹⁰

3. 3:14-19. The prayer and doxology of 3:1,14-21, flowing from the description of the new status of the Gentile Christian audience and their growth as a holy temple explained in chapter 2, again expresses the author's wishes for a deep Christian maturity. The focus of the author's desire for the audience is found in 3:14-19 where prayer is offered to "the Father" that believers be strengthened in the "inner person," that Christ dwell in their hearts, that they understand the dimensions of the love of Christ, and be filled "into all the fulness of God". Clearly this shows that the author wants the audience to come to full growth.¹⁹¹

4. 4:13-16. The goal of the gifts given by Christ (4:7-12) and indeed of the behaviour that maintains unity encouraged in 4:1-6 is encapsulated in the three prepositional (εἰς) statements of 4:13. The goal to be attained is a full, adult, Christian maturity in contrast to the immaturity of the νήπιοι of 4:14 and the instability that goes along with such immaturity. The author explicitly has in mind the growth of the body of Christ as each member of it functions to benefit the maturity of all the members. In this passage as well there is no explicit mention of any ἄγδν that the author was

attempting to counter. The references to false teaching and crafty, deceitful people (4:14) do not presuppose their actual existence among the audience members, but only that the author wants the audience to be fully mature in order to withstand such teaching and people, if and when they do appear.

5. 6:10-17. In this final section of the Eph. sermon the author calls upon the audience to take on the "armour" of God in order to stand firmly in the cosmic battle in the heavenlies. The battle is to be fought not by the audience's own power but in the power of the Lord (6:10). Believers are to be adequately armed so as to be able to stand against the attacks of cosmic forces without being defeated. Although the imagery has changed from that of a "building" in 2:19-22 and a "body" in 4:15-16 to that of a "battle" in 6:10-17, the notion of strength and maturity remains as the author wants the audience to be fully armed in order to withstand "the schemes of the devil" (6:11).

6. Other verses can also be understood to point to the author's concern for increased knowledge, growth and maturity. The behavioral concerns of the paraenesis of chapters 4-6 imply that the author is concerned that the audience members practice a mature Christian lifestyle. The author, at 3:4, wants the audience to comprehend (νοέω) Paul's understanding of the mystery of Christ, and, at 3:13, the author is concerned that the letter's recipients not be dismayed (ἐγχακτεῖν) at Paul's tribulations. Both of these verses add to the picture of the author's concern for the level of

understanding the audience members have of significant factors in Paul's life, and the ramifications of these factors for themselves. An allusion to the behaviour of Christians is present from the opening lines of Eph.: Believers were "chosen...to be holy and blameless...in love" (1:4). The notion of Christian conduct is thus in the author's mind from the beginning of Eph.¹⁹²

The foregoing cursory look at passages that indicate the author's concerns for the audience's growth and maturity is built on the cumulative evidence of the verses mentioned rather than an explicit statement of the writer such as "My purpose for writing to you is..." Perhaps the author's prayers, as revealed in 1:16 and 3:14-15, function as an equivalent to an explicit statement of purpose, that is, in saying, "I pray that God will give you..." the author may be expressing the actual purpose of writing. Certainly the prayers point out the author's desires for the benefit of the audience (cf. Rom. 1:9; 1 Thess. 1:2-3; Phlmn. 4-6). In any case, it appears to be a safe conclusion that at the heart of the author's purpose was his desire for the maturation of the audience.¹⁹³

It is only in 4:1-16 that behaviour and Christian maturity are explicitly linked together. While in Col. 1:9-10 the desire of the author for the audience's maturity and their proper behaviour are linked closely together,¹⁹⁴ the parallels in Eph. stand far apart from each other. The language of Col.

1:9 closely parallels the language of Eph. 1:15-17, but the explicit linking of the author's concerns for audience maturity and behaviour do not follow on immediately, as they do in Col. 1:9-10, [appearing for the first time in Eph. 4:1-16. Bjerkelund has noted this fact and claims that there is no paraenetical application of the several themes found in Eph. 1-3 and only a "difficult" transition to paraenesis in 4:1.¹⁹⁵ Nevertheless, the hypothesis is submitted here that the ethical concern is implicit in Eph. 1-3, because the maturity the author has in mind is, like that of Col., tied closely to the behaviour of the audience. In Col. the behaviour is linked to the definite ἄγωνα that the epistle addresses,¹⁹⁶ while Eph. deals with no specific issue, but has a more general concern for the maturity and behaviour of its audience. This hypothesis maintains that, contrary to the view of Bjerkelund, Eph. does have concerns that lead to paraenesis in its first three chapters and that the transition to paraenesis in 4:1 is not difficult but integral to the author's purpose from the outset of the "sermon".¹⁹⁷ The Eph. sermon in its first three chapters, it is suggested, is intended to impress the audience with the nature and value of salvation in order to lead the θεσποί to a maturity that is expressed behaviorally. The author desires a maturity that is expressed in actual behaviour which will contrast with the former pre-Christian behaviour of the audience (2:1-3) and be in concord with their present existence as saved and reconciled people (2:10; 4:1-16; cf. 2:21-22; 5:8-10). The

text does not use close argumentation to achieve its goal, rather the author has chosen the rhetoric of what is described above as the "sermon" genre in order to build a rapport with the audience so that through this means they would be persuaded to follow the various items of the paraenesis. The goals of being "holy and blameless" (1:4) and of becoming "a holy temple in the Lord" (2:20) have in view a holiness that affects every part of believers' lives.

The author's purpose in the Eph. sermon can be seen to be closely associated with a concern that the audience maintain a strong tie with the gospel, that is, that the audience would have a clear and strong identification with salvation and all that is implied by it, including the corporate life of the church and ethics.¹⁹⁸ The author wished to remind the audience of what God has done in salvation and reconciliation (e.g., 1:3-14; 2:1-10, 11-22). The presence of anamnesis (e.g., διὸ μνημονεύετε..., 2:11) indicates that the audience members had some knowledge of salvation and reconciliation, but were still in need of reminders that would sharpen their consciousness of their participation in the blessings of the Christian faith, and thereby lead to growth.

2.4.8 The Rhetorical Arrangement

In examining the rhetorical arrangement of Eph. the intention is not to provide at this point an extended description of the rhetorical strategy of Eph. as a sermon, i.e., a detailed analysis of the rhetorical stylistics and features that contribute to the overall rhetorical effect.¹⁹⁹ However, a general look at the rhetorical arrangement of Eph. will assist in coming to an understanding of how the various parts of the sermon fit together and function, and therefore of how theology and ethics are linked.

The classical rhetors conceived of the contents of speeches being made up generally of four parts: *exordium*, *narratio*, *argumentatio* and *peroratio*²⁰⁰ These parts could include various subsections, and other units could be added.²⁰¹ Even to the classical rhetors, however, it was too much to insist that every speech contain all four of these major units.²⁰² Parts could be included or excluded according to the particular need of the subject at hand. Deliberative oratory, for example, could, according to Aristotle and Quintilian, leave out the *exordium* and/or *narratio* if either was deemed unnecessary (Arist.Rhet.3.13.14; Quint.Inst.3.8.6,11). Quintilian claimed that all the parts of a judicial speech could be dispensed with except the proof (i.e., the *probatio* or *argumentatio*; Quint.Inst.5.Pr.5), although Aristotle (Arist.Rhet.3.13.4) saw a need for a minimum of two parts,

i.e., a statement of the case ($\pi\rho\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma=narratio$) and proof ($\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma=argumentatio$). Quintilian (Inst.3.8.60) also implies that deliberative oratory could proceed effectively even without an *argumentatio*.²⁰³ The focus of a speech, however, was the *argumentatio* (Arist.Rhet.3.13.4; Quint.Inst.5.Pr.5).²⁰⁴

Each unit of a speech had a particular function to fulfill. The *exordium* was to act as the "key note" (Arist.Rhet.3.14.1) with which a speech began. The intent was to appeal to the audience so as to gain its attention, favourable disposition and sympathy toward the speech (Quint.Inst.3.8.7;4.1.5).²⁰⁵ The *narratio* functioned as the announcement or report of the circumstances upon which the audience members were to base their decisions or actions (Arist.Rhet.3.16.1-11; Quint.Inst.4.2.1).²⁰⁶ It could be put in the form of a reminder of past events in order to lead the audience from memory of the past to appropriate action in the future (Arist.Rhet.3.16.11; Quint.Inst.4.2.31). The *argumentatio* served as the central unit of a speech where the credibility of the speech was explicated,²⁰⁷ and was thus the place where the actual persuasion to make a judgment or take a particular course of action was performed. The *peroratio* had two goals: to refresh the memory and to influence emotionally.²⁰⁸ The *peroratio* was, like the *exordium*, intended to gain and keep the audience's goodwill, but as concluding remarks rather than as introductory remarks (Arist.Rhet.3.19.1-6; Quint.Inst.6.1.1).

Caution is required, however, in the use of the theory of the classical rhetors for analyzing Eph. or any other document or speech. The ancient rhetors were primarily concerned with prescribing methods for the preparation of speeches, not with the analysis and criticism of speeches.²⁰⁹ Their purpose was to present ideal rhetorical theory as they understood it, with a view to teaching their readers and auditors how to prepare and present the best possible speeches.²¹⁰ It should not be expected, therefore, that every speech, whether in written or spoken form, will follow formal rhetorical theory slavishly. Much latitude should be allowed for creativity, and for a loose adherence to the classical format.²¹¹ Speeches can contain the basic four elements of *exordium*, *narratio*, *argumentatio*, and *peroratio*, but variation, combination, or exclusion of any of the elements of a speech must be allowed and even expected. It should be assumed that the primary concern of a speaker/author was not the formal aspects of rhetoric, but that the audience be persuaded by the message of the speech/text, with the formal aspects of rhetoric being a means to that end. In the case of Eph., then, the primary concern of the author was not the formal aspects of the letter's rhetorical features, but rather that the audience be persuaded to move toward a maturity that was expressed behaviorally.

Eph. does not lend itself to an easy determination of its rhetorical arrangement. The text begins at 1:3 with what must

be called an *exordium* because of its introductory nature²¹² and its appeal to the goodwill of the audience members (thereby gaining their attention) by including them (1:13-14) in the salvation spoken of in 1:3-14, and by the expressions of thanksgiving and petition for them in 1:15-19a. The author's language of praise of God, his petition on behalf of the audience, and his inclusion of the audience in salvation continues (with gaps) to 3:21.²¹³ Embedded within this *exordium* is a statement of facts (*narratio*) that speaks of Christ, salvation, and reconciliation, and includes a digression on the message and ministry of Paul (1:19b-2:22; 3:2-13). This *narratio* is clearly linked to the thanksgiving and petition of 1:15-19a by the preposition κατά (1:19b) and the notion of God's power (τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ..., 1:19a) which is illustrated by the resurrection and exaltation of Christ described in 1:19b-23.²¹⁴ This *narratio* is not, however, a statement of facts upon which definite argument is made in a subsequent section. Certainly some argumentation in favour of proper behaviour is made in the paraenesis (4:1-6:20), but that argumentation despite the particle οὖν at 4:1, is not made directly on the basis of the "facts" narrated in chapters 1-3, but rather on pragmatic and theological bases presented within the paraenesis itself.²¹⁵

Since argumentation made directly on the basis of a statement of facts or *narratio* does not appear in Eph.,²¹⁶ the existence of a formal *argumentatio* is called into question. In

classical deliberative oratory the purpose of the *argumentatio* was to argue for a course of action in view of the consequences that would result from it, whether beneficial or detrimental (Arist. Rhet. 3.17.4).²¹⁷ In Eph., however, as was noted in chapter 1,²¹⁸ the absence of explicit references to the parousia or to the judgment of Christians is conspicuous in comparison with the rest of the Pauline corpus, and has long been noted by scholars. The consequences of the audience ignoring the paraenesis are not part of any argumentation, nor indeed are they found anywhere in Eph.²¹⁹ It seems to be clear, therefore, that an *argumentatio*, in the usual formal way as proposed by the ancient rhetors, does not occur in Eph. This absence of connection between the usual *narratio* and *argumentatio* illustrates the difficulty of integrating theology and ethics in Eph. by showing the lack of a clearly expounded connection between the two halves of the letter.

In place of a clearly identifiable and formal *argumentatio* is the paraenesis which may, to adopt a Latin term to correspond with *exordium*, *narratio*, *argumentatio* and *peroratio* and other elements of rhetoric, be called *exhortatio* (4:1-6:9). The *exhortatio* (Greek παραινετικόν) is a unit of rhetoric not dealt with formally by the classical rhetors, and mentioned by them only in passing (e.g., Quint. Inst. 3.6.47; 5.11.10; 9.2.103).²²⁰ It nevertheless exists in Eph. and in other NT epistles²²¹ The *exhortatio* in Eph. functions as a call to the audience members to practice specific behaviour, not in

response to a particular ἄγδν, nor on the foundation of direct argument based on a *narratio*, but because they have been persuaded by an appreciation of and identification with the themes of praise to God, thanksgiving, petition, salvation, grace, reconciliation, life in the heavenlies, etc. contained in the *exordium/narratio*. This explanation of the rhetorical effect of the arrangement of Eph. supports the hypothesis that an ethical concern is implicit in chapters 1-3 by indicating how the *exhortatio* is related to the *exordium/narratio*.

Following the *exhortatio*, set off by the words τοῦ λοιποῦ which suggest the beginning of a concluding section,²²² is a *peroratio* bringing the paraenesis to a climax in the picture of strong and well-armed believers in a cosmic battle against the forces of evil (6:10-20).²²³

The rhetorical arrangement of Eph., then, is understood here according to the following outline (omitting the epistolary prescript and postscript):

<i>Exordium/narratio</i>	1:3-3:21
<i>Exhortatio</i>	4:1-6:9
<i>Peroratio</i>	6:10-20

The author has creatively integrated the *exordium* and *narratio*,²²³ and has developed the *exhortatio* with its self-contained arguments for specific behaviour, rather than an *argumentatio* that would normally argue on the foundation of the statements given in a *narratio*.

2.4.9 Rhetoric and Audience Identification

The audience of Eph. would not have been likely to have been receptive to the sermon if they were not already the Christian people they are described as being.²²⁵ "People can neither understand, accept, nor appreciate lucid, logical, or impassioned utterances that have no bearing on their status in the community and the environment."²²⁶ In other words, while it would be good and proper for people to be receptive to any "important" concepts or events, in fact they are generally receptive only to things which provoke their interest or are significant to their lives at a given point in time. There is a need, therefore, for some sense of identification of an audience with the subject matter which an author/speaker wishes to expound. It should be expected that some sort of identification of the audience with the subject matter would occur in the *exordium/narratio* since the purpose of the *exordium* is to win the favour of the audience, and of the *narratio* to state the facts upon which persuasion is attempted. Since the audience of Eph. had already attained some level of Christian understanding they were likely to have been receptive to a message that had directly to do with their Christian understanding and practice.

The rhetorical effect of identification has been discussed by Burke,²²⁷ followed by Mouat.²²⁸ Burke claims that "You persuade a man only insofar as you talk his language by

speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, *identifying* [Burke's emphasis] your ways with his [*sic.*]"²²⁹ Identification involves using ideas in such a way that the content of the author's/speaker's rhetoric is identified with the beliefs and wishes of the audience,²³⁰ that is, the audience members find themselves in agreement with the statements of the author/speaker. If audience members identify with the subject matter of a speech/text, then assent to the course of action the author/speaker desires for them can take place. By producing an identification of the audience with the speech/text content, a sense of order and continuity in the minds of the audience members reinforces their beliefs about the subject, and draws them to assent to the actions the author/speaker has in mind for them and to the actual performance of the activities.²³¹

In Eph. identification can be seen to play an important role in the overall rhetorical effect. The author has used language that enables the audience members to identify with what they already know about themselves. This identification leads the audience along from the *exordium/narratio* through to the *exhortatio* and *peroratio*. Briefly,²³² examples of this audience identification are evident in passages such as 1:13-14 where the audience's own salvation is linked to the redemptive theme in the "eulogy" of 1:3-12, particularly in the change from ἡμεῖς (1:3-12) to ὑμεῖς (1:13-14); 2:1-10 and 2:11-22, where the Gentile audience's former (ποτέ) existence

and present (vŏv) existence are contrasted with each other; 3:1-13, where the audience's knowledge of Paul indicates their appreciation of him, even if they are not fully aware of his ministry (3:2); 4:4-6, comprising a confessional statement which the audience would remember and be in agreement with; 4:17-24, where the "walk" of τὰ ἔθνη would be identified by the audience with their former lifestyle, and what they had learned about Christ (4:20) would be identified with their knowledge of the gospel and the lifestyle appropriate to their new status; and 5:8-13, where, again, the past and present identity of Christians is indicated. Other sample passages could be listed, but these serve to demonstrate that audience identification was part of the rhetorical strategy of the author.

The result or effect of the rhetorical use of identification is that the audience members are reminded of their personal involvement in the Christian faith. They are impressed once more with the great value of salvation and its implications. When people are impressed in this way it is easy for them to be moved to become personally involved in the kind of behaviour that will lead them on to deeper Christian maturity. This notion of identification sheds light on the connections between theology and ethics in Eph. by indicating how the author's theological themes were brought home to the audience, leading them to behave in accord with the paraenesis.

2.5. Summary and Conclusions

This chapter began with the understanding that there is no clearly expounded connection between the theological themes of Eph. 1-3 and the paraenesis of chapters 4-6. It has sought to present a critical methodology for approaching Eph. that indicates how theology and ethics are related. The validity of the rhetorical critical approach taken has been demonstrated and the particular rhetorical critical methodology used has been defined. The methodological procedure has defined what for the purposes of the present study is being termed "sermon" and indicated that Eph. is such a "sermon"; has identified the rhetorical situation that gave rise to Eph. so far as the text itself reveals it; has indicated the rhetorical arrangement of the epistle; and has shown that the rhetoric of the "sermon" produced audience identification that would lead the recipients to accept and attempt to attain the goals in the author's mind.

Several conclusions relative to the relationship between theology and ethics in Eph. have been drawn and are restated here:

1. Epistolary analysis, while it is useful for determining the dimensions of the letter format, does not explain how theology and ethics are integrated in Eph.
2. The genre of "sermon," for our purposes here (bearing in mind how imprecise the actual word "sermon" may be), is a

combination of deliberative and epideictic genres that is not intended to deal with a particular ἄγῶν and is directed to θεῶποι rather than χριταί. The sermon is intended to impress the θεῶποι with its ideas and themes, to enable the θεῶποι to identify with beliefs and practices with which they already agree, rather than to present them with convincing arguments, and, consequently, to lead them on to an ethical goal. The "sermon," therefore, leads an audience to practice specific behaviour based not on information or concepts from which the behaviour is directly derived, but rather on concepts with which the audience identifies. The sermon builds a rapport with the audience members, attempting to stimulate their thoughts and sentiments, rather than to argue critically.

3. Eph. fits neatly and appropriately into this sermon genre. It is not an essay aimed at dealing simply with ecclesiology and unity, but a rhetorical discourse designed to elicit a desired response.

4. Eph. is intended to impress its audience of Gentile Christians with the nature and value of salvation in order to lead those believers to a full maturity that is expressed ethically or behaviorally.

5. The ethical concern explicit in the *exhortatio* is implicit in the *exordium/narratio* of chapters 1-3.

6. Eph. is composed of an *exordium/narratio* (1:3-3:21), followed by an *exhortatio* (4:1-6:9), and *peroratio* (6:10-20). The *exhortatio* does not argue directly on the basis of the *exordium/narratio* as would be the case in a rhetorical

argumentatio. The *exhortatio* thus functions in the place of an *argumentatio* but not as an exact substitute for it. A frame of mind that is susceptible to the moral exhortations described in the *exhortatio* is encouraged on the basis of an identification with and appreciation of the various themes presented in the *exordium/narratio* that have been impressed upon the minds of the audience members.

7. Language and themes that would produce audience identification are a rhetorical feature used by the author to develop a sense of personal involvement in the audience members in order to lead them on to maturity and corresponding conduct.

Theology and ethics, it is concluded, are integrated in Eph. not by clear, explicit connection and argumentation, but by the rhetorical use of the "sermon". The audience members are reminded of and identify with theological realities with which they are personally involved and on the basis of such identification are impressed with the need to move toward the goals the author has in mind for them.

It remains now to provide a rhetorical analysis of the *exordium/narratio* showing how a mindset susceptible to moral exhortation was intended to be developed,²³³ and to examine the *exhortatio*, showing that supporting argumentation is self-contained within the paraenesis and not derived directly from Eph. 1-3.²³⁴

ENDNOTES

- 1 The same clause is used to introduce the paraenesis in Rom. 12:1 which, similarly, follows a doxology (Rom.11:33-36). The doxology at the end of Eph. 3 is a closing element prior to the commencement of paraenesis at 4:1; see Sanders, 1965:214; cf. Sanders, 1962:256-57; Maurer, 1952-53:152
- 2 Cf. White, 1981:90-91; White, 1984:1731; Funk, 1966:248; Aune, 1987:158; see also Alexander, 1984:579-596; Stowers, 1986:15-16,17-20,27-31. Dahl, 1976:538 states that the concept of "letter" includes the notion of "a message conveyed" as well as the notion of a written document. Cf. White, 1988:85-86.
- 3 Stirewalt, 1969:179; White, 1986:193,202; Aune, 1987:158; Malherbe, 1988:2,12.
- 4 Cf. White, 1983:435; Malherbe, 1986:79; Malherbe, 1988:2; see also Berger, 1974:190.
- 5 Stirewalt, 1969:182; Malherbe, 1986:68; cf. Stowers, 1986:33-34: "Greco-Roman culture regarded the well-delivered and persuasive speech as the most characteristic feature of civilized life. In contrast to our own culture, linguistic skill focused on oral speech; the written word was secondary, derived from primary rhetoric."
- 6 Stowers, 1986:27-28.
- 7 Stowers, 1986:34; Malherbe, 1988:2,3.
- 8 White, 1983:435-36; 1986:192; White, 1988:99 states, "The theological body [of the letter] is characterized by dialogical and argumentative features that are especially influenced by oral, rhetorical traditions."
- 9 This was true, in general, for both Hellenistic and Jewish letters. See Alexander, 1978:161-168; Aune, 1987:174-80.
- 10 Koskenniemi, 1956:155; cf. White, 1984:1731.
- 11 Doty, 1973:34; cf. White, 1981:91. It is surprising that, with the exception of White, 1972, scholars who deal with NT epistolography generally have relatively little to say about the letter body from an epistolary viewpoint; e.g., Schnider and Stenger, 1987 who do not formally deal with the letter body at all. The three sections of their monograph are "Der Briefengang" (pp.3-70), "Der Briefschluss" (pp.71-167), and "Anfang" (pp.168-181).
- 12 White, 1981:91; 1986:198.

13 Sanders, 1962:348-62; Funk, 1966:270, cf.254-255; Doty, 1973:27-47; White, 1981:92; 1983:438; 1984:1740-42; 1986:198-203; cf. Schubert:1939:*passim*; Kümmel, 1975:351; Schnider and Stenger, 1987:*passim*.

14 White, 1981:92. The wish or prayer for health is a feature seen frequently in the papyrus letters (cf. White, 1984:1733-34).

15 White, 1971:90; cf. White, 1972:112n13. White, along with many others, follows the work of Schubert, 1939 on the role of the thanksgiving period in ancient letters.

16 Sanders, 1962:356-7 suggests that the "eucharistō period" of Eph. "...extends at least as far as 2:10". Schnider and Stenger, 1987:44 suggest the thanksgiving period covers all of 1:3-2:22.

17 E.g., Dibelius, 1953:78; Kümmel, 1975:351; cf. Barth, 1974:54; Bruce, 1984:240-41.

18 Mullins, 1971:91; cf. Alexander, 1978:165; Roberts, 1986:188. The prevailing approach to the study of early Christian epistolary style has been limited to what were perceived to be introductory and concluding epistolary elements (Stowers, 1986:22-23; see also note 11 above) with little concern for the body. To his credit Stowers (p. 23) calls for a more functional and holistic approach that examines the role of all letter parts from the vantage point of epistolary theory.

19 Mullins, 1972:380-90, especially pp.387-88. Such forms, says Mullins, are usually employed to "...punctuate a break in the author's thought."

20 Mullins, 1972:388.

21 Mullins, 1972:387.

22 When White, 1971:95 finds what he assumes to be an "introductory formula," i.e., an expression of joy, deep inside the text of Phil. (Phil.4:10), he dismisses it with an allusion to the question of the unity of Phil., suggesting that the expression may belong to an independent letter.

23 White, 1984:1741.

24 White, 1984:1734; 1981:92.

25 Cf. Lausberg, 1960:§§263,266-68.

26 Koester, 1982, II:55.

27 Koester, 1982, II:55.

28 Schnider and Stenger, 1987:62.

29 Berger, 1984:1330-31.

30 The most notable classification of epistolary types, for our purposes, is the first century CE work Epistolary Types, attributed, apparently falsely, to Demetrius of Phalerum, hence the author is referred to as Pseudo-Demetrius. Pseudo-Demetrius listed twenty-one different letter types. An ET of Epistolary Types can be found in Malherbe, 1988:30-41.

31 For a description of epideictic oratory see section 2.4.2 below.

32 See Aune, 1987:161.

33 Cf. Aune, 1987:161.

34 Stowers, 1986.

35 Aune, 1987:162. Cf. White, 1988:88-95, who identifies (with examples) four types: letters of introduction and recommendation; letters of petition; family letters; royal/diplomatic correspondence.

36 Johanson, 1987:63, 64-65. Johanson is concerned particularly with 1 Thess., but the principle of what he calls the "pragmatic dimension" can be applied to any letter.

37 Johanson, 1987:63.

38 Meeks, 1986:161, while speaking of Christian ethics rather than epistolary theory, cautions against ignoring the "living function" in a text while looking for its essence: "To obtain the essence of something, we have to boil it down, distill, filter out; what is left is not the living thing, but a residue, an abstraction." Cf. also Meeks, "Understanding Early Christian Ethics" 1986:3-11.

39 Cf. the views of Koester, cited above, notes 26, 27.

40 Already noted above is the view of some scholars that Eph. has no formal letter body. See also note 17.

41 Cf. Barth, 1974:54.

42 Such as those already noted above in sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3.

43 This is the view, in fact, of Roberts, 1986:198-199, who believes that all of Eph. 1-3 is an extended *berakah* formulation and that the letter body is comprised of three pericopae, viz. 2:1-10, 11-18, 19-22.

- 44 Criteria for identifying the various epistolary transitional phrases can be found in the works on letter writing by Sanders, White, Doty and Mullins noted above.
- 45 The word παρακαλῶ is frequently used for request in ancient letters; other request terms are ἀξίω, δέομαι and ἵκετεύω. See White, 1984:1736.
- 46 While Barth, 1974:55 calls 3:1-4:24 the "second part" of the structure of Eph. (following "prologue," 1:3-14 and "first part" 1:15-2:22) he nevertheless divides the letter into the two usual halves in his commentary, and discusses the change to hortatory material at 4:1 (cf. pp.426, 453).
- 47 Cf. Mullins, 1972:387, as in note 19 above.
- 48 The thoughts of even 2:11-22 cannot be completely isolated as forming the letter body (cf. Roberts, 1986:198-199, as in note 43 above). This pericope has clear parallels (cf. Lincoln, 1987:607-608) with 2:1-10, not to mention the linguistic connection formed by διὸ μνημονεύετε. The pericope 2:1-10 is in turn linked syntactically and thematically to 1:19b-23. Nor can the pericope 3:2-13 be unambiguously labelled "body" since it is a digression from the author's thought in 3:1.
- 49 But see the discussion of the purpose of Eph. in sections 2.4.1 below.
- 50 Aune, 1987:217-218. The category "general letter" appears to be a catch bag for letters that do not lend themselves to clear epistolary analysis.
- 51 Aune, 1987:218.
- 52 These letter types are from the twenty-one identified by Pseudo-Demetrius. See above note 30.
- 53 Or possibly in light of 1:13-14 in particular. O'Brien, 1979:505 fn 8, 513; Abbott, 1897:24-25.
- 54 These parallels are indicated particularly in the language of resurrection and seating in the heavenlies (1:20; 2:5-6). See Schnackenburg, 1982:95; Allen, 1986:103-04.
- 55 Tachau, 1972:134-143; Lincoln, 1987:607-608.
- 56 Bruce, 1984:309.
- 57 See the discussion in section 3.3.9 below.
- 58 Cf. Wuellner, 1976:334, "Hellenistic-Roman and Near Eastern epistolographic studies, no matter how exacting they will be executed, cannot solve the problem of Romans or that

of any other letter of Paul. [Wuellner, in fn 22, includes canonical and apocryphal Pauline letters.] Such studies will clarify the letter *frame* [Wuellner's italics], and the conventions of letter frames, but they cannot solve the problem of the letter structure, or the problems connected with the 'body' of the Pauline letters." See also the more recent comments on this point by Wuellner, 1988:2-3.

59 See above section 2.2.1.

60 Cf. Johanson, 1987:61-65; Wuellner, 1988:2-3.

61 As mentioned earlier in section 2.2.4.

62 Above, section 2.2.1.

63 Schlier, 1957:16.

64 Kirby, 1968:126,135; Mitton, 1951:4,13-14.

65 Aune, 1987:170, notes that "Epistolary preScripts and postScripts could be used to frame almost any kind of composition."

66 Mitton, 1951:4; Fischer, 1973:14.

67 Gnilka, 1971:33.

68 Kirby, 1968:126.

69 Kirby, 1968:136.

70 Schlier, 1957:18; see also fn.4 on same page.

71 Schlier, 1957:21

72 Lincoln, 1981:135.

73 Aune, 1987:158. Cf. the discussion above regarding the use of letters by ancient rhetoricians.

74 Mitton, 1951:13-14; Lincoln, 1981:136-37. Alexander, 1984:584 suggests that "The [Jewish] literary letter could have grown out of the sermon: it may have been regarded as the written analogue of the sermon." Dahl, 1976:268 suggests that Eph. is of a type of Greek letters "...which substitute for a public speech rather than for private conversation".

75 Cf. Kirby, 1968:136; Aune, 1987:81-82. The fact that Eph. 3:4 uses the verb ἀναγινώσκω is no objection to the contention that Eph. was meant to be "heard" rather than "read" by each member of the first audience(s). The verb ἀναγινώσκω and the noun ἀνάγνωσις refer not only to reading, but to public vocal reading and therefore to the hearing of a message read aloud

to an audience. See BAG:51-52; Bultmann, TDNT I:343-344; Schlier, 1957:149; Bruce, 1984:312fn16; see also section 3.3.9 below with note 508, on Eph. 3:4. Meeks, 1986:62, says that "Literacy in the empire, by a very rough estimate, did not exceed 10 per cent on average". It is not possible to be certain of the literacy level of the recipients of Eph., but it is nevertheless reasonable to assume that most persons "heard" the document read rather than read it themselves individually.

76 Dahl, 1978:142.

77 Dahl, 1978:142.

78 Rhetorical criticism applied to the NT has received a good deal of notice in recent years. However, the only work dealing with a rhetorical critical methodology for NT studies to date is Kennedy's New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism, 1984.

79 Betz, 1979; Betz, 1985.

80 Jewett, 1986.

81 Johanson, 1987.

82 Hughes, 1989.

83 Watson, 1988, Invention Arrangement and Style.

84 E.g., Wuellner, 1976; 1984; 1987; 1988.

85 Kinneavy, 1987:4, *passim*.

86 Kennedy, 1984.

87 Aune, 1987. See also the volume of essays edited by Aune, 1988. Others have also used rhetorical criticism to examine NT passages, e.g., Schüssler Fiorenza, 1987:386-403; Watson, 1988:57-88. For other examples, and a brief history of the method see Kennedy, 1984:3-33; Betz, 1986; Wuellner, 1987:448-54; Watson, Invention Arrangement and Style 1988:1-8. See also, Robbins, 1980:73-82; Robbins, 1986:677-687; Black, 1989:252-258; Watson, 1989:301-318. An extensive bibliography has been prepared by Watson, "Bibliography", 1988:465-472.

88 Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969:*passim*; cf. Dearin, 1989:*passim*.

89 Kennedy, 1980:6-11; cf. Johanson 1987:34.

90 In his classic work, Institutio Oratoria.

- 91 Aune, 1987:158. Cf. Malherbe, 1983:54-57.
- 92 Kennedy, 1980:9,129-132; Betz, 1974:353-55; 1979:14ff.; 1986:16-48; Wuellner, 1976:330-51; 1979:177-78; Forbes, 1986:22-24; Kinneavy, 1987:20,56-90; cf. Downing, 1988:212-230. See also Clark, 1957:*passim*.
- 93 Betz, 1986:21-47; cf. BDFS3.
- 94 Betz, 1986:16-21; Wuellner, 1987:450-54; Watson, Invention Arrangement and Style, 1988:4-5.
- 95 Kennedy, 1984:5-6; see above section 2.3.
- 96 See above section 2.2.1; Aune, 1987:158.
- 97 E.g., the *berakah* form in 1:3-14 (see section 3.2.1 below), and ethical materials in Eph. 4-6 (see chapter 4 below).
- 98 Kennedy, 1980:126. It will nevertheless be wise to bear in mind the caution of e.g. Beker, 1988:365, that the current movement toward sociological and rhetorical interpretations not lead to "...a virtual sociological and rhetorical captivity of Paul's thought."
- 99 All classical references are from the English translations of the Loeb Classical Library.
- 100 Kennedy, 1972:3; cf.1984:3. Black, 1965:10-19 argues that rhetoric and rhetorical criticism always have to do with "persuasive" discourse, whether spoken or written, and not with simple informative discourse.
- 101 Aune, 1987:198.
- 102 Pound, 1954:25-26.
- 103 Cf. Morgan, 1988:221. See Petersen, 1978:9-23 for comments on the current movement from form and source criticism to literary aspects of NT study.
- 104 Kennedy, 1984:33-38. He refers to the various procedures of his method as "stages," but recognizes that each "stage" may inform the other stages, adding to the understanding of the text being examined. Wuellner, 1987:455-460 tests Kennedy's stages by applying them to 1 Cor. 9; cf. also Johanson, 1987:39. Interestingly, both Wuellner and Johanson outline Kennedy's methodology in five stages, but differ as to what those stages are. This is due, at least in part, to Kennedy's failure to delineate his stages clearly, and perhaps to his recognition that the stages overlap, support and inform each other.

- 105 Cf. Kennedy, 1984:19. See sections 2.2.2, 2.4.2, and 2.4. below.
- 106 Black, 1965:especially pp.91-147.
- 107 E.g., Arist. Rhet. 1.3.3; Quint. Rhet. 3.4.1-4.
- 108 E.g., Hinks, 1936:172-175; Berger, 1984:1036-39; Stowers, 1986:51-52.
- 109 Many scholars have considered epideictic to be a "catch-all" or "wastebasket" genre for all non-judicial and non-deliberative discourse (cf. Chase, 1961:293; Stowers, 1986:51). Chase, 1961:293-300 has shown, however, that this was not the case in antiquity: "Present day interpretation that indiscriminately employs epideictic as a covering term for all non-deliberative and non-forensic oratory, or for a general oratory of display, is without adequate classical foundation" (p.300). The confusion over the nature of epideictic probably stems, at least in part, from the existence of difficult to define combination genres, e.g., deliberative and epideictic combinations (cf. Stowers, 1986:51,93; Aune, 1987:191), that do not fit completely into one or another of the three classical genres. See the discussion below in sections 2.4.2, 2.4.3, 2.4.4.
- 110 See Black, 1965:114,138.
- 111 See Black, 1965:118.
- 112 Black, 1965:124.
- 113 Hinks, 1936:174.
- 114 Cf. Black, 1965:118,124. Johanson, 1987:41 suggests that such an effect is similar to that of "much commercial advertising"; cf. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969:4-5,9,14-17. While the purpose here is not to perform psychological analysis, it is important to see that language can function so as to affect an audience to follow a course of action that is not explicitly derived from it.
- 115 Black, 1965:138.
- 116 Cf. Black, 1965:31.
- 117 Hinks, 1936:174 indicates that the classical rhetors were unfamiliar with "sermons" and consequently say nothing about them (although he refers to the hortatory discourses of Isocrates, e.g., Panegyricus as a "sermon" i.e., a hortatory [deliberative] speech delivered to the audience of an epideictic discourse). Berger, 1984:1038,1295-1376, adds two other genres: didactic and non-literary forms. In the non-literary category he includes the "Predigt" (pp.1363-1371).

118 Black, 1965:132-37.

119 Kennedy, 1984:19.

120 Cf. Johanson, 1987:42.

121 Cf. Johanson, 1987:40.

122 As Aune, 1987:197, has indicated: "Modern scholars have labelled many early Christian compositions as 'sermons' or 'homilies'. Yet these interchangeable terms are not really labels for a literary genre, since New Testament scholarship has not yet been able to define what a sermon is. One major obstacle is the fact that there are no early Christian texts that can be confidently identified as reasonably accurate versions of early Christian sermons."

123 Unless the term λόγος παρακλήσεως used in Acts 13:15 and Heb.13:22 is such a label.

124 With the exceptions of the epistolary prescript and postscript (1:1-2; 6:21-24).

125 See Kennedy, 1972:7-18; Lausberg, 1960:§§140-223.

126 Judges (κρίται) can refer to those holding official positions, e.g., magistrates, or to anyone who listens to the presentation of an accusatory or defensive argument intended to persuade the listener to make a judgment about the accusations or defenses.

127 Kennedy, 1972:18-21; Lausberg, 1960:§§224-238.

128 Kennedy, 1972:21-23; Lausberg, 1960:§§239-254.

129 Hinks, 1936:174 uses the word "critics" to describe θεωροί, while admitting that "critics" is possibly "too intellectual a word".

130 Lampe, 1961:649 defines θεωρός as "a spectator, one who contemplates". In ancient times the θεωρός was a spectator at a festival, particularly as a representative of a friendly state (Michaelis, TDNT V:318), who seems to have observed for the purpose of learning, but without actual participation in the activity being observed; cf. Plato Rep.476C; Aeschylus Frag.157(289); Demosthenes 19.128.

131 Hinks, 1936:174, "The orator will therefore pay especial attention to his art, by which he hopes to impress his ideas upon them; and they are not arbiters of any question, but critics, even though unconsciously, of the art that he exercises."

132 As noted earlier, section 2.3.4.

- 133 See the discussion above in 2.3.4.
- 134 Aune, 1987:197; see note 122 above.
- 135 Hinks, 1936:174; Johanson, 1987:40; see note 117 above.
- 136 E.g. Lausberg, 1960:§§59-65, 139-254.
- 137 Heinemann, 1971:col.994; cf. Kirby, 1968:93-94.
- 138 Heinemann, 1971:col.994.
- 139 Stegner, 1988:66.
- 140 Heinemann, 1971:cols.994-95; Stegner, 1988:55.
- 141 Heinemann, 1971:col.996.
- 142 Heinemann, 1977:253, but see especially all of pp. 251-256.
- 143 These and other examples can be found in Heinemann, 1977:253-55. Although these examples are admittedly from a later period, Heinemann, 1977:13ff, 252 shows that their form employing the *berakah* introduction dates to the Tannaitic period. See also Stegner, 1988:66-67.
- 144 See Heinemann, 1977:255-256, with examples; cf. also Heinemann, 1971:col.997.
- 145 Stegner, 1988:66.
- 146 Thyen, 1955:59-63,100,119. The weakness of Thyen's claim is that it is based on a reconstruction of the Jewish-Hellenistic homily (as it was his purpose to provide, p.5), not on actual examples of such homilies.
- 147 E.g., Panegyricus, To Demonicus, To Nicocles. Hinks, 1936:174. These sermons were, according to Hinks' reference, a specialty of Isocrates.
- 148 Hinks, 1936:172-74; Chase, 1961:296.
- 149 Black, 1965:138.
- 150 Although possible problems connected with division between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, inferred from 2:11-22 and 4:1-16 have been suggested, along with the possibility of syncretistic tendencies, such problems are not explicit within the text. See the relevant sections in chapter 3 below.
- 151 Berger, 1984:1326-1376, deals with "Vorliterarische Gattungen"; pp.1363-71 specifically deal with the "Predigt".

152 Berger, 1984:1370-1371.

153 Berger, 1984:1367. He compares Acts 17:22-34 with Rom.1:18-2:11, submitting that the same sort of effect occurs in the Rom. passage; he also suggests that Eph.4:17-6:17 and Col.3:5-4:6 are post-conversion analogies of the same sort.

154 Menander lived in the third century CE. He is not to be confused with Menander the comic poet and playwright of late fourth to early third centuries BCE, to whom Quint. *Inst.*10.1.69ff. refers.

155 Cf. the comment in Russell and Wilson, 1981:295, where Menander's *λαλιά* is compared with the Hellenistic diatribe.

156 One wonders if this lack of demand for orderly arrangement is reflected in the digression of Eph.3:2-13, or if such an understanding of the flexible nature of the *λαλιά* allowed for the placement of the more Jewish *berakah*-like eulogy of 1:3-14 ahead of the usual Pauline thanksgiving that does not occur until 1:15ff.

157 Russell and Wilson, 1981:95.

158 This actually happens, it would appear, as Johanson, 1987:41 suggests, in modern commercial advertising (see note 114 above), and also in some examples of modern sermons (cf. Black, 1965:138-146) where audience members respond out of a sense of personal identification with the sermon contents rather than on the basis of concrete argument.

159 Or, again, as Black, 1965:138 puts it, "exhortative discourse". McDonald, 1980:50-68 discusses "Paraclesis and homily in the early Christian church," but excludes Eph. from his survey as being one of the NT books that do not appear to be a homily (p.63).

160 Used by Jewett, 1986:65, although not in reference to a sermonic genre, but to the Pauline letter in general.

161 See above, section 2.3.

162 Taylor, 1985:22-23 has categorized Eph. as epideictic, and more specifically as a subcategory of epideictic he calls a "congratulatory speech" that was often used as a basis for exhortation. Taylor appeals for his description to Burgess, 1902:110-112, 186-187. Burgess (pp.110ff) however, lists the *συμβουλευτικὸν εἶδος* of epideictic under a discussion of Menander's *λαλιά* which was a combination of epideictic and deliberative (see section 2.4.3 above). Burgess (p.111) notes that the *συμβουλευτικὸν εἶδος* was not purely epideictic, and (p.112) that the *προτρεπτικὸς λόγος* of Menander's *λαλιά* was a union of deliberative (*συμβουλευτικόν*) and epideictic (*ἐπιδεικτικόν*) genres. Taylor is correct, however, in saying

that Eph. "...builds on the commonalities of religious experience, language, and liturgy in order to establish a sense of communion between author and audience".

163 Following the lead of the earlier definition of "exigence" in Bitzer, 1968:6.

164 Cf. the approach of Jewett (1986:xiv) to the Thessalonian epistles. For possible historical reconstructions the various introductions and commentaries may be consulted; also monographs such as Percy, 1946:449-466.

165 Or at least not of Ephesus alone. The words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in 1:1 are missing from the oldest Greek MSS.

166 Cf. Percy, 1946:325-26, fn.80.

167 Fischer, 1973:14-15.

168 E.g., the conjectures of Goodspeed, 1956.

169 Sampley, 1978:9.

170 Fischer, 1973:19.

171 Fischer, 1973:14-15.

172 E.g., Kümmel, 1965:352.364; cf. Percy, 1946:443-48.

173 Fischer, 1973:201-02.

174 Schrage, 1988:244.

175 Chadwick, 1960:148-49.

176 Chadwick, 1960:148.

177 Chadwick, 1960:149.

178 Kirby, 1968:145,159. Kirby concludes that Eph. 1-3 (see p.138) form a *berakah* intended for use in public worship, and that chapters 4-6 (see p.143) are a "Manual of Discipline for Church Communities" that could have been used in a sort of covenant renewal ceremony such as those in the Qumran community (cf. 1QS 1.16-3.12).

179 Lincoln, 1981:135-239; followed by Penner, 1983:266-267.

180 Lincoln, 1987:618-619.

181 Lincoln, 1987:618.

182 Martin, 1968:296-302; Martin, 1981:160-167; Käsemann, 1968:291; cf. Sampley, 1971:3; Verhey, 1984:123-126.

183 Mitton, 1951:266.

184 Arnold, 1989:123-124,171.

185 This is not to suggest that at least some of the historical reconstructions of occasion and purpose are not valuable or correct, but only to stress the importance of looking for what the text says about its own purpose.

186 Cf. Col.1:9.

187 Cf. Barth, 1974:162; Schlier, 1957:77; Schlatter, 1963:169-170. The several exegetical questions that arise out of these verses do not affect the conclusion that the author wishes the audience to come to a more mature knowledge of their Christianity. The exegetical issues will be dealt with more fully in chapter 3.

188 Lincoln, 1987:607-609, 617-618. See also the analysis of 2:11-22 in chapter 3 below.

189 Cf. Lincoln, 1987:614-615.

190 Cf. Barth, 1974:323.

191 Cf. Lindemann, 1985:64.

192 Cf. the highly realized eschatological language, especially in 2:4-10.

193 Cf. Percy, 1946:447.

194 That is, the author's prayer for the Colossian Christians maturity is linked with their "worthy walk" (περιπατήσαι ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν, ἐν παντί ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες..., Col.1:10).

195 Bjerkelund, 1967:183. He says: "Er ist das Haupt der Gemeinde, der Versöhner und Friedensstifter, doch erfahren diese Momente keine paränetische Anwendung, so wie es in Kol der Fall ist, woraus sich das Fehlen von οὖν in den ersten Kapiteln dieses Schreibens erklärt. Die drei ersten Kapiteln stehen eher unter einem liturgisch-hymnischen als einem theologisch-paränetischen Gesichtspunkt. Und was den Übergang zur Paränese in 4,1 betrifft, so läßt sich nur schwer ein enges Verhältnis zwischen den drei ersten Kapiteln und die Paränese feststellen, obwohl diese Kapitel Motive enthalten, die zur Paränese überleiten." See the comments in chapter 1, above (section 1.2 with note 43).

196 Cf. Col. 2:8-23.

197 Cf. Luz, 1976:374 who believes that Eph. 4-6 is not an appendix to, but the culmination of Eph. 1-3, even though he questions how the theology and ethics are to be integrated.

198 Cf. Johanson, 1987:41; Lincoln, 1987:618.

199 Such a rhetorical analysis of Eph. 1-3 will be presented in chapter 3 below.

200 See the chart in Lausberg, 1960:§262 for this conception; see also Lausberg, 1960:§§260-442 for an exhaustive treatment of the speech contents or *inventio*.

201 E.g., *propositio*, *divisio*, *confirmatio*, *confutatio* and many others. On this see Lausberg, 1960:§§260-442.

202 See the brief discussion in Johanson, 1987:42-46.

203 Quintilian's actual words, in ET, are, "I acknowledge that in controversial speeches the tone is often lowered in the *exordium*, the statement of facts and the argument, and that if you subtract these three portions, the remainder is more or less of the deliberative type of speech, but what remains must likewise be of a more even flow, avoiding all violence and fury."

204 Lausberg, 1960:§348. "Die *argumentatio* ist so der zentrale, ausschlaggebende Teil der Rede, der durch das *exordium* und die *narratio* vorbereitet wird."

205 Lausberg, 1960:§§263-264.

206 Lausberg, 1960:§289.

207 Lausberg, 1960:§348.

208 Lausberg, 1960:§431, "Die *peroratio*...hat zwei Ziele: Gedächtnisauffrischung und Affektbeeinflussung".

209 See Aune, 1987:199.

210 Quint. *Inst.* 1.Pr.6: "It has been my design to lead my reader from the very cradle of speech through all the stages of education which can be of any service to our budding orator till we have reached the very summit of the art." Quint. *Inst.* 1.Pr.9: "My aim, then, is the education of the perfect orator."

211 The ancient rhetors did, as we have already noted, allow flexibility for overlap and combinations of genres, and for the exclusion of various parts of the *inventio*. Their work, however, deals essentially with speeches that were constructed according to form.

212 Similar, again, to the Jewish introductory benediction or *berakah*; see section 2.4.3 above.

213 Some commentators, e.g., Bruce, 1984:309; Caird, 1976:62, suggest that the petition of 3:1,14-19 is a resumption of the petition of 1:15-19a.

214 For reasons why the *narratio* begins at 1:19b see section 3.3.1 below.

215 See again section 1.2. Dahl, 1976:268 notes that Eph. has no argumentation as in judicial oratory or in the diatribe. These arguments within the *paraenesis* will be taken up in a subsequent chapter, but examples include arguments based on practical social concerns (4:28), and on the more theological concern of the imitation of God and Christ (5:1-2).

216 Although, once again, some theological themes, e.g., "calling" (1:18; 4:1,4) appear in both the *exordium* and the *paraenesis*.

217 Consequently *protrepsis* (προτροπή), a form "...designed to win someone over to a particular enterprise or way of life by demonstrating its superiority" (Malherbe, 1986:122) is of the deliberative genre. Cf. Hinks, 1935:171-172.

218 Section 1.2.

219 Passages mentioning judgment such as 2:3; 4:14,18; 5:6; 6:8-9 do not apply to the audience members in their present, saved condition, but to those who are "outside" salvation. Believers are described as already ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (e.g., 2:6).

220 See Betz, 1979:253-254, also p. 254 fn 12; neither Lausberg, 1960, nor Martin, 1974 deal with *exhortatio* or *paraenesis*. Cf. the references to exhortation in Seneca Letters 94.39,49; 95.34 (*adhortatio*=exhortation); 95.65 (*exhortatio*).

221 Aune, 1987:191. Thyen, 1955:119, suggests Paul followed the Jewish-Hellenistic homily in his use of *paraenesis*.

222 Cf. White, 1986:206.

223 Cf. Schlier, 1957:288.

224 A combination of *exordium* and *narratio* was acceptable according to Anaximenes, Rhet ad Alex 1438b,15-28;1442b,28-32; cf. Johanson, 1987:159

225 See above, section 2.4.6.

226 Mouat, 1966:167 (cf. pp.169-70, "...people rarely attend to that which does not affect them personally and that [sic.] when they are affected personally, the feeling of pleasantness or unpleasantness is aroused)."

227 Burke, 1969: *passim*.

228 Mouat, 1966:171-77.

229 Burke, 1969:55

230 Cf. Mouat, 1966:172.

231 Cf. Mouat, 1966:172.

232 "Briefly" here because the use of identification in individual passages will be taken up in subsequent discussions later in this study.

233 Chapter 3.

234 Chapter 4.

CHAPTER THREE
 RHETORICAL ANALYSIS
 THE *EXORDIUM/NARRATIO*, EPHESIANS 1:3-3:21

3. Introduction

The conclusion has been drawn¹ that Eph. is the written, epistolary version of a rhetorical discourse that may be termed "sermon," and that it was intended to persuade its audience of Gentile Christians to move on to a full Christian maturity that is to be expressed ethically or behaviorally. Such persuasion is accomplished as the author of Eph. addresses an audience of *θεωποί*, not about a particular *ἄγδν*, but with themes and ideas that are intended to make a deep impression on the minds of the audience members, stressing both their relationship to God and God's actions on their behalf, and to bring about an identification on the part of the *θεωποί* with beliefs with which they were already in agreement, thereby stimulating their thoughts, sentiments and, in turn, their behaviour. Eph. calls for specific behaviour in the *exhortatio* (4:1-6:9), not on the basis of direct argument founded on the facts presented in a *narratio* (as would be the case in the usual rhetorical *argumentatio*), but on the basis of the rapport that has been built between the author and the recipients in the *exordium/narratio* (1:3-3:21). Rather than arguing critically on the basis of theological concepts for the behaviour encouraged in the *paraenesis*, Eph.

reminds its audience members of the theological realities with which they are involved and with which as Christians they identify. A renewed appreciation of these theological realities may persuade them to move on to the goals that the author has in mind.

The purpose of this chapter is to present a detailed and technical rhetorical analysis of the *exordium/narratio* in order to demonstrate how the audience members could have been moved by the presentation of the theological themes contained therein toward acceptance and practice of the moral exhortations of the *exhortatio*.

3.1. The Combined *Exordium/Narratio* 1:3-3:21

The combined *exordium/narratio* begins at 1:3 with language of worship (1:3-14), followed by thanksgiving for, and petition on behalf of the recipients (1:15-19a; 3:1,14-19²), and a doxology (3:20-21). Embedded within this praise and petition is a statement of facts or *narratio* that gives some specific perspectives on aspects of christology, soteriology and reconciliation (1:19b-2:22), along with a digression (*digressio*) addressing the ministry and message of Paul (3:2-13). There is a clear linking of thought between the various pericopes.³ These linkages can be seen, for example, at 1:15 (διὰ τοῦτο κ'ἀγώ...); at 1:19b,⁴ where narrative concerning the raised and exalted Christ is tied to the preceding

thanksgiving and petition by the preposition κατά and the notion of God's power (τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ..., 1:19a); at 2:1-6 by καὶ ὑμᾶς and the notions of death, raising, and seating in the heavenlies as in 1:20; at 2:11 (διὸ μνημονεύετε); and at 3:1,14 (τούτου χάριν). A combined *exordium* and *narratio* was acceptable according to Rhet ad Alex 1438b.15-28; 1442b.28-32. The following examination, however, will consider *exordium* and *narratio* separately in order to facilitate understanding.

3.2 The *Exordium*

It may be recalled that, according to the classical rhetoricians, the essential purpose of an *exordium* is to appeal to an audience so as to gain attention, favourable disposition, and sympathy toward a speech (Arist.Rhet.3.14.7; Quint.Inst.3.8.7).⁵ According to Quintilian (Inst.4.1.5), "The sole purpose of the *exordium* is to prepare our audience in such a way that they will be disposed to lend a ready ear to the rest of our speech". In epideictic oratory the sources of such speech are praise and blame (Arist.Rhet.3.14.2), that is, things about oneself, the person being discussed or the subject being discussed that may be praised or blamed (Rhet ad Her.3.6.11; cf. Rhet ad Alex.1440b.5).⁶ The *exordium* should make the hearers believe that they are actually participating

in the praise (Arist.Rhet. 3.14.11). The style of an *exordium* should not resemble argumentation or narrative too closely, and should appear to be unpremeditated (Quint.Inst. 4.1.60).

3.2.1 The Introductory Eulogy, 1:3-14

The eulogy of 1:3-14 has striking similarities to the Jewish *berakah* form⁷ (cf. Gn.14:20; Dan.2:20ff; Barn.6:10; 1Macc.4:30-33; Tob.13:1ff; 1QS11:15; 1Q11:27), even if it has been "Christianized" by the addition of τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.⁸ It stands, in a form critical sense, as an introductory eulogy or benediction⁹ that praises God for his salvific plan and his actions for the benefit of people. Virtually everyone who studies the eulogy notes that it stands as a long, single sentence, and that it is very difficult to analyze.¹⁰ Norden called it "das monströseste Satzkonglomerat (dem von einer Periode kann man da gar nicht mehr reden), das mir in griechischer Sprache begegnet ist."¹¹ While calling the sentence "the most monstrous" is probably very extreme, the eulogy has provoked lively scholarly discussion and debate over its nature, structure, and position in Eph.

3.2.2 The Debate over the Nature and Structure of the Eulogy

Many scholars have written about the nature and structural arrangement of 1:3-14, asking whether the passage is poetic (i.e., hymnic) or prosaic, and inquiring about the sources it

may have come from. Is the eulogy an early Christian liturgy or hymn, or is it based upon such material, or did the author compose it himself? Lohmeyer¹² was one of the first persons to attempt an analysis of the eulogy as being hymnic, seeing it in four large units (vv. 3-4, 5-8, 9-12, 13-14). He suggested that the basis for the two middle units (i.e., vv. 5-8 and 9-12) was an older two-strophe hymn based on the participles *προοπίσας* and *γνωπίσας* that had been recast in their present form with the additions of verses 3-4 and 13-14. Maurer¹³ claimed that 1:3-4 contain the theme of the eulogy which is then explained through the use of participles and verbs in three sections (1:5-8, *προοπίσας*; 1:9-10, *γνωπίσας*; 1:11-14, *ἐκκληρώθημεν* and *ἐσφραγίσθητε*). Over against Lohmeyer, Dahl¹⁴ stated that 1:3-14 does not follow distinct poetic rules, whether they be Hellenistic or Semitic, and that the participles *προοπίσας* and *γνωπίσας* do not define its structure. Dahl submitted¹⁵ that the passage is structured around the "in him" expressions (*ἐν αὐτῷ*, 1:4; *ἐν ᾧ*, 1:7, 11, 13). He insisted that all of the eulogy be seen as a unit, that is, that neither 1:3 nor 1:13-14 may be split off from any formal analysis, particularly since he believes that the specific application of the blessings to believers in 1:13-14 (by means of the change of pronoun from *ἡμεῖς* to *ὁμεῖς*) is part of the author's purpose.¹⁶ Perhaps more significant than Dahl's structural analysis of 1:3-14, however, is his view that baptism was in the author's mind, with the passage amounting to a baptismal eulogy.¹⁷ Cambier¹⁸

took the view that the eulogy was comprised of three strophes, each one ending with the refrain εἰς ἔπαινον (τῆς) δόξης αὐτοῦ (1:6,12,14). Coutts¹⁹ similarly proposed a three part structure set off by the words εἰς ἔπαινον (τῆς) δόξης αὐτοῦ. Coutts attempted what he called the "rash undertaking" of a "tentative"²⁰ reconstruction of stanzas of even length by subtracting what he perceived to be added homiletical content. The reconstruction proposed by Fischer is comprised of three strophes, 1:4-6, 1:7-8 plus the phrase εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτοῦ from verse 12, and 1:13-14, but it admittedly "...ist natürlich sehr unsicher".²¹ Schille²² claims that the participles προοπίσας and γνωπίσας (1:9) divide the eulogy into "...zwei klare Teile" dealing, in turn, with God's plan before the foundation of the cosmos and the execution of that plan.²³ In a recent article on the structure of Eph. 1:3-14, Robbins²⁴ has suggested that the sentence length and method of composition accord with certain principles of Greek rhetoric. Robbins submits that the structure of the eulogy is guided by the amount of a speech that a speaker can fit between breaths, and by the unity and completeness of thought of the words that actually do fit between those breaths. Although Robbins attempts to employ some principles of Greek rhetoric as does the present study, his suggestions appear to be forced, amounting to simply one more structural arrangement that can be disputed on linguistic and structural grounds.²⁵

Despite the various attempts to find in (or force on) 1:3-14 a poetic or hymnic structure, no wholly satisfactory schema has yet been identified.²⁶ Schlier concluded that the eulogy is an *ad hoc* creation of the author in rhythmic prose of hymnic type,²⁷ but is not in fact a hymn. Many commentators take essentially this same view,²⁸ and supply a variety of possible linguistic structures, none of which prove to be definitive or fully satisfying. Schlier himself²⁹ postulated that the benediction of 1:3 forms the basis for the whole eulogy which is then unfolded by means of the three verbs ἐξελέξατο (1:4), ἐχαρίτωσεν (1:6), and ἐπερίσσευσεν (1:8). Gnilka³⁰ arranged the eulogy around the participles εὐλογήσας (1:3), προορίσας (1:4), and γνωρίσας (1:9). Krämer³¹ proposed that the words ἐν Χριστῷ and their equivalents (ἐν αὐτῷ; ἐν ᾧ, etc.) are the organizing principle for the form and content of the eulogy. Disagreeing with the arrangements of Schlier, Gnilka, Krämer and others is Schnackenburg,³² who wishes simply to order the whole of the eulogy under the heading Ἐυλογητὸς ὁ θεός, and arranges the material in six parts that present the primary thought of praise to God (1:3-4), followed by adoption (1:5-6), salvation and forgiveness (1:7-8), revelation of the mystery (1:9-10), inheritance (1:11-12), and an application to the audience (1:13-14).³³ It is to Schnackenburg's credit, however, that he has gone beyond many other scholars by recognizing that structural and linguistic arrangements of the eulogy do not provide completely satisfying explanations of its meaning, and therefore discusses the passage under

structural, syntactical, semantical, and pragmatic categories.³⁴ He suggests the possibility that the various parts of the eulogy have rhetorical function and purpose, even if some of the individual parts of it are based on liturgical or homiletical models that preceded it.³⁵

In his pragmatic analysis, Schnackenburg wishes to consider how the text functions as a "communicative process"³⁶ through which the author seeks to influence the audience. He provides five "insights" upon which his pragmatic analysis is based:³⁷

1. Every text is produced for a communicative purpose.
2. The purpose of a text consists in its persuasive intention.
3. The effect sought for is of an emotional kind.
4. The emotions so affected serve either to confirm or change the norm-systems of the recipients.
5. The emotional effect is produced by means of the vehicle of linguistic signs or devices.

From his pragmatic analysis Schnackenburg concludes³⁸ that the author speaks of praise of God and of the audience members' redemption and salvation experience in order to encourage grateful praise and adherence to Christ, and to make them conscious of their Christian relationship. The author uses the emotions of gratitude, humility and joy to arouse a co-operative spirit within the audience in order to facilitate unity.³⁹ The eulogy presents a point of departure (1:4) for moral exhortation, although the exhortation itself does not appear until 4:1. Schnackenburg claims that the religious

emotions which the author has aroused are the best basis for all that follows in Eph. While Schnackenburg's article does not move further into a more detailed pragmatic analysis, his thoughts point out that attempting to understand both the persuasive purpose and the persuasive effect of the eulogy may prove to be more fruitful than grammatical and structural analyses.

3.2.3 Rhetorical Analysis 1:3-14

The eulogy begins with the *berakah*-like Ἐυλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (cf. 2Cor.1:3ff; 1Pet.1:3ff). The long sentence extending through to verse 14 employs *oratio perpetua*, that is, what could have been a series of sentences is coordinated together as one extended sentence by means of relative clauses, participles and prepositions (Arist.Rhet.3.9.).⁴⁰ This construction reflects, along with the *berakah* form, Semitic influence.⁴¹ God, as the object of praise in 1:3, is identified in the following clause which employs words from the same stem as εὐλογητός,⁴² (ὁ εὐλόγησας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ). Reduplication of the like-sounding words εὐλογητός, εὐλόγησας and εὐλογία serves to impress the notion of blessing on the minds of the audience members.⁴³ This introductory statement sets the stage for the rest of the eulogy by establishing the theme of praise to God in the minds of the audience members. The theme is explicit again in

1:6,12,14 (εἰς ἔπαινον [τῆς] δόξης). There is a powerful rhetorical effect in the initial words of praise in 1:3, however, by means of identification.⁴⁴ Aristotle, quoting Socrates, stated that "...it is not difficult to praise Athenians among Athenians" (Arist.Rhet. 1.9.30; 3.14.11).⁴⁵ By the same sort of logic, it should not be difficult to praise "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" among Christians. The audience of Eph. was composed of people who were already participants in salvation⁴⁶ and were, therefore, presumably cognizant of the fact that God had provided blessings and was worthy of being praised. The theme of praise is one with which the θεῶποι of Eph. could thus identify, since it is an understanding and practice with which they were familiar.⁴⁷ The author of Eph. is treating with esteem a theme which is esteemed by the audience (cf. Arist.Rhet. 1.9.30-31), thereby indicating that he shares their perspective, and moving them to participate in the praise as well. The θεῶποι are no doubt willing to praise God for blessings received. The author is thus using *pathos* (Arist.Rhet. 1.2.5),⁴⁸ that is, he begins the eulogy by arousing a sense of praise in the θεῶποι.⁴⁹

One of the most frequently noted recurring features of the eulogy, viz. the ἐν Χριστῷ phrases, first appears in 1:3.⁵⁰ The use of the preposition ἐν has provoked a good deal of discussion as to whether it should be taken in a locative⁵¹ or in an instrumental⁵² sense, but more pertinent here is the rhetorical effect of the preposition. The preposition ἐν in

the eulogy (and indeed elsewhere in Eph.) is not only coupled with Χριστός (or an equivalent pronoun), but with a number of other words (ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ; ἐν τοῖς ἔπουρανίοις; ἐν ἀγάπῃ; ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ; ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει). These ἐν phrases are syntactically unnecessary since the clauses make good sense through the verb meanings alone.⁵³ The rhetorical effect of the repeated use of the preposition ἐν is two-fold.

1. The rhetorical effect is evident in the rhythmic pattern in 1:3: ὁ εὐλόγησας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἔπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ. Burke indicates how such patterns can "...awaken an attitude of collaborative expectancy in us."⁵⁴ By this he means that awareness of a word pattern "...invites participation regardless of the subject matter."⁵⁵ Yielding to a form leads to audience assent to the matters identified with it. As examples, Burke uses a pattern based on antitheses: "we do this, but they do that; we stay here, but they go there; we look up, but they look down," and cites a passage from As You Like It:

Your brother and my sister no sooner met but they looked, no sooner looked but they loved, no sooner loved but they sighed, no sooner sighed but they asked one another the reason, no sooner knew the reason but they sought the remedy; and in these degrees they have made a pair of stairs to marriage.⁵⁶

When an audience is confronted with word patterns the tendency is to "collaborate"⁵⁷ with the pattern to make it a complete utterance. The same sort of effect can occur when a speaker uses the "body language" of nodding the head, stimulating

head-nodding among the audience members and, potentially, the audience's tacit agreement with the speaker's actual words. While we must be prudent in the acceptance of Burke's caution that "You can't possibly make a statement without its falling into some sort of pattern," and "Given enough industry in observation, abstraction, and classification, you can reduce any expression (even inconsequential or incomplete ones) to some underlying skeletal structure,"⁵⁸ the word pattern based on ἐν in 1:3 is a clear example of *epanaphora* (Rhet. ad Her. 4.13.19). *Epanaphora* is the repetition of the same word at the beginning of successive phrases.⁵⁹ The resultant rhetorical effect in 1:3 (which is not evident in ET's because ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ is usually translated "with every spiritual blessing") is the tendency of the audience to assent to the praise of God and to the proposition that God is the one who blessed "in every spiritual blessing in the heavenlies in Christ."

The initial epanaphoric use of ἐν in 1:3 leads, in turn, to the subsequent repetition of the preposition in 1:4, 6, 7. The flow of thought could move along easily without ἐν αὐτῷ and ἐν ἀγάπῃ in 1:4⁶⁰ and without ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ in 1:6, but the repetition of the ἐν phrases serves to sustain heightened awareness of the thought of 1:3 and to focus attention on the actions of God in Christ.

The effect of epanaphora is remarkable in the thought movement at 1:6-7 (ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἐχομεν), at 1:10-11 (ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν ᾧ καί) and at 1:12-13 (ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἐν ᾧ καί...ἐν ᾧ καί). When one thought is completed by means of an ἐν phrase, the author immediately employs another ἐν phrase to introduce another thought, and, in the case of 1:13, sustains and expands the notion of the explicit inclusion of the audience among those who have received the blessings by means of an additional ἐν phrase. This usage of *epanaphora* serves as an effective means of connecting thoughts as well as emphasizing the relationship of both blessings and believers to Christ. It would be possible to omit ἐν ᾧ from 1:7 and ἐν ᾧ καί from 1:11 and 1:13 without destroying the meaning of the assertions made in the verses. Removal of these repeated ἐν phrases, however, would damage the emphasis on the relationship between blessings and Christ. According to Rhet ad Her. 4.14.21, *epanaphora* is not used because of "...verbal poverty; rather there inheres in the repetition an elegance which the ear can distinguish more easily than words can explain." The epanaphoric pattern of ἐν phrases thus has to do with impressing the minds of the audience members with an identification of the blessings of grace (1:6), redemption (1:7), having been made a portion or lot of God (1:11), and having been sealed with the Holy Spirit in Christ (1:13). The pattern of ἐν phrases also tends to evoke a sense of "collaborative expectancy"⁶¹ among the audience members, who, having already been impressed with the notion that the

blessings referred to are focused "in Christ," will be likely to agree with equivalent expressions whenever they are used in the same pericope.

2. The rhetorical effect of the ἐν phrases as a stylistic device is evident in that they frequently (although not in every case) mark the end and/or beginning of individual thoughts that make up the eulogy (i.e., ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ, 1:3; ἐν ἀγάπῃ, 1:4; ἐν ἡγαπημένῳ from which springs the following ἐν ᾧ, 1:6-7; ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει, 1:8; ἐν αὐτῷ, 1:9; ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, 1:10; ἐν αὐτῷ from which springs the following ἐν ᾧ, 1:10-11; ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ from which springs the following ἐν ᾧ καί, 1:12-13; ἐν ᾧ καί, 1:13).⁶² They signal to the audience that either the end of a thought or the transition to another thought is imminent.⁶³ This is particularly noticeable in the eulogy where ἐν ᾧ and ἐν ᾧ καί appear at 1:7,11,13 (twice). Thus, while the preposition ἐν serves to join thoughts within the larger unit of the eulogy, it also functions as a marker by which notions are set off from each other in the thought flow.⁶⁴ This again impresses the notion of "in Christ" on the audience members, pushing their thoughts to focus on the blessings and, consequently, on the praise of God who provided the blessings, thus playing a role in encouraging the audience members to participate in the praise given in the eulogy.

The introductory theme statement of praise (1:3⁶⁵) is followed by a series of examples of the blessings that God has provided

in order to substantiate the praise. Such a use of examples was recommended by the classical rhetors (Rhet ad Her.3.6.10-11; Rhet ad Alex.1440b.5-1441b.10) for the purpose of arousing praise (Arist.Rhet.1.9.1-39), and was also used in the Jewish *berakah* form.⁶⁶ The examples act as *topoi* (Aris.Rhet.2.18.22), that is, the "themes," "doctrines" or "premises"⁶⁷ that are employed to persuade or move an audience. The examples are in the form of relative clauses that describe the components of the blessings, beginning in 1:4 with the conjunction *καθώς*, which has the force of "because" or "since".⁶⁸ The blessings are denoted as election (1:4), predestination (1:5), redemption and forgiveness (1:7),⁶⁹ revelation of the mystery (1:9), and having been made God's portion or lot (*κληρόομαι*, 1:11). The examples of blessing have the rhetorical effect of arousing praise for the one who has provided the blessings (*εἰς ἔπαινον [τῆς] δόξης*, 1:6,12,14). Praise of God is therefore supported rhetorically by the use of examples of blessings which indicate the ground of such praise, followed by explicit assertion of the result of the blessings.⁷⁰

Clarification for the recitation of blessings in the eulogy is found in the *κατά* clauses (1:5,7,9,11).⁷¹ These clauses are explanatory in that they demonstrate that the source of the various blessings is within God himself. Here again, the pattern established by the repetitive use of the preposition *κατά* has the effect of evoking an expectancy of a reference to the purpose, will and grace of God each time it is used.

While the examples explain the blessings for which God is praised, they also give an advance indication of the behaviour to be practiced by recipients ("ἡμεῖς") of the spiritual blessings. In 1:4 God has "elected us" εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ. The word εἶναι functions as an infinitive of purpose,⁷² expressing the purpose of the verb ἐκλέγομαι. Thus Christians have been chosen for the purpose of being holy and blameless before God and for living in love.⁷³ There is, therefore, an identification of the elect with proper conduct that is impressed upon the minds of the recipients of Eph. from the outset of the letter.⁷⁴ Bearing in mind that we have stated that the purpose of Eph. was an ethical one, i.e., to encourage its audience to move forward to Christian maturity that is expressed behaviorally,⁷⁵ the identification of Christians with proper conduct is not surprising in the *exordium*. *Exordia* were commonly used to signal or provide a sample (προεῖδον, Arist. *Rhet.* 3.14.6; cf. *Rhet ad Alex.* 1436a.31.38) of the main subject of a speech. Although the eulogy does not state that the author's primary concern was the maturity and behaviour of the audience, it does indicate to the audience that Christians and holiness, blamelessness, and love⁷⁶ belong together.⁷⁷

The employment of genitival constructions is a significant factor in the eulogy and indeed throughout Eph.⁷⁸ These genitives are plentiful in the pericope, sometimes forming symmetrical or parallel thoughts (e.g., εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς

χάριτος αὐτοῦ, 1:6; τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων, 1:7; τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, 1:7;⁷⁹ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, 1:9; εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν, 1:10; τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν, 1:13), and are used to explain or enhance the meaning of the clauses of which they are a part. They can indeed be said to have a rhythmic quality.⁸⁰

The use of synonyms or expressions of related meaning (τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ=τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων, 1:7; σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει, 1:8) heightens the rhetorical effect since "The hearer cannot but be impressed when the force of the first expression is renewed by the explanatory synonym" (*Rhet ad Her.* 4.28.38).⁸¹ Similarly, the repetition of the words εὐδοκία (1:5,9) and θέλημα (1:5,9,11) tend to impress the notions of God's "good pleasure" and "will" powerfully on the mind.⁸²

Perhaps the most powerful rhetorical or persuasive effect in the eulogy comes to the fore in 1:13. In this verse the second person pronoun ὑμεῖς is employed rather than the first person ἡμεῖς that is used in verses 3-12. This change of pronoun indicates that the thought of verse 13 is aimed directly at the inclusion of the audience of Eph. in the praise and blessings of the eulogy. Scholarship is divided,⁸³ however, over whether the change from ἡμεῖς to ὑμεῖς has Jewish Christians (ἡμεῖς) and the Gentile Christian audience

(ὕμεῖς) as referents, or if ἡμεῖς refers to Christians in general, with ὑμεῖς being a specific reference to the recipients of Eph. Mitton was evidently baffled by this change of pronouns, both in the eulogy and elsewhere in Eph., calling it an "inexplicable vacillation" and "purposeless variation".⁸⁴ The discussion turns on the meaning of the participle προηλπικότες in 1:12. Were those who "hoped first" in Christ Jewish Christians⁸⁵ who had either hoped in Christ before he came or who had heard and received the gospel temporally prior to Gentiles (cf. Rom. 1:16; Acts 13:46) as did Paul and other Jewish Christians (cf. 2:3), or were they any and all Christians⁸⁶ who had heard and accepted the gospel prior to the audience of Eph?⁸⁷ Those who take ἡμεῖς to refer to Jewish believers appeal essentially to two points: first, that Jews had a temporal priority in regard to Christ, the gospel and salvation, and, second, that since Eph. refers clearly to the temporal priority of Israel as regards salvation history in 2:11-20 (where Gentiles are explicitly referred to as ὑμεῖς, cf. 3:6), any apparent reference to such priority found elsewhere should be understood to have Jews (as against Gentiles) in mind.⁸⁸ Those scholars who see in ἡμεῖς and τοὺς προηλπικότες a reference to Christians in general who hoped in Christ prior to the audience members of Eph., on the other hand, note the absence of explicit references to any distinction between Jew and Gentile in the eulogy, and that the verb προελπίζω does not necessarily refer to Jews who "hoped first" in Christ.

The following considerations appear to be germane to the issue:

1. There seems to be no reason for the audience to think that they, as Gentile Christians, are excluded from being among the "we" of the eulogy from its outset. The audience is composed of believers who would undoubtedly consider "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1:3) to be their God as well. There is no hint that election, holiness, blamelessness and love (1:4), predestination to adoption (1:5), redemption and forgiveness (1:7), having been made a portion or lot (1:11), with a view to the praise of God (1:12), were not understood by the audience as being applicable to themselves. No distinction between or among any persons or groups is made until 1:12-13 where the contrast between "we who had previously hoped in Christ" and "you also" appears.

2. The use of τοὺς προηλπικότες in 1:12 and ὑμεῖς in 1:13 would not necessarily cause the audience to understand that the author intended to distinguish between Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christian audience.⁸⁹ The verb προελπίζω⁹⁰ does not inherently refer to Jews rather than Gentiles. It means simply to hope before, or to hope first. It is unfair to import a theological interpretation of προελπίζω obtained elsewhere and force it on the word when it is used in a context that does not require such an interpretation.

3. A clear reference to any distinction between the Gentile audience and Jews does not occur until 2:11-20. Even there the contrast is not between those who are now (νῦν) Gentile

Christians and Jewish Christians, but between the Gentile Christian audience's former (πότε, i.e., non-Christian) state of separation, not from Jewish Christians, but from Israel and salvation history ^{and their present state of nearness to a vation history.} (2:12).⁹¹ Also, when the pronoun "we" is used in 2:14 it is an inclusive "we," referring to both Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians. It is too much to assume that the former distinctions made between Gentile Christians and Israel in 2:11-20 can be read back into the eulogy⁹² as a distinction between Gentile Christians and Jewish Christians, and that the audience members would understand that the author referred to Jewish Christians in contrast to themselves as Gentile Christians in 1:13.

4. It follows, then, that the change from first person to second person pronouns at 1:13 does not demand that the audience understand a distinction between Jewish and Gentile Christians.⁹³ Further, the employment of both first and second person pronouns in 1:17-19 does not require the conclusion that Jesus Christ is not the Lord of the Gentile audience (1:17), nor that the Gentile audience is not included among those who believe (1:19).⁹⁴

The most straightforward understanding, based upon how the text of the eulogy itself reads, is that "we who hoped first" (1:12) is employed to indicate a contrast between the author along with others who were Christians prior to the audience, and the audience (i.e., ὑμεῖς, 1:13) whom the author wishes at that point to explicitly include within salvation and thus within the praise of God and reception of the blessings. In

other words, the audience members were not **excluded** from the discussion of 1:3-12, but in 1:13 they are explicitly **included** in the discussion.

This inclusion of the audience has great rhetorical force because it lays stress on the participation of the audience in the eulogy, and in the *exordium* more generally, and therefore on audience identification with the theological concepts of Eph. 1-3. According to Aristotle (Rhet.3.14.11), epideictic *exordia* should "...make the hearer believe that he shares the praise, either himself, or his family, or his pursuits, or at any rate in some way or other." While the audience members of Eph. should have felt the force of, and a sense of participation in the praise of 1:3-12, their participation is emphasized and impressed upon them in 1:13. While in 1:3-12 the audience may be seen to be participants in praise and blessings by virtue of being part of "us" (ἡμεῖς), they are in 1:13 directly identified as those who "also" (καί) have been sealed with the Holy Spirit, having heard the gospel message and having believed in Christ. They are full participants in the salvation spoken of in 1:3-12 and in sealing with the Holy Spirit which is the ἀρραβὼν of "our" (ἡμῶν, i.e., all believers) inheritance, and, consequently, are full participants in the praise of God (1:14).⁹⁵ The author, in 1:13, has made an effort to state explicitly the view that the audience has held from the outset (*viz.* their participation in praise and blessings), in order to gain the audience members'

goodwill and persuade them to agree with his ideas and themes.⁹⁶ The audience is consequently likely to be carried along in the direction the author desires.

The persuasive power of this language leading to audience identification and involvement is clarified further when it is realized that identification with and inclusion in a state or activity (e.g., praise of God) necessarily involves people in the behaviour perceived to be in accord with that state or activity.⁹⁷ By persuading the audience to identify with and be included in the thought flow of the eulogy, the author has impressed its members with their involvement and participation not only in praise and in the blessings given by God, but also in the implications of those salvific blessings, e.g., holiness, blamelessness and love (1:4).

3.2.4 Summary

The introductory eulogy is a complex passage based on the Jewish *berakah* format that employs rhetorical features that are intended to develop the recipients' consciousness and appreciation of the praise of God and of the "spiritual blessings" God has bestowed on them. The structure is very complex, not recognizably uniform nor consistently poetic or hymnic.⁹⁸ The theme of praise, the emphasis on and enhancement of the thoughts of the blessings of salvation and redemption, and the inclusion of the audience members as

participants in praise and blessings are intended to arouse the religious emotions of the recipients.⁹⁹ The recipients are made aware of their inclusion among those people who have been chosen to be holy and blameless in love before God. The rhetorical features of the passage lead the audience members not only to mere assent to the assertions in the verses, but also to personal involvement in what has been described. The eulogy functions so as to build a rapport or communicative link between the recipients and their Christian faith, reminding of Christian beliefs, and paving the way for acceptance of and agreement with subsequent theological reminders and behavioral exhortations.

3.2.5 Rhetorical Analysis: Thanksgiving and Prayer 1:15-19a

The thanksgiving and supplication report form the first half of another long sentence similar to the eulogy, thus another example of *oratio perpetua*.¹⁰⁰ The author of Eph. offers thanksgiving and supplication on a double foundation.¹⁰¹ First, the phrase διὰ τοῦτο χάρις points to a foundation in the preceding eulogy.¹⁰² Second, the recipients' faith and love, of which the author has heard, provide a foundation for the author's action. Because of the inclusion and participation of the recipients in the salvific blessings described in 1:3-14, and because word of their faith and love has reached the ear of the author (ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν...καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην...), he is motivated to offer thanksgiving along with

prayer for their continuing growth and maturity. In other words, because the audience members share in the blessings (1:3-14) and because they are actively involved in the Christian faith (1:15), the author himself has been influenced to take action on behalf of the recipients.¹⁰³ Not only can the audience members identify themselves with those who share in the blessings,¹⁰⁴ the author himself also explicitly identifies them in 1:15 as people who possess the virtues of faith and love.¹⁰⁵

The author's thanksgiving and supplication report comprise a *captatio benevolentiae*,¹⁰⁶ that is, the action of seeking after the friendliness and benevolence of the audience.¹⁰⁷ By stating that he has "heard" (ἀκούσας) about the audience the author indicates awareness of and concern for the recipients. This recognition can have a strong rhetorical and emotional effect because it tends to build up the self-esteem of the audience members through the praise that it implicitly directs toward them. The audience members would be persuaded to believe that the author is personally interested in them. It is also intended to make the recipients receptive to the author's thoughts and concerns as they are revealed, and, ultimately, to the author's requests and exhortations.¹⁰⁸ It is therefore not, as Barth correctly states, a "trite *captatio benevolentiae*".¹⁰⁹ The words are presented in the light of the author's genuine concerns for the audience, not merely as a device designed to gain goodwill and attentive ears.

Thanksgiving and supplication are founded on the author's estimation of the value of the audience members' participation and potential in the Christian faith.¹¹⁰ The author is not using flattery nor being dishonest or pretentious.

The recognition given to the audience, coupled with the knowledge of the author's unceasing thanksgiving and supplication on their behalf, demonstrate the author's submission to the welfare of the audience. By yielding to the feelings of the audience members in this way the author identifies himself with the audience. This sort of identification¹¹¹ is persuasive precisely because deference to an audience secures the favour of its members and moves them to a willingness to accept a speaker's/author's suggestions, conclusions, or exhortations. Thankfulness for the recipients' faith and love (even though the thankfulness is directed to God and not to the recipients themselves) would elicit pleasure and acceptance of the author's words. Rhetorically this may be termed *philophronesis* (φιλοφρόνησις), i.e., the attempt to mitigate by means of gentle speech and submission.¹¹²

Verse 16 employs the negative statement οὐ παύομαι to introduce the nature of the author's thanksgiving and supplication for the audience members.¹¹³ This usage (which is also found in Col.1:9) has the reassuring effect of demonstrating that the author does not simply recall the

recipients to mind occasionally, but that he never forgets them. This sort of emphasis by negation heightens the pastoral nature of the whole communication by indicating the author's constant concern for the welfare of the audience. The two participial clauses of 1:16, εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν and μνείαν ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, should both be taken as being governed by οὐ παύομαι.¹¹⁴ Rather than being synonymous (i.e., with μνείαν ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου in apposition to εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν) the two clauses express different, albeit co-ordinated, thoughts. The author is both thankful for the audience members, and mentions them in supplication (as 1:17-19a make clear). Because ἐπὶ followed by words in the genitive case refers to time,¹¹⁵ ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν means "when I pray".¹¹⁶ The verse as a whole may be rendered rhetorically as "I never cease giving thanks for you [and] making mention of you when I pray," with the Greek form being an example of asyndeton because the conjunction καί has not been used.¹¹⁷ The author has in a clear and plerophoric way¹¹⁸ informed the audience members that they are important enough to him to elicit a regular and constant place in his prayers.

The content and purpose of the author's request for the recipients is detailed in 1:17-19a.¹¹⁹ Caragounis claims that the force of the verse is ecbatic and not telic, expressing only the content of the author's prayers, not their purpose.¹²⁰ However, this distinction between content and

purpose is forced.¹²¹ Content and purpose seem to be so closely allied with each other as to be inseparable. The content of the author's prayer is a request that God would give¹²² the recipients πνεύμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ. The author's purpose for mentioning the recipients in prayers is identical. The purpose is expanded by means of the three τίς/τί clauses found in 1:18b-19a.

The rhetorical emphasis in 1:17 directs the audience members to look away from themselves, and identifies God as the one who can answer the author's request. Thus the words ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ are reinforced by the synonymous phrase ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης.¹²³ The author's concern for the welfare and growth of the audience members becomes much more specific and he identifies explicitly with the audience members by the interchange of the pronouns ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς. While intercession addresses "the God of our (ἡμῶν) Lord Jesus Christ," the request is that God "give to you (ὑμῖν) a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him". The author's wish that the audience benefit from his requests is clear. The rhetorical effect is one of *pathos* (Arist. Rhet. 1.2.5; Quint. Inst. 6.1.51; 6.2.2,8) as the audience members feel the emotional force of the author's concerns for them.¹²⁴

In 1:17 and in the τίς/τί clauses (1:18b-19a) the audience members can closely identify themselves with the author's

concern for their growth. That the recipients have already reached a level of maturity is clear from 1:15. The recognition of this level of maturity is intensified by the metaphorical expression πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας [ὑμῶν] in 1:18. This expression has been explained in various ways. Among the explanations are that the metaphor is in apposition to πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ;¹²⁵ that enlightenment of the "eyes of the heart" is necessary for the reception of the "spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him";¹²⁶ and that it is an allusion to baptism, i.e., the supposed event at which enlightenment occurred.¹²⁷ The fact, however, that φωτίζω occurs here as a perfect passive participle (πεφωτισμένους) leads to the view that the metaphor refers to an already accomplished enlightenment, and is consequently to be taken as a parenthetical statement (cf. Quint. Inst. 9.3.23).¹²⁸ On this understanding, 1:18 means "having already had the eyes of your hearts enlightened," and points to the conclusion that the author prays that God will provide an extension to what the audience members already have. This interpretation accords with the contrast of the recipients of Eph. with τὰ ἔθνη who remain darkened, with hardened hearts (4:17-18), and with the rhetorical purpose of Eph. to stimulate the growth and maturity of its Christian audience. The metaphor heightens the emphasis on the need perceived by the author for the growth of the audience members by indicating that, although they have had their hearts enlightened, there is still much

room for further progress. It also allows the recipients to identify themselves as people who have been enlightened.

According to Aristotle (Rhet.3.2.8), metaphor is the most important figure of speech, giving clarity, charm, and distinction as nothing else can.¹²⁹ Metaphors must correspond to what they signify,¹³⁰ and should be derived from what is beautiful in sound, significance, sight, or some other physical sense (Arist. Rhet.3,2,13).¹³¹ The metaphor πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας [ὑμῶν] is mixed, speaking neither of "enlightened eyes" nor of "enlightened hearts," but rather of "enlightened eyes of [your] hearts".¹³² It has a graceful appeal to the senses, with the notions of both hearts and eyes clearly symbolizing the recipients' awareness and appreciation of the Christian faith. Additionally, the metaphor has a rhythmic appeal in its employment of *homœoptoton*¹³³ with the chain of accusative endings (πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς).

The infinitival clause εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς¹³⁴ introduces the three τίς/τί clauses that reveal the author's specific concerns for the audience members' knowledge. The stress is again on the knowledge of the recipients, denoted by the second person pronoun (ὑμᾶς) in contrast to believers in general (εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας, 1:19a). The clauses fall into a repetitive pattern of τίς plus a nominative followed by a genitival description. This pattern invites acceptance of

and collaboration in the statements as listeners are carried along by the repetitive, *melopoeic* formulations.¹³⁵ The content of both the nominative and genitive nouns is impressive and positive (nominatives: ἔλπις, πλούτος, ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος; genitives: κλήσεως, δόξης, κληρονομίας, δυνάμεως), leading to a desire to actually possess knowledge of these things. The use of *homœoptoton* in each clause also heightens the persuasive effect (i.e., τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ; τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ; τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ). The style of 1:18b-19a is, on the whole, plerophoric¹³⁶ because of its pattern of three τίς/τί clauses that reveal the author's lofty aspirations for the recipients. Further, the language of 1:18b-19a has a self-involving effect¹³⁷ as the recipients, by virtue of their recognition that the author is concerned about their knowledge of ἡ ἐλπίς, ὁ πλούτος and τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος, and by their acknowledgement of the importance of and need for that knowledge, would be inclined to be eager to obtain it.

3.2.6 Summary

The report of thanksgiving and supplication in 1:15-19a quite clearly continues the features of an *exordium*. The author of the "sermon" gives the audience members recognition and an enhanced sense of self-esteem. He gives the impression that he loves them, just as they have expressed "love for all the saints". The passage portrays an obvious concern for the

growth and maturity of the recipients, particularly in terms of their knowledge of the Christian faith. The language is positive and uplifting, influencing the emotions. The goodwill and attention of the audience would be gained and maintained by these pleasing thoughts, leading to the persuasion of its members to accept the author's theological narrative and participate in the behaviour he encourages.

3.2.7 Rhetorical Analysis: The Prayer 3:1,14-19

The *exordium* continues following the embedded *narratio* with the prayer of 3:1,14-19, and concludes with the doxology of 3:20-21. The language of prayer and worship observed in 1:3-14, 15-19a is taken up again in these verses¹³⁸ and fulfills the same *exordium*-like function. The prayer commences with the words *τούτου χάριν* in 3.1, the same words being taken up and used again in 3:14 when the prayer is resumed following the *digressio* of 3:2-13.¹³⁹ These words, meaning "because of this," have rhetorical force in at least two ways. First, they recall to mind the content of what has already been stated.¹⁴⁰ Consequently, those things already discussed, along with their own persuasive power, are kept fresh and retain a prominent place in the minds of the audience members. Second, *τούτου χάριν* indicates that the foundation for the thoughts that follow in the author's requests for the audience lie in the facts that are recalled. Thus, by recall the

memory is stirred, and the bases for the following thoughts are found in the things that are recalled.¹⁴¹

Regardless of views taken on the question of the authorship of Eph., the clause ἐγὼ Παῦλος ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἔθνων (3:1) is an emphatic expression that draws attention to Paul. The prayer that follows (vv. 14-19) is consciously attributed to Paul, and thus the respect, appreciation, or feelings that the audience members may have had for him as speaker/writer are drawn out, possibly along with recognition of Paul's authority,¹⁴² with the result that attention and goodwill are attained and attached to the person of Paul. By being termed ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (as also in 4:1) the role of Paul vis-à-vis his relationship to Christ¹⁴³ is graphically identified, and, with the addition of ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἔθνων, Paul is made intensely personal to the Gentile audience as one who has personally become a "prisoner" for their benefit. Also, by referring to the recipients' ethnicity (τῶν ἔθνων) the author gives further ground for emotional response by pointing out that, despite racial differences, Paul, a Jew, would serve them by preaching. Certainly, then, the recognition by the audience that Paul had been concerned enough about them to take on such a task would engender their goodwill toward him and toward a message from him.¹⁴⁴ Quintilian (Inst. 4.1.7) claims that *exordia* sometimes proceed by securing goodwill through the person of the speaker, it being particularly desirable if it can be shown

that the speaker is moved by a sense of duty or other moral consideration. Paul is clearly portrayed in such a way in 3:1.

When the prayer is taken up again in 3:14, it is continued, as is characteristic in Eph.¹⁴⁵ in a long, continuous sentence through to 3:19. The sentence is yet another example of *oratio perpetua*,¹⁴⁶ co-ordinated in this case by ἵνα clauses and infinitival statements. It is the portrayal of action in 3:14, however, that grasps audience attention by the way in which it expresses emotion and devotion to God. The descriptive statement κάμπω τὰ γόνατα μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα is capable of producing an intense sense of *pathos*¹⁴⁷ as the θεῶποι visualize the author physically bowing in prayer. Such an action, while symbolic, indicates an attitude of homage, respect, reverence, submission, and humility that audience members, who have been hearing the language of worship and praise from Eph. 1:3 onward, can be reasonably expected to appreciate and with which they can identify.¹⁴⁸ Hearing of, reading about or otherwise observing such an emotional scene as the "bowing of knees" can easily lead to an emotional collaboration on the part of an audience.¹⁴⁹ The employment of physical action during the course of a speech has a great effect according to Quintilian (*Inst.* 6.1.30-31) "...since they [i.e., physical actions] seem to bring the spectators face to face with the...facts". While hearing the words of 3:14 is not the same as seeing the actual physical act of bowing the

knees, the effect of the vivid imagery is impressive. Many scholars have noted that elsewhere in the Pauline corpus the bowing of knees occurs only in quotations or in reference to other passages (Rom. 11:4; 14:11; Phil. 2:10; cf. Isa. 45:23), and that standing was the usual Jewish posture of prayer.¹⁵⁰ Yet surely the function of the clause κάμπτω τὰ γόνατα μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα in 3:14 is not to indicate one particular posture of prayer as over against another, but rather to affect persuasively the audience members with the emotional image of the author physically bowing in an attitude of worship¹⁵¹ and entreating God on their behalf. This sort of imagery and entreaty could hardly fail to gain the goodwill and respect of the audience for the author and the message of Eph. Since κάμπτω is the principal verb for the whole sentence, the attitude of respect toward God and its concomitant emotions prevail throughout the prayer and following doxology.¹⁵²

The obvious word-play between the like-sounding and common root words πατήρ (3:14) and πατριά (3:15) is recognized by many commentators.¹⁵³ Most writers, however, make extended remarks about the translation difficulties associated with the word πατριά¹⁵⁴ without giving sufficient credit to the rhetorical and functional effect of the play on words. Only Gnilka¹⁵⁵ refers to the word play by the technical term *paronomasia*.¹⁵⁶ This figure of speech uses a modification of sound or change of letters of words so that the resemblance of

certain words to others is unmistakeable (Rhet ad Her. 4.21.29; Quint. Inst. 9.3.66ff).¹⁵⁷ The effect is to enhance the language, to maintain attention and impress the notion of God as Father on the mind.¹⁵⁸ Schnackenburg¹⁵⁹ in fact suggests that the two things that give the prayer its character are the bowing of knees and the devotion directed to the Father. Certainly these two factors give the prayer its sense of direction. The two prepositional phrases πρὸς τὸν πατέρα and ἐξ οὗ πάσα πατριά complement each other and function persuasively in indicating direction to (πρός) and from (ἐκ) God., while still keeping the focus on God to whom Paul is said to bow his knees.

While 3:15 states that ὁ πατήρ is the one from whom πάσα πατριά ἐν οὐρανίοις καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται, it is not a necessity that the precise identity of πάσα πατριά, whether in heaven or on the earth, be defined in order for the words to have their persuasive effect and function.¹⁶⁰ The Father is attributed with creative power in this verse by virtue of being the one who has named πάσα πατριά,¹⁶¹ but the language of "heaven and earth" springs out of the elevated speech of reverence and submission to God, and out of the elevated worship language of Eph. more generally, rather than out of polemic¹⁶² or out of a concern to specify to whom πάσα πατριά ἐν οὐρανίοις καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς refers.¹⁶³ It may well be that πάσα πατριά alludes to human and angelic (or cosmic) beings as some have suggested.¹⁶⁴ However, the meaning and function of the

prayer as a whole is not illuminated by these identifications. There is no particular indication that the author desired the audience members to direct their attention to the specific task of identifying πάσα πατριά.¹⁶⁵ Robinson suggests in fact that the words ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς may have been added for emphasis.¹⁶⁶ The intent of the language is to draw attention to the Father to whom knees are bowed, as the one who has provided many blessings¹⁶⁷ and who can provide the blessings that the prayer requests in the following verses. The cosmic scope of fatherhood (ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς) enhances the sense of respect and homage being paid to the Father by denoting the extent of his power. The tone and action are those of worship, drawing the audience members into an emotional collaboration with the author so that they identify with and share in the devotion and worship of the Father to whom they look for the blessings sought in 3:16-19. Consequently, the attention and goodwill of the audience toward God, the speaker/writer, and the message of Eph. are gained.

The requests themselves are revealed and expanded in the three ἵνα statements of 3:16-19.¹⁶⁸ The rhetorical function of the ἵνα statements is to explain or expand on the prayer by expressing the specific desires that the author has for the audience members. The primary concern of the author is the strengthening of the recipients.¹⁶⁹ While the recipients are obviously at some point of Christian development, their

further growth is desirable.¹⁷⁰ The author looks to God for the provision of strengthening.¹⁷¹ The indication of concern for the audience members' increased strength demonstrates the author's empathy, and would tend to generate goodwill among the recipients for author/speaker and message, just as *exordia* should. Interestingly, the strengthening of the audience members has an ethical overtone in the clause ἐν ἀγάπῃ ῥριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι (3:17), demonstrating that the requested strengthening is intended to be expressed ethically/behaviorally.¹⁷²

The ἵνα statements are final, or purpose assertions.¹⁷³ Each one is very complex and exegesis of them is difficult. What is clear, however, is that each statement is rhetorically expressive and expansive. The author could have made a simple assertion such as "I pray that God will strengthen you," but chose to go to considerable length specifying the nature of the strengthening in mind, showing great concern for the perceived needs of the audience members in the process. The repetition of ἵνα at the beginning of each final statement immediately signals an expectancy¹⁷⁴ among the audience members of an additional expression of the purpose of the prayer, thereby carrying them along in thought and, probably, in the expectation that they would benefit by actually being strengthened.¹⁷⁵ The reiteration strikes an almost rhythmic *melopoeic* effect each time ἵνα occurs, emphasizing and impressing the content and purpose of the prayer requests on

the mind. This is the effect of reduplication¹⁷⁶ where, as in this case, "...a number of clauses may begin with the same word for the sake of force and emphasis" (Quint. Rhet. 9.3.30).

The first ἵνα statement (3:16-17) is a very full¹⁷⁷ three-membered¹⁷⁸ expression given in two parallel infinitival clauses and the prepositional clause ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἑρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι. The essential action requested is that God might give (subjunctive, δῶ) strength to the recipients κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. This last phrase maintains the devotional language of reverence and worship of the Father of 3:14-15, a feature which has already been seen in the exordium in 1:3-14, 15-19a. The rhetoric concerning the glory of God who gives had already been seen in 1:17 (ὁ πατήρ τῆς δόξης, δῶν ὑμῖν, κτλ.), and its repetition here sustains this sharp focus on the nature of God. The Father is perceived to be the source of all the author desires for the audience members. The precise phrase ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ has already occurred in 1:18,¹⁷⁹ and the word πλοῦτος followed by a genitive is also found in 1:7; 2:7; and 3:8, suggesting that the author found the repeated rhetorical reference to the notion of wealth a useful emphatic device. This emphasis on the Father's riches points persuasively to God's power and limitless ability to give the blessings the prayer asks for. The audience will of course agree that God is rich, identify with the concept, and thus be carried along to agree with other assertions. While the nature of the request would be

clear without the inclusion of the prepositional phrase κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, its inclusion, possibly as an aside or parenthesis, increases audience expectancy, making the recipients agreeable participants in the author's thoughts.¹⁸⁰

Both infinitival statements have three components. In the first, there is an immediate employment of synonyms for strength (i.e., δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι)¹⁸¹ amplifying¹⁸² and reinforcing the concept of strength (Rhet ad Her. 4, 28.38; Quint, Inst. 8.4.26). Strengthening is to take place διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἕσω ἄνθρωπον. The definition of this "inner person" has been a point of interest among commentators and a variety of meanings have been submitted.¹⁸³ For the purposes of both rhetorical analysis and immediate contextual and functional interpretation, however, it is more useful to examine how the two parallel infinitival statements (i.e., κραταιωθῆναι κτλ, and κατοικῆσαι κτλ.) relate to each other. Many scholars consider the κατοικῆσαι statement to be in apposition to the κραταιωθῆναι statement, and therefore that each explains the other.¹⁸⁴ The asyndeton between the statements demonstrates their parallelism, showing that "...κατοικῆσαι is not something added to κραταιωθῆναι, but is a further definition of it."¹⁸⁵ The asyndeton also has its rhetorical effect in that it "...at once impresses details on the mind and makes them seem more numerous than they really are" (Quint. Inst. 9.3.50; cf. Rhet ad Her. 4.30.41).¹⁸⁶ The

κατοικῆσαι statement, because of the asyndeton, gives the sense of being an enhancement of the κραταιωθῆναι statement rather than being a separate and supplementary thought.¹⁸⁷

The parallelism between the statements is very easy to see:

κραταιωθῆναι
 διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ
 εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον
 κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν
 διὰ τῆς πίστεως
 ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν

The infinitives, the διὰ phrases, and the εἰς/ἐν phrases have a clear similarity and symmetry with each other.¹⁸⁸ The phrase εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον is thus the equivalent of ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, while the strengthening with power (δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι) corresponds to the indwelling of Christ.¹⁸⁹ The infinitival endings (-αι) are an example of *homoteleuton*.¹⁹⁰ These references to the "inner person" and "the heart" create an appeal to a sense of commitment and to the "inner" religious sense of the audience members.¹⁹¹ Rhetorically, the parallelism is an example of "refining," (*expolitio*¹⁹²) i.e., where a speaker dwells on one topic yet appears to be saying something new by making changes in the words, delivery, or treatment of a topic (Rhet ad Her. 4.42.54). The clauses also form a rhetorical *isocolon*, (Arist. Rhet. 3.9.9; Rhet ad Her. 4.20.27) with each of the statements being comprised of twenty syllables,¹⁹³ thus having a *melopoeic* effect.

The ethical dimension is added to the first ἵνα statement with its concluding member, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἑρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι. Love (ἀγάπη) has already been mentioned as an ethical characteristic of Christians in Eph. 1;4,15,¹⁹⁴ and here reappears as one of the elements the author desires for the recipients. Some would attach ἐν ἀγάπῃ to the preceding part of verse 17,¹⁹⁵ while others leave the whole clause standing on its own.¹⁹⁶ Attaching ἐν ἀγάπῃ to the preceding words, however, damages the parallelism between the infinitival statements. It is best to take ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἑρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι as a separate clause, coordinated with the infinitival statements and as the third member of the longer ἵνα statement.¹⁹⁷ The participles ἑρριζωμένοι and τεθεμελιωμένοι stand as perfect passive nominatives morphologically,¹⁹⁸ yet do not function in the text as nominatives, but are continuous with the prayer wishes.¹⁹⁹ They follow the intent of the subjunctive verb δῶ in 3:16, with the hope that the Father would root and ground the audience members in love. The mixed imagery of horticulture (ῥιζόω) and construction (θεμελιόω)²⁰⁰ is rhetorically powerful in that it carries on the notion of "depth"²⁰¹ evident in the terms "inner person" and "in your hearts," and accents the notions of stability, security, and strength that are fundamental to the author's desire for the audience in the passage.²⁰² The metaphors serve to clarify the author's prayer wishes for the audience members, showing his continuing concern for their welfare and growth.²⁰³

The second ἵνα statement of 3:18-19a begins by reinforcing the notion of strength (ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε) and demonstrating once more that the author's prayer wish is that the audience members would be strengthened as Christians.²⁰⁴ The synonyms for "strength" that have appeared in the prayer (i.e., either noun or verb cognates of κράτος, δύναμις, or ἰσχύς) have already been used together in Eph. (1:19; cf. 6:10). Once again, the use of synonymous terms enhances and intensifies the idea of strengthening, and, consequently, the impression of the notions of growth and maturity, in the minds of the audience members.

The aorist subjunctive ἐξισχύσατε corresponds to the subjunctive δῶ ὑμῖν in verse 16, that is, the wish is not that the recipients might be strong by means of their own efforts, but that the Father will supply this strength.²⁰⁵ This wish is followed, as in the previous ἵνα statement, by two parallel infinitival clauses. Both infinitives (καταλαβέσθαι, γινῶναι) are concerned with knowledge. The identity of the referents of these clauses have been variously described. The phrase σύν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις has been thought possibly to refer to angels,²⁰⁶ but the use of the word ἅγιος in Eph., when not specifically denoting the Holy Spirit (1:13; 4:30) or the "holy apostles and prophets" (3:5), consistently refers to Christians in general.²⁰⁷ "With all the saints" refers, then, to the Christian community, the church.²⁰⁸ Rhetorically, this phrase should impress the audience members with the idea that

they are not in isolation, but part of a larger holy community about which the author is concerned.²⁰⁹ Both ὑμεῖς and ἡμεῖς are thus continuing concerns of the author.²¹⁰

The words in 3:18 that have perhaps generated the most discussion are τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μήκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος.²¹¹ Just what do these dimensions represent? Answers to this question have been diverse and, at times, strained.²¹² Dahl is moving in the right direction, however, when he claims that the difficulty of interpreting 3:18 is overcome "...if one pays attention to the rhetorical form and asks for the function rather than the precise meaning of the passage."²¹³ Perhaps Dahl's claim could be revised to say that rhetorical form and function should be examined not "rather than the precise meaning," but in order to find that meaning in its rhetorical and situational context. In a functional sense, the parallel infinitival clauses help to explain each other structurally in a way similar to the infinitival statements in 3:16-17. They may be arranged as follows:²¹⁴

καταλαβέσθαι
 σύν πάσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις
 τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μήκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος
 γινῶναι τε
 τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ

It can be seen that the clauses parallel each other,²¹⁵ emphasizing the author's concern that the audience members understand knowledge that surpasses knowledge. The dimensions "width and length and height and depth" are the functional equivalent of "the knowledge-surpassing love of Christ".²¹⁶

The four dimensions are therefore employed to point out the concept of immeasurable immensity. Functionally, the point of both clauses is that of understanding or knowing the immeasurable and unknowable nature of the love of Christ.²¹⁷ Rhetorically, the two clauses are the second example in the prayer of refining²¹⁸ and synonymy (*Rhet ad Her.* 4.28.38). The words of 3:19a have been recognized by many commentators as an *oxymoron*, i.e., as paradoxical.²¹⁹ The *oxymoron*, however, actually occurs in both the *καταλαβέσθαι* and *γνῶναι* clauses. In the *καταλαβέσθαι* clause the author wishes the audience members to understand an immensity beyond understanding,²²⁰ while in the *γνῶναι* clause they are to know the unknowable. These ideas are impressed deeply on the minds of the audience members. The author is so concerned about their Christian growth that he offers the prayer that they will be given strength to perceive the imperceptible. Heightening the rhetorical effect even more is the *homoteleuton* or *paramiosis* of the four dimensions of 3:18. Each word has the accusative -ος ending, the rhythm of which intensifies the immensity and emotion of the words.²²¹ Such grand language is bound to impress (if not flatter) the recipients, drawing them along to participate in the great life being described, particularly when that life is specified in the behaviour of chapters 4-6.

The third *ἵνα* statement points to the ultimate goal ("Zielpunkt"²²²) of the prayer. Both of the preceding *ἵνα*

statements were concerned with the strengthening of the audience members, and this final statement continues that concern, not with another word explicitly signifying strength, but with a clause that implies the ultimate strength, i.e., ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ. Robinson calls this clause "the climax of the Apostle's prayer" which "points to an issue even beyond knowledge".²²³ As such, the prayer that the recipients "may be filled into all the fulness of God" is the functional equivalent of all that for which 3:16-19a asks. The effect is enhanced by the paronomasia (*polyptoton*) of the words πληρωθῆτε and πληρώμα. To be filled into all the fulness of God is to be fully strengthened, to be completely rooted and grounded in love, to perceive what is otherwise imperceptible, and to know the knowledge-surpassing love of Christ. This last ἵνα statement acts as a conclusion to the prayer by repeating and ending the requests in a lofty style that summarizes the author's wishes. It is a highly rhetorical close to the prayer language as it directs the audience toward a superlative level of thought and attainment. The author is concerned not with the linguistic and semantical intricacies of the word πληρώμα²²⁴ and what it means to be filled, but with the growth and strength of the audience members that will enable them to practice the ethical activity described subsequently.

3.2.8 Summary

The prayer of 3:14-19 clearly has the characteristics of *exordia*, securing and maintaining the attention and goodwill of the audience. Its imagery and figures of speech are rhetorically expressive of the author's concern for the strength and growth of the audience members. Concern for the perceived needs of the audience is creatively integrated with the devotional and emotional language of worship. The Father is reverently recognized as the one who is able to supply what the recipients need and is therefore requested to do so. The rhetorical effect of the prayer is that of directing the thoughts of the *θεωποί* so that by means of impression, identification, worship and emotion they are moved to collaborate with the thought of the prayer. Consequently, the audience members should be inclined to agree with and participate in the author's thought and directives. They should be encouraged to be open to understanding the immeasurably immense and knowledge-surpassing love of Christ, to desire to be "filled into all the fulness of God," and thereby to be prepared to practice the behaviour called for in the paraenesis.

3.2.9 Rhetorical Analysis: The Doxology 3:20-21

With the doxology the *exordium* and "theological" section of Eph. ends as it began (1:3), i.e., with praise aimed directly toward God. The doxology continues in the devotional tone and style of the immediately preceding prayer wishes²²⁵ for the recipients, and in so doing amplifies the praise that the author believes is due to God because of the blessings that the Father is able to provide.²²⁶ This continuity and amplification of emphasis is evident in the affinities between 3:20 and 3:14-16. In verses 14-15 ὁ πατήρ is described as the creative namer of πάντα πατριά, who is able to give in accord with "the riches of his glory". The capability of God is similarly attested in verse 20 by the words τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ. There is no question that to the author, and to the recipients who were undoubtedly inclined to agree, God the Father is the able provider of all the blessings.²²⁷ The accumulation (Quint.Inst. 8.4.26) of thoughts pointing to the capability of God encourages the audience members to identify with and participate in the offering of praise.

The form of the doxology follows that of Jewish and early Christian usage,²²⁸ containing three elements: reference to the recipient of praise in the dative case; the praise word (δόξα); and a time formula. In many cases the Semitic expression "amen" was added as a concluding word of confirmation. The absence of the copula "be" (i.e., αὐτῷ ἔ

δόξα without a verbal form) in the NT epistolary examples of these doxologies (with the exception of 1 Pet. 4:11, ᾧ ἔστιν ἡ δόξα) seems to support the existence of a well-known formulation. Stuiber²²⁹ indicates that such doxologies were employed in sermons in late Judaism. While such sermons may be from a time later than the composition of Eph., they provide at least circumstantial evidence that doxological formulations were current in sermons like Eph., thus conventionally used in a persuasive style.

The rhetorical features of 3:20 are very impressive. The most obvious is the piling up of comparative language describing the superlative ability of God. The two comparative terms, ὑπὲρ πάντα and ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ are paronomastic and essentially synonymous.²³⁰ The ability of God to supply superabundantly above all ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν indicates that his blessings surpass human comprehension. The rhetorical effect of these words seems to suggest the enhanced rendering "above all that we ask or even think."²³¹ The κατὰ clause of 3:20 clarifies the nature of God's ability to bless beyond human comprehension by asserting that it is in conformity with²³² "the power which works in us". Synonyms (δύναμις and the participle of ἐνεργέω) again intensify the theme. The use of first person forms in the doxology, changed from the second person in the prayer, should be taken in an inclusive sense, that is, that the author includes all Christians among those who are blessed in superabundance.²³³

The rhetorical effect of 3:20 is that of producing a clear identification of God as the one who is to be praised. The *κατά* clause invites the agreement and identification of the audience members with the truth of the assertions on the basis of personal experience. All this, in turn, is likely to persuade the audience members to collaborate and participate in the praise following in verse 21. Once the language has stimulated acquiescence, then sharing in subsequent thoughts or actions will follow easily.

The actual expression of praise occurs in 3:21. The phrase *αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα* is the focus of thought and action, with strong *pathos* appeal. The inclusion of the words *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, the only instance of its kind in NT doxologies, has attracted the attention of commentators.²³⁴ However, from the viewpoint of the pragmatic function and the persuasive nature of the text, *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* is included because the notion of the recipients and their strengthening within the church community (indicated in the usage of plural verbs and pronouns in 3:16-19, and plural verbs and pronoun in 3:20) is at the forefront of thought. The prepositions *ἐν*, *ἐν* and *εἰς* are epanaphoric,²³⁵ providing an impressive rhythmic emphasis.

The temporal expression *εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων* also has a pragmatic and rhetorical function.²³⁶ The genitival construction is an example of *homœoptoton*,²³⁷ while the rhythmic appeal of the word play between the *αἰῶν* forms

accents the impression of extended time. The precise definition of "the age of the ages" is immaterial to our rhetorical analysis, and may have been of little immediate concern to the speaker/writer and audience. Rather, its relevance is in the impression of the extent of the glory and praise that is offered to God. It is the persuasiveness of the language being used as it attempts to influence the audience to agree to a position and share in action that is at the heart of the message being conveyed.

The final ἀμήν acts as a closing liturgical and rhetorical feature. It adds a final note of solemnity and confirmation, possibly uttered as suggestive of a congregational response (cf. 1 Cor.14:16), thereby encouraging acquiescence and participation in the language of worship that precedes.

The doxology with its ἀμήν termination functions as the closing element of the *exordium*. This doxology has reiterated the praise of God seen in chapters 1-3, and presented an emotional and climactic appeal to worship God who can provide blessings. This rhetoric can create in the audience members a sense of obligation to praise, as well as a sense of obligation to follow directives that correspond with the perceptions impressed on their minds.

3.2.10 Summary

The doxology provides fitting concluding thoughts to the *exordium*, maintaining the focus of attention on God and maintaining the goodwill of the audience members directed toward God and their receptivity to the author's message. It effectively elicits audience agreement and identification that may be easily directed to the action that the paraenesis encourages. The doxology strikes a persuasive concluding note to the "theological" part of Eph., and with the "amen" indicates a distinct demarcation point where *exordium*-like material terminates. The θεωροί are left at an intense religious and emotional high point where they may be quite easily influenced to agree with what the author may say subsequently.

3.3 The *Narratio*

The function of *narrationes*, according to the classical rhetoricians, is to state the facts upon which listeners to a speech were to base their decisions or actions (Arist. *Rhet.* 3.16.1-11; Quint. *Inst.* 4.2.1).²³⁸ It serves as "...the persuasive exposition of that which either has been done, or is supposed to have been done..." (Quint. *Inst.* 4.2.31; cf. *Rhet ad Alex.* 1438a.4-6). *Rhetorica ad Herrenium* (1.8.12) refers to three types of *narratio*. The first type presents "...the facts and turn[s] every detail to our advantage so as to

win the victory, and this kind appertains to causes on which a decision is to be rendered." The second type is employed "...as a means of winning belief or incriminating our adversary, or effecting a transition or setting the stage for something...". The third type is that employed simply as exercises by students of rhetoric.²³⁹ The *narratio* could be included in, or as an addition to, the *exordium*, or as a separate section (Rhet ad Alex. 1438b.15-28; 1442b.28-32)

3.3.1 The *Narratio* in Ephesians

It has already been noted that Eph. has a combined *exordium/narratio*.²⁴⁰ The *narratio* (1:19b-3:13) is embedded within the *exordium* (1:3-19 ; 3:1,14-21) and includes a *digressio* (3:2-13). Consequently, Eph. corresponds to the situation described in Rhetorica ad Alexandrum where the *narratio* is included in the *exordium*.²⁴¹ The Eph. *narratio* is of the second type (according to Rhet ad Her. 1.8.12)²⁴² that was intended to set the stage for further thought.

It is obvious that Eph. 1:15-23 comprises one long sentence (*oratio perpetua*). In spite of this fact, the claim that the *narratio* begins at 1:19b is justified on the following grounds.

1. The author's prayer language and prayer report end at 1:19a. This *exordium*-like language is resumed again at 3:1,14.²⁴³ The ideas presented in 1:19b-23 are supportive of

1:15-19a, but are not a continuation of prayer wishes.

2. Rhetorical style changes at 1:19b. The rhetoric changes from that of *captatio benevolentiae*²⁴⁴ and prayer report to that which describes the transcendence of the exalted Christ. Prayer style changes to narrative style.

3. In 1:19b-23 the theme changes from the author's explicit concern for the growth and maturity of the audience to assertions about what God has done in Christ. Despite the clear syntactical link (κατά), verses 19b-23 go on effectively to become a christological statement that provides the basis for the statements concerning the raising and seating of believers with Christ described in 2:1-10.²⁴⁵ Verses 1:19b-23 clearly support the prayer wish of 1:19a that the audience members know "the exceeding greatness of his power" by explaining how God's power is exercised on behalf of believers. However, the thematic images of resurrection and *seating with Christ* in heaven given in 1:19b-23 are linked directly to the resurrection and seating of believers in heaven presented in 2:1-10. The narration of ideas concerned with salvation in 2:1-3:13 are given their foundation in the narration of ideas concerned with Christ's resurrection, exaltation, and position vis-à-vis the church in 1:19b-23.

3.3.2 Rhetorical Analysis 1:19b-23

These verses complete the *oratio perpetua* of 1:15-23.²⁴⁶ A number of points in this passage have been the object of scholarly discussion, including the submission of powers to Christ (1:21-22), the two age structure (1:22), and the head/body relationship of Christ and the church (1:22-23). Perhaps the issues that have been most difficult to solve are those concerning the meaning of πληρώμα and the linguistic, semantical and theological difficulties of the clause τὸ πληρώμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσιν πληρουμένου (1:23b).²⁴⁷ Several scholars have suggested that 1:19b-23 reflects a hymnic source.²⁴⁸ The evidence for such an assertion is not conclusive, however, although it is probable that the text alludes to formulations that had already become current among Christians, such as LXX Ps.109:1.²⁴⁹ At any rate, 1:19b-23 clearly presents a narration dealing with the resurrection, exaltation, and rule of Christ.

Perhaps the most striking rhetorical factor in the pericope is the emphasis on words that denote power. The notion of God's power appears first in 1:19a as part of the author's prayer request that the recipients know "the exceeding greatness of his power among us believers". The κατὰ clause of 1:19b-20 goes on to explain that this power accords with the power exerted in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ. The κατὰ clause plays on the notion of power (δύναμις, 1:19a) by

employing *scesis onomaton*²⁵⁰ or synonymy as a means of amplification (Rhet ad Her. 4.28.38), placing ἐνέργεια, κράτος, and ἰσχυς together. Synonymy as an intensification is used frequently in Eph.,²⁵¹ and the trend to employ substantives followed by genitival constructions is again found here.²⁵² The genitive chain (τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ) is another example of *homœoptoton* (Quint. Inst. 9.3.78; Rhet ad Her. 4.20.28). The concepts clearly portray God's massive strength. It is impressed deeply on the minds of the recipients as the author continues to speak of the powerful acts of God and of Christ's rule over the cosmos.

In verse 20 the clause ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ is amplified by the two clauses following: ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν and καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. These two clauses are in turn amplified by the whole of verse 21. This is a form of *auxesis*²⁵³ or augmentation (Quint. Inst. 8.4.3-9), where the simple assertion about God's action in Christ is expanded in steps that reach a climax in the rule of Christ οὐ μόνον αἰῶνι τούτο ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι. Within this *auxesis* the acts of God are specifically intensified by the participles ἐγείρας and καθίσας and the adverb (here used as a preposition) ὑπέρνω.²⁵⁴ This intensification reflects the author's Messianic interpretation of LXX Ps. 109:1.²⁵⁵ The resurrection and seating of Christ are viewed essentially as one continuous movement that places Christ in a sovereign position.²⁵⁶ The clause καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς

ἐπουρανίους implies (*logopoeia*²⁵⁷) a position of sovereignty (even without the assertion of Christ's rule in 1:22-23a). Position "at the right hand of" suggests the concepts of distinction, honour and power.²⁵⁸ Rhetorical features intensify the idea of Christ's sovereignty particularly in the categories of space and time. The use of the preposition ἐν (three times) and ἐκ (once) in 1:20 embellish the thoughts by virtue of their similarity in sound and the sense of spatial definition they provide. These prepositions give a rhythmic pattern to verse 20 that encourages the audience members to follow, find agreement with, and engage in the author's progression of thought.²⁵⁹ The participle endings (-ας) of ἐγείρας and καθίσας further enhance the *melopoeic* effect.

The word ὑπεράνω adds if not a spatial, at least a further positional category to the role of Christ by placing him higher than any cosmic being.²⁶⁰ By naming these cosmic beings as πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου the author clarifies and emphasizes the fact of Christ's complete rule over all challengers.²⁶¹ This language impresses the idea of Christ's transcendence on the mind, persuading the θεωροί of his sufficiency and power. The actual figure being employed is a variety of amplification variously referred to as *conductio*,²⁶² *congeries*,²⁶³ or *synathroesmus* (συναθροισμός).²⁶⁴ In this "koordinierende Haüfung,"²⁶⁵ terms, which may or may not be synonymous (Quint, *Inst.* 8.4.26-

27; 9.3.48), are accumulated for the purpose of heightening the effect of a statement or thought (Quint. Inst. 8.4.26-27). As with the term *πάσα πατριά* in 3:15²⁶⁶ the precise identity of the "powers" listed in 1:20 is not critical in order for the rhetoric to function effectively, although the audience members were able to identify them.²⁶⁷ The persuasiveness and rhetorical force occur in the ability of the language of 1:21 to lead the audience to a recognition of the sovereignty of Christ over all hostile powers.²⁶⁸

The author's perception of time and a two-age structure is apparent in the last clause of 1:21, *οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι*. Definition of these temporal perceptions, however, are outside the boundaries of rhetorical analysis because it is evident that the author's concern was not to explicate the two-age concept, but rather to point out that the rule of Christ over the powers transcends time. The emphasis should thus be placed on the rhetorical and pragmatic function of the clause.²⁶⁹ The rhetorical force is focused in the words *οὐ μόνον* and *ἀλλὰ καὶ* which serve to specify the transcendent role of Christ over any time period.

The movement that began in 1:20 continues in 1:22 where it is asserted that the rule of Christ extends over the cosmos (*πάντα*).²⁷⁰ The first clause of verse 22 is a citation of LXX Ps. 8:6, indicating the whole of the created order is under the authority of Christ. The second clause, *καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν*

κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῆ ἑκκλησίᾳ, is epexegetical,²⁷¹ for the one to whom the cosmos is made submissive is thereby clearly also the head over the cosmos. The rhetoric of the verse focuses on the repetition (*conduplicatio* or *reduplicatio*, *Rhet ad Her.* 4.28.38; Quint. *Inst.* 9;3;28)²⁷² of the word πάντα in both clauses.²⁷³ The cosmos (πάντα) is described as being subordinate to Christ, using the physiological imagery (*phanoroeia*²⁷⁴) of feet (ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ) and head (κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα). The resulting intensification presses the author's absolute and unmistakable conviction of the cosmic sovereignty of Christ upon the recipients.²⁷⁵

Christ is portrayed as having been given as head over the cosmos to the church (1:22), rather than as head of the church as in 5:23 and Col. 1:18. The words τῆ ἑκκλησίᾳ are taken as a dative of advantage,²⁷⁶ i.e., that Christ rules "to the advantage of" or "on behalf of" the church. The church is described as τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (1:23a). A great deal has been written on the meaning of the head/body relationship,²⁷⁷ with some claiming that christology is overwhelmed by ecclesiology here in 1:23 and elsewhere in Eph.²⁷⁸ But neither the introduction of the concept of the church as the body of Christ in 1:22b-23 nor the headship motif in 1:22, nor even the final clause of 1:23 (τὸ πλήρωμα κτλ.) are intended to function as momentous or dominating ecclesiological statements. The rhetorical and practical/pastoral point that the author makes is that Christ rules for the benefit of the

church, i.e., for the benefit of the recipients themselves. The church, and therefore the audience members, are identified as those for whom Christ reigns. The specific benefit of his reign is the availability of Christ's power for the growth of the recipients. Since the fundamental concern for the audience/church is growth (1:17-19a; 3:14-19), and because the head, body, and growth are bound up together in the paraenesis (4:12,15-16), it seems clear that the description of the church as Christ's body in 1:23a has a view toward a growing body that is gaining strength and moving toward maturity (4:13-16).²⁷⁹ The rhetoric encourages the θεωροί to identify themselves as this church/body.

The remaining clause of the sentence, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου (1:23), is notoriously difficult to exegete.²⁸⁰ There are four essential issues:

1. Is the noun πλήρωμα to be understood in an active (i.e., fulness="that which fills") or a passive (i.e., fulness="that which is filled" or "that which is full")²⁸¹ sense?
2. Is τὸ πλήρωμα to be understood in apposition to τὸ σῶμα, to αὐτόν (1:22), or even to all that has been stated about the exalted Christ from verse 20 onward?²⁸² If πλήρωμα is taken in the active sense and is apposite to τὸ σῶμα, how does the body/church fill Christ?
3. What is the meaning of the phrase τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου? If understood adverbially it will mean

"completely," "fully," or "totally;" if objectively it will mean "all things in all," "everything".

4. The morphology of the genitive participle πληρουμένου is ambiguous, appearing in middle or passive voice. Does Christ perform the filling (cf. Col 2:10), is Christ filled by the church, or does Christ fill himself?²⁸³ Most scholars have taken πληρουμένου in an active sense, although the active form πληροῦντος might have been expected.²⁸⁴

Regardless of which interpretation is selected the syntax and semantics of the clause are strained in one direction or another.²⁸⁵

Rhetorical analysis reveals factors that give some significant insights into both the structure and meaning of 1:23. The initial ἥτις ἐστίν is an explanatory expression ("which is") followed by two explanatory substantives τὸ σῶμα and τὸ πλῆρωμα, both of neuter gender, both ending in -μα, and both followed by genitives which refer to Christ (αὐτοῦ and τοῦ πληρουμένου). There is, therefore, rhetorically speaking, a word play taking place that is comprised of several stylistic features. *Homoteleuton* or *parechesis*²⁸⁶ occurs in the endings of σῶμα and πλῆρωμα. *Homoptoton* occurs in the genitive case endings of αὐτοῦ and πληρουμένου. This *homoptoton* provides an explanation for the employment of the middle/passive morphology of the participle. If the active form πληροῦντος had been used the rhetorical symmetry of 1:23 would have been destroyed. This provides support for the view

specific benefits of this rule for the church are those delineated in 2:1-6 where believers are spoken of as having been raised with Christ out of the realm of subjugation to the powers and seated with Christ in heaven. The author wants to persuade and impress the audience members with the notion that Christ is sovereign on their behalf, thus demonstrating that it is possible for them to attain to the maturity that he has in mind. Ecclesiology does not overpower christology in this passage, but rather is led by christology.²⁹²

3.3.3 Summary

Eph. 1:19b-23 functions as a narration which, while completing the sentence that began at 1:15, addresses the resurrection, seating, and exalted sovereignty of Christ so as to impress the audience with the conviction that Christ is transcendent over any challenging powers, over time, and indeed over the whole cosmos. The verses comprise assertions which remind the recipients of specific actions of God in Christ, which actions form the foundation for their own salvation described in 2:1-10. Such a reminder is likely to lead the recipients to renewed belief in the availability and efficacy of God's power for them. This suggests that a frame of mind is being developed among the recipients that will lead to their susceptibility to the author's moral exhortations in the paraenesis.

The rhetorical impressing of the ideas of massive strength, the complete transcendence and rule of Christ, and the identification of the church/body/fulness of Christ as that for which Christ reigns (and of which the recipients know themselves to be members) is the persuasive power conveyed by the pericope. What has happened to Christ, according to 1:19b-23 is determinative for the ongoing Christian life of the recipients.²⁹³ Christ rules and "fills" the cosmos for the benefit of Christians. This knowledge can make the audience members feel secure and ready to move onward in their Christian existence.

3.3.4 Rhetorical Analysis 2:1-10

Interpreters have frequently referred to chapter 2 as the "centre" or "Mitte,"²⁹⁴ of Eph., or as containing the "key and high point"²⁹⁵ of the document, and hold that it emphasizes the church and unity as the focus of the author's greatest interest.²⁹⁶ Some have also employed rather grandiloquent phraseology to describe 2:8-10 as a comprehensive summary of the gospel preached by Paul.²⁹⁷ But the understanding of the purpose of Eph. and the role of the *narratio* or statement of facts indicated by our rhetorical critical examination suggests that chapter 2 is not in itself the focus of attention in Eph. Rather it is an ingredient in the rhetorical strategy intended to direct the *θεωποί* toward growth and the behaviour described in the paraenesis. The

thoughts narrated in the chapter in fact have a great rhetorical effect by impressing the fulness and gracious nature of God's salvific actions in Christ, along with some of the implications of those actions, on the minds of the audience members.

In 2:1-10 some of the themes and linguistic features of 1:19b-23 are obviously re-employed in an expansion of thought that explicitly includes believers in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ.²⁹⁸ The passage is comprised of three clear sections: 2:1-3, a description of believers' (both the audience's and all other Christians') pre-Christian past; 2:4-7, a description of the present saved state of believers; and 2:8-10, an expansion of the notion of salvation by grace found in 2:5 (χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι) where the action of salvation is attributed solely to God.²⁹⁹ There is considerable rhetorical force at work in the parallelism between 2:1-10 and 1:19b-23. The themes of Christ's resurrection and exaltation are amplified (Quint, Inst, 8.4.1-9)³⁰⁰ through the inclusion of believers with Christ in those events. The audience members are specifically identified as people who are included in salvation. Even though such identification has already occurred in Eph. (e.g., 1:13-14), and the recipients were of course already cognizant of their own salvation, repetition of the ideas in different terms (i.e., terms of resurrection and seating) enhances and impresses on the mind identification

with salvation.³⁰¹ The audience members and all Christians are directly related to God's activities in Christ.

Perhaps the over-arching rhetorical feature in 2:1-10 (and equally in 2:11-22) is the *πότε/νῦν*, "then"/"now" motif.³⁰² The dramatic antithesis between the pre-Christian (*πότε*) status of "death" with its corresponding sinful behaviour and the Christian (*νῦν*) status of life with Christ and its corresponding behaviour of "good works" is the vehicle used to convey the idea of the place and status of Christians in God's salvific actions.³⁰³ The *πότε* is explicit (2:2,3)³⁰⁴ while the *νῦν* is to be inferred from the language of verses 4-6.³⁰⁵ Antithesis as a rhetorical device (Quint.Inst.9.3.81-86; Rhet ad Her.4.15.21)³⁰⁶ is one of several figures "...which attracts the ear of the audience and excites their attention by some resemblance, equality or contrast of words..." (Quint.Inst.9.3.66). The dramatic movement from death to life has an obvious pathetic (i.e. emotional) effect because it arouses the deepest feelings of finality, loss and deprivation (death), contrasted with a sense of continuity, security, progress, and privilege (life). The words "dead through your trespasses and sins" (2:1) and "made alive with Christ" (2:5) are employed as contrasting soteriological terminologies that graphically, and therefore rhetorically/persuasively and emotionally, portray the pre-Christian past and the Christian present. Interestingly,

Bultmann suggested that the then/now and other antitheses were current in early Christian sermons ("Predigten").³⁰⁷

Virtually all scholars note the anacolouthon³⁰⁸ in 2:1-5. The verb completing the thought of verse 1, συζωποιέω, does not appear until verse 5, following the explanatory descriptions of 2:2-4. The employment of anacolouthon has allowed assertion of the direct correlation of the resurrection of Christ to believers to be restrained until the very vivid description of what it means to exist in the state of death can be presented.³⁰⁹ The first words of 2:1, καὶ ὑμᾶς, and the first words of 2:5 καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς, provide a grammatical link with 1:19b-23. The purpose of the link is to lead to the assertion that not only Christ, but also "you" (the Gentile audience) as well as "we all" (ἡμεῖς πάντες, 2:3, meaning the author and all other Christians other than the recipients of Eph.³¹⁰) have been raised from death and exalted with Christ (2:5-6).³¹¹ The former state of death was caused by "trespasses and sins," (τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις). The phrase τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις is a *hendiadys*,³¹² i.e., a figure employing synonymous terms that enhance each other (cf. Rhet ad Her. 4.28.38).³¹³ Schlier suggests that τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις is "...ein predigtmäßiger Doppelausdruck, der die Fülle der Sünde betont...".³¹⁴

Past existence among those who are designated as dead is described by the verbs περιπατέω³¹⁵ (2:2) and ἀναστρέφω (2:3), both of which are followed by descriptive clauses. The two κατά clauses in verse 2 are parallel to each other,³¹⁶ and form an *isocolon* (Rhet ad Her. 4.20..27-28) or *pariosis* (Arist, Rhet. 3.9.9). *Isocolon* occurs when cola (i.e., clauses)³¹⁷ have an equal or nearly equal number of syllables. The balance and fulness of *melopoeic* sound produced thereby impresses itself on the mind and magnifies the themes under discussion. The accusative substantives followed by genitive descriptions provide a rhythmic cadence. The last clause of 2:2 τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας, is in apposition to the preceding clause κατά τὸν ἄρχοντα κτλ.,³¹⁸ and thus has not the form but the effect of being a third rhythmic κατά clause.³¹⁹ The phrase ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας is a Hebraism³²⁰ which, along with τέχνη φύσει ὀργῆς in verse 3, has rhetorical effect by virtue of being a descriptive and convenient catch-phrase that characterizes those who are dead. The word νῦν demonstrates that the insidious πνεῦμα is at work in the present and thus "then" and "now" run temporally in parallel with each other, placement in either death or life categories not being dependent on time, but rather on state of existence as non-Christian or Christian. The three clauses together do not supply any sort of systematic demonology, but simply have the practical function of describing the nature of the pre-Christian "walk".³²¹

The descriptive clauses of 2:2 are balanced by the descriptive clauses of 2:3.³²² Verses 2 and 3 begin with equivalent phrases (ἐν αἵς and ἐν οἷς respectively)³²³ followed in each case by three descriptions of the existence in death. This parallelism has its primary practical function in strengthening the force of the notion of the former existence in death. That existence was influenced by evil powers (2:2) and by human sinfulness (2:3). It demonstrates as well that the author is not isolating the audience members as the only people who were dead, but includes himself and all other Christians as having been in that category.³²⁴ The phrase ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ refers to non-Christians who now still remain as "children of wrath". The Gentile recipients were not alone in their former existence. The author is evidently sensitive to the feelings of the audience members and, while presenting this view of their former situation, also shows deference to them. Verse 3 seems to reflect Pauline anthropology (cf. Gal.5:16-24; Rom.13:14),³²⁵ particularly in the use of the term σὰρξ which is emphasized by its repetition. The first use of σὰρξ (ἀνεστράφωμεν ποτε ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν) parallels the second use (ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκός...), both speaking of the practice of fleshly actions.³²⁶ The word διάνοια is not used elsewhere in an evil sense,³²⁷ but here is aligned with σὰρξ possibly as a synonym,³²⁸ but certainly to emphasize the fleshly nature of the former lifestyle.

The first three verses of Eph. 2 engender a sense of identification³²⁹ among the audience members. In what amounts not only to a statement but also a reminder of the pre-Christian past the recipients are re-apprised of their own identity. They are made to feel that they are a part of the narrative. Their consequent collaboration with the narrative can lead to the development of the frame of mind the author is attempting to elicit.

It has been claimed that 2:4-10 has a hymnic form or quotes an early Christian initiation hymn ("Initiationslied") closely associated with baptism.³³⁰ However, the verses do not have a clear hymnic style (although there are rhetorical features and a rhetorical force) and the connections with 1:19b-23 (and affinities with Col. 2:10-13) indicate that it is very difficult (although perhaps not impossible) to see the passage standing alone as a traditional hymn³³¹ or as a prose prayer taken from a baptismal liturgy.³³² Much more common is the view that connects 2:4-6 with the rite of baptism alone.³³³ Certainly there is a similarity of language between this pericope and the baptismal discussion in Col. 2:10-13 and Rom.6:1-4,³³⁴ but baptism is nowhere explicit in 2:4-6, and similarity of language to other passages (or even dependence for source material) does not demand exact co-ordination of concepts.³³⁵ The similarities of language are themselves not even exactly parallel. As Bruce points out, in contrast to Rom.6 and Col 2 "...in Ephesians to be raised with Christ is the

sequel to being spiritually dead--to death through trespasses rather than to death with Christ".³³⁶ The concept of union with the death of Christ that is observed in other passages where baptism is explicit is clearly lacking in Eph.³³⁷ The assertions in 2:4-6 demonstrate the dramatic contrast between pre-Christian death and Christian life. Thus the then/now form of the passage is dominant and the imagery of baptism, if it can be said to be present at all, is only a distant allusion and not directly pertinent to the task at hand in Eph.³³⁸ It is not the action or symbolism of baptism that the author wishes to impress on the minds of the audience members, but rather the idea that they were dead and now are alive with Christ.

One of the outstanding features of 2:4-10 is the highly realized eschatology that is employed in the passage.³³⁹ While in general "realized eschatology" refers to "...those aspects of eschatology which are somehow conceived of as partially realized in Christian experience within the framework of present time, history and world condition,"³⁴⁰ Eph. 2 is so fully "realized" that it seems to leave no room for an ongoing "earthly" existence.³⁴¹ The realized eschatology is most evident in 2:5-6 where $\sigma\phi\zeta\omega$ appears in the perfect tense, and the resurrection and seating of believers in heaven are described as past events. Such language goes beyond that found elsewhere in the Pauline corpus.³⁴² A future view clearly exists in verse 7, but this should not be

understood as a correction to the eschatology of 2:5-6,³⁴³ nor as a concern to balance the highly realized eschatology against a futurist eschatology. Rather, it is a more general assertion about the future observability of God's grace given to believers (ἐφ' ἡμᾶς) demonstrated by their enlivened, raised and seated state with Christ. Christians themselves are not spoken of as being actively involved in that process.³⁴⁴

Rhetorically the realized eschatology functions as part of the then/now contrast between pre-Christian and Christian states. Under the influence of the language of 1:20-22 and as a continuation of the thought of those verses, 2:5-6 impresses on the audience members the notion that God's actions in Christ have saved them completely. Although they were "dead," they are now very much alive. Salvation is pushed to a much more realized point than elsewhere, consequently making a very clear and striking contrast to the former "then" situation of 2:1-3. However, rather than having their functional purpose in the promotion of a new or different theology of highly realized eschatological salvation, these verses are intended to make an emotional (*pathos*, Arist., Rhet. 1.2.5; Quint., Inst. 6.1.51; 6.2.2-8) impression that elicits an understanding of the nature and scope of salvation as distinguished from existence in the unsaved condition. Existence has been transferred, as it were, from lowest depth to greatest height (2:4-6). Where existence was "then"

characterized by death,³⁴⁵ it is "now" characterized by life. Where formerly existence moved (cf., περιπατέω, ἀναστρέφω, 2:2,3) in conformity to evil and insidious powers, it now operates in conformity to God in Christ (2:10). The language of realized eschatology does not explain the theological ideas of fully completed salvation, or of good works prepared in advance. These themes are the *topoi* (Arist., Rhet. 2.18.22) that, while narrated as realities, are employed to persuade. The practical function of the language is so to emphasize the contrast between "then" and "now" that the audience members will be imbued with a frame of mind appropriate to the rhetorical situation. The realized eschatology presses home the concept of the dramatic change from death to life with Christ so forcefully that it sensitizes the audience members to their state as Christians, thus generating a mindset that makes them susceptible to the author's concern for their growth and to his moral exhortations.

An analysis of the details of the rhetorical stylistics in 2:4-7 reveals a number of important factors. The contrastive ὁ δὲ θεός in verse 4 indicates that an element is being introduced in antithesis to the existence of death in verses 1-3, and that God is the source of this change. The figure of antithesis (ἀντίθετον, see Quint, Inst. 9.3.81-86; Rhet ad Her. 4.15.21) or *antimetabolē* (ἀντιμεταβολή, Rhet ad Her. 4.28.39; cf. Quint. Inst. 9.3.85) should lend

"impressiveness and distinction" to the style³⁴⁶ as it does here by underscoring the nature of two opposite states. The contrast continues through to verse 5 in the aorist verbs *συνεζωποποίησεν*, *συνήγειρεν*, and *συνεκάθισεν*, and the perfect form *σεσφσμένοι*. The words, *πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει*, are reminiscent of *τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ* in 1:7, and embellish the theme of the riches of God by adding "mercy" to the earlier thought of "grace" (cf. 2:7; 3:16). In 2:4b *homæoteleuton* (Arist, *Rhet.* 3.9.9; Quint. *Inst.* 9.3.77-80) occurs in the accusative endings of *τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην*. *Polyptoton* appears in the noun and verb forms *ἀγάπη* and *ἀγαπάω*, placing an emphasis on God's love. God's love is clearly the motivation for his saving acts.³⁴⁷ The use of first person forms in verse 4 (*ἡμεῖς*) and through to verse 10 makes the recipients feel a kinship in salvation with all other Christians.

In verse 5 the thought of 2:1 is taken up again in the words *καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν*, thus completing the *anacolouthon*. In this case, however, the term *νεκρός* is explicitly applied to the pre-Christian state of the author, the audience and all others who are Christians.³⁴⁸ The resumption of the thought of 2:1 draws the audience back to the primary then/now contrast that the author had in mind. The *συν-* compounds in 2:5-6 point out that the transition from death to life is linked directly to inclusion "with" Christ.³⁴⁹ The *paronomasia* of the repeated *συν-* prefix shows

how the words are co-ordinated together.³⁵⁰ and how by similarity of sound (*parechesis*) they maintain a pattern that accents the theme of union with Christ.³⁵¹ The *συν-* words, separated by a parenthetical statement (i.e., *χάριτί ἐστε σεσφσμένοι*) also seem to present a double climax to the then/now contrast. While the contrast between life and death is completed in the word *συζωποιέω*, it is augmented (Quint.*Inst.* 8.4.3-9) by the further assertions of the verbs *συνεγείρω* and *συνκαθίζω*. The links of *συνεγείρω* and *συνκαθίζω* with the simple verbs *ἐγείρω* and *καθίζω* in 1:20 are obvious.³⁵² These links suggest that since Christ is raised and seated in heaven above the dominance of hostile powers (1:21), Christians are also "now" beyond the reach of those powers (cf. 2:2-3).³⁵³ The limitations caused by trespasses and sins (2:1) and by the powers (2:2) are no longer in effect, leaving the way clear for a "walk" in good works. (cf. 2:10). The prepositional phrase *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις* is reminiscent of 1:3,20, and the *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* is reminiscent of 1:3,4,6,7,9,10,11,12,13. Repetition of the prepositional *ἐν* phrases reproduces the same rhetorical effect noted earlier in connection with 1:3.³⁵⁴

The language of the parenthesis of verse 5b (*χάριτί ἐστε σεσφσμένοι*) is picked up and expanded in 2:8-9,³⁵⁵ followed by statements (in 2:10) that complete the then/now schema that commenced in 2:1. In 2:8 the perfect passive form *σεσφσμένοι* recurs.³⁵⁶ Its reappearance agrees with and reinforces

(reduplication, Rhet ad Her. 4.28.38; Quint.Inst. 9.3.28-30) the fully completed (and continuing³⁵⁷) view of salvation seen already in 2:5-6, and should therefore be seen in the same light, i.e., as embellishing the contrast between death ("then") and life ("now"). The definite article is added to χάρις, identifying it as the grace of God already mentioned in verses 5 and 7.³⁵⁸ Also, the phrase διὰ πιστέως is added to χάριτι ἕστε σεσωσμένοι, binding grace and salvation to the notion of faith found frequently in the same connection in the Pauline corpus.³⁵⁹ Verses 8b and 9 function as an accumulation (Quint.Inst. 8.4.26) of persuasive assertions intended to bring home the concept of 2:8a (and 5b).³⁶⁰ These assertions are expressed in the rhetorical form of two parallel negatives, οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν and οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, that underline the positive statement of 2:8a³⁶¹ (reasoning by contraries, Rhet ad Her. 4.18.25; Quint.Inst. 5.11.13-14³⁶²). That salvation is not attained by means of human effort or merit is the clear emphasis of 2:8b-9.³⁶³ The rhythmic flow of the parallel statements demonstrated by the *anaphora* (repetition of the same words at the beginning of clauses, Rhet ad Her. 4.13.19; 4.14.21; Quint.Inst. 9.3.30.45)³⁶⁴ impresses the mind with the inability of personal effort for the attainment of salvation. The word order of the phrase θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον makes an emphatic contrast to the immediately preceding ὑμῶν; God, not humans, is the provider of salvation.³⁶⁵ The noun δῶρον, in its only occurrence in the Pauline letters,³⁶⁶ may simply agree with the neuter τοῦτο so

as to emphasize that salvation in general is a gift by grace through faith, or it may be intended to effect *homoteleuton* in the final -v sounds of οὐκ ἔξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον, οὐκ ἔξ ἔργων.³⁶⁷

Verse 10 completes the then/now contrast of the pericope by employing the same verb (περιπατέω) that was used in 2:1-3, but here in reference to the "now" way of life of "good works" rather than the pre-Christian way of trespasses and sins. This emphasis on behaviour, whether good behaviour (2:10) or bad (2:1-3), indicates that ethical concerns are directly connected to the author's understanding of both pre-Christian and Christian existence.³⁶⁸ Behaviour characterizes both "then" and "now". That 2:10 is a continuation of the thought of 2:8-9 is shown by the γάρ; Christians exist as the ποιήματα and κτίσις of God, salvation being once more attributed to the gracious effort of God alone.³⁶⁹ The description of Christians in an existence of life that is contrasted with death, and that has been brought about by the creative effort of God has *pathos* appeal because of the sense of dignity and of self-identity in relationship to God that it elicits. The words ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ once more remind the audience of the "in Christ" theme of 1:3-14. Good works are the goal of God's creative activity of salvation;³⁷⁰ salvation is οὐκ ἔξ ἔργων, but ἐπι ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς. What seems surprising, however, is that these good works are themselves prepared in advance (προετοιμάζω) by God. Not only has God set the locus of

salvation in heaven (2:6), but he has prepared in advance the good works that the saved inhabitants of heaven are to practice. Believers appear to be reduced to existence as mere automata of God. This exemplifies the real tension that exists between the theological section and the paraenesis of Eph.³⁷¹ To deal with this apparent determinism some scholars have suggested that the dative οἷς be understood as a dative of reference, that προετοιμάζω be understood intransitively, and that the object ἡμᾶς be taken as implicit in the text.³⁷² This would give a rendering something like "created in Christ Jesus for good works with reference to which he [God] prepared us". Other interpreters have suggested that the προ- prefix of the verb προετοιμάζω is to be understood in relationship to the following περιπατέω and the purported baptismal setting of the passage, thus meaning that good works are ready for believers to practice when they become new creations at the time of baptism.³⁷³ The most obvious explanation, however, is that οἷς occurs in the dative, rather than the expected accusative ἅ, by attraction to ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς.³⁷⁴ The good works have been prepared in advance, presumably from before the foundation of the cosmos (cf. 1:4).³⁷⁵ The gift of salvation includes not only the possibility of good conduct, but the good conduct itself.

When viewed from the vantage point of our rhetorical analysis and the pragmatic function of the then/now motif in the pericope, some insights into the issue of the good works

prepared in advance in 2:10 can be attained. The concept of good works previously prepared by God is in accord with the language of the passage that contrasts pre-Christian death and Christian life. A way of life that was "then" in conformity with evil, insidious forces (2:1-3) is "now" in conformity with God's actions. The language of 2:10 is consistent with the explicit assertions of 2:4-9 that God is the sole provider of salvation. Like the realized eschatology of 2:5-6, the presentation of the concept of good works previously prepared by God for Christians, in contrast to the former, non-Christian way of life (2:1-3), serves as an emphatic illustration of the antithesis between "then" and "now" that can impress the audience members with the greatness of salvation.³⁷⁶ When the greatness of salvation is fresh and clear in the mind, the audience members are likely to be in a frame of mind that will be receptive to moral exhortation.

3.3.5 Summary

Eph. 2:1-10 continues the thought of 1:19b-23 by including all those who are Christians as participants with Christ in the enlivening, raising, and seating with Christ in heaven. The then/now contrast schema is employed as the controlling rhetorical vehicle by means of which the author presents a view of fully completed salvation that is intended to elicit a frame of mind among the recipients in accord with the rhetorical situation. The whole pericope should be seen in

the light of the dramatic contrast of "then" and "now", and not simply as an explication of fully realized salvation and previously prepared good works. The gospel, as it is presented in these verses, while not properly a summary of Paul's gospel, functions as an ingredient in the *narratio* intended to impress and persuade the audience members with its fulness, thereby preparing the way for growth and the acceptance of moral exhortation.

3.3.6 Rhetorical Analysis 2:11-22

This pericope, like the eulogy of 1:3-14, has generated extensive discussion and controversy concerning its content, structure, meaning, and role in Eph.³⁷⁷ Historical, form-critical and source-critical investigations have led to explanations of the passage based on Gnostic³⁷⁸ and Jewish³⁷⁹ concepts, on the Qumran material³⁸⁰ and on the contemporary social setting, including concerns of church unity.³⁸¹ Also at issue has been the possible hymnic structure and background of 2:14-18.³⁸² Some have suggested that the passage comprises a baptismal liturgy.³⁸³ The prevailing understanding of the theology of the verses sees them as a discussion of the reconciliation of Jewish and Gentile Christians in one body, the church.³⁸⁴ Lindemann, for example, writes that "In Eph 2,11-22 liegt der Mittelpunkt der theologischen Argumentation des ganzen Briefes," i.e., that Jew and Gentile are built together in unity in one Christian church.³⁸⁵ Some scholars,

on the other hand, have recognized that the reconciliation and unity of Jew and Gentile in one body is not the subject of concern in 2:11-22, but rather is used to illustrate, emphasize and explain the author's concerns.³⁸⁶ There is no explicit indication of ethnic disunity between Jewish and Gentile Christians³⁸⁷ nor is there clear polemic against some other perceived ἄγῳν. In fact, argumentation *per se* does not occur at all in 2:11-22.³⁸⁸ The verses serve as assertions contrasting, as does 2:1-10, the pre-Christian past and the Christian present. The paragraph stands in a formal and in a rhetorical way as an anamnesis (διὸ μνημονεύετε ὅτι..., 2:11), and does not present unity and reconciliation of Jew and Gentile in one body as the central theme of the whole document.³⁸⁹

The guiding rhetorical feature in 2:11-22 is, as it was in 2:1-10, the ποτέ/νῦν "then/"now" schema.³⁹⁰ Structurally there are three sections: 2:11-13, where the then/now motif is explicit (διὸ μνημονεύετε ὅτι ποτε...νῦν δὲ...); 2:14-18, an explanatory excursus embedded within the then/now structure; and 2:19-22, a closing statement where present ("now") status with a view toward growth stands in contrast to past ("then") status with which the recipients are no longer (οὐκέτι, 2:19) associated. This past/present format has two very significant rhetorical effects. First, because the then/now motif has been used for rhetorical effect in 2:1-10, its repetition in 2:11-22 reinforces a thought pattern with which the audience

members are familiar. Since they are already thinking in terms of "then" and "now," i.e., the pre-Christian past and the Christian present, the parallel language of 2:11-22 invites the audience members to continue to co-operate in the contrast and share the author's perspective on their situation.³⁹¹ Second, and bound up with the first, is the rhetorical function and effect of the anamnesis. The concept of remembrance of things past is inherent in the employment of the then/now schema, and is made explicit by the word *μνημονεύω* in 2:11.³⁹² The anamnesis here in 2:11-22 is not employed simply as a recollection, *ἀνακεφαλαίωσις* or *enumeratio* of facts,³⁹³ but as a *recordatio*³⁹⁴ intended to impress the reality of the past on the mind in such a way that an appreciation of the blessings of the present is instilled in the audience members.³⁹⁵ Combined, the then/now motif and the anamnesis form the "axis"³⁹⁶ along which the pericope functions. Because the language calls for the Gentile audience members to remember their personal past and compare it with their present status the passage has *pathos* appeal. Like the contrast between death and life in 2:1-10, and parallel to it, the contrast between past and present status in 2:11-22 is dramatic and emotional. This has a psychological effect by deepening the awareness and meaning of salvation,³⁹⁷ and effectively prepares the recipients to be receptive to the author's thoughts and concerns for movement toward growth (2:21-22).

In 2:11-13 the main idea of the anamnesis is expressed in the assertions that "then" the recipients of Eph. were "apart from Christ," but are "now in Christ". The "then" assertion is in the form of an *anacolouthon*³⁹⁸ in verses 11-12, ποτὲ ὑμεῖς...ὅτι ἦτε τῷ καίρῳ ἐκείνῳ [ποτὲ] χωρὶς Χριστοῦ. While the author is concerned to bring the past to mind, using *anacolouthon* to withhold the verb (ἦτε) until verse 12 allows the (correct) impression to be given that the audience members are still "now" τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί.³⁹⁹ It is true that non-Jewish people did not call themselves "Gentiles" in contrast to Jews,⁴⁰⁰ but they were designated as such from a Jewish viewpoint, and Gentile Christians would undoubtedly recognize the terminology. It is the fact that the recipients of Eph. were Gentiles that permits the employment of the descriptions in 2:11-22 and makes them effective. The words ἐν σαρκί and ἀποβυστία point out the perceived moral and physical connotations of being from the class "Gentile". Both terms carry a pejorative sense, the rhetorical effect reflecting and emphasizing the condemning attitude of Jews toward τὰ ἔθνη.⁴⁰¹ However, the repetition or *epanalepsis*⁴⁰² of ἐν σαρκί in the phrase at the end of verse 11, where it is tied to χειροποίητος⁴⁰³ effectively shows, from the author's Christian viewpoint, that the negative attitude of Jews toward Gentiles could be turned on its head; both Jew and Gentile can be viewed ἐν σαρκί. Negative distinctions between Jew and Gentile are thus not considered to be proper concerns.⁴⁰⁴ The *polyptoton* (Quint. *Inst.* 9.3.36-37; *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.22.30)⁴⁰⁵ of

the participles λεγόμενος and λεγομένη enhances the rhetorical effect. While the statement conceivably could have omitted λεγομένης, its occurrence demonstrates that the author considers that those who refer to Gentiles in a deprecatory way are not thereby increasing their own standing, but are subject to the same sort of categorization that they themselves employ.⁴⁰⁶

Verse 12 contains an expansion or amplification by reasoning (Quint, Inst. 8.4.15-26⁴⁰⁷ that moves to its antithetical conclusion in verse 13. The pre-Christian condition of being "apart from Christ" is amplified by two *isocola* (Rhet ad Her. 4.20.27-28; Arist. Rhet. 3.9.9)⁴⁰⁸ The two cola ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τη πλιτειας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ and [καί] ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τη ἑπαγγελιας share an almost equal number of syllables, as do the two cola following, ἐλπίδα μή ἔχοντες and ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. These *isocola* produce a rhythmic metre that impresses the mind with the nature of the former non-Christian state in relation to Israel and salvation history. The first *isocolon* is also characterized by the *homoteleuton* (like endings, Quint, Inst. 9.3.77-80) of ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι and ξένοι, and by the *hæptoton* (like cases, Rhet ad Her. 4.20.28) of the genitival word chains in both cola. The second *isocolon* is characterized by negative assertions about the pre-Christian existence of the audience in the words μή and ἄθεοι. These features enhance the impression that life "then" was seriously deprived, and help to underscore the impression that

life "now" is to be valued. The former situation of the Gentile audience is viewed in 2:12, at least in part, in relation to Israel. The use of this *topos* raises the question of why such language is employed. Jews in the pre-Christian state were equally "apart from Christ".⁴⁰⁹ The pre-Christian past of Gentiles, however, did have the distinct disadvantage of being separated from salvation history.⁴¹⁰ The audience of Eph., undoubtedly being aware of the Jewish antecedents of salvation (2:11-22 is, after all, an anamnesis, i.e. it calls to memory thing already known⁴¹¹), would have been familiar with the rhetoric of 2:11-13. The recollection of the former (non-) relationship to Israel and salvation history is thus employed by the author as a persuasive vehicle intended to bring home his concerns. The memory of the former condition separated from the historical antecedents of salvation and indeed from salvation itself, is an important part of the author's rhetorical strategy. The value of being "now" in Christ in contrast to the erstwhile deprivation apart from Christ is an impressive and emotional thought. By employing such rhetoric the author moves the audience members toward the mindset susceptible to moral exhortation.⁴¹² The purpose of the reference to Israel in 2:11-18 is not to provide a concise history of Jew-Gentile relations,⁴¹³ but rather to be a vehicle for comparing "then" and "now" so that the present saved state is appreciated and fresh in the mind.

The then/now antithesis in 2:11-13 is brought to its conclusion in verse 13 by the contrastive *νυνί δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ*.⁴¹⁴ The *ἐν Χριστῷ* picks up on a theme already familiar in Eph. The contrast is amplified by an additional comparison (cf. Quint. *Inst.* 8.4.9-14)⁴¹⁵ in the words *ὑμεῖς οἱ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγενήθετε ἐγγύς*. The ideas of "then" and "now" are paralleled and amplified by "far" (*μακρὰν*) and "near" (*ἐγγύς*). This imagery heightens the rhetorical effect with the inference being that existence "near" is preferable to existence "far". Most scholars have taken the terms "far" and "near" as a reference to Isa. 57:19.⁴¹⁶ As Lincoln has indicated⁴¹⁷, however, Isa. 57:19 refers to the "far" and "near" of Israel, and does not use the terms in reference to Gentiles being brought into Judaism.⁴¹⁸ However, some passages in non-biblical literature discuss the proselytism of Gentiles to Judaism and employ the "far" and "near" terminology which has apparently been taken over here in 2:13.⁴¹⁹ The reference in verse 13 is not intended to claim that Gentile Christians are now connected with Israel, in contrast to the separation from Israel denoted in verse 12. Rather, there is the more pertinent soteriological concern that the Gentile audience of Eph. be re-apprised of their present Christian status. This soteriological emphasis is supported by the phrase *ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ*.⁴²⁰ Consequently it is not the thought of Isa.57:19 that generates the "far" and "near" in verse 13, and the subsequent reference in 2:17; it is more likely that the notion of "far" and "near," taken from

proselyte terminology, in 2:13 prompted the recollection of Isa. 57:19 which then appears in verse 17.⁴²¹ The rhetorical force of these concepts directs the audience members to focus on the difference between pre-Christian and Christian existence, and on a renewed understanding and appreciation of salvation.⁴²²

Much of the scholarly discussion of 2:14-18 has, as mentioned earlier, centred on the debate over whether or not these verses have a hymnic source,⁴²³ the nature of their OT connections, and whether or not they have a background in Gnosticism, Judaism, or early Christian thought.⁴²⁴ From a rhetorical critical point of view, 2:14-18 arises out of the soteriological then now, far/near contrast of verses 11-13, and function as a pointed and moving explanation in the soteriological term of renunciation and peace of how the "far" were brought "near".⁴²⁵ With the thought of "far" and "near" having brought to mind certain OT passages (Isa.57:19; 52:7; perhaps also Zech.9.10 where peace is directed "to the nations," $\square!:\lambda?$), the author prefaces direct reference to them (in 2:17) with material that will help clarify some benefits of the Christian state against the disadvantages of the state "apart from Christ". At the same time, it prepares the audience to accept and agree with the assertions.⁴²⁶ Even if the issue concerning traditional hymnic, liturgical, or confessional content remains, there is no question that 2:14-18 carries a lyrical tone with a spiritual focus in

reconciliation and peace, arouses *pathos* and worship, and conveys themes with which the audience members may identify.⁴²⁷

The leading statement, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, is immediately striking in that it contrasts with the tone of the three preceding verses; the assertion that Christ himself "is our peace" changes the focus from the then/now, far/near language to a more personal focus on Christ. To people who believe in Christ and in the efficacy of his salvific work (as the audience members of Eph. did), the assertion that Christ is the embodiment of peace would elicit quick agreement and engender an emotional response. The fact that Christ is referred to as "our (ἡμῶν) peace" induces a sense of personal identification with the concept.⁴²⁸ Rhythmic effect is evident in the parallelism and *isocolon* of the clauses. The first two clauses of verse 14 (omitting the connective γὰρ), αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν and ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφοτέρωθεν, are essentially parallel in thought: peace (εἰρήνη) must surely mean that those who were formerly divided (τὰ ἀμφοτέρωθεν) now exist in unity.⁴²⁹ The clauses form an *isocolon* with each one being comprised of ten syllables.

The next three clauses (2:14b-15a), τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ,⁴³⁰ and τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας⁴³¹ fit together as a unit of co-ordinated cola (tricola, Rhet ad Her. 4.19.26)⁴³² that

reaches its greatest force in the last clause.⁴³³ These cola are parallel to each other, indicating that barriers separating Jew and Gentile (τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ, τὴν ἔχθραν, and τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν) have been destroyed. The terms "dividing wall" and "the hostility" graphically describe the effect of "the law" on Jewish-Gentile relationships (all three terms therefore refer to the Torah),⁴³⁴ and are employed persuasively by the author to drive home the conviction that Christ, as "the one who made both one," has abolished that which divided Jew and Gentile in the former pre-Christian state. The rhetorical effect builds as one metaphor is placed upon another ("the dividing wall...the hostility") until the fundamental barrier is explicitly identified⁴³⁵ ("...the law"). Adding to the effect are the synonyms (Rhet ad Her. 4.28.38) μεσότοιχον and φράγμος,⁴³⁶ as well as ἐντολή and δόγμα.⁴³⁷ The *paramiosis* (similarity of the final syllables of clauses, Arist. Rhet. 3.9.9) of the first and last clauses (ending with λύσας and καταργήσας respectively) adds to the lyrical effect. Although the purpose of the destruction of the barrier between Jew and Gentile seems to be manifestly clear, the ἵνα clause of verse 15b expresses the aim of the action in a restatement and refining (Rhet ad Her. 4.42.54) of the earlier clause ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἑμφοτέρα ἓν, with some additional nuancing. The parallelism of τοὺς δύο with τὰ ἑμφοτέρα is obvious, as is the parallelism of ἓν (2:14b) and ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον.⁴³⁸ To this notion of the unification of divided parties, however, is

bound the striking thought of the creation (κτίση) of new existence (ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον) that is tied directly to Christ (ἐν αὐτῷ).⁴³⁹ This new existence is not a composite of the former states of Jew and Gentile, but is a new condition characterized by peace (εἰρήνη).⁴⁴⁰ By speaking in such terms the author impresses the idea that "now" and "near" are much to be preferred to "then" and "far". The rhetoric of "peace" from verse 14 is reiterated again in the words ποιῶν εἰρήνην.

Verse 16 emphasizes once more the unification of Jew and Gentile with yet further explanation. Christ made both one (2:14), created from the two one new person (2:15b), and "reconciled both in one body through the cross (ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, 2:16).⁴⁴¹ The reconciliation of "both" is explained in three prepositional phrases, ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι, τῷ θεῷ,⁴⁴² and διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ. This rhetoric identifies the "one new person" as "one body,"⁴⁴³ but also adds to the horizontal, Jew and Gentile reconciliation the vertical reconciliation of both "to God."⁴⁴⁴ The third phrase, "through the cross," directs the audience members to remember that it is the death of Christ that has effected the benefits of peace and reconciliation being described. The last clause of verse 16, ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ, recalls τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ from verse 14, but here indicates that not only the "hostility"

between Jew and Gentile, but also that between humans and God has been destroyed.⁴⁴⁵

Having prepared the way by explaining the reconciling work of Christ who brought Jew and Gentile (and humans and God, 2:16) together by destroying the barriers that separate them, the author is ready in 2:17 to refer directly to the OT passages that were prompted by the notion of "far" and "near" in 2:13. The rhetorical force flows through the progression of ideas that the barriers to unity and peace have been broken down by Christ, reconciliation of those "far" and "near" has actually taken place, and, with supporting evidence from the OT, an announcement of peace to "far and "near" has been made.⁴⁴⁶ The thought of the announcement of peace to far and near, couched in the author's recollection of OT passages,⁴⁴⁷ required the background material of 2:14-16 in order to be more intelligible. Going immediately to verse 17 without the words of verses 14-16 would have left the soteriological connections of the preaching of peace too vague; one would wonder just what the preaching and the peace entailed. As it stands, it is clear that the peace involves the dissolution of barriers between Jew and Gentile and their reconciliation as the new creation. The rhetorical effect of 2:17 itself is that of impressing on the audience the view that salvation, as described in the terms of peace and reconciliation in 2:14-16, is proclaimed to "you who were far" (ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν), i.e., the Gentile Christian audience of Eph.,⁴⁴⁸ as well as to those

who were already "near", i.e., Jews. In this way the view of verse 13 that the Gentile recipients who were "then far have been made near" is supported by an appeal to the scripture of those who were a part of the commonwealth of Israel and participants in the covenants of promise (2:12). This can only serve to press home very persuasively the idea that the now/near saved existence is to be much preferred to the then/far existence. The rhythm of the two phrases εἰρήνη ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν and τοῖς ἑγγύς sharpens the distinction between those of Gentile or Jewish background, yet at the same time demonstrates that "both" are recipients of the same message of peace.

The explanation of the reconciliation of "far" and "near" concludes in 2:18 with the assertion that both Jew and Gentile have (ἔχομεν) unified access to the Father. The occurrence of the phrase οἱ ἀμφοτέροι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι is a repetition or *conduplicatio* (Rhet ad Her. 4.28.38; Quint. Inst. 9.3.28-30) of ἀμφοτέροι (2:14,16) and τοῦς δύο (2:15), and of the rhetorical meaning of ἐν (2:14), εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον (2:15), and ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι (2:16).⁴⁴⁹ Together with the notion of "access to the Father" these forms describe the state opposite to the former existence "apart from Christ" (χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, 2:12), i.e., being "in Christ" (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 2:13).⁴⁵⁰ Verse 18 concisely repeats the themes of verses 14-17, but instead of using the terms of the destruction of barriers, of peace and of reconciliation, speaks of access to the Father through

Christ (δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγήν...πρὸς τὸν πατέρα).⁴⁵¹ This emphasizes that Jew and Gentile together possess⁴⁵² a vertical soteriological relationship with the Father.⁴⁵³ The force of the whole verse is such that it emphasizes the notion that access to the Father has been provided and both Jews and Gentiles can share in this access.

The closing section of the pericope (2:19-22) returns to the then/now pattern of 2:11-13, but takes that schema to a higher level where present Christian existence is portrayed in terms of a continuing and growing community.⁴⁵⁴ The thought of the then/now, far/near relationship of Jews and Gentiles is expressed in verse 19 (you were ξένοι καὶ πάροιχοι, but now you are συμπολιταὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἴκετοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ), but this image is then dropped in favour of an architectural image based on the words οἶκος and ναός.⁴⁵⁵ The anamnesis has recalled the past in order to enhance the present; the present existence is subsequently described as one which aims toward functioning maturity.

The initial ἄρα οὖν in 2:19 functions as a literary signal indicating that thought is being resumed and that some logical conclusion or inference is about to be drawn.⁴⁵⁶ The resumption of the then/now pattern is implicit in the expressions οὐκέτι ἐστὲ (then) and ἀλλὰ ἐστὲ (now). The Gentile audience members are driven to make personal identification with the statements of verse 19 through the

direct, second person address (ἐστὲ). Rather than presenting a straightforward statement of the audience members' pre-Christian condition, this antithesis has refined (Rhet ad Her. 4.42.54.58) the then/now motif by placing the "then" statement in a negative formulation (οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροιχοι) followed by a positive "now" statement (ἀλλὰ ἐστὲ συμπολίται τῶν ἁγίων⁴⁵⁷ καὶ οἴκελοι τοῦ θεοῦ). This inverse, past to present relationship is enhanced by the *homœoptoton* of the nominative plural endings of ξένοι, πάροιχοι, συμπολίται, and οἴκελοι. While the words ξένοι and πάροιχοι can have slightly different meanings,⁴⁵⁸ they are used here to describe the same persons, i.e. the Gentile audience of Eph. in its pre-Christian state, and effectively form a hendiadys.⁴⁵⁹ Together they are equivalent to the participle ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι in 2:12⁴⁶⁰. The phrases συμπολίται τῶν ἁγίων and οἴκελοι τοῦ θεοῦ are essentially synonymous. The inverse parallelism of the negative and positive assertions of the contrast is obvious; where the Gentile audience members were formerly strangers to Israel and salvation history, they are now citizens and household members with each other, i.e. full sharers in salvation. These features in 2:19 serve to reinforce the then/now contrast, pressing home the great value of the present, Christian state.

The most significant rhetorical feature in 2:19-22 is the elaborate paronomasia (Rhet ad Her. 4.21.29; Quint. Inst. 9.3.66ff) based on the word οἶκος.⁴⁶¹ From the initial past

versus present contrast of πάροικοι and οἰκεῖοι in 2:19 the word play progresses through the verses by means of the words ἐποικοδομηθέντες (2:20), οἰκοδομή (2:21), συνοικοδομεῖσθε (2:22), and κατοικητήριον (2:22). While the then/now contrast has brought out the worth of the saved condition against the background of the unsaved state, the movement described by the verbal forms using the οἰκ- root changes the focus toward the author's fundamental concern for the maturation of the recipients.⁴⁶² The anamnesis has functioned so as to highlight salvation, but verses 20-22 direct that memory of salvation toward the spiritual growth of the community. The architectural metaphor⁴⁶³ begins in 2:19 with πάροικοι, literally meaning "those beside a house," who have become οἰκεῖοι, "those who belong to a house".⁴⁶⁴ In 2:20 there is a shift in the imagery from viewing the recipients as members of the household of God to viewing them as the house itself.⁴⁶⁵ They have been built upon a foundation (ἐποικοδομηθέντες, aorist passive, 2:20), they are a building (οἰκοδομή, 2:21), and they are being built together (συνοικοδομεῖσθε, present passive, 2:22) as a dwelling (κατοικητήριον, 2:22) of God. Tied closely to these words is the sacral image of the ναὸν ἁγίον (2:21);⁴⁶⁶ Christians as a building are a holy temple where God dwells.⁴⁶⁷

There are several other rhetorical features in 2:19-22 worthy of note. The genitive absolute expression, ὄντος ἄκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, presents an impressive image of the

position and role of Christ in the structure.⁴⁶⁸ Verses 21 and 22 are parallel to each other.⁴⁶⁹ Both verses begin with ἐν ϕ (*anaphora*, Rhet ad Her. 4.13.19; 4.14.21),⁴⁷⁰ and both speak of the ongoing⁴⁷¹ growth of the building as a spiritual dwelling, the words ναὸν ἅγιον and κατοικητήριον being, in this case, synonyms.⁴⁷² A significant difference between the verses, however, is the addition of ὑμεῖς in 2:22; its inclusion reinforces the sense of participation the audience members have as part of the dwelling of God (cf. Arist. Rhet. 3.14.11). Also, the συν- compounds συμπολιταί (2:19), συναρμολογουμένη (2:21), and συνοικοδομεῖσθε (2:22) enhance the sense of community being stressed in the passage.⁴⁷³ Finally, the contrast between pre-Christian and Christian existence is ended with the ἐν πνεύματι of 2:22 standing against the ἐν σαρκί of 2:11.⁴⁷⁴

Seen together, the rhetorical features of 2:19-22 function in a way that presses home the understanding that the present Christian status of the audience members transcends the former pre-Christian state. As Christians, the audience members are being "framed together" as a growing dwelling place of God. The rhetorical effect of the language is such that it can develop a frame of mind that identifies closely with the concepts and images described so that the audience members will see themselves as the growing temple of God, and, subsequently, participate in the behaviour that the author deems to be in accord with the goal of growth and maturity.

3.3.7 Summary

Eph. 2:11-22 continues the then/now pattern of 2:1-10. By recalling the past in order to emphasize the present this pericope drives home the author's view that the present, Christian condition is vastly superior to the past, pre-Christian state. The superiority of the present condition "in Christ" (2:13) is illustrated most emphatically by the former segregation of Jew and Gentile and separation of the audience members from salvation history, in contrast to the reconciliation and peace that has come through the destruction of barriers and the announcement of the peace accomplished by and embodied in Christ. The new, reconciled community of believers is moving onward in growth toward maturity. By attempting to persuade the recipients of Eph. of the truth of this narration, the author strives to impress on their minds that they are themselves sharers in salvation and that they too are growing as a "dwelling of God" toward Christian maturity. The frame of mind thereby developed (i.e., an appreciation of the blessings of the present, growing Christian existence) will make the audience responsive to the exhortation that follows later in the paraenesis.

3.3.8 The *Digressio* 3:2-13

It has already been noted that 3:2-13 forms a digression in the flow of the prayer language of 3:1,14-21.⁴⁷⁵ The digression acts as a reminder about Paul ("Paulus-Anamnese")⁴⁷⁶ that describes the source and nature of the ministry and message of Paul to the Gentiles.⁴⁷⁷

According to Quintilian the *digressio*⁴⁷⁸ (Greek παρέκβασις, a deviation⁴⁷⁹) is defined as "...the handling of some theme, which must have some bearing on the case, in a passage that involves digression from the logical order of our speech" (Quint.Inst.4.3.14)⁴⁸⁰. The *digressio* is an optional speech component that can be placed in any part of an oration (Quint.Inst.4.3.12),⁴⁸¹ but is perhaps most frequently employed in the *narratio*.⁴⁸² The digression may be short (Quint.Inst.9.2.56) or long (Quint.Inst.4.3.17). The primary content of the excurses is usually some form of epideictic description (Quint.Inst.4.3.12-13).⁴⁸³ The function of the *digressio* is to heighten the effect of the themes being discussed by a speaker/author (Quint.Inst.4.3.5-7), to "amplify" (or "abridge") a topic (Quint. Inst.4.3.15), or make a *pathos* appeal (Quint.Inst.4.3.15-16). In judicial rhetoric the *digressio* is employed to excite or mollify the judge, to make the judge disposed to listen favourably to argumentation (Quint.Inst.4.3.9), or "...as emollients to soften the harder elements of our statement" (Quint.Inst.4.9.10).⁴⁸⁴ The

digressio, then, enhances a discourse by providing additional, if tangential, information to the concern at hand.

3.3.9 Rhetorical Analysis: The *Digressio* 3:2-13

Perhaps the first question to be asked about the *digressio* has to do with its pragmatic function in the text of Eph. Why does the author digress? What rhetorical role does the *digressio* play in relationship to its context and to the rhetorical purpose of Eph.? Comprehensive answers to these questions cannot be given until a complete rhetorical analysis is performed, but some indications of what incited the thoughts in these verses are apparent at the outset of examination. The words of 3:1, ἐγὼ Παῦλος ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἔθνων may have prompted the author to question whether or not the recipients appreciated the significance of Paul's role in the proclamation of the gospel.⁴⁸⁵ The digression provides an explanation of Paul's ministry on behalf of the Gentile audience of Eph., and on behalf of Gentiles more generally.⁴⁸⁶ The forms ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἔθνων (3:1), εἰς ὑμᾶς (3:2), ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν and ἥτις ἐστὶν δόξα ὑμῶν (3:13), along with the more general references to Gentiles in verses 6 and 8, bracket the passage and are therefore operative throughout, demonstrating a direct concern that the audience members understand Paul's ministry on their behalf.⁴⁸⁷ This "for you" rhetoric identifies the Gentile audience members (and Gentiles more generally) as the

beneficiaries of Paul's revelation and his preaching ministry, and persuades them to identify themselves as people who have been touched by Paul's work. The recipients will feel (thus *pathos* effect) themselves to be participants (Arist, Rhet. 3.14.11) in the benefits of Paul's work. The "for you" rhetoric is also employed to persuade the audience members not to be dismayed or to despair (ἐγκακέω, 3:13) over Paul's personal situation, in view of the benefits his circumstances bring to them (ἥτις ἔστιν δόξα ὑμῶν).

Several concepts link 3:2-13 closely to 2:11-22, serving to deepen thoughts that have already been brought out.⁴⁸⁸ The recipients are addressed as Gentiles (3:1, cf. 2:11), apostles and prophets are mentioned together (3:5, cf. 2:20), συν- compounds are used to describe the relational connections of Gentiles with Jews in Christ (3:6, cf. 2:19,21,22),⁴⁸⁹ the recipients are sharers in the promises (3:6, cf. 2:12-13) and are members of the same body (3:6, cf. 2:16), and access to the Father is available (3:12, cf. 2:18). This sort of repetition of connected ideas (cf. Rhet ad Her. 4.28.38) fixes the impression of the view of reconciliation that was presented in 2:11-22 on the mind, and demonstrates the effort of the author to emphasize the Christian status of the audience. The constant reiteration of the fact of their Christian state will make the audience receptive to a call for behaviour that coincides with Christian identity.

The *digressio* as a whole has a basic repetitive structure where 3:2-7 and 3:8-12 parallel each other.⁴⁹⁰ Both sections speak of the grace given to Paul and of his preaching ministry to Gentiles; both speak of how the "mystery" had formerly been unknown, but is "now" revealed; both also point out the relationships that now exist in Christ. This repetitive structure presses home the nature of Paul's ministry on behalf of Gentiles, and enhances the *pathos* appeal by emphasizing that Paul had been given and was performing his ministry for the benefit of the Gentile audience.

The *digressio* begins with a rhetorical device in the words, εἰ γε ἤκούσατε.⁴⁹¹ These words are used to move the discussion away from what was intended to be a prayer (3:1, resumed at 3:14) to the content of the digression. Whether εἰ γε ἤκούσατε gives the affirmative notion "since you have heard" or the doubtful "if indeed you have heard" (cf. 4:21),⁴⁹² the words are rhetorically persuasive because they guide the audience in a specific direction of thought by suggesting that a clarification of the preceding statement is about to be made.⁴⁹³ The content of the clarification and explanation is expressed in the following clause, τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς .⁴⁹⁴ The semantics and syntax of this clause are difficult to grasp. The substantive οἰκονομία can refer to God's plan or administration of salvation (1:10; 3:9) or to Paul's task of proclamation to Gentiles (3:2; Col. 1:25; cf. 1Cor.

4:1;9;17));⁴⁹⁵ here it denotes Paul's task or ministry of proclamation since the concern of the passage is to explain Paul's circumstances and the connection of those circumstances to the Gentiles (3:1,7,9), not simply to explain the nature of the revelation made to Paul.⁴⁹⁶ The genitive chain τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης is ambiguous and can be understood as either epexegetic⁴⁹⁷ or objective.⁴⁹⁸ If epexegetic, the clause will mean that the task of administering or proclaiming was itself the gift of God's grace to Paul. If objective, it will mean that Paul was given the task of administering or proclaiming the grace of God (i.e., the mystery, the gospel, 3:3-7) to the Gentiles.⁴⁹⁹ Rhetorically, a decision either way is of little consequence because it is clear that Paul had a God-given ministry to the Gentiles (εἰς ὑμᾶς, 3:2) regardless of which grammatical option is chosen. The rhetorical force of the clause lies in the way in which it is programmatic for the whole *digressio*: it explains that Paul had a ministry to the Gentiles (εἰς ὑμᾶς) which, as the digression goes on to indicate, was fulfilled despite personal suffering (3:1,13).

Verses 3 to 6 act as an amplification by augmentation (Quint. Inst. 8.4.1-9)⁵⁰⁰ of verse 2 by describing the content of Paul's message to Gentiles. The conjunction ὅτι (assuming that it belongs in the text⁵⁰¹), serves as the rhetorical connector that ties the amplification to εἰ γε ἤκούσατε in 3:2.⁵⁰² By stating that the "mystery" was made known to Paul

by revelation (κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνώρισθη μοι) the notion that Paul's ministry was given to him by God rather than by human agency is emphasized (cf. Gal. 1:11-16).⁵⁰³ This emphasis continues on through 3:7 (ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη κτλ., 3:5; κατὰ τὴν δωρεάν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι, 3:7) The rhetorical force of these statements indicates that Paul could legitimately and authoritatively (i.e., with God-given authority) speak about the "mystery" and about his function in regard to it.⁵⁰⁴ The rhetorical effect on the audience members would be to persuade them to accept a message from (or purported to be from) Paul as similarly authoritative, resulting in adherence to the appeals made later in the paraenesis. Motivation for behaviour would therefore be supported in these verses by the psychological effect of a (legitimate) authority figure, rather than by direct argumentation. Most scholars believe that the καθὼς clause at the end of verse 3 refers to the things written "briefly" earlier in Eph.,⁵⁰⁵ although this conclusion is perhaps not absolutely certain.⁵⁰⁶ In any case, the effect of the clause is like that of an *enumeratio*⁵⁰⁷ that reminds the audience of things that have already been stated, in this case encouraging them to refer to the earlier statements for justification of the claim. The recipients of Eph. are effectively invited to judge the nature of Paul's insight into the revealed mystery for themselves (3:4). When they read or hear⁵⁰⁸ about the knowledge given to Paul his ministry and authorization to speak will be recognized.

The antithetical then/now schema reappears in 3:5 (ὁ ἑτέραις γενεαῖς...ὡς νῦν).⁵⁰⁹ Here, however, it does not make a direct contrast between pre-Christian and Christian states as it did in Eph. 2, but defines the time of the revelation of the mystery as being in Paul's generation (νῦν).⁵¹⁰ Since the audience is already familiar with the past/present antithesis and its connection with salvation and reconciliation, its use here will invite recognition and acceptance of the statements it supports, which are tied to salvation and reconciliation in 3:6. The parallelism of the three antithetical sequences (ὁ ἑτέραις γενεαῖς/ὡς νῦν; οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη/ἀπεκαλύφθη; τοῖς υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων/τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ κτλ.)⁵¹¹ makes a sharp and impressive distinction between past and present.⁵¹² The specific information revealed is expressed in the three συν- compounds of verse 6,⁵¹³ and carries essentially the same force as the συν- compounds in 2:5-6,19,21,22. The *parechesis*⁵¹⁴ of the συν- prefixes and the *paramæosis*⁵¹⁵ of the neuter plural -α endings give a lyrical *melopoeic* effect to the flow of words and assists in driving home a vivid impression of the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile. Verse 7 takes up the thought of 3:2 and brings the first half of the *digressio* to a close.⁵¹⁶ Functionally, 3:7 reiterates that Paul's ministry is God-given and therefore authoritative. The parallel κατὰ clauses (κατὰ τὴν δωρεάν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι and κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ)⁵¹⁷ emphasize the source and energy behind the gift to Paul. The plerophoric terminology and the *homœoptoton* of the genitive

chain (τὴν δωρεάν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι)⁵¹⁸ intensifies the sense,⁵¹⁹ as does the piling up of synonymous terms (τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως) that are reminiscent of the string of synonyms indicating power in 1:19.

The second section of the *digressio* (3:8-12) begins with the self-conscious and self-effacing statement ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων ἀγίων. The theme of preaching to the Gentiles in verses 8 and 9 conceivably could have been expressed without this initial statement, or it could have been included in a later, secondary position.⁵²⁰ However, placing it in the emphatic position at the beginning of the sentence intensifies the rhetorical force of the assertion. The rhetorical figure at work here is *ethopoeia* (Greek: ἠθοποιΐα) or *notatio* (Rhet ad Her. 4.50.63-52.65; Quint. Inst. 9.2.58-63), which is a character delineation intended to persuade listeners to accept or reject the ideas a speaker/author is asserting.⁵²¹ Here in 3:8 the figure is employed to enhance the view that all personal merit of Paul is disclaimed; his ministry and the content of his proclamation were wholly a gift of God.⁵²² The bestowing of grace by God is given the accent.⁵²³ At the same time, however, this rhetoric tends to place Paul in a favourable light as one who is humbled and awed by the stewardship entrusted to him.⁵²⁴ Following this statement is the main clause of 3:8, ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὐτῇ, which reinforces what has already been said in 3:2,7.

The goal and content of the giving of grace to Paul is explained in two infinitival clauses (τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι...; καὶ φωτίσαι..., 3:8b-9);⁵²⁵ the content of the revelation of the mystery was to be imparted by Paul to other people⁵²⁶ (i.e., to the Gentiles, τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, 3:8; to all people, πάντας,⁵²⁷ 3:9). The clauses are not precisely parallel, but the second (καὶ φωτίσαι πάντας..., 3:9) builds on the first by amplifying its meaning. Together, the clauses restate in different words what had already been said in 3:5-6,⁵²⁸ but now emphasize the proclamation of the content of the mystery (by means of the infinitives) over the content itself. The rich imagery employed is very impressive. The "untraceable riches" is a rhetorical image that, using the idea of "riches" (πλοῦτος) seen elsewhere in Eph.,⁵²⁹ claims that Christ is so rich that his wealth cannot be comprehended.⁵³⁰ The view of the mystery as hidden (...τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων...) harks back to the then/now image of 3:5.⁵³¹ The clause τὸ ἄρρητον τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι at the end of verse 9, while considered by Schlier to be a refutation of Gnostic thought that distinguished between creator and redeemer,⁵³² serves as a rhetorical enhancement of God as the one in whom the mystery was hidden and who also created the mystery (cf. 3:11; 1:4,11).

While the meaning of 3:10 has been the subject of a good deal of scholarly discussion,⁵³³ the rhetorical force of the verse has its basis in the repetition of the then/now motif. The

plan of God which had been hidden (3:9) is hidden no longer; the result of the elucidation⁵³⁴ (φωτίζω, 3:9) is that "now" (νῦν) the "multiform wisdom of God" may be made known (γνωρισθῆ, aorist subjunctive).⁵³⁵ The practical function of 3:10 is to explain that this "wisdom of God" (i.e., the gospel, 3:8; the formerly hidden plan of the mystery, 3:9) is "now" capable of, and in fact is, being proclaimed. More rhetorical force is produced by the amplification of the concepts of verses 5-7 that expands the scope of the revealed mystery to cosmic dimensions. Where the agents of the proclamation in 3:5-7 were the apostles, prophets and Paul, and the recipients of the proclamation were Gentiles, in 3:10 the agency of proclamation is the church (διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας), and the recipients are cosmic powers (ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς οὐρανότοις). Such a comprehensive view of the extent of God's plan can impress a sense of awe and wonder on the mind, and perhaps even a sense of identification as the recipients of these thoughts realize that they are members of this church.⁵³⁶ The descriptive phrase ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ serves as a synonym for the revealed mystery. The cosmic extent of proclamation is in accord with God's plan from "eternity" (κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰώνων, 3:11).⁵³⁷ The grand scope of the mystery in terms of both cosmic dimensions and time produces a strong impression of its nature on the mind.

The rather strong rhetoric of 3:12 moves off, syntactically, from 3:11.⁵³⁸ The persuasive strength of the verse has an emotional (*pathos*) tone: "we have boldness and access in confidence" (ἔχομεν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ προσαγωγὴν ἐν πεποιθήσει). This language elicits a sense of security among the recipients. They may also experience a strong sense of identification, realizing that they are part of the "we" (ἔχομεν) to whom the author refers, and knowing, too, that they have faith in Christ.⁵³⁹

The final statement of the *digressio* (3:13) seems to be prompted by two rhetorical movements. First, the general tenor of the *digressio*, as it explains the nature of Paul's ministry "for you Gentiles" (3:1,2), leads to the request that the audience members not be dismayed⁵⁴⁰ at Paul's suffering which is also "for you" (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν δόξα ὑμῶν).⁵⁴¹ Second, possession of the security asserted in 3:12 leads immediately, both syntactically⁵⁴² and rhetorically, to the wish that sufferings not be a cause for loss of heart. The digression has aroused *pathos*, a sense of understanding of Paul's work, and has perhaps engendered a sense of loyalty and responsibility toward Paul as a servant (διάκονος, 3:7) of the Gentiles. Verse 13 closes these thoughts, however, by attempting to dispel any unnecessary concern for Paul, who has suffered as a prisoner, but has done so boldly and in confidence (3:12), seeing in his sufferings a benefit for Gentile Christians. Paul's sufferings have in fact led to the

"glory" (ἡτις ἐστὶν δόξα ὑμῶν) of the audience members. That they have "glory" (i.e. they are joint heirs, members of the same body, joint partakers of the promises in Christ through the gospel, 3:6, and have boldness, access, and confidence through faith, 3:12) is rhetorically forceful in that it enhances the idea that Paul's ministry has been for their personal benefit, and leads to a sense of identification with the gospel and their status as Christians. The digression has drawn attention to Paul personally, and to his ministry, and has indicated the benefits that have accrued from his suffering as a "prisoner". The rhetorical force of 3:13 is such that it emphasizes the value for the audience of Paul's sufferings while simultaneously de-emphasizing possible dismay over those sufferings, focusing the attention of the audience members instead on the extension of the gospel to Gentiles generally, to cosmic powers, and, indeed, to themselves.

3.3.10 Summary

The *digressio* of 3:2-13 provides, as digressions should, additional thoughts that enhance the themes of Eph., even if the additions are not crucial to the logic of the epistle.⁵⁴³ It does have significant impact on the rhetorical force and rhetorical purpose of Eph. Prompted by the assertion of 3:1, the *digressio* functions as a description of the source and nature of Paul's ministry to the Gentiles ("for you", 3:1,2,13) that dispels possible dismay on the part of the

audience members over his sufferings on their behalf. The author is primarily concerned to demonstrate that Paul's ministry, and even his sufferings, were for their (Gentile) benefit. The *digressio* is also concerned to indicate that the audience of Eph. understand that Paul's ministry is God-given, that Paul accepts and appreciates it⁵⁴⁴ as God-given, and that they should not lose heart at the thought of Paul's circumstances. The passage portrays Paul as a legitimate and authoritative figure, but does so without detracting from the gospel message which Paul received and preached. At the same time, the digression explains the meaning of the "mystery," generates sympathy for Paul (yet requests that sympathy not lead to despair, 3:13), elicits *pathos* among the audience members along with a sense of their collective security as Christians, and drives home the knowledge that Gentiles are joint-participants (with Jews) in the gospel (3:6).⁵⁴⁵ The pericope acts as a reinforcement of the meaning of the gospel (as received and proclaimed by Paul) for the audience. The result of the author's statement of these concerns is, rhetorically speaking, that the audience members will be persuaded to accept the authority of Paul to speak, and, consequently, will be encouraged to practice the behaviour to which he (purportedly) exhorts them in the paraenesis.

ENDNOTES

- 1 In chapter 2, above.
- 2 Some commentators, e.g., Caird, 1976:62; Bruce, 1984:309, suggest that the petition of 3:1,14-19 is a resumption of the petition of 1:15-19a.
- 3 Many scholars have noted the linguistic and thematic connections that link the several pericopes in the section 1:3-3:21, e.g., Kirby, 1968:129; Houlden, 1970:264; Allen, 1986:103-104.
- 4 Justification for the claim that the *narratio* begins at 1:19b follows in section 3.3.1 below.
- 5 Lausberg, 1960:§§263-288. See above, section 2.4.8
- 6 The *exordia* of epideictic speeches are particularly noted here because the *exordium* of Eph. is so thoroughly pervaded by the themes of praise and worship.
- 7 As was noted with examples in section 2.4.3 above. Cf. also Schlier, 1957:37 (and in fn 1); Schnackenburg, 1982:43; Robinson, 1964:194-235 who suggests (p.204) that, in general, the Jewish tendency was to give a blessing (ברכה hence εὐλογία) and the early Christian tendency was to give a thanksgiving (hence εὐχαριστία). On links with Qumran documents see Kuhn, 1968:115ff., who claims the similarities show a "...continuity of tradition between Eph. and the Qumran literature".
- 8 Cf. Schille, 1965:69; Bruce, 1984:252.
- 9 Dahl, 1951:250.
- 10 See the general discussion of sentence length in Eph. in van Roon, 1974:105-113.
- 11 Norden, 1956:253.
- 12 Lohmeyer, 1926:120ff. For criticisms of Lohmeyer's proposal see Sanders, 1965:224.
- 13 Maurer, 1951-52:151-54.
- 14 Dahl, 1951:255
- 15 Following M. Dibelius, see Dahl, 1951:255.
- 16 Dahl, 1951:254.
- 17 Dahl, 1951:263-64. He was apparently the first to suggest (in his 1945 article, pp.85-103) that the whole of Eph. was

- intended for a baptismal setting or occasion (see Best, 1987:88), a view that has been followed by many other scholars, e.g., Percy, 1946:447; Coutts, 1956-57:124; Schlier, 1957:21; Kirby, 1968:150-161; Halter, 1977:227-33; Lincoln, 1981:137.
- 18 Cambier, 1963:58-104.
- 19 Coutts, 1956-57:115-127.
- 20 Coutts, 1956-57:120. Coutts' self-assessment seems to have been correct; cf. Houlden, 1977:264, who refers to it as "excessive ingenuity," while Barth, 1974:99 calls Coutts procedure "arbitrary and forced".
- 21 Fischer, 1973:113-14.
- 22 Schille, 1965:65-73.
- 23 Schille, 1965:67. He refers to 1:3-4 as the introduction to the two main parts (p.67), and 1:13-14 as the application to the audience.
- 24 Robbins, 1986:677-687.
- 25 Robbins, 1986:677 confesses that there is "some opaqueness of thought" in his reconstruction. Robbins divides 1:3-14 into rhetorical "periods"; the passage, however, is "continuous" (see Arist. Rhet. 3.9) because the sentence does not stop until the author's meaning is completed in v.14. See below on 1:3 with note 40.
- 26 Cf. Sanders, 1965:227.
- 27 Schlier, 1957:40-41.
- 28 Gnilka, 1971:59; Schnackenburg, 1977:68; Lincoln, 1981:136; Schnackenburg, 1982:43-44.
- 29 Schlier, 1957:39.
- 30 Gnilka, 1971:59. But cf. the hymnic arrangement of Lohmeyer noted above.
- 31 Krämer, 1967:38-41. Cf. the views of Dahl noted above.
- 32 Schnackenburg, 1982:43-44; cf. Schnackenburg, 1977:70-74.
- 33 Schnackenburg, 1982:42-47.
- 34 Schnackenburg, 1977:72-87; cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:44.
- 35 Schnackenburg, 1977:72.

36 Schnackenburg, 1977:83.

37 Schnackenburg, 1977:83. The "insights" are derived by Schnackenburg from Breuer, 1974:138-139. The five points presented here comprise my own representation of the "insights" from Schnackenburg's and Breuer's German.

38 Schnackenburg, 1977:85-86

39 Although Schnackenburg admits (1977:86) that the notion of unity is not as obvious in 1:3-14 as it is in 2:11-22 and 4:1-6.

40 On *oratio perpetua* (Greek λέξις εἰρομένη) see Lausberg, 1960:§§921-922; BDF:§458; Martin, 1974:316; van Roon, 1974:111-113.

41 van Roon, 1974:113; BDF §458.

42 Cf. Schille, 1965:70 fn76; Schnackenburg, 1982:48.

43 The device of reduplication "...is the repetition of one or more words for the purpose of Amplification or Appeal to Pity." "The reiteration of the same word makes a deep impression on the hearer..." (*Rhet ad Her.* 4.28.38). This effect recurs in the use of χάρις and its cognate verb form ἔχαρίτωσεν in 1:6; cf. Percy, 1946:32.

44 Cf. Burke, 1969:55.

45 On identification see section 2.4.9.

46 See the discussion concerning the audience in section 2.4.6, above.

47 Cf. Burke, 1969:55-56.

48 See Lanham, 1968:74; Kennedy, 1984:15.

49 Cf. the views of Schnackenburg noted in section 3.2.1 above.

50 Schlier, 1957:44; Allan, 1958-59:54-62; Gniska, 1971:63; Caird, 1976:34; Houlden, 1977:266; see also Caragounis, 1977:152-157 and the references given there; see also the references in section 3.2.2 above. Barth, 1974:100 speaks of the "somersaults" of prepositions in the eulogy.

51 E.g., Schlier, 1957:44.

52 E.g., Maurer, 1951-52:159; Cambier, 1963:66f; Allan, 1963:57f. Cf. Caragounis, 1977:136-137, who takes the ἐν phrases in both local and instrumental senses.

53 van Roon, 1974:113.

54 Burke, 1969:58-59.

55 Burke, 1969:58.

56 Burke, 1969:58.

57 Burke, 1969:58-59.

58 Burke, 1969:65. Such reduction seems to have occurred in the use of some of the form critical and structural analyses of the eulogy performed by some scholars.

59 Cf. Lanham, 1968:8 (*anaphora*); Burke, 1969:66.

60 The words ἐν ἀγάπῃ are understood to be linked with the end of verse 4, rather than with the beginning of verse 5. While many scholars link ἐν ἀγάπῃ with προοπίσας in verse 5, thus meaning God's love (e.g., Abbott, 1897:8; Schlier, 1957:52-53; Gnilka, 1971:72; Schnackenburg, 1977:73; 1982:45,52), others are ambivalent, allowing ἐν ἀγάπῃ to go with either verse 4 or verse 5 (e.g., Houlden, 1970:267; Caird, 1976:35; Bruce, 1984:256;), and at least one other (Barth, 1974:79-80) insists on attaching ἐν ἀγάπῃ to both verses. However, other usages of ἐν ἀγάπῃ in Eph. and in the Pauline corpus refer not to God's love, but to human love (Eph.3:1ff; 4:2,15,16; 5:2; 1Cor.4:21; 16:14; 2Cor.6:6; 8:7; Col.2:2; 1Thess.5:13; 1Tim.4:12; 2Tim.1:13), suggesting that human love is in mind in 1:4; cf. Robinson, 1903:143.

61 As, again, in Burke, 1969:58-59.

62 See van Roon, 1974:118. While Percy, 1946:27-31 believes the ἐν phrases stem from the influence of the LXX on the NT, van Roon prefers to attribute the influence to Hebrew sources.

63 van Roon, 1974:118, writing about the use of prepositions in this context, says, "To the ear, however, they form an automatic signal that the end (or the beginning) of a sentence is near." Cf. Barth, 1974:100.

64 van Roon, 1974:119; Lausberg, 1960:§§990,997.

65 Most commentators agree that 1:3 forms the theme sentence for the whole eulogy, e.g., Dahl, 1951:254; Schlier, 1957:39; Gnilka, 1971:254; Schnackenburg, 1982:45; cf. Caragounis, 1977:49; Dunn, 1970:159. Some scholars, e.g., Maurer, 1951-52:154 include verse 4 in the theme sentence.

66 Kirby, 1968:84-89; Bruce, 1984:252; cf. Caragounis, 1977:49; cf. Ps.66:20;72:18; also see Schille, 1965:69-70.

67 According to Kennedy, 1984:78-79, that which in rhetoric is called "topics" would be called "themes" by a literary critic, "doctrines" by a theologian, and "premises" by a philosopher.

68 See BDF §453; Schnackenburg, 1982:44.

69 In 1:7 τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων is set in apposition to τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ. See Caird, 1976:37; Abbott, 1897:13.

70 Robinson, 1903:28; Bruce, 1984:258,264,267.

71 Schnackenburg, 1982:44.

72 Cf. Abbott, 1897:7, who says that as an infinitive of purpose "the usage is quite classical"; Caird, 1976:35; Schnackenburg, 1982:44.

73 It is possible to take εἶναι as an infinitive of result. However, whether infinitive of result or purpose, εἶναι indicates that "the end in view" (Zerwick, §381) was behavioral.

74 Additionally, the two accusatives ἁγίους καὶ ἁμώμους are an example of *homœoptoton*, where words appear in the same case and with the same terminations (Rhet ad Her.4.20.28), producing a rhythmic, ear-pleasing effect. Lausberg, 1960:§§729-731.

75 See section 2.4.7 above.

76 See note 60 above on the linking of ἐν ἀγάπῃ with verse 4 rather than verse 5.

77 Bruce, 1984:255 speaks of "...a dominant ethical quality about divine election..." in 1:4.

78 Percy, 1946:188-190; van Roon, 1974:121-128.

79 The words τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος provide an example of *homœoteleuton*, i.e., words that have the same endings but are in different cases (Rhet ad Her.4.20.28); Lausberg, 1960:§§725-728.

80 van Roon, 1974:126, writing of the similar use of genitives throughout Eph. says, "One even has the impression that the ceaseless reverberations of genitives and connections forged by genitives were...designed to please the ear, in which case it would not be inappropriate to speak of a rhythm of genitives."

81 Lausberg, 1960:§563; van Roon, 1974:128-129.

82 See van Roon, 1974:162,184.

83 As Schnackenburg, 1977:78 fn 25 has indicated; see the bibliography there. Also see Abbott, 1897:20-21; Robinson, 1903:35; Percy, 1946:266-267; Schlier, 1957:40,67-68; Wilson, 1964:676-80; Barth, 1974:92ff,130-133; Jayne, 1974:151-52; Caird, 1976:41; Schnackenburg, 1982:62-63; Bruce, 1984:264f.

84 Mitton, 1951:225-27. Mitton ameliorates these comments in his 1976 commentary (p.58) by suggesting that "...you must here mean second-generation Christians, almost all of whom were Gentiles by birth." Cf. Coutts, 1956-57:120 who says there is "no logical reason" for the change from first to second person.

85 Abbott, 1897:20-21; Robinson, 1903:35; Scott, 1930:147-148; Schlier, 1957:40,67-68; Houlden, 1970:270; Barth, 1974:30-33; Caird, 1976:41; Bruce, 1984:264f.

86 Percy, 1946:266-67; Wilson, 1964:676-80; Schnackenburg, 1982:62-63.

87 A third possibility (according to Bultmann, TDNT II:535), that if "we" refers to all Christians, then the *προ-* prefix refers to the present with a view to the eschaton seems very unlikely, particularly since *προηλπικότες* is a perfect participle, thus meaning "we who had [already] hoped first".

88 Cf. Barth, 1974:131.

89 This is true even if it is allowed that the author had such a distinction in his own mind.

90 A *hapax legomenon* in the NT at Eph. 1:12.

91 Cf. Lincoln, 1987:614-18.

92 As Barth, 1974:131-32 attempts to do.

93 Nor as Gnllka, 1971:84 points out, is the change in pronouns reason to take 1:13-14 as a later appendation.

94 Gnllka, 1971:84 suggests that the pronoun changes in 1:15ff. look like Pauline terminology, "...oder sagen wir besser: die Terminologie der Missionsprache".

95 Many scholars have associated the notion of being sealed (*σφραγίζω*) with baptism (see the references in note 17 above, also Gnllka, 1971:85; cf. Schrage, 1988:174-177; for extensive bibliographical references see Barth, 1974:135 fn.336). Halter, 1977:230 claims that exegetical research indicates that baptism is meant by sealing in 1:13. Yet, as Schnackenburg, 1964:81ff; Schnackenburg, 1982:64, and Barth, 1974:139-143 point out, that view is disputed on historical

and exegetical grounds. Baptism is not explicit at Eph. 2:5-6 nor at 1:13, and even if these verses elicit a recollection of baptism (even if their composition recalled baptism to the mind of the author), there is insufficient reason based on a straightforward reading of these verses to say that baptism and sealing are essentially equivalent. Halter wishes to connect baptism and behaviour (as the title of his work, Taufe und Ethos: paulinische Kriterien für Proprium christlicher Moral, suggests), claiming that baptism demands ethical behaviour (pp. 231-33). But the notion of sealing in 1:13 is used to demonstrate rhetorically that the audience of Eph. is included within the blessings and participates in the praise of God described in the eulogy. It is thus neither sealing nor baptism as such (even if baptism is construed as a referent in 1:13) that push the audience members to participate in moral practice, but rather the fact that they are included among all those people who have received spiritual blessings from God, leading to the praise of God (1:14c).

96 See Burke, 1969:55-56.

97 See Evans, 1963:139, "...insofar as I actually look on x as y in my daily life, it becomes true that x is y. For example, if I look on my suffering as a means to moral growth, it is likely that my suffering will be a means to moral growth." "In general, people tend to conform to the roles which they see themselves as playing,"

98 Thus the difficulties in achieving a satisfactory structural schema for the eulogy; see above, sections 3.2.1. and 3.2.2. The eulogy apparently does not exhibit signs of having had a consciously pre-organized plan, but appears to be more extemporaneous (cf. Schlier, 1957:40-41), but still using the *berakah* format.

99 Cf. Schnackenburg's "Einsichten" noted earlier in section 3.2.2.

100 See section 3.2.3 above and note 40.

101 Cf. Schlier, 1957:75.

102 Most commentators take $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega$ to refer to the whole of the preceding eulogy, e.g., Abbott, 1897:24; Schlier, 1957:75; Gnilka, 1971:88; Houlden, 1970:272; cf. Caragounis, 1977:63, rather than limiting the reference to 1:13-14, cf. Abbott, 1897:24. See Col. 1:9.

103 See the discussion of 1:15-19a in section 2.4.7 on the purpose of Eph. The fundamental concern of the author for the audience is that the audience should move forward from where they are toward maturity.

104 See section 3.2.3 above on 1:13-14.

105 The audience members are therefore practicing the love of 1:4 (see note 60 above), and can consequently identify themselves as people who are doing what the elect should be doing. The fact that they are already behaving in a loving way in no way inhibits the author's concern for further maturation (1:17-19a).

106 Cf. Quint.Inst.4.1.16-17, who suggests linking the praise of a judge to the furtherance of a case. See Johanson, 1987:157-60.

107 Wiles, 1974:172; Schnackenburg, 1977:84; see Aune, 1987:126,211,216.

108 Schnackenburg, 1982:69; cf. the comments of Beare, 1955:149 regarding the similar language in Col.1:4,9.

109 Barth, 1974:161. Nor should it be understood as being "scarcely more than formal" (Houlden, 1970:272-272) as an epistolary device.

110 Indicated by the $\delta\iota\alpha$, "on account of," "because of".

111 See the discussion on this idea in Burke, 1969:55-56.

112 See Lanham, 1968:77.

113 The synonymous but positive usage with πάντοτε is frequently found in expressions of thanksgiving in the Pauline corpus: Rom.1:9-10; 1Cor.1:4; Phil.1:4; Col.1:3; 1Thess.1:2; 2Thess.1:3; cf. Eph.5:20. Cf. Schlier, 1957:76; he notes the use of ἁδιαλείπτως in 1Thess.1:2; 2:13; 5:17, and ἐν παντί in 1Thess.5:18.

114 See the discussion in Caragounis, 1977:63-64; cf. Abbott, 1897:26.

115 See BDF §§458-463; also Rom.1:10; 1Thess.1:2; Philm.4 for similar usage.

116 Caragounis, 1977:64.

117 On asyndeton see Rhet ad Her.4.30.41; Arist.Rhet.3.12.4; Lausberg, 1960:§§709-711.

118 "Plerophoric" (fulness of language and sense) because the author states that he **both** gives thanks and makes intercession in his prayers on behalf of the recipients. See Kuhn, 1968:116; Gnllka, 1971:88.

119 See again the discussion of the purpose of Eph. in section 2.4.7.

- 120 Caragounis, 1977:64-65; cf. Abbott, 1897:26; see also Schlier, 1957:77.
- 121 Both Caragounis and Abbott (see references in note 120 above) argue on the basis of usages found in other places, not on the text as it stands in Eph.1:17-19a.
- 122 δῶν is taken as a subjunctive, although it can be construed morphologically as an optative. See BDF§§369,95.
- 123 On synonymy see Rhet ad Her.4.28.38; cf. Arist.Rhet.3.2.7.
- 124 See Lanham, 1968:74. Schlier, 1957:77 states: "Schon hier ist wieder das Pathos zu spüren, das Paulus bereits in der Eulogie bewegt, wie er denn auch in den folgenden Versen über der Erinnerung an sein Gebet für die Gemeinde in die Sprache des Gebetes selbst gerät".
- 125 Abbott, 1897:28-29; Caragounis, 1977:65-66.
- 126 Robinson, 1903:39,149-150.
- 127 Schlier, 1957:79-80; Houlden, 1970:275. This view is in accord with the baptismal connections seen by some interpreters as mentioned above in notes 17 and 95. The metaphor does not make an explicit reference to baptism, nor are there clear grounds for equating baptism and "enlightenment" in this verse.
- 128 This view is held by Barth, 1974:149-150. See Lausberg, 1960:§860.
- 129 Cf. Pound's (1954:25-26) notion of *phanopoeia*, the casting of images on the visual imagination.
- 130 If they are not appropriate their discordance will be obvious and detrimental to the communication (Arist.Rhet.3.2). Rhet ad Her.4.34.45 states that "Metaphor is used for the sake of creating a vivid mental picture...".
- 131 Aristotle illustrates this by saying (Rhet.3.2.13), "It is better, for instance, to say 'rosy-fingered morn' than 'crimson-fingered' or, worse still, 'red-fingered morn'." Cf. Quint.Inst.8.6.4-8.
- 132 Cf. the use of the same mixed metaphor in 1Clem.36:2; 59:3; MPol.2:3.
- 133 A series of words in the same case or inflection, Rhet ad Her.4.20.28; Lausberg, 1960:§§729-731; cf. note 74 above.
- 134 εἰδέναι may be taken as an infinitive of both purpose and result.

135 Burke, 1969:57-58. *Melopoeia* (as described in section 2.3.2 above) is musical sound or orchestration that directs the flow of meaning.

136 Schnackenburg, 1982:70.

137 Evans, 1963:12-13, *et passim*.

138 Arnold, 1989:85f; Caird, 1976:62,68; O'Brien, 1978-79:505; Bruce, 1984:271; Gnilka, 1971:179 notes that the prayer has the same character as the rest of Eph. 1-3.

139 This is the view shared by most scholars, e.g. Abbott, 1897:93; Robinson, 1903:82,166; Percy, 1946:302; Gnilka, 1971:179; Barth, 1974:327; Caragounis, 1977:72,74; Schnackenburg, 1982:146; Bruce, 1984:311; Patzia, 1984:199.

140 The referent of τοῦτου χάρις is variously interpreted as being all of Eph. 2 (Abbott, 1897:93; Robinson, 1903:166), all of Eph. 1-3 (Lindemann, 1985:64), the previous two paragraphs (i.e. 2:11-22, Caragounis, 1977:72f.), only 2:20-23 (Percy, 1946.302). Gnilka, 1971:179fn6, suggests that τοῦτου χάρις ties together all of 1:16-3:13; Arnold, 1989:86 claims τοῦτου χάρις refers to all of Eph. 2 which has developed, in turn, out of 1:15-23. Since 3:1,14-19 resumes *exordium*-like language it is most likely that τοῦτου χάρις refers to the author's recollection of all of the *narratio*.

141 These effects are not entirely unlike, although not exactly the same as, those of *recapitulatio* as used in the *peroratio* of a speech; see Lausberg, 1960:§§434-435.

142 Barth, 1974:327 suggests that then use of ἐγώ is "Invariably...a display of authority"; but cf. 1:15 (καὶ ἐγώ) and 5:32 (ἐγώ).

143 Cf. Phlmn. 1,9; 1Tim. 1:8.

144 But, as Barth, 1974:328 correctly notes, it is not a plea for pity or admiration, even if pity or admiration were forthcoming from the audience.

145 E.g., 1:3-14; 1:15-23; 2:1-10.

146 See above, sections 3.2.3; 3.2.5 and references in note 40.

147 Cf. Arist. Rhet. 1.2.5; Quint. Inst. 6.2.8.

148 See the discussion of identification with the language of worship in section 3.2.3 above.

149 The use of emotion was considered appropriate in any section of a speech according to Quintilian, although most

frequently employed in the *exordium* and *peroratio*;
Inst. 6.1.51; 6.2.2.

150 Gnilka, 1971:180; Caird, 1976:658; Caragounis, 1977:74fn84; Nielen, 1937:309 states, "Im Synagogengottesdienst wurde besonders ein litaneiartiges Gebet mit Fürbitten für die verschiedenen Stände, das nach der Schriftlesung gesprochen wurde, knieend verrichtet." Cf. also 1Chron. 29:20; 1Clem. 57:1.

151 von Severus, 1972:col 1170 says that γονυπετεῖν (i.e., to kneel) in Eph. 3:14 is an idea parallel to προσεύχεσθαι (i.e., to worship).

152 The prayer of 3:14-19 is thus somewhat more emotive than that of 1:15-19a.

153 E.g., Robinson, 1903:174; Houlden, 1970:302; Gnilka, 1971:181; Bruce, 1984:324-325; Patzia, 1984:199.

154 Does πατριά mean "family," "fatherhood," the rabbinic "family below" and "family above" (Schlier, 1957:167-168), "lineage," "descent," (Barth, 1974:308), "human" and "spirit" (i.e., angel) life (Schnackenburg, 1982:149-159), or some other? None of these words seem to properly convey the meaning of πατριά, nor do they bring across the effect of the paronomasia. For our purposes here it is better to leave the two prepositional phrases πρὸς τὸν πατέρα and ἐξ οὗ πάσα πατριά in Greek.

155 Gnilka, 1971:181.

156 See Lausberg, 1960:§637.

157 The paronomasia may be further categorized as *adnominatio*, the repetition of a word with change in letter or sounds (Lausberg, 1960:§637; Lanham, 1968:3) or *polyptoton*, the repetition of words from the same root but with different endings (Lausberg, 1960:§§640-648; Lanham, 1968:78).

158 Gnilka, 1971:181fn1 correctly notes that if the prepositional phrase in 3:14 πρὸς τὸν πατέρα was followed by τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as some MSS in fact read (cf. 1:3), that the paronomasia would be distorted.

159 Schnackenburg, 1982:148.

160 Although this is the issue a number of scholars have tried to explain. See note 154 above.

161 Caird, 1976:69; Arnold, 1989:58-59. Note also 3:9b, ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι; God has already been designated as creator.

162 Schlier, 1957:168, however, thinks 3:15 is anti-Gnostic polemic.

163 Cf. Gnllka, 1971:182.

164 For discussion of the possibilities see Barth, 1974:379-384.

165 It is probable that the audience members already knew the definition of πᾶσα πατριᾶ even if it is not clear to modern interpreters. Arnold, 1989:58 (with note 55) suggests that "The phrase is no doubt used in its most expansive sense, i.e. every living being finds the source of its life in God the 'Father'".

166 Robinson, 1903:174-175.

167 Hence the words τοῦτου χάριν at 3:1,14.

168 Cf. Arnold, 1989:86. The prayer for the audience in 1:16-19a similarly has a three-fold request indicated in the τίς clauses found there; see above, section 3.2.5.

169 Cf. Percy, 1946:302; Schnackenburg, 1982:150.

170 Lindemann, 1975:64 suggests that the recipients may have had a weak faith ("Glaubenschwäche"). See also Schnackenburg, 1982:150. However, 1:15 speaks of the renown of their faith. Still, as Lindemann says, no faith is so strong that it cannot be strengthened further.

171 Zerwick, 1962:104; Schnackenburg, 1982:150.

172 See again the earlier discussion of the purpose of Eph. in section 2.4.7, especially as it relates to 3:14-19.

173 Lindemann, 1985:63.

174 On such expectancy see, again, Burke, 1969:58-59.

175. I.e., identification with the tone of prayer; Burke, 1989: *passim*.

176 Technically referred to as *reduplicatio* or *conduplicatio*; Lausberg, 1960:§612; *Rhet ad Her.* 4.28.38; *Quint. Inst.* 9.3.28ff, especially 9.3.30.

177 Pleonastic and baroque according to Barth, 1974:369.

178 Cf. Schlier, 1957:168.

179 Except that πλοῦτος occurs in the nominative case in 1:18 in reference to τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ, and in the accusative in 3:16 in reference to ὁ πατήρ.

180 As in the "head nodding" effect mentioned in the discussion of 1:3-14 in section 3.2.3 above.

181 Houlden, 1970:303; cf. Eph. 1:19; 6:10.

182 On synonyms as *amplificatio* see Lausberg, 1960:§§400-409; Quint. Inst. 8.4.1-29.

183 These possible definitions have included Jewish, Hellenistic, Gnostic and specifically Christian notions based on passages found in a variety of texts. See especially Abbott, 1897:95; Robinson, 1903:175; Percy, 1946:305; Schlier, 1957:169; Houlden, 1970:303; Gnllka, 1971:183 Schnackenburg, 1982:150; cf. also Arnold 1989:88,89.

184 Abbott, 1897:96; Schlier, 1957:168; Barth, 1974:369-370; Schnackenburg, 1982:147,151; Bruce, 1984:326-27; Lindemann, 1985:65; Patzia, 1984:200.

185 Abbott, 1897:96.

186 Lausberg, 1960:§709: "Die Wirkung ist die pathetisch-vereindringlichenden Steigerung".

187 Cf. BDF:§§462,494.

188 Although Schlier, 1957:168 designates the two parallel statements as "chiastisch verbundenen" they are not strictly speaking chiasmic because they have a direct parallelism, not an inverted parallelism. Cf. BDF:§477; Gnllka, 1971:182.

189 A theological discussion of these features would take us beyond the parameters of the present rhetorical analysis, but see the discussion in e.g., Schnackenburg, 1982:151, and Pauline passages dealing with the indwelling Christ and the Holy Spirit such as 1Cor. 3:16; 2Cor. 1:22; 3:17; Rom. 8:9-11; Gal. 2:20.

190 *Homoteleuton* occurs when words or clauses have endings with the same sound; Quint. Inst. 9.3.77-80.

191 Barth, 1974:385-388 wonders about "mysticism" in 3:16-19. The verses may be considered to have a "mystical" content in that they touch on concepts that transcend precise logical definition and enter the realm of spirituality.

192 Lausberg, 1960:§§830ff.

193 Lausberg, 1960:§§719-754; Lanham, 1968:62.

194 On the phrase ἐν ἀγάπῃ referring to human love and on its usage and syntax in 1:4 see above, section 3.2.3 and note 60.

195 E.g., Robinson, 1903:175; cf. NEB.

- 196 E.g. Abbott, 1897:96; Zerwick, 1962:104.
- 197 Cf. Schlier, 1957:170; Arnold, 1989:87; they are not to be taken as finite verbs as Gnilka, 1971:185 suggests.
- 198 And are another example of *homøoteleuton*.
- 199 Cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:151fn359. Arnold, 1989:98 suggests they should be understood in an optative sense, continuous with the prayer wishes.
- 200 Cf. Col.2:7.
- 201 Houlden, 1970:303.
- 202 Schlier, 1957:170, "Dabei ist durch beiden Partizipien die unerschütterliche Festigkeit des Standes in der Liebe betont."
- 203 On the effective use of metaphor see Arist. Rhet.3.2.8,13 and note 130 above.
- 204 Cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:150. The verb ἐξισχύω underscores the author's concern for the strengthening of the recipients.
- 205 This indicates that, as Lindemann, 1985:65, claims, the second ἵνα statement of 3:14-19 is subordinate to and an intensification of the first. At the same time, however, the second ἵνα statement has a parallelism to the first in that it indicates a purpose of the bowed knees of 3:14.
- 206 Dahl, 1975:73; Lindemann, 1985:64.
- 207 See Eph.1:1,4,15,18; 2:19,21; 3:8,18; 4:12; 5:3,27; 6:18.
- 208 Schlier, 1957; Caird, 1976:70; Schnackenburg, 1982:151; Patzia, 1984:201-202.
- 209 Cf. Patzia, 1984:201-202.
- 210 See the discussion of the ἡμεῖς/ὁμεῖς interchange in the rhetorical analysis of 1:3-14 in section 3.2.3 above. Note also the return to the use of the pronoun ἡμεῖς in 3:20.
- 211 For discussion and bibliography see Abbott, 1897:99f; Schlier, 1957:171-173; Gnilka, 1971:186-189; Barth, 1974:395-397; Dahl, 1975:57-75; Arnold, 1989:90-93.
- 212 "Fanciful" and "ingenious" according to Mitton, 1976:134.
- 213 Dahl, 1975:74.
- 214 Cf. Dahl, 1975:57.

215 The clauses are parallel in that they both are the goal of the strengthening requested from God (ὥνα ἐξισχύσατε); cf. Gnilka, 1971:185; Schnackenburg, 1982:151.

216 Ὑπερβάλλουσαν is an attributive participle. The hyphenated compound "knowledge-surpassing" is used here as an attempt to represent τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως effectively.

217 Arnold, 1989:92 likewise has concluded that the dimensions have a "dynamic" rather than "spatial" meaning: "...they [the recipients] would recognize the terms as a rhetorical expression of supernatural power."

218 See above on 3:16-17.

219 Abbott, 1897:101; Barth, 1974:373; Bruce, 1984:329, "deliberately paradoxical;" cf. Arnold, 1989:98-99. On *oxymoron* see Lausberg, 1960:§807.

220 Dahl, 1975:73 describes such dimensions as symbolizing "...what is beyond human comprehension."

221 See Arist. Rhet. 3.9.9.

222 Schnackenburg, 1982:154; cf. Schlier, 1957:175; Lindemann, 1985:67-68.

223 Robinson, 1903:87.

224 A discussion of the linguistic, semantical, and theological issues surrounding the word πλήρωμα is beyond the limits of this rhetorical analysis. See the discussion below on 1:23, with the literature noted there.

225 Schnackenburg, 1982:157 speaks of the organic connection of the prayer and doxology "von Bitten zur Preisen". Cf. Abbott, 1897:103; Gnilka, 1971:191.

226 Even as praise was offered to God in the eulogy (1:3-14), although there it was given because of blessings that God had already provided for Christians.

227 An idea that has, again, been impressed on the mind from the beginning of Eph.

228 Lock, 1929:139; Deichgräber, 1967:25; Houlden, 1970:305; Gnilka, 1971:191; Barth, 1974:374; Schnackenburg, 1982:157; Bruce, 1984:330; Arnold, 1989:101. For examples of doxological expressions see 1Chron.29:10-13; 4Macc.18:24; Rom.11:33-35; 16:25-27; Gal.1:5; Phil.4:20; 1Tim.1:17; 2Tim.4:18; 1Pet.4:11 Jude 25-25; Rev.1:6; MPol.20:2.

- 229 Stuibler, 1959:col.211. See also again section 2.4.3 above and Heinemann, 1971:col.997; Heinemann, 1977:255-256.
- 230 Schnackenburg, 1982:158. The double compound adverb ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ from ὑπέρ, ἐκ, and περισσός means "superabundantly," "exceedingly abundant," "above abundance," "infinitely more than;" cf. BAG:848; BDF:§185,1.
- 231 Robinson, 1903:177 speaks of the "exuberance" of this emphasis.
- 232 Κατά means "in conformity with," "just as," "by virtue of" (Abbott, 1897:103), "to judge by" (Caird, 1976:70).
- 233 Cf. the earlier discussion of the ἡμεῖς/ὕμεῖς interchange in 1:3-14 in section 3.2.3 above.
- 234 Houlden, 1970:302; Gnllka, 1971:191; Barth, 1974:376; Caird,, 1976:70; Bruce, 1984:331. The issue is that of the relationship between the phrases ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ and ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.
- 235 On *epanaphora* see the discussion of the repetitive ἐν in 1:3-14, section 3.2.3 above.
- 236 And need not, as Schnackenburg, 1982:159 and Barth, 1974:376 suggest, generate any aeon speculation or thoughts of secret meanings.
- 237 See Lausberg, 1960:§729.
- 238 See the brief discussion of *narratio* in section 2.4.8 above. See also Lausberg, 1960:§§290-292.
- 239 I.e., the *progymnasmata* or "prefatory exercises;" Rhet ad Her. 1.8.12, note f; Lanham, 1968:1968:80-81.
- 240 In section 2.4.8 and 3.1 above.
- 241 Section 3.3.
- 242 See above section 3.3.
- 243 Cf. Schlier, 1957:57,146,167; Caird, 1976:62,68; O'Brien, 1978-79:505; Bruce, 1984:271; Arnold, 1989:85f.
- 244 See above, section 3.2.5.
- 245 Bruce, 1984:272; Arnold, 1989:78, "The final request for an increased knowledge of God's incomparably great power leads the author into a christological excursus extolling the brilliant manifestation of the power in the resurrection (v.20a) and exaltation (vv.20b-23) of Christ." "This anticipates the author's subsequent discussion of the

relevance of this life-giving power to the believer in also being made alive (συζωοποιέω, 2:5)."

246 See above, sections 3.2.3 with note 40, and 3.2.5 with note 100.

247 In addition to the commentaries, many articles and sections of monographs have discussed the issues of 1:23, e.g., Lightfoot, 1856:257-253; Robinson, 1903:241-259; A. Hitchcock, 1910-11:91; F. Hitchcock, 1922:135-150; Hanson, 1946:127-129; Moule, 1949:53; Mitton, 1951:94-97; Moule, 1951:74-86; Moule, 1957:164-169; Mussner, Christus, 1968:45-64; Ernst, 1970:105-119; Yates, 1971-72:146-151; van Roon, 1974:227-262; Lindemann, 1975:59-62, 213-217; Lona, 1984:312-335; Arnold, 1989:82-85.

248 Dibelius-Greeven, 1953:64; Sanders, 1965:21-223; Deichgräber, 1967:161-165; Ernst, 1970:105; Gnllka, 1971:93; Lindemann, 1975:204; Schnackenburg, 1982:70-71; cf. also Schlier, 1957:86; Schille, 1965:103fn4.

249 Cf. Lindemann, 1975:208; Lincoln, 1982:40; Arnold, 1989:78.

250 *Scesis onamaton* is the employment of a string of synonymous expressions; Lanham, 1968:90,125.

251 As has been already seen in 3:16. On the heaping up of synonyms for power cf. Eph.6:10 and Col.1:11.

252 Cf. Schlier, 1957:85fn4; Houlden, 1970:276; Barth, 1974:152. For examples see Eph.1:6,10,18; 2:2; 3:2, etc.; cf. Col.1:5,12,13,24, etc.

253 See Lanham, 1968:18,124; Lausberg, 1960:§259.

254 Ὑπεράνω is used here as a preposition with the following genitive as also in 4:10.

255 See Lincoln, 1982:40-42.

256 See Rom.8:34; Col.3:1; cf. MPol.2:1f.

257 Pound, 1954:25-26.

258 Beare, 1953:634; Lincoln, 1981:145; Lincoln, 1982:40. Cf. LXX Ex.15:6; 1Kgs.4:4; 2Kgs.6:2; 4Kgs.19:15; 1Chron.13:6; Ps.79:1,17; 98:1; Isa.37:16; 41:10; 48:13; Jer.22:24.

259 Cf. Burke, 1969:58-59.

260 That ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, δύναμις, κυριότης and ὄνομα refer to cosmic beings is clear from usage in Eph.3:10; 6:12, even though clear elucidation of terms (to say nothing of a clear

Pauline demonology) is lacking (cf. Barth, 1974:171). The author could assume that the audience members were familiar with the terms, even though modern interpreters remain puzzled, at least to some extent. See Abbott, 1897:32-34; Schlier, 1957:87; Barth, 1974:171-183; Lindemann, 1975:208; Caird, 1956:*passim*; Schnackenburg, 1982:76. Most recently Arnold, 1989:*passim*, has shown the significance to Eph. of "powers" as they were connected with magical practices current in western Asia Minor at the time of writing. The "powers" need not be limited to Jewish concepts of demonology/angelology, but extend to pagan views of pernicious cosmic beings.

261 See especially the discussion on this point in Arnold, 1989:52-56, 70-85.

262 Cf. Lausberg, 1960:§671,3.

263 Cf. Lausberg, 1960:§406.

264 Cf. Lausberg, 1960:§667; Lanham, 1968:96.

265 Lausberg, 1960:§667.

266 See the discussion of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ in section 3.2.7 above.

267 See note 260 above.

268 Arnold, 1989:*passim* addresses the widespread concern regarding "powers" in Asia Minor in the first century CE. Eph.1:19b-23 demonstrates Christ's transcendence above all "powers," perhaps in view of the concern of the audience members about the powers that were part of the pagan religious and cultural milieu. Arnold (p.123) overstates his case, however, when he claims that "The most pressing question...was where does Christ stand in relationship to powers?" This question may have been significant for the audience of Eph., but surely it only describes one aspect of thought in Eph., and should not be described as "the most pressing question".

269 Lindemann, 1975:209,211 suggests that 1:21 brings out the timelessness and eternity of an already realized salvation. In fact the actual stress is on the continuing sovereignty and rule of Christ, thus clearing the way for and supporting the growth of the audience members.

270 Lindemann, 1975:212; Lincoln, 1981:146; Schnackenburg, 1982:79.

271 Lindemann, 1975:212; cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:78.

272 Lausberg, 1960:§612; Lanham, 1968:27.

273 Cf. Caird, 1976:48. It is therefore unlikely that Schnackenburg's (1982:79) suggestion that ὑπὲρ πάντα is an addition to κεφαλὴν is correct.

274 Casting images on the visual imagination; Pound, 1954:25-26.

275 The eschatology suggested by 1:22 has raised many questions, for, according to 1Cor.15:23-28, where LXX Ps.8:6 is also cited, the submission of powers to Christ will occur at the parousia. This would mean that the rule of Christ is not yet total and full, in contrast to Eph. Eph.1:22, however, is not concerned with the precise parameters of time, but with impressing the audience members with the nature of Christ's sovereignty. Christ reigns over the cosmos absolutely, without regard to time, in the author's mind. Cf. Mussner, Christus, 1968:45-46; Gnilka, 1971:96; Lindemann, 1975:212; Halter, 1977:389-390.

276 Cf. Caird, 1976:48; Lindemann, 1975:212; Lincoln, 1981:146.

277 E.g., Käsemann, 1933; Percy, 1942; Hanson, 1946; Percy, 1946; Best, 1955; Barth, 1960; Käsemann, 1963; Mussner, Christus, 1968; Ernst, 1970; Käsemann, 1971; Schnackenburg, 1974; Allen, 1982; Allen 1986; see also the bibliography in Barth, 1974:414-417.

278 Especially Käsemann, 1963:293; 1968:288; 1970:89; 1977:120; Keck, 1979:4.

279 Cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:79. On the body and growth see Lona, 1984:320,336ff.

280 See the references in note 247 above.

281 Cf. Gnilka, 1971:97-98.

282 This last view, however unlikely, was held by Bengel and followed by Bruce, 1984:276, and Chadwick, 1962:983.

283 Some have suggested that τοῦ πληρουμένου may refer to God rather than Christ, e.g., Lona, 1984:317. Our rhetorical analysis, however, (see the following discussion), clearly points to Christ as the referent.

284 Middle forms can be understood in an active sense; BDF:§316; Zerwick, 1963:§235.

285 A summary of the various interpretations may be found in Ernst, 1970:108-117.

286 *Parechesis* is the repetition of the same sound in words in close succession; Lanham, 1968:71-72; BDF:§488,2. Cf. also

the figure *paromæosis*, the parallelism of sound in words and clauses. *Paromæosis* can include both *homæoptoton* and *homæoteleuton*. See *Rhet. ad Alex.* 1436a.5-13; *Arist. Rhet.* 3.9.9; Lausberg, 1960:§732.

287 *Polyptoton* (*adnominatio*) is a form of paronomasia in which words from the same root but in different cases are repeated. *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.22.30-31; *Quint. Inst.* 9.3.36f; Lausberg, 1960:§§640-648; Lanham, 1968:78,124. Lausberg, 1960:§646 refers to the *polyptoton* of the pronoun αὐτός in Rom. 11:36.

288 Cf. Lincoln, 1981:147.

289 See Barth, 1974:158.

290 Both words are in apposition to τῆ ἑκκλησίᾳ. Τοῦ πληρουμένου, by virtue of being balanced with αὐτοῦ, refers to Christ and not to God; see note 283 above.

291 Thus πλήρωμα is used in its passive sense.

292 Barth, 1974:158 claims of 1:23 that "...one purpose is clearly recognizable: to describe the essence of the church." The verse is clearly descriptive, but the intent is in no way to describe the "essence of the church" (whatever that may be), but to demonstrate that Christ rules with a view to the benefit of the church.

293 Cf. Lincoln, 1981:145.

294 E.g., Lindemann, 1975:106; Lindemann, 1985:34.

295 Barth, 1974:275.

296 Schnackenburg, 1982:86.

297 See the examples and discussion refuting this point in Lincoln, 1983:617-630, especially pp.617-618. Cf. also Houlden, 1970:279-280; Patzia, 1984:161.

298 The parallels between 1:19b-23 and 2:1-10 are clear and have been frequently noted. See Gnilka, 1971:113; Tachau, 1972:135; Barth, 1974:212; Schnackenburg, 1982:87,95; Allen, 1986:103f. Cf. also Beare, 1953:638; Houlden, 1970:279; Patzia, 1984:153. There are also thematic links with 1:3-14, e.g., the notions of grace and love; see Tachau, 1972:135. The intertextuality between Eph. 2:1-10 and Col. 2:11-13, and the dependence of Eph. on Col. as source material for the pericope (Halter, 1977:234 believes that Eph. 2:1-10 serves as a commentary on Col. 2:11-13), while interesting, is outside the bounds of our rhetorical analysis of the function of 2:1-10 vis-à-vis the purpose of Eph.

299 Cf. Lincoln, 1983:619.

300 Lausberg, 1960:§§400-403.

301 Tachau, 1972:135 says that the parallelism between 1:20 and 2:5f indicates that what is said about Christ is validated in believers.

302 On the "then"/"now" motif in general in the NT see Tachau, 1972:79-96; for discussion specific to 2:1-10 see pp.134-143.

303 Tachau, 1972:141; cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:87. Tachau is also correct in saying that the time antithesis (πατέ/νῦν) is employed to show the contrast of the contents between the former non-Christian life and the present Christian life, rather than a contrast of ages or historical epochs.

304 Although already implied in 2:1; Tachau, 1972:136. Cf. Col.2:13.

305 See Lincoln, 1983:619-620; Lona, 1984:245. This is not altogether unlike the effect described in Quint.Inst.4.2.52-53 where the rhetorical use of time is discussed briefly: "For some things have such a natural sequence and coherence that if only the first portion of your statement is satisfactory, the judge will himself anticipate what you have got to say in the later part."

306 Lausberg, 1960:§§661-662.

307 Bultmann, 1910:25-26,94; Bultmann, RGG² III:1675-1677; cf. Tachau, 1972:13.

308 On anacolouthon see Lausberg, 1960:§924; BDF:§466-470. The anacolouthic construction in 2:1-5 is called both "einfach" (Lona, 1984:245) and "highly complex" (Houlden, 1970:280).

309 Robinson, 1903:47 suggests the broken construction clears up obscurities and prevents misconceptions. By contrast, Caird, 1976:50 says that "...the impetuosity of Paul's thought runs away with his syntax." A concern for explanation and clarity along with a desire for dramatic impression are evident rather than impetuosity.

310 Although "we also" has often been taken as a reference to Jews (Abbott, 1897:43; Robinson, 1903:155; Schlier, 1957:100,106; Houlden, 1970:280; Barth, 1974:216-217; Caird, 1976:52; Bruce, 1984:280) this view has probably been imported from 2:11-22. There is no explicit or implied contrast between Jew and Gentile until 2:11-13. See the earlier discussion of this point in section 3.2.3 above; cf. Lindemann, 1975:112; Lindemann, 1985:37.

- 311 The thought of course not being completed until 2:6.
- 312 Lanham, 1968:53. *Hendiadys* is the expression of an idea by two nouns connected by "and"; cf. Barth, 1974:212.
- 313 On the use of παραπτώμα and ἁμαρτία as synonyms see the discussion of Eph. 1:7 in section 3.2.3 above; Abbott, 1897:39; cf. Rom. 5:20. It is noteworthy that when the anacolouthic sentence is resumed in 2:5 only παραπτώμα is used.
- 314 Schlier, 1957; cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:90.
- 315 The verb περιπατέω is used eight times in Eph. (2:2,10; 4:1,17 [twice]; 5:2,8,15) as a metaphor (Arist. *Rhet.* 3.2.8ff; Quint. *Inst.* 8.6.8) for behaviour. It is a Hebraism used frequently in the LXX. Rabbinic exposition dealing with behaviour was denoted as *halacha*, a way to walk or path to follow. See Robinson, 1903:153; Schlier, 1957:101; Barth, 1974:213-214; Caird, 1976:51.
- 316 Houlden, 1970:281; Bruce, 1984:281.
- 317 A colon is, according to *Rhet ad Her.* 4.199.26, "...a sentence member, brief and complete, which does not express the entire thought, but is, in turn, supplemented by another colon." See also Arist. *Rhet.* 3.9.5-10 dealing with κῶλον.
- 318 Tachau, 1972:136; Lindemann, 1975:110 and fn24; Bruce, 1984:283; Lona, 1984:249. Schlier, 1957:104 has suggested that τοῦ πνεύματος is apposite to τοῦ ἄερος; cf. the discussion in Barth, 1974:214-215 and Bruce, 1984:283; Caird, 1976:51.
- 319 If τοῦ πνεύματος κτλ. was not in apposition to κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα κτλ. and thus a clause of equivalent meaning, it might have been written as a third κατὰ clause, viz. κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος (cf. Robinson, 1903:154). As it stands, the parallelism and effect of the *isocolon* runs to all three clauses; cf. Houlden, 1970:283.
- 320 Abbott, 1897:42; Barth, 1974:215-216; Lindemann, 1975:110; Caird, 1976:51; Schnackenburg, 1982:91.
- 321 Lona, 1984:250.
- 322 Cf. Abbott, 1897:43; Robinson, 1903:155; Lindemann, 1975:112-113.
- 323 The feminine ἐν αἰς occurs because of attraction to the preceding feminine ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις.
- 324 See above on 2:1 and note 310.

- 325 As Gnilka, 1971:116; Schnackenburg, 1982:92; and Lona, 1984:251 have noted.
- 326 Cf. Quint. Inst. 9.3.28 where addition or doubling of words adds to the force of a statement.
- 327 Abbott, 1897:44.
- 328 And possibly a hendiadys.
- 329 Identification as in earlier discussions above and in Burke, 1969:56ff.
- 330 This view was promoted principally by Schille, 1965:53-59, followed by Barth, 1974:217-218; cf. Lona, 1984:256.
- 331 Fischer, 1973:121; Lindemann, 1975:116; Luz, 1976:369; Lincoln, 1983:619; cf. Gnilka, 1971:121fn3.
- 332 Sanders, 1965:219; Fischer, 1973:121-122.
- 333 See especially Schlier, 1957:109-111; Schnackenburg, 1964:73-78; Schille, 1965:102ff; Tannehill, 1967:52-54; Gnilka, 1971:117; Fischer, 1973:121ff; Halter, 1977:233-242; Schnackenburg, 1982:94.
- 334 The comparison of 2:4-6 with Col.2:12-13 appears to be the standard argument for connecting the Eph. passage with baptism; see especially Schnackenburg, 1964:73; Halter, 1977:234,237-238.
- 335 Cf. the earlier discussion of the purported connections of baptism in 1:13 in note 95 above.
- 336 Bruce, 1984:285-286. Cf. also Barth, 1974:234.
- 337 Lincoln, 1983:621. Halter, 1977:237 is mistaken in his claim that what Col. explicates Eph. says in the single word συζωποιέω in 2:5, including the notion of dying with Christ as in Rom.6, Col.2, and Col.3. Such a view stretches the ties between Col. and Eph. much too far.
- 338 Cf. Lindemann, 1975:67-68; Caird, 1976:52; Bruce, 1984:285-286; Lona, 1984:361-362.
- 339 The shortcomings of the term "realized eschatology" are recognized, but it is nevertheless useful as a common technical term. A useful discussion of the appropriateness of the term can be found in Aune, 1972:1,6.
- 340 Aune, 1972:6.
- 341 This state of affairs in Eph. 2 illustrates one of the issues in integrating theology and ethics in the letter. When

such fully realized resurrection life appears side-by-side with paraenesis the one would seem to cancel out the other.

342 The language has been explained in several ways by the scholarly community. Schille, 1965:104-105, says the eschatology of Eph. is an enthusiastic blunder that needs correction; the community must be called back from heaven to earth, a task performed, says Schille, in 2:10. Halter, 1977:238 similarly refers to 2:6 as an enthusiastic statement that explains 1:20f. These interpretations are unacceptable since they attribute an over-enthusiasm to the author even though the rest of Eph. does not indicate such exuberance or immaturity. Abbott, 1897:49 explains that salvation is fully complete in regard to deliverance from the former existence of 2:1-3, yet incomplete in regard to what is still to come. Caird, 1976:53 and Bruce, 1984:287 suggest that future salvation is so sure that it can be spoken of as already present. These views are unsatisfying because they do not explain why such language was used.

343 As Fischer, 1973:122 who suggests 2:7 is a comment that points out the author's eschatological reservations.

344 The third person verb ἐνδείξεται attributes the action to God. However, it seems clear that the ἵνα clause of 2:7 indicates that actions described in 2:5-6 have the display of God's grace as their purpose or goal. Cf. Lindemann, 1975:129; Schnackenburg, 1982:96.

345 The discussions about the meaning of νέκρος in the context of 2:1-3 are assisted by noting that both death and life (συζωποιέω) are descriptive of states of being, as shown in the employment of εἶμι (ὄντας) in 2:1,5. Existence is characterized "then" by death and "now" by life. These characterizations are tied to relationships either with insidious powers (2:1-3) or to God and Christ (2:4-6,8-10).

346 Rhet ad Her. 4.15.21.

347 Schlier, 1957:109.

348 Indicated by the first person pronoun ἡμεῖς. It was already noted, however, that all persons in the pre-Christian state were considered to be "dead" according to verse 3.

349 Some, e.g. Fischer, 1973:123-128, attempt to shed light on the συν- compounds by discussing what they consider to be sources and parallels in the literature of the mystery religions. The existence of linguistic parallels, however, does not prove connection with the mystery religions.

350 Schnackenburg, 1982:88.

351 The textual variant in 2:5, i.e. ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, rather than simply τῷ Χριστῷ, is unlikely because the emphasis is placed on union with Christ through the συν- prefixes. See Abbott, 1897:47.

352 See note 298 above.

353 This, however, points out the by now familiar tension between chapters 1-3 and the paraenesis where there is an exhortation (6:10-20) to resist the powers.

354 See above, section 3.2.3.

355 Schlier, 1957:115; Gnllka, 1971:129; Barth, 1974:224; Lincoln, 1983:619-620.

356 Both the verb (σῶζω) and the noun (σωτηρία) forms are usually employed in reference to the future, i.e., to salvation in a final sense (Rom.1:16; 5:9-10; 8:24; 10:1,9,10,13; 11:26; 13:11; 1Cor.3:15; 5:5; 2Cor.7:10; 1Thess.5:9; cf. occurrences in the subjunctive mood: 1Cor.7:16; 9:22; 10:33; 1Thess.2:16), although salvation is also spoken of as a present process (1Cor.1:18; 15:2; 2Cor.2:15; 6:12; Phil.2:12).

357 The perfect tense implies past completed action with present and ongoing effect; Patzia, 1984:162; cf. Lincoln, 1981:230fn65.

358 Abbott, 1897:51; Bruce, 1984:289fn63.

359 The phrases διὰ πιστέως and ἐκ πιστέως are used interchangeably in the Pauline letters, with ἐκ πιστέως being employed more frequently; see Rom.3:21-30; 4:16; 5:1; 9:30; Gal.2:16; 3:8-11; Phil.3:9. The exegetical issue in Eph.2:8 (see Abbott, 1897:51; Robinson, 1904:157; Barth, 1974:225; Bruce, 1984:289) is whether or not διὰ πιστέως followed by καὶ τούτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον indicates that faith is a gift of God. The neuter forms τούτο τὸ δῶρον do not agree with the feminines πίστις, χάρις or σωτηρία (the noun cognate form of σεσωσμένοι), although gender agreement is not always necessary (BDF:§132). More importantly, however, the context, because it is emphasizing salvation as the transition from death to life with Christ, shows that it is salvation as a whole, including grace and faith, to which verse 8 refers.

360 And not merely as a tautology, i.e., a pleonasmus or redundancy; cf. Hodge 1856:119.

361 Barth, 1974:225-226.

362 Lausberg, 1960:§§629-630.

- 363 Cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:97. Works (genitive plural ἔργων) in 2:9 refer to human effort in general, not to works of the law; see Lincoln, 1983:623.
- 364 Lausberg, 1960:§629-630.
- 365 Abbott, 1897:52.
- 366 The synonym δωρεά is frequently used; cf. Lincoln, 1983:622,625.
- 367 Cf. the usage in 3:7 of the accusative of δωρεά in a κατά clause co-ordinated with the accusative of ἐνέργεια in the following κατά clause. This example suggests a concern for the appropriate rhetorical use of gender and repetitive sound. See also the occurrence of δωρεά in 4:7. Philostratus, Lives of the Sophists 2.10.7 (third century CE) distinguished between δῶρον, apparently as material valuables (gifts), and δωρεά, apparently as non-material valuables (grants). This distinction does not fit with the ideas of Eph. 2:9.
- 368 Schlier, 1957:117.
- 369 The language of creation (κτίζω) points to the concept of Christians as new creations (Eph.2:15; 4:24; 2Cor.5:17; Gal.6:15).
- 370 Ἐπί followed by the dative ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς indicates purpose, cf. Gal.5:13; 1Thess.4:7; BDF:§235; Zerwick:§129; Lindemann, 1985:42.
- 371 Tachau, 1972:142: "Ein Zusammenhang mit dem parännetischen Teil des Epheserbriefes ist nicht wahrnehmbar." See section 1.2 above.
- 372 See, for example, Abbott, 1897:54-55.
- 373 See Schlier, 1957:117.
- 374 Barth, 1974:227 calls this attraction a "sophisticated rhetorical device". It perhaps fits in the category of *enallagē*, the substitution of case, person, gender, number, tense, mood, part of speech for another; Quint.Inst.9.3.12f; Lausberg, 1960:§509; Lanham, 1968:40; cf. BDF:§294.
- 375 Robinson, 1903:157; Houlden, 1970:285; Barth, 1974:227,249; Lincoln, 1983:624.
- 376 Cf. Fischer, 1973:130, who claims that good works as the goal of salvation is a moralizing contradiction when compared with the rest of the Pauline corpus.
- 377 For the most comprehensive survey of interpretations see Rader, 1978:177-249. Useful summaries can also be found in

- 389 Even though the theme of unity recurs in 3:6; 4:3-6,13-16.
- 390 See above on 2:1-10, section 3.3.4. Also Tachau, 1972:79-96 and especially pp.137-141; Mussner, Christus 1968:89; Lindemann, 1975:147-148; Schnackenburg, 1984:473-475; Lona, 1984:258.
- 391 I.e., to collaborate with the author's views; Burke, 1969:56-58.
- 392 This corroborates that 2:1-10 also acts as an anamnesis.
- 393 Anamnesis as ἀνακεφαλαίωσις or *enumeratio* is formally employed most often in the *peroratio*, although it may occur elsewhere; see Arist.Rhet.3.19.1; Rhet ad Her.2.30.47; Quint.Inst.6.1.1-8; Lausberg, 1960:§§432-434; Lanham, 1968:41-42.
- 394 Lanham, 1968:7,85: "Recalling matters of the past; ideas events, persons". Cf. Ps.137.
- 395 See Schnackenburg, 1984:477. On the role of anamnesis in biblical literature see Dahl, 1947:69-95.
- 396 Schnackenburg, 1984:474.
- 397 Schnackenburg, 1982:107.
- 398 Cf. Abbott, 1897:55-57; Barth, 1974:255-256; Lindemann, 1975:148; Lindemann, 1985:44.
- 399 The present passive participles οἱ λεγόμενοι and τῆς λεγομένης also indicate that the ethnic/physical descriptions are still "now" employed.
- 400 Caird, 1976:55; Lincoln, 1987:609.
- 401 Abbott, 1897:56; Barth, 1974:254-255.
- 402 *Epanalepsis* is the repetition of a word following a parenthesis. See Quint.Inst.9.3.29; Lausberg, 1960:§§616-618.
- 403 Perhaps in contrast to "made by God" or "not made by hands" (Col.2:11). That circumcision was "made by hands" indicates that it was a physical distinction which in itself did not make Jews superior to Gentiles. Schnackenburg, 1984:477; Schlier, 1957:119.
- 404 Lincoln, 1987:609.
- 405 Repetition of words from the same root but with different endings. Lausberg, 1960:§§640-647.

406 Lona, 1984:258 suggests that 2:11 is a chiasmus:

ὅτι ποτὲ ὑμεῖς τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκὶ	a
οἱ λεγόμενοι ἄκροβυστία	b
ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς	b'
ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου	a'

Although an intriguing idea, and perhaps partially true, full chiasmic order is not consistent, especially because τὰ ἔθνη and χειροποιήτου are not equivalents. The rhetorical features predominate and partial chiasmic structure is secondary. On the larger scale of the whole pericope, the elaborate chiasmus of Kirby, 1968:156 is strained, and the parallels he suggests do not match in every case.

407 Lausberg, 1960:§405.

408 Or *parisoses*. Schnackenburg, 1984:478; see above, section 3.3.4 on 2:2.

409 Rom.3:9-26; Mussner, *Christus* 1968:77; Tachau, 1972:137. Cf. also Eph.2:16; Lincoln, 1987:613; and note 444 below.

410 Mussner, *Christus* 1968:76-79; Schnackenburg, 1982:108; Lona, 1984:261; cf. Lindemann, 1975:147-148.

411 It is possible, however, that the audience was not sufficiently aware of its previous deprivation "apart from Christ" and the rhetoric is attempting to evoke a deeper understanding of it.

412 Schnackenburg, 1984:478 is correct in stating that the semantic colouring provided in the images of 2:12 enhances and clarifies the then/now form.

413 Nor, again, to suggest disunity between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians.

414 Νῦν δέ is in contrast to τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ. Abbott, 1897:59.

415 "...the form [of amplification] which depends on comparison seeks to rise from the less to the greater, since by raising what is below it must necessarily exalt that which is above..." Quint. *Inst.* 8.4.9.

416 Abbott, 1897:60; Robinson, 1903:160; Schlier, 1957:121; Houlden, 1970:289; Barth, 1974:260,278; Stuhlmacher, 1974:347; Caird, 1976:56; Schnackenburg, 1982:111; Bruce, 1984:295; Patzia, 1984:171.

417 Lincoln, 1982:26; Lincoln, 1987:610.

418 Nor do Dan.9:7 and Esther 9:20 as suggested by Schlier, 1957:121.

419 See the discussion and references in Lincoln, 1982:26-28; Lincoln, 1987:610-611; cf. Gnllka, 1971:137.

420 Cf. Eph.1:7.

421 Lincoln, 1987:610; Gnllka, 1971:137.

422 Just as in the author's mind it results in the attitude of worship displayed in 3:1,14. See above, section 3.2.7.

423 See the references in note 382 above.

424 The verses are often treated as a "Fremdkörper", Lindemann, 1975:152. See the references in notes 378-380 above. For connections with Jewish and rabbinical materials see Lincoln, 1982:27-28.

425 Reconciliation and peace in 2:14-18 may be categorized as soteriological rather than merely religious, racial, social, or political because the author of Eph. is fundamentally concerned with an anamnesis of pre-Christian and Christian, i.e., unsaved and saved conditions, not with the disunity of Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians.

426 Cf. Lincoln, 1982:27, who also points to the christological thoughts of vv.14-15: "However, before he introduces what strikes him as a fitting citation he wants to prepare the way for its notion of peace and link it firmly with Christ and what he has accomplished". See also Mussner, Christus 1968:100; Lona, 1984:257; Schnackenburg, 1984:440,481.

427 The arguments over a the existence of a traditional hymnic background are based on various possible reconstructions for which unquestionable, hard evidence is lacking. The issue is thus perhaps impossible to decide definitively. The language may sound more lyrical and poetic than it actually is because of the emotional theme of "peace" and the identification of Christ as peace.

428 Schnackenburg, 1982:112; Schnackenburg, 1984:481.

429 The thematic connection with 4:3 is clear enough. Even if the exhortation to maintain the unity of the faith in the bond of peace is not directly argued or motivated on the basis of the anamnesis of 2:11-22, the author clearly understood that unity and peace are provided by Christ himself.

430 Whether τὴν ἑχθρὰν is to be connected to λύσας or to καταργήσας is a question of debate. Meaning remains the same

regardless of which option is chosen; Robinson, 1903:161; Bruce, 1984:298; cf. Abbott, 1897:61-63.

431 The genitive nominal construction followed by a prepositional phrase with ἐν of this clause is typical of Eph.; cf. 1:17; 2:7,22; 3:4; Merklein, 1973:100.

432 Lausberg, 1960:§§928-934; cf. also Quint. Inst. 9.4.22-23; 9.4.122-127; Arist. Rhet. 3.9.5-7.

434 The various explanations of the meaning of the "dividing wall" are well known. However, it was the Torah and the exclusivism it bred that provided the primary barrier between Jews and Gentiles. See Mussner, Christus 1968:84; Lindemann, 1975:173; Schnackenburg, 1982:114-115; Lincoln, 1987:611-612.

435 In "paratactical order," Barth, 1974:264.

436 Φραγμός is in apposition to τὸ μεσότοιχον, therefore its synonym; Abbott, 1897:61; Houlden, 1970:290; Schnackenburg, 1982:113.

437 Mitton, 1976:106.

438 This same parallelism extends into verse 16 in τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους and ἐνὶ σῶματι.

439 Cf. Lincoln, 1987:612.

440 And thus when those "far" are brought "near" (2:13) they are not "called the circumcision" (2:11), etc., i.e., they do not become Jews, even though the notion of being "apart from Christ" in 2:12 was described partly in terms of separation from Israel.

441 The parallelism of τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους to τὰ ἀμφοτέρα (2:14) and τοὺς δύο (2:15), and the parallelism of ἐν ἐνὶ σῶματι to ἐν (2:14) and ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον have already been noted just above (see also note 438). The change from the neuter τὰ ἀμφοτέρα to the accusative masculine τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους in 2:16 and masculine οἱ ἀμφοτέροι in 2:18 has received differing explanations; Houlden, 1970:291; Lindemann, 1975:175; cf. Abbott, 1897:65.

442 Even though the dative phrase τῷ θεῷ is not preceded by a preposition it does carry the force of a prepositional phrase (cf. Col.1:20).

443 Abbott, 1897:66; Merklein, 1973:97.

444 Lincoln, 1987:613, who also correctly states that verse 16 indicates that Jews were apart from Christ as well as Gentiles, although this is not explicit in the previous verses.

445 Cf. Bruce, 1984:300.

446 Lindemann, 1975:177 describes the progression as: Christ is our peace, 2:14; Christ creates peace, 2:15b; Christ announces peace, 2:17. Cf. Barth, 1974:266. The concern of many commentators to define the precise time Christ made this announcement of peace (Abbott, 1897:66; Schlier, 1957:137-139; Mussner, Christus 1968:101; Gnilka, 1971:146; Fischer, 1973:131f; Lindemann, 1975:176f; Caird, 1976:60; Mitton, 1976:109) is unnecessary. The timing is not part of the author's rhetorical interest. Rather, the various actions of Christ in 2:14-18 are seen together as one package where Christ is the peace-announcer, the peace-bringer, and the embodiment of peace. Cf. Schnackenburg, 1984:483-484; Lincoln, 1987:29-30.

447 A review of the details of how the OT verses are tied together for use in 2:17 is not necessary for our purposes here, but a good review can be found in Lincoln, 1982:27-30.

448 Lincoln, 1982:29.

449 See above, notes 438, 441; Robinson, 1903:162; cf. Schlier,, 1957:139; Lindemann, 1975:179.

450 Houlden, 1970:292.

451 Cf. Rom. 5:1-2.

452 Barth, 1974:26 refers to the several "possessive" statements in Eph. 1:7; 2:18; 3:12.

453 The notion of God as Father (ὁ πατήρ) is an important one to the author as evidenced by its frequent use in Eph. 1:2,3,17; 2:18; 3:14; 4:6; 5:20; 6:23.

454 Lincoln, 1987:613.

455 Houlden, 1970:292.

456 Mussner, Christus 1968:105; Lindemann, 1975:182; Schnackenburg, 1984:485; BDF:§451,2b.

457 Although ἄγιος has been thought to refer to Jews (Barth, 1974:269-270), to Jewish Christians (Caird, 1976:60), or to angels (Schlier, 1957:140-141; Gnilka, 1971:154; Lindemann, 1975:183), the context of Eph. (cf. 1:1,15,18; 3:8,18; 4:12; 5:3; 6:18) demands that the reference be to all Christians. The recipients of Eph. are now fellow citizens with all other Christians. See Abbott, 1897:69; Lincoln, 1987:613-614.

458 Ἐένοχος, according to Abbott, 1897:68, means foreigner or stranger in general, while πάροικος refers to a resident

foreigner who has no rights of citizenship. See also Barth, 1974:268-269.

459 Barth, 1974:269; cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:121.

460 Abbott, 1897:68; Robinson, 1903:163; cf. LXX Ex.2:22, παροικὸς εἶμι ἐν γῆ ἄλλοτρία.

461 Robinson, 1903:163; Caird, 1976:60-61; Schnackenburg, 1982:120.

462 See again the discussion of the rhetorical purpose of Eph. in section 2.4.7 above.

463 On metaphor see Arist.Rhet.3.2.8ff; Quint.Inst.8.6.8.

464 I.e., family members; Abbott, 1897:69.

465 Barth, 1974:270.

466 McKelvey, 1969:116-117; Gnllka, 1971:159.

467 Thus, as Lincoln, 1987:615 states, the audience members "...are to see themselves as being built in Christ into the very place in which God himself is present in the Spirit. In this way...Israel's privileges in proximity to God, historically associated with the Jerusalem temple, have completely faded from view as the focus of attention has become Gentile Christians' role in God's new temple of the end-time, pervaded by the Spirit".

468 In 2:20 the meanings of "the foundation of the apostles and prophets" and of the word ἀπογωνίατος have been knotty issues. Discussion of them is beyond the scope of rhetorical analysis. Rhetorical force would still exist if, say, Christ had been referred to as the foundation (cf. 1Cor.3:11). Whether ἀπογωνίατος means cornerstone or capstone makes no difference to the rhetorical force here; either way Christ is the most significant and visible person in the building construction.

469 McKelvey, 1969:116; Gnllka, 1971:159.

470 Lausberg, 1960:§629.

471 That the growth is ongoing is indicated by the present tenses of ἀύξω and συνοικοδομέω.

472 McKelvey, 1969:116.

473 Cf. the συν- compounds in 2:5-6.

474 Robinson, 1903:166; Lincoln, 1987:609.

- 475 See above, sections 3.1; 3.2.7, with the references in note 139.
- 476 Schnackenburg, 1982:129.
- 477 Many scholars point out the intertextuality between Eph.3:2-13 and Col.1:23-29: Lührmann, 1965:118-120; Gnilka, 1971:166; Merklein Amt, 1973:160; Schnackenburg, 1982:129; Lona, 1984:278; Lindemann, 1985:57.
- 478 Also called *digressus* (Quint.Inst.10.1.49), *egressio*, *egressus* (Quint.Inst.4.3.12). Cf. also Quint.Inst.9.1.28.
- 479 BAG:630.
- 480 Lausberg, 1960:§§340-342.
- 481 In the *exordium* (Lausberg, 1960:§288), the *argumentatio* (§415), and the *peroratio* (§431).
- 482 Lausberg, 1960:§340. *Digressiones* can be inserted at the beginning (§301), middle, or end (§314) of the *narratio*.
- 483 Lausberg, 1960:§342.
- 484 The same purposes presumably apply to *digressiones* in discourses in other genres which are directed to θεῶποι rather than χριῖται.
- 485 Cf. Schlier, 1957:147; Bruce, 1984:311.
- 486 Once again the question of authorship is recognized. However, it is Paul who is named in the passage whether he was the author or the purported author.
- 487 Cf. Barth, 1974:350; Lindemann, 1985:58.
- 488 Schnackenburg, 1982:129.
- 489 Cf. 2:5-6 where συν- compounds occur, but not in reference to relations between Jews and Gentiles.
- 490 Schnackenburg, 1982:132; Lona, 1984:278; cf. Barth, 1974:350-351. The two parts are parallel in that 3:8-12 has a content similar to 3:2-7. Verses 8-12 also act as a continuation of verses 2-7 that presents a new thought.
- 491 On the meaning and usage of εἶ γε see BDF:§439,2; 454; Abbott, 1897:77-78; Robinson, 1903:167; Percy, 1946:343fn6; Schlier,, 1957:147fn6; Merklein, Amt 1973:162,173; Barth, 1974:328; Caragounis, 1977:96-97; Schnackenburg, 1982:132; Lona, 1984:281.

492 Abbott, 1897:78 appears to have the correct idea in saying εἴ γε may be used "...where the writer may be 'practically' certain, but doubt is conceivable". Schnackenburg, 1982:132fn309 also is correct in claiming that εἴ γε is used to signal a reminder about Paul (cf. 4:21).

493 Cf. Robinson, 1903:167; also Merklein Amt, 1973:173.

494 Caragounis, 1977:98.

495 For discussion of the meaning of οἰκονομία see Michel, TDNT V:151-153; Abbott, 1897:79; Mitton, 1951:91-94; Schlier, 1957:148; Reumann, 1966-67:157; Merklein Amt, 1973:173-174; Barth, 1974:328, 358-359; Lona, 1984:281; Schnackenburg, 1982:132.

496 Houlden, 1970:297; Merklein Amt, 1973:174; Lona, 1984:281; *contra* Abbott, 1897:79; Robinson, 1903:167; Schlier, 1957:148.

497 Merklein Amt, 1973:174; Caird, 1976:63; Patzia, 1984:188.

498 Abbott, 1897:79.

499 The participle τῆς δοθείσης may be in the genitive by attraction to χάριτος; cf. Col.1:25, κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι. See Abbott, 1897:79; Caragounis, 1977:98. The genitive endings in the clause also indicate the existence of *homœoptoton*.

500 Lausberg, 1960:§§402-403.

501 Ὅτι is omitted by p⁴⁶ B G and other MSS.

502 Schlier, 1957:148.

503 The preposition κατὰ acts as a modal adverb, that is, it indicates the mode of "making known" and thus focuses attention on the manner of making known rather than on the act of revelation itself. Abbott, 1897:79; Schlier, 1957:148; Caragounis, 1977:99.

504 The purpose of the revelation to Paul was that he would communicate the content of the revelation to others. Schnackenburg, 1982:133.

505 Abbott, 1897:79; Robinson, 1903:167; Percy, 1946:350; Schlier, 1957:149; Gnllka, 1971:164; Barth, 1974:329; van Roon, 1974:84; Caird, 1976:64; Lindemann, 1985:58.

506 Caragounis, 1977:99; Bruce, 1984:412.

507 A summary or recollection intended to refresh the hearers' memory. See the references in note 393 above.

508 The verb ἀναγινώσκω and the noun ἀνάγνωσις refer not only to reading, but to public, vocal reading, and therefore to hearing by an audience. Consequently, the use of the participle ἀναγινώσκοντες in 3:4 does not detract from the contention that Eph. was "heard" by many of its first recipients as a "sermon," rather than only being read. Bultmann, TDNT I:343-344; BAG:51,52; Schlier, 1957:149; Bruce, 1984:312fn16.

509 See above, section 3.3.4 on 2:1-10 and section 3.3.6 on 2:11-22 regarding the then/now motif; Merklein Amt, 1973:164.

510 Schlier, 1957:149; Barth, 1974:331,333; Schnackenburg, 1982:134.

511 The grammatical issues surrounding the words τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις ἐν πνεύματι do not need to be examined here. See Merklein Amt, 1973:187ff; Lincoln, 1982:16-57, and the commentaries. However, surely the function of the statement is explained by the then/now schema where apostles and prophets stand in contrast to "sons of men". Apostles and prophets are simply those through whom the revelation was transmitted.

512 Schlier, 1957:149; Merklein Amt, 1973:164; Barth, 1974:331.

513 The infinitive εἶναι is epexegetical; Abbott, 1897:83; Schlier, 1957:151; Merklein Amt, 1973:170; Lona, 1984:286.

514 The repetition of the same sound in words in close succession. See the references in note 286 above.

515 Similarity of final syllables. See the references in note 286 above.

516 Cf. Houlden, 1970; Merklein Amt, 1973:223.

517 Houlden, 1970:249; Caragounis, 1977:105. It is possible, however, as Schnackenburg, 1982:136fn327 says, to see the second κατὰ clause subordinated to the first, simply underscoring that Paul's ministry was a gift from God.

518 The genitive τῆς δοθείσης agrees with χάριτος, although Ψ and many other MSS read the accusative τὴν δοθεῖσαν in agreement with δωρεάν. The accusative reading would destroy the *homœoptoton*. Cf. 3:2 and note 499 above.

519 See Merklein Amt, 1973:223 ("tautological"); Barth, 1974:338 ("redundant diction").

520 Cf. 3:2 where μοι is placed at the end of the statement concerning the administration of the grace of God given to Paul.

521 Lausberg, 1960:§§820,822; Lanham, 1968:46.

522 Schlier, 1957:152 speaks of the "paradox" of the ministry of preaching being given to the "least". Cf. 1Cor.15:9; 1Tim.1:15; IgTral.13,1.

523 Schnackenburg, 1982:137.

524 The term ἐλαχιστότερος is a combined comparative/superlative form that is perhaps best described by the dissonant sounding "smallestest," "leaster," (Barth, 1974:340), or "lessermost" (Bruce, 1984:317-318fn40). See Schnackenburg, 1982:137; BDF:§§60,2; 61,2.

525 Cf. Abbott, 1957:1897:86; Caragounis, 1977:106; Lona, 1984:292.

526 Cf. Merklein Amt, 1973:176-177.

527 There is some doubt, textually, about the inclusion of πάντας in 3:9; it is omitted in Ψ A 1739 1881 and other MSS. See Metzger, 1971:603. The view that the gospel is for all people is in any case clear from the general context.

528 Schnackenburg, 1982:138; Lindemann, 1985:60.

529 See the discussion on the use of πλοῦτος in section 3.2.7 on 3:16.

530 The adjective ἀνεξιχνίαστος comes from ἵχνος, "footprint" or "track," and thus describes things which cannot be tracked or traced; untrackable, untraceable. Cf. BAG:64; Bruce, 1984:319fn56.

531 The "then" side of the motif appears in verse 9 although the "now" side does not occur until the final clause of verse 10. See below.

532 Schlier, 1957:154-155. But, as has already been indicated, clear evidence of the existence of Gnostic teaching at the time of the composition of Eph. is lacking.

533 In the commentaries and other writings. See Dahl, 1965:63-75; Merklein Amt, 1973:183; Caragounis, 1977:109; Lincoln, 1981:154-155.

534 The ἵνα clause of 3:10 is resultative or final, not consecutive. Schlier, 1957:153; Gnllka, 1971:173-174; Schnackenburg, 1982:141; Lona, 1984:296; Lindemann, 1985:61; cf. Caragounis, 1977:108.

535 Abbott, 1897:88; Lincoln, 1981:154; cf. Patzia, 1984:192-193.

536 The nature of the instrumentality of the church in spreading the message in the cosmos (διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας) is puzzling, but it is perhaps most likely that the church has both an active role of proclamation as well as a passive role of simply existing as a reminder that the mystery has been revealed. Cf. Schlier, 1957:157; Barth, 1974:363-366; Caird, 1976:66-67; Caragounis, 1977:109; Schnackenburg, 1982:141-142.

537 Cf. 3:9; 1:4, 11. Although the genitive τῶν αἰώνων can have meanings other than "from eternity," the notion of God's involvement in salvific planning and activity from "before the foundation of the cosmos" (1:4) suggests the same meaning here. Cf. Robinson, 1903:171; Barth, 1974:345-346; 1Tim. 1:17; Rom. 16:26.

538 ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν is the obvious antecedent of ἐν ᾧ.

539 διὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ is understood as an objective genitive, i.e., "through faith in him". Abbott, 1897:91; Robinson, 1903:173; Bruce, 1984:322.

540 The clause διὸ αὐτοῦμαι μὴ ἐγκακεῖν ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν μου can be interpreted either as "I ask that I not be dismayed by my sufferings," or "I ask that you not be dismayed by my sufferings". Throughout the *digressio*, in fact from 3:1, the concern has been for the recipients understanding of Paul's ministry for them, not for Paul's own peace of mind. The request is therefore that the recipients not lose heart over what has happened to Paul. See Abbott, 1897:91; Schlier, 1957:159; Barth, 1974:348; Patzia, 1984:196.

541 Caragounis, 1977:11 suggests that 3:1 gives the digression its *raison d'être* while 3:13 returns to that *raison* in light of the content of the digression.

542 The διὸ has 3:12 as its nearest referent.

543 See above, section 3.3.8.

544 Indicated by Paul's amazement (3:8) at receiving such grace.

545 The goal of the revelation to Paul, as expressed in Eph., is the reconciliation of Gentiles with Jews through the gospel. Lührmann, 1965:120.

CHAPTER FOUR
THE PARAENESIS 4:1-6:20

4. The Paraenesis 4:1-6:20

The preceding analysis of the *exordium* and *narratio* of Eph. has indicated the rhetorical effect that is operative in the letter. The "sermonic" language of Eph. 1-3 impresses its ideas and themes on the audience members (θεωροί), encouraging them to remember and identify with Christian beliefs and understandings. The "sermon" consequently builds a rapport between author and audience, stimulating the audience members' thoughts and sentiments, and gaining their tacit agreement, resulting in their susceptibility to moral exhortation.

Where, according to the classical rhetorical theory, an *argumentatio* would have been expected, Eph. has the paraenesis or *exhortatio* of chapters 4-6.¹ The *exhortatio* does not contain arguments for behaviour that have a direct basis in the statement of facts (*narratio*). There are, as has been demonstrated, notions in Eph. 1-3 that are in apparent direct contradiction to the moral exhortations of chapters 4-6.² The actual connection between Eph. 1-3 and 4-6 occurs through the rhetorical effect of the *exordium* and the *narratio*. A frame of mind will have been developed among the recipients that should lead them to accept the paraenesis and, it is assumed, to practice the behaviour that it calls for. The recipients are meant to have been so strongly and favourably impressed

with their Christianity as it has been presented in the *exordium* and *narratio* that they may be agreeably inclined toward a call to conduct their lives in a way seen to accord with that presentation. The exhortations have a general sense of moral propriety or rightness about them that induces acceptance of them by sincere Christians. The particle οὖν in 4:1 does not act as a direct causal connector that introduces conclusions, argumentation or proof, but draws on the rhetorical effect of the "sermonic" language of chapters 1-3. The particle serves to mark a continuation³ of the concern for Christian growth and maturity.⁴ The growth and maturity is, in turn, to be given expression in the practice of the behaviour encouraged in the paraenesis. The οὖν makes a general connection indicating transition from language that has emphasized praise of God, the great value of salvation, and reliance on God to provide the things necessary for Christian growth and maturity, to language that is directly hortatory.

The goal of this chapter is to demonstrate that the *exhortatio* presents its own self-contained argumentations that have theological, pragmatic, rhetorical, or social (i.e., church community) foundations. Detailed analysis of the paraenesis is not necessary here, and the chapter will therefore only survey Eph. 4-6, concentrating attention on passages in which supporting argumentation occurs and how it functions.⁵

4.1 The *Exhortatio* 4:1-6:9

4.1.1 Eph. 4:4-6

Although there is a clear thematic continuity of the concept of unity from 2:11-22; 3:2-13, through to 4:1-3(-16),⁶ the appeal for behaviour that is worthy of the calling of God (4:1) and will preserve the "unity of the Spirit" (4:3) is not directly supported by chapters 1-3.⁷ The theological motivation and argumentation for the exhortation of 4:1-3 actually occurs in 4:4-6.⁸ The series of nominative phrases may reflect early confessional forms,⁹ but even if they were not formally confessional they at least represent what would have been recognized as true assertions, thereby reminding the audience of concepts that were foundational to Christian belief and reinforcing them on the mind. The seven units (ἐν σῶμα, ἐν πνεῦμα, μιᾷ ἐλπίς, εἰς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἐν βάπτισμα, εἰς θεός)¹⁰ justify¹¹ and establish¹² the exhortation to maintain unity by simply naming basic factors which, taken together, suggest the unity of the Christian community.¹³ The recipients of Eph. live, as Christians, in somatic (ἐν σῶμα) and pneumatic (ἐν πνεῦμα) unity¹⁴ in regard to the one hope of their calling. This unity has been expressed in their recognition of one Lord, of one faith (i.e., faith in Christ, 1:13), and in their one baptism.¹⁵ All of this is grounded in the existence of one, all-pervasive God (4:6).¹⁶

These verses also have significant rhetorical force.¹⁷ The reiteration or *anaphora* of ἐν in verse 4a, and the repetition of the word "one" whether in masculine, feminine, or neuter gender to describe the seven units, have strong persuasive and pathetic (*pathos*) effects. The *conduplicatio* of πᾶς forms in 4:6 (εἰς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν) strongly accents the transcendence, pervasiveness, and immanence of God. The asyndeton of the units forces each nominative expression to stand boldly and clearly on its own. The rhetorical effect adds appreciably to the foundation verses 4-6 give to the behavioral appeal in 4:1-3.

4.1.2 Eph. 4:7-11

These verse are notoriously difficult.¹⁸ The problems centre on the reference to LXX Ps. 67:18 (4:8) and on the meaning of the descent of Christ (4:9-10).¹⁹ Regardless of the difficulties, however, the practical function of 4:7-11 is to provide a theological foundation for the employment of the "gifts" given to Christians (4:7), the gifts delineated being specific ministers (4:11) who are given with a view to the goal of growth and maturity in unity (4:12-16). Verse 7 begins, and verse 11 continues, the emphasis on the giving of gifts.²⁰ The intervening verses (8-10) provide a scriptural explanation of the source and bestowal of the gifts, based on a reference to LXX Psalm 67:18. The giver of gifts is the ascended Christ; he ascended in order to fill the cosmos.²¹

It is clear that the author finds support for the concern for the growth and maturity in unity of the church community in the Christ-provided gifts. Theologically, these verses provide a solid basis for the giving of gifts in the ascended Christ. Rhetorically the verses are persuasive because the audience members, having strong faith in Christ (cf. 1:13,15), would be receptive to the gifts and would tend to be agreeable to movement toward the goals of 4:12-16.

4.1.3 Eph. 4:20-21

Following the exhortation to refrain from the lifestyle of the Gentiles (μηκέτι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ, 4:17-19)²² is the strong contrastive statement "But you did not so learn Christ" (ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν, 4:20). This statement gives the argumentative foundation for the exhortation. By asserting that the audience members had "not so learned Christ" the author implies that the principles of Christian ethics are precisely the opposite²³ of those of the "Gentile" way of life that is characterized by futility (ματαιότης), by being darkened (σκοτώω), by being separated from the life of God (ἀπολλητριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ), and by immoral practices. The statement of verse 20, together with verse 21, assumes that the recipients have already received instruction about Christian behaviour²⁴ and should know that the way of life described in 4:17-19 is unacceptable.²⁵ The expression ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν has no

parallel in the NT.²⁶ Precisely how the words "learn Christ" are to be understood is perhaps uncertain,²⁷ but their force is clear: the "Gentile" lifestyle described in 4:17-19 is unacceptable for those who are now Christians. The argumentative force is essentially rhetorical in nature. The statement of 4:20 prompts the response "No, we did not," and the εἰ γε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε κτλ. of 4:21 implies the audience response "Yes, we heard and learned". This rhetoric presses home the conviction that living as the "Gentiles" should not even be considered by the audience members.

4.1.4 Eph. 4:25-5:2

This pericope contains both direct, implicit, and rhetorical argumentation to support its exhortations. The exhortations amount to moral commonplaces that are employed here to support community and social interactions among the Christian audience members. The directive to "put off falsehood and speak truth" (4:25) is motivated by the practical sounding assertion "because we are members of one another" (ὅτι ἕσμεν ἀλλήλων μέλη). This is a specifically Christian foundation for the exhortation,²⁸ for it is Christians who are considered to be "members" together of the saved community.²⁹ Membership in the community implies an attitude toward other people that precludes lying.³⁰ Exhortations against excessive or unjustified anger as in 4:26 were well known in the ancient Mediterranean world,³¹ as were, apparently, supporting sayings

like "Do not let the sun set on your anger".³² This saying, together with the following "give no place to the devil" (4:27) provides implicit and rhetorical support for being angry without sin by suggesting that prolonged anger is wrong and may be an area that allows one to be susceptible to potential evil. The exhortation to "labour" (κοπιᾶτω, 4:28) rather than steal is undergirded by the possibility of active service to persons in need (ἵνα ἔχη μεταδιδόναι τῷ χρείαν ἔχοντι). Labour was widely promoted as being beneficial to both labourers and those affected by the labour of others.³³ The ἵνα clause of 4:29 corresponds with and complements the ἵνα clause of 4:28.³⁴ Whether by personal labour (4:28) or by edifying speech (4:29), Christians are encouraged to behave in ways that "give" (μεταδίδωμι, 4:28; δίδωμι, 4:29) benefits to other persons. The author's concern is to exhort the audience to do things that build up rather than undermine human relationships.³⁵

The recipients are not to grieve the Holy Spirit (καὶ μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἔσφραγίσθητε εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως, 4:30). Just how this verse is to be connected to the preceding exhortations is difficult to say with certainty.³⁶ The argument of the verse, however, resides in the clear but implicit suggestion that grieving the Holy Spirit is wrong. Since the Holy Spirit is the divine power closely involved with salvation as the one in whom Christians

are sealed (cf. 1:13-14), behaviour causing distress (λυπή) to the Holy Spirit is considered to be immoral.

In 4:32 and 5:2 motivation for the moral qualities of kindness, compassion, forgiveness (4:32, in contrast to the negative behaviour of 4:31), and love (5:2) is based on what has already been done for Christians. The καθώς clauses (καθώς ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν, 4:32; καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, κτλ., 5:2)³⁷ speak of the forgiveness and love that the recipients know have already been granted to them.³⁸ Christians are to practice forgiveness (along with the near relatives of forgiveness, viz. kindness and compassion) because they have been forgiven,³⁹ and are to love because they have been loved. The verses thus argue for conformity with the actions of God (4:32) and Christ (5:2)⁴⁰ on the theological ground of the salvific activity of God and Christ.⁴¹

4.1.5 Eph. 5:3-14

Most of 5:3-14 is comprised of motivations or actual argumentation. Exhortations occur in 5:3a, 4a, 6a, 7, 11, while arguments supporting the behaviour that is encouraged are found in 5:3b, 4bc, 5, 6b, 8-10, 12-14. The audience members are exhorted to refuse participation in various sins that are practiced by non-Christians (cf. 5:7).⁴² The exhortations are a continuation of the directives that began

in 4:25.⁴³ The motivations for abstention from the vices listed in 5:3-4 are a practical appeal to the recipients' consciousness of proper Christian behaviour (καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις, 5:3; ἃ οὐκ ἀνήκεν, 5:4).⁴⁴ The author assumes that the "saints" being addressed are aware that the behaviour being castigated is inappropriate, and, consequently, does not add an explanation of why such conduct is unacceptable.⁴⁵ What is added is the positive encouragement to be thankful (ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία, 5:4c); this line enhances the prohibition against sins of language (ἀίσχροτης, μωρολογία, εὐτραπεία), and therefore supports the motivation, by offering a positive alternative.⁴⁶

Explicated argument does occur, however, in 5:5-6. Many scholars have interpreted 5:5 as an indication that participation in the sins of fornication, uncleanness and covetousness will disqualify Christians from their inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God.⁴⁷ No such threat of potential judgment is here given to Christians, however, nor does it occur in 5:6 where the "sons of disobedience" are non-Christians;⁴⁸ they are the "them" (αὐτῶν) with whom the audience members who are "now light" (νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ, 5:8) are not to become participants (5:7).⁴⁹ The argument of 5:5-6 is against participation in the evil activities of those who are without inheritance in the kingdom and are "sons of disobedience" and turns on the contrast of behaviour that is

"proper" and "fitting" with the conduct of those who are not members of the Christian community.⁵⁰

The argumentation against becoming participants with "them" (μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε συμμετοχοὶ αὐτῶν, 5:7) employs the familiar "then"/"now" schema (5:8-10),⁵¹ and is tied closely to the exhortations by the γάρ in 5:8.⁵² While it has been quite common to associate 5:8-14 either wholly or in part with a perceived baptismal liturgy,⁵³ baptism is not explicit, is perhaps not in the author's mind at all, and is at best only alluded to by the imagery employed in the verses, particularly 5:14.⁵⁴ The thrust and function of the verses remain the same whether or not baptism is actually in view. The argumentation is quite straightforward: formerly ("then", ποτέ) the audience members were darkness, "now" (νῦν) they are light in the Lord; consequently they should behave as "children of light" (τέκνα φωτός).⁵⁵ The darkness/light imagery obviously portrays the evil/good, vice/virtue, pre-Christian/Christian contrasts.⁵⁶ Those who are now light (i.e., Christians) will seek to do what is pleasing to the Lord (δοκιμάζοντες τί ἐστὶν εὐάρεστον τῷ κυρίῳ, 5:10),⁵⁷ and the "fruit" which they as light produce (ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός, 5:9) is goodness (ἀγαθωσύνη), righteousness (δικαιοσύνη), and truth (ἀληθεία). Existence as light is directly connected with behaviour.⁵⁸ To exist as light is to be a saved and morally virtuous person. The author draws upon the then/now schema and the familiar "darkness"/"light" contrast to demonstrate to the audience

members that as light they must not participate in the activities of those who are still in darkness.⁵⁹

The darkness/light imagery continues in 5:11-14, with verse 11 exhorting against fellowship with (μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε) the unfruitful works of darkness (cf. 5:9) followed by the directive to expose them. The supporting argumentation in 5:12-14 is connected to the exhortation by γάρ (5:12,14; cf. 5:8) and δέ (5:13). The essential argumentation of 5:12 is the assertion that it is shameful even to mention the works of darkness (αἰσχρὸν ἔστιν καὶ λέγειν).⁶⁰ The directive to expose evil practices (5:11b) is undergirded in 5:13-14a by the assertion that everything (τὰ πάντα, 5:13; πᾶν, 5:14a) so exposed is illuminated and becomes light.⁶¹ The (evangelistic⁶²) value of exposing darkness to light is justified by the resultant increase of light.

The hymnic/poetic lines of 5:14b come from an unknown source.⁶³ The words amount to a "wake up call" ("Weckruf")⁶⁴ followed by the assertion that Christ shines on those who have woken and risen from death. The hymnic passage closes the darkness/light contrast schema that began in verse 8. The language has affinities with 5:13-14a by alluding to the power of light as a benefit to those on whom it shines. The christological motivation to "sleepers" and "dead persons" (cf. 2:1,5) is clear: they should rouse themselves and receive the benefits of being shone upon by Christ. The hymn also

makes clear that Christ is the force behind the illumination (καὶ ἐπιφάσει σοι ὁ Χριστός).⁶⁵ The argument of 5:14b follows on from verses 13 and 14a. That those who are exposed to light are illuminated and become light themselves is supported (διὸ λέγει) by the hymn/poem because it exhorts people to let Christ illuminate them and transform them into light. The hymn/poem reminds those who are already believers of the illumination that has occurred in their lives. This will lead to a sense of identification on the part of the recipients with light and its connotations and ramifications in 5:8-14. In this way the darkness/light contrast and the claims for the effect of light are supported by what was probably a familiar quotation.

4.1.6 Eph. 5:15-21

Perhaps the greatest exegetical difficulty in this pericope is determining whether to include 5:21 with 5:15-20 or to place it with the Haupttafel commencing at 5:22.⁶⁶ The participle ὑποτασσόμενοι appears to be dependent on the imperative πληροῦσθε in 5:18 as are the participles λαλοῦντες (5:19), ἄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες (5:19) and εὐχαριστοῦντες (5:20),⁶⁷ although many have argued that ὑποτασσόμενοι functions here as an independent imperative.⁶⁸ Verse 22 does not have a verbal form and clearly relies on ὑποτασσόμενοι.⁶⁹ It may be most appropriate to treat 5:21 as a transitional statement that is tied with the exhortations of 5:15-20 and with the

Haustafel.⁷¹ It is treated here with verses 15-20 because of its grammatical connections, but with full recognition of the obvious links to the subsequent verses.⁷²

The argumentation presented in the passage is rhetorical and based on contrast and on pragmatic perceptions. The contrast schema employing μή/ἀλλά is used three times (5:15,17,18).⁷² This antithesis appeals to the pragmatic and "common sense" understanding of the audience members by stirring up their perceptions of the moral categories of right and wrong, good and evil:⁷³ behave not as unwise, but as wise (5:15); not as fools, but as those who understand the Lord's will (5:17); not in the debauchery of drunkenness, but as those who are filled with the Spirit (5:18). These antitheses make a rhetorical appeal by impressing the audience members with the total unsuitability of the immoral activities and the appropriateness of wisdom, of understanding the Lord's will, and of being filled with the Holy Spirit. As Christians they have a stake in moral actions because they are morally right and good, thus in accord with those who are "now light" (cf. 5:8)⁷⁴ The consequences of wise behaviour and of having been filled with the Holy Spirit are the activities of "speaking to each other" (λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς, 5:19), "singing and making melody" (ᾄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες, 5:19), "thanksgiving" (εὐχαριστοῦντες, 5:20) and "submitting to one another" (ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις, 5:21). None would argue that such behaviour is wrong.

Explicit motivation for the behaviour encouraged occurs in the ὅτι clause of 5:16 (ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραὶ εἰσιν).⁷⁵ This clause is governed by the exhortation to "walk carefully" (5:15a), since the participle ἐξαγοραζόμενοι (5:16a) is dependent on the verb "walk" (περιπατέω) in verse 15a.⁷⁶ The following clause (διὰ τοῦτο μὴ γίνεσθε ἄφρονες, 5:17a) is supported by the ὅτι clause. Consequently, the words "because the days are evil" provide support for all the exhortations of 5:15-17.

In verse 18 implicit argumentation against becoming intoxicated with wine is given in the words ἐν ᾧ ἔστιν ἄσωτία. The clear implication is that drunkenness is immoral because it leads to "debauchery" (ἄσωτία).

4.1.7 The Haustafel 5:22-6:9

Much has been written on the Ephesians Haustafel and on the phenomenon of Haustafeln more generally.⁷⁷ It seems clear that the NT Haustafeln (Eph. 5:22-6:9; Col. 3:18-4:1; cf. 1Pet. 2:13-3:7) have taken over and adapted to Christian, pastoral purposes forms that had been widely used in the ancient Mediterranean world.⁷⁸ The Eph. pericope has obvious affinities with Col. 3:18-4:1, but with an expansion and deepening of thought and meaning.⁷⁹ The purpose of the Haustafel in Eph. is to explain and exemplify how the desired

growth and maturity should be expressed behaviorally in specific Christian relationships.⁸⁰

4.1.7.1 Wives and Husbands 5:22-33

The argumentation supporting the directives to husbands and wives is founded on christological, ecclesiological, rhetorical and pragmatic concepts.⁸¹ The description of the relationship of Christ to the church is so strong in 5:22-33⁸² that some have thought that the theology of motivation for that relationship predominates over the exhortations.⁸³ The primary concern of the author, however, is the role of Christian wives and husbands within the marriage relationship. The exhortations to wives and husbands are alternated with supporting argument based on the relationship of Christ and the church.⁸⁴

The argumentation springs, initially, from the encouragement of mutual submission in 5:21, ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ.⁸⁵ One of the motivations for the submission of wives to husbands lies in the phrase ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ (5:22; cf. 6:5).⁸⁶ This statement serves to remind wives⁸⁷ of their relationship to Christ. This relationship is illustrated and clarified in verses 23-24: since Christ is the head of the church and the saviour of the body,⁸⁸ and the husband is the head of the wife in an analogous way, wives should submit to their own husbands in the way in which the church submits to Christ. The

christological and ecclesiological connections are explicit. What is not explicit is the rhetorical/persuasive effect that encourages acceptance and practice of the exhortation through the recognition by wives of their agreement with the assertions.

The motivation for husbands to love their wives is grounded (5:25b) in an analogy that reminds husbands of the loving action of Christ and their relationship to Christ's love as members of the church community (καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς). Christ loved and gave to the ultimate point (it is implied) of death for the benefit of the church and for salvation (αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος, 5:23); the benefits extend, obviously, to Christian husbands. Husbands should therefore be encouraged to love in the same way and give to the same extent. Verses 26-27 are not included in the essential argumentation, but express additional descriptions of the purpose and results of Christ's actions in support of the argument.⁸⁹ Exhortation occurs in 5:28 where Christian husbands are for the second time directed to love their wives. Here, however, the supporting argumentation is based on the husbands' practical concern for themselves (5:28b-29b) followed by further reference to Christ's actions on behalf of the church (5:29c-30). Husbands are to love their wives "as their own bodies" (ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα, 5:29). This very practical reasoning appeals to the normal concern of people for the care of their own bodies.

The rhetorical power of this argument lies in its simple ability to elicit understanding and concurrence.⁹⁰ The christological element is added in 5:29c, stating that Christ has treated the church in the same way that husbands should treat their wives. Christian husbands should so love their wives because they are (together with their Christian wives) members of the body that Christ has "loved," "nourished" (ἐκτρέφω, 5:29) and "cherished" (θάλπω, 5:29).⁹¹

The thoughts of 5:28-30 are oriented toward and perhaps prompt the quotation of Gn. 2:24 cited in 5:31.⁹² The quotation acts as a foundation for and confirmation of the assertion that husbands love their wives as their own bodies because it states that marriage partners are in fact "one flesh" (καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν).⁹³ The reference to Genesis is thus to be understood as part of the supporting argumentation.

4.1.7.2 Children and Fathers 6:1-4

When children (τέχνα)⁹⁴ are directed to obey their parents (ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῦσιν ὑμῶν, 6:1) the exhortation is based on the general ethical argument "for this is right" (τοῦτο γὰρ ἔστιν δίκαιον).⁹⁵ This pragmatic⁹⁶ argument is of the same kind as that found in 5:3-4 (καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις; & οὐκ ἀνήκεν) in that it appeals to the recipients' (in this case children's) consciousness of what is morally acceptable.⁹⁷ This consciousness is supported by the quotation of the fifth

commandment (Dt. 5:16; Ex. 20:12) including the command's further role as the first given with promise.⁹⁸ The force of the quotation occurs in the way in which it confirms the assertion that obeying parents is "right" by referring to what was perceived to be a God-given injunction.

The exhortation to fathers (6:4) is a positive continuation of the directive to children (6:1). While the motivation of 6:1 ("for this is right") is not explicitly repeated, there can be no doubt that fathers are being exhorted to treat their children in a manner that is "right".⁹⁹ The μή/ἀλλά schema of the verse reinforces the exhortation by implicitly indicating that provoking anger (παροργίζω) in children is wrong, while nurturing (ἐκτρέφω) them is right. Fathers are encouraged to practice what are already known, "right" approaches to child-rearing.

4.1.7.3 Slaves and Masters 6:5-9

Slaves are directed to "obey" (ὑπακούω) their masters with fear and trembling and with sincerity of heart (6:5). The argumentation, like that already seen in 5:22,25,29, is founded on the relationship of Christian slaves to Christ (ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ). Potentially undesirable or unpleasant circumstances are no excuse for behaviour that does not accord with the relationship of Christian slaves to Christ. The μή/ἀλλά format of 6:6 adds to the argument by directing

Christian slaves to behave as slaves of Christ (ὡς δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ) who do God's will (which here is to be obedient slaves) and do not practice the insincerity of "eye-service" and "person-pleasing". A variation of the same argumentation occurs in 6:7b (ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις).¹⁰⁰

A strong motivation for the behaviour of both slaves and masters is found in the two statements beginning with εἰδότες ὅτι in 6:8,9.¹⁰¹ Both parties in the Christian master/slave relationship "know that" the Lord (Christ) is the ultimate authority (cf. 1:21-22), will reward those who "do good," and is Lord of both master and slave without prejudice. They should, therefore, act from this understanding.¹⁰² The argument, succinctly, is that Christ is lord of all, and every action in the master/slave relationship should be done with the connection of both parties to Christ fully in mind.

4.2 The *Peroratio* 6:10-20

Only brief comments on the *peroratio* are requisite here. The role of a *peroratio*, according to the rhetors, is to conclude an oration by refreshing the memory and influencing the emotions (Arist. Rhet. 3.19.1-6; Quint. Inst. 6.1.1; Rhet. ad Her. 2.30.47).¹⁰³ Aristotle (Rhet. 3.19.1-5) speaks of two kinds of *peroratio*, those which deal with the facts of a case and those which deal with the emotional aspects of a case.¹⁰⁴ Quintilian suggests that "...we may give full rein to our

emotions..." (Inst. 4.1.28; cf. 6.1.9-10) and "...let loose the whole torrent of our eloquence" (Inst. 6.1.51) in the peroration.¹⁰⁵

Eph. 6:10-20 sets itself off as the *peroratio* of the "sermon" with the words τοῦ λοιποῦ.¹⁰⁶ The author's major concluding wishes are expressed in 6:10-11 by the imperative forms ἐνδυναμοῦσθε and ἐνδύσασθε that exhort the audience members to action in view of the battle between the forces of good and evil (6:12-13).¹⁰⁷ The audience members must become conscious of the conflict between themselves and evil powers.¹⁰⁸ These verses expand the horizon¹⁰⁹ of, and therefore amplify (Arist. Rhet. 3.9.1; Rhet ad Her. 2.20.47-49), the paraenesis by directing the thoughts of the recipients beyond the level of behaviour in their human relationships with Christians or non-Christians to behaviour vis-à-vis evil cosmic powers. There is a thematic continuum of the concept of power in 6:10 (ἐνδυναμοῦσθε ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ) with that already observed in 1:19b-22 and 3:16.¹¹⁰ It is clear that strength is "in the Lord," that is, the power needed to fight the battle comes from outside the believer. This is consistent with what has been asserted about the source of strengthening earlier in Eph. (1:19a; 3:16,18). Only reliance on the Lord's power (as exemplified in putting on the armour, 6:14-17) will result in a successful stand against the enemy. Although 6:10-20 does not refresh the memory by presenting a clear recapitulation of what has already been stated or argued

in Eph., it does serve to maintain the impression that Christian strength and maturity are critical commodities in view of the struggle against evil powers. The exhortations to "be strong in the Lord" and "put on the armour of God" are tied directly to fundamental Christian conceptions as delineated in the metaphorical armour: "truth," "righteousness" (6:14), "the gospel of peace" (6:15), "faith" (6:16), "salvation," and "the word of God" (6:17).¹¹¹

The *peroratio* brings Eph. to an emotional climax in its vivid description of the ultimate battle that will require the strength of Christian maturity implied by the employment of the armour of God (πανοπλία, 6:11,13). The imagery of the metaphorical implements of war is impressive. By taking up this armour and making a "stand" (ἵστημι, ἀνίστημι, 6:11,13) Christians behave in a manner that is opposed to the evil powers (cf. 2:2-3), and (by implication) are fully protected against defeat. Heeding the exhortation to "put on the panoply of God" is to appropriate the armaments that have provided victory over the powers. Behaviour, consequently, will result in invincible strength.

These concluding verses serve as an effective peroration to Eph. because they focus Christian attention and behaviour on the crucial and emotional struggle against the forces that had formerly led the recipients to sin and ensuing death (2:1-3). The *peroratio* draws the audience members into action that is

surrounded by *pathos*, and that results in a firm stand against the strikingly described rulers, authorities, cosmocrators of this darkness, and the evil spirits in the heavenlies (6:12). The θεῶποι will be persuaded emotionally by the dramatic war imagery to don the πανοπλία and become effective combatants.

4.3 Summary

The paraenesis of Eph. presents its own, self-contained supporting argumentation. The moral exhortations are not directly founded or given explication on the basis of the theological presentation of chapters 1-3.¹¹² The *exhortatio* functions as the call to practical application of the author's concerns for the growth and maturity of the audience. It in no way serves as an *argumentatio* validating the narrative of chapters 1-3. Rather, it calls for specific conduct from its audience, given that the audience has been persuaded to have a frame of mind ready to appropriate the exhortations.

ENDNOTES

- 1 See the discussion of this point in section 2.4.8.
- 2 See the discussion in chapter 1.
- 3 Cf. BDF §451; BAG:597. οὐὐ does not always indicate causal connection, frequently showing continuation of thought, thus meaning "so" or "so then". Barth, 1974:426 notes that while οὐὐ can emphasize "...the logical dependence of ethical advice upon the preceding doctrinal statements," Eph. is different: "However, the content of Eph. 1-3 is doxological rather than dogmatic. The direct connection of the ethical chapters 4-6 with the praise of God rather than with a doctrine of God is a specific feature of Ephesians".
- 4 See, again, the discussion of the purpose of Eph. in section 2.4.7.
- 5 Moral exhortation was well-known in ancient times. Discussions of proper behaviour were frequent in Hellenistic and Jewish literature, and there are many affinities between non-Christian material on ethics and Eph. and other NT documents. For discussion and references see especially Malherbe, 1986:*passim* and Meeks, 1986:*passim*; but also see Easton, 1932:1-12; Vögtle, 1936; Wibbing, 1959; Schrage, 1961; Kamlah, 1964; Gnilka, 1970:392-410; Schweizer, 1977:397-413.
- 6 As has been frequently pointed out, although some scholars have wrongly claimed that 4:1-16 has a direct basis in the notion of unity in 2:11-22, based on the assumption that Eph. as a whole is primarily concerned with church unity. See Schlier, 1957:178; Houlden, 1970:307; Barth, 1974:426; Mussner, 1974:325-336; Caird, 1976:70-71; Merklein, 1981:194,210; Bruce, 1984:333; Patzia, 1984:205. See also the references to thematic links between Eph.1-3 and 4-6 in section 1.2 above.
- 7 Although the "calling" of God (4:1,4) clearly relates to the author's wish stated in 1:18 that the audience members understand "the hope of his calling".
- 8 Schlier, 1957:186-187; Gnilka, 1971:200; Wengst, 1972:141; Barth, 1974:463; Ridderbos, 1975:378; Schnackenburg, 1982:162.
- 9 Schlier, 1957:185-186; Bjerkelund, 1967:187; Barth, 1974:429,462-472; Bruce, 1984:335-336; for opposing views see Wengst, 1972:141; Caird, 1976:72; Schnackenburg, 1982:162. The primary objection to the whole of 4:4-6 being a confessional form is the discordant καὶ ὡς clause in verse 4b. It is possible, however, that the rest of the verses have some background in confessional form(s) as an εἰς acclamation. See also Dibelius, 1956:14-29.

- 10 Although scholars have often spoken of a seven-membered unity formula, it is evident that the actual structure of 4:4-6 is comprised of two units (ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεύμα) and four units (εἰς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἐν βάπτισμα, εἰς θεός) with the καθώς clause (μία ἔλπις) as a parenthesis between them. See Dahl, 1945:85-103; Bjerkelund, 1967:186-187. The καθώς clause is intended to complement the first two units.
- 11 Schlier, 1957:186.
- 12 Gnllka, 1971:200.
- 13 Hanson, 1946:151 says that 4:4-6 is not just a repetition of a confession, but "It is argumentative, didactic, parenetic. In other words it is a diatribe, not an acclamation. As a result of this, the problem of the relation between v.3 and the formula of unity in v.4-6 is solved. The author admonishes the congregation to keep the unity of the Spirit (v.3) and after that he enumerates his arguments: 'It is, you know, one body...'. "
- 14 Schlier, 1957:187. Somatic unity has already been suggested in 1:22-23; 2:16, and pneumatic unity in 1:13; 2:18,22 and in 4:3 where unity is from the Spirit (ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος, genitive of origin).
- 15 Cf. Schlier, 1957:187.
- 16 Cf. Barth, 1974:465-466.
- 17 Schlier, 1957:186. Schlier also refers to "einem gewissen psychologischen Zwang" (p.185). Cf. Barth, 1974:429,467; Nieder, 1956:96-98.
- 18 Schnackenburg, 1982:173 says that this passage "...ist einer der dichtesten, auch schwierigsten und problemreichsten Abschnitte des ganzen Schreibens".
- 19 For discussion of the issues see the various commentaries and Caird, 1964:535-545; Rubinkiewicz, 1975:219-224; Smith, 1975:181-189; McNamara, 1976:80f; Lincoln, 1981:155-163; Lincoln, 1982:18-25.
- 20 Cf. Caird, 1976:73; Lincoln, 1981:156; Lincoln, 1982:18.
- 21 Indicated by the purpose clause ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα.
- 22 Reference to τὰ ἔθνη in 4:17 is obviously exclusive of the Gentile audience of Eph. as the second person pronoun contrasted with third person forms demonstrates. "Gentiles" here are those who are in the unsaved state (ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ, 4:18).
- 23 Houlden, 1970:318.

24 That they have already "learned" is demonstrated by the aorist form ἐμάθετε. That they have "heard" and "been taught" is assumed in 4:21 by the aorist verbs and by the expression εἰ γε (see the comments and notes on εἰ γε in 3:2 in section 3.3.6.2 above). Cf. the comments of Ridderbos, 1975:240; Caird, 1976:81; Schnackenburg, 1982:203.

25 The aorist infinitives ἀποθέσθαι (4:22) and ἐνδύσασθαι (4:24) should be taken as epexegetic, referring to the teaching that the recipients had encountered at some earlier time. What they had "learned," "heard" and "been taught" previous to receiving Eph. was "to put off the old person" and "put on the new person" (but contrast the language of 2:10). See Abbott, 1897:136; Robinson, 1903:190; Houlden, 1970:318.

26 Abbott, 1897:134; Robinson, 1903:190; Caird, 1976:80; Schnackenburg, 1982:202; Lindemann, 1985:85.

27 Does it mean "you learned from Christ," "you learned about Christ," "you learned concerning Christ" or "you learned Christ himself"? In what way is Christ "learned" directly or personally? See Abbott, 1897:134-135; Schlier, 1957:216; Gnllka, 1971:226; Schnackenburg, 1982:203; cf. Col. 2:6. Ridderbos, 1975:436 submits that "learned" is equivalent to "received" (παραλαμβάνω) in Col. 2:6, and as such is "...a *terminus technicus* for the acceptance of the authoritative apostolic tradition concerning Christ (1 Cor. 11:23; 15:1,3; Gal. 1:9; Phil. 4:9; Col. 2:6; 1 Thess. 2:13; 4:1; 2 Thess. 3:6)." Cf. also Lindemann, 1985:85 who suggests that "learned" is a sort of catchword for the reception of early missionary preaching.

28 Halter, 1977:258.

29 Cf. Rom. 12:4-5; 1 Cor. 12:12-27; Eph. 2:19-22; 3:6; 5:30; see Nieder, 1956:78.

30 Cf. Gnllka, 1971:239; Schnackenburg, 1982:211.

31 See Malherbe, 1986:157-158.

32 Cf. Plutarch, *De Fraternal Amore* (Περὶ φιλαδελφίας), 478A-492A, especially 488B: "We should next pattern ourselves after the Pythagoreans, who, though related not at all by birth, yet sharing a common discipline, if ever they were led by anger into recrimination, never let the sun go down before they joined right hands, embraced each other and were reconciled".

33 Malherbe, 1986:151-152; cf. Nieder, 1956:79-81; Acts 20:35-35; 1 Thess. 2:9; 4:11-12; 2 Thess. 3:6-10; Did. 4:5-8.

34 Schnackenburg, 1982:213.

35 Halter, 1977:260 speaks of these exhortations (4:25-29) as being self-understood ("selbstverständlichen Mahnungen"). Stating them, however, is not without object as is evident in the general concern for edification shown in the ὅτι clause of 4:25 and the ἵνα clauses 4:28-29. This, of course, accords with the rhetorical purpose of Eph. to promote Christian growth and maturity that is expressed behaviorally. Cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:213.

36 Grieving the Holy Spirit may be connected to the use of λόγος σαπρός (4:29; Abbott, 1897:144; Bruce, 1984:363), or to anything that does not edify (4:25-29; Robinson, 1903:194; cf. Bruce, 1984:363; Barth, 1974:548).

37 A similar καθώς clause is found in 5:25; Robinson, 1903:196; Gnllka, 1971:244; cf. Col. 3:12-13.

38 Schnackenburg, 1982:215. The exhortations to become "imitators of God" and to "walk in love" appear to be a development of the exhortations to be kind, compassionate, and forgiving, "just as God in Christ forgave you," through the γίνεσθε οὖν at the beginning of 5:1. Cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:217.

39 There is an obvious paronomasia on the two forms of χαρίζομαι cognates: γίνεσθε δὲ...χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς, καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἔχαρίσατο ὑμῖν.

40 Schrage, 1988:245.

41 That the verses refer to the saving acts of God and Christ is evident in 4:32 through the words ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἔχαρίσατο, and in 5:2 by the oblique reference to the death of Christ: παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας. See Nieder, 1956:45.

42 The audience members are described in this passage as "saints" (ἅγιοι, 5:3), as "light" (φῶς, 5:8), and are to behave as "children of light" (ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε, 5:8). This is in contrast to those who are outside the kingdom of Christ and God (5:5). They are described as the "sons of disobedience" (5:6), as "darkness" (5:8), and as asleep and dead (5:14). Cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:220; Schrage, 1988:247.

43 The word δέ in 5:3 is consecutive, not contrastive.

44 Schnackenburg, 1982:223; cf. 1 Thess. 4:3-7. Nieder, 1956:159 notes that the motives given in 5:3-4 are also found in Stoic ethics and in popular philosophy.

45 Gnllka, 1971:246 explains that the exhortation of 5:3 is grounded in the fact that Christians are "saints," i.e., they are holy and should therefore behave in accord with holiness. Halter, 1977:269-270, who has attempted to connect ethics

closely with baptism, claims that the moral demand of these verses is based on baptism, that is, that it is not right for Christians to practice the vices because they (Christians) have been sanctified in baptism. This surely presses the words of 5:3-4 much too far. Even if, as some contend (see the discussion below), 5:8-14 alludes to baptism, it is too big a step to read it into the words of 5:3-4 and see it as the basis for abstaining from the vices.

46 There is a word play (paronomasia) in the like-sounding and contrasting words εὐτραπεία and εὐχαριστία. Robinson, 1903:116; Scott, 1930:226; Caird, 1976:84.

47 Robinson, 1903:116; Barth, 1974:564; Caird, 1976:83 (but cf. p. 85); Halter, 1977:272-273,280.

48 Christians are those who have been adopted and possess an inheritance (1:5,11). The audience members were formerly ("then") the sons of disobedience (2:2), but are now alive with Christ in heaven (2:5-6).

49 The pronoun αὐτῶν may be understood as referring to the persons who practice the vices or to the vices themselves. Cf. Abbott, 1897:152; Schlier, 1957:236; Barth, 1974:566-567; Schnackenburg, 1982:226. Since 5:5-6, containing the nearest antecedents, have the persons primarily in view it is most likely that 5:7 speaks of refusing to participate with the persons, not simply in the vices alone. Cf. also the word αὐτῶν in 5:12.

50 Engberg-Pedersen, 1989:89. Abbott, 1897:151-152 and Barth, 1974:565-566 say that those who deceive with empty words (5:6) would have been persons within the Christian community. This view, however, does not accord with the reference to "them" (αὐτῶν) in 5:7, nor with the assertion that the recipients are no longer darkness (5:8).

51 Schnackenburg, 1952:161; Schnackenburg, 1982:226. See section 3.3.4 on 2:1-10 and 3.3.5 on 2:11-22 on the use of the then/now, ποτέ/νῦν motif.

52 Schnackenburg, 1982:221.

53 See the following for discussion of various views of the possible baptismal connections: Abbott, 1897:158; Noack, 1951:52-64; Schnackenburg, 1952:160-166; Schille, 1965:95-96; Houlden, 1970:327; Caird, 1976:86; Halter, 1977:272-280; Schnackenburg, 1982:226-227; Bruce, 1984:376-377; Patzia, 1984:236.

54 The imagery of rising out of death is reminiscent of rising with Christ in baptism in e.g. Rom. 6:1-4.

- 55 "Children of light" is a Hebraism, here amounting to a positive contrast to the negative "sons of disobedience" of 5:6. See Schlier, 1957:237 with fn. 2; Barth, 1974:600fn 173.
- 56 The darkness/light contrast is observed frequently in the Bible and other ancient literature: Ps. 88:12; Jn. 8:12; 9:5; 12:46; Acts 26:18; 2 Cor. 4:6; 6:14; Col. 1:12-13; 1 Thess. 5:4-5; 1QS 3:18-25; Test. Levi 18:4; Barn. 18-20. See also Schnackenburg, 1952:163 with fn.13. Barth, 1974:600 notes that darkness and light possess ethical meaning.
- 57 The explanation of behaving as "children of light" is given by 5:10 with verse 9 being an additional, parenthetical thought. See Barth, 1974:569.
- 58 Cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:227.
- 59 Cf. Abbott, 1897:153.
- 60 Barth, 1974:572 suggests that "the tone of this sentence expresses contempt".
- 61 Cf. Lk. 8:17; Jn. 3:20-21; Schnackenburg, 1982:231.
- 62 See Schnackenburg, 1952:161; Schnackenburg, 1982:232; and especially Engberg-Pedersen, 1989:89-110 on the meaning and usage of ἐλέγχειν.
- 63 See the commentaries and Noack, 1951:52-64; Schnackenburg, 1952:160-161; Schille, 1965:95-96; Gnilka, 1970:405-407; Halter, 1977:272-280.
- 64 Schnackenburg, 1952:161.
- 65 Cf. Barth, 1974:576,598.
- 66 For discussion see especially Baltensweiler, 1967:218-219; Sampley, 1971:114-117; Robinson, 1964:194-235.
- 67 Cf. Abbott, 1897:164; Schlier, 1957:242; Sampley, 1971:114; Barth, 1974:608; Patzia, 1984:241-242.
- 68 See Schlier, 1957:250; Houlden 1970:332; Barth, 1974:608; Caird, 1976:87-88; cf the discussion in Sampley, 1971:114-115fn1.
- 69 Confusion over this issue is probably the cause of the variant textual readings that include forms of ὑποτάσσω in 5:22. Cf. Abbott, 1897:164; Col. 3:18.
- 70 Houlden, 1970:332; Barth, 1974:608; Patzia, 1984:242. Sampley, 1971:117 writes: "Eph 5:21 is to be understood not only as a specific injunction to be followed by all Christians but it is also a general introduction to the entire Haustafel

form and therefore a rubric under which all of 5:22-6:9 is to be interpreted".

71 This, of course, raises the issue of how 5:22-33 and indeed the whole Haustafel is related to the paraenesis (i.e., to 4:1-5:21). While this question is beyond the scope of the present study, the vocatives αἱ γυναῖκες (5:22), οἱ ἄνδρες (5:25), τὰ τέκνα (6:1), οἱ δοῦλοι (6:5), and οἱ κύριοι (6:9) can be understood as subsections under the general heading of "submission" (5:21) which, in turn, comes under the notion of the walk of wise persons of 5:15.

72 Gnilka, 1971:266; Schnackenburg, 1982:238.

73 The contrast schema in 5:8-14 of darkness and light has been dropped in favour of somewhat more tangible images in 5:15-18; cf. Schnackenburg, 1982:244-245.

74 The exhortations of 5:15-21 are connected to 5:8-14 by the resumptive οὖν in 5:15. Abbott, 1897:159; Robinson, 1903:202; Schlier, 1957:243; Barth, 1974:577; Schnackenburg, 1982:239.

75 Schnackenburg, 1982:238.

76 The first clause of 5:16, ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρὸν, illustrates how the careful walk of wise persons (σοφοί) is to be made. Schnackenburg, 1982:238.

77 In addition to the commentaries see especially the following: Baltensweiler, 1967:218-235; Gnilka, 1970:407-410; Sampley, 1971: *passim*; Crouch, 1972: *passim*; Schrage, 1975:1-22; Schweizer, 1977:397-413; Schweizer, 1979:195-209; Thraede, 1980:359-368; Balch, 1988:25-50.

78 Weidinger, 1928: *passim*; Sampley, 1971:16-30; Crouch, 1972: *passim*; Baltensweiler, 1967:214-215; Gnilka, 1970:407-410; Fischer, 1973:162-163; Schweizer, 1977:399-406; Stagg, 1979:542; Schweizer, 1979:195-209; Balch, 1988:25-50. For examples of this form (from Hierocles, On Duties) see Malherbe, 1986:85-104, along with the additional references given there.

79 Schnackenburg, 1982:246.

80 Cf. Patzia, 1984:244-245.

81 Many scholars have noted the christological and ecclesiological argumentation/motivation, but have paid scant attention to the rhetorical and pragmatic motivations in the passage. See Baltensweiler, 1967:233; Sampley, 1971:121-133; Barth, 1974:652,704; Schweizer, 1977:400; Schweizer, 1979:203-205; Hahn, 1981:99; Schnackenburg, 1982:248-249; Schrage, 1988:249.

82 As indicated in the ὡς (καθώς) καὶ ὁ Χριστός clauses in 5:23,25,29.

83 E.g., Schlier, 1957:253; Sampley, 1971:133. The discussion of motives is, as Barth, 1974:652-654 shows, potentially complex. However, the discussion of "...all too subtle distinctions may well reveal more of the skill of Paul's interpreters, than of the apostle's intention and the comprehension of his first readers" (Barth, 654). Schrage, 1988:249 writes, "Marriage is not an ontological mystery representing the relationship between Christ and the church. Instead, rules governing the conduct of marriage partners are derived from the relationship."

84 Sampley, 1971:121-122.

85 See the discussion of the syntax of 5:21 in section 4.1.6 above.

86 Barth, 1974:613; Schweizer, 1979:203. The singular κύριος refers to Christ and not to "masters" since it is not apposite to the plural τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν; Abbott, 1897:165; Bruce, 1984:384.

87 Wives are being directly addressed through the vocative αἱ γυναῖκες. Cf. the same form of direct address to husbands (5:25), children (6:1), fathers (6:4), slaves (6:5), and masters (6:9). See also note 71 above.

88 The connections of the words αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος have occasioned considerable discussion as to whether or not they are also analogous to the husband-wife relationship. See e.g., Baltensweiler, 1967:224-225. The practical function of the clause is to illustrate and reinforce the preeminent position of Christ.

89 Baltensweiler, 1967:226.

90 The truism that "no one hates his own flesh" gains easy assent; Sampley, 1971:143-144.

91 Schnackenburg, 1982:249.

92 Lincoln, 1982:31; Schnackenburg, 1982:258.

93 Sampley, 1971:110; Lincoln, 1982:31; Patzia, 1984:251. Both σῶμα and σὰρξ are employed in 5:28-31, but are, in this case, interchangeable; Lincoln, 1982:31.

94 Since children, along with husbands, wives (5:22-33), fathers (6:4), slaves and masters (6:5-9), are addressed it is evident that that the author of Eph. (as in Col.) considers them to be ethically responsible. Cf. Schweizer, 1979:202-203.

- 95 Schnackenburg, 1982:265.
- 96 Barth, 1974:756.
- 97 Patzia, 1984:254. See the discussion in section 4.1.5 above.
- 98 Bruce, 1984:397-398.
- 99 Schnackenburg, 1982:265.
- 100 Schnackenburg, 1982:266.
- 101 Schnackenburg, 1982:266.
- 102 Cf. Lincoln, 1981:164.
- 103 Lausberg, 1960:§§431-442. See the brief discussion of the *peroratio* in section 2.4.8 above.
- 104 In classical judicial rhetoric the *peroratio* may have three parts according to Rhet ad Her.2.30.47 (summing up; amplification; appeal to pity [emotion]), or four parts according to Arist.Rhet.3.19.1 (dispose the judge favourably; amplify; excite emotions; recapitulate).
- 105 Lanham, 1968:76 writes, "This conclusion was often an *impassioned* [Lanham's emphasis] summary, not simply a review of previous arguments".
- 106 Schnackenburg, 1982:273; White, 1986:202; cf. Abbott, 1897:180; Schlier, 1957:289; Barth, 1974:760.
- 107 References to the Christian life as a battle against evil can be found in Lincoln, 1981:164-165.
- 108 Gnllka, 1971:303.
- 109 Schnackenburg, 1982:272: "Der Horizont erweitert sich universel-kosmisch auf die Situation der Christen in dieser Weltzeit..."
- 110 Caird, 1976:91; Bruce, 1984:403; Arnold, 1989:103-122.
- 111 Cf. Caird, 1976:91, who notes that all of the armaments relate to the gospel.
- 112 It is evident that while there are clear thematic connections between Eph. 1-3 and 4-6 and the letter is obviously a unity, the paraenesis could nevertheless stand on its own or with different "sermonic" or other kind of material, given only some minor alterations.

CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSION

This study began by describing the disparity between the "theological" (chapters 1-3) and "ethical" (chapters 4-6) halves of Eph.¹ Despite having been paid little attention, the interpretive task of integrating "theology" and "ethics" in Eph. is crucial for the purpose of understanding the nature and cohesiveness of the letter.² The foregoing examination has the merit of showing how the "theological" and "ethical" sections of the document are integrated with each other. In so doing it has presented a scholarly, rhetorical critical analysis and interpretation of Eph. Neither of these tasks has been performed previously.

Various findings and conclusions have been indicated in the preceding chapters. Many of them have dealt with points of rhetorical, functional, and other exegetical interest, and need not be repeated here. The conclusions that are directly germane to the elucidation of the relationship between theology and ethics in Eph. are reviewed in this final chapter.

1. The paraenesis of Eph. is not directly and argumentatively derived from the theological narrative of Eph.1-3. There is no explicated connection, despite the occurrence of the particle οὖν at 4:1, between the theological themes and the moral exhortations.

2. While Eph. stands as a letter, epistolary analysis does not provide an explanation of how theological and ethical sections are related. In fact, in the case of Eph. it is difficult to define clearly the letter elements (e.g., the letter body) according to the methods of epistolary analysis.³

3. The purpose of Eph., based on the verses that seem to indicate most clearly the concerns of the author for the audience members, and the benefits he wished for them, was to promote the Christian growth and maturity of the recipients and the expression of those qualities in their behaviour. Eph. addresses Gentile Christians who, while already at a level of Christian maturity (1:15), were considered by the author to be in need of further growth (cf. 1:16-19; 3:14-19; 4:13-16).⁴

4. A rhetorical critical method⁵, as it has been presented, provides a new angle of approach to the interpretation of the letter. It has the distinct advantage of being able to show a way through the difficulties of integrating theology and ethics in Eph.

5. Eph. has, for the purposes of this study, been designated as "sermon".⁶ This generic designation as "sermon" refers to a combination of epideictic and deliberative genres that does not address a specific issue or controversy (ἄγῶν), and is directed to an audience of θεῶποι rather than an audience of

χριστάι.⁷ Eph. has epideictic characteristics in that it praises God, is without an ἄγων, and addresses θεῶποι. It has deliberative characteristics in that it is hortatory. As a "sermon" Eph. impresses the θεῶποι with its ideas and themes in order to lead them to identify with beliefs and practices with which they as Christians have previously agreed. In this way the audience members are made susceptible to moral exhortation and are prepared for the practice of the behaviour encouraged. Eph. does not present critical and convincing arguments based on the ideas and themes of chapters 1-3, but builds a rapport with its audience members, stimulating their thoughts and sentiments, thereby setting the stage for, and developing a frame of mind open to ethical appeals.

6. From a rhetorical critical point of view, Eph. is comprised of a combined *exordium/narratio* (1:3-3:21) followed by an *exhortatio* (4:1-6:9) and a *peroratio* (6:10-20).⁸ Where speeches would usually have an *argumentatio* that would contain critical argumentation based on a preceding "statement of facts" or *narratio*, Eph. has the paraenesis, or what has here been termed *exhortatio*. The *exhortatio* functions in place of, although not as an exact substitute for, an *argumentatio*.

7. The *exhortatio* (paraenesis), rather than arguing on the basis of the notions presented in the *exordium/narratio*, contains its own, self-contained argumentation and motivation in favour of the behaviour for which it calls.⁹ It assumes

that the audience is already receptive to Christian exhortation. The particle οὐν at 4:1 does not indicate a result derived from Eph. 1-3, but a continuation of the author's concern for the growth of the audience.

8. The combined *exordium/narratio* is intended to elicit agreement, to remind of things past, and to develop a desire to move forward in Christian faith and life. It has been shown¹⁰ that the language of the *exordium/narratio* is capable of forming a frame of mind or mindset that is appropriate to the rhetorical situation.

9. It is concluded that theology and ethics are integrated in Eph. not by clear, explicit connection, but by the rhetorical use of language, i.e., by what has been defined as "sermon". The audience members are reminded of and identify with theological concepts and realities with which they are personally involved. They are impressed with the need and desirability of living in accord with these concepts and realities, and are thereby led to practice the behaviour the author encourages, and to develop Christian maturity that is, ultimately, εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

ENDNOTES

1 See section 1.2.

2 Cf. the comments of e.g., Luz, 1976:374, as noted in section 1.2 and quoted in note 44. Many authors have claimed simply that the exhortations of Eph.4-6 are founded on the theology of Eph. 1-3 apparently without being aware of, or else ignoring, the tensions between the two halves of the epistle.

3 See sections 2.2 to 2.2.6 above.

4 See sections 2.4.5 to 2.4.7 above.

5 See sections 2.3.1 to 2.4.9 above.

6 Recognizing the shortcomings of the word "sermon".

7 See sections 2.3; 2.4.2 to 2.4.4 above.

8 See section 2.4.8 above.

9 See sections 4.1 to 4.1.7.3 above.

10 In the rhetorical analysis of chapter 3 above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, T.K. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians. (ICC)
Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1897.
- Adcock, F.E. "Literary Traditions and Early Greek Code-Makers." The Cambridge Historical Journal 2, 1927:95-109.
- Alexander, P.S. "Epistolary Literature." Compendia Rerum Iudaicum ad Novum Testamentum, Section Two, Volume II: Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period, Michael E. Stone, ed. Philadelphia: Fortress; Assen: van Gorcum, 1984:579-596.
- _____ "Remarks on Aramaic Epistolography in the Persian Period." JSS 23/2 (1978):155-170.
- Allan, J.A. The Epistle to the Ephesians. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- _____ "The In Christ Formula in Ephesians." NTS 5 (1958-59):54-62.
- Allen, T.G. "The Body of Christ Concept in Ephesians." PhD. Thesis. University of Glasgow, 1982.
- _____ "Exaltation and Solidarity with Christ, Eph. 1:20 and 2:6." JSNT 28 (1986):103-120.
- _____ "God the Namer, A Note on Ephesians 1:21." NTS 32/3 (1986):470-475.
- Andresen, C. "Zum Formular frühchristlicher Gemeindebriefe." ZNW 56 (1965):233-259.
- Andrews, M.E. The Ethical Teaching of Paul: A Study in Origin. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1934.
- _____ "The Problem of Motive in the Ethics of Paul." JR 13 (1933):200-215.
- Aristotle. The Art of Rhetoric. (LCL) ET by J.H. Freese. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Arnold, C.E. Ephesians: Power and Magic. (SNTSMS 63) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

- Aune, D.E. The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity. (NovT Supplement Series 28) Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- _____, ed. Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament. (SBL Sources for Biblical Study 21) Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- _____. The New Testament in its Literary Environment. (Library of Early Christianity 8) Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.
- Balch, D.L. "Household Codes." Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament David E. Aune, ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988:25-50.
- Baltensweiler, H. Die Ehe im Neuen Testament. Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1967.
- Bahr, G.J. "Paul and Letter Writing in the First Century." CBQ 28 (1966):465-477.
- Barclay, W. Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians. The Daily Study Bible. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976.
- _____. "The One, New Man." Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology R.A. Guelich, ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978:73-91.
- Barrett, C.K. Essays on Paul. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Barrett, C.K. From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.
- Barth, M. The Broken Wall. London: Collins, 1960.
- _____. Ephesians. (The Anchor Bible) 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1974.
- _____. "Die Parusie im Epheserbrief, Eph.4:13." Neues Testament und Geschichte, H. Baltensweiler & B. Reicke eds., Zürich: Theologischer Verlag/ Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (P. Siebeck), 1972:239-250.
- Beardslee, W.A. Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul. London: SCM Press, 1961.
- _____. Literary Criticism of the New Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.
- _____. "Recent Literary Criticism." The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters. E.J. Epp and G.W. MacRae, eds. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989:175-198.

- Beare, F.W. "Ephesians." Interpreter's Bible X:597-749.
Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953.
- Beker, J.C. Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel. Philadelphia: Fortress,
1982.
- _____ "Paul's Theology: Consistent or Inconsistent." NTS
34 (1988):364-377.
- Bengel, J.A. "Ephesians" Bengel's New Testament Commentaries,
vol.2. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1981.
- Berger, K. "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament."
Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt 25.2. H.
Temporini & W. Haase eds., Berlin/New York: Walter de
Gruyter, 1984:1031-1432.
- Best, E. "Fashions in Exegesis: Ephesians 1:3." Scripture:
Meaning and Method. B.P. Thompson, ed. Hull: Hull
University Press, 1987:79-91.
- _____ One Body in Christ. London: SPCK, 1955.
- Betz, H.D. Galatians. Hermeneia Series, Philadelphia:
Fortress, 1979.
- _____ "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's
Letter to the Galatians" NTS 21 (1975):353-79.
- _____ "Das Problem der Grundlagen der paulinischen Ethik
(Röm 12,1-2)." ZThK 85/2 (May 1988):199-218.
- _____ "The Problem of Rhetoric and Theology according to
the Apostle Paul" L'Apôtre Paul. A. Vanhoye, ed.,
Leuven: University Press, 1986, pp.16-48.
- _____ 2 Corinthians 8 and 9: A Commentary on Two
Administrative Letters of the Apostle Paul. (Hermeneia
Series) Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Bieder, W. Berufung im Neuen Testament. (ATANT 38) Zürich:
Zwingli, 1961.
- Bitzer, L.F. "The Rhetorical Situation" Philosophy and
Rhetoric. 1 (1968):1-14.
- Bjerkelund, C.J. Parakalō. Form Funktion und Sinn der
parakalō-Sätze in den paulinischen Briefen. Oslo:
Universitetsforlaget, 1967.
- Black, C. C. "Keeping Up with Recent Studies XVI:
Rhetorical Criticism and Biblical Interpretation." ExpT
100/7 (1989):252-258.

Black, Edwin. Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method. New York/London: Macmillan, 1965.

Braaten, C.E. Eschatology and Ethics. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974.

Breuer, D. Einführung in die Pragmatische Texttheorie. (UTB 106) München, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1974.

Bruce, F.F. The Epistles to the Colossians to Philemon and to the Ephesians. (NIC) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

_____ The Epistle to the Ephesians. London: Pickering and Inglis, 1961.

_____ Paul and Jesus. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1974.

_____ Paul Apostle of the Heart Set Free. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

_____ "St. Paul in Rome: 4. The Epistle to the Ephesians" BJRL 49,2 (1967):303-322.

Bultmann, R. ἀναγινώσκω, ἀνάγνωσις. TDNT I:343-344.

_____ "Literaturgeschichte, Biblische, 1.3." RGG² III:1675-1677.

_____ "Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus" ZNW 23 (1924):123-40. ET "The Problem of Ethics in the Writings of Paul" The Old Man and the New Man. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1967:7-32.

_____ προελπίζω. TDNT II:535.

_____ Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe. (FRLANT 13) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910 (reprint 1984).

_____ Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. London: SCM Press, 1952.

Burgess, T.C. "Epideictic Literature". Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902. Also published in Studies in Classical Philology 3 (1902):89-261.

Burke, K. A Rhetoric of Motives. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.

_____ A Rhetoric of Religion. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1970.

- Cadbury, H.J. "The Dilemma of Ephesians." NTS 5 (1958-59):91-102.
- Caird, G.B. "The Descent of Christ in Ephesians 4:7-11." Studia Evangelica vol. II. F.L. Cross, ed. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964:535-545.
- _____ The Language and Imagery of the Bible. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980.
- _____ Paul's Letters from Prison. (New Clarendon Bible) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- _____ Principalities and Powers. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Cambier, J. "La Bénédiction d'Éphésiens 1,3-14." ZNW 54 (1963):58-104.
- _____ "La Signification Christologique d'Éphésiens 4:7-10." NTS 9 (1962-63): 262-268.
- Caragounis, C.C. The Ephesian Mysterion. (Coniectanea Biblica NT Series 8) Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1977.
- Chadwick, H. "Die Absicht des Epheserbriefes." ZNW 51 (1960):145-153.
- _____ "Ephesians." Peake's Commentary on the Bible. M. Black & H.H. Rowley, eds. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1962.
- Champion, L.G. Benedictions and Doxologies in the Epistles of Paul. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- Chase, J.R. "The Classical Conception of Epideictic." Quarterly Journal of Speech 47 (1961):293-300.
- Cicero. De Inventione. ET by H.M. Hubbell (LCL). London: Heinemann/Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Clark, D.L. Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.
- Classen, C.J. "Ars Rhetorica: L'Essence, Possibilités, Gefahren." Rhetorica 6/1 (1988):7-19.
- Colpe, C. "Zur Leib-Christi-Vorstellung im Epheserbrief." Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche. W. Eltester, ed. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1960:172-187.
- Coutts, J. "Ephesians 1:3-14 and 1 Peter 1:3-12." NTS 3 (1956-57):115-127.

- _____ "Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians." NTS 4 (1957-58):201-206.
- Cross, F.L., ed. Studies in Ephesians. London: Mowbray, 1956.
- Crouch, J.E. The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Crowther, C. "Works, Work and Good Works." ExpT 81 (1969-70):166-171.
- Cullmann, O. Early Christian Worship. ET by A.S. Todd and J.B. Torrance 6th ed. London: SCM, 1953.
- Dahl, N.A. "Adresse und Proömium des Epheserbriefes." TZ 7 (1951):241-264.
- _____ "Anamnesis." ST 1 (1947 [1948]):69-95.
- _____ "Christ, Creation and the Church." The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. W.D. Davies and D. Daube, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956:422-443.
- _____ "Cosmic Dimensions and Religious Knowledge (Eph. 3:18)." Jesus und Paulus. E.E. Ellis & E Grässer, eds. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975:57-75.
- _____ "Dopet i Efersierbrevet." SvTK 21 (1945):85-103.
- _____ "Der Epheserbrief und der verlorene, erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther." Abraham unser Vater. O. Betz, P. Schmidt und M. Hengel, eds. Leiden/Köln: Brill, 1963:65-77.
- _____ "Das Geheimnis der Kirche nach Eph 3,8-10." Zur Auferbauung des Leibes Christi. E. Schlunk und A. Peters, eds. Kassel, 1965.
- _____ "Gentiles, Christians, and Israelites in the Epistle to the Ephesians." HTR 79:1-3 (1986):31-39; also in Christians among Jews and Gentiles. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986:31-39.
- _____ "Interpreting Ephesians: Then and Now." CurrThM 5 (1978):133-143.
- _____ "Letter." IDB Supplement. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976:538-540.
- _____ "Ephesians, Letter to the." IDB Supplement. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976:268-269.

- Daube, D. "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation." Understanding the Talmud. Alan Corré, ed. New York: Ktav, 1975:275-289.
- Davies, W.D. "Ethics in the New Testament." IDB E-J: 167-176.
- _____ Jewish and Pauline Studies. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- _____ Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. London: SPCK, 1962.
- Dearin, R.D., ed. The New Rhetoric of Chaim Perelman. Lanham/New York/London: University Press of America, 1989.
- Deichgräber, R. Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Deidun, T.J. New Covenant Morality in Paul. (Analecta Biblica 89) Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1981.
- Deissmann, Adolf. Light from the Ancient East. ET by L.R.M. Strachan. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910.
- Denton, D.R. "Inheritance in Paul and Ephesians." EQ 54/3 (1982):157-162.
- Dibelius, M. (and Greeven, H.) An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon. Tübingen: Mohr, 1953.
- _____ "Die Christianisierung einer hellenistischen Formel." Botschaft und Geschichte II. Tübingen: Mohr, 1956:14-29.
- Dinkler, E. "Zum Problem der Ethik bei Paulus: Rechtsnahme und Rechtsverzicht (1 Kor 6,1-11)." ZThK 49 (1952):167-200.
- Dodd, C.H. The Apostolic Preaching and its Development. London: Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 1936.
- _____ "The Ethics of the Pauline Epistles." The Evolution of Ethics as Revealed in the Great Religions E.H. Sneath, ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927:293-326.
- Donfried, K.P. "Justification and Last Judgment in Paul." ZNW 67 (1976):90-110.
- Doty, W.G. "The Classification of Epistolary Literature." CBQ 31 (1969):183-199.
- _____ Letters in Primitive Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.

- Downing, G.F. "A Bas Les Aristos: The Relevance of Higher Literature for the Understanding of the Earliest Christian Writers." NovT 30/3 (1988):212-230.
- Dunn, J.D.G. Baptism in the Holy Spirit. London: SCM, 1970.
- Early Christian Writings: The Apostolic Fathers. ET by M. Staniforth; A. Louth, ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987.
- Easton, B.S. "New Testament Ethical Lists." JBL 51 (1932):1-12.
- Engberg-Pedersen, T. "Ephesians 5,12-13: ἐλέγχειν and Conversion in the New Testament." ZNW 80 1/2 (1989):89-110.
- Enslin, M.S. The Ethics of Paul. Revised edition. New York: Abingdon, 1962.
- Epp, E.J., and MacRae, Geo. W., eds. The New Testament and its Modern Interpreters. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Ernst, J. Pleroma und Pleroma Christi. (Biblische Untersuchungen, Band 5) Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1970.
- Evans, D.D. The Logic of Self-Involvement. London: SCM Press, 1963.
- Fischer, K.M. Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes. (FRLANT 111) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.
- Flowers, H.J. "Paul's Prayer for the Ephesians; a Study of Eph. 1:15-23." ExpT 38 (1926-27):227-233.
- Forbes, C. "Comparison, Self-Praise and Irony: Paul's Boasting and the Conventions of Hellenistic Rhetoric." NTS 32 (1986):1-30.
- Foulkes, F. The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians. (Tyndale NT Commentary) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963
- Francis, F.O. "The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs in James and John." ZNW 61 (1970):110-126.
- Fung, R.Y.K. "The Nature of the Ministry According to Paul." EQ 54/3 (1982):129-147.
- Funk, R.W. Language Hermeneutic and the Word of God. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

- Furnish, V.P. "Pauline Studies." The New Testament and its Modern Interpreters. E.J. Epp and Geo. W. MacRae, eds. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989:321-350.
- _____. Theology and Ethics in Paul. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968.
- Gadamer, H.G. Rhetorik und Hermeneutik. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1976.
- Giavini, G. "La Structure Littéraire d'Ephésiens 2:11-22." NTS 16 (1969-70):209-211.
- Gnilka, J. "Christus unser Friede--ein Friedens--Erlöserlied in Eph 2,14-17." Die Zeit Jesu. G. Bornkamm and K. Rahner, eds. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1970:190-207.
- _____. Der Epheserbrief. (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament) Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1971.
- _____. "Parännetische Traditionen im Epheserbrief." Mélanges Biblique en hommage au B. Rigaux. A. Descamps and A. de Halleaux, eds. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970:397-410.
- Goodspeed, E.J. The Key to Ephesians. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- Grube, G.M.A. A Greek Critic: Demetrius On Style. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961.
- Hahn, F. "Die christologische Begründung urchristlicher Paränese." ZNW 72 (1981):88-99.
- Hall, R.G. "The Rhetorical Outline of Galatians: A Reconsideration." JBL 106 (1987):277-287.
- Halter, H. Taufe und Ethos: paulinische Kriterien für das Proprium christlicher Moral. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1977.
- Hanson, S. The Unity of the Church in the New Testament. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckerit AB, 1946.
- Hasenstab, R. Modelle paulinischer Ethik. (Tübinger theologische Studien, Band 11) Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, 1977.
- Hauerwas, S. The Peaceable Kingdom: A Primer in Christian Ethics. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984.
- Hays, R.B. The Faith of Jesus Christ. (SBLDS 56) Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1983.

Heinemann, J. Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977.

_____ "Preaching: In the Talmudic Period." EJ XIII:cols. 994-998.

Hendriksen, W. Galatians and Ephesians. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1969.

Henry, P. New Directions in New Testament Study. London: SCM Press, 1979.

Hinks, D.A.G. "Tria Genera Causarum." CQ 30 (1936):170-176.

Hitchcock, A.E.N. "Ephesians 1:23." ExpT 22 (1910-11):91.

Hitchcock, F.R.M. "The Pleroma as the Medium of the Self-Realization of Christ." Expositor (8th series) 24 (1922):135-150.

Hodge, C. Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1876.

Hooker, M.D. "Paul and Covenantal Nomism." Paul and Paulinism. M.D. Hooker and S.G. Wilson, eds. London: SPCK, 1982:47-56.

Houlden, J.L. Ethics and the New Testament. Harmondsworth: Penguin: 1973.

_____ Paul's Letters from Prison. (Pelican NT Commentaries) Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.

Hughes, F.W. Early Christian Rhetoric and Second Thessalonians. (JSNTSup 30) Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.

Isocrates. Works. (LCL) ET by Geo. Norlin and LaRue van Hook. London: Heinemann; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1928.

Jayne, D. "'We' and 'You' in Ephesians 1:3-14." ExpT 85 (1974):151-152.

Jervell, J., and Meeks, W.A. God's Christ and His People. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977.

Jewett, R. The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Johann B. C. To A the Bre vren. (Con ectanea Bib, a NT Series 6) Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1987

Johnston, G. Ephesians, Philippians, and Philemon. (The Century Bible, new edition) London: Thos. Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1967.

Jordan, M.D. "Ancient Philosophic Protreptic and the Problem of Persuasive Genres." Rhetorica 4/4 (1986):309-333.

- Judge, E.A. "St Paul and Classical Society." JAC 15 (1972):19-36.
- Kadushin, M. Worship and Ethics: A Study in Rabbinic Judaism. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1978.
- Kamlah, E. Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (P. Siebeck), 1964.
- Käsemann, E. "Ephesians and Acts." Studies in Luke-Acts. L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn, eds. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968:288-297.
- _____ "Das Interpretationsproblem des Epheserbriefes." TLZ 86 (1961):1-8.
- _____ Jesus Means Freedom. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970.
- _____ Leib und Leib Christi. Tübingen: Mohr, 1933.
- _____ "Paulus und der Frühkatholizismus." ZThK 60 (1963):75-89.
- _____ Perspectives on Paul. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- _____ "Predigt-Meditation über Epheser 2,17-22." Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960:280-283.
- _____ "Unity and Diversity in New Testament Ecclesiology." NovT 6 (1963):290ff.
- Keck, L.E. "Justification of the Ungodly and Ethics." Rechtfertigung. J. Friedrich *et. al.*, eds. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck); Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976:199-210.
- _____ Paul and his Letters. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- _____ and Furnish, V.P. The Pauline Letters. Nashville: Abingdon, 1984.
- Kelly, J.N.D. Early Christian Creeds. London: Longman Group Ltd., 1972.
- Kennedy, G.A. The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World 300 BC-AD 300. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- _____ Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Traditions from Ancient to Modern Times. London: Croom Helm; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.

- _____ Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- _____ New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- King, A.C. "Ephesians in the Light of Form Criticism." ExpT 63 (1951-52):273-276.
- Kinneavy, J.L. Greek Rhetorical Origins of Christian Faith. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Kirby, J.C. Ephesians Baptism and Pentecost. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1968.
- Koester, H. Introduction to the New Testament. Vol. 1, "History, Culture and Religion of the Hellenistic Age." Vol. 2, "History and Literature of Early Christianity." Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- Koskenniemi, H. Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Christi. Helsinki: Akateeminen Kirjakauppa, 1956.
- Krämer, H. "Zur sprachlichen Form der Eulogie Eph 1:3-14." WuD 9 (1967):34-46.
- Kuhn, K.G. "The Epistle to the Ephesians in the Light of Qumran Texts." Paul and Qumran. J. Murphy-O'Connor, ed. London: Geoffrey Chapman Ltd., 1968:115-131. German version in NTS 7 (1960-61):334-346.
- Kümmel, W.G., Feine, P., Behm, J. Introduction to the New Testament. Revised edition. Nashville: Abingdon, 1975.
- Ladd, G.E. A Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Lampe, G.W.H. A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.
- Lanham, R.A. A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms. Berkely/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968.
- Lausberg, H. Handbuch der Literarischen Rhetorik: eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft. 2 vols. München: Hueber, 1960.
- Lemmer, H.R. "Reciprocity between Eschatology and Pneuma in Ephesians 1:3-14." Neotestamentica 21 (1987):159-182.
- Lewis, N. Life in Egypt under Roman Rule. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

Lightfoot, J.B. Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul. London: Macmillan, 1895.

_____ "On the meaning of πλήρωμα." St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon. London: Macmillan, 1856:257-273.

Lincoln, A.T. "The Church and Israel in Ephesians 2." CBQ 49 (1987):605-624.

_____ "Ephesians 2:8-10: A Summary of Paul's Gospel?" CBQ 45 (1983):617-630.

_____ Paradise Now and Not Yet. (SNTSMS 43) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

_____ "A Re-examination of 'The Heavens' in Ephesians." NTS 19 (1973):468-483.

_____ "The Use of the Old Testament in Ephesians." JSNT 14 (1982):16-57.

Lindars, B. New Testament Apologetic. London: SCM Press, 1961.

Lindemann, A. Die Aufhebung der Zeit. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1975.

_____ "Bemerkungen zu den Adressaten und zum Anlaß des Epheserbriefes." ZNW 67 (1976):235-251.

_____ Der Epheserbrief. (Zürcher Bibelkommentar NT 8) Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1985.

_____ Paulus im ältesten Christentum. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1979.

Lock, W. The Epistle to the Ephesians. (Westminster Commentaries) London: Methuen & Co., 1929

Lohmeyer, E. "Das Proömium des Epheserbriefes." ThBl 5 (1926):120ff.

Lohse, E. Colossians and Philemon. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

Lona, H.E. Die Eschatologie im Kolosser- und Epheserbrief. (Forschung zur Bibel 48) Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1984.

Longinus. On the Sublime. (LCL) ET by W.H. Fyfe. London: Heinemann; New York: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Lührmann, D. Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden. (WMANT 16) Neukirchen/Vluyn: Neukirchen Verlag, 1965.

- Luz, U. "Rechtfertigung bei den Paulusschülern." Rechtfertigung. J. Friedrich, et. al., eds. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1976:365-384.
- Malherbe, A.J. Ancient Epistolary Theorists. (SBL Sources for Biblical Study 19) Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988. (Originally published in Ohio Journal of Religious Studies 5 (1977):3-77.)
- _____ "Greco-Roman Religion and Philosophy and the New Testament." The New Testament and its Modern Interpreters. E.J. Epp and G.W. MacRae, eds. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- _____ Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook. (Library of Early Christianity 4) Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- _____ Social Aspects of Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- Marshall, I. H. "Early Catholicism in the New Testament." New Dimensions in New Testament Study. R.N. Longenecker and M.C. Tenney, eds. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.
- Martin, J. Antike Rhetorik: Technik und Methode. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2.3) München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1974.
- Martin, R.P. "Ephesians." The New Bible Commentary Revised. D. Guthrie, et. al., eds. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.
- _____ "An Epistle in Search of a Life-Setting." ExpT 79 (1968):296-302.
- _____ Reconciliation: A Study of Paul's Theology. London: Marshall Morgan & Scott; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981.
- Maurer, C. "Der Hymnus von Epheser 1 als Schlüssel zum ganzen Briefe." EvTh 11 (1951-52):151-172.
- McDonald, J.I.H. Kerygma and Didache. (SNTSMS 37) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- McKelvey, R.J. The New Temple. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- McNamara, M. The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch. (Analecta Biblica 27) Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1976.
- Meeks, W.A. "In One Body: The Unity of Humankind in Colossians and Ephesians." God's Christ and His People.

- J. Jervell and W.A. Meeks, eds. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977:209-221.
- _____ The Moral World of the First Christians. (Library of Early Christianity 6) Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- _____ "Understanding Early Christian Ethics." JBL 105 (1986):3-11.
- Menander. Menander Rhetor. D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson, eds. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Merk, O. Handeln aus Glauben: Die Motivierungen der paulinischen Ethik. (Marburger Theologische Studien 5) Marburg: Elwert, 1968.
- Merklein, H. Christus und die Kirche: Die theologische Grundstruktur des Epheserbriefes nach Eph 2,11-18. (SBS 66) Stuttgart: KBW, 1973.
- _____ Das kirchliche Amt nach dem Epheserbriefe. München: Kosel-Verlag, 1973.
- _____ "Epheser 4,1-5,20 als Rezeption von Kolosser 3,1-17 (zugleich ein Beitrag zur Problematik des Epheserbriefes)." Kontinuität und Einheit. P.-G. Müller and W. Stenger, eds. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1981:194-210.
- _____ "Zur Tradition und Komposition von Eph 2,14-18." BZ 7 (1973):79-102.
- Metzger, B.M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Meuzelaar, J.J. Der Leib des Messias. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1961.
- Michaelis, W. θεωπέω. TDNT V:315-383.
- Michel, O. οἰκονομία. TDNT V:151-153.
- Mitton, C. L. Ephesians (The New Century Bible) London: Oliphants, 1976.
- _____ The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.
- _____ The Formulation of the Pauline Corpus of Letters. London: The Epworth Press, 1955.
- Moore, M.S. "Ephesians 2:14-16: A History of Recent Interpretation." EQ 54 (1982):163-169.

- Morgan, R., with Barton, J. Biblical Interpretation.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Mouat, L.H. "An Approach to Rhetorical Criticism." The Rhetorical Idiom. D.C. Bryant, ed. New York: Russel & Russel, 1966:161-177.
- Moule, C.F.D. "Fulness and Fill in the New Testament." SJT 4 (1951):79-86.
- _____ "The Influence of Circumstances on the Use of Eschatological Terms." JTS 15 (1964):1-15.
- _____ "A Note on Ephesians 1:22-23." ExpT 60 (1949):53.
- _____ "Obligation in the Ethic of Paul." Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox. W. Farmer, C.F.D. Moule, R.R. Niebuhr, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967:389-406.
- Mullenburg, J. "Form Criticism and Beyond." JBL 88 (1969):1-18.
- Mullins, T.Y. "Disclosure as a Literary Form in the New Testament." NovT 7 (1964):44-50.
- _____ "Formulas in New Testament Epistles." JBL 91 (1972):380-390.
- _____ "Petition as Literary Form." NovT 5 (1962):46-54.
- Munro, W. "Colossians 3:18-4:1 and Ephesians 5:21-26: Evidences of a Late Literary Stratum?" NTS 18 (1972):434-437.
- Mussner, F. Christus, das All und die Kirche. Studien zur Theologie des Epheserbriefes. (Trierer Theologische Studien 5) Trier: Paulinus Verlag, 1968².
- _____ "Contributions made by Qumran to the Understanding of the Epistle to the Ephesians." Paul and Qumran. J. Murphy-O'Connor, ed. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968:159-178.
- _____ "Eph 2 als ökumenisches Modell." Neues Testament und Kirche. J. Gnllka, ed. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1974:325-336.
- Nauck, W. "Das οὖν paräneticum." ZNW 49 (1958):134-135.
- Nieder, L. Die Motive der religiös-sittlichen Paränese in den paulinischen Gemeindebriefen. (Münchener Theologischer Studien I/12) München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1956.

- Nielen, J. Gebet und Gottesdienst im Neuen Testament.
Freiburg: Herder, 1937.
- Noack, B. "Das Zitat in Ephes. 5:14." ST 5 (1951):52-64.
- Norden, E. Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede. 4th edition Stuttgart: Teubner, 1956.
- O'Brien, P.T. "Ephesians 1: An Unusual Introduction to a New Testament Letter." NTS 25 (1978-79):504-516.
- _____ Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul. (Novum Testamentum Supplement Series 49) Leiden : Brill, 1977.
- _____ "Thanksgiving and the Gospel of Paul." NTS 21 (1974-75):144-155.
- Oden, T.C. Radical Obedience: The Ethics of Rudolf Bultmann. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Osborn, E. Ethical Patterns in Early Christian Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Parsons, M. "Being Precedes Act: Indicative and Imperative in Paul's Writing." EQ 60 (1988):99-127.
- Patzia, A.G. Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians. (Good News Commentary) San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984.
- _____ "The Deutero-Pauline Hypothesis: An Attempt at Clarification." EQ 52 (1980):27-42.
- Penner, E. "The Enthronement Motif in Ephesians." unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1983.
- Percy, E. Der Leib Christi. Lund: Universitets Arsschrift, 1942.
- _____ Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe. Lund: Gleerup, 1946.
- _____ "Zu den Problemen des Kolosser- und Epheserbriefes." ZNW 43 (1951):178-194.
- Perelman, C., and Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation. Notre Dame/London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- Perkins, P. "New Testament Ethics: Questions and Contexts." RelStRev 10/4 (1984):321-327.

- Petersen, N.R. Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.
- Philostratus. The Lives of the Sophists. ET by Wilmer Cave Wright (LCL). London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Plutarch. "On Brotherly Love" (De fraterno amore; Περὶ φιλαδέλφειας). Moralia. ET by W.C. Helmbold (LCL). London: Heinemann; New York: Harvard University Press, 1936.
- Pokorný, P. Der Epheserbrief und die Gnosis. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965.
- Pound, E. "How to Read." Literary Essays of Ezra Pound. T.S. Eliot, ed. London: Faber & Faber, 1954:15-40 (essay written 1927-28).
- Pseudo-Demetrius [Demetrius of Phalerum]. "Epistolary Types". ET by A.J. Malherbe in Ancient Epistolary Theorists. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988:30-41.
- _____ On Style. ET by W. R. Roberts (LCL). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902 (in volume with Aristotle, Poetics).
- Quintilian. Institutio Oratoria. 4 vols. ET by H. E. Butler (LCL). London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Rader, W. The Church and Racial Hostility. A History of the Interpretation of Ephesians 2:11-22. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1978.
- Reumann, J. "Oikonomia='Covenant;' Terms for Heilsgeschichte in Early Christian Usage." NovT 3 (1959):282-292.
- _____ "Oikonomia--Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan Heilsgeschichte." NTS 13 (1966-67):147-167.
- Rhetorica ad Alexandrum. ET by H. Rackham (LCL). London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957 (in volume with Aristotle, Problems II).
- Rhetorica ad Herennium. ET by H. Caplan (LCL). London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Ridderbos, H. Paul, An Outline of his Theology. ET by J.R. DeWitt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Robbins, C.J. "The Composition of Ephesians 1:3-14." JBL 105 (1986):677-687.

- _____ "Rhetorical Structure of Philippians 2:6-11." CBQ 42 (1980):73-82.
- Roberts, J.H. "Transitional Techniques to the Letter Body in the Corpus Paulinum." A South African Perspective on the New Testament. J.H. Petzer and P.J. Hartin, eds. Leiden: Brill, 1986:187-201.
- Robinson, J. A. "The Church as Fulfillment of Christ: A Note on Eph. 1:23." Expositor 5th series 7 (1898):241-259.
- _____ St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: A Revised Text and Translation with Exposition and Notes. London: Macmillan, 1903.
- Robinson, J.A.T. The Body. London: SCM Press, 1952.
- Robinson, J.M. "Die Hodajoth-Formel in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums." Apophoreta. Walther Eltester, ed. (BZNW 30) Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1964:194-235.
- Roetzel, C. "The Judgment Form in Paul's Letters." JBL 88 (1969):305-312.
- Roon, A. van. The Authenticity of Ephesians. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Rubinkiewicz, R. "Psalm 68:19 (=Eph. 4:18) Another Textual Tradition or Targum." NovT 17 (1975):219-224.
- Russell, D.A. and Winterbottom, M., eds. Ancient Literary Criticism. The Principal Texts in New Translations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- _____ Menander Rhetor. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Sampey, J.P. And the Two Shall Become One Flesh. (SNTSMS 16) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Sanders, E.P. Paul and Palestinian Judaism. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- Sanders, J.T. Ethics in the New Testament: Change and Development. London: SCM Press, 1975.
- _____ "Hymnic Elements in Ephesians 1-3." ZNW 56 (1965):214-232.
- _____ "The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letters of the Pauline Corpus." JBL 81 (1962):348-362.
- Schille, G. Frühchristliche Hymnen. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965.

Schlatter, A. Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon. Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1963.

Schlier, H. Der Brief an die Epheser. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1957.

_____ "Vom Wesen der apostolischen Ermahnung nach Röm 12,1-2." Die Zeit der Kirche. Freiburg: Herder, 1955:74-89.

_____ "Die Eigenart der christlichen Mahnung nach dem Apostel Paulus." Besinnung auf das Neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1967²:340-357.

Schnackenburg, R. Baptism in the Thought of Paul. ET by G.R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.

_____ Der Brief an die Epheser. (EKK 10) Zürich: Benziger Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982.

_____ "Christus, Geist und Gemeinde." Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973:279-296.

_____ The Church in the New Testament. ET by W.J. O'Hara. London: Burns & Oates, 1974.

_____ "Er hat uns mitauferweckt. Zur Tauflehre des Epheserbriefes." LJ 2 (1952):159-183.

_____ "Die große Eulogie Eph 1,3-14. Analyse unter textlinguistischen Aspekten." BZ 21 (1977):67-87.

_____ The Moral Teaching of the New Testament. ET by J. Holland Smith and W.J. O'Hara. New York: Herder & Herder, 1965.

_____ "Zur Exegese von Eph 2,11-22 im Hinblick auf das Verhältnis von Kirche und Israel." The New Testament Age. 2 vols. W.C. Weinrich, ed. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press:II/468-475.

Schnider, F., and Stenger, W. Studien zum neutestamentlichen Briefformular. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Schrage, W. Die konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinischen Paränese: Ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Ethik. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1961.

_____ The Ethics of the New Testament. ET by David E. Green. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988.

_____ "Zur Ethik der neutestamentlichen Haustafeln." NTS 21 (1975):1-22.

Schüssler Fiorenza, E. "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians." NTS 33 (1987):386-403.

Schubert, P. "Form and Function of the Pauline Letters." JR 19 (1939):365-377.

_____ Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings.
(BZNW 20) Berlin: Töpelman, 1939.

Schweitzer, A. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1953 [1931].

Schweizer, E. "Gottesgerechtigkeit und Lasterkataloge bei Paulus (inkl. Kol und Eph)." Rechtfertigung. J. Friedrich, et. al., eds. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Siebeck), 1976:461-478.

_____ "Traditional Ethical Patterns in the Pauline and post-Pauline Letters and their Development (lists of vices and house-tables)." Text and Interpretation. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979:195-209.

_____ "Die Weltlichkeit des Neuen Testaments: die Haustafeln." Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. H. Donner, R. Herbert, R. Smend, eds. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977:397-413.

Scott, E.F. The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians. (Moffatt NT Commentaries) London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930.

Scroggs, R. "Paul as Rhetorician: Two Homilies on Rom. 1-11." Jews, Greeks and Christians, Essays in honour of W.D. Davies. R. Hammerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs, eds. Leiden: Brill, 1976:271-298.

Seneca. Epistles. ET by R.M. Gummere (LCL). London: Heinemann; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1917.

Ševčenko, I. "A Shadow Outline of Virtue: The Classical Heritage of Greek Christian Literature: Second to Seventh Centuries." Age of Spirituality: A Symposium. Kurt Weitzman, ed. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1980:53-73.

Severus, E. von. "Gebet I." RAC VIII, 1972:1134-1258.

Smith, G.V. "Paul's Use of Ps. 68:18 in Eph. 4:8." JETS 18 (1975):181-189.

Spencer, A.B. Paul's Literary Style. Jackson, Ms.: ETS Monograph Series, 1984.

- Spencer, R.A., ed. Orientation by Disorientation: Studies in Literary Criticism and Biblical Literary Criticism. Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1980.
- Stagg, F. "The Domestic Code and Final Appeal, Eph. 5:21-6:24." RevExp 76 (1979):541-552.
- Standaert, B. "La rhétorique ancienne dans saint Paul." L'Apôtre Paul. A. Vanhoye, ed. Leuven: University Press, 1986:78-92.
- Stegner, W.R. "The Ancient Jewish Synagogue Homily." Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament. D.E. Aune, ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988:51-69.
- Steinmetz, F.-J. "Parusie-Erwartung im Epheserbrief?" Biblica 50 (1969):328-336.
- Stirewalt, M. L., Jr. "The Form and Function of the Greek Letter-Essay." The Romans Debate. K.P. Donfried, ed. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977:175-206.
- _____ "Paul's Evaluation of Letter Writing." Search the Scriptures. J.M. Myers, et. al., eds. Leiden: Brill, 1969:179-196.
- Stowers, S. Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity. (Library of Early Christianity 5) Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Stuhlmacher, P. "Er ist unser Friede (Eph 2,14). Zur Exegese und Bedeutung von Eph 2,14-18." Neues Testament und Kirche. J. Gnllka, ed. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1974:337-358.
- Stuiber, A. "Doxologie." RAC IV:210-226.
- Styler, G.M. "The Basis of Obligation in Paul's Christology and Ethics." Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament. B. Lindars and S. Smalley, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973:175-187.
- Tachau, P. "Einst" und "Jetzt" im Neuen Testament. Beobachtungen zu einem urchristlichen Predigt-schema in der neutestamentlichen Briefliteratur und zu seiner Vorgeschichte. (FRLANT 105) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Tannehill, R.C. Dying and Rising with Christ. (BZNW 32) Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1967.
- Taylor, W.F. "Ephesians." Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament: Ephesians, Colossians. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985.

- Thraede, K. "Zum historischen Hintergrund der 'Haustafeln' im Neuen Testament." Pietas. Münster: Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum Ergänzungsband, vol. 8, 1980:359-368.
- Thyen, H. Der Stil der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1955.
- Verhey, A. The Great Reversal: Ethics and the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Vouga, F. "Zur rhetorischen Gattung des Galaterbriefes." ZNW 79 (1988):291-292.
- Watson, D.F. Invention, Arrangement and Style. (SBL Dissertation Series 104) Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- _____ "A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and its Implications for the Unity Question." NovT 30 (1988):57-88.
- _____ "1 Corinthians 10:23-11:17 in the Light of Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Role of Rhetorical Questions." JBL 108 (1989):301-318.
- _____ "The New Testament and Greco-Roman Rhetoric: A Bibliography." JETS 31 (1988):465-472.
- Webster, J.B. "Christology, Imitability and Ethics." SJT 39 (1986):309-326.
- Weiss, J. "The Pauline Ethics." The History of Primitive Christianity. 2 vols. F.C. Grant, ed. New York: Wilson-Erickson, 1937:II/546-594.
- Wengst K. Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1972.
- Wernle, P. Der Christ und die Sünde bei Paulus. Freiburg/Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr (P. Siebeck), 1897.
- White, J.L. "Ancient Greek Letters." Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament. D.E. Aune, ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988:85-105.
- _____ The Form and Function of the Body of the Greek Letter in the Non-literary Papyri and in the Apostle Paul. (SBLDS 2) Missoula: Scholars Press, 1972.
- _____ "The Greek Documentary Letter Tradition, Third Century B.C.E. to Third Century C.E." Semlea 22 (1981):89-106.
- _____ "Introductory Formulae in the Body of the Pauline Letter." JBL 90 (1971):91-97.

- _____ Light From Ancient Letters. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- _____ "New Testament Epistolary Literature in the Framework of Ancient Epistolography." Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt 25.2. H. Temporini and W. Haase, eds. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1984:1730-1756.
- Wibbing, S. Die Tugend- und Lasterkatologe im Neuen Testament und ihre Traditionsgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Qumran-Texte. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1959.
- Wiles, G.P. Paul's Intercessory Prayers. (SNTSMS 24) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Wilhelmi, G. "Der Versöhner-Hymnus in Eph 2,14ff." ZNW 78 (1987):145-152.
- Wilson, R.A. "'We' and 'You' in the Epistle to the Ephesians." Studia Evangelica II. F.L. Cross, ed. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964:676-680.
- Windisch, H. "Das Problem des paulinischen Imperativs." ZNW 23 (1924):265-281.
- Wuellner, W. "Epistolography and Rhetoric in 1 Corinthians." paper delivered to the Society for New Testament Study, 1988.
- _____ "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans." CBQ 38 (1976):330-351.
- _____ "Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?" CBQ 49 (1987):448-463.
- Yates, R. "A Re-examination of Ephesians 1:23." ExpT 83 (1971-72):146-151.
- Zerwick, M. Der Brief an die Epheser. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1962.