

Allen, Thomas G. (1982) *The Body of Christ concept in Ephesians*. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/1698/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the Author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

THE BODY OF CHRIST CONCEPT IN EPHESIANS

BY

THOMAS G. ALLEN

Submitted in partial fulfillment  
for the degree of Ph. D.  
in the Faculty of Divinity  
University of Glasgow

December, 1982

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to numerous people in Scotland and the USA who have supported and encouraged me throughout this endeavor, but who for purposes of space cannot be specifically named. Without the gracious access given me to the libraries of Memphis Theological Seminary and Southwestern at Memphis the task of finishing this thesis in Brinkley, Arkansas would have been extremely difficult. But special thanks are due to Mrs. Annie Mae Lewis, and the staff of the Harding Graduate School of Religion library in Memphis, Tennessee. Without their helpful assistance a difficult task would have been all but impossible. I must also acknowledge the sustaining friendship of Professor W. Larry Lacy of Southwestern at Memphis. Our informal discussions on the broader issues of religion and philosophy have hopefully helped me to avoid the trap of "tunnel vision." Also deserving my special gratitude is my Professor, Ernest Best. I am indebted to his work which has been an inspiration and guidepost, and grateful for his patience and willingness to stay with me during the years in which this work has taken shape. Last but not least, I owe my thanks and my heart to my wife, Teri. Not only did she type and help proofread the manuscript, but her love has upheld me amid the ebb and flow of emotions that accompany Ph. D. work. To her this thesis is dedicated.

Τῷ δὲ δυναμέῳ ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν  
αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην  
ἐν ἡμῖν, αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ  
εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.

(Eph iii 20-21)



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary.....	viii
Principal Abbreviations.....	xi
Introduction.....	1
Purpose and Method.....	1
Exegetical Presuppositions.....	4
The Exegetical Question.....	10
CHAPTER I: THE UNITY OF HEAD AND BODY: EPH i 20-23.....	17
Context.....	17
Interrelation of i 20-23 and ii 1-10.....	19
The Believer's Exaltation and Solidarity with Christ....	20
Exegesis.....	27
The Character of the Pericope.....	27
Verse by Verse Analysis.....	35
vs. 20.....	35
vs. 21.....	38
vs. 22.....	43
Excursus: The Church as ἐκκλησία.....	48
Excursus: Christ as the Cosmic Head.....	64
vs. 23.....	77
Excursus: The Context and Meaning of πλήρωμα.....	92
Conclusion.....	113
CHAPTER II: GENTILES AND JEWS IN ONE BODY: EPH ii 16, iii 6...116	
Eph ii 16.....	116
The General Context.....	117
The Immediate Context.....	120
The Character of the Pericope.....	121
Verse by Verse Analysis.....	126
vs. 14.....	126
vs. 15.....	131
vs. 16.....	136
vs. 17.....	138
vs. 18.....	140
A Survey of the Interpretation of ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι,....	142
Arguments for the Crucified Body of Jesus.....	143
Arguments for the Church Body.....	150

The Grammatical Position and Primary Point of Reference of ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι.....	153
Eph iii 6.....	164
iii 6 in Context.....	164
Σύσσωμα in the Context of iii 6 .....	167
Conclusion.....	175
CHAPTER III: UNITY AND DIVERSITY IN THE GROWING BODY:	
EPH iv 1-16 (25).....	178
Context.....	178
Exegesis.....	181
The Character of the Pericope.....	181
Excursus: The Confessional Character of Eph iv 4-6...	182
Verse by Verse Analysis.....	186
vs. 4.....	186
vs. 5.....	192
vs. 6.....	194
vs. 7.....	195
vs. 8.....	199
vs. 9.....	201
vs. 10.....	202
vs. 11.....	204
vs. 12.....	208
vs. 13.....	213
vs. 14.....	224
vs. 15.....	226
vs. 16.....	233
Note on ἀλλήλων μέλη (iv 25).....	243
Conclusion.....	244
CHAPTER IV: THE BODY OF CHRIST AND THE BRIDE OF CHRIST:	
EPH v 22-33.....	251
Context.....	251
Excursus: The NT <u>Haustafeln</u> .....	252
The Ephesians <u>Haustafel</u> .....	256
Analysis of Eph v 22-33.....	261
Exegesis.....	262
The Exhortation to Wives.....	262
vs. 22.....	262
vs. 23.....	263
Excursus: Gen ii 24 and Marriage.....	265
vs. 24.....	278

The Exhortation to the Husbands.....	280
vs. 25.....	280
vs. 26.....	282
vs. 27.....	284
Excursus: The Ephesian Nuptial Imagery.....	285
vs. 28.....	296
vs. 29.....	298
vs. 30.....	300
The Scripture Quotation, Its Significance and Application.....	301
vs. 31.....	301
vs. 32.....	303
vs. 33.....	308
Conclusion.....	309
CONCLUSION.....	315
Christ's Supremacy and the Church's Unity.....	315
The Church as the Body of Christ.....	320
Underlying Characteristics.....	320
Specific Relations.....	323
Further Observations and Areas for Research.....	328
APPENDIX A: CORPORATE PERSONALITY: TOWARDS A DEFINITION.....	332
APPENDIX B: ΣΩΜΑ.....	340
Man and Σῶμα.....	340
The Greek World.....	340
The Jewish World.....	343
The New Testament.....	349
World, Society, and Σῶμα.....	354
Historical Overview.....	354
Points of Departure.....	358
Comparative Associations of the Body.....	367
Six Areas of Special Concern.....	369
APPENDIX C: ΣΩΜΑ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ in the Pauline Context.....	375
I Cor vi 15.....	375
I Cor x 17.....	376
I Cor xi 29.....	377
I Cor xii 12-27.....	377
Rom xii 4-5.....	379

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION.....384

NOTES TO CHAPTER I.....388

NOTES TO CHAPTER II.....423

NOTES TO CHAPTER III.....440

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV.....461

NOTES TO THE CONCLUSION.....482

NOTES TO APPENDIX A.....482

NOTES TO APPENDIX B.....485

NOTES TO APPENDIX C.....495

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....498

\*NOTE on Citations: Apart from the New Testament and LXX, quotations and translations of Greek and Latin authors are from the Loeb Classical Library unless noted otherwise. Quotations of the Babylonian Talmud and Midrash Rabba are cited from the Soncino editions.



## SUMMARY

Research into the Body of Christ concept in Ephesians has been largely dominated by the overriding question about the idea's origin and development in the Pauline Corpus. The conflicting answers to this larger problem as it pertains to Ephesians are often the reflection of different exegetical pictures of the idea's use in the letter. It is this exegetical question that forms the focus of our inquiry. We exegete the passages in Ephesians where the Body of Christ concept appears in order to unearth and clarify the idea's use and function in context. In so doing we hope to contribute modestly to the overall understanding of the letter and to the problem of the origin and development of the Body image.

Our exegesis shows that the Body of Christ concept is used to communicate the Church's twofold unity with-in Christ, i.e. the believers' solidarity with Christ and their fellowship with one another in Christ. Especially in i 20-23 does the former come to the fore. Christ is viewed as the New Adam who establishes a renewed cosmic order in which man is no longer subject to cosmic powers. As the special recipient of his benefits and blessings the Church shares the New Adam's exalted life as his new humanity. The underlying idea of Christ's solidarity with the Church is best understood in terms of Semitic corporate personality. Christ is functionally identified with believers such that his personhood supplies the necessary conditions for the Church's life and unity, its corporate self-identity. Adapting the popular social-political body metaphor to his own Semitic presuppositions, the author uses the Body of Christ image to convey the God-willed unity of a person. The Body denotes the Church as the corporate expression of Christ's person, whose distinct and individual function is represented by the Head. If Christ may be called the Head of all things, it is still the Church and not the cosmos

that is his Body. The unity of Head and Body distinguishes the Church from the cosmos, defining the Church as the special recipient of those divine acts whereby Christ's cosmic rule is established and his new life mediated.

The Church's participation in this new life entails a profound change in the constitution of God's people, and the mystery formerly hidden, now revealed, shows that Gentiles as well as Jews share the blessings inaugurated by the rule of Christ's peace. In Eph ii 14-18 and iii 6, then, the fellowship of Gentile and Jewish believers is stressed. The peace that Christ establishes between Gentiles and Jews is the outward expression of the peace established between God and all men. Gentiles and Jews receive reconciliation as members of one and the same Body; both share in the inheritance and promise, living together in the common life of the same Body. Here the idea of racial solidarity is conflated with the idea of an organism governed by one life principle. Again the source of this common life is the person of Christ who effects reconciliation through the cross. The unity of the Body members manifests corporately their unity with the Person who is this Body, Christ.

It becomes clear in iv 4-16 that such unity does not entail a stagnant sameness, but a living diversity. Christ gives different gifts in different measures so that each believer might receive the grace to serve and walk worthy of God's calling. Special gifts are given that through them Christ might prepare others for service so that each may work to build up and strengthen the bond of unity between themselves and with Christ. The final aim is that all together as the Body of Christ might attain to a Full-grown Man, to grow into the corporate person who is revealed in the function of the Head, Christ. Christ as Head is the whole Body in the function of being the source and goal of its life and growth. Thus the inner unity of the Body depends on its



receiving and responding to Christ's functional activity as Head. The inner unity of Body members manifests their unity with the person who is this Body in the mode of being its Head.

Such living in response to and dependency on the life that comes from this one Lord cannot leave untouched even the most basic structures of human existence such as marriage (v 22-33).. Here the Head/Body imagery helps interpret the one flesh relation of marriage and the unity between Christ and the Church is again accented. Christ, who loved the Church and gave himself for it is now called the Savior of the Body. Here as throughout Ephesians the Body retains a passive quality, defining the inward character rather than the outward content of obedience. Believers as Body members do not make up the Body, but Christ through his love and self-offering binds himself to believers and so constitutes the Church by his unity with believers. As members of the Body, believers are not seen reaching out to the world, but as special recipients of Christ's ongoing care and love.

Throughout the author uses the Body of Christ concept to communicate his Semitic presuppositions, best described under the rubric "corporate personality." From this perspective the Body concept offers an adaptable and useful tool for conveying the God-willed bond between Christ and believers and believers with one another. This solidifying bond is perhaps best described as the life-bond of love. As Christ gave his own body, the Church as his Body is the corporate expression of his self-giving love, seen in the ever increasing fellowship of believers loving one another in unity with and in Christ. Thus, the Body of Christ denotes the Church in its twofold unity with-in Christ as the special recipient of his love.

## PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS

I. Commentaries on Ephesians and Colossians and some basic works are cited by the name of the author. Short titles are also used and are self-explanatory.

### II. Biblical Books

OT= Old Testament

Gen

Ex

Lev

Num

Deut

Josh

Judg

I-II Sam

I-II Kgs

I-IV Ki (LXX)

Isa

Jer

Ez

Hos

Jl

Amos

Obad

Jonah

Mic

Nah

Zeph

Hag

Zech

Mal

Job

Ps.(s)

Prov

Ruth

S. of S.

Ecc

Lam

Esth

Dan

Ezra

Neh

I-II Chr

Apocrypha

Bar

I-II Esdr

Ep Jer

I-IV Macc

Sir

Tob

Wis

NT= New Testament

Matt, Mt\*

Mark, Mk

Luke, Lk

John, Jn

Acts

Rom

I-II Cor

Gal

Eph

Phil

Col

I-II Thess, I-II Th

---

\*Shorter abbreviations are used in the notes.



NT con't.

I-II Tim

Tit

Phm

Heb

Jas

I-II Pet

I-III John

Jude, Ju

Rev

### III. Other Abbreviations

AB = Anchor Bible

Acts Thom. = Acts of Thomas

Aen. Tact. = Aeneas Tacticus

AER = American Ecclesiastical Review

AnBib = Analecta Biblica

Ap. John = Apocryphon of John

Apc. Abr. = Apocalypse of Abraham

Apc. Bar. gr. = Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (III Baruch)

Apc. Mos. = Apocalypse of Moses

App. = Appendix

Arist. = Aristotle

An. = De Anima

Gen.An. = De Generatione Animalium

Metaph. = Metaphysica

Part.An. = De Partibus Animalium

Pol. = Politica

Rhet. = Rhetorica

Aristoph. Pl. = Aristophanes, Plutus

v. Arnim, Stoic. vet. fr. = H. von Arnim, ed. Stoicorum verterum fragmenta. 4 vols. Leipzig, 1903-1924.

AV = Authorized Version

Baba bat = Babylonian Talmud: Baba batra

Barn = Barnabas

Bauer = W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. Danker, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature. 2nd ed. Chicago, 1979.

BDB = F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford, 1955.

Ber = Babylonian Talmud: Berakot

Best = E. Best, One Body in Christ. London, 1955.

BG = Codex Berolensis 8502

Bib = Biblica

Bl-D = F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature. Trans. & rev. R. W. Funk. Chicago, 1961.

BNTC = Black's New Testament Commentaries

Bull Evang Theol Soc = Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society

BJRL = Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester

BZ = Biblische Zeitschrift

BZAW = Beihefte zur ZAW

BZNW = Beihefte zur ZNW

CBC = Cambridge Bible Commentary

CBQ = Catholic Biblical Quarterly

CD = Cairo Damascus Document (Qumran)

ch(s). = chapter(s)

Chrys. = Chrysippus

Cic. = M. Tullius Cicero

Flac. = Oratio pro L. Flacco

Mur. = Oratio pro L. Murena

Nat. Deor. = De Natura Deorum

Phil. = Orationes Philippicae in M. Antonium

Cl. Al. = Clement of Alexandria

Ecl. Proph. = Eclogae Propheticae

Exc. Theod. = Excerpta ex Theodoto

I-II Clem = I-II Epistles of Clement

Coni Neot = Coniectanea neotestamentica

Corp. Herm. = Corpus Hermeticum

Curtius = Q. Curtius Rufus

Demosth. Or. = Demosthenes, Orationes

DeutR = Midrash: Deuteronomy Rabbah

Did = Didache

Dio Chrys. = Dion Chrysostomus

Diod. S. = Diodorus Siculus

Diog. L. = Diogenes Laertius

Dion. Hal. Ant.Rom. = Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Antiquitates Romanae

DNTT = The new international Dictionary of New Testament Theology, 3 vols. gen. ed. C. Brown. Exeter/Grand Rapids, 1975-1978.

DSS = Dead Sea Scrolls

I-III En. = I-III Enoch (Ethiopic, Slavonic, and Hebrew Enoch)

Ep. Ar. = The Epistle of Aristeas

Epic. Diss. = Epictetus, Dissertationes

Epiph. Haer. = Epiphanius, Haereses

Erub = Babylonian Talmud: Erubin

Eur. Or. = Euripides, Orestes

EvTh = Evangelische Theologie

Exeg. Soul = Exegesis on the Soul

ExGT = The Expositor's Greek Testament, 5 vols. ed. W. R. Nicoll.  
repr. Grand Rapids, 1951.

Exp = Expositor

ExR = Midrash: Exodus Rabba

ExT = Expository Times

Foerster, I-II = W. Foerster, ed. Gnosis, 2 vols. English ed. R. McL.  
Wilson. Oxford, 1972, 1974.

FRLANT = Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen  
Testaments

fs. = Festschrift für

Galen, Lex. = Galen's Lexicon.

GenR = Midrash: Genesis Rabba

Gorg. Fr. = Gorgias, in H. Diels Die Fragmenta der Vorsokratiker, II.  
4th ed. 1922.

Gos. Phil. = Gospel of Philip

Gos. Thom. = Gospel of Thomas

Ḥag = Babylonian Talmud: Ḥagiga

HAT = Handbuch zum Alten Testament

Hatch-Redpath = E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath. A Concordance to the  
Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament.  
2 vols. Oxford, 1897.

HDB = J. Hastings, ed. A Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Edinburgh,  
1901-1902.

Hdt. = Herodotus

Her. = Hermeneia

Hesoid. Op. = Hesiodus, Opera et Dies

Hipp. Ref. = Hippolytus, Refutatio Omnium Haeresium

HKNT = Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament

HNTC = Harper's New Testament Commentaries

Hom. = Homer

Il. = Iliad; Od. = Odyssey

Hyp. Arch. = Hypostasis of the Archons

HNT = Handbuch zum Neuen Testament

IB = The Interpreter's Bible, 12 vols. gen. ed. G. A. Buttrick.  
Nashville, 1951-1957.

ICC = International Critical Commentary



- IDB = The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 4 vols. gen. ed. G. A. Buttrick. Nashville, 1962.
- IDB Suppl = The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Supplementary Volume. gen. ed. K. Crim. Nashville, 1976.
- Ign. = Ignatius
- Sm. = ad Smyrnaeos
- Tr. = ad Trallianos
- Iren: Adv.Haer. = Irenaeus, Adversus Haeresus
- Isoc. Or. = Isocrates, Orationes
- JB = Jerusalem Bible
- JBL = Journal of Biblical Literature
- Jos. = Josephus
- Ant. = Antiquitates Judaicae
- Ap. = Contra Apionem
- Bell. = Bellum Judaicum
- JTS = Journal of Theological Studies
- Jub = Jubilees
- KHAT = Kurzer Handbuch zum Alten Testament
- Knox = W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge, 1939.
- KNT = Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
- LevR = Midrash: Leviticus Rabba
- LexThQ = Lexington Theological Quarterly
- Lib. = Libanius
- Lidd-Scott = H. G. Liddell, R. Scott et al. A Greek English Lexicon. 9th ed. Oxford, 1940.
- Liv. = Titus Livius (Livy)
- LXX = Septuagint
- Mak = Babylonian Talmud: Makkot
- Mek Ex = Mekilta Exodus
- MeyerK = Meyer, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
- MG = J. P. Migne, ed. Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graeca. Paris, 1844ff.
- Midr Ps = Midrash on the Psalms
- Mitton, EE = C. L. Mitton, The Epistle to the Ephesians. Its Authorship Origin and Purpose. Oxford, 1951.
- MM = J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-literary Sources. London, 1914-1930.
- MNTC = Moffatt New Testament Commentary
- Moult.-Geden = W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, A Concordance to the Greek Testament. 4th ed. Edinburgh, 1963

MT = Masoretic Text

M. Sanh = Mishnah: Sanhedrin

Mussner, CAK = F. Mussner, Christus, das All und die Kirche. Trier, 1955.

n. = note

NCB = New Century Bible

NEB = New English Bible

N.F. = Neue Folge

NHL = The Nag Hammadi Library in English, ed. J. M. Robinson. New York/London, 1977.

NICNT = The New International Commentary on the New Testament

Nid = Babylonian Talmud: Niddah

NIV = New International Version

NRT = La nouvelle revue theologique

n.s. = new series

NT = Novum Testamentum

NTL = New Testament Library

NTS = New Testament Studies

NT Suppl = Supplements to Novum Testamentum

NuR = Midrash: Numbers Rabba

Onosander, Strat. = Onosander, Strategicus

Orig. World = On the Origin of the World

Orphic Frag. = Orphicorum Fragmenta, ed. O. Kern. 1922.

o.s. = old series

O. Sol. = Odes of Solomon

OTL = Old Testament Library

Ovid. Tris. = P. Ovidius Naso, Tristia

Pesach = Babylonian Talmud: Pesachim

PesiqR = Pesiqta Rabbati

Philo = Philo of Alexandria

Abr. = De Abrahamo

Aet.Mund. = De Aeternitate Mundi

Agric. = De Agricultura

Ap. pro Iud. = Apologia pro Iudaeis

Conf.Ling. = De Confusione Linguarum

Congr. = De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia

Decal. = De Decalogo

Det.Pot.Ins. = Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari solet

Ebr. = De Ebrietate

Philo con't

Fug. = De Fuga et Inventione

Gig. = De Gigantibus

Leg.All. = Legum Allegoriae

Migr.Abr. = De Migratione Abrahami

Op.Mund. = De Opificio Mundi

Plant. = De Plantatione

Post.Cain. = De Posteritate Caini

Praem.Poen. = De Praemiis et Poenis

Quaest. in Ex. = Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum

Quaest. in Gen. = Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin

Rer.Div.Her. = Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres sit

Sacr. AC. = De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini

Som. = De Somniis

Spec.Leg. = De Specialibus Legibus

Virt. = De Virtutibus

Vit.Mos. = De Vita Mosis

Pirqe R. El. = Pirqe Rabbi Eleizer

Plat. = Plato

Epin. = Epinomis

Gorg. = Gorgias

Leg. = Leges

Phaedr. = Phaedrus

Phileb. = Philebus

Prot. = Protagoras

Resp. = Respublica

Sym. = Symposion

Theaet. = Theaetetus

Tim. = Timaeus

PLeid = Papyri Gracci Musci antiquarii publici Lugduni -Batavi, ed.  
C. Leemanns, 1843ff.

PLille = Papyrus Grecs Lille, eds. P. Jouguet, P. Collart, et al., 1912.

Plut. = Plutarchus (Plutarch)

Cor. = De Coriolanus

Def.Orac. = De Defectu Oraculorum

Frat.Amor. = De Fratero Amore

Galb. = De Galba

Lib.Ed. = De Liberis Educandis

Phil(op). = De Philopoemene

Plut. con't.

Pomp. = De Pompeio

Praec. Coniug. = Praecepta Coniugalium

Sol. = De Solon

Pol Phil. = Polycarp to the Philippians

PQ = Paul and Qumran, ed. J. Murphey-O'Connor. London, 1968.

Preis. Zaub. = K. Preisendanz, Papyri Graecae Magicae. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1973.

Ps. = Pseudo

Ps. Arist. Mund. = Pseudo-Aristotle, De Mundo

Ps. Callisth. = Pseudo-Callisthenes

Ps. Philo, Lib. Anti. Bib. = Pseudo-Philo, Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum

1Q = Qumran Scrolls from Cave I

1QH = Hodoyot (Thanksgiving Hymns)

1QIsa<sup>a</sup> = First copy of the Isaiah scroll

1QM = Malhamah (War Scroll)

1QpHab = Peshar on Habakkuk

1QS = Serek hayyahad (Community Rule or Manual of Discipline)

4QpPs = Peshar on the Psalms from Cave IV

RB = Revue Biblique

Rev Exp = Review and Expositor

RGG<sup>3</sup> = Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 3rd. ed. 7 vols. ed. K. Galling et al. Tübingen, 1957-1965.

Robertson, A Grammar = A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville, 1934.

RSV = Revised Standard Version

Sanh = Babylonian Talmud: Sanhedrin

S. Bar(uch) = Syriac Baruch (II Baruch)

SBLMS = Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series

SBT = Studies in Biblical Theology

SCHNT = Studia ad corpus hellenisticum novi testamenti

Sen. = L. Annaeus Seneca

Clem. = De Clementia

Ep. = Epistulae

Ira = De Ira

Sex. Emp. Math. = Sextus Empiricus, Adversus Mathematicos

Shab = Babylonian Talmud: Shabbath

Sib Or = Sibylline Oracles

SJT = Scottish Journal of Theology



SNTSMS = Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series

Sot = Babylonian Talmud: Sota

Stob. Anth. = Johannes Stobaeus, Anthology

Str-B = H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrash. 6 vols. München, vols. 1-4, 1922-1928; vols. 5-6, 1956-1961.

Stud. Paul. Cong. Inter. = Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus, 1961. 2 vols. AnBib 17-18. Rome, 1963.

SUNT = Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments

Supp. Epigr. Graec. = Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, ed. J. J. E. Hondius et al. Leiden, 1923-1938.

Tacitus, An. = Tacitus, Annales

TDan = Testament of Daniel

TDNT = Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 9 vols. eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Trans. G. W. Bromily. Grand Rapids, 1964-1973. Index vol. compiled by R. E. Pitkin, 1976.

Tg. Ps = Targum of the Psalms

TLev = Testament of Levi

TLZ = Theologische Literaturzeitung

Tri. Tract. = Tripartite Tractate

TrThZ = Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift

t Taan = Tosepta: Taanit

TU = Texte und Untersuchungen

TZ = Theologische Zeitschrift

TZeb = Testament of Zebulon

Vergil. Aen. = P. Vergilius Maro (Virgil), Aeneis

Vit. Ad. = Vita Adae et Evae

vs(s). = verse(s)

VT = Vetus Testamentum

WZKM = Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes

Xenoph. = Xenophon

An. = Anabasis

Cyrop. = Cyropaedia

Mem. = Memorabilia Socratis

Yeb = Babylonian Talmud: Yebamot

ZAW = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

ZNW = Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche



## INTRODUCTION

### PURPOSE AND METHOD

The primary objective of this investigation is to understand the use and function of the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$   $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  concept in Ephesians. In doing so, we hope to contribute to two ongoing discussions: (1) understanding Ephesians as a whole, and (2) understanding the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$   $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  concept within the Pauline Corpus. Our method will be exegetical. We will exegete the passages in which the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$   $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  idea appears to determine the general characteristics of the concept's use and function in context. This will provide a sound basis for grasping the idea's overall meaning in Ephesians, and also a starting point from which others may pursue the question of placing the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  concept of Ephesians in the broader framework of the idea in the Pauline Corpus. Our objectives and method need further explanation.

Just a glance at Ephesians suggests that the image of the Body of Christ was important to its author. The term,  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ , appears nine times. Seven instances are clearly descriptive of the Church (i 23; iv 4, 12, 16, 16; v 23, 30). Of the remaining two, one is disputed and may refer to the crucified body of Jesus or the Church (ii 16). Even the last one, which is the only purely anthropological use of the term, appears in and is probably informed by a context that employs the Church concept (v 28). Also the use of the variant cognate,  $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\omega\mu\omicron\varsigma$ , probably involves the Body of Christ idea (iii 6). The same may be stated of an isolated instance of  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta$  (iv 25). So just these simple statistical data suggest that the Body of Christ idea is important to our author's understanding of the Church.

The Church's centrality in the subject matter of Ephesians, also makes understanding of the letter dependent in part on an adequate grasp of the author's Body of Christ concept. For example, the theme of Church unity is prevalent throughout the letter, and the Body of Christ image is

observably pertinent to the discussion of unity. This does not necessitate that the Body of Christ image is the letter's most important concept, or the key to the letter's meaning. Still, our understanding would be deficient without this important piece in the jigsaw puzzle that Ephesians presents us. Without that piece the picture is unrecognizable; but with that piece alone the picture is also unrecognizable. The total picture becomes clear only as the pieces are assembled.

The quest for this total picture is unusually difficult with regard to Ephesians. Not only is there little agreement on the author's use of *σῶμα Χριστοῦ*, but also on other fundamental matters such as who the author was or why the letter was written. The number of disputed factors is unusually large and the overall picture is unusually vague. With research and scholarly opinion at such a fluid stage, our investigation can only be a contribution to the ongoing discussion. Without an adequate grasp of the total picture, a study of its parts is difficult and hazardous. Yet without inquiries into the parts, the total picture can never be adequately focused. This tension seems unavoidable: how can we make a comprehensive statement of the author's use of *σῶμα Χριστοῦ* when we cannot even be certain who he was, to whom he was writing, when he was writing, or what prompted him to write, etc.? Accordingly the goals of our study must remain proportionately modest. Although the ideal of a comprehensive statement eludes us, we may aim at making partial statements, which are somewhat independent of wider concerns such as authorship and date, and are the stepping stones to a full understanding. We may proceed along these lines because at least one datum remains fairly fixed and lends itself to investigation, the text.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the text is the foundation on which all other hypotheses must be built, and this is especially so with Ephesians where many questions must be left unanswered. On this reason alone we might rest our case for an exegetical study of the letter's Body of Christ concept. The study's immediate value would be



its contribution to a fuller understanding of Ephesians. Still, this is not the sole reason for our approach.

The unsettled disputes over the source of *σῶμα Χριστοῦ* and the circumstances of its development in Colossians and Ephesians also restrict the goals of our study, making the exegetical approach fitting. These wider issues have largely dominated research of the concept in Ephesians.<sup>2</sup> But the questions of origin and development cannot be properly posed, much less resolved, until a prior question has been answered: how does the image function within its immediate context? To answer this prior question we must be as aware as possible of the term's background, and plainly the Pauline Corpus is an essential part of that background. Still, our primary focus will not be on the concept's origin and development in the Pauline Corpus, but its use in Ephesians. A certain tension here is again undeniable: how can one fully understand what *σῶμα Χριστοῦ* expresses without an awareness of its origin and development? In response we affirm that passages in which the term occurs, and the letter as a whole, create a limited context for understanding. This limited context may not provide all the answers to questions about origin and development, but it does provide the clearest and most available evidence for understanding the author's use of the concept. Such evidence should also provide criteria and clues to aid the exegete in sifting through various options concerning origins and background, and other such problems. The exegetical approach, then, provides a means of dealing with these problems as they arise in the investigation.

In view of the approach and scope of our study, a twofold task remains by way of introduction. First we will outline the basic exegetical presuppositions of our study, thus providing a broad framework for our exegesis. This framework is important because exegesis cannot be conducted in a vacuum. If with Ephesians this is made more difficult because of the greater number of unknowns, it can nevertheless not be avoided. Second we

offer a brief history of the debate surrounding the Body of Christ concept in Ephesians. This will enable us to focus on some of the major issues involved, and also to see within the context of the ongoing discussion the importance of asking the exegetical question.

## EXEGETICAL PRESUPPOSITIONS

The difficulties in accurately accounting for the Sitz im Leben of Ephesians are, as mentioned, unusually numerous. Here we do not aim to provide an extended discussion of these problems, but to outline the broad limits within which our study will be conducted, discussing briefly the letter's authorship, historical sources, setting, literary character, and occasion and purpose.

### A. Authorship

No problem about Ephesians looms larger, or at least has received more attention, than that of authorship.<sup>3</sup> Some scholars affirm Pauline authorship of Ephesians, others deny it, and others leave the issue undecided.<sup>4</sup> To answer the many questions raised by this problem would take us far afield. Moreover, some problems that our study will address would not be immediately solved if the author were known. For example, the interpretation of σῶμα Χριστοῦ in I Corinthians and Romans is disputed despite Paul's acknowledged authorship. Of course, knowing the author helps eliminate certain options and make others unlikely. Still, what the relevant texts say in context is the final measure of what is or is not acceptable. This is even more the case where authorship is disputed. Thus for our purposes, we neither affirm nor deny Pauline authorship of Ephesians.

Given this agnostic position, is there anything that may be affirmed about the author of Ephesians? Many scholars believe the author was a Jewish Christian.<sup>5</sup> This is, of course, obvious if the author is Paul, but not so obvious if he is not. Comments at ii 3, 11 and 17 read like those of a Jewish Christian. These passages may be coupled with three other



factors: (a) the presence of Semitisms in the letter, (b) the author's understanding of the Jewish-Gentile relationship which reflects a Jewish perspective (ii 11ff; iii 6; iv 17f), and (c) the author's treatment of Scripture which resembles Rabbinic methods (iv 8ff).<sup>6</sup> This makes a probable, though not certain, case that the author was a Jewish Christian. Assuming an imitator wrote the letter, it remains open how successfully he emulates Paul, who is, of course, a Jewish Christian. But if the letter was written by a Gentile, he was extraordinarily successful in writing like a 1st century Jew. While this is a possibility, it is more likely that the author was a Christian Jew, whether Paul or a disciple of Paul.

Certainly the author is familiar with Paul's thought and writing, although Ephesians shows differences as well as similarities in style, vocabulary and themes to Paul's undisputed letters. For instance, Cadbury sums up the issue of style:

...which is more likely - that an imitator of Paul in the first century composed a writing ninety or ninety-five per cent in accordance with Paul's style or that Paul himself wrote a letter diverging five or ten per cent from his usual style?<sup>7</sup>

The issue involves theology as much as style, and scholars might disagree somewhat on the percentage points used, but in general Cadbury's statement points to the central difficulty of the authorship question: i.e. weighing the differences and similarities to the undisputed Pauline works and the emergence of new circumstances. But clearly there would be no problem at all if the letter did not belong to the Pauline school of thought. Thus, we conclude that if the letter was not by Paul, it was by someone who knew Paul's thought well and could apply it creatively. The author of Ephesians, then, was either Paul or a Jewish Christian thoroughly familiar with Paul's thought.

## B. Historical Sources

The author relies on many and varied sources to express his thought. Perhaps the most immediate effect of our position on authorship is the implications this has for the use of the parallel materials from the Pauline

Corpus. It is generally agreed that such parallels exist and are important for interpreting Ephesians, but scholars explain them by different means, such as (a) common authorship, (b) literary dependency, or perhaps (c) common traditions.<sup>8</sup> While these explanations are not mutually exclusive, stressing one or the other involves a decision on authorship. Our agnostic position on authorship requires a similar open posture here. So the Pauline Corpus is an important source for understanding Ephesians, but one to be used with caution. Preferably parallels will be used only to reinforce arguments based on the text. Admittedly, this is not always so straightforward, for parallels sometimes help to define options and bring new insight. Still, the major thrust of our approach is to allow Ephesians to speak for itself, rather than force it into a preconceived Pauline mold built on materials in the Pauline Corpus.

The most important test of this method is in our use of Colossians, which deserves special mention. Though perhaps less heatedly than in the case of Ephesians, the authorship of Colossians is nonetheless disputed.<sup>9</sup> Our position will be similar to that for Ephesians: we neither affirm nor deny Pauline authorship; but we do affirm its position in the stream of Pauline thought.<sup>10</sup> Colossians and Ephesians share a large amount of vocabulary, phraseology, and themes; yet there are also important differences. For example, sometimes the same word is used with a different point of reference and perhaps even changes in meaning (e.g. πλήρωμα).<sup>11</sup> Again, three possible solutions may explain this relationship: (a) common authorship, (b) literary dependency, or (c) common traditions. (c) can hardly explain certain correlations such as the statements about Tychicus (Eph vi 21f; Col iv 7f), though this category need not be excluded altogether. Nor are (a) and (b) mutually exclusive. Most scholars think that Colossians is prior to Ephesians, and consequently the latter is dependent upon the former. There are dissenting voices, however, and the issue often becomes involved.<sup>12</sup> It is sufficient for us to affirm that Colossians and



Ephesians are closely related, sharing a common milieu of vocabulary and thought, but leaving the exact contours of this relation open.

Ephesians also reflects the use of materials outside the Pauline Corpus.<sup>13</sup> The Old Testament is alluded to and explicitly quoted (e.g. i 20, 22; ii 17; iv 8, 25f; v 31; vi 2). It also is probable that the author has adapted some early Christian liturgical traditions (e.g. v 14) and ethical codes (e.g. v 22-vi 9). Scholars also suggest that parallels and background materials are found in other NT books such as I Peter and Acts, or in Qumran writings or in Gnosticism. If not all of these proposals are equally convincing, their variety at least points to the complex background out of which our letter emerged. The relevance of these background materials must be assessed in the course of our inquiry.

### C. Historical Setting

In view of the problems surrounding authorship little may be said about Ephesians' historical setting. If Paul wrote the letter, then it originated from one of his imprisonments. Caesarea and Rome are the more likely candidates and the date would be around A.D. 60.<sup>14</sup> If Paul is not the author, then scholars usually consider the letter, due to its association with Ephesus and with Colossians, to have come from somewhere in Asia Minor and to be dated sometime before A.D. 100.<sup>15</sup> For our study, then, we will make no assumption about the letter's place of origin. We may assume that it was written in the rough period of A.D. 60-100.

Although the letter's association with Ephesus is long-standing, its destination is nonetheless disputed. Paul was well known in Ephesus, but the letter suggests (i 15; iii 1, iv 20f) that he did not know the readers personally. Also the letter has a more general and less personal tone. These facts are difficult to reconcile with an Ephesian destination, even for a Pauline imitator.<sup>16</sup> Some of the better manuscripts, however, omit the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in i 1, although all the manuscripts preserve the prescript ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ.<sup>17</sup> This has led to a variety of proposals

about the letter's destination. We need not detail this debate, but simply note a few important facts about the readers. The readers were largely, if not exclusively Gentiles (ii 11). As mentioned, they did not know Paul personally, although the author assumes an interest in Paul's affairs (vi 22). Also the author does seem to have a concrete circle of people in view (i 15; iii 1; vi 21f).<sup>18</sup> The less personal tone of the letter suggests a larger group, perhaps involving several congregations and cities. The area in which they lived is also uncertain, though many scholars think somewhere in Asia Minor is likely.<sup>19</sup> In summary, the readers were Gentile Christians who did not know Paul personally and who probably lived in a cluster of towns somewhere in Asia Minor.

#### D. Literary Character

Ephesians is less personal in tone and more general in approach than other letters in the Pauline Corpus, and this is reflected in its style. The sentences are often long and labored, and the phraseology is often drawn out by a series of prepositional phrases or by the piling up of genitive combinations. Most scholars recognize this as the elevated style of prayer and liturgy.<sup>20</sup> Recently, K. G. Kuhn demonstrated the similarities of this language with the Semitic constructions of the Qumran writings, particularly the hymns.<sup>21</sup> Also much attention has been given to the liturgical and other traditional materials behind the text. This emphasis reaches its apex in E. Käsemann's assessment of the letter's character: "The entire letter appears to be a mosaic composed of extensive as well as tiny elements of tradition, and the author's skill lies chiefly in the selection and ordering of the material available to him."<sup>22</sup> But granted the large amount of traditional material, Ephesians has too much inner cohesion to suggest that the author's chief contribution was scissors and paste. More likely the author is resorting to formulations and images that have been thoroughly internalized through worship experience. In any case, we must assess the author's use of traditional materials in the course of the study.



This raises another critical question: do we have a "letter" before us at all? Again, scholars are divided: some regard the document as a treatise or tract in the garb of a letter; others see it as a genuine letter, though usually of an encyclical nature.<sup>23</sup> The truth probably lies somewhere between these two poles. Ephesians is clearly not a situational letter like Galatians or I Corinthians. Still, its view of the readers is too concrete to warrant the outright title of a treatise or tract. Perhaps we should avoid rigid either/or categories and attempt a middle-ground description such as "letter-homily" or "homiletic letter." For our purposes it is sufficient to regard Ephesians as a genuine correspondence, whose content is somewhat impersonal in tone and general in its approach to thematic concerns.

#### E. Occasion and Purpose

The occasion and purpose of Ephesians has been described in numerous ways. J. N. Sanders and Bruce suggest that in Ephesians Paul, with his mind still occupied with the implications of the Colossian controversy, set out in a meditative and prayerful style his "spiritual testament to the Church."<sup>24</sup> Similarly Schlier takes the letter as a "Sophiaredede" in which Paul responds to a Jewish-Christian Gnosticism that threatens the young churches of the East.<sup>25</sup> Goodspeed, Knox, and Mitton have made famous the theory that Ephesians arose in connection with the collection of the Pauline letters and served as an introductory summary of Paul's teaching.<sup>26</sup> Still other scholars see Ephesians as a discourse on baptism and its implications for newly converted Gentiles,<sup>27</sup> while Chadwick hypothesizes that the letter intends to gather the entire Gentile mission under the single umbrella of the Apostle to the Gentiles.<sup>28</sup> Käsemann, Kümmel, and Martin argue that Ephesians is addressed to a post-Pauline crisis in which Gentile Christianity has forgotten the Jewish roots of its faith and has failed, due perhaps to current gnostic interpretations, to grasp the moral implications of the Pauline Gospel.<sup>29</sup>

These theories show that the letter's occasion and purpose is bound up with the authorship question. We must, then, leave this question open. But we may point to three thematic concerns which any statement of the letter's occasion and purpose must incorporate. The author stresses: (1) Christ's superiority and supremacy over the entire cosmos and its various powers; (2) the universality, unity and ongoing spiritual purpose and struggle of the Church; (3) the prayerful concern of Paul as the imprisoned Apostle for the Gentiles.<sup>30</sup> These three themes find a common focal point in the revelation of the mystery of Christ. The circumstances, however, that prompted the bringing together of these themes are far from clear. For the purposes of this study, these questions must be largely left open.

We sum up our exegetical presuppositions in the following list:

1. Ephesians was written either by Paul or a (Jewish) Christian thoroughly acquainted with his thought.
2. The author of Ephesians drew on diverse sources, and the background of a given passage must be determined on its own merits.
3. The Pauline Corpus is an important source for understanding Ephesians, but care must be exercised to allow Ephesians to speak for itself.
4. Colossians is closely related to Ephesians, sharing a common milieu of vocabulary and thought, but the exact nature of the relation is to be left open.
5. The question of the letter's origin is to be left open.
6. The letter may be dated roughly in the period A.D. 60-100.
7. The readers were Gentile Christians who did not know Paul personally and who probably lived in a cluster of towns in Asia Minor.
8. Ephesians' style is often liturgical, containing a variety of early Christian traditions, and its tone and approach is somewhat impersonal and general.
9. The question of the letter's occasion and purpose is left open, though we note that any theory must explain the threefold accent on God's mystery, involving Christ, the Church, and the Apostle to the Gentiles.

## THE EXEGETICAL QUESTION

To put our investigation in proper perspective we outline briefly the highlights of the ongoing discussion of the Body of Christ concept in Ephesians. Traditionally the Body of Christ idea of Ephesians, and that of Colossians, was viewed as an extension of the concept in the



homologumena. Any differences were considered embellishments arising naturally from applying the popular metaphor in new circumstances.<sup>31</sup> In 1930, however, Schlier made a radical departure from this explanation in a treatise entitled Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief. Schlier applied the results of the History of Religions School to the exegesis of Ephesians.<sup>32</sup> He interpreted a number of motifs in Ephesians, including the Body of Christ idea, within the framework of a gnostic redeemer myth.

Schlier ultimately denied the continuity of the conception as found in I Corinthians and Romans and that found in Ephesians.<sup>33</sup> He pointed out that unlike the social metaphor of the homologumena, the idea in Ephesians concentrates on the believers' union with Christ. Thus, the Church, indeed the universal Church, is explicitly and more concretely identified with Christ's Body. Moreover, unlike in I Corinthians and Romans, in Ephesians Christ is at once the Head, and the Head + the Body. Schlier also notes that the body may be conceived as a "trunk" and grows, quite unnaturally, into the Head, which in turn is the source of this growth. In Eph v 23-32 we discover an equation between body, flesh, wife and the Church which cannot be explained by the conception in the homologumena. Finally and most important, Christ as Head and Body is in Ephesians equated with the All. Schlier believed a comprehensive explanation of these features could only be provided by recourse to a gnostic redeemer myth in which the redeemed souls were incorporated into the gigantic body of a cosmic redeemer figure.

Three years after Schlier's publication, Käsemann published a concentrated study on the Pauline body concept.<sup>34</sup> Though Käsemann essentially agreed with Schlier's interpretation of Ephesians, he also felt that the gnostic framework was important for understanding the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$   $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  of I Corinthians and Romans.<sup>35</sup> These proposals raised questions, not only about the source of the concept, but also about the use of historical parallels and methodology. They have tended to dominate and shape the debate about the Body of Christ for the last fifty years.

In 1942 E. Percy rejected this "gnostic" interpretation, proposing instead an inner-Christian development.<sup>36</sup> In place of a gnostic redeemer myth, Percy points to the OT idea of a corporate representative. With this backdrop Percy replaces incorporation into the cosmic body of a gnostic redeemer with incorporation into the historical body of Jesus.<sup>37</sup> He finds this scheme in the homologumena and the antilegomena and thus maintains the continuity of the concept throughout the Pauline Corpus. In Ephesians, ii 16 is crucial for Percy, because it supposedly demonstrates the believers' real union with the historical body of the crucified Jesus.<sup>38</sup> The motifs of the Head and growth are considered natural developments arising from an inherent "Spannung" in the Body concept itself.<sup>39</sup>

In the ensuing debate, Schlief, perhaps with an eye to Percy's criticism, altered his earlier view.<sup>40</sup> Like Percy, he sees the Church's origin in the crucified body of Jesus. But unlike Percy, this body is seen as a cosmic body. The background for this concept is no longer simply found in Gnosticism, but in Jewish Adam speculations influenced by the oriental-gnostic "Urmensch-Erlöser Mythos."<sup>41</sup> These shifts or perhaps refinements in Schlief's position, though significant, have not greatly altered his exegetical picture of Ephesians or his formulation of the problem. But it is precisely this exegetical picture that Percy's proposal, albeit somewhat indirectly, called into question.

In 1955 this problem was addressed more directly by F. Mussner in an exegetical study entitled Christus, das All und die Kirche. The title itself suggests the root problem, understanding the interrelation between Christ, Church and the cosmos. Mussner adamantly denied the "gnostic" explanation, noting especially the absence of a cosmic body in Ephesians. He proposed understanding the Body of Christ as a sacramental organism, joining the Hellenistic idea of an organism and sacramental unity.<sup>42</sup>

A year after Mussner's publication, Benoit re-investigated the problem.<sup>43</sup> Following Percy in his overall understanding of the concept in



I Corinthians and Romans, Benoit felt Percy's natural development theory inadequate to explain the Head concept.<sup>44</sup> Rejecting influence from a Gnostic Heavenly Anthropos concept, he argues that the idea of Christ being the Head (in the OT and Jewish sense of 'ruler') of the angelic powers was combined with the Body of Christ concept. This allowed the eventual development of a Head concept along the lines of the Hellenistic idea of a life-giving principle. Benoit finds evidence for this process in Colossians.<sup>45</sup> Thus, he attempts to provide a framework for understanding the cosmic implications of the Body of Christ concept without resort to a Macroanthropos scheme.

But other scholars have not relinquished this cosmic understanding of the Body of Christ. P. Pokorný, for instance, argues that the concept in Ephesians and Colossians has five characteristics:

Es handelt sich a) um das Motiv des geistigen Menschen als lebendiger "Überpersonlichen Person" (Eph. 4, 13-15); b) um die Vorstellung des kosmischen Leibes (1, 23; 4, 15; Kol. 1, 17); c) um die Vorstellung des soziologischen Organismus (4, 16; 5, 29-30; Kol. 2, 17-19); d) um die Vorstellung des Hauptes, von dem das Leben abhängt (1, 23; 4, 15; Kol. 1, 18; 2, 19), and e) um das für Eph. und Kol. typische Motiv des geistigen Wachstums (4, 15-16; Kol. 2, 16).<sup>46</sup>

On the basis of these criteria Pokorny thinks that the Ephesian conception is a response to a gnostic scheme similar to that found in the so-called Naassene sermon.

An altogether different approach is made by Schweizer.<sup>47</sup> In his attempt to trace the development of the Body of Christ image within the Pauline Corpus, Schweizer suggests that Col i 15-20 reveals a hymn that originally belonged to a group of Christian enthusiasts. This group interpreted Christ's ascension as a physical event that reconciled heaven and earth, and thus answered the Hellenistic problem of cosmic unity. In this process they adapted Paul's Body of Christ concept to the popular conception of a cosmic body: "Christ is the world-soul permeating and ruling the whole cosmos; as such he - not Zeus or Ether or any God of a mystery religion - became, in the ascension, the head of the universe."<sup>48</sup>

Schweizer thinks that his scheme has been re-interpreted in Pauline fashion in Colossians and Ephesians. The Body is not the cosmos, but the universal Church through which Christ meets the world. Christ's headship is now viewed in Jewish fashion as rulership, and cosmic permeation is interpreted as the extensive growth of the gospel throughout the world. Especially in Ephesians does this growth manifest what in fact already is.<sup>49</sup> Thus, Christ's Lordship is preserved and bodily obedience replaces metaphysical salvation.

This brief survey highlights some of the issues faced in our study. It seems ironic that Schlier's intense concentration on the background of Ephesians has led more to a concentrated effort on the problems of origin and development than to a thorough exegesis of the texts in Ephesians where the idea occurs. One cannot determine the differences between the homologumena and the antilegomena, for instance, until one determines what each in fact says. Of course, one cannot determine what a text says without some appreciation of its background. But the final cutting edge has to be the text itself. The exegetical question is the prior one.

The history of the problem itself reveals this. For instance, in discussing the theories of Schlier, Percy and Mussner, C. Colpe makes an astute observation: "Die widerstreitenden Thesen drehen sich im Grunde alle um die Frage, ob der Epheserbrief die Vorstellung von einem Christus kosmischen Ausmasses kennt, genauer, ob Christus, welcher κεφαλὴ und σῶμα ist, identisch mit dem ist, was durch die Formel τὰ πάντα bezeichnet wird."<sup>50</sup> Colpe immediately answers this affirmatively and then attempts to find the background to this conception in Philo. Agreement with Colpe is unnecessary to see the correctness of his procedure. We must determine first whether Ephesians actually identifies the Body of Christ and the All, before any attempt to offer a full explanation of its origin and development. Colpe brings the exegetical question to the fore.



Our inquiry must proceed with this exegetical question in view. On some points there is general agreement. The universal Church is explicitly called the Body of Christ, and Christ is the Head of this Body. The Body is in some sense built up and it grows. The Body concept is used in a discussion about marriage and linked to the Bride of Christ concept. However, just how the author understands these points is disputed. As we have seen, the question exists whether the Body of Christ is identified with the All. How does the Head relate to the Body? Does σῶμα in Eph ii 16 refer to Christ's crucified body or the Church? Does the Body grow extensively or intensively? How does the Body concept relate to the Bride concept? These and other questions must be answered by a detailed study of the texts themselves. The history of religions question cannot be ignored, but it must be approached within the context of its specific application to the passage at hand. Only in this way will any broad theory about the historical context of the idea and its development find a sound basis.

In conclusion we note that scholarship has largely concentrated upon the religionsgeschichtliche question of the origin and development of the Body of Christ image in the Pauline Corpus. This preoccupation has tended to blur, more by neglect than necessity, our vision of how the author of Ephesians himself understood this image and what he intended to communicate when he used it. Why does he use the image when and where he does? Are there any common factors or characteristics that permeate all or most of its usage? Does our author actually have a Body of Christ concept, or is his usage inconsistent and contradictory? How is the image incorporated into the overall thematic purpose of the letter? If because of the fluid state of research regarding so much of Ephesians, full answers to all these questions cannot be attained, we must nevertheless provide partial answers as we are able. Not only will this enable others to

construct a better overall picture of Ephesians, it will also provide a better basis for further research into the history of religions problem.

Our exegetical task, then, is to define the use and function of the Body of Christ concept in Ephesians. We shall offer a detailed exegesis of each passage in which  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  occurs. We shall study each passage in the order of appearance to allow us to see how the idea unfolds in the author's thought. We will then summarize in a concluding chapter the results of our investigation.



## I

### THE UNITY OF HEAD AND BODY: EPHESIANS i 20-23

We begin with an exegesis of i 20-23. Here κεφαλή and σῶμα appear for the first time in Ephesians, and in relation to other important concepts such as πάντα, ἐκκλησία, and πλήρωμα. Any attempt to understand this cluster of ideas presents the reader with numerous exegetical questions. As stated earlier, a much debated point is whether the author has adapted a Macrocosm or perhaps a Macroanthropos scheme to his own purposes. If so, what prompted him to apply a cosmic oriented image to the Church? If not, what alternative construction may account for the pericope's cosmic imagery? Related to this more general question are some specific problems of importance to our study. What, for instance, is the relationship between κεφαλή and πάντα? Does πάντα represent "all things," or "all members," or perhaps "all other heads?" Even more germane to our study is how κεφαλή and σῶμα are related. Are the terms two distinct ways of expressing the same basic relationship? Or are they united, organically or otherwise, and thus form a single composite image? A related question concerns πλήρωμα - πληρουμένου. Does this much debated phrase define the Body-Head relationship? If not, how is it to be understood? If so, does the Body fill the Head, or the Head fill the Body? To answer these questions we proceed to an exegesis of the passage.

#### I. CONTEXT

Ephesians is unique in the Pauline Corpus in containing both a berakah (i 3ff) and an introductory thanksgiving (i 15ff).<sup>1</sup> After the initial greeting, the author embarks on a lengthy benediction, praising God for the blessings of salvation. He then begins to thank God for the specific work accomplished among his readers. The sentence beginning at vs. 15 continues through vs. 23, and has been aptly described as an

oratio perpetua.<sup>2</sup> While it begins with a thanksgiving for the readers' "faith in the Lord Jesus" and their "love towards all the saints,"<sup>3</sup> it quickly develops into an intercessory prayer. In vss. 17-18 the author petitions the "Father of glory" and asks that the readers might receive wisdom and insight, having the eyes of their hearts enlightened in knowing Him.<sup>4</sup> Scott outlines what the author wishes his readers to know: "(1) the fact of eternal life; (2) the wonder and glory of it; (3) the presence in us even now of a power that will realize it."<sup>5</sup> This present power corresponds to, or perhaps better, has its basis in the "working of God's great might that He has worked in Christ" (vss. 19b-20a).<sup>6</sup> Thus, such power is neither elusive nor abstract, but actual and effective as revealed in the resurrection and session at God's right hand. The author now acclaims and expounds upon Christ's unique position as the medium and instrument of that power (vss. 20ff). His descriptive praise moves from Christ's resurrection to his session at God's right hand above every cosmic power, and from there to his relation to the Church. Thus the totality of Christ's relation to the Church shares in the totality of his relation to God and the world.<sup>7</sup>

In ch. ii the author sets forth in greater detail the significance of Christ's mediation for believers. The chapter falls easily into two parts, vss. 1-10 and vss. 11-22. Each section appraises from a different angle the saving event of Christ by demonstrating its transforming effect on the life-situation of believers, i.e. by contrasting their former condition apart from Christ to their present condition in Christ. In both sections the author seems aware of the readers' former status as Gentiles, and clarifies their relation to Jewish Christians (vss. 2-3, vss. 11ff).<sup>8</sup> This theme, of course, is more prominent in ii 11-22 where Christ's death emerges as the central point of departure. We shall discuss this more fully in the following chapter. But while Christ's atoning death was probably presupposed throughout i 20-23 and ii 1-10, the focus of these



passages is on Christ's exaltation and the believer's exaltation with Christ respectively. This affinity in focus intimates a degree of interrelation that requires investigation.

#### The Interrelation of i 20-23 and ii 1-10

A notable correlation in both thought and vocabulary exists between i 20ff and ii 1-10. For instance, the words *ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς κ.τ.λ.* (ii 1, 5) echo the words *ἐκ νεκρῶν* (i 20). Also the phrase *κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας* (ii 2) appears to suggest a member, if not a leading member, of the more exhaustive list *πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως κ.τ.λ.* (i 21). Finally the phrases *κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* (ii 2) and *ἐν τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις* (ii 7) are reminiscent of *ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι* (i 21). If these instances may be considered simply as accidental overlappings, the same cannot be said for the more pronounced correlation between i 20 and ii 6:

i 20: <i>ἐγείρας αὐτόν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις</i>	ii 6: <i>καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ</i>
---	---

This amount of parallelism goes beyond the bounds of coincidence.

What then are we to make of this correlation? It would be inappropriate to conclude that ii 1-10 is simply a continuation of i 20-23.

Vs. 23 forms a natural conclusion to i 20-23 and the parallels are insufficient to justify a one-to-one application of the truths mentioned in i 20ff. Thus we suggest that the correlations reflect not so much a specific literary device as they reveal an underlying conceptual framework. In other words, the correlations show the author's conviction that what God, who is the principal actor in both passages, has accomplished in Christ, He has also accomplished for believers.<sup>9</sup> Christ's exaltation above all the powers of the universe forms the basis of the believers' resurrection and enthronement; it releases them from death in sins, from the powers of

this world and the passions of their flesh. Indeed, if in iii 20 the author speaks of τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν, which in turn recalls i 19-20, then ii 5-6 confirms that the power at work in believers is that which raised Jesus from the dead and seated him at God's right hand in the heavenlies. This points to a real and effective solidarity between Christ and his followers.

What, then, is the nature of this solidarity between Christ and believers? The question is relevant to our inquiry to the extent that the Body of Christ idea points to the unity between Christ and the Church. While there are various images and perspectives on this unity, the correlation between i 20-23 and ii 1-10 suggests, at least, a broad framework from within which the author views Christ's unity with believers. Since the author clearly sees a definite relation between Christ's exaltation and that of believers, a brief examination of the nature of the believers' exaltation should yield some fruitful guidelines for understanding the unity between Christ and his followers. This in turn should shed light on the kind of unity envisioned by the Body image.

### The Believer's Exaltation and Solidarity with Christ

Nowhere else in the Pauline Corpus is the present exalted status of believers stated with such boldness and so little (immediate) qualification. Other passages in the Corpus, e.g. I Thess iv 16 and I Cor xv (cf. also Rom viii 11,23; Phil iii 21; II Tim ii 11,18; and perhaps Eph v 14), point to a future resurrection for believers. Col ii 12 and perhaps Rom vi 3f come close to what is affirmed here (cf. Gal ii 20; II Cor iv 10f; Col iii 3; Tit iii 5; also I Pet i 3). But in Col ii 12 and Rom vi 3f the connection with baptism is explicit and there is no mention of an enthronement with Christ. So our passage stands apart in the bold manner in which it proclaims the realized salvation of believers as an exaltation with Christ. How, then, are we to understand this exaltation?<sup>10</sup> Five points are relatively clear:



(1) The believer's exaltation is an act of God. God is the principal actor here and attributes such as mercy, love, kindness, and grace, describe the character of His action. Believers do not exalt themselves but are wholly dependent on God's act and decision. The believer's exalted life is the product of God's grace and will be proven so when (or as) the source of that life is unveiled in the coming ages (vs. 7).

(2) God exalts believers with Christ.<sup>11</sup> The author stresses the solidarity between Christ and believers by using συν-compounds.<sup>12</sup> These verbs imply that in raising and enthroning Christ, God raises and enthrones believers along with him. Still, believers do not simply accompany Christ as if on a journey over the same terrain, but possess and experience exalted life only in union with Christ. We may recognize here the inclusive nature of Christ's exaltation; it includes the believer's exaltation.

(3) The believer's exaltation with Christ is God's act in Christ.<sup>13</sup> Because Christ's exaltation is inclusive, it is unique and determinative.<sup>14</sup> God makes Christ more than the mediator of exalted life; by acting in Christ God makes him the determinative source that defines the very nature and quality of that life. Thus to share this new life is to share the events that shape its character. So God's exalting the believer with Christ is not a separate act from exalting Christ. Christ is united to believers precisely in his distinctive role as the Lord and source of new life.

(4) God's act in Christ affects the believer spiritually. The text does not picture a physical resuscitation, nor a bodily transportation.<sup>15</sup> The author and his readers are physically alive and on earth. But in Christ's exaltation believers share in the eschatological event whereby God inaugurates the ruler of the new age.<sup>16</sup> Believers are no longer dead in sins, numbered among the "sons of disobedience," "worthy of wrath,"<sup>17</sup> enslaved to the evil powers of this age. They are now alive, created in Christ for good works,<sup>18</sup> objects of God's mercy, love and grace, living under Christ's supreme authority. So this "spiritual" exaltation effects not just man's inward being, but the total spiritual framework in which he, inwardly and outwardly, lives and relates to God and the world.

(5) Believers share in Christ's exaltation through faith. Virtually nothing is said about when the believer himself experiences this exaltation. Most scholars think baptism is in view,<sup>19</sup> although Barth argues for the sealing of the Holy Spirit.<sup>20</sup> But neither baptism nor the Spirit is explicitly named and the only real clue is the mention of faith in vs. 8. The author is less concerned with when this exaltation occurs in believers than that it has occurred for believers with Christ. Within this framework faith is the appropriate response to what God has done for believers

in Christ. But baptism and the gift of the Spirit need not be excluded altogether when considered different aspects of the one faith experience.

Various proposals are made to explain the historical and religious background of these verses. Barth stresses the Biblical parallels of these statements.<sup>21</sup> But while this background is informative as a general framework, it leaves unanswered the crucial questions about realized eschatology and solidarity with Christ. Other scholars have sought a more specific model in the syncretistic religious movements of the Hellenistic era. Fischer believes our text reflects the mimesis idea of the Mystery Religions,<sup>22</sup> while Schlier connects it with the gnostic idea of the Himmelfahrt.<sup>23</sup> Pokorný seeks the best of both worlds, arguing that Eph ii 4-7 was formulated specifically in opposition to a "gnostischen Mysterienweihe des männlichen Erlösertypus."<sup>24</sup>

These views are not held without difficulty. When read in terms of the mimesis idea, the  $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ -compounds (vss. 5-6) suggest that Christ is somehow exalted anew each time a believer is exalted with Him. Such a cyclical understanding of Christ's exaltation is unlikely in view of the once-and-for-allness of God's act in Christ.<sup>25</sup> But neither can our verses be molded into the gnostic pattern of metaphysical salvation. The dualism of Ephesians is expressed ethically in renewed morality, rather than metaphysically in the soul's escape from evil matter.<sup>26</sup> While it remains possible that our author is critically responding to mystery and gnostic conceptions, his approach is more indirect than direct and the framework for his own thinking lies elsewhere.

In his earlier work Mussner sought the background to these verses in Jewish apocalyptic writings.<sup>27</sup> These writings do indeed provide some basis for understanding the eschatological framework of two contrasting dominions or ages, and also the solidarity of the Messiah with the community of saints. It also helps to explain the close connection between possessing new life and ruling (i.e. being enthroned).<sup>28</sup> But there is



little to explain how it is that the saints are already raised and enthroned. The question is not simply a matter of transferring once future references to present ones because the Messiah has already come. The question is whether such eschatology can be transferred without also altering the concept of the solidarity between the Messiah and the elect.

More recently, Mussner and other scholars have drawn attention to the Qumran writings.<sup>29</sup> Here the idea of an experienced and present salvation is most noteworthy. Individuals are "raised" upon entering the community, which as a spiritual temple is the place of salvation and heavenly reality. Mussner advocates that in Eph ii we find the same pattern of salvation as in 1QH XI 8b-14 and 1QH III 19-23:

Delivery, re-creation, and entry are achieved through acceptance into the company of the chosen on earth, which gives knowledge of the wondrous mysteries of God, his holy spirit, and his righteousness. In 1QH 11:13f, this recreation of the member of the community is associated with the universal renewal of all creation, of which it is the inauguration here and now. ...The pattern of salvation outlined above from the Hodayoth also underlies the argument of ch. 2 of Eph:

(i) Deliverance through grace from a state of death caused by sin, and elevation into the heavenly region (2:1-11).

(ii) The transformation of 'both' (Jews and Gentiles) into one new man (2:13-17).

(iii) Entry into the heavenly community in the spiritual temple of the Church (2:18-22).<sup>30</sup>

While these parallels are impressive, a discernable difference exists between the Qumran conception and that of our text. In Qumran, the believer's exaltation is presupposed by the present eschatological community of salvation: the believer is raised by God and united to a community. In Ephesians, however, the believer's exaltation presupposes not a community, but God's eschatological act in Christ.<sup>31</sup> Of course, in Ephesians too the believer belongs to a community, namely the Church, and this too may be described as a spiritual temple (ii 21-22). Moreover our author certainly thought that belonging to Christ entailed belonging to the Church. To this degree, entrance into the Church through baptism or conversion (if the two are considered separate) may well have been considered an



exaltation in a manner similar to the Qumran passages. But unlike the Qumran community, the Christian community itself has its sole source of life in the person and work of Christ. Entering this community expresses not simply the believer's exaltation by God, but his exaltation with Christ. The community is not simply the assembly of God's elect; it is bound so closely to Christ that it is called his Body. Even as a "spiritual dwelling of God" it is "in him." So while the Qumran materials provide some inviting hints for understanding this realized salvation, they do not explain how this exaltation occurs with Christ. This brings the question about the nature of the solidarity between Christ and believers to the forefront.

Ultimately the solidarity between Christ and believers rests in God's decision to unite Christ and believers, i.e. His eternal election of believers in Christ. This is clearly stated in i 4ff, but it is also implied at ii 5f where God is the principal actor. Still, questions remain about the nature of the bond created by this decision and also about how such a decision is carried out and made effective. As to the first question, vs. 5 shows that Christ and believers are bound by a common life. Since the believer's salvation is spiritual, it follows that the life that binds Christ and the believer is also spiritual. Still "spiritual" can be a misleading term when it causes us to focus exclusively upon the subjective or inward side of man's experience of God. The believer's exaltation also has its outward aspects, and so too the life-bond which binds Christ to the believer must transcend a simple inward unity that is divorced from the harsh reality of everyday living. Similar objections apply to the category of "faith." An alternative category is "love." The life of the Spirit and the life of faith are the life of love. This expresses both the inward and outward aspects of this relationship. The category of "love" also allows us to see how the life-bond created by God's decision is of the same nature as the force that motivates that decision. Thus,

the solidarity between Christ and the believer could be said to lie in God's love as manifested in His eternal election of believers in Christ.

How, then, is the election in which God's love is demonstrated to be conceived? Perhaps God out of His love simply places believers with Christ. Thus it is revealed to the believer that he has a share in Christ's death and resurrection. So while Christ's death and resurrection reveals a salvation for man, it does not reveal a man's share in that salvation, since this is known only in a knowledge of his election. This interpretation hardly does justice to the revelatory nature of Christ's mission. Moreover it separates God's decision to raise Christ from that to raise believers with Christ, running against the whole tenor of ii 5ff. A better solution, then, is that Christ's own resurrection and session actually reveals God's decision to raise believers with Christ. This is possible if Christ's exaltation is representative and inclusive. Christ is united to believers precisely in his unique and loving role as the Lord and mediating source of new life. Generally, then, Christ reveals God's decision to love man, because he is God's decision to love man, God's chosen representative for man, Man-elected.

This set of ideas is clearer when viewed from a Semitic understanding of the One and Many, usually discussed under the rubric "corporate personality."<sup>32</sup> Here the One in which the Many participate, need not be an abstract ideal, but is quite capable of being a historical reality. Such wholistic thinking would have been natural to anyone familiar with Hebrew, if not also someone thoroughly entrenched in the LXX. This Semitic mind-set makes our proposed formulation about election not only possible, but probable. It also explains the close link between being exalted with Christ and entering the community that appears as a result of God raising believers with Christ. To be included in Christ's exaltation means also to be included in the corporate person that is the community. But while



corporate personality provides a general framework, we may ask what specific shape this corporate thinking takes here.

J. Coutts makes the inviting proposal that behind these verses lies the idea of Christ as the second or last Adam:

It is possible that behind the use of συνζωοποιέω lies the thought of Christ as the Second Adam. Cf. I Cor. xv. 22 ὡςπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται; xv. 45 ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν. This supposition is supported by the linked quotations from Pss. cx and viii at 1 Cor. xv. 25, 27 and in the credal passage Eph. i. 20-22. It is possible, therefore, that this line of thought is in the author's mind throughout chs. i and ii. 1-6. At any rate, it is certainly there when the author closes the first paragraph of ch. ii with the words αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἐσμεν ποίημα, κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.<sup>33</sup>

While Coutts' argument is attractive, neither here nor elsewhere in the letter does the author explicitly mention Adam or contrast him to Christ (contrast Rom v and I Cor xv). So if this idea was in the author's mind, it must have been inherent in his Christology. Our author was probably aware of the Christ-Adam typology found elsewhere in the Pauline Corpus. If so, it is reasonable that his Christology could take on Adam-like qualities without requiring a definite contrast. This possibility is even more probable when we recall that in Judaism as a whole the conditions of paradise experienced by Adam were expected to be restored in the days of the Messiah.<sup>34</sup> The Qumran community, for instance, considered themselves the true heirs of Adam's glory which will be fully restored in the last days. D. Aune has even shown that the sect's realized eschatology can be related to the restoration of Edenic conditions.<sup>35</sup> When the correlation of Urzeit and Endzeit is brought into conjunction with the eschatological event of Christ's death and resurrection, it makes possible a common conceptual basis for the conflation of various Christological categories, each contributing to the understanding of how man's or Adam's lost glory is recovered. This possibility will receive further attention in our detailed analysis of i 20-23.



Apart from this more specific proposal, and assuming we are correct that the author's statements about the believer's exaltation with Christ reflect a Semitic pattern of thinking about the One and Many, we are faced with an important question: does the author attempt to translate this Semitic concept into terms more understandable to his Gentile readers? Clearly the author makes no overt accommodation, stating, "A in our culture is comparable to B in yours." It remains open, however, whether he used imagery readily understood to his readers to provide a common point of reference. The test of success in this case is not the degree to which the author simply substitutes Hellenistic categories for Semitic ones. It is rather to be measured by the extent he is able to transfuse categories familiar to his readers with new meaning such that they now form the basis for understanding his thought. This may involve using terms familiar to the readers in ways that are innovative, if not abrupt and unusual. In view of this question, at least a prima facie suspicion exists that the introduction of the Church as the Body and Fullness of Christ at the conclusion of a pericope that otherwise concentrates upon Christ, may well constitute such an attempt. This does not mean that i 22b-23 are transitional in character; but even as the conclusion of i 20-23 they may set the stage for much of what follows in ch. ii. If correct about this, we would expect to see this communicative and instructive process more or less at work within the passage itself. Our suspicion may be confirmed only by examining the pericope itself.

## II. EXEGESIS

We now direct our attention to the passage itself. We shall first discuss the literary character of the passage and then proceed to a detailed analysis of each verse.

### The Character of the Pericope

In Eph i 20-23 the ideas of thanksgiving and petition seem to melt into what may be called an excursus of instructive praise. A meditative

sense of wonder and joy over the events mentioned permeates the entire passage, thus maintaining the prayerful atmosphere of the preceding context. However, to call this passage a prayer is at best misleading. Indeed, the aim of the excursus is not simply ascriptive, but also didactic; i.e. the author, by describing what God has done, not only praises God, he also reminds (or perhaps informs) his readers what God has done. Not surprisingly, then, the author resorts to conventional ideas and expressions. The mention of Christ's resurrection, the allusions to Ps cx lb and viii 7, and perhaps the list of powers, all indicate the use of material that was common and probably widespread in the early Christian community. It is the form and nature in which this material was received by the author that is open to debate. Thus the passage is variously characterized. H. Conzelmann describes it as "eine dichterisch gehobene Meditation über des Glaubensbekenntnis," while M. Dibelius calls it "eine Art Hymnus."<sup>36</sup> More recently, scholars such as G. Schille, R. Deichgräber, and J. Ernst, go further and argue that the author has adopted and redacted an early Christian hymn.<sup>37</sup> Others such as J. T. Sanders and M. Barth also affirm the hymnic character of the passage, but leave open the possibility that the author himself is responsible for the text's liturgical form.<sup>38</sup> The issue, then, is not simply the form of the passage, but also how it received that form.

Although little agreement exists over details, two considerations are commonly put forth by those who propose that our author has adapted an early Christian hymn: (1) the passage's similarity to other passages thought to be hymns; (2) the stylistic structure of the pericope.

(1) The theme of i 20-23 is similar to other passages that many scholars now regard as hymns or based on hymns. For instance, J. T. Sanders states that our text "contains subject matter similar to the second half of the Christological drama in Phil. 2, 6-11; Col. 1, 15-20;



I Tim. 3, 3-16; I Pet. 3, 18 and Heb. 1, 3."<sup>39</sup> Deichgräber offers the following chart, adding I Pet ii 2ff to the passages already mentioned.<sup>40</sup>

	Phil 2	Kol 1	I Tim 3	Hb 1	I Pt 2	I Pt 3	Eph 1
Präexistenz	2,6a	1,15		1,3a			
Schöpfungs- mitter		1,16		(1,2c)			
Erhaltung der Schöpfung		1,17b		1,3b			
Inkarnation	2,6.7	1,19	3,16aα				
Erniedrigung Leiden Tod	2,8	1,20		1,3c	2,21ff	3,18	
Auferstehung		1,18b			3,18		1,20a
Erhöhung	2,9a		3,16aβ	1,3c	3,22a		1,20b
Neuer Name	2,9a			(1,4)			(1,21)
Unterwerfung der Mächte	2,10f		3,16bα	(1,6)	3,22b		(1,22a)
Mission			3,16bβcα				
Einsetzung zum Haupt des Soma							1,22b

The chart certainly supports our contention that Eph i 20ff uses themes and ideas common in the Church. It is less certain, however, whether the chart proves that our passage exhibits the thematic structure of a hymn or liturgy. Two points warrant<sup>a</sup> attention: (a) The themes of Eph i 20ff, especially Christ's resurrection and enthronement, were essential and common aspects of the early Church's theology. As we shall see shortly, our passage finds both a thematic and material parallel in I Cor xv 12-27, which is certainly not a hymn. Such a non-liturgical parallel does not disprove that Eph i 20ff is a hymn or liturgy, but it does show that the ideas and language of our text were not confined to a liturgical format or tradition. (b) Eph i 20ff differs from the other passages of the chart: it lacks any specific reference to Christ's pre-existence, incarnation, humility or passion. It mentions Christ's death only in connection with his resurrection. This omission is striking in view of the rather consistent format that the chart presents. Admitting



this, Deichgräber can only speculate that the author uses a hymnic fragment.<sup>41</sup> As with (a), this point does not disprove that Eph i 20ff is a hymn or liturgical fragment, but it does suggest that the parallels can have only a secondary role in deciding the issue. The case for Eph i 20ff being a hymn rests primarily on stylistic grounds.

(2) Certain stylistic considerations indicate that a hymn may underlie this passage. Deichgräber avers: "Während nun aber in v. 15-19 durchgängig liturgische Prosa vorliegt, haben wir von v. 20 an auch deutliche Anzeichen poetischer Struktur. Der Text formt sich stellenweise zu klaren Verszeilen, die im p. m. zueinandergehören (v. 20 und 22)."<sup>42</sup>

Sanders draws attention to two other factors. First he notes that in the couplets 20a-20b and 22a-22b each line has its verb near the beginning. Second he contrasts the author's less frequent use of καί to its repetition (parataxis) here. Both factors, according to Sanders, indicate the presence of a hymn.<sup>43</sup>

But while generally agreed on these points, scholars diverge widely when actually reconstructing an original hymn. The debate centers on the form and function of vss. 21 and 23. Schille regards the latter half of vs. 21 as a prosaic expansion by the author.<sup>44</sup> But Deichgräber deletes the entire verse:

Es ist jedoch zu fragen, ob nicht auch die in V. 21a vorangehende Aufzählung zu streichen ist. Sie ist ebenfalls prosaisch. Für einen poetischen Text wäre sie jedenfalls auffällig ungegliedert. Es würde sich auch eine unverhältnismässig lange Verszeile ergeben. Dazu kommt, dass bei Auslassung des ganzen V. 21 kein Bruch zwischen V. 20 und V. 22 entstehen würde.<sup>45</sup>

But there is reason to include vs. 21a, at least, in the traditional material used here. Much in I Cor xv 20-28 parallels Eph i 20ff:

I Cor xv 20 (cf. xv 12,15)	Eph i 20
Χριστός ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγίγεται	ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν
I Cor xv 24	Eph i 21
ὅταν καταρῇσει πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν	ὑπέρανω πασῆς ἀρχῆς
καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν	καὶ ἐξουσίας
καὶ δύναμιν	καὶ δυνάμεις κ.τ.λ.

I Cor xv 27

πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν  
ὑπὸ τοῦς πόδας αὐτοῦ

Eph i 22

καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν  
ὑπὸ τοῦς πόδας αὐτοῦ

Both passages use the same formula for the resurrection. To the extent they overlap, each list of the powers is in the same order. Also, the allusions to Ps viii 6 (LXX viii 7) are in verbal agreement against the MT and the LXX, and each passage alludes to Ps cx 1: I Cor xv 25 to 1c and Eph i 20 to 1b. So I Cor xv 20-28 shows how elements of Eph i 20ff were loosely gathered together prior to our author's use of them.<sup>48</sup> Of import here is how Christ's superiority to the powers belongs to this traditional material. Re-examining Deichgräber's chart, we note this motif is frequently present, though expressed in a variety of ways (Phil ii 10f; I Tim iii 16b; I Pet iii 22b; cf. Col i 16 and Heb i 6). Thus Deichgräber's reconstruction without vs. 21a does not account for all the traditional material present.

Similar questions surround the status of vs. 23. Deichgräber and Schille regard the verse as a redactional gloss reflecting the vocabulary and theology of Ephesians.<sup>49</sup> Barth points out that the relative pronoun (ὅστις) is not commonly used in liturgical constructions.<sup>50</sup> Ernst, however, simply deletes τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ of vs. 22, and refers vs. 23 intact to Christ's cosmic body and fullness.<sup>51</sup> Thus, according to Ernst, the author follows the example of the Colossian redactor at Col i 18 and changes the reference from the cosmos to the Church. There are several objections to this thesis: (a) σῶμα and πλήρωμα occur throughout the letter in reference to the Church. If the author added the reference to the Church, it is just as likely that he added this verse which reflects his vocabulary. (b) Had the author intended to substitute the Church for the cosmos, it is surprising that he did not simply add τῆς ἐκκλησίας to τὸ σῶμα. This is especially the case since Ernst insists that he follows the example of Col i 18. (c) Ernst argues that the idea of a filled cosmos is to be found in Hellenistic Judaism and Stoic philosophy, but admits that the



use of τὸ πλήρωμα in this connection would be a novelty. None of these objections are by themselves insurmountable, but taken as a group they do warrant caution regarding Ernst's proposal. Ultimately, whether a reference to a cosmic body lies behind the text, and to what extent, if any, the author of Ephesians has been influenced by such an idea, must be determined by an examination of the passage as it stands. But Ernst's proposal does raise the question as to the extent vs. 23 may be incorporated into an overall hymnic construction of the passage.

The difficulty of reconstructing an original hymn raises a crucial question: has the author adapted an early Christian hymn for his own purposes; or has he put elements of tradition into an overall hymnic form? An acceptable thesis must explain the following points:

(1) The author does not introduce this passage as a citation, but incorporates it into an oratio perpetua. The pericope lacks an introductory formula or citation particle (γάρ, δέ, ὅτι) or any inferential conjunction (ἀρὰ οὖν, μὴ οὖν τις).<sup>52</sup> If, as proponents suggest, the hymn begins with ἐγείρας, it also lacks the customary introductory relative pronoun. This implies that the author is not singing a hymn or confessing a creed; not is he in any obvious way citing this passage as a proof text for some theological point (cf. iv 8 and v 14). Rather by the way the ideas are introduced, he is describing the power that God has worked in Christ. This description is both praise and instruction; he not only acclaims what God has done but intends for his readers to learn or grasp the significance of this fact. As suggested this may be called an excursus of instructive praise.

(2) In this excursus the author clearly uses traditional materials. As we have seen, the passage has thematic parallels to other passages thought to be liturgical. Our text differs by lacking any reference to Christ's pre-existence, incarnation, humility or passion. Nor are such themes confined to a hymnic tradition. In the non-liturgical text,



I Cor xv 20-28, we saw how portions of Eph i 20ff had been loosely clustered prior to our author's use of them. In viewing the high degree of correlation between these passages, Sanders and Gnifka have made the likely suggestion that at an early date elements of preaching and teaching began to be used in liturgical settings.<sup>53</sup> This would help explain the presence of this material in a poetic context of instructive praise. During the NT era, however, this process was at a fairly fluid stage such that conventional ideas and language had not attained a fixed form.<sup>54</sup> This is, in fact, confirmed by Deichgräber's chart where the many common themes are expressed diversely.

(3) The pericope as a whole bears the linguistic stamp of our author. A frequent criterion of a quotation, whether a hymn or otherwise, is that the passage "shows differences in language and style from the author."<sup>55</sup> When we examine the passage, three terms do not occur elsewhere in Ephesians and have no parallel: δεξιός, κυριότης, ὑπο + acc. Two other terms do not occur elsewhere in Ephesians but have what at least approaches a parallel: καθίζω (cf. ii 6) and μέλλω (cf. ii 7). The term ἐγείρω does recur at v 14 but this is quoted material; on the other hand it has a parallel at ii 6. The remaining terms recur as follows:

vs. 20: ἐνεργέω - i 11, ii 2, iii 20 (cf. i 19, iii 7, iv 16); ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ - i 10,12, iii 11 (cf. i 1,2, ii 6,7,10,13, iii 6,21, iv 32); νεκρός - ii 1,5, v 14; ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις - i 3, ii 6, iii 10, vi 12.

vs. 21: ὑπεράνω - iv 10; πᾶς (6 times in vss. 21-23) - too numerous to list (39 times outside this passage) - ἀρχὴ καὶ ἐξουσία - iii 10, vi 12 (cf. ii 2); δύναμις - i 19, iii 7,16,20; ὀνομάζω - iii 5, v 3; αἰών - ii 1,7, iii 9,11,21.

vs. 22: ὑποτάσσω - v 21,22,24; πούς - vi 15; δίδωμι - i 17, iii 2,7,8,16, iv 7,8,11; κεφαλὴ - iv 15, v 23,23; ὑπέρ + acc. - iii 19; ἐκκλησία - iii 10,21, v 23,24,25,27,29,32.

vs. 23: ὅστις - iii 13, iv 19, vi 2; σῶμα - ii 16, iv 6,13,16,16, v 23,28,30 (cf. iii 6); πλήρωμα - i 10, iii 19, iv 13; πληρώω - iii 19, iv 10, v 18.

Some of these recurrences are more formal than material; some could be accounted for as the author's additions to a proto-hymn; others as the influence of the proto-hymn on the rest of Ephesians. On the whole,

however, the amount of common vocabulary is high, and we agree with Sanders that to the extent such a criterion is valid, the evidence suggests that the passage is not a quotation.<sup>56</sup>

(4) Finally, the passage has an overall hymnic quality. Looking at the more obvious distichs, vss. 20a-b and 22a-b, we note how the second stich defines and expands the significance of the first. This gives the second stich the structural effect of a responsive thought parallel. This parallelism occurs throughout, undergirded by repeated use of  $\pi\alpha\varsigma$  and of word pairs:  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ - $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$ / $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ ,  $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\rho\omicron\iota$ / $\delta\epsilon\Xi\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ - $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\alpha$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$  κ.τ.λ./ $\delta\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$ ,  $\delta$   $\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$   $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ / $\delta$   $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ ,  $\upsilon\pi\acute{\omicron}$ / $\upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ ,  $\pi\acute{\omicron}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ / $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\eta}$ / $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ / $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\rho\omega\mu\alpha$ . These pairs are so used and phrased as to create an overlapping staircase effect. These features, yielding a poetic movement that tends towards comprehensiveness, are reminiscent of Semitic style.<sup>57</sup> Even in vs. 21 we may meet what W. R. Walters calls a "long tour" of more or less synonymous terms.<sup>58</sup> Such a series is not altogether uncommon in Hebrew poetry.<sup>59</sup> So when viewed under the OT pattern of thought and word parallels, the passage as it stands bears a consistent, even if rough, hymnic structure.

What, then, are we to conclude from our discussion? In view of (1) and (3) it is unlikely that our author found these statements in another source exactly as we find them here. Has he, then, modified a hymnic fragment? This explanation would explain (2), though it needs to account for the absence of Christ's pre-existence, incarnation or passion. (1) and (3) are more difficult under this view, though they could be explained by the interplay between the redactor and his sources. If so, then, in view of (3) the redactor was either familiar enough with the hymn's language that he could use it as his own, or he modified the piece so extensively as to make it his own. In either case, the text as it stands remains the best starting point for the author's view. Such a proposal meets greater difficulty in (4). A consistent hymnic structure throughout



the passage makes the search for redactions unnecessary. It is, of course, not impossible that the author recognized a hymnic fragment's basic structure and worked in his own expressions in compliance with the hymnic form. If so, the original piece would not have the same structural impact as the author's reworked version, and so again, the text as it stands is the best point of departure for exegesis. Despite these possibilities, we find it more likely that the author himself put these elements of tradition into their present hymnic form. When the poetic structure is recognized as coming from the author, then points (1), (2), and (3) fall easily into place. We suggest, then, that in describing God's power at work in Christ, the author, perhaps even recognizing the hymnic background of Pss cx 1b and viii 7, simulated an OT hymnic style to create an exalted atmosphere and add profundity to his statements of instructive praise.<sup>60</sup>

#### Verse by Verse Analysis

vs. 20: ἣν ἐνήργηκεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, The starting point of this hymnic excursus is God's mighty act in Christ. The relation between Christ's and the believer's exaltation is already implied in the transition from vs. 19 to vs. 20.<sup>61</sup> The present power at work among believers (cf. iii 20) has its basis in or corresponds to "the working of God's great might which He has worked in the Messiah." The word play, κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν...ἣν ἐνήργηκεν, makes the transition from petitionary prayer to an excursus of instructive praise less harsh. The smoothness of the transition is also enhanced by the perfect tense of ἐνεργέω, which marks the ongoing effectiveness of God's "working."<sup>62</sup> The words, ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, indicate the focal point of God's activity: God has worked in the Christ.<sup>63</sup> God's mighty work in Christ is the fountain from which the following acclamations of descriptive praise flow forth, and back to which they ultimately lead.



ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, God's mighty act in Christ is illustrated in His raising Christ from the dead. Christ's resurrection is a uniform teaching of the New Testament.<sup>64</sup> It is an eschatological act in which God marks His approval on the crucified Jesus (e.g. Acts iii 15, iv 10) and shows this one to be the Christ (Acts ii 36), God's Son (Rom i 4, cf. also Acts xiii 33; Gal i 16; I Thess i 10), and universal Lord and Judge (Acts x 36ff, xvii 31, cf. also Matt xxviii 18, Phil ii 8ff).<sup>65</sup> Since the context speaks of Christ's favored position and his superiority to the cosmic powers, many of these ideas may be implicit here. Even so, the stress is on God's glorious power, and this association between the resurrection and God's power is not unusual. Staab states: "Immer -ausser I Thess. 4,14- wenn Paulus von Auferstehung Christi spricht, führt er sie auf die Macht oder Glorie Gottes zurück."<sup>66</sup>

We should also note that Christ was raised ἐκ νεκρῶν.<sup>67</sup> Resurrection presupposes death. Like others Jesus entered the realm of the dead where the power of death rules and holds its victims captive. But in raising him out from among these dead ones God broke death's hold on the crucified Jesus. Even so, the transition from resurrection to universal rule may not seem particularly logical to the modern reader. In I Cor xv, however, death is considered the last enemy of God; to have victory over this foe entails victory over all foes.<sup>68</sup> Taken in this manner, Christ's resurrection already encompasses and implicitly expresses his exaltation. Thus, the resurrection and the session should not be greatly separated. The raising up of Christ from the dead reaches its zenith in his being seated at God's right hand in the heavenlies. If traditionally the resurrection indicates what Christ has been raised from, then the session shows what he has been raised to. These present two aspects of a single event, Christ's exaltation.

καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, These words recall Ps cx 1b,<sup>69</sup> which reads in the LXX (cix 1b): κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶ μου. Interestingly,

explicit quotations of Ps cx 1b agree with the LXX, but as D. M. Hay notes, "a large proportion of the allusions to it have constructions with dexia (en dexia Rom 8.34; Col 3.1; Eph 1.20; 1 Pet 3.22; Heb 1.3; 8.1; 10.12; 12.2; tē dexia Acts 2.33; 5.31; epi dexia Sib Or 2.243)." <sup>70</sup> The parallels to the construction of our text, ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, make the local rather than instrumental sense probable. God seated Christ at His right hand.

The session motif denotes God's abundant favor towards the person at His right hand and the delegation of His authority and power. It is easy to see why this Psalm was adapted to various contexts. Hay gives this summary of its interpretation outside the New Testament:

Ps 110 probably came into being as an oracle legitimating a particular Israelite King of the pre-exilic period. The earliest definite interpretations are those of the OG translation and the Testament of Job; in the latter a pious individual is promised a throne at God's right as his heavenly reward. Possibly other Jewish interpreters of the pre-Christian era applied the psalm to human leaders (the Hasmoneans, the future Davidic messiah), or to supernatural figures (the son of man, Enoch, the heavenly Melchizedek). Later Jewish Literature frequently applied it to the messiah, sometimes to Abraham or other men. In all these interpretations the psalm was construed as describing a person who enjoyed extraordinary favor with God. The right-hand SESSION was not, however, regularly associated with any single function or activity of that person. Sometimes it was understood to imply his inactivity. <sup>71</sup>

In the New Testament Ps cx is the most frequently cited OT Scripture and universally applies to the Messiah. <sup>72</sup> In the Synoptic Gospels it is twice found on the lips of Jesus. At Mark xii 36, Matt xxii 44, and Luke xx 42f Jesus asks in reference to Ps cx 1 why David calls the Messiah "Lord" if he is to be his son. The point seems to be that a restored Davidic Kingdom does not exhaust Jesus' (or the Church's) understanding of Messiahship. <sup>73</sup> As such the saying exposes "the futility of Messianic hopes which do not rise above the earthly and human plane." <sup>74</sup> In Mark xiv 62 and parallels, Ps cx 1b appears in combination with the Son of Man imagery of Dan vii. <sup>75</sup> Such a combination strongly suggests that the Messiah's throne is regarded here as heavenly, not earthly.

The heavenly dimension of Christ's throne also emerges where the Psalm denotes Christ's post-resurrection glory and status.<sup>76</sup> Christ no longer abides on earth, but in heaven (Acts ii 33-36, vii 55-56). There at God's right hand he is intercessor for the saints (Rom viii 34), and greater than the angels as a Son (Heb i 13); there his enemies are subject to him (I Cor xv 25; I Pet iii 22). As already seen the emphasis in Ephesians is on God's glorious power at work in Christ; not surprisingly, Christ's enthronement is considered heavenly and superior to all other potents.

ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, These words bring out the heavenly dimension of Christ's enthronement. The phrase occurs five times in Ephesians (i 3, 20; ii 6, iii 10, vi 12) and in view of this repeated usage a uniform meaning is likely.<sup>77</sup> Most scholars interpret the phrase locally throughout as "heavenly places."<sup>78</sup> While the boundaries of these places cannot be pinpointed exactly, they must be sufficiently broad to explain references to all spiritual blessings (i 3), God's throne (i 20), believers raised and seated with Christ (ii 6), and evil spiritual powers (vi 12, and probably iii 10). At i 20 the phrase serves as a periphrasis for heaven and is more or less synonymous with ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (cf. vi 9).<sup>79</sup> This locates God's throne in heaven and perhaps also implies a contrast to an earthly throne. After all the Psalm had frequently been interpreted with respect to an earthly kingdom. By his exaltation the anointed one shares the throne of God, not as earthly king, but as the heavenly Lord above all other powers.

vs. 21: ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος, The verse as a whole clarifies the position and status of Christ in the heavenlies: God seated Christ at His right hand above every principality, authority, power, and lordship and every name that is named, not only in this age but also in the coming one.



The grammatical disposition needs clarification at two points.

(a) The preposition *ὑπεράνω* attaches itself most naturally to *καθίσας* and is probably not intensive, "high above," but simply "above."<sup>80</sup> Thus it indicates that in seating Christ at His right hand, God seated him above all the powers. While the imagery is clearly spatial, the meaning primarily concerns superiority in rank and authority. Indeed, it is difficult to know what being above a name means in the literal spatial sense (unless, of course, name here actually means "person"). (b) The mention of the two ages goes best with *ὀνομαζομένου*. It is unlikely that the phrases define *καθίσας* since not only is the distance prohibitive, but also the sense is difficult.<sup>81</sup> *καθίσας* is an aorist participle that defines here God's completed action. Thus to join the mention of the two ages to this participle would entail that God's action occurred not only in this age but also in the next; in other words, God enthroned Christ in both ages simultaneously. While such an interpretation is not altogether impossible, it is unduly complicated and overly subtle. The reference is more easily taken with the nearer *ὀνομαζομένου*.<sup>82</sup>

The terms *ἀρχή*, *ἐξουσία*, *δύναμις*, *κυριότης* are not personal names, but refer to various classes of the angelic and spiritual beings who occupy the heavenly regions.<sup>83</sup> In both Judaism (especially the Apocalyptic literature) and Hellenism the belief in such angelic beings was widespread and an accepted aspect of sophisticated as well as popular religious thought. Such spiritual powers were thought to be closely associated with events on earth, presiding "over all forms and structures of power operative in the corporate life of men, the guardians of the religious, legal, political, and social order."<sup>84</sup> There seems little point, however, in trying to categorize these powers into a rigid hierarchical system. This does not mean that such a classification did not exist, or that it was insignificant; it means simply that we do not have sufficient data upon which to make a decision.

What kind of powers, then, does the list at Eph i 21 envision? Elsewhere in Ephesians there is explicit mention of evil powers (ii 2, iv 27, vi 11-12, and probably iii 10). It is improbable that our list would exclude these. Does it then refer solely to evil powers? The mention of "subjection" in vs. 22 might support this view.<sup>85</sup> Even so this view does not take into account the mention of the two ages later in the verse. This presents us with various possibilities. The list of vs. 21a may have concerned evil powers and then at vs. 21bc the author expands this to include, "every name named, not only those in this age (e.g. those listed in vs. 21a) but also in the coming age." Or it may suggest that individual powers within those listed in vs. 21a as well as others, may be good or bad, or perhaps face the choice of siding with this world or the next. In any case, the author affirms that at God's right hand Christ is above every power, not only those who are admittedly evil (obeying God only unwittingly or unwillingly) but also those who are willing (though perhaps not always successful) servants of God; all are under Christ's authority.

καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου, The author does not intend his list of powers to be exhaustive, so he expands the reference to include every name that is named.<sup>86</sup> Here God is the namer (cf. Phil ii 9f).<sup>87</sup> In the Old Testament the giving and calling of names often expresses the namer's authority and also the new position or essential character that those named thereby attain.<sup>88</sup> When, for example, God gives a new name to Abraham, it represents the divinely authorized calling to a new status before God (Gen xvii 5). At Ps cxlvii 4 we read how God "determines the number of the stars, he gives to all of them their names." God then is their Lord and Creator, calling them into being and putting them into His service.<sup>89</sup> Along similar lines God calls Israel by name (Isa xlii 1; lxiii 19).

The naming of names was also a part of ancient Near Eastern enthronement rituals.<sup>90</sup> Probably through a court prophet, the deity calls the name of the king with all his titles and thereby establishes his throne with divine authorization.<sup>91</sup> This idea seems to be behind Isa xlv 4 when God says of Cyrus: "For the sake of my servant Jacob and Israel my chosen, I call you by your name, I surname you, though you do not know me."<sup>92</sup> Thus Cyrus (unawares) is called into an office of God's service; by divine authority he has been named for service. Similar ideas lie behind I En xlvii 2-3: "At that hour that Son of Man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name before the Head of Days. Yea, before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits." The Son of Man is not simply called into being, but called into being in an official capacity, to serve as God's official agent. When God names a name, He calls the name-bearer into being-for His service.

So at i 21 the list of spiritual powers is made comprehensive, including "every name that God calls into being-for His service," or more loosely, "every spiritual being that God creates and establishes in power." As the case of Cyrus suggests, these powers need not be aware of this and many may have attempted to usurp God's power. But each has been named by God and remains under his authority. This present authority is seen nowhere more clearly than in the fact that God has seated Christ at His right hand above every other power that He calls into being and service, not only in this age, but also the coming age.

οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι, The contrast between this age and the age to come has been taken over from Jewish apocalyptic. Sasse's summary of the two aeon doctrine in the New Testament is not an inappropriate description of its occurrence here:

In its view of the two aeons the NT is in essential agreement with 1st century apocalyptic. The framework of eschatological notions is broken only by the fact that the αἰὼν μέλλων is no longer merely in the future. Believers are already



redeemed from this present evil αἰών (Gl. 1:4) and have tasted the powers of the future αἰών (Hb. 6:5). If according to the teaching of Jewish and early Christian eschatology the resurrection of the dead implies the transition from the one aeon to the other and the beginning of the new and eternal creation, the new aeon has begun already, though as yet concealed from the eyes of men, in and with the resurrection of Christ, inasmuch as this is the beginning of the general resurrection (1 C. 15:20,23).<sup>93</sup>

Use of the scheme here maximizes the scope of Christ's supremacy. The stress upon Christ's superiority over the powers of this evil age is understandable; Christ's defeat of these powers signals the dawn of a new age of peace. But why was it important to stress Christ's superiority over the powers of the coming age? Evidently Christ's relation to these angelic beings was somewhat problematic. If the new age was regarded as the old age restored, would not a spiritual power of the new world be greater than a human member of the new world, such as Jesus? Would not these powers be greater than man, in a good sense, just as they were greater than man in this age, only in an evil sense? That some such speculation was a problem for the early Church is evinced by Colossians and the early chapters of Hebrews. Here the author's procedure is indirect; he does not deny the goodness of the powers of the coming age, but stresses that Christ is superior to them. This indirectly, but quite clearly, provides a means of judging such angelic powers. If one experiences an angelic power who claims to be higher than Christ, one knows it to be false.

Also when viewed in this manner an important underlying theme emerges. The cosmic disorder of the old aeon involves the role and position of the cosmic and angelic powers to man. By setting Christ above the evil powers of this age, God has set man in his rightful place in the cosmos, a position characteristic of the coming age (cf. Heb ii 5). So by indicating Christ's position over the angels of the coming aeon, the author shows that Christ's authority over the evil powers is an expression of a (re)newed cosmic order, whose benefits are available to those who belong

to that order. This theme, only hinted at here, becomes clearer in the next verse.

vs. 22: καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοῦς πόδας αὐτοῦ, This sentence refers to Ps viii 6 (LXX Ps viii 7) and shows a change of perspective. Hitherto God has acted in or on Christ and thereby established Christ's relation to Himself "at His right hand," and to the powers of the world, "above every rule and authority, etc." Here Christ's domain is not only expanded to include πάντα, "all things;" it is also made the direct object of God's action. What was previously only implicit is explicit; all things are subject to Christ. Also, the point is reiterated by way of summary that the power behind Christ is nothing less than the power of God.

Ps viii praises the majesty of God revealed in His creation.<sup>94</sup> Verse 6 originally referred to man's ideal position in the world and his dominion over nature; it is reminiscent of Gen i 26-28. Each of these idealistic portrayals of man intimate an almost prophetic yearning for what should be. Some scholars believe the Psalm was originally connected to an autumn festival and perhaps sung by the king.<sup>95</sup> If so, its picture of man would be linked with regal status. Eaton comments:

It is not without importance to note that such a portrayal of man in his paradisaical splendour was especially linked in the ancient world with the royal office. Ezekiel was familiar with this practice in Phoenicia, Ez. 28.12f; cf. Pss. 72.9; 80.17; 144.3. If the King is in the foreground of the psalm, it is as leading representative of all humanity, bearing the ancestral destiny of Adam.<sup>96</sup>

If Eaton is correct, the NT's messianic interpretation of the Psalm and its connection to Ps cx become more understandable.

Outside Eph i 22, Ps viii 6 is explicitly referred to at I Cor xv 27, and in the fuller quotation of Ps viii 4-6 at Heb ii 6-8.<sup>97</sup> Other allusions are suspected behind the use of ὑποτάξει...τὰ πάντα at Phil iii 21 and ὑποταγέμενων in I Pet iii 22.<sup>98</sup> Since these references involve only a word or two, our primary concern must be with I Cor xv 25ff and Heb ii 6ff. These passages portray common elements put to different use,



(1) In both places Ps cx appears in the surrounding context, and indicates Christ's heavenly and supreme position over all hostile spiritual powers.<sup>99</sup> For Paul cx 1b shows that Christ must reign until all his enemies, the last being death, are subdued. That this last enemy will be destroyed is assured because God has put all things under Christ's feet. In Hebrews the connection with Ps viii is weaker. Ps cx 1 contrasts Christ's position of utter sovereignty with the angels' secondary role of serving those who inherit salvation. If it is asked how a crucified man attains to such a position of supremacy and his message gains a greater validity, Ps viii shows that it is not to angels that the coming world is subjected.<sup>100</sup>

(2) In both places Christ fulfills Ps viii as God's design for man. In I Cor xv Paul prepares the reader for this interpretation by comparing and contrasting Christ and Adam (vss. 20-23, cf. vs. 45). In this context, Ps viii 6 shows that Christ obtains this dominion in fulfillment of God's design for man, thus making it available and sure for the believer in Christ. In Heb ii 8 it is unclear whether Ps viii 6 is referred to Christ or mankind.<sup>101</sup> But in vss. 9ff Jesus is clearly seen to fulfill the Psalm because of his death. He was made temporarily (<sup>ὅτι</sup>βραχύς) lower than the angels and crowned with glory and honor.<sup>102</sup> As becomes clear later, it is on the basis of his solidarity with man in all life's phases that Christ becomes ὁ ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν and ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς. This suggests that Christ's incarnation and death have the purpose of fulfilling God's intention for man to have all things subject to him. Thus in different ways, both Paul and Hebrews point to Christ's solidarity with mankind, which in turn opens to man the possibility of sharing in the fulfillment Christ offers.

(3) Both Paul and Hebrews use Ps viii 6 as a kind of proof text. In each "all things" is made all inclusive, meaning everything, but the application is different. In I Cor xv Paul assures his readers that "all



things" includes death, the final enemy. In Heb ii "all things" excludes nothing and therefore includes angels. In neither place does πάντα mean "death" or the "angelic world"; it is an all inclusive term, from which these authors argue that such spiritual powers are included in Christ's domain.

This brief analysis shows a common underlying interpretation of Pss cx and viii that can be variously applied. Caird summarizes the common kernel:

Psalm cx, which was the foundation of the church's belief in the lordship of Christ and in his heavenly reign, declared that this reign meant the subjection of all hostile powers; and Psalm viii showed that the universal supremacy of Christ was fulfilment of God's design for man.<sup>103</sup>

When so viewed, the Psalms picture Christ's dominion as a fulfillment, even a restoration of man's position in the cosmos; it is a regaining of Adam's glory and the establishment of God's purpose and will for man.

It is unclear how in applying these Psalms to Christ, original references to hostile nations and earthly creation now embrace the spiritual and cosmic powers. Certainly such extensions evince a deeper transformation in the understanding of who the Messiah is and the range of problems that he faces and solves. To see death, for instance, as the last enemy is to see the Messiah's mission in terms of man's universal predicament, which traces itself back to Adam. The impact of a crucified, then resurrected Messiah especially in a theological atmosphere that often correlated Urzeit and Endzeit may account for much of this, though other influences need not be ruled out.<sup>104</sup> But by whatever historical route these interpretations arrived, one may perceive their inner logic once it is acknowledged that Christ's dominion fulfills God's purpose for man.

We see this first in the extension of the Psalms to refer to and include spiritual powers. In fulfilling and establishing man's rightful position in the cosmos, or to put it another way, in restoring Adam's glory, Christ must face and defeat any power, whether human or spiritual,

that obstructs the fulfillment of that mission. As such, Christ's supreme position over the nations (Ps cx) and the earthly creation itself (Ps viii) includes dominion over those spiritual forces, whether good or bad, that presently control and determine the affairs of man and the world he lives in. Thus the establishment of man's true dominion over the world entails freedom from spiritual forces, and the Psalms are naturally seen to refer to and include them.

A second aspect of the inner logic concerns its Christological implications. If Christ fulfills God's purpose and will for man, then this implies and presupposes his solidarity with man. In fact this solidarity opens the possibility of sharing through faith in this salvation. However, Christ's solidarity with man is a function of his overall mission to restore man to his rightful position in the cosmos. Since this mission is accomplished in his death and resurrection, it clearly has an eschatological function, i.e. Christ in his solidarity with man is establishing the conditions of the Endzeit. This, of course, lends itself to a comparison with the conditions of the Urzeit, which served as a paradigm for salvation. It also leads to further comparisons as well as contrasts with Adam. It does not, however, exclude, but in fact encourages comparisons, contrasts, and relations with other figures such as Abraham, Isaac, David, or the offices of king or high priest, insofar as these model and perhaps in certain instances actually prefigure the nature of Christ's solidarity with man in his function of restoring man's glory. For brevity's sake we call this idea a New Adam theology. By this title we imply that the Christ/Adam contrast conveys much that is essential to the idea; especially the ideas of corporate solidarity and eschatological function. Still, we submit that the idea can be present without a comparison or contrast to Adam, and that other conceptions come to bear without being related directly to Adam.

In Eph i 20-22, we find that our author shares the same underlying interpretation of Pss cx and viii as found in I Corinthians and Hebrews, though his use of the material differs in emphasis. As in I Cor xv and Heb i, Ephesians uses Ps cx to stress Christ's sovereignty over the spiritual powers. Unlike these other passages, however, vs. 1b is not cited and the point of reference is not limited to hostile powers, but includes all powers. The idea of "victory" is not left behind, but is perceived now in its broadest implications. The subject matter concerns God's power; a power that is at work in believers and that is demonstrated in God's act in Christ. Through God's power Christ is more than victorious over his enemies; his victory establishes a new cosmic order. God's power at work in Christ shows itself in his new position above all powers, even those in the coming age. Thus Christ's exaltation is cosmic in dimension, transforming the very foundations of the world order.

At this point the author introduces Ps viii 6. As in I Cor xv and Heb ii, πάντα is all inclusive, being limited neither spatially nor temporally, and meaning "all created existence" or simply "everything." Unlike I Cor xv and Heb ii, the Psalm reference here is not used to show that some part of creation, such as death or angels, is included. It expands to the utmost the borders of Christ's dominion, and so crowns the theme of vss. 20-21, Christ's supreme sovereignty. But the verse also draws the reader forward to vss. 22bf. If the Psalm originally referred to mankind, it now applies to Christ as man's representative, the New Adam; Christ's universal Lordship initiates the cosmic order of the new age, fulfilling God's design for man. The similarities noted earlier between I Cor xv and this passage, the hints of this theology in ii 1-10, the occasional appearance of phrases like "one new man" (ii 15) and "perfect man" (iv 13), as well as the interpretation of Gen ii 24 in light of Christ and the Church (v 22-33), all point to a New Adam theology. In



what follows, the author draws out the implications for the Church of Christ's supreme position in the world as the New Adam.

καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, This sentence connects Christ's exalted position in the world with his relation to the Church and so draws out the implications of the New Adam theology intimated in vs. 22a. As indicated as early as the berakah of i 3ff Christ's relation to believers is of major importance to our author. The introduction here of the concept of the Church within the cosmic setting of Christ's exaltation greatly highlights this importance. This is the first of nine occurrences of ἐκκλησία in Ephesians; all refer to the universal Church (i 23; iii 10, 21; v 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32).<sup>105</sup> A brief discussion of the term's background and use is in order here.

#### Excursus: The Church as ἐκκλησία

In secular Greek ἐκκλησία refers to a "gathering" or "meeting" of people, especially a political assembly of a πόλις.<sup>106</sup> Apart from isolated instances of this secular meaning (Acts xix 32, 39f), and at least one reference to the "assembly in the wilderness" (Acts vii 38; cf. Heb ii 11-12), the NT writings refer the term to the Christian community. While the details of how and why ἐκκλησία was chosen are still debated, there is widespread agreement among scholars that the term takes up the OT word, לָקָח, as mediated through the LXX.<sup>107</sup>

The OT expression לָקָח denotes either actively or passively a "gathering of people."<sup>108</sup> The term did not necessarily have a religious connotation and could refer, for example, to the "mustering of an army" (Ez xvii 17). Nor are Israel and its concerns always implied (Ez xxvii 27; xxxii 22). Indeed, Ps xxvi 5 can refer to a לָקָח of evil doers. Still, the term does attain theological importance in many contexts, particularly in Deuteronomy. For instance, ix 10 and x 4 recall the day on which the community was assembled before the Lord for the Sinaitic covenant in the words לָקָח ה' יוֹם, "the day of the assembly." That this gathering is

not simply a past event, but an ongoing relationship, is apparent when in xxiii 1ff., certain people such as eunuchs and bastards are excluded from this assembly of the Lord,  $\eta\eta\eta? \lambda\eta\eta$ , i.e. "the whole organized commonwealth as it assembled officially for various purposes, particularly worship."<sup>109</sup> This designation as a people of God is attested elsewhere in the Old Testament (e.g. II Chr xx 5, 14; xxx 2, 4; and frequently in the Psalms).<sup>110</sup> Even so, the theological import lay not so much in the term itself as in that explicitly or implicitly this assembly is summoned by God and constituted by those who in obedience respond to His call.<sup>111</sup>

In the LXX,  $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$  occurs some 100 times, almost always as a rendition of  $\lambda\eta\eta$ . But  $\lambda\eta\eta$  is also translated by terms such as  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\acute{\eta}$ ,  $\delta\chi\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  or  $\pi\lambda\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$ .<sup>112</sup> So when using  $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ , the LXX translators apparently had a fairly constant meaning in mind.<sup>113</sup> Emil Schürer suggested that in later Judaism  $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$  denotes "the congregation of those called to salvation by God as the  $\lambda\eta\eta$ , the ideal community of Israel."<sup>114</sup> J. Murphy sees this religious value judgment reflected in LXX usage. After examining the relevant passages he states:

Hence it appears that in the Septuagint the word "ekklesia" signifies a special, elite group: the chosen people of God. It designates them very often as assembled precisely as the "people of God," to attend to some extra-ordinary task: one of judgment, the reading of the Law, the exercise of worship. There are other passages, however, where the word "ekklesia" seems to designate the people as a nation, a chosen congregation; but there is always this notion of an elite. The "assembly" is occupied with the affairs of God, with His rules for membership, or with more secular affairs insofar as they concern this chosen race.<sup>115</sup>

So in taking up  $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$  from the LXX, the primitive community of Christians shows the same sense of continuity with the OT covenant people as expressed in other NT terms such as  $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\iota$ ,  $\lambda\alpha\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ ,  $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\acute{\iota}$ , or  $\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\acute{\iota}$ .<sup>116</sup> In none of these is it a matter of simple transferal, but of fulfillment, of the community's Messianic and eschatological consciousness. H. Ridderbos describes this situation with regard to  $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ :

...in it [ἐκκλησία] the consciousness was voiced that in its existence as the Christian Church the true people of God, the Messianic congregation of the end time (cf. Matt. 16: 18ff.), had been revealed, and that the privileges and qualities attributed to ancient Israel in the making of the covenant in the wilderness had found their God-intended application in this church.<sup>117</sup>

The eschatological content of this consciousness probably received its greatest impetus from the resurrection and subsequent appearances.<sup>118</sup>

L. Coenen describes this Church consciousness:

Its roots lie in the fact that some of the disciples became witnesses of resurrection appearances. They thus became commissioned bearers of the news that the time of salvation had dawned. The concept of the Church in the primitive community is characterized by consciousness of being in the eschatological situation created by the resurrection appearances (cf. 1 Cor. 15:3ff.). It is a situation in which one is already experiencing the signs of the end.<sup>119</sup>

As Coenen's reference to I Cor. xv 3ff intimates, Paul essentially agrees with this primitive view. When the Corinthians are in danger of lapsing into an individualistic and mystical piety that stresses enthusiasm and ecstasy, Paul stresses the historical-redemptive dimension of the Church's being. As Schmidt states:

God's community of the New Covenant, first really in existence when Jesus Christ is risen from the dead, does not derive commission and claim from the enthusiasm of men of spiritual gifts, but only from a definite number of perfectly definite appearances of the risen Lord...Paul himself was endowed with spiritual gifts, and knew what it was to have visions and auditions, trance and ecstasy (cf. II Cor xii). But the source of his apostolate as service of God's ἐκκλησία did not lie in that quarter; it was to be found simply and solely in the Damascus vision, the event which set him among the original witnesses of the resurrection.<sup>120</sup>

If these "definite appearances" have been limited to a few, the redemptive bias of the resurrection is not in any way limited. For when Paul states that without a risen Christ men are still in their sins (I Cor xv 17), he argues from the inseparability of the Christ who rose, and the Christ who "died for our sins" (xv 3). In Paul, then, perhaps more clearly than elsewhere in the New Testament, the eschatological consciousness of the Church cannot be separated from the proclamation of Christ's death, through which the risen Christ becomes present to the faith of the



community (cf. e.g. I Cor xi 17ff.). In the issue of God's call through the Gospel, the ἐκκλησία may be considered the event of an eschatological summons.<sup>121</sup> In the consciousness of this summons the community confesses and worships Christ as Lord, thus both setting itself apart from the world and expressing in its existence and ongoing life, God's claim on the world.

What has been said could equally apply to the local congregation as to the universal Church. The question then arises as to which is the starting point for Paul's idea of the Church.<sup>122</sup> Certainly from a purely statistical standpoint, the universal Church may appear only a secondary generalization.<sup>123</sup> But this view overlooks Paul's ~~wholistic~~ holistic and organic thinking.<sup>124</sup> The universal Church is not simply the sum of local congregations; it is the totality of the eschatological community as it emerges in all its various historical forms and manifestations out of the single summons of Christ as Lord. As a historical phenomenon the Church is still in the process of becoming what it is; any claim to transcendence is of necessity rooted in its transcendent Lord. Notably the references to the Church at large in the undisputed letters are often connected with persecution. For persecution of even a local congregation is an offense against the entire eschatological process whereby Christ is proclaimed as Lord. The local congregation is not, then, an isolated phenomenon, but an expression of a totality that gives it definition. So Paul at I Cor i 2 can refer to "the Church of God as it is in Corinth."<sup>125</sup> In the undisputed letters, the implications of the Church as a totality are largely undeveloped.<sup>126</sup> Only in the disputed letters of Colossians and Ephesians does the universal Church become an object of theological reflection and concern.

In Colossians ἐκκλησία can refer to the local congregation (iv 15, 16) and this calls for no special attention. In i 18 and 24, however, ἐκκλησία denotes the universal Church in a manner that evinces

theological development. In a hymn (i 15-20) portraying Christ's role in creation and redemption, Christ is called the Head of the Body which is the Church (i 18). The use of κεφαλή/σῶμα stresses in one stroke Christ's unity with and distinctiveness from the Church. Here the relation of the exalted Christ to the Church is now a theological concern. Apparently the false teachers at Colossae conceded to Christ a high, perhaps the highest position in their cosmic schemes. Yet access to salvation still required placating the angelic powers, who in their visionary appearances were probably thought to prescribe various rituals and methods for attaining true redemption and freedom. Colossians, however, strikes at the very core of this tendency. Christ's cosmic attributes are seen precisely in the effectiveness of his reconciling work on the cross. Thus, from the cosmic backdrop of i 18, the Church emerges as the place not only where Christ's cosmic attributes are recognized, but also redemptively realized. It is the special recipient of Christ's redemptive work. The Head/Body image especially informs the readers that the Church partakes of the cosmic victory and reconciliation won by Christ through his cross (vs. 20) and resurrection (vs. 18). As Christ's Body, the community is identified with him who as its Head died and was raised. As such it belongs to the end-time period characterized by this Head of every principality and authority.

The same historical-redemptive aspect is also present in i 24. Paul through his commission to preach must suffer, and these sufferings are to fill what is lacking in the sufferings of Christ's body, the Church. These sufferings are best understood as the Messianic woes, which are experienced by the end-time gathering before the Messiah's return.<sup>127</sup> If this "gathering" is called Christ's Body, it is because Christ through the death and resurrection of his body has identified himself with this community as the very source and purpose of its existence. Precisely here service to Christ and God have become service to and for the Church. For

Paul this service is seen in the preaching of the mystery:  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu \upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ . If, as is probable, this means "Christ in you Gentiles,"<sup>128</sup> then already in Colossians the "mystery" is associated with the nature of this end-time gathering: a community marked historically by the new humanity which in Christ knows no distinction between "Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave, free man, but Christ is all and in all" (iii 11).

It is hardly accidental that the Church becomes an object of theological reflection in a letter that stresses Christ's utter supremacy. The Church as a totality is seen in vital unity with its exalted and supreme Lord; it is the special recipient of God's act in Christ.<sup>129</sup> But if Colossians raises the Christ-Church relation to a new level, Ephesians expounds upon the inner dynamic of that relation, especially within the context of God's eternal purposes. Only within the framework of this special and dynamic unity between Christ and the Church are the statements about the Church properly understood. We will discuss i 22b shortly; here we may see briefly how this applies to iii 10 and 21, and conclude with a short comment on v 22ff.

At iii 10 we learn that the administration of the mystery was concealed from the beginning so that God might now make known to the spiritual powers His manifold wisdom through the Church. The Church consisting of Gentiles and Jews bears witness to God's unfolding purpose to "gather all things under one Head in Christ" (i 10). Especially here it is important to observe the Church's dynamic quality. The Church is the eschatological community that is emerging and gathering under the banner of Christ's Lordship. This does not mean that this gathering community has no inner structure. Rather it means that its structure is dependent on and continues to express the character and ongoing effect of God's act in Christ, the very act that summons the community to gather. So the inner unity between Gentiles and Jews cannot be separated from Christ's



summons to peace, issued to both Gentile and Jew together (cf. ii 14-18). The Church bears witness to God's wisdom only in its vital unity with and dependency on Christ. Only within the framework of this unity does the Church attain a certain quasi-independence. It is the special recipient of God's redemptive act in Christ, bearing the marks and reflecting the character of the actor. But the Church receives this act only in its unity and submission to him in whom God acts, i.e. Christ. Thus the independence of the Church as an instrument of God's revelation must be seen in the broader context of the author's exposition of the nature of its unity with Christ.

Much the same may be said about its occurrence in the doxology at iii 21. Here the author calls for God's glory to be shown ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.<sup>130</sup> The preceding verse speaks of God's power at work in the believer, which relates to the power at work in Christ's exaltation (i 20ff). Since the Church shares in Christ's power, it also shares in the divine glory manifested in him. The relative equality of Church and Christ is not to be understood apart from the special dynamic relation between them. Since the Church is the totality of the end-time gathering, both as event and as abiding community, this gathering reflects the divine glory as it responds to and lives under the summons of Christ as Lord. The glory manifested in the Church is none other than that manifested in Christ, only it is seen through the window of Christ's special relation to the Church. The glory seen in Christ, while having the same source as that in the Church (namely God) is not limited to his relation to the Church but properly pertains to all things.<sup>131</sup> Thus setting Church and Christ side by side brings out the special status of the Church within the divine economy. But again, this quasi-independence should not be divorced from the author's intention of expounding on the dynamic relationship between Christ and his Church. For only in union with Christ does the Church exist as a bearer of divine glory.

Finally, the Christ/Church relation receives an especially forceful exposition in Eph v 22ff. We discuss this passage in detail in ch. iv.<sup>132</sup> Here we may simply point out that under the Bride of Christ imagery the Church attains perhaps its highest, and plainly its most independent status. At the same time, and with equal elegance, this passage makes clear that the Church has this status only as the special recipient of Christ's uniting and redeeming love.

In summary, then, we have seen that as a translation of  $\eta\eta\eta$ , the LXX uses  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$  to denote a special or elite group, gathered for some high and usually divine purpose. In taking over this term the NT community expresses its continuity with the OT people in its special role as the eschatological assembly wherein former OT attributes and promises attain fulfillment. The eschatological consciousness of this community was informed by Christ's resurrection and subsequent appearances. Especially Paul links this eschatological character of the Church to the proclamation of a crucified as well as resurrected Lord, thus setting it on a historical-redemptive foundation. The emphasis on the proclamation of Christ's Lordship also allows the dynamic quality of the Church to emerge. The Church is not simply (perhaps not even primarily) an institute, but an event, a happening. It is the totality of the end-time assembly, assembling and assembled in response to the eschatological summons of its Lord. Only in Colossians and Ephesians, however, is the Church as this dynamic totality a direct object of reflection. When uncertainty over Christ's position in the cosmos threatens the all-sufficiency of the Gospel, Colossians affirms the absolute supremacy of Christ in the creation and thus puts in bold relief the effectiveness and accomplishment of this supreme one's work on the cross. In doing so, however, the Church as a totality emerges as the special recipient of this act of salvation, and the unity of Christ and the Church reaches a new level of emphasis.



Ephesians shares this view and expounds on the inner dynamic of the Christ/Church relation.

---

In i 22b ἡ ἐκκλησία designates the Church in its special relation to the resurrected and enthroned Christ. It is the end-time assembly of those who confess and worship the revealed eschatological ruler who is above every power and has all things under his feet.<sup>133</sup> Especially here, then, is Christ's supreme position in the cosmos linked to his special affiliation with the Church. Both themes belong to the author's New Adam theology. It is the New Adam who holds this supreme position and in union with him the Church already partakes of his new humanity with its inherent blessings.<sup>134</sup>

The author introduces κεφαλὴ and σῶμα to clarify the nature and implications of this New Adam theology; and thus the relation between Christ, Church and cosmos. The precise manner in which they do this is disputed, however. Some scholars believe the main point is to affirm Christ's headship over all things as a gift to the Church. To the extent that Christ's headship of the Church comes into the picture at all, it is only implied. Others think that the stress is on Christ's headship of the Church and his headship of the world is at best implied. Still others seek a middle position and suggest that the text equally affirms both headships.<sup>135</sup> The debate centers on the array of possibilities that the grammatical disposition of the verse presents the exegete. We shall discuss four specific problems.

(1) What is the significance of the position of αὐτόν? This much, at least, is clear: Christ is again the direct object of God's action. But some scholars contend that the term's emphatic position points to Christ's exalted position as a point of thematic transition: "him, the One thus exalted and ruling over all."<sup>136</sup> This understanding requires vs. 22b to denote an action that is quite distinct from and subsequent to the subjection in vs. 22a; and this is Christ becoming Head of the Church,



In ii 6, however, believers are said to participate in Christ's resurrection and enthronement; it is unlikely that he becomes their Head after believers have been raised with him. It is more likely that vs. 22b presents a different perspective on the same event as vs. 22a. This accords well with the passage's hymnic parallelism. Thus the position of αὐτόν, which clearly parallels the position of the preceding πάντα, does not introduce a new act, but underlines by way of Christ's person the continuity between two perspectives on the same act.

(2) Does κεφαλὴν stand in apposition to αὐτόν or does it form a predicate accusative? Since appositives normally stand adjacent to their referents, the position of κεφαλὴν commends the latter alternative.<sup>137</sup> Also the anarthrous construction of κεφαλὴν probably favors the predicate accusative.<sup>138</sup> How from a purely Greek viewpoint the predicate accusative functions with δίδωμι, is exemplified by the marital custom of a father giving his daughter to someone for a wife: θυγάτερὰ δίδωμι τινὶ γυναῖκα.<sup>139</sup> The overall effect of this disposition is that the father (the subject) proposes a relationship between the daughter (the direct object) and a man (the indirect object), which has the intention of making the girl the man's wife (the predicate accusative). The predicate accusative thus indicates the intention of the giving, by expressing the mode in which the donor intends his gift to be received by the recipient. In this case, it is that for which the father offers his daughter to the man: to be his wife. If applied to vs. 22b, the conclusion is unavoidable: God gives Christ to the Church to be its Head. But apart from Biblical Greek and sources influenced thereby, examples of δίδωμι with the double accusative are uncommon.<sup>140</sup>

(3) Does the construction δίδωμι τινά τε τινὶ show Semitic influence? Many scholars believe that the verb is used here like the Hebrew יָתַן and bears a meaning similar to τίθημι. For instance, van Roon comments: "This verb, with the double accusative is found with this

meaning in the LXX as a translation of the  $\text{לְעֵלֹה}$  with a double accusative. The Hebrew construction is generally used when someone is acting in the fullness of might of  $\text{לְעֵלֹה}$  (or)  $\text{לְעֵלֹה}$  when God acts, the latter being the most usual."<sup>141</sup> But Meyer calls this interpretation "arbitrary," and Howard emphatically avers: " $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$  always means 'to give' and is always used with an indirect object, implicitly or explicitly understood, here =  $\tau\eta\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ."<sup>142</sup> The case for Semitic influence, however, is quite strong. The letter contains other Semitisms and the pericope's poetic style shows Semitic influence.<sup>143</sup> So the presence of a Semitism cannot, then, be excluded arbitrarily.

In Hebrew the expression  $\text{שָׂאֵל לְעֵלֹה}$  was used to denote the appointment or making of a ruler or leader (e.g. Num xiv 4; Neh ix 17). In this regard  $\text{לְעֵלֹה}$  serves as a synonym for  $\text{שָׂאֵל}$  (Judg xi 8; Ps xviii 44; Hos ii 2).<sup>144</sup> The idiom also occurs with the double accusative:  $\text{שָׂאֵל לְעֵלֹה}$   $\text{עַל־יָדָיו}$  (Deut i 15, cf. also Ex xviii 25). This meaning is perhaps associated with the complex of ideas behind Deut xxviii 13:  $\text{וְהָיָה לְעֵלֹה}$   $\text{בְּיָדָיו}$   $\text{לְעֵלֹה}$ . The LXX translations of these places, however, are not uniform and do not provide exact parallels to our passage.<sup>145</sup> Even so they show that  $\text{לְעֵלֹה}$  and  $\text{שָׂאֵל}$  were connected in a manner similar to our passage.

The use of  $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$  has generally been expanded in the LXX appearing for  $\text{לְעֵלֹה}$  where one might normally expect  $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\mu\iota$  or  $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ .<sup>146</sup> This expansion is especially evident when  $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$  occurs with the double accusative in the sense "appoint" or "constitute," (e.g. LXX Ex viii 1; Num xi 29; III Ki xvi 2; Ixxiii 14; Isa lv 4; Jer xxiv 15; xxxvi 26; Ez iii 8, 17; xii 6, xxxiii 7). In view of the relative rarity of this construction outside the LXX and its sphere of influence, this point increases the probability of a Semitism at i 22b. Finally, the position of  $\tau\eta\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$  after both verb and predicate accusative is from a Greek viewpoint unusual, if not awkward. It is unclear whether the phrase modifies



the verb, the predicate accusative, or both. This unusual construction, though not widespread in the LXX, can at least be accounted for from the Semitic standpoint (e.g. Ex vii 1; Isa lv 4; Ps lxxiii (LXX lxxiv) 14; Ez iii 8).

Altogether, these factors make a Semitism likely here. This need not mean, as some scholars infer, that God's establishment of Christ's headship is any less a gift or act of grace. This is probably why we find the more pregnant δίδωμι instead of the somewhat sterile τίθημι. When understood from the OT idea of God who acts in the fullness of His creative power, "giving" is not seen simply in its intentionality, but also in its resultant effect; it then transcends a "delivering," "offering," or "presenting" and becomes an act of "constituting," "installing" or "making." The idea is that God constitutes or makes Christ (the direct object) Head (the predicate accusative) with reference to the Church (the indirect object). Thus the predicate accusative does not tell us simply what God intended Christ to be, but what He has made him, namely "Head." As the indirect object the Church indicates that with respect to which the entire movement of Christ being made Head takes place. Thus the sentence indicates that a relationship has been constituted between Christ who is made Head and the Church with respect to which he is made Head; or more simply, Christ is made the Church's Head. To what extent this headship is cosmic in scope depends on the interpretation of ὑπέρ πάντα.

(4) What is the referent and meaning of ὑπέρ πάντα? This difficult phrase invites diverse interpretations, though oddly it has occasioned little detailed comment.<sup>147</sup> Any satisfactory interpretation must account for: (a) the natural comparative force of ὑπέρ; (b) the cosmic content of πάντα; and (c) the phrase's position in the sentence.

(a) Ὑπέρ has the root meaning "over" or "above."<sup>148</sup> With the accusative it is used locally in geographical descriptions and according to



Mayser frequently "beim körperlichen Signalelement der Steckbriefe."<sup>149</sup> Apart from a variant reading in Heb ix 5 (D\*E\*) the local meaning does not occur in the New Testament or the LXX.<sup>150</sup> When used figuratively ὑπέρ + accusative signifies what the referent is beyond, over, or above in number, rank, or quality.<sup>151</sup> As such it always bears a certain comparative force, and may be translated according to the context as "more than," "greater than," "beyond," or "superior to," (cf., e.g. Matt x 24, 37; II Cor i 8; xii 13; Gal i 14; Phil ii 9; Phm 16). This figurative use is also known to Ephesians as ὑπέρ πάντα at iii 20 shows.

Our author's interest in locality in i 20f makes a local meaning in vs. 22b tempting. But the author usually uses ὑπεράνω in this regard (cf. i 21, iv 10), and even this spatial imagery is used to indicate Christ's supremacy. It is unlikely then that the term is to be understood in a strictly spatial sense. As to the figurative meaning, we may eliminate the idea of "number"; "rank" and "quality" are to the fore and here the distinction between the two should probably not be pressed. The question, then, is to what πάντα is compared. The answer naturally depends on our understanding of πάντα and how the phrase functions in the sentence. But before addressing these question, we note that the meaning is not, Christ is "Head of all things"; ὑπέρ simply does not carry this sense of superintendence.<sup>152</sup>

(b) In view of the context πάντα is plainly cosmic in scope. To be sure, Mussner contends that when the cosmos is in view the article is present, τὰ πάντα.<sup>153</sup> But the anarthrous construction here simply reflects that in the preceding sentence (vs. 22a).<sup>154</sup> There, with a tradition history reaching back to Ps viii 6, πάντα refers to all things both on earth and in heaven; nothing is left outside of God's subjection. So in vs. 22b too, the whole created existence is in view. Even so, πάντα is not a monolithic or static concept, but admits various perspectives and dimensions.<sup>155</sup> Here the questions of power, superiority and

rank in this creation are to the fore. The term could refer to everything in its potency to dominate, or again to everything as organized under authority. What is excluded, however, is a limitation to persons in the Church, such as bishops, apostles, etc., or more generally to matters pertaining to the Church.<sup>156</sup>

(c) The position of ὑπὲρ πάντα calls for explanation. The phrase's point of comparison is best found nearby, such that its position in the sentence is understandable. This eliminates alternatives that require a transposition of the phrase,<sup>157</sup> and leaves two options: (i) an attributive phrase that describes κεφαλὴν, or (ii) an adverbial phrase that describes the total action of Christ being made Head to the Church.

(i) Due to its position ὑπὲρ πάντα is frequently thought to define the predicate accusative κεφαλὴν. One might have expected κεφαλὴν τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα since the article usually precedes an attributive prepositional phrase. But this is not always the case, and the anarthrous κεφαλὴν may render the ensuing article unnecessary. Viewed in this manner the words may function as a conceptual unit.

Allowing ὑπὲρ its natural force, the comparison lies in the idea of headship. Appreciative of this, Bauer joins the comparative force of the preposition with the unlimited πάντα and translates in the superlative: "the Supreme Head." Bauer is perhaps correct that ὑπὲρ + πάντα puts any comparison in the superlative. Also this rendering yields a unified concept. With this reading πάντα means everything in its power to rule, i.e. every head, and the cosmic powers would serve as the point of comparison. But of what are these powers considered heads? It cannot be the cosmos; "all things" can hardly in the same breath refer to everything that governs as head and everything that is governed. In this regard Best is correct in seeing that what is at stake is headship over the Church: "if they [cosmic powers] can lay any claim to headship over the Church, and such a claim is implied in the very names given to them, then the



headship of Christ is above, superior to, their headship."<sup>158</sup> But now we can see the real difficulty with this view: ὐπέρ itself admits no resort to a "claim to headship," or "possible heads"; it introduces a comparison of actual heads to the Church, of which Christ, of course, would be the highest. There is very little to justify that the cosmic powers were considered actual heads over the Church; if a claim to headship can be inferred from their names, an actual headship cannot.

(ii) Ὑπέρ πάντα may be taken as an adverbial phrase that qualifies the whole movement of making Christ Head to the Church. This allows πάντα to mean "everything," and the phrase to take us forward.<sup>159</sup> In this way, attention is immediately focused on that with respect to which Christ is made Head, i.e. on the domain of Christ's headship. The meaning would be that "God made Christ Head, above everything subject to him, to the Church;" or "Above everything with respect to which God made Christ Head, He made him Head with respect to the Church."

This interpretation satisfies the three criteria outlined above.

(a) It accounts for the comparative force of ὕπέρ. In taking us forward, however, the point of comparison is not in the mere idea of headship, i.e. between Christ and other possible heads. It is in the domain of Christ's headship, i.e. between everything of which Christ is made Head, and the Church of which He is in a special sense made Head. (b) This rendering also accounts for the cosmic scope of πάντα. By finding the point of comparison in the domain of Christ's headship, πάντα retains the same force as in vs. 22a. It is an all inclusive reference to the created order. Even so, the concept is not static but dynamic in character. Only the focus is not on all things in their power to govern as heads, but all things as they are subject to, delegated and organized under divine authority.

(c) This interpretation also accounts for the phrase's position in the sentence. Since the phrase qualifies the movement of Christ being



made Head to the Church, it naturally follows the predicate accusative. Perhaps the phrase could have followed the indirect object, i.e. the Church. We suggest several reasons for the phrase's position. This position allows for a smoother transition to the ensuing statement about Christ's Body. Also, by placing the phrase between the predicate accusative and indirect object the author throws this relation into bold relief. Beyond these points of convenience and emphasis, the position of the phrase avoids a possible confusion. To place the phrase after the indirect object might suggest that the comparison is between the Church with Christ as its Head and all things with some unnamed power(s) as head(s).<sup>160</sup> So the phrase's position clarifies that the divine authority under whom all things are organized and subjected is none other than Christ whom God made Head.

Thus this interpretation meets our three criteria, and avoids the difficulties inherent in other alternatives. Finally, this view accords well with our findings about ἐκκλησία, which signifies the special recipient of God's redemptive act in Christ. For these reasons, this interpretation is to be preferred.

Notably Christ's headship of the Church is affirmed within the context of his headship of all things. It is above everything to which Christ has been made Head, that Christ is made Head to the Church, and in view of vs. 22b, "everything to which he has been made Head" must mean "everything which is subjected under his feet." So when God makes Christ Head to the Church, this is a different perspective on the same act whereby He subjects all things under Christ's feet, including every power in this world and the next. If, as is likely, the Church is included in the "all things" of vs. 22a, then vs. 22b shows that this act also incorporates a special relation between Christ and the Church; a relation that surpasses in quality and rank any other such relation Christ has with the

cosmos at large. So there is continuity and discontinuity between the Christ/Church relation and the Christ/cosmos relation.

Thus, our author affirms Christ's headship of both the Church and the world: the former affirmation is direct, the latter is indirect, but just as clear. Christ's headship of the Church is in both rank and quality the highest expression of Christ's headship of all things.<sup>161</sup> Still, the Christ/cosmos relation forms the framework for the author's statements about Christ and the Church. Therefore an inquiry into the meaning of Christ's headship of all things will help clarify the distinctive character of Christ's headship of the Church. While κεφαλή and πάντα are clearly related in this passage, that relation is not spelled out, but left to be inferred from the terms themselves. Having discussed πάντα, we now focus on κεφαλή.

---

#### Excursus: Christ as the Cosmic Head

During the Hellenistic period in which Ephesians was written, κεφαλή carried many connotations and was applied in diverse contexts. We discuss many of these in Appendix B and here offer a brief summary.<sup>162</sup>

(1) The head is the most prominent and elevated part of man. In Greek and Hellenistic Jewish literature it is often considered the seat of the soul and reason and the leading member of the body. The body was created to serve the head and finds in it its raison d'etre.

(2) The head can indicate the whole person and his life, especially as the place of blessing and cursing. While this aspect is found in Greek, it is more prominent in Hebrew. There the head functions as the primary vehicle for receiving and manifesting realities and experiences vital to man's existence in the world.

(3) In extended meanings the head denotes what is high, elevated and superior and can have similar connotations as ἀρχή and τέλος.

(4) In social-political comparisons, the head may represent the leading member(s) of a group which in turn is considered a body. The nature of the head/body relation varies from place to place. Government by the head is not always implied in these, and where the idea does occur the head functions not as the center of the nervous system, but as the organ that mediates various capacities vital to life.

(5) As a translation of ψᾱλ, κεφαλή came to denote a chief or ruler without the further adjunct of a body. In this regard it is associated with πρωτότοκος, ἄρχων, ἀρχηγός, and even interchangeable with ἀρχή. Here the term takes on a more representative character since what is first not only "rules" but contains within itself the nature and determinative character of what follows.



(6) Κεφαλή can indicate the heavens, God, or the divine Logos. Within Macroanthropos conceptions the head was associated with the heavens, but had no special function. This probably changed under the influence of Stoic Logos conceptions and Philo explicitly identifies the head of all things with the Logos. But ὁ ἄνθρωπος could also be used in a cosmic reference to God and so it is hazardous to immediately conclude the presence of κεφαλή in a cosmic context necessarily implies the Macroanthropos scheme.

(7) Finally a negative result may be noted. Nowhere is headship of all things ever attributed to a historical person. Philo's identification of the High Priest with the Logos comes closest to this idea. But for Philo this is made allegorically; he certainly never hints that a particular High Priest is in essence the Logos or head of all things.

In the NT writings κεφαλή attains real theological content only in the Pauline Corpus. Of note are the occurrences in I Cor xi 3ff.<sup>163</sup> In discussing whether women should wear veils during worship, Paul offers an order of authority: man is the head of woman, Christ is the head of man, and God the head of Christ.<sup>164</sup> In what follows, the anatomical and figurative senses of κεφαλή play off one another. Despite references to the anatomical head, the model of authority is not the head/body relation, but "priority of being."<sup>165</sup> In the man's case, this priority is noted in two ways: the woman is created (i) from man and (ii) for man (vs. 8f). Κεφαλή is an especially apt term for expressing these two aspects in their "determinative" dimension: i.e. with κεφαλή, source and goal are seen in their present capacity to determine and rule.<sup>166</sup> Thus as the head of every man, Christ governs as the source and goal of every man's existence.<sup>167</sup> Even so, this is a mediating position since God Himself is the head of Christ. So if I Cor xi 3ff does not yield direct information about Christ's headship of all things, it does provide insight into the theological significance that κεφαλή may have, quite apart from the adjunct, σῶμα. This use of κεφαλή is of possible influence on its use in more cosmic contexts in Colossians and Ephesians. To these we now turn.

Col i 18: καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας, This verse belongs to the hymnic passage, Col i 15-20.<sup>168</sup> If the ideas here belong to the general milieu of Hellenistic Judaism, their specific content and character are Christian.<sup>169</sup> Κεφαλή stands



here in association with εἰκὼν, ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος. Such associations accent the representative character of κεφαλή so that the Head does not simply stand over the Body but is vitally united to it. As the text stands this refers to Christ's headship of the Church. One may suggest that the κεφαλή of I Cor xi has been joined with the σῶμα Χριστοῦ of I Cor xii, and elsewhere. In this fashion the Head would be united to the Body, sharing as its determinative source and goal the attributes and blessings of Christ's exalted life.

Many scholars, however, believe that the author adds τῆς ἐκκλησίας to an original proto-hymn. In this case, ἡ κεφαλή τοῦ σώματος could refer in the original version to a Macroanthropos conception.<sup>170</sup> By adding the reference to the Church, the author links cosmology and ecclesiology so that through the Church and the preaching of the Gospel Christ as the divine Wisdom or Logos penetrates the cosmos.<sup>171</sup> Linguistic considerations alone do not determine the issue; if εἰκὼν and πρωτότοκος (vs. 15) can associate κεφαλή with cosmic statements, then εἰκὼν and πρωτότοκος (vs. 19) can associate it with the Church. Ultimately the question hinges on whether one construes vs. 18b with what precedes or what follows. There is, however, no widespread agreement on the hymn's original form.<sup>172</sup> If some scholars drop the reference to the Church and align the verse with the preceding cosmic statements, other transpose it to the end of the hymn, while still others eliminate it altogether.<sup>173</sup> Still another alternative is that the author received the material in an already redacted form such that vss. 17-18 belong not to the original hymn, but to the first redaction.<sup>174</sup>

Such diverse possibilities make firm conclusions about a Macroanthropos scheme underlying this text difficult. But granted the possibility, the idea need not have influenced the author's Body concept. In i 24 and iii 15 the Body image appears quite apart from cosmic considerations. This is understandable since the letter stands within the Pauline

tradition.<sup>175</sup> So by adding τῆς ἐκκλησίας the author may not mean the Church is a new, even if mini-cosmos. He may be radically juxtaposing his own redemptive-historical understanding of the Body in terms of Semitic corporate personality to the more spatial cosmic concept. In this case the cosmos is linked to the Church, not through the realignment of a cosmic scheme, but through the restoration of man's rightful position in the cosmos in the New Adam. This leaves open the possibility that the author adapted a cosmic perspective for κεφαλή without adapting the underlying Macroanthropos scheme as such.

Col ii 10: ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή πασῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας,  
 Here κεφαλή attains cosmic significance; Christ is the "head of every principality and authority." The context concerns the "bodily" indwelling of "all the fullness of God" in Christ.<sup>176</sup> Σωματικῶς, "bodily," is variously interpreted; most refer it to the historical Jesus, though some refer it to the Church.<sup>177</sup> But little suggests a reference to the cosmos.<sup>178</sup> The ensuing context, discusses the believer's incorporation into Christ through baptism and faith (vs. 12); so if this Head has a Body, it is the Church. Thus, Christ's headship over these spiritual powers is seen in its salvific value and effects. This is particularly clear in vss. 14-15 where Christ is victorious over these powers in the cross.<sup>179</sup> In light of this, κεφαλή conceivably means "ruler" or "chief" without further connotations.

The cosmic range of this headship and the recurrence of the terms πλήρωμα, ἀρχη and ἐξουσια recall i 15-20.<sup>180</sup> There Christ's role in creation provided a basis for his authority over various powers (vs. 15). Perhaps in ii 10 too, κεφαλή indicates the "source" of these powers.<sup>181</sup> If so, the idea cannot be separated from the theme of victory and subjection inherent in the context. Is there a tension here between Christ regarded as the mediator of creation and his victory in power through the cross?<sup>182</sup> We suggest that any tension is more apparent than real.



In Col ii 16f, the author argues that regulations about food, drink, and festivals are but a shadow of what is to come; the substance or reality belongs to Christ.<sup>183</sup> The passage reflects two fundamental convictions about the new eschatological age: (1) the powers and institutions of the old age are emptied of their potency and significance through the cross and resurrection. (2) This victorious event ushers in a new age and a new source of life. Thus believers must avoid the entanglements of ritual requirements and angel worship and cling to him (the Head) who has conquered the powers and brought new life (vss. 18-19). Christ, then, is the eschatological Head, who rules, but whose rule ends the old age and begins the new one, the source of a new life.

Inquiring more closely into the relation between the old and new, one discovers not only discontinuity, but also continuity. While Christ, or the new age consubstantial with him, does not embody a Platonic realm of ideas, he does provide the old age its raison d'etre.<sup>184</sup> Some such view would have been necessary to anyone who held (1) that the world is fallen and (2) God's ultimate purpose for the world is to be accomplished. (Why else would God maintain a fallen world?) Thus, Christ as the eschatological Head not only rules, but his rule forms the very purpose of the old age's existence, precisely as the source of the new age. To the extent that the new age is considered incomplete, or to put it another way, that the two ages overlap, Christ embodies the goal of all things.

It could be argued on philosophical grounds that whatever embodies the purpose of a created thing resides in the mind of the creator as that thing's source. This idea is present (and thus viable exegetically) during the period of the New Testament in the common correlation of the Urzeit and Endzeit. Such a correlation is implicit in Col i 15-20. He who embodies and mediates the creation of the Urzeit has introduced the Endzeit through his redemptive acts of resurrection (vs. 18b) and death (vs. 20). Christ's role in creation is, then, not alien to his



eschatological function as redeemer and reconciler. The latter is simply the former in its redemptive effects. If Christ must be revealed and established, this is not because he lacks power as the mediating source of creation. On the contrary, this forms the foundation from which he is able to take the necessary steps to quell the rebellion of creation and to secure for it its God-intended issue.<sup>185</sup> So while at ii 10 κεφαλή does mean ruler, we suggest that it is a particularly pregnant term which allows a certain fluidity of thought. With this single term, the author captures the connotations of creative source and eschatological goal and marshals them together into the present as God's creative, providential and pervasive will and rule.

Col ii 19: καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα κ.τ.λ., A close link exists here between Christ's headship of the Church and that over the cosmic powers.<sup>186</sup> The Head to which the Church is united and from which it grows is none other than the Head of every principality and power. The false teachers, who claim a superior spiritual existence, in truth have not perceived the cosmic significance of Christ's victory. Their proud insistence on self-abasement, visions and worship of angels shows they do not cling to the exalted Head who provides unity and divine growth to all the Body. Thus they sever themselves from the redemptive life that Christ as Head supplies the Body, the very life that (ironically) provides the ingredients of wisdom and security from cosmic forces that they apparently so yearn for. The Body, then, is united to the Head as the special recipient of the blessings that Christ's headship over the powers brings. It most naturally refers to the Church.<sup>187</sup>

But granted that the Church is the intended reference, the author may have historicized a cosmic formula. We discussed this theory earlier regarding i 18 and its acceptance here is related to its acceptance there.<sup>188</sup> Here we make three brief points: (1) The physiological terms for body unity and growth are so general that they hardly speak for a specifically

cosmic context.<sup>189</sup> (2) The Body's growth concerns the spiritual maturity and unity of the Church with Christ, not its outward extension or penetration into the cosmos.<sup>190</sup> In what follows the author depicts the believer's union with Christ in his death and resurrection. Here the consequences of this union for the believer's relation to the world concern shunning the ways of the world, rather than going out into the world. (3) The Church is clearly the special recipient of Christ's salvific acts as the exalted Head, and as such is contrasted to the cosmic powers.<sup>191</sup> It is difficult to see how the idea of a cosmic body could provide the impetus to identify the Church as precisely that special Body of the Head that is distinct from and set over against the cosmos at large.

Generally, then, Colossians attests a close relation between Christ's headship over the cosmic powers and his headship of the Church. Both spring from the author's understanding of Christ's redemptive work. Christ's headship over the powers shows that the author's salvific framework is cosmic in scope. But within that framework the Head/Body concept describes the special inclusive and redemptive relation between Christ and the Church.

In Ephesians, outside i 23, κεφαλή refers to Christ as Head of the Body, the Church (iv 15f; v 23), and to man as head of his wife (v 23). Of these only iv 15 has any possible relevance here. Even so, the verse stresses Christ's relation to the Church, and any cosmic implications depend largely on our conclusions here. So we defer discussion until ch.iii.

Eph i 10: ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, The context concerns making known the mystery of God's will according to the good pleasure that He put forth in Christ for administration at the fullness of the times. The key word is ἀνακεφαλαιόομαι.<sup>192</sup>

This rare verb is a combination of ἀνα and κεφαλαιόω. The latter verb is derived from κεφάλαιον, which means "chief or main point," "sum" or "summary." The noun and simple verb are frequent in mathematical



contexts and perhaps the addition of ἀνα is prompted by the ancient practice of adding up from the bottom and placing the sum at the top.<sup>193</sup> But the word group is also used in rhetoric, and it is in this context that the compound form most often occurs.<sup>194</sup> Notably the best introductions were sometimes thought to contain a short summary, which served as a κεφαλή to the body of the speech (Arist. *Rhet.* III 14, 1415b 5). Perhaps, then, ἀνα indicates (or came to indicate) the repetition involved in restating the main point in a concluding summary.<sup>195</sup>

The only NT instances of ἀνακεφαλαιόω are at Eph i 10 and Rom xiii 9. In Rom xiii 9 it describes the relation of the love-commandment to the whole law, and is usually translated "summed up," or "comprised."<sup>196</sup> But if the love-commandment "sums up" the others, the idea is not that by adding up the doing of each commandment, we somehow arrive at love. The thought is certainly more penetrating. All the commandments find in the love-commandment a concise statement of their underlying source and overriding goal. Thus when this commandment is viewed as the "main point" of all the others, the others emerge in a new light. The love-command does not impose a unity on the others; it rather reveals the divine unity inherent in the other commandments. Thus other commandments are subordinate to the love-commandment because to sever them from love is to sever them from their divine basis and purpose.

In Eph i 10 the meaning of ἀνακεφαλαιόομαι is disputed.<sup>197</sup> Some scholars, adapting the idea of "gathering together" which occurs in any summing up, render the verb as "unite."<sup>198</sup> Others allow κεφαλή a certain say, and translate the word as "comprehend under one Head."<sup>199</sup> Still others take ἀνα to indicate repetition, thus yielding "restore" or "re-unite" or even "renew."<sup>200</sup> There are two problems here: (1) Does κεφαλή play a part in the word's meaning? (2) Does the term suggest repetition?

(1) Ἀνακεφαλαιόω is clearly derived from κεφάλαιον, not κεφαλή. Still κεφάλαιον is itself derived from κεφαλή, and also some account



should be taken that ψᾱ indicates either "head" or "sum" or "main thing."<sup>201</sup> So while κεφαλή is not the direct stem of the verb, it belongs to the same word group and in the proper context might be influential. The question, then, hinges on the theological meaning and context of the expression.<sup>202</sup>

The interpretation "unite" suggests that Christ consists of, contains, or represents in himself all the elements and beings of the cosmos, and hence characterizes cosmic unity.<sup>203</sup> We agree with this view to the extent that God makes Christ the focal point of all things. Yet it is precisely this cosmic unity in Christ that cannot be viewed apart from God's elective, authoritative, albeit gracious and unified will. After all, the verse ultimately defines the mystery of God's will, which implies the authority and power to execute and accomplish that will. These ideas are not extraneous to our verb. The main point of a discussion is that from which the discussion follows and back to which it leads. In summing up minor points are clearly subordinated to the main point. Since God's will to arrange all things under a single heading should not be separated from the divine rule and power through which such an arrangement is revealed, established, and exercised, an association with κεφαλή is natural enough and appropriate to the context. As seen in Colossians κεφαλή can capture the connotations of "source and goal" and focus these to express what mediates God's all pervasive rule. Something similar is appropriate here. Christ is the mediating source and goal of all things as the mediator of God's will. It seems likely, then, κεφαλή has influenced the choice of this verb.<sup>204</sup> If so, the association with κεφαλή accents how cosmic unity ultimately depends on the divine order and rule that is revealed and established in Christ.

(2) Does the verb imply a previous unity that was lost, but is now regained? Notably, ἀνακεφαλαιόω does not bear the idea of making order out of chaos. It is a rhetorical term that indicates the act of gathering

various elements of a discussion and restating them as to their common unifying theme, i.e. to the chief point from which the discussion follows and to which it leads. An element of repetition always exists here because a summary must restate the individual elements, only now making explicit the unity of the preceding discussion with regard to the main point. Such a "summing up" does not impose a unity, but reveals or expresses what unity exists among the parts.

It is significant, then, that the context concerns making known the mystery of God's will. At stake is the unveiling of the unity of all things in the God who created all things (iii 9), and who works all things according to his purpose (i 11). Since Christ is the κεφάλαιον, he is the main point from which all things proceed and to which they lead. This view is also echoed in Col i 15ff.<sup>205</sup> This is not to deny the brokenness and separateness of the cosmos. Evidently the author saw in the breaking down of a discussion into its parts an analogy to the breaking down of the original cosmic order. The cosmos was commonly conceived to be organized under various cosmic powers and divided into various epochs. But even amid the very real divisions caused by sin and evil, God's will is at work. At the right time God shows forth His good purpose in Christ and introduces a new administration in Christ; He reheads and reorganizes all things in Christ. This administration is new, not in that its organizing principle (i.e. Christ) is new, but in that now Christ is revealed with all things under his feet. In other words, Christ is reinstated as Head with all the other heads subordinated and co-ordinated to him, in the same sense that a summary restates the main point, with all the preceding discussion subordinated and co-ordinated to it. But even here, as in Col i 10, this headship has a redemptive bias towards believers. It is precisely in him to whom all things are subordinated and co-ordinated, in whom believers are made God's portion (vs. 11).

Eph i 23: Our text distinctly shows that Christ is this cosmic Head precisely as the New Adam. Probably by the time of Ephesians the Last Adam motif that pictures Christ as the Second Man from Heaven (I Cor xv 45ff) was already combined with Wisdom and Logos motifs that portray Christ as the Mediator of creation (I Cor viii 6, Col i 15ff).<sup>206</sup> Such a conflation would facilitate the New Adam's assumption of cosmic attributes. But it does not explain why the New Adam's exalted position is depicted by κεφαλή. At this point one might feel driven to some adaptation of a Macroanthropos scheme. This requires not only the joining of the Second Man from Heaven and Wisdom/Logos motifs, but also the combination of these ideas with the Macroanthropos concept.<sup>207</sup> But κεφαλή need not presuppose a body for it to be of cosmic significance, and nothing here suggests that the cosmos is Christ's Body. So even if a Macroanthropos scheme facilitated the designation of Christ as κεφαλή, it was hardly the motivating factor.

Perhaps a more fruitful approach would be to see a conflation of various themes attested in I Corinthians: the Mediator of creation (viii 6); the Head of every man (xi 3); the Body of Christ (vi 15, x 17, xii 12ff); the Second Man from Heaven (xv 47). Here are the ingredients for the conception found in Colossians and Ephesians. Perhaps when the all-sufficiency of Christ's work and the Gospel were threatened, these themes were brought together in varying ways to accent Christ's supremacy in creation and redemption as well as the Church's unity with this exalted one. Such a combination could also enlighten the New Adam theology of Ephesians.

As earlier suggested Christ as the New Adam restores man to his God-intended position in the cosmos. The New Adam must face and defeat any power, earthly or heavenly, that obstructs fulfillment of that mission. If this spells defeat for the spiritual powers, it also spells cosmic unity. For cosmic unity cannot be attained apart from God's intended order for the world. Especially here we note a point of contact with Wisdom and



Logos speculations. The subjection of all things to this New Adam suggests that God's will for the cosmos is fulfilled in this man, and that he mediates this will through his rule over all things. In other words, it is not Wisdom, the Logos, or the Torah that mediates God's will and brings cosmic order and unity; it is rather through the personal rule of the eschatological Head that God's will is revealed and established. Christ, then, is this New Adam precisely as the incarnated Lord and Mediator of creation, the mediating source and goal of all things, God's κεφάλαιον for all things.

At the same time it is clear that Christ shares the benefits of his rule with all men who in faith recognize him as Lord. Unlike Wisdom who cannot find a dwelling place among men or who simply imparts salvation through the gift of wisdom, or unlike Philo's Logos that remains transcendent and must be grasped through philosophical mysticism, or even unlike the Torah whose prescriptions must be scrupulously obeyed, the Lord and Mediator of creation comes to mankind as a man and imparts salvation by giving his own humanity on the cross. Thus if Christ now rules all things as the New Adam, he also makes available to all men the blessings of that rule by embracing within himself all who through faith share his humanity. Thus, the rule of all things is seen in its redemptive benefits for man.

In this scheme κεφαλή has a dual function. First it parallels πούς and so picks up the connotation of Christ's supreme sovereignty. In this regard κεφαλή is a likely choice of words; it often denoted the chief, the ruler, the determinative source and goal of a thing. Adam could be numbered among the heads of humanity (Jub ii 23), or the Messiah could be described as the "head of the Gentiles" or "nations" (LXX Ps xvii 34, 44).<sup>208</sup> The cosmic range of this headship could have been a simple extension of Christology along the lines we saw in the Psalms.<sup>209</sup> This process was probably facilitated by the understanding of this New Adam as the incarnated Mediator of creation. But second, Christ's victory over

his enemies and the subjection of all things to him does not concern Christ as an isolated individual, but as the New Adam who incorporates within himself a new humanity. Thus κεφαλή does not simply look back to πούς, but more importantly looks forward to σῶμα. Indeed if our analysis of vs. 22b is correct, Christ's headship of the Church is the primary starting point, the place where his headship of the cosmos is revealed and established.

In conclusion, Christ's headship of all things has a fourfold significance:

(1) Christ as κεφαλή governs the cosmos as its supreme ruler. The ideas of authority and rule are the primary point of departure. Christ is the eschatological ruler of all things.

(2) Christ as κεφαλή governs the cosmos as its creative source and eschatological goal. If Christ is the Head of the cosmos, the cosmos is nonetheless not his body. The cosmos is rather subject to Christ in its dependence on him as the source and goal of its being. In capturing these connotations of source and goal, κεφαλή indicates these in their present determinative effect, i.e. where the source and goal of a thing impinges on the existence of that thing as rule and authority.

(3) Christ as κεφαλή governs the cosmos as the focal point of its unity. If Christ's headship serves as the main point from which all things proceed and to which they lead, then this serves not only to subordinate, but also to co-ordinate all things to him. Cosmic unity, then, depends on the unity of the divine will that Christ's rule mediates.

(4) Finally, Christ as κεφαλή governs all things as the New Adam. Christ's headship of the cosmos is never viewed apart from its redemptive benefits for man. As the New Adam Christ establishes a renewed cosmic order in which man regains his former glory and is no longer subject to cosmic powers. It is for this reason that Christ's headship of the Church is the highest expression of his headship over all things; the Church, the new humanity, is the special recipient of those divine acts whereby Christ's eschatological rule over all things is revealed and established.

---

Our analysis of vs. 22b has suggested that the Church is the highest expression of Christ's headship over all things. If Christ as the New Adam fulfills man's destiny as revealed in Ps viii, the Church as the new humanity stands with the cosmos in being subject to Christ, but with Christ in sharing the qualities and attributes of Christ's status as the New Adam. Thus the Church is distinguished from the cosmos at large as the special recipient of those attributes, qualities, blessings and benefits that characterize Christ's relation to the world. If Christ rules the cosmos, then

the Church is subject to that rule, but now as the special recipient of all the benefits of that rule. If the cosmos has its source and goal in Christ, so too the Church, but now as the source and goal of a higher order of life through which God makes known His wisdom to the cosmic powers. If the cosmos finds unity in Christ, the Church's unity with Christ evinces more than a co-ordinated order of being, but that of an intimate personal fellowship, a sharing of humanity. What then distinguishes the Church from the cosmos is its special unity with Christ by which it receives and shares Christ's attributes and blessings. This is confirmed by a characteristic of Christ's headship of the Church, which his headship of the cosmos does not share; the Church is Christ's Body.

vs. 23: ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, According to Bauer ὅστις may emphasize "a characteristic quality by which a preceding statement is to be confirmed,"<sup>210</sup> Such an understanding here adds emphasis to the description of the Church as Christ's Body; it indicates that something essential to the Christ/Church relation is being discussed. That God made Christ, above all things, to the Church is now confirmed by the Church's unity with this exalted one as his Body. It is in view of this God-willed unity between Christ and his Church that our author now describes the Church as τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ. In this manner he draws attention to the God-given nature and structure of Christ's relation to the Church. But how, then, are Christ as the Head and the Church as his Body related? There have been several proposals.

(a) The Head/Body relation might reflect ancient medical opinions about the brain and the body. This view, championed by Lightfoot, has recently been taken up by Barth,<sup>211</sup> Barth summarizes the views of Hippocrates and Galen:

...Hippocrates' and Galen's neurological doctrine amounts to the following: the head, i.e. the brain, is the coordinator and integrator of the body's sensations. Thus it is the body's chief administrator. It not only receives, registers, arranges, and retains messages, but much more, it also has a causative, almost creative, function: it selects, evaluates, and steers



the sensations of the body communicated to it, and decides on a proper reaction to them.<sup>212</sup>

Barth concludes that our author "could ascribe to the head more than a representative or dominating function. He could attribute to it the power to perceive, to interpret, to coordinate, and to unify all that went on in the body and its several members."<sup>213</sup>

There are several limitations to this proposal. The medical texts speak of the brain, not the head. Also what little evidence there is in Ephesians points to the heart, not the head, as the seat of will and reason (i 18; iii 17; iv 18). When this fact is coupled with the author's use of σάρξ and σῶμα in v 29ff, it seems clear that his anthropology reflects OT presuppositions.<sup>214</sup> If the author based the Head/Body relation solely on such medical ideas, it would conflict with his own anthropological presuppositions. Finally, this background suggests that σῶμα denotes the trunk. Yet elsewhere σῶμα plainly depicts the entire body (ii 16; iv 4, 12; v 23, 28, 30). Even here and at iv 16 the use of αὐτοῦ and ἐξ οὗ instead of αὐτῆς and ἐξ ἧς suggests that σῶμα is the entire body and not just the trunk. Thus while informative this background does not explain the oscillation between Christ as Head and Christ as Body.

(b) Ancient physiological insights are reflected on a more popular level when the leader of a social-political group is compared to the head of a body. Sometimes, of course, these comparisons simply focus on the head's prominent position as the highest member.<sup>215</sup> But often the head possesses capacities vital to the body, such as life, health, and unity.<sup>216</sup> Nor was the referent always a political relationship. Philo, for instance, states that the virtuous one, whether a single man or a nation, will be the κεφαλὴν μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους . . . τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἅπαντας οἷον μέρη σώματος ψυχούμενα ταῖς ἐν κεφαλῇ καὶ ὑπεράνω δυνάμεσιν (Praem.Poen. 125).<sup>217</sup>

While this background presupposes that κεφαλή is the seat of the rational powers and soul, σῶμα often denotes the whole body and not just the trunk. The real difficulty is that in Ephesians Christ is not simply united with the Body as Head, but in some sense is identified with this Body as Head: i.e. Christ is not simply the One, but also the Many. This apparent inconsistency in the terms' reference point causes some scholars to dispute the influence of the popular social-political comparisons. Schlier, for example, states: "Im Umkreis der griechisch-römischer Texte gibt es keine formale Analogie zu den Gleichungen: σῶμα (ἐκκλησία) = Christus, κεφαλή = Christus und σῶμα + κεφαλή = Christus."<sup>218</sup>

(c) The background for this oscillation between Christ as Head and as Body is perhaps found in pantheistic statements about the cosmos. Orphic Frag. 168, for example, states in l. 2: Ζεὺς κεφαλή, Ζεὺς μέσσα, Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα τετυκται; and then in l. 12: πάντα γὰρ ἐν Ζηνὸς μεγάλῳ τάδε σώματι κεῖται.<sup>219</sup> Zeus is both the head as the source and principle of all things, and the body in which they lie. Zeus as head is not identified with the body by virtue of the head's function but by virtue of his pantheistic identification with all things as the All-God. He is both head and body simply because he is all things. But in Ephesians Christ's identity with the Body springs from his activity as Head. Thus his identity with the Body is not pantheistic, but functional. Also in Ephesians τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ defines the Church, and neither Christ as Head nor the Church as his Body is identified with τὰ πάντα in this pantheistic sense. In fact both Christ and the Church stand over against τὰ πάντα precisely as κεφαλή and σῶμα. How and why, then, were these cosmic statements applied to Christ and the Church so as to make them stand apart from the cosmos?

In his earlier work Schlier referred to this fragment while putting forth gnostic parallels to the Ephesian Body concept.<sup>220</sup> The gnostic



materials show how such cosmic statements were modified to indicate a world of souls. When the lateness of the texts and the methodology of their reconstruction raised serious objections, Schlier later spoke of a Jewish Adam-speculation influenced by an oriental-gnostic "Urmensch-Erlöser-Mythus."<sup>221</sup> Unfortunately Schlier leaves the lines of this development unusually vague and the clarity of his former thesis has largely been lost.<sup>222</sup>

While abandoning recourse to Gnosticism, Schweizer nonetheless agrees with Schlier that our author has historicized a cosmic scheme prevalent at Colossae.<sup>223</sup> Christ as the cosmic Head now fills and permeates the cosmos through his Body. That the Body is not merely the trunk is again linguistically based on Orphic Frag. 168.<sup>224</sup> But clearly, Christ and Church cannot be identified in the same pantheistic sense presupposed in the Orphic fragment and similar statements. So when pressed for the author's own use of the Head/Body conception, Schweizer resorts to ideas found in I Corinthians: the head is re-interpreted in Jewish fashion as  $\psi\chi\alpha$  and the body in Pauline fashion as the Body of Christ.<sup>225</sup> The cosmic conception only shows any real influence in explaining the cosmic context and bringing to bear a universalist tendency by which Christ's world dominion is realized through the preaching of the gospel, and manifested in the Church consisting of Gentiles and Jews.<sup>226</sup> But to the extent that these aspects are exegetically justified they may be accounted for quite apart from the Macroanthropos scheme by a New Adam conception wherein Christ as the New Adam fulfills God's intended cosmic order and embraces a new humanity consisting of Jews and Gentiles. Moreover it must be noted that  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  had too varied a background to evoke automatically cosmic imagery.<sup>227</sup> If  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ 's identification with the  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$  evokes an image, it is the social-political comparisons of popular philosophy. To be sure there is much that is unusual about this usage here, not the least its appearance in a cosmic context. But it is equally clear that the cosmic context is



not determined by the use of σῶμα for the Church, but by virtue of Christ's exaltation to God's right hand. Thus it is unwarranted<sup>a</sup> to conclude that our author has been greatly influenced by a Macroanthropos scheme, and a different source must be sought for unusual aspects of the text's presentation.

(d) A quite different approach is to deny that the Head and Body represent a unified image or metaphor. While the Church is indeed Christ's Body and thus is united to him who is the Head, it does not necessarily follow that Christ is the Head of the Body. This approach generally takes κεφαλή in the OT sense of שָׂרָא, and σῶμα as in I Corinthians and Romans, understood in terms of corporate personality. H. Ridderbos follows this line and after an analysis of the major texts he concludes:

If one may assume with certainty, therefore, that the concepts "head" and "body" each have their own independence and are not to be viewed as representations mutually dependent on each other, on the other hand it can also be seen from the above how these two qualifications can be so closely related to each other. The ground for this conjunction does not lie in that "head" and "body" in Paul's thought may be said gradually to have merged into one composite metaphor, but that both concepts, each in its own way and each from "its own side," materially give expression to the same idea, namely, that of the church's belonging to Christ, both in the redemptive-historical and corporate as well as in the pneumatic sense of the word. Thereby "head" in that relationship places all the emphasis on the initial position and the resultant redemptive significance of Christ with respect to the church; while "body" on the other hand regards the same relationship from the side of the Church. It expresses the entirely unique character of the church's belonging to Christ, ...<sup>228</sup>

We too have seen that κεφαλή was used independently of σῶμα. It is also noteworthy that in vss. 22-23 the author does not explicitly state that Christ is ἡ κεφαλή τοῦ σώματος; in other words he is not in this instance arguing to the headship of the Body. But it does not follow that the Head and Body are unrelated. In fact the author is arguing from the divine-willed unity manifest in the Head/Body relationship such that the mention of τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ confirms Christ's solidarity with the Church as its very own κεφαλή. The reference to the entire Body means then that without the Head there simply is no Body; only united to the Church

as its Head is the Church Christ's Body. To deny that the independent lines of κεφαλή and σῶμα merged into a single image is unwarranted and some type of organic relationship is a likely point of departure.

(e) Finally some scholars have suggested that κεφαλή in the Jewish sense of chief has been joined with the σῶμα Χριστοῦ of the undisputed letters. Benoit thinks the ideas of Christ as Head of the powers and the Pauline σῶμα Χριστοῦ conception have been joined and were then influenced by Hellenistic conceptions.<sup>229</sup> He writes:

...je pense que l'image du Christ-Tête apparaît d'abord, non par rapport au Corps-Eglise, mais par rapport aux Puissances célestes, pour marquer sa suprématie sur elles: il est leur Tête au sens de "chef", d'autorité, qui est le sens biblique de cette métaphore. Ce n'est qu'ensuite, dans une deuxième étape, que cette donnée ainsi introduite se trouve combinée avec le thème du Corps, grâce à une autre valeur, hellénistique cette fois, de la métaphore: le Christ devient alors Tête du Corps, en tant qu'il est son principe vital; ce qui n'exclut pas d'ailleurs qu'il joue aussi par rapport à lui un rôle d'autorité.<sup>230</sup>

In view of the cross-cultural situation in which our author writes, Benoit's suggestion that the Head/Body conception shows Hellenistic and Semitic influence is plausible.<sup>231</sup> But in saying that the author's idea eventually conforms to popular usage, Benoit fails to address the very questions raised by the author's unique usage. Assuming κεφαλή and σῶμα have been joined in some such fashion as Benoit has proposed, has their original Semitic orientation simply been negated? If the Hellenistic metaphor provides a framework for the author's usage, has he simply abandoned his OT presuppositions about man? Does a physiological relation between the head and body necessitate that the physiology is Greek in conception? We believe the answers to these questions are negative.

With the words, τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, the Church is closely related to the person of Christ. This much, at least, is clear from the qualifying genitive, αὐτοῦ. The thought here is similar to and probably stems from Paul's usage of σῶμα in the undisputed letters (e.g. I Cor xii 12ff;



Rom xii 4ff),<sup>232</sup> There Paul has taken over the common Hellenistic metaphor, probably as mediated through Hellenistic Judaism, and filled it with his own Semitic presuppositions about man. Thus the members are not related to a body which may in Greek fashion be distinct from the person, but to a body which is the outward side of man as a created being. Thus in extending this idea to the Church, the metaphor acquires an important, personal twist. The Church is not like a body, nor is it simply a body, but rather, the Body of Christ. The resulting functional identity of Christ and Church is probably best understood on the basis of Semitic corporate personality.<sup>233</sup> Both the Semitic understanding of the body and the idea of corporate personality have their roots in a concrete type of synthetic thinking, best described as *wholistic*.

This conceptual matrix is appropriate to our passage also, especially as the ideas are associated with the New Adam theology discernable in the immediate context and in ii 1-10. Of course, unlike in I Corinthians and Romans, the stress on the unity between body members is at best latent here (cf. however iv 4-16). Instead the unity between Christ and the Church is accented. Also, unlike I Corinthians and Romans, our passage does not speak of *σῶμα* alone, but also of Christ as the *κεφαλή*. We find a similar situation in Colossians (i 18, ii 19).<sup>234</sup> There we suggested that in view of the new situation at Colossae, Christ as *κεφαλή* from I Cor xi 3ff and the Church as *σῶμα Χριστοῦ* from I Cor xii 27, were brought together.

This naturally raises the question as to how the two terms are related. To answer we must point to the various factors at work:

(1) The author wishes here to clarify for his Gentile readers the implications of his New Adam theology. Christ and Church are united as the New Adam and a new humanity. As our terminology suggests, a comparison with Adam will aid in understanding the kind of unity envisioned here.



In Hebrew thought Adam was commonly identified with his descendants in that all are bound to him in their dependency on him for life.<sup>235</sup> But if mankind shares Adam's life, this is ultimately the result of God's creative will: i.e. in creating Adam God created a being capable of sharing his life through the divinely endowed process of procreation. Thus the total unity of human life has a certain structure, expressed in Semitic thought as a functional identity between Adam and his descendants. This has justifiably been called "corporate personality."<sup>236</sup> Adam not only represents his descendants, he also through his own personhood supplies the necessary conditions for his descendants' life and common humanity. Adam's relation to his descendants may be considered a relation to his "self", not in the extension of his own personal consciousness, but in that his self determines the conditions, traits and qualities of the ongoing life that his descendants share and on which they depend. If this dependency is largely conceived in terms of physical descent, this should not be construed in terms of a modern understanding of the biological process. It also includes the social and environmental realities and relationships that together make up personal identity, not the least of which is one's relationship to God. Thus being in Adam means more than being his physical descendant; it means inheriting a specific kind of life. By carrying within himself the life of his descendants Adam determines the character of their life not just passively by being such and such a being, but also actively, by doing such and such things. Mankind, then, expresses the personality of Adam precisely where his personhood and personal actions have supplied the necessary conditions, attributes and relationships of its ongoing life, namely its common humanity, or better its corporate self-identity.

Likewise Christ stands in solidarity with his followers. Christ through his personhood and personal actions supplies to those who believe, the necessary conditions, qualities and relationships of a new life, a new

humanity, a new corporate self-identity. Thus, Christ's relation to his followers is a "self" relation in the same corporate sense as in the case of Adam. It is tempting to suggest that Christ is the "spiritual" father of every believer and thus the beginning of a new age with a new humanity. That this idea is not explicitly used intimates the author's own awareness that the parallel is not exact.

A person has no choice as to whether he is born, but ultimately his free choice is involved in being a believer. It is true that the author is concerned here not with the making of Christians, but their relation to Christ once they are Christians; and to that extent the parallel holds. But the aspect of freedom does filter through the structure of unity in one important sense. In receiving Adam's life, men generally take it as their own; but in receiving Christ's life one continually confesses that this is a gift and not one's own. It is in this freedom of confession that the two differ. One participates not simply in an ongoing stream of life, but in an ongoing relationship to the source of life.

Also to be noted is that the followers of Christ are not other than the descendants of Adam. Christ is not simply a new beginning; he is this beginning precisely as he fulfills God's intended destiny and purpose for man. In this redemptive dimension of restoring man to his glory Christ assumes not only the attributes of key human figures in the history of salvation, but also divine qualities usually ascribed to God or divine figures such as Wisdom. To be the New Adam, Christ must be more than a duplicate of the first man. Christ is a divine figure, but he is so as man, as the New Adam (probably in terms of an incarnation, but perhaps not necessarily).

Thus while the parallel is limited, it is still useful and important. While Adam is identified with his descendants as their progenitor, Christ is identified with his followers as their redeemer. If the bond between Adam and his descendants is based on the divinely endowed gift of



procreation, that between Christ and believers is based on the divinely endowed gift of saving love.<sup>237</sup> In each case it is a God-willed bond that involves a relation between the key figure and his corporate self.

(2) Among possible images for conveying this unity between the New Adam and his new humanity, κεφαλή/σῶμα certainly presents a viable option. The author could have expected his readers to recognize or at least deduce several key points. Head and body share a common life, and this unity of life has a specific structure. Having become Christians and with the LXX as their Scripture, the readers would appreciate the body as God's creation and the structure of its unity as divinely willed. Finally, in the popular metaphor the head supplies the body with various qualities and capacities, such as life itself, or health or unity.<sup>238</sup> In this regard, the image has an advantage over even a direct parallel with Adam; it suggests the body's continuing dependency on the head.

But several aspects of the metaphor failed to meet the author's understanding of the relation or were roadblocks to its adaptation:

(a) The head/body relation does not reflect the element of human freedom involved. However, the author is not concerned here with how people become Christians, but with the character of the unity between Christ and those who are already believers. Moreover, the body metaphor was often used in political contexts that presupposed its members' freedom. Thus, this is not a roadblock to the idea's use, only to any suggestion that the idea is other than a metaphor.

(b) A more serious problem is the possible conflict between Hellenistic and Jewish presuppositions about the seat of will and reason. The popular metaphor locates this in the head, but our author seems to find it in the heart. Several points deserve mention.

(i) While the Hellenistic metaphor does presuppose that the seat of will and reason is in the head, it often does not draw upon this in any explicit way. It stresses that the head is the source of life, unity,



and health. There is a certain similarity here to the Hebrew  $\text{רֹאשׁ}$ . In social-political contexts the Hebrew term denotes authority and rule, not on the basis of the reason's control of the body, but on the priority of being.<sup>239</sup> The term denotes the heads of family-tribes, and it is perhaps significant that Mowinkel can say: "In the head of a family the family's soul is concentrated."<sup>240</sup> We have seen how Paul uses these ideas in I Cor xi 3 where the term indicates the authoritative source and goal of a being. Thus, both  $\text{κεφαλή}$  in the popular metaphor and  $\text{רֹאשׁ}$  used in social-political contexts bear similar ideas of prominence and determinative source.

(ii) It is noteworthy that in Apocalyptic literature the head of a beast sometimes indicated the ruler(s) of a kingdom.<sup>241</sup> When dealing with a picture image, an outer body member may have been felt to be more effective. It is noteworthy, too, that in Isa i 4 the head stands parallel to the heart: "the whole head is sick and the whole heart faint." The head denotes outwardly what the heart denotes inwardly. If the ruling member of the body is to be outwardly visualized, the head is a likely choice.

(iii) While in OT anthropology the head is not the seat of psychic and rational activity, it is still an organ vital to life. The head is a primary vehicle for receiving and manifesting those realities and experiences vital to man's existence in the world.<sup>242</sup> It is the man who is blessed, cursed, anointed, exalted, judged; it is where such inward attitudes as humiliation or rebellion are made known. In its height and priority the head stands first among the other members and may be contrasted to the feet or tail. If in Hellenistic physiology the head is the seat of the soul's powers, in Semitic thought the head mediates the powers of life and blessing to the body; if in Hellenistic thought the head decides, in Semitic thought it manifests in its actions the person's decision and feelings. Hellenistic and Semitic conceptions differ most

significantly in that for the Hellenist the seat of the soul is static and generally confined to one member, while for the Semite it is more dynamic, and can be manifested in any member.<sup>243</sup> The member that manifests the soul is determined by the personal function or action being stressed at that time. In OT thought, then, the head has decisive importance when the person is engaged in those functions and activities which the head represents. Only this decisive status is not permanent.

In his desire to communicate the implications of his New Adam theology the author saw a useful parallel in the Hellenistic metaphor. He can take over the aspect of the head's decisive significance because for him he can view the head as decisive under certain conditions. So as long as those conditions remain constant he can allow the head a permanent decisiveness. Even so it is not likely that he adapted the notion that the head is the seat of reason and will. Rather he combines the social and physiological implications of *ἐνκεφαλή*. The emphasis, then, is not on the head's decisions, but those acts and experiences that manifest its exalted and ruling position as the source and goal of the body's life. Such a combination would perhaps not have suggested itself apart from the Hellenistic metaphor. But in view of the metaphor, and once Christ was labeled *κεφαλή* and the Church his *σῶμα*, the combination seems natural and understandable. Thus, under the influence of the popular conception, Christ as *κεφαλή* was identified with the *κεφαλή* of *σῶμα Χριστοῦ*. The Head of this Body now gains and maintains its decisive significance because it is viewed from that perspective wherein Christ is the ruling source and goal of the Church's life. In other words, the Body is viewed as engaged in the personal function that the Head represents.

(c) Another problem with the Hellenistic metaphor as it stands, is that it does not convey the important aspect that the bond between Christ and the Church is between two modes of Christ's person, his individual and corporate identity. To solve this problem our author fills out the

idea with Semitic presuppositions about man's members and his body. In OT anthropology the body members indicated the whole man in a particular mode of being or activity. The feet are the man who stands or runs, the eyes the man who sees, the head the man who is exalted or blessed, etc.<sup>244</sup> The body, however, is the outward manifestation of man in his finite and created selfhood. It is the person who lives and is acted on by himself or others, but not generally the man who acts.<sup>245</sup>

These two strands about the members and about the body were occasionally brought together in the Jewish thinking of the Hellenistic era.<sup>246</sup> The body stands over against a particular member as the person's totality. It is the most immediate recipient of the particular member's action or lack of action: i.e. the activity of a particular member passively involves and implicates the whole body. The idea resembles the Greek idea of an organism, but with an important difference. The body under this view is not seen abstractly, but as the outward side of someone. Thus the member-functions are not just united to an organism; they are wholistically identified with the person who is this body. The body's unity depends less on the idea of an organism than on the integration of the person with all his created capacities and functions. What unites the body members, is not so much the body's common substance or its physical interactions, but the common relation that each member has with the person with whom the member is wholistically identified. Thus the unity of the body ultimately goes back to the unity of the person that God has created.

If correct in this, we have grounds for seeing how σῶμα is always the entire Body and yet how the Head can be set in conjunction with this Body. We may describe the κεφαλή/σῶμα relation in this manner: the head is a particular mode of an entire person's being as it stands in relation to the person's total self. Σῶμα makes it possible to conceptualize as a united whole that which receives the mode of being or activity that κεφαλή presents. Thus, Semitic anthropological concepts help our



author express that the Head and Body are related as a God-given unity between two modes of a "self."

When applied to Christ and the Church, we see that their relation concerns a functional identity. Christ as the New Adam is the whole Body (i.e. the Church) as he identifies himself through the loving redemptive acts of his body with those descendants of Adam who receive his body in their need of reconciliation, unity, growth and salvation. In other words, the body that Christ gave to the Church through the cross and resurrection, has now become the image of those to whom he gave it. This Body is the special recipient of Christ's salvific acts. But as Christ identifies his body with that Body which embraces all those who receive his body, this body is identified with that Body in a particular mode of being, namely as the mediating source of life (resurrection) and blessing (the new position of man in the world and with God); he is the "Head" of the Body. Thus, Head and Body form a dynamic unity based on the functional identity of two modes of the self: Christ's individual self and Christ's corporate self. The relation, however, is decisively one way; without the individual self, the necessary conditions for the corporate group do not exist; without the Head, there is no Body.<sup>247</sup>

(d) Finally the popular political image does not provide any real parallel to the cosmic context of our author's usage. At this point one might feel driven to some Macroanthropos scheme. We suggest another avenue; Christ as the New Adam restores cosmic order and peace. In Colossians we saw that Christ's headship over the powers and his headship of the Church are related. In our passage Christ's position in the Church is viewed as the highest expression of his position in the world. This is because headship of the Church means restoring man to his proper place in the cosmic order, and hence entails the subjection of all things under this one's feet. Thus the cosmic context highlights the redemptive bias of Christ's headship of the Church.

In summary: like the cosmos, the Church finds in its Head an exalted ruler who governs on the basis of being its determinative source and goal. Unlike the cosmos, Christ's headship of the Church is not simply the source and goal of a new cosmic order, but of a new, special position within that order, a new quality of life; it is the headship of a Body. The Head/Body relation indicates a God-willed unity wherein the Body receives and shares the conditions, qualities, and powers of the exalted one, the Head. These ideas relate to the readers the essential aspects of the author's New Adam theology. This attempt is facilitated by the adaptation of the Hellenistic metaphor to Semitic presuppositions about the head and body. The head gains and maintains its decisive significance because the κεφαλή of the σῶμα Χριστοῦ is constantly viewed from and identified with those divine acts and conditions whereby Christ functions as the ruling source and goal of the Church's life. The head and body indicate two perspectives on the same person and hence their unity is based ultimately on the God-willed unity of the created person or self. Translated into the image, the two modes indicate Christ as a representative individual and as the corporate group he represents. The Head supplies the necessary conditions, attributes, and qualities for the Body's life, and the Body is passively engaged as the special recipient of the Head's specific functions.

How, then, did the author intend for his readers to gather these implications of his Semitic presuppositions? First, he conveys them by his use of the terms. Τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ certainly indicates that this Body is Christ's Body. This brings to the fore that the Church is related to Christ as a certain dimension of his person. Since σῶμα could be compared to a group, it is reasonable to assume that his readers would grasp the main point. But while use of the personal genitive may convey that κεφαλή and σῶμα are related as two modes of the whole person, they do not specify the actual dynamics of the relation. For this, the author uses a definition. This brings us to the next part of this verse.

Τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου, If the πλήρωμα clause defines the Head/Body relation, this does not mean that πλήρωμα/πληροῦν are physiological concepts. In communicating his theological assumptions the author has used κεφαλή/σῶμα in a unique fashion. He now offers a parallel description of this relation to help clarify its contours. Thus any explanation must at least be compatible and understandable in terms of the Head/Body conception, even if the two are not exact equivalents. Unfortunately, from our standpoint, the clause is not altogether clear. It presents the exegete with problems ranging from grammatical considerations to the theological interpretation of the terms involved. We discuss first the theological background of πλήρωμα/πληροῦν and then turn to the specific problems of this verse.

#### Excursus: The Context and Meaning of πλήρωμα<sup>248</sup>

The noun πλήρωμα is a cognate of the verb πληροῦν. The verb stems from the root πλη = "full," "fullness," and means literally "to fill" or figuratively, "to fulfill."<sup>249</sup> The noun is formed with the ending -μα, which generally in NT Greek indicates the result of the cognate verb's action.<sup>250</sup> When applied to πλήρωμα we obtain the idea: "that which results from or is caused by filling," namely "fullness," "completeness," "complement," or "totality."<sup>251</sup> The difficulty arises in applying this abstract notion to concrete cases where the term's passive or active significance is important to its meaning. The classic expositions of this problem are those of J. B. Lightfoot and J. A. Robinson. Lightfoot argued from the passive connotation of "result" that πλήρωμα was always passive.<sup>252</sup> Robinson, however, showed that this so-called passive sense was an active sense cast in different terms. He suggested that πλήρωμα always has an active sense.<sup>253</sup> Scholars generally concede today that the lexical data are inconclusive and the interpretation of a particular instance must be determined by its context.<sup>254</sup> So from the basic idea of "fullness" or "completeness," four major nuances may be attested:



(i) "that which fills," "full contents;" (ii) "sum total," "totality;" (iii) "what is filled;" (iv) "the act of filling."<sup>255</sup>

Such lexical data, while important, are too general to provide any immediate direction for understanding the term's theological implication.<sup>256</sup> For this we must investigate the theological or philosophical environments that may have influenced our author's use of the term;

(1) Hellenistic Philosophy: The idea that the cosmos is "full," having no emptiness, was common at this period.<sup>257</sup> Essentially it reflects the pantheistic conception that the cosmos has its source and unifying principle in a single material substance, the one divine and ultimate Urstoff, which the Stoics identified with the Logos.<sup>258</sup> So for the cosmos to be full means no deprivation of Being exists in the world. God fills the world and the world fills God, both are of the same divine substance. However, among the early and middle Stoics πλήρωμα does not occur in this connection.<sup>259</sup> The idea is represented by the verb πληροῦν or the adjective πλήρης, usually in contrast to τὸ κένον.

In the later Corpus Hermeticum, however, these Stoic conceptions are related to πλήρωμα.<sup>260</sup> At XVI 3, the One and All are said to be inseparable, so that "all things" are not πλῆθος, but πλήρωμα. Here πλήρωμα connotes a unity within a multiplicity: it indicates the totality of all things in their unity with the one divine and life-giving (or perhaps better "existence-giving") principle. Similarly in XII 15 God as the cosmos is called πλήρωμα τῆς ζωῆς. "Life" has virtually become synonymous with "Being." From this viewpoint τὸ ἓν, τὸ πᾶν, τὰ πάντα, κόσμος, πλήρωμα, θεός are all interchangeable.<sup>261</sup> Alongside this thoroughgoing monism we find a clear-cut dualism at VI 4: ὁ γὰρ κόσμος πλήρωμά ἐστιν τῆς κακίας, ὁ δὲ θεὸς τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ...<sup>262</sup> This juxtaposition of world and God reveals a tendency that comes to full expression in the more specifically Gnostic systems. Finally in the Hermetica literature πλήρωμα and πληροῦν have no significant relation. The verb is

used with γνῶσις, and in these instances probably assumes soteriological importance.<sup>263</sup> But this is nowhere associated with πλήρωμα.

(2) Gnosticism: Especially among the Valentinian Gnostics πλήρωμα is an important, if not technical concept.<sup>264</sup> Essentially the term represents the total number of emanations or aeons that came forth from the Forefather. These emanations are personified divine attributes such as Mind, Truth, Logos, Life, Sophia, etc., a total of thirty in all.<sup>265</sup> As the term emanation suggests, these aeons share a common substance with the Forefather and hence as a totality are filled by and united to him. Even so, the Forefather is the "unbegotten" and thus is distinguished from the aeons that proceed from him. As such, the πλήρωμα holds a position between the Forefather and the cosmos, and hence indicates the geographical location of all truly spiritual and divine realities.<sup>266</sup> It is separated from the cosmos, or "emptiness," by the horos, the boundary, which sometimes is associated with the "cross."<sup>267</sup>

Along with the ideas of "totality" and "location," the πλήρωμα is characterized by its "unity."<sup>268</sup> This is especially clear when Sophia falls outside the boundary. This causes a crisis within the πλήρωμα, which ultimately explains the creation of the present evil and ignorant cosmos and the divine origin of the spiritual elect.<sup>269</sup> To restore its original state the πλήρωμα produces its most perfect fruit, Jesus, who descends into the evil and ignorant world, gathers the scattered fragments of the divine substance, namely the spirits of the enlightened elect, and ascends with them back into the πλήρωμα.<sup>270</sup> Thus the starting point and goal of redemption is to restore the πλήρωμα to unity and perfection.<sup>271</sup>

Not surprisingly, then, the πλήρωμα was viewed antithetically to the cosmos: "Not only have the thirty Aeons their terrestrial counterparts; but their subdivisions also are represented in this lower region... Even individual men and women...have their archetypes in this higher sphere of intelligible being."<sup>272</sup> Lightfoot is probably correct in seeing



Platonic influence here.<sup>273</sup> But with its intense individualization the term attains a soteriological import that is hardly Platonic. The individual does not simply have a counterpart in the spiritual realm, but rather through union with this counterpart in the "bridal chamber" he is united with his divine origin and so stands in the sphere of salvation.<sup>274</sup>

In the Gnostic systems we encounter a use of πλήρωμα that goes beyond Stoicism. The intense dualism of Gnosticism is one reason, but not the whole point. Gnosticism is not simply a Platonized Stoicism, for it has a soteriological element that takes it beyond philosophy into religion.<sup>275</sup> This soteriological element at once gives it an affinity to the NT writings which more philosophical sources could not by nature have. We must not, however, mistake a common theological motif that uses similar vocabulary for an historical influence, especially since the Gnostic texts are late and often show Christian influence. Most scholars no longer link the NT passages to the technical Gnostic use of πλήρωμα.<sup>276</sup> The question remains, however, whether a less technical, yet specific understanding of πλήρωμα may have existed.<sup>277</sup>

(3) Judaism: In the LXX πλήρωμα has no significant theological import, but usually indicates the "contents" of the earth or sea, etc.<sup>278</sup> Πληροῦν and πλήρης do occur in contexts of theological import. Jer xxiii 24 accents the all-knowing, seeing and hearing presence of God who fills heaven and earth.<sup>279</sup> The text has a specifically ethical bias: i.e. to show the impossibility of the evil-doer hiding his deeds from God or escaping His judgment. Likewise Wis i 7 affirms that the evil-doer has no escape from God. Only here it is the "Spirit of the Lord" who is the instrument of God's perception.<sup>280</sup> Elsewhere God fills His temple, or His work, the earth or creation, with divine qualities such as glory, knowledge and mercy.<sup>281</sup> Such filling often has an eschatological bent, and may incur blessing or judgment.<sup>282</sup> These attributes indicate specific modes of God's presence in the world and may show an early tendency towards a theology of transcendence.



The desire to maintain God's transcendence over the world intensified in Judaism. This gave rise to an elaborate angelology, God being in the highest and supreme heaven (I En i 3; TLev iii 4).<sup>283</sup> There also arose, probably with the aid of current philosophical conceptions, the idea of a more embracing, mediating and personified force that bears within itself the divine qualities inherent in God's relation to the world. This idea is seen in Wis i 7 where the divine Spirit binds all things together and is thus immanent throughout the world.<sup>284</sup> Elsewhere in the Sapiential books this role is attributed to Wisdom. That the two ideas are identified is already suggested in vs. 6: "For Wisdom is a kindly spirit." At Wis vii 21-28 Wisdom is depicted as an intermediate entity that embraces within itself divine attributes. It expresses as a breath, emanation, reflection, mirror and image, God's own power, glory, purity, light and goodness. Also of note is Wisdom's soteriological work: "renewing all things" and "entering holy souls and making them friends of God, and prophets." While πλήρωμα does not occur in this regard, Ernst rightly finds this complex of ideas informative and conceivably of influence.<sup>285</sup>

The theme of God's transcendence and immanence is also present in Philo. But again, it is πληροῦν, not πλήρωμα, that occurs in this connection.<sup>286</sup> Stoic influence is evident when Philo states that God fills the cosmos with Himself (Leg. All. III 4; Conf. Ling. 136).<sup>287</sup> For the Alexandrian Jew, however, God remains transcendent and is thus contained by nothing (Conf. Ling. 136, Post. Cain. 14). God, then, fills the cosmos with Himself, by virtue of his divine δυνάμεις, "powers."<sup>288</sup> These activities or powers attain a quasi-independence and serve as inter-mediating entities which bring God near, even for man's salvation (Quaest. in Gen. IV 130).<sup>289</sup> Here it is the Logos, not Wisdom, that plays the key role.<sup>290</sup> The Logos not only stands alongside the other powers as the supreme and eldest, it also denotes the totality of these powers. In

this manner the Logos is the "place," the sphere of the intelligible world into which man must enter if he is to worship God properly (Som. I 62).<sup>291</sup>

In a different direction, Philo says that the soul through good nature, learning, and practice becomes the πλήρωμα ἀρετῶν (Praem.Poen. 65). The term is passive here as the ensuing statement suggests: οὐδέν ἐν ἑαυτῇ καταλιποῦσα κενὸν εἰς πάροδον ἄλλων.<sup>292</sup> The soul is so filled with virtues that the possibility of vice is excluded. Such a soul, in particular Jacob, produces twelve sons, the number corresponding to the perfect number of the Zodiac. Has there been an identification or at least an extension of the πλήρωμα ἀρετῶν to Jacob's sons? Elsewhere (Som. II 31-36) the names of the twelve sons symbolize essential deeds or qualities. Reuben is a symbol of good natural endowments; Symeon, of aptness to learn; Zabulon, of light; Naphthali, of peace, etc. The κεφαλή/ζῶον metaphor is used in a similar context. Philo describes Esau as the progenitor of vices and passions in this manner: κεφαλή δὲ ὡς ζῴου πάντων τῶν λεχθέντων μερῶν ὁ γενάρχης ἐστὶν Ἡσαῦ (Congr. 61). As Esau is the antitype of Jacob, presumably the latter could be called the progenitor of virtues. This much, at least, is clear: virtues and vices were allegorically identified, perhaps even typified by persons. This suggests an atmosphere in which such a πλήρωμα ἀρετῶν could have been identified with Jacob's sons, or perhaps the Platonic world of ideas, or again the heavenly bodies of the Zodiac.<sup>293</sup>

In the Rabbinic writings we discover a rather different picture. Instead of the δυνάμεις the Rabbis speak of God's middoth (measures or attributes), which relate God more directly to His people and the world.<sup>294</sup> This differs from the Philonic idea because to the Hellenistic mind God is only "defined" negatively.<sup>295</sup> The Rabbis also attributed many characteristics of Wisdom to the Torah. Thus, the Torah is the first of the seven things created before the world; it has a role in creation; and in fact,

it constitutes the raison d'être of the world.<sup>296</sup> Finally, the Rabbis often used periphrastic expressions to protect the transcendent and holy God from crude anthropomorphisms.<sup>297</sup> Especially popular was the use of shekhinah to denote God's presence in a particular place, people, small group, or even person.<sup>298</sup>

We conclude this section with several observations: (a) Unlike the Stoic and Gnostic conceptions, divine "filling" need not involve an ontological identity of sharing a common substance, but rather a relationship, a dynamic presence. Such a relationship may involve a functional identity in that what is filled conforms to the divine will and thus exhibits the qualities of God's presence. This points to a common life in the sense of fellowship, but not necessarily of substance. (b) As to transcendence and immanence, πληροῦν clearly concerns the latter, God's nearness. The manner in which this occurs ranges from the all-encompassing presence of God's perceptive powers to His presence in the attributes of His work. It may require mediating powers or a single entity that represents the totality of God's relation to the world. It may occur on a cosmic level embracing heaven and earth, or on the personal level of a group or individual. (c) Πληροῦν occurs within contexts that concern not simply God's nearness, but the revelation and knowledge of that nearness; it concerns God's openness, not His hiddenness. Such revelation may result from a prophetic vision, the gift of wisdom, the turning of the reason inward, or perhaps the contemplation of the Torah. In eschatological contexts God's filling is more closely aligned with the act and means of revelation. (d) Finally, πληροῦν concerns a dynamic rather than static presence. God comes near for man's benefit and blessing, although to reject this may result in judgment. Although differently conceived, directly or indirectly, salvation is a key issue in the Jewish texts we have discussed. God's presence is imperative for man's deliverance from bondage, whether conceived as enslavement to sense perception, moral evil, or more



historically to nations, or cosmically to demonic powers, or any combination of the above. This soteriological element places the Jewish idea closer to the Gnostic usage than to popular philosophical conceptions. Still πλήρωμα itself does not occur in these Jewish texts, while in later Gnostic usage, the πληροῦν does not appear in connection with the noun. This suggests that πλήρωμα rose out of its association with πληροῦν. Once this usage was established, however, the noun probably became an object of speculation apart from the verb.

(4) The New Testament: Apart from Colossians and Ephesians, πλήρωμα rarely attains any theological import in the New Testament.<sup>299</sup> John i 16, states that Christians share in the fullness of Christ: ὅτι ἐκ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος. The meaning is determined by πλήρης of vs. 14, which modifies λόγος and μονογενής.<sup>300</sup> So as the totality of grace and truth, or perhaps more broadly as the totality of all God's divine attributes,<sup>301</sup> this fullness of Christ is fundamentally related to God's salvific act of sending the Son as the Word become flesh.

In the Pauline Corpus πλήρωμα and πληροῦν attain a developed theological content in Colossians and Ephesians.<sup>302</sup> In addition to Eph i 23, four texts are of special importance:<sup>303</sup>

(a) Col i 19: ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι.

(b) Col ii 9: ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι.

(c) Eph iii 19: ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ.

(d) Eph iv 10, 13: ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα . . . μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες . . . εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

A cursory look at these passages (along with Eph i 23) reveals several points. Πλήρωμα often occurs with πᾶν. This intimates that πλήρωμα represents an aggregate or sum total of a plurality.<sup>304</sup> At Col i 19 πλήρωμα lacks a qualifying genitive, indicating it has a fairly specific meaning.<sup>305</sup> Finally, πλήρωμα and πληροῦν are often closely

associated, suggesting a stage of development where the noun's meaning is still shaped by the verb's.<sup>306</sup>

(a) Col i 19: The verse occurs in the soteriological part of the liturgical unit of i 15-20.<sup>307</sup> Moving from Christ's role in creation to his role in salvation the hymn declares that in the man Jesus, "who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead,"<sup>308</sup>  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  τὸ πλήρωμα "was pleased to dwell and through him to reconcile all things unto him."<sup>309</sup> In the LXX,  $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  often denotes God's good pleasure in right conduct and by implication divine election (LXX Pss xliii 4; cix 11; cxlix 4, cf. Mark i 11 and par;),<sup>310</sup> The joining of God's good pleasure and His dwelling presence also occurs in the LXX (Ps lxvii 17). We are dealing, then, with ideas known to Hellenistic Judaism.

$\Pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  τὸ πλήρωμα is best taken as a periphrastic expression for God that indicates God in all the fullness and totality of His divine attributes, powers, virtues, and graces.<sup>311</sup> The noun is probably passive, indicating what results from God's filling, i.e. the entire complement of divine attributes and powers that results from and hence exhibits God's dynamic presence. Thus, Christ in his utter conformity to God's will is filled by God's dynamic presence and exhibits completely His divine qualities. This view accords well with  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , which accents the entirety of this aggregate of attributes and virtues. Perhaps this stress is polemical, confronting incipient or proto-gnostic conceptions.<sup>312</sup> But whether the term comes from stoic or gnostic quarters, its use conforms to the Jewish understanding of the verb. This too favors the idea that the noun is at an early stage of development. Especially as the noun was in the process of assimilating the various theological connotations of the verb under one rubric, it would be natural to accent the idea of totality even when the stress was not strictly necessary.

(b) Col ii 9: The false teachers at Colossae, while apparently giving Christ a heavenly status, were unwilling to accept the sufficiency

of his work.<sup>313</sup> Evidently they taught that such divine treasures as wisdom, knowledge and insight were not fully available through Christ.<sup>314</sup> Probably they considered angels, whom they revered, as communicators of these important qualities and powers. The author counters forcefully that all divine attributes are centered and available in Christ, including some that the false teachers may not have considered important, e.g. love, compassion, humility, kindness, meekness, etc. (cf. Col iii 12ff). These virtues and qualities are not considered abstractly as characteristics of divinity; that would have been suggested by θεϊότης.<sup>315</sup> Rather they are more concretely attributes of θεότης, the "Godhead," "deity," or "divine being." They are dynamic and relational; they manifest and point to, not simply a divine presence, but the divine presence of the one creator God.

All the attributes, virtues, and graces that emerge from and exhibit the loving presence of God reside in Christ "bodily." Σωματικῶς is best understood from the Pauline view of the body as the outward side of man as a created being.<sup>316</sup> From this viewpoint it is clear that πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα dwells in Christ in the manner of his incarnated person. A functional identity exists between πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα and Christ such that the manner of the πλήρωμα's indwelling is consistent with the manner in which Christ makes that πλήρωμα available: i.e. bodily, through his person on the outward side, his history as incarnated, crucified and resurrected.

Thus the conclusion follows: καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι.<sup>317</sup> With the word-play between πλήρωμα and πεπληρωμένοι the author stresses that in Christ nothing necessary for full salvation is lacking.<sup>318</sup> Believers are not filled by πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα per se; they share in this πλήρωμα by virtue of union with Christ.<sup>319</sup> This is clearer when we recall that Christ bears this fullness bodily, i.e. as a man, indeed the New Adam. Believers, then, share this πλήρωμα as they share the new



humanity offered in Christ. So to be filled in the fullness-indwelling Christ means to partake of the attributes and blessings of Christ's eschatological existence, to share the new humanity of the New Adam who inaugurates the new eschatological age. Since this new age fulfills God's purpose for the old age, we may speak of believers, or of the world, being "fulfilled" in Christ. Indeed, when understood in the absolute sense, the filling of the believer with the qualities and powers of Christ's eschatological existence is well viewed as the fulfillment of his humanity in Christ.

(c) Eph iii 19: The verse is the final request of the author's prayer for the spiritual enrichment of his Gentile readers towards an ever deepening experience of God's presence and revelation in Christ. The prayer has a threefold structure indicated by the threefold use of *ἵνα*.<sup>320</sup> In vss. 16-17 the author asks that his readers be granted the strengthening power of God's presence through the divine Spirit in the inner man and that Christ might continually dwell in the faithful heart. The fruit of this strengthening presence, or the quality through which it is made manifest, is the love in which the believer becomes rooted and grounded.<sup>321</sup> In vs. 18 the request again centers on power, but this time the power to comprehend the cosmic dimensions of Christ's love, which in fact surpasses knowledge.<sup>322</sup> This empowering to comprehend, while an individual experience, is not limited to a few, nor obtained in isolation from the community, but gained *σὺν πάνσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις*.<sup>323</sup> The gift of knowledge does not set one above his fellows, but binds him to others in service and love.

At vs. 19 the author consummates the prayer, creating a final and ultimate perspective. *Πληροῦν/πλήρωμα* evoke ideas appropriate to this context. What in Colossians was seen as a present possession of Christ is now related to believers as their ultimate goal.<sup>324</sup> The author desires that his readers be and have all that God intends. If this general meaning is sufficiently clear, the details are more difficult to decipher.

The construction πληροῦν εἰς is somewhat unusual.<sup>325</sup> Πληροῦν is best understood in an absolute sense and εἰς in the sense of "unto," "up to the measure of," "to the degree that."<sup>326</sup> Πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ indicates, then, the degree or limit that believers are filled. When it is noted how this limit carries the sense of ultimacy, the idea of a final "goal" becomes more sharply focused.<sup>327</sup> The author prays that his readers be brought to fullness up to the measure of the fullness that results from God's filling.<sup>328</sup> When God comes near and works to conform the believer's life to His will and purpose, the believer comes to share and exhibit the totality of divine attributes, and blessings that emerge from living wholly in His loving presence. For our author, then, the Christian life finds its concrete and ultimate objective in the total expression of those qualities that indicate God's loving presence within the believer's life.<sup>329</sup> Indeed, to define this totality one can do no better than "the love of Christ that surpasses knowledge." Being filled with the totality of Christ's love means not only receiving more love, but also becoming more loving.

How, then, have the attributes of Christian existence come to be identified with the attributes of God? The answer lies in the passage's teleological perspective. From this viewpoint the essential qualities and blessings of Christian existence are precisely those of an existence wholly and perfectly permeated by God. Now in Christ such an existence is revealed, not as an ideal, but as a concrete standard and present reality which fulfills God's purpose for creation. This present reality constitutes the ultimate goal of mankind, indeed, of creation. So when God's fullness is seen as the goal of salvation, this is viewed from its functional identity with Christ, through whom this divine fullness becomes available to faith as a new mode of existence.<sup>330</sup>

Once viewed as the qualities, powers and blessings of the new mode of existence revealed and accomplished in Christ, one may speak of this



"fullness of God" in terms of the Church. Especially viewed in its final perfection in Christ, the Church manifests the totality of attributes of God's loving presence. However, all that the Church is in its relation to God, it is in its dependence on Christ as the mediator of its life. Thus if the Church's life, either now or in its perfected state, expresses the fullness of God, it does so only as it expresses the life of Christ within it.

(d) Eph iv 10-13:<sup>331</sup> At iv 10 the author connects Christ's descent and ascent with the filling of all things. This cosmic filling goes beyond a mere "penetration" of Christ's presence and power. Such penetration must be seen in its effect on the object; i.e. τὰ πάντα is viewed in its need for salvation. It might be clearer, then, to render "make all things full" or "fulfill all things." At vs. 13 the Church's goal is attaining the full measure of maturity τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The underlying presupposition here is that in Christ God's full salvation and purpose for man is revealed and made available to the Church. Since this goal is just defined as the Perfect Man, the idea of Christ's new and perfect humanity is likely in view here too.<sup>332</sup> τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ refers to the totality of the divine qualities and powers of the new humanity revealed in Christ and mediated through him to the Church. This filling of the Church is closely associated with the filling of all things because both occur in the same salvation event. This double nuance is clearer when Christ is seen as the New Adam. In the salvific act whereby he mediates a new humanity to the Church, he establishes that humanity once and for all, thus fulfilling God's intended order and purpose for the cosmos. Thus, while both the cosmos and Church are filled by Christ, the Church stands apart from the cosmos as a special recipient of this filling; it alone is called the fullness of Christ.

We conclude this excursus with a few observations. There is no clear-cut answer as to the source of the πλήρωμα concept in Colossians and



Ephesians. Conceivably the noun is derived from a source representing a transitional phase between Stoicism and Gnosticism. Certainly the ideas of totality and unity are germane to our subject matter. Of course, these ideas are inherent in the noun itself, and the texts possibly indicate an early effort to gather the verb's theological implications under the rubric of the noun. In any case, use of the verb in Hellenistic Judaism is well attested and informative. Close association of the noun and verb in Colossians and Ephesians suggests that whatever the noun's derivation its use reflects the Jewish suppositions of the verb. This means that "filling" connotes not a sharing of substance, but of a relationship, a dynamic presence. The terms indicate God's coming near, His openness, His concern for salvation, the sharing of all the attributes and powers of a common life and fellowship.

In Colossians the totality of God's attributes and graces is said to dwell in Christ. It is not the cosmos, temple, or the angelic hierarchy, the world of ideas, but Christ in whom this totality resides bodily and with whom it is identified. The term thus denotes Christ's relation to God; God is present in Christ and Christ exhibits this presence in his life. By virtue of union with Christ believers are also filled and fulfilled. Mediated through Christ, God's fullness becomes functionally identified with the qualities, virtues, and graces of Christ's eschatological existence, i.e. the new humanity of the New Adam. This thought is also present in Ephesians, only now related directly to the Church as τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. This complement of divine powers and attributes, which fill the new humanity of the Church may be summed up in a word, love.

At i 23 the context concerns the Christ/Church relation as depicted by the Head/Body relation. Our analysis thus far suggests that by defining the Body concept with πλήρωμα the author continues to clarify how Christ shares with believers the qualities and blessings of his new exalted position in the world, i.e. the unity between Christ as the New Adam and the

Church as the new humanity. How, then, does the πλήρωμα clause help clarify the relation between Christ as Head and the Church as his Body?

The exegete faces here three major grammatical problems:<sup>336</sup>

(1) The clause may stand in apposition to αὐτόν or σῶμα. The choice determines whether πλήρωμα defines Christ or the Church.

(2) Granted that πλήρωμα means "fullness" or "totality," the noun may assume a passive, or an active significance, or perhaps both.

(3) The voice of πληρουμένου is either passive or middle. The former requires τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν to be an adverbial phrase; the latter allows τὰ πάντα to denote the direct object of the verb and ἐν πᾶσιν to be either an intensification or the instrument of the filling.

Scholars have proposed an array of solutions to these questions. Since these proposals are summarized by Ernst, Yates, and others, we may proceed to the questions listed and discuss the major options as they emerge.<sup>337</sup>

(1) The clause is most naturally taken in apposition to τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ and the immediate proximity of σῶμα and πλήρωμα favors this. Hitchcock and Moule, however, take πλήρωμα in apposition to αὐτόν and πληρουμένου as middle with an active sense.<sup>338</sup> This yields the meaning: "Christ has been appointed by God to be not only the supreme head to the Church but also the fullness - the all-inclusive representative - of God the all-filler."<sup>339</sup> Besides the difficulty of the distance separating αὐτόν and πλήρωμα, this view makes ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ "a useless insertion, and worse than useless, as serving only to separate πλ. from ἔδωκεν."<sup>340</sup> This difficulty might be avoided if πληρουμένου is taken as passive such that Christ as the Head is the fullness of the Body which is being filled all in all.<sup>341</sup> Grammatically, this view is possible, but strained. Were it not for the theological difficulties involved in interpreting the clause, its apposition to σῶμα would be unquestioned.

(2) Πλήρωμα may be active, "what fills;" both active and passive, "what fills and is filled;" or passive, "what is filled."

(a) A popular view is to take the noun as active, the verb as passive, and τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν as adverbial. Thus, the Church as Christ's Body fills Christ who is being completely filled. Support for

this interpretation is often sought in the Head/Body imagery. As the Head needs a Body to function and is incomplete without it, so too Christ is incomplete without the Church. This view, which goes back to the Church Fathers, is supported by such modern scholars as J. A. Robinson, Beare, Yates, and Overfield.<sup>342</sup> The strength of this interpretation lies in two factors: (i) Especially in its earlier presentations this view takes seriously the clause's appositive position to σῶμα, and thus understands the terms in connection with the Head/Body imagery. (ii) This view also has sound linguistic evidence. In the NT writings πλήρωμα usually has an active significance and πληρουμένου is most easily understood as passive. Only τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν is difficult to account for and even here it is a possible variant on the classical παντάπασιν.<sup>343</sup>

But these advantages are outweighed by a serious theological difficulty. This view implies that Christ's person is incomplete or deficient without the Church. The idea that the Body completes the Head would certainly be unique in Colossians and Ephesians. Elsewhere the Body's need of and dependence on the Head is stressed.<sup>344</sup> Moreover, this view requires σῶμα to refer to the trunk, whereas it most likely refers to the entire Body.<sup>345</sup> In view of such difficulties Yates avoids this Head/Body connection and rests his case on the linguistic data. He attempts to overcome "the difficulty of an implied deficiency in the Person of Christ" by understanding the verse in terms of "the doctrine of inclusive personality:"

Christ is seen as the inclusive personality into which Christians are incorporated by faith in Baptism. The Body of those who are 'in Christ' is also the Church. In this way there is no theological difficulty in maintaining that the Church is that which completes, or even constitutes Christ.<sup>346</sup>

Yates rightly detects the presence of corporate categories here, but his explanation of their use lacks clarity. If Christ being filled refers to incorporation into the Body of Christ, which is the Church, then ultimately the Church completes the Church, or the Body fills the Body. If such a rendering is possible, it is unusual, if not forced, and one



wonders whether the readers would have understood it. Indeed, what Yates fails to appreciate is how σῶμα and πλήρωμα represent the author's attempt to communicate his understanding of the One and Many: σῶμα and πλήρωμα indicate the Many, and κεφαλή and πληροῦν denote the One. This makes clear that any adequate interpretation of the πλήρωμα clause cannot ignore its correlation to the Head/Body imagery.

(b) Warnach, Schlier, and Ernst have argued that πλήρωμα as well as πληρουμένου is both active and passive.<sup>347</sup> Warnach interprets this in terms of the Head/Body imagery: "Wie nämlich der physische Leib vom Haupte her belebende Kraft erhält und in einem des Hauptes wesensgemässe Ergänzung ist, so wird die Kirche mit Christi Leben erfüllt und stellt wiederum Seine Ergänzung zum 'ganzen Christus.'"<sup>348</sup> Christ being filled is now conceived as the Church completing the cosmic Macroanthropos, Christ. This is possible because the Church as a new creation is the "wiederhergestellte Ursprungsordnung der Schöpfung."<sup>349</sup> Schlier supports this interpretation with Gnostic instances where πλήρωμα indicates in spatial terms a divine sphere or place. This is identified with the Church, which is "der Ort, da sich diese Fülle Christi niederlassen hat und anwesend ist, und zwar die Fülle des Christus, der durch sie das All und den kosmos in seine Fülle hineinnimmt."<sup>350</sup> Both Warnach and Schlier interpret ἐν πᾶσιν as masculine and thus in terms of the members of the Church who fill the world and hence bring to realization, that is, fulfill Christ's filling of all things.<sup>351</sup>

Ernst, aware of the criticisms against Schlier's use of later gnostic materials, follows Benoit in viewing the verse from stoic pantheistic conceptions.<sup>352</sup> The essential point is that the principle that fills the cosmos is itself filled by all things. When this idea is connected to that of Church growth (iv 15-6), the Body is filled by Christ, but it in turn causes all things to grow into him such that the Church fills Christ with all things. This linking of "filling" with "growing" ultimately

rests on an understanding of πληροῦν that implies a material identity between the filler and the filled. But this idea is alien to our author's Jewish heritage; in Jewish usage God remains transcendent which entails an abandonment of precisely that understanding of "filling" that establishes an ontological identity of substance.<sup>353</sup> It would be very odd in applying these terms to Christ and the Church, for the author suddenly to abandon the Jewish presuppositions of the verb. Nor does the author's use of the Head/Body imagery suggest that he has. His starting point is not the mutual dependence of Head and Body as manifested in a shared material substance, but the God-willed unity that results from God's creative act whereby the Head may represent and implicate the whole Body in a particular function. The author's usage points, then, not to an ontological, but to a functional identity between Christ and Church.

(c) Πλήρωμα is best taken as a passive noun.<sup>354</sup> While the emphasis is on the idea of totality, or completeness, this is seen in its dependency on Christ's filling. Both σῶμα and πλήρωμα may depict the One/Many relation. With σῶμα the accent is usually on unity and diversity, but the idea of totality is also present. With πλήρωμα the stress is generally on totality, but the idea of unity and multiplicity is also present. But πλήρωμα also suggests an idea missing in the Greek body metaphor. The many elements of the πλήρωμα are united precisely by the filling that makes them a totality. Thus when a person serves as the agent who fills, he is united by virtue of this filling function to the Many who receive his filling and are hence united by it. This agrees well with the author's idea that the Body is the passive recipient of the Head's representative functions.<sup>355</sup> It also avoids the inference that Christ is somehow filled by the Church; the Church results from Christ filling believers, even as the Body is filled by the Head.

It is sometimes averred that the Head fills the Body with its thoughts and decisions,<sup>356</sup> But this is foreign to the author's

understanding of the Head. Best offers a better solution:

We do not think of him as filling it with his thoughts and directions; he rather fills it with the plenitude of the divine graces and virtues, which are summed up, as we have seen in 3. 19 in "love." The Head fills the Body with love. Love creates fellowship; thus the Head and the Body are united in fellowship, and the members of the Body with one another. The principal idea here is not the direction of the Body by the Head, but the unity of both in love; and this unity comes from the Head who contributes the love to the Body.<sup>357</sup>

As already seen the Head/Body imagery may depict the Head's impartation of vital qualities to the Body.<sup>358</sup> So such an association of πλήρωμα as the plenitude of divine attributes and graces with σῶμα is understandable. But how are we to understand this in context; "love" is not even mentioned.

The context concerns praising God for what He has done in Christ for believers. He has raised and enthroned Christ, given him life and a position of blessed favor, an exalted mode of existence. Now ii 4-6 states that believers partake of this life and its blessings because of τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ ἣν ἠγάπησεν ἡωᾶς. The aorist tense refers to the act whereby God loves, which according to the context is Christ's exaltation. Still Christ's exaltation should not be greatly separated from his cross. As shown in i 6-7 God's grace has been freely bestowed in the ἡγαπημένῳ in whom believers have redemption through his blood. So the act whereby the Head fills the Body with its exalted mode of existence, is an act of love, and that love therefore characterizes the totality of that filling.

Thus the noun is best understood passively. This avoids problems inherent in other alternatives, and accords well with the author's Head/Body imagery and the letter's broader thematic concerns.

(3) Πληρουμένου is either middle or passive in form. Since the middle voice is sometimes intensive, the term here might denote the act of filling.<sup>359</sup> This allows τὰ πάντα to be the direct object of the filling. Ἐν πᾶσιν becomes, then, either the instrument of filling, e.g. the powers or members of the Church, or it may be an intensification of the



verb. Since the author gives no clue to what  $\pi\alpha\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$  refers, the more general reading, "in every way" is preferable. But since the author knows and uses the active voice (iv 10), it is unlikely that the term here bears an active sense per se.<sup>360</sup> If the middle form is intended, the middle sense must be taken seriously. Of course, the Greek middle is not exactly like the English reflexive; it may indicate participation in the result of the action, "to fill for oneself."<sup>361</sup>

This rendering is possible in our context. The Body is that which is filled by him who fills for himself all things in every respect. In filling the cosmos Christ participates in the result of that action; i.e. he fills himself in some way. So, defining  $\tau\acute{o}$   $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ,  $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\rho\omega\mu\alpha$  indicates the totality of the self that Christ fills when he fills all things: the Body is the total self that is filled when the Head fills for itself all things. Head and Body, then, are functionally identified in the act of being filled; the middle suggests that the act of being filled is a participation in the act whereby Christ fills all things. The Church, then, becomes the special recipient of this filling in that it participates in this filling as the totality (the Body) that passively receives and is involved in the action of one of its members, namely the Head.

But while this solution is workable, this middle sense of  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu$  is rare in Koine Greek<sup>362</sup> and the overall scheme is somewhat subtle. What then can be made of the passive sense? Benoit, who takes  $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\rho\omega\mu\alpha$  as passive, nonetheless affirms that the verb indicates that Christ is filled by the Church, the new creation.<sup>363</sup> But as already seen, this view rests on pantheistic conceptions foreign to our author. A likely solution is that Christ is filled by God. As Best states: "So Christ fills the Church with his life; the Church is his pleroma even as he is the pleroma of God. He who fills the Church is himself being filled. The thought here is then practically the same as Col. 2, 9, 10..."<sup>364</sup>

This view requires τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν to be taken adverbially as a variation on the classical παντάπασιν. The importance of πᾶν throughout the passage makes a more definite content likely. Still, a variation on the classical usage, need not be devoid of content. The adverbial accusative may indicate that with reference to which something is done.<sup>365</sup> The context concerns Christ's position and authority in the cosmos which is continually viewed as God's act. Perhaps, then, the idea is that God fills Christ with reference to the cosmos in every way. Christ possesses the totality of divine attributes such that no aspect of his relation to the world lacks the full presence and authority of God. God fills Christ with His love for, His goodness and mercy towards, His power over (etc.) all things in every way. Christ is, to borrow Moule's phrase, "the all-inclusive representative of God" with respect to all things.<sup>366</sup> This thought would be implied in the classical παντάπασιν; the author's variation simply makes it clearer.

So Christ fills the Church by virtue of being himself filled by God with regard to all things in every way. The Church is filled by virtue of its unity with Christ who is filled by God. Again Christ is functionally identified with the Church as the place wherein the Church is filled. This explains the author's Semitic presuppositions; the Head is the vehicle whereby exaltation and blessings are bestowed on the whole person. The Head is the whole Body in the mode of being filled by God with respect to all things in every way. The Body is the totality that passively partakes of the actions whereby God fills this Head. Thus, the Head fills the Body, in that it mediates to the Body those divine attributes, virtues, and blessings of life (in a word, "love") with which it is filled by God.

This view differs from that which uses the middle voice in that now God is the filler of the Head. Also the idea that this Head fills all things is left to be implied from this Head being "the all-inclusive representative of God" with reference to all things. While either view is

possible, that which takes πληρουμένου as passive is simplest grammatically and therefore preferable. It is an apt conclusion and summary to the passage's entire train of thought. For our purposes, however, a hard and fast decision is unnecessary.

### III. CONCLUSION

Our study has shown that in the framework of an oratio perpetua the author moves from thanksgiving to prayer to the acclaiming of God's power. In vss. 20-23 the author simulates an OT hymnic style to create an exalted atmosphere and add profundity to his instructive praise of God's power. The passage moves from Christ's resurrection to his exalted position in the world, and from this to his relation to the Church. The passage shows how the totality of Christ's relation to the Church shares in the totality of his relation to God and the world. In fact the Church is the special recipient of God's salvific acts in Christ and Christ's headship of the Church is the highest expression in quality and rank of his headship over all things. This follows because the Church is the new humanity of the New Adam under whom God has subjected all things. It is clear from ii 4-6 that believers participate in Christ's exaltation, and in i 22-23 the author seems to lay the groundwork for his readers to understand his Semitic corporate categories.

At this point the author introduces κεφαλή/σῶμα and πλήρωμα/πληροῦν. In arguing to Christ's headship of the Church, and in drawing out the implications and elevating the significance of this by means of the cosmic context, the author actually argues from the headship of the Body. These terms were a familiar or at least natural means for explaining his corporate categories. However, realizing his understanding of the Body may seem unusual to his readers, he adds a word of clarification in the πλήρωμα clause, which also sums up the thrust of the entire passage.

Our analysis of the relation between κεφαλή and πάντα showed that κεφαλή indicates Christ as the eschatological Head whose divine rule



manifests the source and goal of all things. To explain these formulations, we found resort to a Macroanthropos scheme unnecessary. If the author was aware of such a conception, he shows little interest in it and seems little influenced by it. For him Christ is the Head of all things, but the Church, not the world, is his Body. The cosmic context emerges from the implications of the author's New Adam theology. Christ as the New Adam restores man to his proper position in the cosmos and establishes God's intended destiny for man and His intended order for the cosmos. Thus the Church is not a mini-cosmos, but the new humanity of the New Adam. In effect the cosmic context highlights the special salvific significance of Christ's relation to the Church.

The Head/Body imagery conveys the dynamics of this corporate relationship between Christ and the Church. What distinguishes the Church from the cosmos in its relation to Christ is its special unity with Christ, a unity understood as a shared nature, the qualities and powers of a new exalted mode of existence. In joining the Head and Body the author stands within the framework of popular conceptions that could easily communicate important aspects of Christ's relationship to the Church. The head and body share a common life that evinces a God-willed unity and structure. In the metaphor the head supplies the body with vital capacities such as life, health, or unity. This was often an analogy for the communication of various qualities and virtues of an emperor or virtuous man to a larger populace.

Adapting this metaphor the author fills it with his own Semitic presuppositions; after all it is these presuppositions that he wishes to communicate. So the Head is not the seat of reason or will, filling the Body with thoughts and decisions, but the seat of exaltation and blessing, filling the Body with the qualities and powers of Christ's exalted mode of existence. The Head maintains this place of significance because Christ and Church are always seen from the perspective of God's acts in Christ,

whereby he is made the ruling source and goal of the Church's life. That these divine acts are precisely those that establish and reveal Christ as the eschatological Head over all things, shows the special position that the Church holds as the Body of Christ. In this regard the Body remains a passive recipient; it indicates the totality of the person acted upon through his members. The author's Semitic assumptions allow him to view the various body functions as particular dimensions of the person's self. The terminology so conceived may now convey the unity of Christ and the Church as a functional identity between Christ and the corporate Christ.

The author makes this functional aspect clearer in the *πλήρωμα* clause: the Body is that which is filled by the Head that is filled by God with reference to all things in every way. The Head is the whole Body in the mode of being filled with the divine attributes, graces, and powers of God. As these are mediated from the Head to the Body, the Body manifests and exhibits the loving presence of Christ. Once again the cosmic framework helps highlight the special salvific import of the statements for the Church. The Head is lifted on high with regard to all things, but the Body shares in the Head's exalted mode of existence. What above all characterizes this new mode of existence is love. That which binds Christ to believers is his love for them as himself. So bound he fills them with this exalted quality of existence, even as the Head fills the Body. The Body is the fullness, the totality of the love that results from and exhibits the loving presence among believers of him who as the Head of this Body is filled with God's love with respect to all things in every way.

Finally, in this passage the Head/Body imagery clearly concerns the inner unity between Christ and the Church. Another aspect latent in the author's Body concept is not drawn out, the unity between Body members. The role that this idea plays in the author's concept remains to be seen.

## II

### GENTILES AND JEWS IN ONE BODY: EPHESIANS ii 16, iii 6

While the relation between Gentiles and Jews may have been alluded to earlier in the letter, this thematic concern comes to the fore in ii 11-22 and iii 1-13. The former passage focuses on the work of the reconciling Christ and the latter points to Paul's unique role in the proclamation of the newly revealed mystery. In each passage the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  concept has a role in communicating the new found unity in Christ between Gentiles and Jews (ii 16, iii 6). Our purpose in this chapter will be to determine the meaning and function of the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  idea in these texts. We shall discuss each text in context.

#### I. EPH ii 16

The problems surrounding the interpretation of Eph ii 11-22 are various and complex.<sup>1</sup> Not among the least difficult is the interpretation of  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota\ \sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  at vs. 16. Some commentators refer the phrase to the crucified body of Jesus; other scholars refer it to the Church conceived as the Body of Christ. Still others believe the phrase is intentionally ambiguous, referring to both the individual body of Jesus and the corporate Body of Christ, as these two are "mystically" or perhaps "ontologically" united.<sup>2</sup> Of course, even here one must decide whether the crucified body is seen in its union with the Church or vice versa. So with regard to the phrase's primary point of reference, the alternatives remain either the crucified body or the corporate Body. In order to establish this primary point of reference, we will discuss the general and immediate context of the verse and then survey the arguments for each of the various interpretations of the phrase. We will then determine the phrase's grammatical position which in turn will aid us in establishing its primary point of reference.



### A. The General Context

Eph ii falls easily into two sections, vss. 1-10 and 11-22. From different though not unrelated perspectives, each section appraises the saving Christ event by demonstrating its transforming effect on the life situation of the believer. The believer's former condition apart from Christ is contrasted to his present condition in Christ. We have already seen how vss. 1-10 depict the transition of the believer's moral and spiritual position before God as one from death to exalted life.<sup>3</sup> In vss. 11-22 this transition finds historical and social expression;<sup>4</sup> the movement is from social-historical alienation from Christ to social-historical fellowship in Christ. The author shows his Gentile readers that the grace by which they are raised from death to life cannot be seen apart from the peace by which they are included in the social-historical community of God's people.

Eph ii 11-22 itself divides into three parts which Barth entitles: "(a) the description of the division of mankind (vss. 11-12); (b) the praise of Christ's work of reconciliation (13-18); (c) the elaboration of the tangible result of peace, i.e. the growing church (19-22)."<sup>5</sup> This analysis shows how vss. 13-18 form a core framed by "a sketch of man's sociological situation before the coming of Christ and a description of the present life of God's people."<sup>6</sup> To better understand this movement from past alienation to present fellowship, we must note the various strands of thought involved.

(1) The author addresses Gentile Christians and their inclusion in God's people remains foremost in his mind. The use of the article in the expression τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί and the following explanation οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία indicate that the author sees his readers as former members of a religio-social and historical class.<sup>7</sup> In this former state, the readers were χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, ἀπολλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ (vs. 12). But now through the work and person

of Christ, the situation has changed. They have been brought "near" in the blood of Christ (vs. 13) and as such they are no longer ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι, ἀλλὰ ἐστὲ συμπολιταὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ (vs. 19). Thus the primary consideration is the transition from Gentiles once alienated from God's people to Gentiles now included in God's people. It is not because they are Gentiles that they have received Christ, but as Gentiles, i.e. in their uncircumcision. The movement passes from alienation to acceptance and vss. 14-18 tell how and why this is possible.

(2) But if Gentiles now belong to God's people, then this means a redefinition of what constitutes God's people. The community to which the Gentile Christians now belong, depicted in vss. 19-22, finds itself in both continuity and discontinuity with the community τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου (vs. 11). The author has not rejected the religio-historical significance of Israel, or even circumcision, but he does re-define that significance in view of his Christology. Hence he does not state that the uncircumcised Gentiles were formerly "without the Law," but rather "without Christ." Since this receives definition in ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, the "commonwealth of Israel" refers to Israel as the special social-historical recipient of the covenants that promise (Messianic) salvation.<sup>8</sup> Alienation from this community meant alienation from the promised Christ and entailed the absence of hope and God in the world.<sup>9</sup> So defined the continuity between traditional Israel and the Church as the new Messianic community lies in the person of Christ as the promised one. In him the covenants are fulfilled.<sup>10</sup>

The discontinuity lies in Christ's abolition of the traditional religio-social distinction between Jew and Gentile as symbolized by circumcision and upheld by the Law. The inclusion of Gentiles within the

historical community of God's people means more than the mere amalgamation of two peoples into one people. Those who were once "far" have been brought "near" such that the old distinctions are deprived of their validity. Circumcision and uncircumcision belong to the old order of existence; they are of the flesh and the Law, not of the Spirit and Christ.<sup>11</sup> Christ reveals, not a new Israel, but the true spiritual Israel and establishes her historically in the spiritual community of which he himself is cornerstone, and of which the apostles and prophets are the foundation.<sup>12</sup>

(3) The new structure of God's community points to a changed situation with the God who constitutes His people. The author does not think of God without a community that truly testifies that He is God and to the acts whereby He makes Himself known. For the author access to God means access to just such a community. Thus, formerly the exclusion of the Gentiles from Israel entailed exclusion from God. (vs. 12); the inclusion of the Gentiles in the new fellowship in Christ means that the readers form a κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι. (vs. 22). What distinguishes such a community as God's are those divine acts whereby He constitutes the community and stamps it with a particular character. So the admission of the uncircumcised into God's people points to something new on the historical horizon; a new God-given way of belonging to God's people apart from circumcision and the legalism of the Law. There is now available to all men alike, a fresh way of relating to God, a new kind of existence, indeed a new humanity, that was formerly unavailable.<sup>12</sup> Thus the very structure of the Church as a new humanity that incorporates Gentiles and Jews points to a changed situation with regard to mankind's relation to God.

It is within this framework, then that vss. 14-18 praise the reconciling work and person of Christ. Christ is the center, indeed, the cornerstone of God's people, whether past, present, or future; whether under



the old or new covenant. The change described is instigated by and through Christ. In him the community of the Law, from which the Gentiles were once alienated, has died; and through him the community of the Spirit, to which the Gentiles are now joined, has appeared. The actual contours of this action, however, become clear only as we consider vss. 14-18 in particular.

#### B. The Immediate Context

Vss. 14-18 form an excursus on the person and work of Christ that serves to justify and clarify the declaration of vs. 13, namely that in Christ's blood Gentiles have now been incorporated into God's people. The author's thinking is characterized by the overlapping of totalities. Man's relation to God (vss. 1-10) cannot be seen apart from man's religio-social history as manifested in the distinction between Jews and Gentiles (vss. 11-22). But neither can this history be separated from the new found peace in Christ which itself entails God's relation to mankind. This helps explain the movement from peace between Jews and Gentiles to peace between men and God.

The passage consists of two complex sentences, vss. 14-16 forming one, vss. 17-18 the other. The style is elevated, as indicated by the participial constructions and thought parallels.<sup>13</sup> Structurally the two sentences are related by the recurrence of key words, such as "peace" or "both in one." The first sentence identifies the person of Christ as ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, and this receives definition in the ensuing participial phrases. These delineate Christ's destruction of the barriers that once excluded the Gentiles from ἡ πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. The purpose of this work receives significant elaboration in vss. 15b and 16; the barrier is broken down so that Christ might create a new humanity and reconcile man as a whole to God. It is here that ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι occurs. The second sentence brings the reader to the climactic affirmation and re-interpretation of Isa lxi 6 and lvii 19: Christ is proclaimed the herald

of peace, both to Gentiles and Jews. This declaration in particular, but the entire pericope in general finds confirmation in vs. 18: "Through Christ both Gentiles and Jews united together in the one Spirit have access to the Father." The establishment of peace grounds itself in the emergence of God's people in their true character. No longer are God's people distinguished by adherence to the Law, which divides men according to distinctions made in the flesh, but rather they are marked by their faith in Christ who unites men according to the bond of peace realized in the Spirit.<sup>14</sup>

### 1. The Character of the Pericope

As just described, the verses form a kind of hymnic midrash on Isa lli 7 and lvii 19.<sup>15</sup> For some time, however, scholars have maintained that behind these verses lies material that was formed independently of the author. J. C. Kirby, for instance, believes that the entirety of vss. 11-22 is an elaborate chiasmus that circulated separately from Ephesians.<sup>16</sup> But while Kirby's suggestions are often insightful, his overall thesis is unlikely.<sup>17</sup>

In a different vein, Schlier has long maintained that the passage contains Gnostic materials that our author has reworked.<sup>18</sup> Basic to this contention is that τα ἀμφοτέρω originally referred to τὰ ἐπουράνια and τὰ ὑπερουράνια between which was set a cosmic μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ.<sup>19</sup> Schlier originally called the text an excursus and fell short of calling it a citation.<sup>20</sup> G. Schille, however, detected certain stylistic traits that indicated that the author adapted for his own purposes an already reworked Gnostic hymn.<sup>21</sup>

With regard to literary criteria, Schille pointed to the confessional "We-style," the presence of introductory and concluding formula γάρ - ἀπὸ οὖν, parallelismus membrorum, and the "Partizipal- und Relativstil," all as indications of a cited hymn.<sup>22</sup> He considered the references to "enmity" (vss. 15, 16) and "both in one Spirit" (vs. 18) as

interpretive glosses that interrupt the hymnic rhythm.<sup>23</sup> This yields a reconstruction with αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν as the "Themazeile" and with the remaining verses forming three couplets.<sup>24</sup>

Schille's thesis has been severely criticized by R. Deichgräber.<sup>25</sup> Deichgräber argues that the "We-style" can be overemphasized. One meets it often in Ephesians, especially where the author wishes to demonstrate experiences common to all Christians.<sup>26</sup> He also objects to Schille's understanding of γάρ and ἄρα οὖν: "Das Wörtchen γάρ in V. 14 ist nicht ein 'γάρ-recitativum', sondern ein ganz gewöhnliches, kausal verknüpfendes γάρ. Ebensowenig ist ἄρα οὖν in V. 19 Hinweis auf das Vorangehen eines Zitates. Es liegt eine ganz gewöhnliche Schlussfolgerung mit entsprechenden Partikeln vor."<sup>27</sup> Deichgräber also thinks that the style of the verses does not bear out Schille's thesis. He points, for instance, to the length of the sentences, 9-12 words, and contrasts this to the 4-5 word sentences of the widely recognized hymn in Phil. ii 6-11. Moreover, the sentence structure is prosaic: "Die Verse 14-16 bilden einen einzigen Satz mit zahlreichen Nebenbestimmungen und Appositionen, die in der für den Eph typischen Art oft nur locker an das regierende Verb angefügt sind."<sup>28</sup> Finally, Deichgräber considers that the passage is too dependent on the context to be considered a citation: "Schliesslich ist zu fragen, ob der Text von Vers 14-18 ohne den Kontext überhaupt verständlich ist. Löst man die Verse 14-18 heraus, so hängt vor allem τὰ ἀμφοτέρω (Vers 14) beziehungslos in der Luft, und nicht anders steht es mit dem folgenden οἱ δύο (Vers 15)."<sup>29</sup>

Since the work of Deichgräber, proponents of a quoted hymn have greatly reduced the original piece of tradition that the author uses. Sanders, for instance, suggests that we have only the second stanza of a hymn.<sup>30</sup> He considers the references to "enmity" (vss. 14, 16), the abolition of Law (vs. 15a), the "making peace" (vs. 15c), and "through the cross" (vs. 16a) as additions of the author. Moreover, everything after



vs. 16 is deemed "unlikely."<sup>31</sup> Against Deichgräber, he evaluates the "participial predication," parallelismus membrorum, and the opening αὐτός ἐστιν as sufficient proof of the "liturgical setting of this 'poem'."<sup>32</sup> With respect to the pericope's dependence on the context for understanding, he counters that "the same thing is not at all originally meant by these terms in the quotation as the context forces them to mean."<sup>33</sup> In a similar fashion, R. Martin has concentrated on vss. 14-16.<sup>34</sup> Martin thinks that it is the mention of the dividing wall (vs. 14), the nullification of the Law (vs. 15a), perhaps the "making-peace" (vs. 15c), and "through the cross" (vs. 16) that reveal the hand of the author. In this manner the "one body" indicates the incarnated body of Jesus which incorporates and reconciles the heavenly and earthly realms and so slays the enmity between them.<sup>35</sup>

M. Fischer thinks that the idea of a piece of tradition which the author reworks offers the best solution to certain difficulties that the text presents.<sup>36</sup> Fischer detects a certain vacillation in the text between cosmic and historical levels; this is evinced in the change from the neuter τα ἀμφοτέρω to masculine forms in vss. 15b, 16, 18. Also ἐλθὼν in vs. 17 most naturally refers to the incarnation but the mention of the cross in vs. 16 makes this difficult. In his reconstruction, Fischer eliminates not only the reference to the Law (vs. 15a), but also the entirety of vss. 15b-16, 18.<sup>37</sup> In this manner the reference to the "one body," which Fischer interprets as a "christliche Variante der Vorstellung vom Allgott als Makroanthropos," offers an ecclesiological alternative to the gnostic cosmic Christology of the original hymn.<sup>38</sup>

Also according to J. Gnülka, the peace of the original hymn is not the peace between nations or groups, but cosmic peace, the peace of the universe.<sup>39</sup> Christ is this peace because he is the "Man" who embraces the All within himself.<sup>40</sup> Unlike Schille, Sanders, and Fischer, however, Gnülka argues against any reliance on gnostic sources. The wall which

divides and separates the heavenly realm and earthly realm, is also found in Jewish Apocalyptic literature (cf. Apc. Bar. gr. ii 1ff; TLev ii 7).<sup>41</sup> Gnülka believes our author re-interprets the hymn along historical lines: "Der Verf. ist besorgt, die Geschichtlichkeit der Erlösung und des Erlösers, die sich im Lied ins Kosmische aufzulösen droht, zu sichern. Darum begreift er die Zusammenfassung der beiden Sphären als die Vereinigung der beiden Menschheitsgruppen Juden und Heiden."<sup>42</sup> As indication of this re-interpretation Gnülka sees the mention of the Law (vs. 15a), the words οἱ δούο (vs. 15b), the whole of vs. 16b and vs. 18 as additions of the author.<sup>43</sup>

In reviewing these various proposals it becomes clear that these scholars are able to detect an independent hymn only in a much fragmented and redacted form. Indeed, in view of the amount of material usually assigned to the author, it becomes inappropriate to suggest that γάρ - ἀρα οὖν frames a quotation. It would be more accurate to say the words frame an excursus that contains a hymnic fragment or bits of liturgical material. Even here there is little reason to assume that the author stopped at adding phrases; he may have utterly changed some and left out others. The range of possibilities runs ad infinitum. But granted that the author might be using an hymnic fragment, one is struck by the disparity in the various reconstructions proposed by scholars. We see this, for example, with regard to vs. 16b. Some scholars included the verse and refer ἐν σῶμα to Christ's incarnated body;<sup>44</sup> others exclude the verse and ἐν σῶμα becomes an ecclesiological correction to a cosmic Christology.<sup>45</sup> While such wide disagreement over the reconstruction of the hymn does not necessarily speak against the idea itself, neither does it inspire confidence.

If the proponents of the hymn disagree over its original form, they do agree on its original cosmic orientation. The cosmic interpretation of τὰ ἀμφοτέρω and τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ forms a common point of

departure from which these scholars reconstruct the hymn's original cosmological framework. This in turn serves as a cutting-edge that helps determine what belongs to the original version and what are redactions of the author. This procedure is seen most clearly in Gnllka. He points out that the reconstructed cosmology of the original hymn differs from that of Ephesians and deduces from this that vss. 14-18 contain material not written by the author of Ephesians.<sup>46</sup> But this conflict in cosmology might just as well point out that the cosmic interpretation of τὰ ἀμφοτέρω and τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ is neither the best nor most probable interpretation. Other alternatives do exist. The neuter construction may be filled out by γέννη or perhaps refer to τὸ μακρὸν and τὸ ἐγγύς.<sup>47</sup> The dividing wall may simply be a circumlocution for the Law or perhaps an allusion to the balustrade of the Jerusalem temple, beyond which Gentiles were forbidden to pass.<sup>48</sup> That these alternatives are in agreement with the context does not speak against the general hymnic character of the passage per se, but it does call into question the assumption that these hymnic features are sufficient grounds for imposing a cosmological framework on the text that is otherwise foreign to the writer.

For our purposes the text as it stands is the only secure point of departure for detecting the author's intention. We cannot dogmatically deny that hymnic or liturgical materials are involved; if <sup>this is the case,</sup> so the author has thoroughly reworked them and made them his own. But it must seriously be entertained whether the hymnic features are not best explained as coming from the author himself. This would not only explain various hymnic features, but also its close webbing to the context. It also explains why even in vss. 17-18 where such hymnic aspects are less apparent, the passage nonetheless maintains its structural unity through the use of key words. Thus in commenting on the person of and work of Christ, the author assumes an exalted and semi-hymnic style that adds emphasis and



profundity to his Christological interpretation of Isa l*ii* 7 and l*vii* 19. As a working hypothesis we shall consider Eph ii 14-18 an excursus on the person and work of Christ, that may be characterized as an hymnic midrash on Isa l*ii* 7 and l*vii* 19.

## 2. Verse by Verse Analysis

Vs. 14: Αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, The pronoun αὐτός is not only intensive in form, but emphatic in its position. It stresses that Christ in the person of Jesus constitutes ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν.<sup>49</sup> This assertion presupposes that peace finds its source in a person. As Gnika comments: "Der hier verhandelte Friede ist darum weder ein System noch eine Theorie oder Philosophie, sondern er ist personal geprägt, sogar mit einer Person identisch."<sup>50</sup> For the author this person is the promised Messiah, and if this Messianic peace is to be contrasted to any particular system, the context suggests that of the Mosaic Law. But such a juxtaposition of the Messiah and the Torah indicates another presupposition behind the declaration: Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah. It is Christ Jesus who is our peace.

In the Greek world εἰρήνη originally denoted the occasional respite in the endless state of war.<sup>51</sup> But even with all its social and historical implications, the peace in view here is not the result of human effort, but a divine gift; it comes from God in the person of Christ. In our passage, then, εἰρήνη is essentially religious in character (as also the εἰρήνη).<sup>52</sup> This reflects the Jewish use of the term based on the Hebrew שָׁלוֹם.<sup>53</sup> The concept was closely associated with the Messianic age and so ingrained in the eschatological expectations of Israel that in later Rabbinic writings it was used as a Messianic title.<sup>54</sup> As such, "peace" carried the sense of Messianic salvation, and according to Bauer this was prevalent in Christian thought: "Since according to the prophets peace will be characteristic of the Messianic Kgd<sup>m</sup>., Christian thought also

frequently regards εἰ. as nearly synonymous w. Messianic salvation."<sup>55</sup> In view of the allusion to Isa lvii 19 in vs. 17, it is likely that εἰρήνη refers to Messianic peace. It characterizes that salvific state that marks the dawn of the Messianic age.

The eschatological picture of Israel at everlasting peace with the nations shows that this peace goes beyond a personal inner tranquility and reaches deep into the social fabric of life.<sup>56</sup> The author does not make a dichotomy between man's relation to God and his relation to his fellow man. Man's hostility towards God continually manifests itself in his hatred towards his neighbor. In the same vein, peace with God embraces the totality of human existence; everlasting peace among men cannot be achieved apart from peace with their Creator.<sup>57</sup> The peace in view here is the all embracing salvation of the Messianic age that brings healing and life to every aspect of the human situation.<sup>58</sup>

The author does not tell us why Christ in his person is "peace," but why he is "our peace;" i.e. how he who is peace effects peace for and between Gentiles and Jews. The change from ὑμεῖς (vs. 13) to ἡμεῖς accentuates the universality of the peace as a common experience and possession of both Gentile and Jewish Christians. For the author this inclusion of the Gentiles in the eschatological community of peace was not without Scriptural warrant. While OT prophecies spoke of God's judgment of the nations, they also spoke of peace for all peoples, for all those "far" as well as "near." But what had hitherto been hidden from past generations (cf. iii 5-6) is that Gentiles do not enter this salvific peace through circumcision, the Law, or the Jerusalem temple, but through Christ. The promised deliverer of Israel does not bring Gentiles near by making them Jews, but by creating a new humanity in which the religious distinction between the two and the effect of the Law has been nullified, by "making both things one and the same."

ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφοτέρω ἐν, Literally the clause reads, "he who made both things one thing." The aorist tense of ποιήσας emphasizes the action as accomplished. As we have seen, some scholars believe the neuter construction of τὰ ἀμφοτέρω reflects an earlier tradition that originally referred to cosmic spheres.<sup>59</sup> But even if this were the case, the expression hardly retains that meaning here.<sup>60</sup> The author clearly wishes to focus on the religio-social division between Gentiles and Jews, and the question remains as to why he uses the neuter gender.

Some scholars think an ellipsis of γενή or perhaps ἔθνη has taken place.<sup>61</sup> On the other hand Abbott feels this is unnecessary: "It is simply an instance of the neuter being used of persons in a general sense."<sup>62</sup> Barth and Caird concur in this judgment and point to I Cor i 27-28 as a parallel.<sup>63</sup> Blass - Debrunner inform us that "the neuter is sometimes used with reference to persons if it is not the individuals but a general quality that is to be emphasized."<sup>64</sup> Since the general qualities of what is Gentile and what is Jewish are clearly in mind, this solution seems most likely. The question is whether one may be more specific.

We suggest that τὰ ἀμφοτέρω reflects the making of the adverbs μακρὸν and ἐγγύς into neuter substantives. In this way the author focuses not simply on the individuals who are "far" or "near," but on what it means to be far or near. Gentiles were physically excluded from Jewish fellowship, and this religio-social incompatibility was manifested in visible and concrete ways, not the least of which was circumcision. But this material division could also be conceived spatially as the terms far and near show and the reference to the dividing wall suggests. The change to the neuter gender reflects the author's attitude that in bringing Gentiles near and in being "our peace," Christ has not made Gentiles into Jews. Rather he has united what is far and what is near, and thus made with respect to their religio-social compatibility, Jews and Gentiles one and the same.<sup>65</sup> In other words, he destroyed the



partition of the fence that hitherto determined what is far and what is near.

καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, The καὶ is epexegetical and may be rendered "inasmuch as," or "in that."<sup>66</sup> The aorist tense of λύσας stresses the action as a completed event. Μεσότοιχον occurs only here in the New Testament and is rare outside it. The word refers to a "dividing wall," or perhaps "partition," and emphasizes division.<sup>67</sup> Generally φραγμός what makes an enclosure such as a fence or hedge, or perhaps a city wall.<sup>68</sup> In the LXX it often denotes a "protective barrier" (e.g. Isa v 2, 5; Pss lxxix 13, lxxxviii 41; cf. Mic iv 14). The idea though not the term (but cf. περιφραγέω) occurs in Ep. Ar. 139f (cf. 142) in association with the Mosaic Law.<sup>69</sup> But if the Torah protected Jews from Gentiles, it also became a source of hostility and contention between them (cf. III Macc iii 4). The phrase as a whole, then, defines the wall of hostility that exists between Gentiles and Jews as a result of the legal fence erected between them.<sup>70</sup>

The only remaining question concerns whether the author had some concrete image in mind which raises this metaphor to the level of a significant circumlocution. Various alternatives have been proposed; the two most important are (1) a cosmic barrier between the heavenly and the earthly worlds, and (2) the balustrade in the Jerusalem temple, which prohibited Gentiles to enter the inner courts of the sanctuary.

We have already encountered the proposal that τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ represents a cosmic barrier which divides heaven and earth.<sup>71</sup> Its most noted proponent is H. Schlier.<sup>72</sup> He maintains that Jewish descriptions of the Law as a wall, such as those already cited, were combined with certain Apocalyptic allusions to a cosmic barrier which consisted of a stream or fire wall.<sup>73</sup> As such, the Law attains cosmic significance and the process reaches vivid expression in various (Jewish) Gnostic concepts, such as the Valentinian idea of "horos" or "limit."<sup>74</sup> The

"dividing wall" plays an important role in the Gnostic Redeemer myth, in which the Redeemer must penetrate or destroy this cosmic barrier in order to save the lost. The author re-interprets the myth to demonstrate the cosmic significance of the Law, and to show that its abolition is not simply a moral and historical occasion, but an "ontologisches und weltöffentliches Geschehen."<sup>75</sup> Unfortunately too many of the texts which Schlier cites are too late to make his argument decisive.<sup>76</sup> Gnllka, who has recognized this, bases his argument on the Apocalyptic references alone.<sup>77</sup> According to him, the twofold division and reconciliation between God and man and between Jews and Gentiles (as evinced in vs. 16), is best explained by the author's adaptation and re-interpretation of a cosmic barrier prevalent in the cosmology of his readers. The author has thus re-interpreted the barrier in terms of the Law, historicizing the cosmology and thus portraying the actual situation of Jews divided from Gentiles, and both divided from God.<sup>78</sup>

But without the framework of a cosmic Redeemer, the scanty references in the Apocalyptic literature are not wholly relevant to the text. Moreover, the twofold division and reconciliation, which serves as the point of departure for the "cosmic" interpretation, only reaches full expression as the author defines why the wall, hostility, and the Law are destroyed and nullified. The wall separates men from God, not because it constitutes a barrier between heaven and earth, but because it separates men from the community of God on the basis of the flesh, i.e. circumcision and uncircumcision. The division between Jew and Gentile meant the division between God's people and not-God's people. Indeed, until the wall is destroyed, the Messiah himself is separated from the Gentiles. That this wall also represents a division between all men and God, only becomes clear when Christ destroys the wall and thus reveals God's purpose for all men. As such, the wall that divides Jews and Gentiles is the historical expression of mankind's separation from God; it is a sign of the old age,



This being the case, an allusion to the balustrade of the Jerusalem temple is an attractive alternative.<sup>79</sup> Here the distinction between circumcision and uncircumcision receives its most concrete and historical expression. Access to the temple meant access to God. Exclusion from the temple meant exclusion from God. Indeed, only a few verses following, the Church itself emerges as a holy temple and a dwelling of God. As such, the image would give extra weight to certain aspects of the language employed in the text; e.g. ἐγγύς, μακράν, προσαγωγή, οἰκοδομή and ναός.<sup>80</sup> But the image, if it really is in the mind of the author, remains a symbolical allusion, a circumlocution; the phrase's primary import comes from its vivid portrayal of the "hostility" and "the law of commandments in decrees."

τὴν ἔχθραν, ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, The "hostility" stands in opposition to the "peace" that Christ is and indicates the hostile division between Gentiles and Jews.<sup>81</sup> In this case, τὴν ἔχθραν is best taken with λύσας and in apposition to τὸ μεσότοιχον.<sup>82</sup> In view of ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ (vs. 13) and διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ (vs. 16), the phrase ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ probably refers to Christ's crucified flesh.<sup>83</sup> It is not clear whether the phrase belongs to λύσας or καταργήσας; most commentators take it with λύσας.<sup>84</sup> In either case, σάρξ indicates Christ's solidarity with the plight of a divided humanity under the Law, and points to Christ's death as the ultimate atoning act that establishes peace.

Vs. 15: τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας, What has hitherto remained implicit, now becomes explicit. The construction should be read as a whole,<sup>85</sup> It probably refers to the Torah, i.e. not merely to the Pentateuch, but to the entire legal system which grew from and around it. The author probably did not make a clear-cut distinction between the "holy law" and its subsequent interpretations.<sup>86</sup> For him, the two were totally interrelated such that the Torah represented



the Holy-Law-in-its-effect-on-the-flesh, or perhaps, the Holy-Law-expressed-in-interpretations-according-to-the-flesh. This, of course, does not mean the Torah was considered evil, but rather the authority it exercised over the flesh yielded ill effects. The effect in view here is the hostile division (in flesh) between Jews and Gentiles. But Christ emptied the commandments of their power; he brought the Law to no effect, which is the more precise meaning of καταργέω.<sup>87</sup> As such, it is tempting to allow the emphasis of the phrase to fall on τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν and translate νόμος in its broader sense (cf. Rom viii 2ff, Heb vii 16): "having abolished the authority exercised by the commandments (as) expressed in decrees."

ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, The author now explains why Christ destroyed the barriers and abolished the religio-social distinctions between Gentiles and Jews. The movement from the Gentile's alienation to his acceptance embraces not only the destruction of the division that exists within humanity, but the creation of a new humanity. The key question concerns the interpretation of εἰς καινὸς ἄνθρωπος. Does the phrase refer to the Church as a corporate entity composed of Gentiles and Jews, or is it a corporate or group type, a genus tertium, which every Christian represents, whether Gentile or Jewish?<sup>88</sup> In favor of the former is the emphasis on the "one" in opposition to the "two," which suggests that the new man is created by the union of Gentile and Jew.<sup>89</sup> In favor of the latter, is that the phrase καινὸς ἄνθρωπος appears only here and in iv 24 in the New Testament; in the latter passage the words clearly denote the individual Christian.<sup>90</sup> A closer examination of ii 15 demonstrates that the one new man is probably a group type.

The forward position of τοὺς δύο underlines the division between Gentiles and Jews as the focal point of the discussion. But the shift from the neuter τὰ ἀμφοτέρω to the masculine τοὺς δύο is not

accidental.<sup>91</sup> The masculine gender clearly anticipates ἓνα καὶνὸν ἄνθρωπον, and thus indicates the two old men, namely the Gentile and the Jew. This strongly suggests that the author is thinking in terms of group types, i.e. the typical Gentile and Jew.<sup>92</sup> This, of course, was not an abstraction since for the author an individual could truly embody the characteristics of a group so as to be its representative.

While a synonym of ποιέω, κτίζω is not an exact equivalent, and should not be rendered "fashion" or "make." According to Foerster, the word group to which κτίζω belongs was in NT days used especially "for the founding of cities, houses, games, and sects, and for the discovery and settlement of countries. It denotes specifically the basic intellectual and volitional act by which something comes into being."<sup>93</sup> In the LXX and subsequently in the New Testament, the term defines the divine activity whereby God calls things to be by His word and command, i.e. creation.<sup>94</sup> In Eph ii 15, Christ is the creator and the verb is modified by two prepositional phrases. The purpose of destroying the barrier that divides what is far and near concerns the establishing or calling both the Gentile and the Jew into being in Christ with one new man in view.

The phrase ἐν αὐτῷ indicates the place where the two men, the Gentile and the Jew are created or brought to life.<sup>95</sup> Christ does not create Gentiles and Jews ex nihilo; he rather calls them to life in himself. This whole matrix of thought may well reflect Rabbinic teaching about proselytes.<sup>96</sup> To bring a Gentile near, i.e. to make him a Jew and incorporate him into Israel, was seen as making him a new creation. Here, of course, it is not into Israel that Gentiles are incorporated, but rather both Gentiles and Jews are established in Christ. This reflects the author's New Adam theology. As the New Adam Christ incorporates all peoples and brings both the Gentile and the Jew to life in himself. We suggest, then, that ἐν αὐτῷ indicates Christ in his corporate mode of existence, i.e. where he is functionally identified with all believers



and hence the place where the Gentile and Jewish believers come to be and live. The use of *κτίζω* shows, however, that Gentiles and Jews are not in Christ as a matter of natural processes, but as a matter of Christ's own creative (and sacrificial) will. The establishment of the two within Christ has a single purpose, to make each a new man.<sup>97</sup>

In the New Testament *κτίζω* occurs with *εἰς* only here, Col i 16, and I Tim iv 3. In the two latter cases, *εἰς* clearly indicates the goal or purpose with reference to which the action is conceived and towards which it is directed; one may render the term in these places with "for" although "with a view to" is perhaps more accurate. In our passage the idea may be rendered: Christ calls the two into being in himself with one new man in view. The creation of Gentiles and Jews in Christ has one and the same goal or purpose, to make both new men. But the emphasis falls on the oneness of this new man. Christ does not create the two within himself to make the Gentile one kind of man and the Jew another; Gentiles and Jews may be different in many respects, and these differences may continue, but with regard to being established in Christ both have the one purpose and goal, both share a common new humanity that serves as the basis of their unity and peace.

If we are correct in this assessment, the *εἰς καινὸς ἄνθρωπος* depicts the one new social genus of the individual who is created in Christ. As the parallels in iv 24 and Col iii 10 suggest, the terminology probably stems from a New Adam theology and was closely associated with baptism.<sup>98</sup> This does not mean that the new man is the New Adam; it rather indicates the one new mode of existence that is created and established in the New Adam. It is the stamp of Christ's new humanity that is found and reflected in every person who has been brought to new life in Christ.<sup>99</sup> *Καινός* which basically means new in "kind" or "quality" supports this view.<sup>100</sup> The oneness of this new mode of existence contrasts the twoness of the former mode of existence.<sup>101</sup> It must be remembered that even here



the author does not conceive of the individual apart from the corporate existence in which he lives. The former corporate existence in Adam was (and still is where Christ is not recognized) divided according to distinctions of the flesh, and this was manifested in two types of men, the Gentile and the Jew. But the new corporate existence in Christ is united in the bond of the Spirit, and this is reflected in the one new kind of man who is neither Gentile nor Jew. Thus, Christ destroyed the hostile barriers between God's people and not-God's people so that he might bring the two men, the Gentile and Jew to life in himself with one and the same new kind of man as the goal, so making peace.

ποιῶν εἰρήνῃν, The present tense of ποιῶν is noteworthy; it underscores the ongoing effectiveness of that peace which Christ is, and as such, which he has brought. It is not clear whether Christ establishes this peace in his incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection or exaltation.<sup>102</sup> Unfortunately, the tense of κτίσῃ, aorist subjunctive, aids us little in the decision. The reference to "blood" (vs. 13) and perhaps "flesh" (vs. 14) point to the death of Christ as the moment of creation. But saying that the purpose of Christ's death was to create the one new kind of man is not the same as saying that the new man was created at his death. On the other hand, the use of κτίζω, καινός, and the present tense of ποιῶν all stress the entrance of a new state of affairs and point more naturally to the resurrected and exalted Lord. It is possible, however, that for the author the death and resurrection were considered one event. Such a situation would arise naturally if the terminology involved were closely associated with baptism.<sup>103</sup> Such a solution becomes plausible when we compare iv 24 ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, with Gal iii 27 ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε. To the extent the death and resurrection of Christ are considered one event, just so is the activity of the resurrected Lord to be considered the accomplished, yet ongoing, result of his death. It is

in this sense Christ's death points to a corporate mode of existence (cf. II Cor v 14) into which both Gentile and Jew enter in baptism and out of which they each emerge as one and the same new kind of man, and so earmarks the dawning of the new eschatological age of continual peace.

Vs. 16: καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, Here we shall discuss the verse without reference to ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι in order to clarify its immediate context. We shall return later to a more detailed analysis of the position and meaning of the phrase. The conjunction καὶ is probably intensive and could be accurately rendered "indeed." It denotes a logical, rather than temporal sequence, and places the verse under ἵνα.<sup>104</sup> As a coordinate final clause, the verse presents a further reflection upon the destruction of the barriers that stood between God's people and not-God's people. The word ἀποκαταλλάσσω occurs only three times in the New Testament, here, and Col i 20, 22. It is an intensified form of καταλλάσσω and means much the same: "to reconcile."<sup>105</sup> Τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους refers to the Jews and Gentiles, once again as the individual types who represent man as a whole. In slight contrast to τοὺς δύο, τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους tends to mark "togetherness," and may be compared to the Latin "utrique ('both together')."<sup>106</sup> Thus Christ destroyed the dividing wall, the enmity and even abolishes the Law in order to deal with both the Gentile and the Jew together, i.e. mankind as a whole. The statement focuses on the Gentile's inclusion in this reconciling act, and thus its intention is positive. But its implications would have been difficult for the ardent Jew to accept. To be sure, the average Jew likely acknowledged his need of personal reconciliation with God. But that the circumcised should receive such reconciliation together with the uncircumcised implies that possession and works of the Law, whatever advantage they might bring, do not themselves bring salvation, and hence do not characterize the essential identity of God's people.

Christ, then, empties the Law of its authority in order to reconcile mankind as a whole τῷ Θεῷ. It is only here that the wall, enmity, and even the Law clearly emerge as obstacles to God. But the logic is clear enough, especially when we bear in mind that access to God implies and finds its historical expression in access to His people. So to reconcile both the Gentile and the Jew, Christ eliminated those obstacles which prohibited the communion of Jew and Gentile with one another. This enables us to appreciate the social dimension of the reconciliation in view here. The Messianic peace remains peace for all nations, represented here by the Jew and the Gentile. However, the humanity which is divided according to the flesh distinctions of circumcision and uncircumcision does not receive this peace, but rather the humanity which is united in Christ. This idea has already been expressed in the one new kind of man who has been created and lives in Christ. But it goes deeper and unearths an implicit assumption that runs through not only this passage, but also the entire letter: the oneness of God expresses itself in the oneness of His people.<sup>107</sup>

The reconciliation occurs διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ. The words point to the sacrificial death of Jesus as the means of reconciliation. In Pauline theology the "cross" is of considerable theological import.<sup>108</sup> It stands against the wisdom of the world (I Cor i 17f) and all human pride (Gal vi 14). It denotes the utter depth of Christ's humble obedience (Phil ii 8), and the means of cosmic reconciliation (Col i 20). Perhaps here the cross points to the shame, rejection and hatred that Christ bore as God's beloved. The human hatred that put Jesus on the cross was in fact a hatred towards God Himself.<sup>109</sup> But through Christ's sacrificial love this cruel symbol of hostility has become the symbol and instrument of reconciliation.

ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἐχθρὰν ἐν αὐτῷ, The reconciliation with God and the slaying of the enmity are two perspectives on one event. The



enmity that stands between Gentiles and Jews also stands against both being reconciled to God together, i.e. against God's purpose for man, and hence against God Himself. It is likely that the author saw in the division of the far and near, the uncircumcision and circumcision, not-God's people and God's people, the historical expression of the hostility between man as flesh and God as Spirit (cf. Rom viii 5-7, Gal v 17). In any case, the enmity here is between God and man, and the new found access to God occurs in the unity of the Spirit, not of the flesh.

The aorist tense of ἀποκτείνας is in marked contrast to the present tense of ποιῶν (vs. 15): the making of peace is considered in its continued effectiveness while the slaying of the enmity is viewed as a completed event.<sup>110</sup> Scholars have understood ἐν αὐτῷ variously as "in himself," "in the one body," or "in the cross."<sup>111</sup> The mention of the cross followed by the use of ἀποκτείνω, "to kill,"<sup>112</sup> clearly points to Christ's death as the frame of reference. If the reference is to Christ's body, then it is his crucified body that is in view. Since other alternatives exist, however, it would be methodologically unsound to take ἐν αὐτῷ in reference to ἓν σῶμα, and then move back from this to prove that σῶμα refers to Christ's crucified body. But even if ἓν σῶμα does refer to Christ's crucified body, the other alternatives remain equally viable. In view of τὴν ἐχθρὰν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ (vs. 14) and ἐν αὐτῷ (vs. 15b), "in himself" is clearly possible.<sup>113</sup> But σταυρός is the easiest and most probable point of reference.<sup>114</sup> Christ's act of reconciliation does not simply occur through the cross, but also in his death on the cross, or more poignantly "at the cross." Beare is right to note the touch of irony: the hatred that put Jesus on the cross, is itself slain therein.<sup>115</sup>

Vs. 17: καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς, Of the various ways in which ἐλθὼν has been taken (e.g. the incarnation, ascension, coming of the Spirit, the

preaching of the Apostles), that which embraces the entire spectrum of the Christ event is preferable.<sup>116</sup> Christ's very "coming" is an announcement of peace because he in his very person is "our peace." As Barth states:

The authorized messenger is in person the message of peace. He not only evangelizes, but he is an evangelist. When he brings the news of peace he brings peace itself; therefore his words and his very presence make for peace. Indeed, in this case, "the medium is the message." Christ's advent and person as such, including the mode of his work and death, are an act of proclamation.<sup>117</sup>

The circumstantial participle has, then, more of an instrumental than mere temporal force: "And (so) by having come," or "and with his coming he brought good tidings."

The remainder of the verse, a conflation of Isa lli 7 and lvii 19,<sup>118</sup> supports this interpretation. Isa lli 7 and surrounding context carried considerable eschatological import. The herald who publishes peace and proclaims Yahweh's kingship over all, inaugurates the new age.<sup>119</sup> This eschatological matrix of ideas is still present in Palestinian Judaism, although there is no uniformity as to the identity of the מְבַשֵּׁר.<sup>120</sup> In our passage, however, the herald is clearly Christ and his coming proclaims the arrival of the Messianic age of peace. Isa lvii 19 originally referred to Jews in exile and those in Jerusalem.<sup>121</sup> In Rabbinic literature, the terms "far" and "near" were often used in proselyte teaching. The Rabbis could apply Isa lvii 19 to already converted Gentiles, i.e. proselytes, and Jews, though this was not frequent.<sup>122</sup> Perhaps by the time of Ephesians the text had already been claimed by the Christian Gentile mission.<sup>123</sup> The surrounding context (especially the LXX version) could easily have been applied to Christ and even read in the light of Isaiah's suffering servant theme.<sup>124</sup> In any case, our author uses the text in the context of Christ's death and the addition of ὑμεῖς before τοῖς μακρὰν puts the stress on the Gentile's inclusion in the salvation

Christ offers.<sup>125</sup> He thus affirms through Scripture that the Gentiles have a God-intended share in the Messiah's redemptive suffering and salvation; in a word, his peace. Thus, by conflating these two passages, the author uniquely portrays the arrival of the Messiah, and hence the Messianic age, as the proclamation of the Messianic peace in which Gentiles and Jews share.

Vs. 18: ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. In particular this verse confirms vs. 17; but insofar as vs. 17 embodies the central thrust of vss. 14-16, vs. 18 substantiates the pericope as a whole. Ὅτι does not outline the content of the peace, but rather tells the reader why Christ's coming means peace to both far and near. It is causal.<sup>126</sup>

The words δι' αὐτοῦ, refer to Christ; He is the living and present person, who with his coming has accomplished and proclaimed peace to both far and near. The forward position of the phrase marks its importance: only by means of Christ do the believers possess access to the Father. The present tense of ἔχομεν stresses not only the present reality of the access, but also the believers' present reliance upon Christ as the means by whom they possess such access. While προσαγωγὴν could be either transitive or intransitive, its use in iii 12 favors the latter.<sup>127</sup> Its suitability here arises from its connotation of "nearness." In the LXX προσάγω frequently translates the Hebrew word בָּרַךְ, "to come near," while ἐγγύς translates בָּרַךְ.<sup>128</sup> Τὸν πατέρα probably looks back to i 3ff. The believers' access to the Father emphasizes their common adoption as sons through Christ (i 5).<sup>129</sup>

Within the context, πνεῦμα most likely refers to the Holy Spirit of the promise (i 13), which serves as the believer's first installment of his inheritance (i 14), and in which he has been sealed unto the day of redemption (iv 30).<sup>130</sup> For Ephesians, as in the New Testament generally, the gift of the Spirit indicates the breaking in of the eschatological



age. In Acts ii 16ff, for example, Peter interprets the Pentecost experience as the arrival of the "last days" in fulfillment of Joel ii 28-32. Also in Acts x 1-11, 18 the Gentile's reception of the Spirit has important implications. There, the falling of the Spirit silences all questions concerning Peter's encounter with the household of Cornelius; including the circumcision party's critical question: "Why did you go to uncircumcised men and eat with them?" The religio-social implications of the gift, and as a result, of baptism too, become evident. To refuse to have fellowship with him who has been given the Spirit is to call unacceptable what God has called acceptable, unclean what God has cleansed; it is to withstand God (Acts x 10-16, xi 17). In light of this, it is easy to understand why the Spirit became closely linked to the unity of fellowship, both with God and fellow believers (cf. II Cor xiii 14).

The occurrence of ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι in a context concerning the religio-social distinctions between Gentiles and Jews suggests that Ephesians approaches the problem from a similar perspective. Moreover, iv 3 τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος and iv 4 ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεύμα make it abundantly clear that the strong association between unity and the Spirit is not incidental.<sup>131</sup> In light of this, it is surprising that most scholars ascribe ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι to ἔχομεν or προαγωγήν and then interpret it to be the means by which, or medium in which, believers possess their access to the Father.<sup>132</sup> While the statement itself is not altogether false, such a construction here is not without difficulties. Not only does it make δι' αὐτοῦ somewhat redundant, it treats the Spirit as an external possibility rather than an internal actuality. It is simpler and more in line with the context to let οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι stand as a single grammatical unit,<sup>133</sup> The phrase does not inform us how and where believers possess their access to God, but rather how and where they stand as current possessors of that

access through Christ. As such, we are able to see that possession of the Spirit forms the basis of the argument, not the conclusion.

This becomes clearer when we consider seriously the close association between access and unity. For the author access to God finds its most concrete expression in access to His community.<sup>134</sup> This entails, however, that the means whereby a person has access to God's community becomes a focal point of the community's unity. For instance, as long as the Torah is regarded as the means of salvation, circumcision functions as a visible and essential sign of the oneness of God's people. Of course, the hostility that arose over this distinction in the flesh took on for our author special theological significance as an indication of man's life in the old age. But with the arrival of the Messianic age, the hostility inherent in Adam in whom Gentile and Jew are divided according to the flesh has now given way to the peace inherent in Christ in whom Gentile and Jew, both being new men, are united in the Spirit. Thus the common possession of the Spirit, probably closely associated with baptism, constitutes the new mode in which the oneness of God's people is expressed. This, of course, presupposes and reflects a newly revealed means by which God has made Himself available and accessible to that people. This revealed means of access is none other than Christ himself.

### C. A Survey of the Interpretation of ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι

In this section we will briefly review the various interpretations of ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι. While scholars often agree as to what σῶμα actually refers, they often seem to disagree as to why. A closer look at the different proposals shows, however, that something of a consensus emerges among the differing camps in three ways. In support of their interpretation, scholars usually (a) defend or assume a certain grammatical disposition of the verse, (b) point to important analogous expressions in the context, and (c) note any relevant parallels from within or without Ephesians.

# 1. Arguments for the Crucified Body of Jesus

## a. Grammatical Considerations

Perhaps the most noted proponent of this position is E. Percy. He sees in vs. 16 "den Schlüssel zum Verständnis der ganzen Vorstellung von der Gemeinde als Leib Christi bei Paulus."<sup>135</sup> Grammatically, however, Percy never really clarifies whether ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι modifies τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους or ἀποκατάλλαξιν.<sup>136</sup> On the one hand, he says that "in diesem Leibe sind die Glaubigen als in ihm eingeschlossen eins und mit Gott versöhnt worden."<sup>137</sup> This indicates that the phrase belongs to τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους, i.e. it explains where the "two" are. On the other hand, he also says this body is that "in welchem die Versöhnung der beiden Menschgruppen mit Gott als Ereignis stattfand."<sup>138</sup> This indicates that the phrase belongs to ἀποκατάλλαξιν, i.e. it explains where the reconciliation took place. This ambiguity probably lies in Percy's understanding of Christ's death. For Percy, Christ did not die as a private person, but as the "Stellvertreter der Menschen,"<sup>139</sup> Be that as it may, van Roon is clearer when he describes our phrase as an adverbial adjunct to the verb ἀποκατάλλαξιν.<sup>140</sup>

According to van Roon, the phrase functions similarly to ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ in II Cor v 19 and ἐν τῷ σώματί μου in Phil i 20 and identifies the place where the reconciliation took place. Such a construction gains extra weight when one considers the phrase διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ. If ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι identifies the place of reconciliation, then διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ indicates the method by which it came about. Thus, if one ascribes ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι to ἀποκατάλλαξιν, it is difficult to deny the defining influence of the sister adjunct διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, and this points strongly towards the physical body of Jesus.<sup>141</sup> But are not references to the physical body of Jesus generally followed by an αὐτοῦ? In response van Roon states: "the mere fact that Christ happens to be the subject of the sentence renders an adjunct to express that this one



body is no other body than the body of Christ, unnecessary after the words ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι."<sup>142</sup> Do not the words ἐν σῶμα often refer to the Church? Again according to van Roon:

Now it is true that the words ἐν σῶμα in the above-mentioned places in Col. and the HP refer on occasion to community amongst the faithful. But that is no conclusive reason to ascribe the same meaning to these words in Eph. 2:16. In our view, the indications presented by the context outweigh the importance of their meaning in those other passages.<sup>143</sup>

From this, the importance of the context emerges and these scholars seek confirmation of their views in analogous expressions in the context.

#### b. Analogous Expressions in the Context

Percy finds his strongest support in the use of ἐν αὐτῷ in vs. 15b:

Hinzu kommt, dass unsere Interpretation von V. 16 obendrein durch die zunächst vorhergehende Aussage in V. 15b bestätigt wird, wenn es dort heisst: ἵνα τοῦς δύο κτίση ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα καινόν ἄνθρωπον; das ἐν αὐτῷ in diesem Satze entspricht offenbar dem ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι in V. 16.<sup>144</sup>

Percy may well be correct that ἐν αὐτῷ corresponds to ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι, but this hardly determines the question. If as Percy assumes, the "Stellvertreter der Menschen" forms the background here, then ἐν αὐτῷ might itself refer to Christ in his corporate rather than individual dimension. But even if ἐν αὐτῷ refers to Christ individually, the correspondence with ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι could be between Christ conceived individually and Christ conceived corporately.

M. Barth is perhaps on firmer ground, when he notes the strong association between the terms "flesh" of vs. 14, "blood" of vs. 13, and "body" of vs. 16:

The reference made in 2:14 to the flesh of Christ and in 2:15 to "one single body" can serve as a strong support for the sacrificial interpretation of Christ's death, for Paul uses "flesh" and "body" occasionally as interchangeable synonyms. The single nouns "blood", "body", or "flesh" as well as the combined nouns "blood and flesh" or "blood and body" occur in his writings and elsewhere as designations of Christ's sacrifice.<sup>145</sup>

We shall return later to Barth's conclusion that Eph ii 14-18 ascribes the making of peace to the "sacrifice" of Christ. For our purpose here, it is sufficient to note that if these parallels hold to the author's intention, then the case for the "crucified body" is highly strengthened.

### c. Parallel Texts

Next we must consider the parallel texts that these authors proffer in support of their interpretation. For Percy, Eph ii 16 constitutes one of the three passages that clearly link the conception of the "Stellvertreter" or "Stammvater" to the σῶμα concept:

Es ist offenbar dieser Gedanke, der in der von uns oben behandelten Stelle Röm 7,4 zum Ausdruck kommt, wenn dort gesagt wird, dass die Gläubigen durch den Leib Christi dem Gesetz getötet wurden, oder in Kol 1,22, wenn es dort heisst, dass sie in seinem fleischlichen Leibe versöhnt wurden, oder in Eph 2,16, wenn dort von der Versöhnung der beiden mit Gott "in einem Leibe" gesprochen wird.<sup>146</sup>

According to Percy, each of these passages concerns the crucified body of Christ. In Romans vii 4, where the believers are said to have died to the Law, the context is similar to Eph ii 16:

....das ἐθανατώθητε deutet nämlich hier, und zwar in Übereinstimmung mit Röm 6, 3-11, offenbar auf den Leib hin, der am Kreuze starb. Der sowohl hinter dieser Stelle als auch Eph 2,14f. liegende Gedanke kann dann nur der sein, dass die Gläubigen also in Christus in seinem Tode real eingeschlossen in diesem Tode selbst dem Gesetz starben; damit hat dann das Gesetz aufgehört, auch für sie Gültigkeit zu haben.<sup>147</sup>

Unfortunately, the meaning of Romans vii 4 is highly contested. Percy is probably on safer grounds when he draws attention to the striking verbal similarity of Col i 22. Percy believes that the author of Eph took the construction ἀποκαταλλάξῃ ἐν....σώματι from Col i 22, although the latter passage belongs to a somewhat different context.<sup>148</sup> As such, the attributive τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ becomes definitive for determining which body is being referred to.<sup>149</sup>

Cerfaux argues in a similar fashion when he writes:

From now on Paul stresses the distinction between the mortal body of Christ and his risen body. The former is called "the body according to the flesh", while the latter

is "the body of glory".....speaking of the mortal body of Christ, Paul adds this detail: it is in "the body of his flesh" that we are reconciled through his death (Col. 1:22). We see a parallel to this text in Eph. 2:16: Christ Jesus reconciles the two men (the Jew and the gentile) "in one body through the cross", and ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι is understood to mean the crucified body.<sup>150</sup>

But Cerfaux also adds in a footnote that "the formula ἐν ἑνὶ shows us that Paul is thinking of our identification with this body."<sup>151</sup> This brings us to the important interpretive question: Why is the oneness of the physical body of Jesus so explicitly stressed?

#### d. The Interpretive Problem of ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι

The major question that faces the exegete who sees here a reference to the crucified body is why the author designates and describes it as one body. Answers to this question are varied; we shall discuss the constructions of Percy, Barth, and van Roon.

For Percy, the central theme of ii 14-18 does not revolve around the idea that the Gentiles and Jews form one Church. Instead the author wishes to emphasize that the "heilsgeschichtliche Unterschied" between the two groups has ceased.<sup>152</sup> Thus Christ has opened a new road to salvation, a road accessible to both Jews and Gentiles. Since this new way of salvation occurs διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, a specific historical event, Percy sees the ἑν as emphasizing the "Einmaligkeit" of Christ's bodily death on the cross.<sup>153</sup>

Barth also stresses the "once-and-for-all-ness" of Christ's reconciling death, though from a somewhat different perspective. He considers the sacrifice of the cross as an act of worship in which Christ portrays the High Priest. Christ, then, is "the sole officiant" of the Church's worship and his death is the one and only sacrifice, the sole "sacrament:" "Around this sacrifice in which Christ the priest offers himself as victim to God, the one people of God is gathered,"<sup>154</sup> How then are we to understand ἐν σῶμα within this context? Unfortunately, Barth never



commits himself clearly to a position. With respect to the word ἓν, which he translates "a single," he considers the word added here and in vs. 15 and vs. 18 for accentuation.<sup>155</sup> But as to exactly why σῶμα is accentuated, Barth does little more than make a suggestion by asking a question in a footnote: "Does 'One body' in Eph 2:16 mean just one victim, or one sacrifice?"<sup>156</sup>

Van Roon also sees the cross as the essential, peace-making event, but he understands ἓν as simply bringing to bear that there exists no difference between the groups.<sup>157</sup> He argues that εἷς can be used emphatically in which case it means 'einer und derselbe' (one and the same man) or 'ein einziger' (one single man). [sic]<sup>158</sup> Thus in vs. 15b, the author states that Christ made the two groups, earlier named as ἀκροβυστία and περιτομή, into one man. The word εἷς accentuates that there is no difference: "Both groups form the 'one new man' who is distinguished by unity and knows no differences."<sup>159</sup> In vs. 16, the author states that "Christ reconciles both groups with one body, by means of the cross."<sup>160</sup> Here again ἓν, the neuter of εἷς, stresses that there is no difference between the groups: "for both, the reconciliation took place within one and the same body and this happened through the cross."<sup>161</sup> Finally, in vs. 18 a similar picture emerges again. Here the author declares that both have access to the Father in one and the same Spirit. As in vs. 15 and 16, ἓν emphasizes the lack of difference between the groups.<sup>162</sup>

This, then, concludes our survey of the arguments for the crucified body. Let us briefly summarize the main points of the argument:

a. Ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι belongs to the verb ἀποκαταλλάξῃ and defines the location of the reconciliation of the two groups with God. Since the enactment of this reconciliation occurs διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, the place of this enactment is probably the physical body of Jesus, hanging on the cross.

b. Since σάρξ and σῶμα are often used as synonyms, the use of ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ in vs. 14 supports this view (cf. also the use of ἐν αὐτῷ in vs. 15).

c. The parallel text of Col i 22 offers strong confirmation. There the crucified body is clearly indicated and the verbal similarity between the passages is striking.

d. Finally, the oneness of the body was emphasized in order to stress (i) the once-and-for-all-ness of the event, or (ii) the one sacrifice as opposed to the multiplicity of sacrifices of the Jewish cult, or (iii) the lack of difference between the groups as far as salvation was concerned.

By way of transition to arguments for the Church Body it is important to note that many scholars who refer ἐν σῶμα to the crucified body of Jesus are not content to leave it as such. Even Percy emphasizes that Christ did not die as a private person, but as the Patriarch-representative who embraces all his descendants in his fate.<sup>163</sup> Zerwick argues in a similar manner when he calls Christ the "second Adam": "This 'one body' of Christ can only be the body of Jesus Christ on the cross. Jews and Gentiles have died in him, for he who hung on the cross already embraced the whole of humanity, since he was the second Adam."<sup>164</sup> A somewhat different perspective is offered by Schlier, who interprets the text in light of the Gnostic redeemer myth as opposed to Percy's "Stammvater" conception. He states that a certain ambiguity surrounds this passage inasmuch as the author himself did not make rigid distinctions between the crucified body and the Church Body:

Das ἐν σῶμα ist im Sinn des Apostels in unserem Zusammenhang ohne Zweifel der Leib Christi am Kreuz. Aber man wird auch, gerade im Blick auf τοὺς ἀμφοτέροσ, das ja nicht mehr einen Gegensatz des einen Leibes gegenüber den zwei Gruppen erfordert, sondern das mehr im Sinn von 4,4 und Kol 3,15 verstehen lässt, nicht übersehen dürfen, dass in dem Leibe Christi am Kreuz, der nun Juden und Heiden auf sich genommen und Gott versöhnt hat, virtuell und potentiell die Kirche da ist. Die Doppeldeutigkeit des Begriffes σῶμα an unserer Stelle, die in der geteilten



Meinung der Exegeten sich widerspiegelt, ist m. E. durch die Sache bedingt und insofern eine echte.<sup>165</sup>

Thus Percy, Zerwick, and Schlier all ascribe the primary point of reference to the crucified body of Christ. They have all attempted to provide a conceptual framework which will explain why the author would employ an expression that (a) usually applies to the Church, within a context that (b) speaks of the unity between Jews and Gentiles, but which (c) specifies that this unity depends upon the reconciliation of mankind with God, which occurs in the crucified body of Jesus.

On the other hand, some scholars interpret this ambiguity from the opposite perspective: they consider that the Church is primarily in mind in its function as the "extention of the Incarnation." Scott argues this way:

The one Body is the Church, in which Jews and Gentiles are now united. In the previous verse, however, Paul has spoken of Christ as creating one new man in himself. The Church is regarded as the fulfilment on a vaster scale of what had been effected in Christ's own life. It is nothing else than his larger Incarnation. The creation of the Church as the 'body of Christ' was through the cross, which had at once brought men into union with one another and into fellowship with God.<sup>166</sup>

Such a relationship between the Church and the crucified body of Christ is also maintained by J. A. T. Robinson. With respect to Col i 22 and Eph ii 16, he says: "The context of these two passages each supplies the use that is lacking respectively in the other, and shows that the Pauline gospel depends on both of them being held securely together."<sup>167</sup> For Robinson, this "being held securely together" ultimately means that the one is the extension of the other.

The point common to all these theories is the manner in which they stipulate a genuine, though often ambiguous, connection between the crucified body and the Church Body. The connection may be seen differently as mystical, as sacramental or again as ontological. Of course, not all scholars agree that such a "Doppeldeutigkeit" exists in ii 16,<sup>168</sup> and it



remains to be seen where a genuine link between the crucified body and Church Body may be established. What has become clear, however, is that whether one supposes such a connection or not, he must decide whether the primary point of reference is the crucified body or the Church. For that reason, we may turn directly to consider the arguments for the Church Body.

## 2. Arguments for the Church Body

### a. Grammatical Considerations

We have already mentioned that it is not easy to understand why the physical body of Jesus should be called "one body," and that the absence of a defining αὐτοῦ is quite unusual if the physical body is in mind.<sup>169</sup> Beyond these two negative considerations, there are other points which more positively indicate a reference to the Church. Abbott, for instance, notes that the word order indicates a strong association between τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους and ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι. He translates the phrase "both now united in one body."<sup>170</sup> This contrasts ἐν σῶμα with τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους, and it is noteworthy that this association is not unfamiliar to the context. The concept of "twoness," or "bothness," is contrasted to "oneness" no less than four times within ii 14-18. This argument gains added weight if Salmond is correct in stressing the change from τοὺς δύο to τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους. The τοὺς δύο presents a more numerical conception, while τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους, "both of them together," brings the aspect of unity more in focus.<sup>171</sup> Thus, Braune speaks for many when he says: "'In one body' denotes the sphere in which the reconciliation is consummated: over against 'both' there is now only 'one body', in which they are; each does not need a separate. To supply 'being' ὄντας in thought is the simplest interpretation."<sup>172</sup>

The difficulty arises, however, when we try to understand just exactly how or when "both of them together" are in the "one body." Is it before, during, or after the process of reconciliation? Fischer avoids

this problem when he translates ἐν with the German "zu": "'Er versöhnte die beiden zu einem einzigen Leibe mit Gott durch das Kreuz.' Das ἐν ist nicht einmal störend, weil in der Koine ἐν and εἰς wechseln können, ganz besonders ist ἐν im Sinne von "zu" beliebt, wenn die Dauer des zu Erreichenden betont werden soll."<sup>173</sup> But such a translation here is at best difficult. It requires that ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι be joined to the verb, such that the reconciliation "into" one body and the reconciliation with God are two separate yet simultaneous actions which occur through the cross. To be sure, the idea is attractive, but it is difficult to see that the text actually means this, and it is best to give ἐν some other sense.<sup>174</sup> This shows, however, that the grammatical status of the phrase becomes important for our understanding its point of reference. Are there any analogous expressions in the context that help determine the issue?

#### b. Analogous Expressions in the Context

Abbott calls our attention to the relationship between the ἐν σῶμα and the εἰς καινὸς ἄνθρωπος: "The ἐν σῶμα is the εἰς καινὸς ἄνθρωπος. So most commentators, It is not the Church, for it is only as reconciled that Jews and Greeks belong to the Church. But when reconciled they become the body of Christ, and so the Church,"<sup>175</sup> But not all commentators agree as to what exactly the "one new man" refers,<sup>176</sup> Some see the "one new man," "one body," and "one spirit" as three designations of the same thing. Stig Hanson argues in this manner when he understands all three as referring to "the Church as the New Humanity conceived as one man whose Head is Christ, and considered from two different aspects partly as a sōma, partly as a pneuma."<sup>177</sup>

Earlier we argued for a different interpretation: the new man is the single new type of man who emerges and lives in Christ,<sup>178</sup> Of course, even here the new man typifies the Church, as the Gentile typifies all Gentiles and the Jew, all Israelites. But even so, if ἐν σῶμα refers to

the Church as the Corporate Christ, then, an exact correspondence is unlikely. It is possible, however, that ἐν σῶμα picks up not simply the one new man, but Christ's establishment of the two men in himself. In other words the one Body is the Corporate Christ in which the two men have become one and the same kind of new man, and hence united together in peace. Thus, there would remain a certain correspondence between the new man and the Body; the oneness in individual equality is correlated to the oneness in corporate solidarity and mutual dependence. These are two perspectives on the same unity that stands against the hostility of the former division.

Whether one interprets the new man corporately as the Church, or individually as a new type of person, i.e. the Christian, what both interpretations have in common with our passage is that the oneness of the new man is directly contrasted to the former twoness of the Jews and Gentiles.

Much the same point holds true for ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι in vs. 18.

J. A. Robinson makes note of this correspondence:

This is the 'one body' which has resulted from the union of the two sections. It is the 'one body' to which the 'one Spirit' of v. 18 corresponds. It is not the human body of the Lord Jesus, that was referred to above in v. 15 by the expression 'in His flesh.' Here St. Paul is speaking of that larger body of the exalted Christ, of which he has already declared that it is His fulness or completion, and of which he will presently declare that "there is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling."<sup>179</sup>

The same thought appears to lie behind N. A. Dahl's statement concerning the "one Spirit":

Die Trennung zwischen Heiden und Juden gehörte in den Bereich des Fleisches, aber in der neuen Schöpfung ist das Alte vergangen (2 Kor. 5,17). Die Heiden sind nicht Israeliten geworden, aber der Heilige Geist ist denen, die glauben, gegeben, Heiden wie Juden. Alle Glieder des einen Leibes dürfen voll Vertrauen in einem Geiste zu Gott kommen und zu Vater sagen (vgl. 1,13ff).<sup>180</sup>



Again according to these scholars, unity is the key to understanding the Body concept here. The one new man and the one Spirit are not exact equivalents to the one Body; but they are related in that each brings its own perspective to the unity and peace between Gentiles and Jews. In each case, however, the unity stands in contrast to the former hostility and division.

### c. Parallel Texts

Perhaps one of the strongest arguments that in Eph ii 16 "in one body" refers to the Church is the common use of  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  in the Pauline Corpus. Especially relevant are I Cor x 17, xii 13; Col iii 15; and Eph iv 4.<sup>181</sup> The impressive point of these parallels is that in each the phrase indicates the Church without further attributives. Whether these parallels can be considered to be decisive is questionable. But seeing that the context concerns unity, these parallels lend strong support to the thesis that the Church Body is the point of reference.

Let us now summarize briefly the argument for the Church Body:

- a.  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \epsilon\upsilon\iota\ \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  belongs to  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\omicron\tau\epsilon\acute{\rho}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  and thus indicates where the two-together are in contrast to their former state of distinction.
- b. This contrast between the twoness and oneness occurs throughout the passage in such a way as to emphasize unity between the two groups. This naturally points to the united Church community as the subject under discussion.
- c. Finally, this view is confirmed by the frequent use of the phrase within the Pauline Corpus to denote the united community.

### D. The Grammatical Position and Primary Point of Reference of $\epsilon\upsilon\ \epsilon\upsilon\iota\ \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota$

The aim of this section is to discover the primary point of reference of  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ . We say "primary" because we do not wish to deny the possibility of a genuine connection between the crucified body and the Church

Body. But even if such a connection exists, it is important to establish the perspective from which the author argues. For instance, if ἐν σῶμα represents the Church's identity with the Messiah, understood as the mediator of reconciliation, then the crucified body constitutes the primary point of reference. On the other hand, if ἐν σῶμα represents the Messiah's identity with the Church, understood as the recipient of reconciliation, then the Church Body is clearly the main point of reference. Thus, with respect to the primary point of reference, there exist only two alternatives: ἐν σῶμα characterizes the means of reconciliation, in which case it points to the crucified body, or it characterizes the recipient of reconciliation, in which case it points to the Church Body.

In view of this, the grammatical position of the phrase is clearly an important consideration. The phrase could belong to either ἀποκατάλλαξη or τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους. To be sure, the author could have made the matter clearer if he used a different word order or had inserted τοὺς or perhaps ὄντας before the phrase. But as it stands, the adjunct could easily belong to ἀποκατάλλαξη, and the word order, which is especially flexible in Koine Greek,<sup>182</sup> hardly speaks against it. On the other hand, not only is Koine less exacting than classical Greek in its usage of the article and copulative participle,<sup>183</sup> but also the immense scope of its favorite preposition ἐν is almost unfathomable;<sup>184</sup> so it is equally possible for the phrase to modify τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους. So the problem remains and we must search other channels for its solution.

Certainly the parallel text, Col i 22, supports ascription to ἀποκατάλλαξη. There the phrase clearly modifies the verb. To be sure, the exact meaning of the text depends upon whether one reads ἀποκατήλλαξεν or ἀποκατηλλάγητε.<sup>185</sup> But in either case the verse offers a compelling parallel. In both passages ἀποκατάλλάσω occurs; in both the



preposition ἐν followed by σώματι is used; in both a prepositional phrase beginning with διὰ denotes the means or method of reconciliation.

Nevertheless, there are good reasons not to base our understanding of Eph ii 16 on Col i 21.<sup>186</sup> In general, Colossians might be using Ephesians here, or each might be using a common source for different purposes.<sup>187</sup> In any case, there are important differences in the two texts. In Colossians the body is clearly identified as "the body of his flesh," as opposed to "one body" in Ephesians. In Colossians the reconciliation occurs διὰ τοῦ θανάτου as opposed to διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ in Ephesians. But more specifically, and more importantly, the "object" or "recipient" of reconciliation is not important to Colossians in the same manner that it is to Ephesians.<sup>188</sup> This, of course, does not mean that in Colossians, the recipients of reconciliation were not important, but Colossians does not reflect on or stress the character of these recipients as the direct object of reconciliation. For Ephesians, however, it is important to accentuate that "both," the Gentile as well as the Jew, obtain reconciliation with God. This accent should not be overlooked when we consider the noteworthy difference in the manner in which the two passages appear to the eye and sound to the ear. In Ephesians not only is the direct object emphasized, but also the position of the direct object, τῷ θεῷ, separates ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι from διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ. This tends to isolate τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι as a syntactical or grammatical unit. Such an impression may be illusory or the consequence of chance. Is there any evidence that indicates otherwise?

Notable is the apparently conscious parallelism of οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι and τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι.<sup>189</sup> Indeed, the agreement in the choice and order of words is striking and even survives a change of case.<sup>190</sup> Moreover, in iv 4 σῶμα and πνεῦμα again occur in close relation. This supports the conclusion that οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι consciously parallels τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ



σώματι. If so, then it follows that in the mind and intention of the author τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι was a grammatical unit.

Earlier we argued that οἱ ἀμφοτέροι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι should be taken together. Here it is important to note that it matters little whether ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι actually belongs to οἱ ἀμφοτέροι. It is the position of οἱ ἀμφοτέροι adjacent to ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι that has or has not consciously been influenced by the words τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι. If it has, then τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι forms a grammatical unit. That οἱ ἀμφοτέροι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι also constitutes a syntactical whole, of course, reinforces our argument and demonstrates that the parallel is material as well as formal.

Now it is clear that if the words τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι do not form a conceptual or grammatical unit,<sup>191</sup> then the words οἱ ἀμφοτέροι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι can hardly be considered to parallel them consciously: i.e. any parallelism or similarity which exists, does so unconsciously or coincidentally. Thus, if τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι does not form a grammatical unit, then not only is the position of τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους adjacent to ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι coincidental, i.e. the words could have been placed elsewhere without loss of meaning, but also the words οἱ ἀμφοτέροι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι coincidentally parallel this coincidental arrangement in vs. 16. Moreover, if in our earlier discussion, we have been mistaken and οἱ ἀμφοτέροι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι does not belong together, then a third coincidence arises: the coincidental arrangement of οἱ ἀμφοτέροι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι coincidentally parallels the coincidental arrangement τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι. While such a string of coincidences is not impossible, it seems highly unlikely. More probable is the conclusion that ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι modifies τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους such that the words make up a single syntactical unit.

This conclusion has important consequences. The construction excludes any transitional or progressive understanding of ἐν (=into), as

well as any instrumental meaning (=by means of).<sup>192</sup> Both of these alternatives require either the phrase to modify ἀποκατάλλαξεν or the reader to assume some action verb between τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους and ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι. The former possibility has already been dismissed; the latter has no justification. As such, the phrase depicts neither the progression from one state to another, nor the means by which such a transition has been accomplished. Instead, the phrase concerns the character and nature of τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους.

Earlier we saw that in slight contrast to τοὺς δύο, τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους connotes "togetherness" or "unity."<sup>193</sup> But while this attributive quality is implicit in the term, it does not come to clear expression. Thus, in vs. 14 the idea remains dormant in the background. The immediate context offers sufficient grounds to believe that the author wishes to stress this implicit aspect of togetherness. But the addition of ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι leaves little room for doubt. The phrase gives concrete expression to the implicit quality of togetherness inherent in τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους so that the quality becomes explicit. As such, ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι forms an adverbial modification to the attributive quality inherent in τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους, and this may well explain the absence of τοὺς or ὄντας.

It is noteworthy that the author has chosen τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους with its implicit quality of togetherness to denote the incompatible Gentile and Jew. This suggests that the choice arises not from the term's point of reference as if it reflected an intrinsic unity between the Gentile as Gentile and Jew as Jew, such as their common humanity. The togetherness is not intrinsic to the Gentile and Jew, but arises from the reconciler, who determines the recipients of his reconciling act. Christ does not reconcile the Gentile to God in one way and the Jew in another; by means of the same cross he offers the same reconciliation to both. But if Christ offers to both the same reconciliation by the same act, it becomes



clear that Christ views the Gentile and Jew, not separately, but together. Their togetherness emerges from Christ viewing them both together as the unified object, the single whole, towards which his act of reconciliation to God is directed.

Insofar as ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι modifies the implicit quality of togetherness inherent in τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους, it makes explicit the unity that exists between the Gentile and Jew as a result of Christ making them both joint recipients of his reconciliation. The thought that probably remains foremost in the author's mind is the Gentile's inclusion in Christ's reconciliation. So ἐν σῶμα refers to a particular body to which both the Gentile and Jew belong together. This suggests that ἐν is intensive, "the one" or "one and the same." The particularity and intensification of the body's oneness helps bring out that the togetherness of the Gentile and Jew is not a natural state, but the result of that act whereby Christ reconciles both to God.

It is tempting to take the preposition ἐν with a circumstantial sense: "both together in the manner (or form) of one body," or simply "both together as one body."<sup>194</sup> This rendering allows the togetherness of the Gentile and Jew, as fellow recipients of Christ's reconciliation, full and vivid expression. They make up one party, while God makes up the other. But such a rendering might leave the false impression that the unity originates from the Gentile and Jew themselves. Moreover, the author has probably not abandoned his discussion of concrete individuals conceived as types.<sup>195</sup> These, in and of themselves, could hardly form the one body. Besides, had the author intended merely to stress the manner in which the Gentile and Jew were united, then ὡς would have been a more likely word (cf. e.g., Philo, Spec. Leg. III 131).

It is better, then, to give ἐν its normal local sense. This avoids the impression that the body consists of the Gentile and Jew. The body stands over these two individuals and the groups they typify as that



wherein they are both together. But even here the idea is not strictly spatial, as if the meaning were simply both are "inside" the one body. The phrase rather tells where the two are together by virtue of how they are together. In other words, the phrase is local by virtue of being circumstantial. This becomes clearer when we take seriously the image that ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι evokes. One is in a body, by virtue of being a member of that body. For example, I Cor xii 18 states: νυνὶ δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἔθετο τὰ μέλα, ἕν ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ σώματι καθὼς ἠθέλησεν. In ii 16, then, we might render the entire idea: "both together in the manner of being in one and the same body." But the manner of being in a body is more simply put as being a member of the body. So perhaps a looser translation is preferable: "both together as (or being) members of one and the same body." This rendering helps bring out both the locus and mode of the togetherness inherent in τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους. The overall effect is that τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι functions as both a conceptual and grammatical unit. It defines as a single whole or totality the object towards which Christ's reconciling act to God is directed.

This understanding has two important consequences. (1) "Ἐν σῶμα must be regarded as co-terminus with τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους. Since the reconciliation occurs in Christ's death on the cross,<sup>196</sup> it follows that what is reconciled by Christ is in some sense present to him. In other words, the Gentile and the Jew are envisioned to be members of the one body at the time of Christ's death. The statement is hardly surprising in the light of passages such as i 4ff. But it does not mean that ἕν σῶμα and the physical body of Jesus are necessarily identical. It merely states that Jesus in his death has ἕν σῶμα in view as that which he reconciles to God. But this brings us to a second point. (2) "Ἐν σῶμα partakes of the direct object's reception of the verb's action. To the extent that the one body defines and characterizes the object of Christ's

reconciliation, τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους, just so is it synonymous with that object. To be sure, the individual Gentile and Jew are not themselves the one body. But τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους does indicate that they receive the reconciliation together. Now when this togetherness is further defined as membership in one and the same body, it becomes clear that this one body is itself the recipient of the reconciliation. The Gentile and Jew receive this reconciliation together by virtue of the fact they receive it as members of the one body that receives it. To suggest that the body is the object of reconciliation accords well with the passive character that σῶμα often has.<sup>197</sup> That Christ may be viewed as the reconciler of the body is hardly surprising in view of v 23: αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος. As such ἐν σῶμα can only refer to the Church, unless Jesus himself was regarded as in need of reconciliation. Indeed, if the crucified body of Jesus is identifiable with this body at all, it is so only in terms of its Church dimension. Thus the primary point of reference is the one Church, the Corporate Christ.

What relation has this Body with Christ? The lack of αὐτοῦ suggests that the relation of ἐν σῶμα to Christ is not primarily in view. This does not mean, of course, that such a relation does not exist, nor that the concept is understandable outside such a relation. Rather the pronoun's absence merely indicates that the author wishes to stress the unity of the Gentile and Jew as members of the one Body; rather than that Body's relation to Christ. In the light of i 23, iv 12, and v 30 a strong relation between Christ and ἐν σῶμα seems probable.

It seems probable that our author is thinking ~~wholistically~~ holistically here and that σῶμα is used to indicate a corporate personality. In our discussion of i 22-23 we saw a similar use of σῶμα to communicate the author's New Adam theology.<sup>198</sup> Certainly the mention of the new man in vs. 15 supports a similar view here. In contrast to Adam in whom there are two old kinds of men, Christ is the New Adam in whom one new kind of man is

brought into existence. But to the extent Adam provides an implicit antitype, this is viewed in its corporate effect: a humanity divided among itself and hostile towards God. Solidarity with Adam means alienation from God and from one's fellow man, while solidarity with Christ means reconciliation with God and one's fellowman. It is not insignificant, however, that the author speaks of this divided humanity in terms of the religio-historical distinction between Jews and Gentiles. This sets the problem of man's alienation from God and his fellow man into the context of God's plan of salvation, which is bound up with God's election of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and ultimately the history of Israel. Indeed, if the division between Jews and Gentiles is a socio-historical expression of man's hostility towards God, it also points to the promise of salvation. In Jewish thinking, this promise was bound up with the promise of the Messiah. This naturally raises the question whether alongside the Adamic antitype, there is also a more positive prototype that influenced the author's formulation as to how the New Adam functions and provides the necessary restoration and reconciliation.<sup>199</sup>

We suggest that the New Adam is viewed here as the Son of God understood from the perspective of a priestly Messiah who resembles Isaac. Christ as the New Adam not only abolishes the hostility between Gentiles and Jews, and reconciles both to God, he provides access to the Father. This certainly suggests the adoption of both Gentiles and Jews as sons (cf. i 5) and implies Christ's Sonship as well. But how is this motif to be understood with reference to Christ's death? We believe that the Akedah or "binding of Isaac" offers a good parallel and was conceivably of influence.<sup>200</sup>

The tradition of the Akedah was widespread and relatively early in Judaism (cf. Jos. Ant. I xiii 1-4; IV Macc xiii 12, xvi 20; Ps. Philo, Lib. Anti. Bib. xviii 5, xxxii 2-4, xl 2).<sup>201</sup> G. Vermes has shown that Isaac's willingness to sacrifice himself was considered a true sacrifice



that had "a permanent redemptive effect on behalf of its people."<sup>202</sup> It could be seen as the prototype for martyrdom, the basis of the temple cult and a prefiguration of the resurrection.<sup>203</sup> It was also connected to the promise of man inheriting the world. Vermes describes this view in Ps. Philo:

Ps. Philo believed that by Isaac's unique example God conferred upon human nature its true dignity, the dignity of a divinely required and freely offered self-sacrifice. The blessing resulting from it would extend to all men for ever, and they would understand that they possess the same humanity which was made holy by Isaac's sacrifice....Isaac's self-offering justified God in His choice of mankind as heir to the created world.<sup>204</sup>

There also seems to be a connection between the Akedah and the conception of the priestly Messiah in the Testament of Levi.<sup>205</sup> At TLev xviii 6-7 the priestly Messiah's relation to God is compared to Abraham's relation to Isaac. In the following verses we learn that this priestly Messiah will enlighten the Gentiles and bring sin and lawlessness to an end; he will remove "the threatening sword against Adam," give the saints "the spirit of holiness," and empower "his children to tread upon evil spirits,"

Such a background is quite informative for our text. Within the context of the covenants of the promise and the temple imagery Christ is viewed as the priestly Messiah, who as God's Son was not spared as was Abraham's son, Isaac. Like Isaac he willingly gave himself, but unlike Isaac he actually was sacrificed. And so the blessings of Abraham, the father of faith for Gentile and Jew alike, become available to all peoples (cf. Rom iv 10-17, Gal iii 6-29), and through Christ both Gentiles and Jews united in one Spirit have access to God the Father. The New Adam's sacrifice provides justification for God's election of man, and confers on all believers, whether Gentile or Jew, a new humanity.

We think it likely that the motifs surrounding the Akedah help explain the conceptual framework out of which our author formed his Christology

under the impact of the death and resurrection of Jesus. Of course, by this we do not mean that the author is making an explicit parallel to Isaac, or for that matter, Adam. He focuses his attention only and directly on the person and work of Christ Jesus. For this reason we may be content with leaving our proposal largely on the level of a suggestion. The Patriarchs such as Adam, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, or offices such as the King or High Priest provide important analogies to man's revealed purpose and destiny, the kind of actions necessary for reconciliation, and the kind of bond that exists between Christ and the Church. In each case, the figure stands not alone, but rather his actions are viewed in their wholistic effect on the totality with which the key person is functionally identified. But none of the models is in itself adequate. The Christ event itself interprets the models, and that which binds Christ to the Church goes beyond physical descent, political allegiance, or mere cultic representation. What binds Christ to the Church is the God-willed love that he expressed in the giving of his body on the cross for others.

It is precisely this loving identification of Christ with the Church in its need for reconciliation that forms the rationale for using ἔν σῶμα as an image for the Church. The sacrifice of Christ's personal body is seen in its ongoing effectiveness such that the history of this body is functionally identified with those to whom Christ brings reconciliation, i.e. the Church.<sup>206</sup> Thus, that which in love Christ gave on the cross, namely his body, has become the image for that to which he gave his body, namely the Church. In this way the image serves to communicate the unity between the One who loves and the Many who are loved (and hence are called to love one another).

Thus in ii 16 ἔν σῶμα denotes the Church as the Corporate Christ. Σῶμα offers the author a way to communicate his Semitic presuppositions about the One and the Many. It indicates Christ in his functional identification with the Church on behalf of the Church as the object of



reconciliation. The idea that the Body is the recipient of reconciliation brings out its passive and objective character. However, the main emphasis is upon the Body's unity. The Body is a united whole that receives the reconciliation as a totality. Since both the Gentile and Jew are in this one Body, they receive Christ's reconciliation as a unity, as members of that Body. The underlying presupposition is that a body is a God-willed unity and what happens to the body involves all its members. That this Body includes the Gentile as well as the Jew, or to put it another way, that the promised Messiah of Israel identifies himself with the Gentile as well as the Jew, the author regards as a mystery, hidden from past generations, but now revealed to the Church. With this we may turn to iii 6.

## II. Eph iii 6

We now turn our attention to iii 6 in order to determine the meaning and function of *σῶσωμα*. We will first outline the context in general and then turn to vs. 6 and more specifically to *σῶσωμα*.

### A. iii 6 in Context

In ii 11-22 we discovered that Christ's reconciliation of man with God receives socio-historical expression in the reconciliation of Gentile and Jew in Christ. Through the reconciling work of Christ the once alienated Gentiles are now built together with the Jews upon the foundation that consists of the apostles and prophets and of which Christ himself is the cornerstone.<sup>207</sup> At iii 1 the author apparently intends to resume the prayer he began at i 15ff.<sup>208</sup> But having no more than started, he embarks on another train of thought, and the prayer itself is not resumed until iii 14.<sup>209</sup>

The following parenthesis, iii 2-13, consists of three sentences.<sup>210</sup> The first describes Paul's reception of the *μυστήριον*.<sup>211</sup> This reception of the mystery sets Paul within the larger framework of God's



activity, and demonstrates that both he and his gospel belong to the apostolic and prophetic foundation of the Church. The second sentence enlarges upon Paul's particular role as preacher of Christ to the Gentiles and instructor (or revealer) of the οἰκονομία<sup>212</sup> of the mystery to all men.<sup>213</sup> Here again mention of the mystery determines the perspective wherein we are to view Paul's ministry. His preaching and teaching are not to be understood apart from the Church through which the manifold wisdom of God is made known to the principalities and powers. Paul, too, is a member of this Church; his ministry, too, must find its basis in its larger purpose; he, too, has no access other than that offered in Christ. The last short sentence concludes the parenthesis with mention of the apostle's afflictions, which are for the glory of the Gentiles. Coming where this does, these sufferings almost constitute a final proof of his credentials to pray an effective prayer on behalf of the readers.

Our primary concern lies with the first sentence.<sup>214</sup> In vs. 2 the readers are assumed to have heard of the οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ that was given Paul for the Gentiles.<sup>215</sup> In a manner similar to i 8-9, vs. 3 relates the χάρις which was given to Paul to the μυστήριον made known to him κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν.<sup>216</sup> The mystery (or secret) receives further definition in vss. 3b-6. From vss. 3b-4 we learn that the readers are expected to perceive from what has already been written in the letter, Paul's insight ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.<sup>217</sup> The words τοῦ Χριστοῦ probably stand in apposition to τῷ μυστηρίῳ.<sup>218</sup> This means that the mystery is not Christ's possession, nor does it merely pertain to him. The Christ in his person constitutes the mystery. In vs. 5, however, we learn that such insight has not been granted to the "sons of men" in former generations.<sup>219</sup> Indeed, Paul's possession of the mystery, which has been "amply" demonstrated in the letter itself, sets him apart and places him within the circle of apostles and prophets. These constitute the foundation upon which both Gentiles and Jews are built, i.e. the

foundation of the Church, Christ himself being the cornerstone (ii 20). It becomes clear, then, that Paul's position in the Church remains at the center of attention. Churches who owe their existence whether directly or indirectly to the person of Paul are founded upon the historical base that extends to Christ himself.<sup>220</sup> Moreover, the close association between the mystery of Christ and the new status of the Gentiles in Christ shows that the gospel, of which Paul became a minister and through which the Gentiles gain their new status in Christ, belongs not only to Paul but also to all the mystery-bearing apostles and prophets. Thus, while Paul may be the unique representative of and missionary to the Gentiles, the mission itself through the revelation of the mystery of Christ carries the endorsement of the Church's apostolic and prophetic foundation, the foundation of which Christ himself is cornerstone.

Within this context vs. 6 serves to further clarify and define the mystery which is Christ.<sup>221</sup> The mystery that is Christ, which was formerly hidden but now revealed, is this: the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, etc. This, of course, raises the question as to how the mystery can mean at one and the same both Christ and the new status of the Gentiles. Schlier attempts to overcome this difficulty by pointing out that Christ should not be understood apart from his Body, the Church: "das Geheimnis ist hier wieder Christus, aber wieder unter einem anderen Aspekt, nämlich unter dem Aspekt seiner Dimension und seines Anwesens, seines 'Leibes,' der Kirche."<sup>222</sup> Schlier is certainly correct to the extent that he suggests how Christ may be viewed from varying perspectives. But he is wrong to limit this explanation to the Body of Christ concept.  $\Sigma\upsilon\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  is only one of three terms that describe the new status of the Gentiles in Christ; the other terms must also be brought into a framework that allows this variation in perspective.

This is possible when we recognize that the author thinks in totalities that can overlap and merge. Such wholistic thinking makes it



possible to functionally identify a thing, person or event and the history that it determines. If Christ is the mystery, so is the history that he determines, and this is clearly seen in the new found unity between Gentiles and Jews. The idea here shows an affinity to what the author has already established in ii 14-18. There we saw how Christ in his person constituted the peace between Gentile and Jew, and that this expressed in socio-historical terms the peace between God and man. Here the unity of Gentiles and Jews expresses within the structures of human existence God's revelation of the mystery which is Christ.<sup>223</sup> What remains to be seen is whether the threefold description in vs. 6 provides any indication as to how the ecclesiological content of the mystery is wholistically connected to its Christological content.

#### B. Σύσσωμα in the Context of iii 6

In vs. 6 the author apparently summarizes various aspects discussed earlier in the letter (i 13-14 and ii 11-22). Such a summary statement falls in line with iii 3 where he refers the reader to what has just been written. The Gentile's new status in Christ clearly forms the verse's point of departure, and it becomes apparent that the character of this new status expresses manifestly, at least to the author, the μυστηρίον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The Gentiles are συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμετόχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας in Christ Jesus through the gospel. The three words, each prefixed with συν, stand in the accusative case and are plural. The strong similarity in form leads one to expect a similarity in thought.

Of the three, συγκληρονόμος is the most common in the New Testament. But it is itself infrequent, having only three other NT occurrences (Rom viii 17, Heb xi 19, I Pet iii 7). In each case the word bears the same meaning: "inheriting together with," or with a more substantive flavor, "fellow heir."<sup>224</sup> But each passage has a different point of



reference. At Rom viii 17 believers are fellow heirs with Christ, while in Heb xi 9 Isaac and Jacob inherit together with Abraham the promise (land). I Pet iii 7 calls man and wife "joint heirs of the grace of life." In Eph iii 6 the Gentiles are fellow heirs with the Jews of the Messianic salvation offered in Christ; i.e., they share in the salvific blessing hitherto thought to be reserved for Jews.<sup>225</sup>

Elsewhere in Ephesians the inheritance is associated with "glory" (i 18) and "the Kingdom of Christ and God" (v 5). In i 14 the Holy Spirit of the promise is called the ἀρραβὼν (down-payment) of the inheritance.<sup>226</sup> The inheritance in view is best understood as neither wholly present nor wholly future, but held in a certain eschatological tension.<sup>227</sup> A similar tension between the now and the future is evinced in the writings of the Qumran sect, and for them the inheritance could be called the "glory of Adam."<sup>228</sup> This is suggestive since we have seen that Christ functions as the New Adam who restores man to his proper position above all things (i 22-23) and creates the Gentile and Jew in himself with one new kind of man in view (ii 15).<sup>229</sup> But it is noteworthy that at iii 6 the participation of Jewish believers in this inheritance is simply taken for granted. This should not be understood apart from the author's definition of Israel in terms of his Christology (ii 12). If formerly Gentiles were without Christ, then in some sense at least, Israel was with Christ.<sup>230</sup> But this means that the Jewish participation in the inheritance is actually dependent on Christ, i.e. Christ is the true κληρονόμος, and Jews are heirs by virtue of their solidarity with Christ. But now when the true heir finally appears, the secret plan that he in his person represents is made known. In their union with Christ by means of the Gospel the Gentiles are now seen to be co-heirs with the Jews of the inheritance, the renewed glory of Adam that Christ inherits.

Συμμέτοχος appears in the New Testament only here and later at vs. 7. It means "sharing with someone in something," or perhaps

"fellow-(or co-)partakers."<sup>231</sup> In terms of imagery the word is clearly the weakest of the three. While συγκληρονόμα and σύσσωμα could stand alone, συμμετοχα evidently requires the further definition that it receives in τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. This weighs against τῆς ἐπαγγελίας also belonging to συγκλημονόμα and σύσσωμα.<sup>232</sup> Indeed, if the genitive phrase did belong to all three words then συμμετοχα not only contributes nothing to the imagery, but also nothing to the sense.

Some scholars think that ἡ ἐπαγγελία refers to the promised Holy Spirit (i. 14).<sup>233</sup> But the absolute use of ἡ ἐπαγγελία for the Holy Spirit would be unusual and there is little reason to impose such a limitation on the word here.<sup>234</sup> More likely the term refers to the promise of the Messianic salvation now realized and offered in Christ Jesus.<sup>235</sup> This promise includes, but is not exhausted by the gift of the Holy Spirit. It is likely, then, that the three expressions do not build to a climax but convey more or less parallel aspects of the same truth.<sup>236</sup> This also suggests that ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου should not be limited to τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. It is best taken with εἶναι as defining the place where and the means whereby the Gentiles are co-heirs and co-promise-partakers with the Jews, namely in Christ Jesus through the Gospel.<sup>237</sup> In the union with Christ that occurs through the hearing and believing of the Gospel, Gentiles share together with believing Jews in the Messianic salvation that Christ brings.

The unity expressed in συγκληρονόμα and συμμετοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας was impossible as long as the Law was regarded as the constitution of God's people. The inheritance and the promise reflect themes that run throughout the OT account of Israel's history.<sup>238</sup> Through her descent from the Patriarchs and in her obedience to the Law, Israel possessed the inheritance and promise as sacred and unique national privileges. As such they were important to its self-identity as God's chosen nation. By the time of the New Testament the inheritance and promise had



taken on an eschatological bias. The inheritance was to be acquired in the Messianic kingdom and the promises fulfilled in the days of the Messiah.<sup>239</sup> Also, by the time of the New Testament, physical descent alone did not insure the inheritance and promise. This is especially clear in the Qumran writings where the sect alone is the faithful remnant that inherits Adam's glory (cf. e.g. CD III 1-20). But also, generally, solidarity with a Patriarch extended beyond physical descent and came to mean the sharing of a common life principle which the Patriarch embodied.<sup>240</sup> Of course, for the Jew this was the Law and accordingly the inheritance and promise were wedded to adherence to the Law.

In the undisputed letters of Paul the picture changes. In his dispute with Judaizers he divorces the inheritance-promise from the Law, associating the former with life and the latter with death (Gal iii 6-iv 7, Rom iv 13-17, vii 8-12). In Eph ii 15 we learned that the Law has been emptied of its force, and the Law does not constitute the new community's vital principle of life. Thus, whatever else συγκληρονόμα and συμμετοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας imply, it is not that Gentiles have become Law-abiding Israelites. This point is also present in σύσσωμα when understood in relation to the author's Body of Christ concept. Regardless of how this concept is understood exactly, it clearly indicates a God-willed unity that is inherent and non-accidental. Such a unity between the uncircumcised and the circumcised was inconceivable within a Law-abiding community, whether Jewish or Christian.

Of the three expressions, σύσσωμος is the rarest. The term does not appear in any extant Greek text prior to Ephesians, and afterwards only in the Fathers, the sole exception being in Anatacius Sinaites in A.D. 670.<sup>241</sup> Due to this rarity and to the author's abundant use of terms prefixed with συν, the consensus among scholars is that the term was coined by the author.<sup>242</sup> From the Fathers onward the phrase has been interpreted with reference to the author's Body of Christ concept.<sup>243</sup>



"Members of the same body" (RSV) and "part of the same body" (NEB) represent common translations.

Only E. Preuschen has seriously objected to this interpretation.<sup>244</sup> He notes that σῶμα may mean "slave."<sup>245</sup> Thus, paying due respect to the legal character of συγκληρονόμος (cf. Gal iv 1f) and parallel to the more common σύνδουλος (Col i 7, iv 7, Rev vi 11, xix 10, xxii 9), σύσσωμα would mean "fellow-slaves." The sentence would then gain this structure: "die Heiden sind Miterben und Mitsclaven, und so oder so nehmen sie Teil an der Verheissung."<sup>246</sup> Under this construction τῆς ἐπαγγελίας belongs to all three συν-words and all three build to a climax.<sup>247</sup>

We have already noted that συμμετοχα adds nothing to the sense if τῆς ἐπαγγελίας belongs to the other two terms, and have suggested that the words are three variations on the same theme, rather than build to a climax. But beyond these objections there is a more serious drawback: why, if he wanted to call the Gentiles "fellow-slaves," did not the author use the more common and less ambiguous σύνδουλοι? Unfortunately, Preuschen never addresses this question. In view of the Fathers' uniform interpretation,<sup>248</sup> and in view of the significant role that the Body of Christ concept plays in Ephesians, Preuschen's thesis seems unlikely. His construction is actually the natural outcome of reading the terms as nouns. Indeed, when approached in this manner, σύσσωμα must literally mean "fellow-body." Along the same line, since σῶμα could mean "person," "fellow-person" is another alternative.<sup>249</sup> But while taking the words as nouns helps focus on the people in their relationship to one another, it overlooks the terms' genuine adjectival character.<sup>250</sup> The plural form of the words may, in fact, only reflect agreement with the referent.

When allowed their adjectival force, each of the terms portrays a particular quality or mode of existence. As the concentration on the

Gentile-Jew relation shows, the adjuncts describe a mode of "social" existence; they focus upon the nature and character of a community, the Church. Outwardly, then, the general thrust of the verse seems clear enough. As Gnülka says: "Juden und Heiden sind in der Völkerkirche geeint (vgl. 2, 11-22). Zusammen mit den Juden sind die Heiden Erben, Leib und Verheissungsträger. Es besteht kein Unterschied mehr."<sup>251</sup> On the other hand, to understand the statement as a mere assessment of Church structure misses entirely its profound Christological impact. Since the community's particular mode of social existence, as depicted by the terms, finds its source in Christ, the statement concerns not only the nature and character of the community, but also the source of that community's nature and character, namely Christ himself. This, of course, implies that the terms actually do reflect different aspects of the same truth. If so, one would expect to find a common Christological imagery underlying each of the three. Or to put the question another way: what is the basic social pattern of life that each adjunct presupposes, and how does this point to Christ?

Considered as Israel's national privileges, heirdom and promise-participation might suggest that the common social pattern of "citizenship" underlies the three terms. If the Law is eliminated as the common factor that unites the citizens, then allegiance to their king is the most likely candidate. Thus, the unity of the citizens would express their loyalty and unity to their king. Support for such an interpretation may be found in the close association of the inheritance with the kingdom of Christ and God (v 5) and the association of the covenants of promise with the commonwealth of Israel (ii 12). Such a pattern would also be congenial to the use of σώσωμα, since a kingdom or state was frequently compared to a σῶμα. Indeed Philo (Spec. Leg. III 131) applies σῶμα indirectly to Israel itself. Under this view, as Barth suggests, "'to become a member of the same body' is analogous to joining an army or



club, or to naturalization in a city or state."<sup>252</sup> Thus, along these lines the terms are practically the same as συμπολιται.

But while this interpretation has merit, it soon becomes clear that this is no ordinary kingdom. "Citizenship" is not confined to a geographical location, but is an eschatological and world-wide phenomenon. The Gentiles do not become Jews (not even believing Jews); rather both the Gentile and the Jew become a new kind of man. They inherit God's intended glory for Adam. Indeed, while the idea of inheritance is closely associated with that of "citizenship" it actually suggests another social pattern, that of "kinship" or "family."<sup>253</sup> Even in the Philo passage just cited, the High Priest is considered as the common kinsman of all members of the nation. Of course, the High Priest's bond to his people ultimately goes back to the nation's common inheritance and promise in association with its Patriarchs. In other words, for Israel the social pattern of citizenship is closely bound to the pattern of kinship, as based on their descent from and adherence to the life-model of the Patriarchs whom God elected. Ultimately this elective process goes back to the creation of Adam himself (cf. e.g. Jub xix 24, xxii 13).

Seen in this manner, the implication of the three expressions becomes even sharper: Gentiles and Jews belong to the same family, God's family. Now when the inheritance and promise of Messianic salvation are seen as the receiving of Adam's glory, it seems likely that Christ is seen here as the New Adam, a New Patriarch who embodies the Messianic principle of life (πνεῦμα), and who becomes the source and head of a new race and new kind of life, of which both Gentile and Jew may inherit and partake. Whether a more specific model may be ascertained remains speculative. Perhaps this New Adam is viewed as a New Isaac, a priestly Messiah, who offers himself willingly to death, and in doing so makes the blessings of Abraham, the father of faith for both Jews and Gentiles (cf. Rom iv 16f, Gal iii 6ff), available to all through the Gospel (cf. ii 14-16).<sup>254</sup>



If this understanding is basically correct, then,  $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  points not simply to the unity between believing Gentiles and Jews, but also to that unity as a result of a common life. It seems that  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  offered the author an opportunity to combine two types of solidarity. As a synonym of  $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\varsigma$  it could represent the kind of solidarity usually denoted by concepts such as kindred, family, perhaps even marriage.<sup>255</sup> At the same time it could in terms of organic wholeness represent a unity with one continuous and present vital life principle. With such a combination the author is able to demonstrate a social-historical unity between Gentile and Jew, while at the same time to emphasize that the basis of this lies in the Church's solidarity with Christ. While the author does not make explicit where in the Body the source of this unity and life arises, he would probably point to Christ as the Head ( i 22f, iv 15f, v 23f).

Our word, however, is not intended to be the most profound of the three expressions. Its position between the other two expressions does not permit this. But its position does allow the word to serve as an interpretive guide.<sup>256</sup> It helps bring out the point that the new found unity between the Jews and Gentiles is at the same time a unity with Christ. This idea is also present in the other two terms when viewed under the pattern of kinship with a Patriarch, but it is less obvious to one not acquainted with Biblical traditions. Thus,  $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  becomes a good tool for communicating the kind of unity that being fellow-heirs and fellow-promise-partakers involves. The Body to which the Gentile belongs with the Jew, is the Body that Christ reconciles to God; it is the corporate Body with which Christ identifies himself and for which he dies. If the inheritance and promise are wrapped up in the fate of Christ's personal body then the Church as Christ's corporate Body is that which receives the inheritance and promise, thus making its members fellow-heirs and co-promise-partakers in Christ.

### III. Conclusion

In ii 16 and iii 6 the author focuses on the new found unity between Gentiles and Jews in Christ. He uses ἐν σῶμα and σὺσῶμα to indicate the kind of unity that now exists in the Church. In each case σῶμα refers to the Corporate Christ, the Church, and this once again is best understood on the basis of Semitic presuppositions. The term serves to communicate the author's understanding of the One and Many. We may note that this use has an explicit and implicit side. (1) The stress in these passages is clearly on the unity between Church members. The unity between Gentiles and Jews is not accidental, it is God-willed. The idea focuses on the equality and solidarity of the Body such that σῶμα shows an affinity to σῶμα. This is combined with the idea of σῶμα as a single organism. What happens to one part is equally valid for the other; every Body member is dependent on the same single life that enlivens the totality. The Body's diversity does not come to sharp focus, however, although it is possible that the idea is present. What is clear is that the Body is a passive recipient. This is especially so at ii 16 where the Church is the object of reconciliation. But it is equally present at iii 6; as the inheritance and promise come to the believers so too life comes to the Body.

(2) The unity of the Church is an expression of its unity with Christ. How Christ's identity with the Church actually functions within the Body concept is not stressed in these passages. Elsewhere, of course, Christ functions as the Head and the author presumably has not forgotten this. But in these passages the Body's unity with Christ is seen from its social aspect; i.e. the oneness of the Body is an expression of the Body's oneness with the person who is identified with that Body. For the author a body is always the outward manifestation of someone. For this reason the oneness of a body's members expresses the unified integration of those members with the person who is that body. So the oneness of the Church

members manifests their oneness with Christ. This connection between the unity of the Church and its unity with Christ suggests that the believer's unity with the exalted Christ and his participation with Christ in a new cosmic order cannot be severed from the life and unity of the Church. Whether by chance or more likely by design, the author avoids thereby an overly enthusiastic interpretation of the Church's union with its heavenly Lord. Even so the point is undeveloped and it remains to be seen how the author might bring it to bear.<sup>257</sup>

Only in an indirect manner does the unity among believers say something about their relation to the world. Certainly it is tempting to go further and suggest that the Church outwardly manifests Christ to the world. But while that may be true on other grounds, the author does not use  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  in this way. He focuses the idea of outward manifestation inwardly on the relation between Church and Christ. The inner unity of the Church is an outward manifestation of its inner unity with Christ. While the author might well agree with the idea that the Body manifests Christ to the world, this is nonetheless a deduction from his use and not reflected directly in that use.



### III

#### UNITY AND DIVERSITY IN THE GROWING BODY: EPHESIANS iv 1-16 (25)

In Eph iv 4-16, the author's Body concept plays an important role. In describing the nature and character of Christian unity, the author begins in vs. 4 with "one Body," defines service to the Church as building up Christ's Body (vs. 12) and sums up (vs. 16) with reference to the Body that grows and builds itself up in love. But if the Body concept is clearly important, its usage still raises significant exegetical questions. If, as the context suggests, the mention of *ἐν σῶμα* (vs. 4) refers to the Church as the Body of Christ, why is the Church listed before *ἐν πνεῦμα*? What conception of the Church would explain this unusual order?

After discussing the Church's God-given unity, the author turns to its God-given diversity. He supports with Scripture his claim that diverse gifts have been given to the Church. The author's use of this Scripture (Ps lxxviii 19) presents its own difficulties. When the author lists the gifts that Christ gives, he defines their purpose as equipping the saints for a work of service *εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. Does the author have in view the historical construction of the Church through the Gentile mission or the spiritual edification of the Church in its bond with Christ? Similar questions surround the growth motif in vss. 15-16; is it extensive or intensive?

Another matrix of problems concerns understanding the Church's goals (vs. 13). Does attaining to *ἄνδρα τέλειον* mean individual Christians attain to perfect manhood, or does the Church as the Bride meet her perfect husband, or again does the trunk of the Body reach to the heavenly Head, or does the Body of Christ mature into a full-grown man? How does the imagery of maturity relate to Church unity? A similar question emerges where vs. 15 reads *αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὃς ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός*. If the verb is intransitive, is the pronoun

identified with Christ as the Head? What would it mean to "grow into the Head in all respects?" But perhaps the pronoun is to be taken corporately, and the verb as transitive. This would mean that the Church causes all things to grow into Christ's Body and thus be united under his headship. But is this the only alternative that explains a corporate interpretation of αὐτόν and a cosmic reference for τὰ πάντα?

Finally, vs. 16 presents an elaborate physiological metaphor of the Body's growth which has its source in the Head. How do we explain this Head/Body relation? Is it the incidental appearance of two different metaphors with no real connection? If this is unlikely, does "all the Body" include the Head, or simply refer to the trunk of the Body? Earlier we suggested that the author's holistic presuppositions played a part in the Head/Body concept. Does this hold true here? These questions require an exegetical study for proper answers, and to this task we now turn.

## I. CONTEXT

In ch. iv the author begins the paraenetical portion of the letter by urging Christians to walk worthily of their calling. It is soon clear that Christian unity plays a large role in this "walking," and what follows in chs. 4-6 largely deals with those activities without which Christian unity would be impossible. Eph iv 4-16 helps lay the basis for this discussion by emphasizing the God-given grounds for Church unity. The text stands apart from the preceding and following verses in that these deal directly with exhortation. Vss. 1-3 exhort Christians to walk (περιπατῆσαι) worthily of their calling; vss. 17ff resume this theme, albeit negatively, by warning that the readers are no longer to walk (περιπατεῖν) as the pagan Gentiles.<sup>1</sup> Thus the Church, deep in unity and rich in diversity, stands over against the world.<sup>2</sup> Putting off the old nature, and putting on the new nature rooted in Christ, believers are to abandon ungodly ways and imitate God whose nature is manifested and exemplified in the sacrificial love of Jesus.



Since vss. 1-3 set the stage for vss. 4-16 they require brief comment. The author exhorts his readers to lead a life worthy of the calling by which they were called.<sup>3</sup> The roots of Christian unity already appear here in God's calling, i.e. in the whole divine process of salvation effected in Christ and proclaimed through the gospel.<sup>4</sup> The calling (always singular) cannot be separated from the one living God who calls the one Church through its one Lord. Such unity, however, is not static or monolithic; but as ἡς ἐκλήθητε intimates, it bears all the vitality and variety which individual experience of that calling affords.

In exhorting his readers to live in a manner worthy of God's calling, the author describes the essential qualities and dispositions that accompany and characterize this life.<sup>5</sup> The Christian walk is to be marked by its humility, meekness, patience, mutual forbearance in love, and zeal for unity (cf. Col iii 12ff). Scott aptly states: "These virtues are insisted on, not only because they are distinctive Christian virtues, but because there cannot be any real community without them."<sup>6</sup> It is likely that these "fruits" of the Christian life are rooted in the example of Christ. One recalls the words: "I am gentle and lowly in heart" (Matt xi 29). But more important is the example of Christ's sacrificial love shown on the cross. In iv 3, love defines the motive, the raison d'être of "forbearing one another." It enables believers to bind together and fully share each others lives, the good and the bad. But in bringing out this uniting and self-giving disposition, love epitomizes the virtues listed and gives them a positive content.<sup>7</sup> The mutual love that Christians share and practice has its basis in and is response to God's love in Christ (cf. v 1f).<sup>8</sup>

If "love" is a fitting climax to the virtues listed, then the following participial clause is an appropriate expression of what love means for the Church's life. Believers are to be zealous, and vigilant in their efforts to preserve and guard the unity of the Spirit through



the bond of peace.<sup>9</sup> This unity is regarded as a given to be cared for and maintained. In view is the twofold unity brought about by the Holy Spirit dwelling among believers.<sup>10</sup> One aspect is the unity which the Spirit creates between believers. Eadie proposes that the different functions and officers discussed in vs. 7ff are already in mind here.<sup>11</sup> Other scholars refer it to the reconciliation of the Gentiles and Jews.<sup>12</sup> As Chrysostom comments: "The Spirit unites those who are separated by race and customs,"<sup>13</sup> Both the earlier stress on the reconciliation of the Gentiles and Jews (ii 11-22, iii 6) and the fact that the different functions are not yet mentioned, slightly favor Chrysostom's view. But perhaps the two views are not mutually exclusive (cf. I Cor xii 12ff). Whether directly or indirectly, what is said prepares for the following discussion. The second dimension of this unity is the relation between man and the one Spirit. As believers live in harmony with one another in the Spirit, they also live in harmony with the Spirit who supplies in turn the power to walk with humility and meekness, with patience and love. Thus, the Spirit not only creates the unity by His presence, but also sustains it by His presence. Without the Spirit's life-giving presence the unity would not exist.

Such an emphasis on the Spirit's role in unity might easily fall prey to subjective speculation without some objective criteria by which to judge what keeping this unity means in practice. This is given in the phrase ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης.<sup>14</sup> The articles suggest that something concrete is in mind and one recalls ii 14ff, where Christ is called "our peace." There the peace that Christ made between Gentiles and Jews reflected in socio-historical terms the peace Christ established between God and man through the cross.<sup>15</sup> In Christ, the New Adam, the eschatological age of peace has broken into history, and a new united mankind attains its rightful position in the cosmic order.<sup>16</sup> In Christ mankind is no longer divided into the circumcised and uncircumcised; no longer

are men enslaved to the powers of this age; but seated with Christ in the heavenlies (ii 6) and united through him in one Body and one Spirit (ii 16, 18). There and here εἰρήνῃ, like αἰγλή, is a comprehensive concept almost equivalent to salvation. In its close association with the eschatological event of Christ, peace attains a certain objective quality that transcends the meaning of inner tranquility. Thus in Col iii 15 the peace of Christ is the umpire that rules in the hearts of believers.<sup>17</sup> Here it is the bond through which believers are to preserve the unity and harmony of the Spirit.

Σύνδεσμος is derived from συνδέω, "to bind together," and essentially means "that which binds together,"<sup>18</sup> In Col ii 19 the term denotes "bonds" or ligaments," appearing with ἀφαί as part of a physiological metaphor.<sup>19</sup> Perhaps the anatomical metaphor is still in mind at Col iii 14 when love is named σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος, but the general meaning "bond" is equally possible.<sup>20</sup> In Eph iv 3 the term is followed by a reference to "one Body," so again the physiological meaning is possible (cf. Col iii 14-15).<sup>21</sup> For our purposes, however, we may leave the question open and be content with the general thrust of the phrase, "the bond of peace." In Col iii 14 love is the bond; here it is peace. The thoughts, however, are not far apart, since peace, understood in terms of ii 14-18, may be seen as the victory of God's forbearing love in Christ. Appropriately, then, the Christians' walk and forbearance in love finds its parallel in the believers' zeal to preserve the unity of the Spirit through that which (like a ligament of the Body?) binds them together, namely the peace of Christ. The author now begins a lengthy description of the grounds and character of the Church's unity.

## II. EXEGESIS

### The Character of the Pericope

At iv 4 the author departs from his exhortation to describe the God-given grounds and nature of Church unity. This excursus on Church unity



continues through vs. 16, falling into two parts: (1) vss. 4-6 depict the oneness of the Church by presenting seven focal points around which it unites. (2) Vss. 7-16 describe the nature and purpose of the Church's diversity as it grows in its dynamic union with Christ. Both sections contain traditional material. In the latter section the author quotes Ps lxxviii 19 and offers a midrashic interpretation. We discuss the problems related to this usage as they arise in the exegesis. Of special import here is the confessional character of vss. 4-6.

Excursus: The Confessional Character of Eph iv 4-6

In vss. 4-6 seven terse assertions of Christian belief describe Christian unity. The sevenfold formulation serves not so much as the foundation on which the virtuous life (vss. 1-3) builds unity, but as the source from which the virtuous life springs and flourishes and hence preserves unity. In this we agree with Gnllka:

Die praktischen Verhaltensregeln in den VV 1-3 sind auf diese Formeln hingeordnet und empfangen von ihnen ihren Sinn. Man könnte auch sagen, dass die Formeln das geforderte Verhalten begründen, aber besser ist es, dieses Verhalten als die einzig sinnvolle Äusserung einer theologischen Vorgegebenheit aufzufassen, denn diese theologisch vorgegebene Einheit trägt ohne Zweifel den Akzent.<sup>22</sup>

Thus as the author moves from the Church to the Lord, to the God and Father, the theological necessity of the Church's unity becomes clear.<sup>23</sup> The Church's unity emerges from the unity of its life-giving source, the unity of God. The abbreviated and assertive character of the sevenfold formulation gives it a certain creedal quality.<sup>24</sup> Most scholars recognize this confessional or creedal character although they disagree on how the passage received its structure.<sup>25</sup> The obvious starting point is the recurring use of some form of εἰς, climaxing in the affirmation εἰς θεός.

Confessional formulae concerning the oneness and uniqueness of God were common in Judaism.<sup>26</sup> The best known is the shema which was recited by loyal Jews everywhere twice a day: "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one."<sup>27</sup> In Hellenistic Judaism particularly, the shema served as a basis



for further speculation. It is likely that at an early date Hellenistic Judaism laid claim to Stoic  $\pi\alpha\nu$ -conceptions and placed them under the affirmation of  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ .<sup>28</sup> Paul appears to rely on some such source in the creedal formulation at I Cor viii 6.<sup>29</sup> Here in discussing food offered to idols, Paul states in opposition to pagan polytheism: "...yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist." Beyond the opposition to polytheism, however, the affirmation of one God served as the theological basis for the unity of God's people and their Lord's one name or the one temple or the one Law.<sup>30</sup> But the connection between God's oneness and His people's unity is also directly made:  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma \gamma\alpha\rho \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\acute{o} \epsilon\beta\rho\alpha\iota\omega\nu \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\nu$  (Jos. Ant. IV 201). Such formulations were common and often occurred in twofold and threefold forms.<sup>31</sup>

In Eph iv 4-6 we face two questions: (1) How much does this passage owe to previously formulated traditions? (2) What is the particular emphasis of the "one" formula here?

(1) Scholars disagree as to whether vss. 4-6 contain quoted material. Dibelius detects in vss. 5-6 "ein gewisser architektonischer Aufbau;" "...zweimal werden drei Glieder zueinander gestellt; das erste Mal ist  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma - \mu\acute{\iota}\alpha - \epsilon\nu$  das (mit Absicht die 3 Genera abwandelnde?) Bindeschema, das zweite Mal das bekannte Präpositionenspiel, hier mit  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota} - \delta\iota\acute{\alpha} - \epsilon\nu$  s. zu Col. 1,16."<sup>32</sup> He concludes that in vss. 5-6 the author is quoting a traditional formula. Similarly, Cullmann and Neufeld suggest that vss. 5-6 contain a bipartite formula that acknowledged God as Father and Jesus as Lord (cf. I Cor viii 6, I Tim ii 2).<sup>33</sup> Staab thinks it was originally part of the baptismal rite.<sup>34</sup>

It is noteworthy that these scholars exclude vs. 4 as a redaction of the author. Certainly vs. 4b departs somewhat from the text's crisp confessional style. Also, when separated from this context, the mention of

Body and Spirit make an unusually vague beginning for a creed,<sup>35</sup> Indeed, the one Body and one Spirit so vividly recall ii 16 and 18 that in all probability these terms reflect the author's hand. But could vss. 5-6 also have been formulated by the author?

Coutts believes that the author here is "summarizing his theme of unity in and through baptism by taking up the phrases he has already used in expounding it,"<sup>36</sup> Agreement with Coutts' general thesis is unnecessary to note that, of the seven elements, only baptism is not mentioned in chs. i-iii and even this may be implied in places (e.g. ii 6, ii 15-16). Also favoring Coutts' suggestion is the order of the elements. In the context the order is dramatic and reaches a fitting climax in its rising from Church to Lord to God. But would this have had the same effect when separated from its moorings in the letter? We have already suggested that vs. 4 forms a poor beginning for a creed; not because one cannot begin with the Church, but because outside the context of the letter it would not be clear with what one is beginning. There can be less objection to the order, Lord-God, but even this is at odds with the clearest and best parallels in the New Testament (I Cor viii 6 and I Tim ii 5). Also most such formulae in Judaism begin with God, though admittedly not all do.<sup>37</sup>

It is perhaps best to seek a mediating position as do Barth and Schlier. They conclude that while much here owes its Sitz im Leben to earlier formulations, the author himself is responsible for the "total" structure of vss. 4-6.<sup>38</sup> We would go slightly further; it is probable that vs. 4 is from the author's hand. The formulations in vss. 5-6, however, bear more distinct traditional traits. Even so one cannot be certain that the verses as a whole originally belonged together. When one reviews the various acclamations about the one God and one Lord in the New Testament and similar expressions in Judaism, one is struck by the great fluidity of the traditions. In view of these factors, it is likely that the author himself has compiled traditional expressions and formulae,



giving the passage its overall creedal shape. Thus, the text's character is not simply the reflection of the author's sources, but also of his intention to put his statements in a confessional form.

(2) What, then, is the particular emphasis of this sevenfold "one" formula? In view of the letter as a whole, the unity of God's people as expressed in the reconciliation of Gentile and Jew is the most obvious choice. As we have seen, the connection between the unity of God and that of His people was common in Judaism. It is also a recurring theme throughout the Pauline Corpus. In Rom iii 28-30, we read that since God is one, there is only one way to salvation for both Jew and Gentile, i.e. justification by faith (cf. Rom x 12; I Tim ii 4-6). Even more often, the unity of Gentile and Jew is related to the oneness of Christ himself, involving concepts such as baptism, one Body, one Spirit, the old and new man (Gal iii 27, I Cor xii 12-13, Col iii 9-11). Neither race, religion, economic standing, nor sex bars one from belonging to Christ and his one community.

Unlike these other passages, however, Eph iv 4-6 does not mention Jews and Gentiles explicitly. But in light of ii 11-22 and iii 6, 14ff, it is unlikely that the author has forgotten them. Having based his exhortation on the thematic concerns of chs. i-iii, he now focuses on the ongoing theological necessity of the Church unity revealed in the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile. Thus the individual Christian must constantly walk in that unity, must strive to maintain it, yet also recognize his own dependence on it. In this way the Christian's moral life and his particular "grace" (v. 7) are integrated and subjected to the one people of the one God. Thus we agree with Barth when he says:

Finally, in Ephesians the purpose and implication of the confession "One God" is this: God makes the decision, has the power, and performs the deed of making "one new man" out of a mankind divided in hostility. In this epistle God's oneness is directly, i.e. causatively, dynamically, effectively, but also epistemologically, related to the unity of the church. Because God is one his people are one and are to live on the basis and in recognition of unity.<sup>39</sup>



In conclusion we propose that vss. 4-6 bear a confessional character. We think it likely that the author is responsible for the passage's overall structure, as he composed and compiled suitable materials. By his sevenfold use of εἷς, climaxing in εἷς θεός, the author grounds Church unity in the unity of its God and its Lord. The creedal format and its early position in the paraenesis cause the theme of unity to permeate the following chapters. Indeed, the confessional character of the text helps to show that in the Christian walk of love unity is confessed and lived.

### Verse by Verse Analysis

vs. 4: ἓν σῶμα καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα, καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν, In vs. 4 we encounter an array of exegetical problems. Why does ἓν σῶμα precede ἓν πνεῦμα? Indeed, to what does this σῶμα refer, the eucharist, the crucified, the resurrected or ecclesiastical body? Does πνεῦμα refer to the Holy Spirit or to the community spirit? Is the author tapping upon an anthropological truth when he says there is "one body and one spirit?" Finally how is ἐλπίς to be understood? How is the one hope related to ἓν σῶμα καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα? Is the subjective attitude or the objective content of hope in view? What is the relation between hope and the calling? We shall consider the last question first,

The clause ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν suggests a close connection between the one hope and God's calling. Dibelius understands ἐν as εἷς, thus indicating that believers are called into one hope.<sup>40</sup> But this makes τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν somewhat superfluous. A simpler solution is to give ἐκλήθητε a pregnant sense, "to call to be."<sup>41</sup> This allows ἐν its normal sense, indicating the sphere in which believers stand as a result of God's gracious summons. We paraphrase: "You were called to be and live in one hope, the very hope that arises from God having called you to salvation." God's call effects in all believers one and the same hope. Now since this hope belongs to and accompanies His

call, to be called by Him is to be called to be in that one hope. Thus, as Gnllka states: "bedacht ist nicht an den Ruf zur Hoffnung, sondern daran, dass der Ruf in der Weise erfolgte, dass allen dieselbe Hoffnung mit demselben Rufgegeben wurde."<sup>42</sup>

The link between hope and God's calling is also found in i 18, where the author prays that his readers might know "what is the hope of His calling." This is expanded and explained in the two aspects, "the riches of his glorious inheritance in the saints," and "the immeasurable greatness of his power in us who believe" (i 18-19). The basis for this hope is clear in vss. 20-23. There Christ is lauded as the risen one at the right hand of God, having all things subjected under his feet. As discussed earlier, the author sees Christ as the New Adam who gains dominion over the cosmos in fulfillment of Ps viii 6, establishing cosmic order.<sup>43</sup> Noteworthy is how hope is related to this enthronement of Christ as man's representative. Was hope related to a New Adam conception?

In Col i 27 <sup>grounds for supposing that</sup> we find it may have been. There the mystery is defined as Christ among (in) the Gentiles, "the hope of glory." Martin sees this anticipation of restoring man's lost glory as "a trace of Paul's teaching of two Adams. What the first Adam lost in Paradise...is regained by the New Adam, Christ and his people made up of believing Jews and Gentiles."<sup>44</sup> The linking of hope and the unity of Gentiles and Jews is also found in Eph ii 12, albeit negatively. The Gentile Christians were formerly without Christ, "being alienated from the commonwealth of Israel and foreigners to the covenants of the promise, not having hope and godless in the world" (ii 12). Here having hope means belonging to that community whose hope is the Messiah. This hope first seems simply an extension of the traditional "covenants of the promise" to the Gentiles.<sup>45</sup> But as becomes clear in ii 14-18, this Messianic community partakes of a new kind of humanity (ii 15). Here too we detected a New Adam conception at work. Thus Minear's statement, though given in a slightly different context, is



applicable here:

In Christ as the New Adam, the "one man", God offers "acquittal and life" to all men and thus includes all creation within the scope of redemption (Rom. 5-8; I Cor. 15). Those who share the life of this new man are bound together into one new hope.<sup>46</sup>

Hope, viewed as the subjective mode in which believers partake of the Messianic salvation, should not be greatly separated from the objective content of hope, which is the salvation itself. For as E. Hoffmann states: "...hope is not theoretical knowledge about a promised future salvation but a function of a living faith."<sup>47</sup> But notably the new kind of man who shares in this one hope, does so as a member of a new and united humanity. This implies the community of hope, a dimension of hope visible in the fellowship created by the community's united and expectant response to the objective content of God's calling and promise. Thus no person or group partakes of the Messianic hope without partaking of the one Messianic community. Indeed, it is the community's experience of hope that sustains and nourishes the individual's experience. It is not surprising, then, that the author has linked the one hope to the one Body and the one Spirit.

Here, *καθώς* is best taken in a comparative sense, "just as" or "to the same extent that."<sup>48</sup> In this way the Body, Spirit, and hope are connected with the process of God's salvation in Christ, i.e. God's calling in Christ. *Ἐν πνεύμα* is an accompaniment of the calling that God issues to believers in Christ; it refers, as elsewhere in the letter, to the Holy Spirit (cf. i 13; ii 18, 22; iii 5, 16; iv 3, 30; v 18; vi 17, 18). It does not refer to the human spirit in the sense of "communal spirit," as if simply sharing a common and harmonious disposition.<sup>49</sup> Nor is the reference to the anthropological truth that body and spirit are inseparable.<sup>50</sup> To the extent that this *πνεύμα* is seen to animate this *σῶμα*, the point is not the body/soul dicotomy, but the possession of a body by the Holy Spirit, i.e. God acting through His Spirit to bring life to and hence lay claim on the person as a totality,



As discussed earlier, the Spirit serves as the down payment of the future inheritance, or as the seal for the day of redemption.<sup>51</sup> Indeed, the gift of the Spirit was a sign of the Messianic age which has dawned with the coming of the Messiah, Jesus. With the gift of the Spirit the future age has broken into the present in that abiding presence of God among his people, which unites, strengthens, fills, inspires, and even reveals mysteries to believers in Christ. Thus the Spirit is an eschatological gift, and so not surprisingly associated with the one hope. But as already said, the community's eschatological hope is related to the author's New Adam conception. Is then, the one Spirit also associated with this idea?

Evidence of an association between the Spirit and a New Adam concept is slight, often seen only in the nuance of a word. For instance, ἐνεφύσησεν in John xx 22 probably echoes LXX Gen ii 7. However, a clear example linking the restoration of the Urzeit and the Spirit occurs in TLex xviii 10-12:

And he /the Messiah/ shall open the gates of paradise, And shall remove the threatening sword against Adam. And he shall give to the saints to eat from the tree of life, And the spirit of holiness shall be on them. And Beliar shall be bound by him, And he shall give power to his children to tread upon evil spirits.<sup>52</sup>

The passage shows how the Messianic salvation reverses the exclusion of Adam from Eden. In contrast to Adam, the priestly Messiah (who seems to have a positive parallel in Isaac) opens the way to the tree of life and gives his followers the spirit of holiness and power over evil spirits.<sup>53</sup> Like Adam in a negative sense, but also like the positive figure, Isaac, the Messiah here through his actions represents, shapes, and determines the history and fate of "his children."

The clearest example of such a connection, however, comes from the undisputed letters of Paul. Describing Paul's understanding of the age of the Spirit, Davies states:

...as in other respects so in its treatment of the Spirit Paul's mind reverted to the thought of Creation, to the origin

of life. Christ is the Second Adam, who has become life-giving Spirit, and He is contrasted with the first Adam of whom we read in Genesis that 'God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul'. The Spirit is essentially creative, life-giving, and it is a familiar fact that for Paul the whole of the Christian life in its ethical no less than in its 'ecstatic' aspects is the expression of the activity of the Holy Spirit.<sup>54</sup>

Davies is drawing on I Cor xv 45, where Paul discusses the resurrection body. In using the Adam-last Adam typology, Paul compares Adam's creation (Gen ii 7) and Christ's resurrection. Hamilton comments: "In the same way that God breathed the breath of life into the man of dust so that breath and man's life became synonymous, so also at Christ's resurrection the Father breathed the Holy Spirit into His dead Son so that He lived and so that Spirit and life of the resurrected Christ became synonymous."<sup>55</sup> This makes the Christ/Spirit relation especially Christocentric, analogous to the relation between a man and his life. "The grace or the gospel in this fact," Hamilton continues, "is that Christ's life of resurrection and exaltation is a communicable one. It is not confined to Christ. It is a life that can make others alive. It is a life-giving Spirit (πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν)."<sup>56</sup>

We suggest that some such connection between Christ as the New Adam and the Spirit is operative in Ephesians. This means that the blessing that the Spirit brings as a down payment of the future inheritance is nothing less than the new kind of humanity that Christ creates in himself and communicates to believers. Such a new humanity has many facets, but due to its theological implications, the reconciliation and unity of the Gentiles and Jews played a major role in our author's thinking. Thus, the one Spirit is the creative and binding force that brings life and unity to the community of believers in Christ, to the ἐν σῶμα.

Ἐν σῶμα stands first in this sevenfold acclamation of unity, and, as one Spirit and one hope, denotes an aspect of the Christian's united mode of existence. A reference to the eucharistic loaf would be extremely oblique. Nor is it likely that the term is to be limited to Christ's

crucified body.<sup>57</sup> After a call to maintain the unity of the Spirit the most natural reference is the one Church.<sup>58</sup> Still, it is difficult to see how or why the Church stands before the Spirit. Some scholars think the author proceeds empirically, beginning, as Robinson says, "from what is most immediately present to view."<sup>59</sup> A more satisfactory view, however, is that ἐν σῶμα denotes the Church in its vital relation to Christ; it is Christ's Body.

This is best understood in terms of Semitic corporate personality, shaped here by a New Adam concept. Christ as the New Adam is functionally identified with those who belong to him through faith so as to shape their destiny. The redemptive acts made in and through Christ's personal body are seen as acts for and towards his Body the Church. Thus the New Adam through his bodily acts inaugurates the history of a new and united humanity, and is identifiable in it. Understood corporately, ἐν σῶμα indicates the solidarity between the New Adam and the new humanity he began. As suggested earlier, this combines two aspects.<sup>60</sup> First, as a synonym of σῶμα it represents the kind of solidarity usually connoted by kindred, family, perhaps even marriage. Second, it represents the unity of organic wholeness, i.e. the presence of one continuous life principle throughout the different members of an organism. This combination allows the author to make clear his understanding of a united people. A united people results, not from a mere external allegiance, but from a common life, discovered in the person who gives the group its corporate identity. Thus the socio-historical unity of Gentile and Jew is rooted in the Church's solidarity with Christ who establishes peace and creates a new kind of man. As we learn shortly, this life and unity is dynamic; Christ continues to supply life to the community and to sustain and even increase its unity through the diverse ministries he gives.

Understood as the Corporate Christ, ἐν σῶμα logically precedes the one Spirit. If the Body/Spirit relation has anthropological overtones,



then the point is how the Holy Spirit quickens and lays claim on the whole person.<sup>61</sup> Since God through His Spirit gives life to the buried Christ, the Church as Christ's Body must see its own spiritual life as the partaking of his death and resurrection. Thus God calls believers to be in one Body and one Spirit and one hope. Together they are incorporated into the one redemptive history of the New Adam, being quickened together with him through the Holy Spirit, who binds believers together in the one hope of their calling.

Vs. 5: εἷς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα, If the Body, Spirit, and hope indicate the united mode of existence in which Christians were called, then the next verse indicates how this new life is communicated and sustained. The εἷς κύριος is Jesus Christ. The title κύριος appears often in the Church's early confessional and liturgical material.<sup>62</sup> The Aramaic formula, μαρναθα, and the short creedal statement κύριος Ἰησοῦς belong to a very early period of Christian tradition. The affirmation, εἷς κύριος, was itself probably originally contrasted to pagan polytheism (cf. I Cor viii 6).<sup>63</sup> As the risen and exalted Lord, Jesus has been invested with supreme authority over all powers and is the sole mediator of God's salvation to men.

Some scholars interpret κύριος here as almost a substitute for κεφαλή. For example, Robinson comments: "This Body depends for its existence upon one Lord, its Divine Head, to whom it is united by one Faith and one Baptism."<sup>64</sup> But while κύριος and κεφαλή may overlap in meaning, the use of κύριος in such a confessional context is understandable apart from the κεφαλή conception. Κύριος is more personal than κεφαλή, pointing to the believer's dependence on one Lord who without partiality (cf. vi 9) claims personal trust and obedience. There is one salvation through one Lord who in grace blesses all men who come to him through faith, Jew or Gentile (cf. ii 8-12, Rom x 12, I Tim ii 4-6).

As already intimated μία πίστις refers to the one faith through which believers are saved by grace (ii 8). The one faith is not a system

of doctrine,<sup>65</sup> nor simply the individual's subjective experience of trust. Rather as with the one hope, it is the community's faith, expressing that trusting response to the Lord that unites believers both to their Lord, and together in the Lord. Thus this faith attains a specific shape and content determined by the communal experience of trusting its one Lord. The more personal and individual aspect of this one faith is not thereby eliminated, but given a more stable basis, thus allowing it to be expressed concretely in the one baptism.

Possibly ἐν βάπτισμα refers to a corporate event.<sup>66</sup> But more likely it is the Church ritual in which believers individually confess and affirm that the community's experience of trusting its one Lord is now effective in their own lives. As a rite of Christian initiation, baptism is an especially appropriate focal point of unity. Elsewhere in the Pauline Corpus it is related to two dimensions of the Christian experience that also receive attention in Ephesians: (a) the Christian has a share in Christ's death and resurrection (Rom vi 1-4; cf. Eph ii 1-10); (b) the Christian Church is a unity (I Cor xii 12-13; Gal iii 26ff; cf. Eph ii 14-18; iii 6).<sup>67</sup> Coutts points out that Church unity can also be seen from two angles, which occur elsewhere in the Pauline Corpus in connection with baptism.

The theme of unity is seen in two lights. First, the unity in the Church transcends the natural barriers, particularly the barrier of race between Jew and Gentile. Second, the unity in the Church grows out of differences in gifts and functions within the Church, and must transcend differences in temperament. The former is mainly the theme of Gal. iii. 26ff., the latter of I Cor. xii. 12-13. The theme of racial unity runs from ii. 11 to the end of ch. iii in Ephesians. What we may call the theme of social unity runs throughout ch. iv, unity through differing functions, iv. 1-16, unity and peace among Christians through avoidance of anger, etc., and through the cultivation of mercy and long suffering, iv. 17-32.<sup>68</sup>

Coutts analysis does provide a certain rationale for βάπτισμα standing within this creedal statement and for its appropriateness to focus on certain major themes of this letter. Thus the Christian existence to which we are called is communicated and sustained through the one Lord, who



alone mediates God's blessings to all men through the one faith that unites believers both with him and in him, and through baptism which ritually and personally expresses that unity with and in Christ.

Vs. 6: εἷς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν παῶσιν, Finally the unity of the Church reaches its depth in the one and only God and Father of all, who is over all, through all, and in all. Scholars disagree as to what πάντων refers, some translating it as "all things," others, "all Christians."<sup>69</sup> Some manuscript evidence exists for adding ἡμῶν to the last prepositional phrase (e.g. D F G Ψ lat sy). Such weak attestation suggests that it is an interpretive gloss. While not decisive, it does show that the phrase's limitation to Christians was a fairly early view. The scribe probably added the word to make clear what he thought the context implied. Scholars who follow this lead generally point to the main consideration of the text, the unity of the Church. This is clear in vs. 4, and the mention of one Lord in vs. 5 is immediately followed by the Church realities of faith and baptism.

Scholars who argue the opposite view believe other considerations are equally important. Gnllka contends that in view of parallels in Hellenistic Judaism, we should take seriously the "Radikalität des hier sich aussprechenden Monotheismus" and the "Gewicht der vierfachen πάντα-Aussage."<sup>70</sup> We can speak of God as the Father of all things because He is the creator of all things. Robinson argues similarly:

The Apostle is indeed primarily thinking of the Body of Christ and all its members. The unity of that Body is the truth which he seeks to enforce. But when he has risen at length to find the source of human unity in the unity of the Divine fatherhood, his thought widens its scope. The words 'Father of all' cannot be less inclusive than the earlier words, 'the Father of whom all fatherhood in heaven and on earth is named.' And the final clause, 'who is above all and through all and in all', is true not only of intelligent beings which can claim the Divine fatherhood, but of the total range of things, over which God is supreme, through which He moves and acts, and in which He dwells.<sup>71</sup>

While the interpretation of this verse remains difficult, the words certainly include the Church whose members are adopted sons through the



Son, Christ (i 5). But we should also take seriously the creedal quality of the verse. The Christian's claim to sonship is not inwardly derived, but outwardly given in Christ through grace. Our author knows no special class or race that has a corner on Christ's Lordship or God's Fatherhood. It is true that the Church in its one faith is united to its one Lord. But the Church's affirmation is not that its faith makes Christ Lord, or that his Lordship is limited to believers. While the emphasis may lie in Christ's relation to the Church, his supreme Lordship over all things supplies the larger context that gives meaning and substance to the community's one faith and baptism. If Christ is not recognized universally as Lord, it is nonetheless the community's hope that one day he will be. And in the context of confession, what will be may be seen through faith as what is. Likewise, to claim God as Father is to acknowledge that the one God who creates all things is in fact the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ in whom all things are to be summed up or brought under one Head (i 10). So, through the faith that God is what He will be, the author acclaims Him to be the Father of all things.

Vs. 7: Ἐνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ.<sup>72</sup> The author now offers a new perspective on the Church's unity. In vss. 4-6 he affirmed through a sevenfold affirmation that the Church's unity ultimately lies in the oneness of the God and Father of all things. He now continues by describing this unity's rich and diverse character. Although such distinctions as that which formerly divided Gentile and Jew have now lost their importance, each new man in Christ is not a carbon copy of his brother. The unity of Christ's Church, as Gnllka states:

...ist nicht Nivellierung und Gleichmacherei, sondern bewährt sich und kommt zum Ausdruck in der Vielgestalt individueller Züge. Diese stellen sich dar in verschiedenen Diensten und Dienstleistungen, die in der Kirche vollzogen werden. Durch ihren vollzug wird Kirche erbaut, wächst sie als der Leib Christi heran.<sup>73</sup>

The words ἐνὶ δεῦν ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν refer to every Christian; God excludes no Christian from the enabling grace to serve. Just as God destined all Christians to be His sons for the praise of his glorious grace with which He graces them in the beloved (i 5-6); just as He lavishes His grace on all, making known to them the mystery of His will (i 8-9), and as He saves all believers from death and sin by His grace (ii 5,8), so too God gives to all the saints the grace to serve Him. Just as the author prays that his readers will know the hope of God's calling and all that it entails (i 18f), and comprehend with all the saints the unsearchable depths of Christ's love (iii 18f); just as he exhorts his readers to walk worthily of God's calling (iv 1f), to put away the old man (iv 22f), to be wise and discern the will of the Lord (v 15-17), so too he expects every Christian to grow together with his brethren, each exercising in love their divinely given role in Christ's Body (iv 16).

Schlier and Merklein, however, maintain that the diverse structure of the Church is not in view here, but the theological significance of special Church offices.<sup>74</sup> It is to a closed group of specially endowed officials (listed in vs. 11) that vs. 7 refers. Vs. 11 would then establish the evangelists, pastors and teachers within the same circle as the apostles and prophets, and hence secure for posterity their authoritative position in the Church.<sup>75</sup> Of this proposal we make the following criticisms:

(1) If vss. 7-16 were meant to establish the theological significance of these and only these offices, it is odd that the author draws no direct paraenetical conclusions from his argument. Why, for example, does he not ask his readers to obey or follow these whom Christ has set over them (Heb xiii 17; I Pet v 1-5)? Certainly he shows no hesitancy to discuss submission and obedience in other respects (cf. v 21-vi 9). This is especially true if the author intends to secure recognition of the authority of the evangelists, pastors and teachers. If this was a primary concern why did he not make it explicit?

(2) If the author intends to establish an official ministry, then one might expect precision and clarity as to what the offices are. In



fact his language betrays a certain looseness in construction. Scholars still debate whether τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους refer to one or two offices.<sup>76</sup> Whatever the answer, the language is imprecise, if not ambiguous. This is surprising if a primary concern is to enumerate and establish an official list of Church offices.

(3) In vss. 1-3 the author exhorts the readers to live a life worthy of God's calling. This involves an individual responsibility towards fellow Christians, such as forbearing one another in love, and keeping the unity of the Spirit. This unity is a given and in vss. 4-6 the author centers on some key points around which the Church is united. Now vss. 7-16 introduce a new perspective on this theme, indicated by the particle δέ.<sup>77</sup> But if this change in perspective also includes a rather radical shift in whom is being addressed, one might expect the author to make this clear. This is especially so since nothing in vss. 1-6 prepares the reader for such a change.<sup>78</sup>

(4) As we shall argue later, vs. 12 should be read as a whole: "with a view to equipping the saints for a work of service to build up the Body of Christ."<sup>79</sup> With vs. 11 the author probably indicates how certain kinds of gifts have a vital structural relation to other types. In this way the gifts listed in vs. 11 may be considered samples of a ministry of the Word, and this, then, could be distinguished from the more general "work of service" rendered by all saints.<sup>80</sup> But the "lay" person's "work of service" is not thereby any less a gift given by God through Christ. To be sure, their gifts are not of the same measure as an apostle's or teacher's, but they are not any less gifts. This accords well with vs. 7; each has a gift, but according to the measure that Christ gives.

(5) Finally, the Body of Christ image favors vs. 7 referring to every believer.<sup>81</sup> The position of ἐν σῶμα at the beginning of the seven-fold affirmation of unity gives it a pervading influence on the following discussion. This is marked by the term's recurrence in vss. 12 and 16, and in more subtle ways such as the parallel between vs. 7 and vs. 16: ἐν μέτρῳ ἐν ὅς ἐκάστου μέρους.<sup>82</sup> This clearly refers to the individual Christian; to conclude otherwise makes the Body consist solely of Church officials.

We think it best, then, to refer vs. 7 to every Christian. The Church is a Body, as Gnllka states, "in dem es keine toten Glieder geben darf."<sup>83</sup> Thus ἐν δὲ ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν focuses on Church members



individually, and  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  contrasts this to the unity that believers share as a corporate whole (vss. 3ff). Such a conjunction of the One and Many is familiar in the Pauline Corpus (cf. I Cor xii and Rom xii 3ff).

It is the God and Father of all things who grants to each Christian  $\eta\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  ( $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\acute{o}\theta\eta$  = passivum divinum).<sup>84</sup> By God's unmerited favor believers have been both saved (ii 5, 8) and empowered to serve. There is a distinction and a connection between the grace that saves and that which manifests itself in manifold  $\chi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ . In Eph iii 2, 7, and 8  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$   $\delta\omicron\theta\eta\acute{\nu}\alpha\iota$  is a recurring phrase denoting Paul's special grace, i.e. his special ministry and service with regard to the revelation of the mystery and the Gentile mission. This grace is from God, given to Paul personally for the benefit of others (iii 2). It is a gift ( $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ ) that defines him as a servant ( $\delta\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ) of the gospel (iii 7). And in iii 8 Paul's role in the Gentile mission is explicitly defined as his special grace. In each instance  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$   $\delta\omicron\theta\eta\acute{\nu}\alpha\iota$  denotes the imparting of a special grace, a special ministry, or gift of service, which in the context is more specifically applied to Paul's case.<sup>85</sup> The distinction between salvific grace and the special grace to serve seems clear here. The Gentile mission does not constitute Paul's salvation. Still the use of  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  for both ideas suggests some connection.

We see such a connection at work in Eph iv 1-7. The salvation described in Eph ii 1-10 is not mere acceptance of doctrine or an inward state of bliss; it entails a responsibility, a walk worthy of God's calling (cf. Gal i 15f). This calling (iv 1) is God's gracious call to salvation made effective in all believers; the grace (iv 7) is God's gift of service, extended to all believers on the basis of His calling. The grace whereby God calls believers leads to the grace that provides the necessary framework wherein the individual Christian responds to and faithfully works out in concrete service the implications of his salvation. As

the presence of the article suggests, God gives to each Christian the same grace, that unmerited favor that enables the believer to serve.

Even so this "grace to serve" is a ποικίλη χάρις (I Pet iv 10) and God grants His gift κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ. It is possible to take τοῦ Χριστοῦ epexegetically, thus making Christ himself the gift.<sup>86</sup> But in vss. 8 and 11 Christ is clearly the giver and so here too the genitive is best taken as subjective: "the gift that Christ gives."<sup>87</sup> There is a correspondence between what God gives and what Christ gives. God grants each Christian the grace to serve in accordance with the measure or size of the gift that Christ gives to each.<sup>88</sup> Thus God's grace has a certain structure; the same grace is granted to all, but limited and measured differently as to the specific service and activity given to each. This limitation is itself part of God's grace. No one is asked to do or be everything; rather Christ measures out a gift for each that will serve and benefit the whole.

Vs. 8: διὸ λέγει, Ἀναβάς εἰς ὕψος ἠχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν, ἔδωκεν δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.<sup>89</sup> The author supports his assertion in vs. 7 with a Scripture citation, Ps lxxviii 19.<sup>90</sup> Probably sung during a festival procession Ps lxxviii consists of a libretto of songs that center thematically on the Lord's victorious assumption of kingship in Zion.<sup>91</sup> Vss. 16-19 focus on God's choice of Mount Zion as His dwelling place while vs. 19, in particular, pictures God as a victorious king who ascends to his throne, leading captives in triumph and receiving tribute and gifts among men.<sup>92</sup> LXX Ps lxxvii 19 retains this picture with a literal rendering of the Hebrew: ἀνέβης εἰς ὕψος, ἠχμαλώτευσας αἰχμαλωσίαν, ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ.

Our author applies this verse to the ascended Jesus. His text, however, shows important variations as R. Rubinkiewicz outlines:

The text of Eph differs in four points from those of the Septuagint and HT. In Eph there is ἀναβάς instead of ἀναβῆς, the third person of the verb αἰχμαλωτεύειν instead of the second, ἔδωκεν instead of ἔλαβες, and τοῖς ἀνθρώποις



instead of ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ. The most important variant is ἔδωκεν because the others can be understood as a small adjustment of the text that does not change the main idea.<sup>93</sup>

Notably the change to ἔδωκεν alters the text's meaning at precisely the point that makes it useful for the author's purposes.

Taking into account the exegetical techniques of that day, our author could have altered the text himself. But more likely, he is relying on a now unknown textual tradition.<sup>94</sup> This possibility is suggested by the Aramaic Targum:

Thou hast ascended to heaven, that is Moses, the prophet;  
thou hast taken captivity captive, thou hast learnt the  
words of the Torah;  
thou hast given it as gifts to men and also with the  
rebellious, if they turn in repentance,  
the Shekina of the Lord God dwells.<sup>95</sup>

Although Moses is not mentioned at Eph iv 8f, some scholars believe that this Targum tradition is in view.<sup>96</sup> Rubinkiewicz, however, has made a reasonable case that the Targum presupposes an earlier and shorter tradition that refers as the MT and LXX to God rather than Moses.<sup>97</sup> Indeed, a reference to God provides the necessary theological motivation for changing (by virtue of the exegetical technique, "al-tikre") נָקַח, "to take," to נָתַן, "to give."<sup>98</sup> If this is correct, our author is applying a former reference to God to Christ. This fits well with vs. 7 which suggests that a correspondence exists between God's grace and Christ's gift. Christ as God's representative ascends on high and takes captive a host of captives.

Most modern commentators refer the captives mentioned in iv 8 to the demonic powers.<sup>99</sup> At i 20-23 our author stresses Christ's position of authority over these powers and ii 4-6 shows how believers share in the victory. So here Christ as king ascends his throne in victory, leading his enemies captive (cf. Col ii 15) and distributing the spoils of victory to his people (or perhaps his army). Another alternative is suggested, however, by TDan v 10-11.<sup>100</sup> There the salvation of the Lord is said to arise from the tribes of Judah and Levi and he will do battle with Beliar:



καὶ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν λήψεται ἀπὸ τοῦ Βελίαρ, τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἁγίων. καὶ ἐπιστρέψει καρδίας ἀπειθεῖς πρὸς Κύριον. καὶ δώσει τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις αὐτὸν εἰρήνην αἰώνιον. In view of this text the prisoners may be the Christians themselves, released from their former captivity now to serve a new master. The king in ascending to his throne, brings with him a host of newly released prisoners and shares with these the spoils of his victory over their former master. For our purposes we need not choose between these alternatives.<sup>101</sup> Implied in both is the defeat of the demonic powers and the giving of gifts to those formerly under (or at least threatened by) their dominion. In both, the gifts confirm the reality of the king's victory and the establishment of his rule. The plural δόματα provides the rationale that there is not one gift, but many.

Vs. 9: τὸ δὲ Ἀνέβη τί ἐστίν, εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς;<sup>102</sup> With vs. 9 the author begins a midrash-pesher interpretation of the Psalm citation.<sup>103</sup> His purpose is to show how Christ's acts correspond to and fulfill what Scripture ascribes to God.<sup>104</sup> The author concentrates on ἀνέβη and ἔδωκεν, and so stresses the link between Christ's ascent and the giving of gifts.<sup>105</sup>

The logic of εἰ μὴ ὅτι tells us clearly that the ascent presupposes a descent.<sup>106</sup> But does the descent precede or follow the ascent? Some scholars argue that the descent refers to Christ's descent in the Spirit at Pentecost.<sup>107</sup> As we have seen, the Targum rendition and also other Rabbinic literature associate Ps lxxviii 19 with Moses' ascent to receive the Torah and his descent to give it.<sup>108</sup> Possibly the Psalm was read in this connection during the festival of Pentecost.<sup>109</sup> Accordingly, Eph iv is meant to show that the Psalm refers to Christ, not Moses, and in contrast to giving the Torah, Christ descends in the Spirit and gives gifts.

There are, however, important objections to this thesis. (1) There is little to indicate that the author is re-interpreting the Targumic

tradition about Moses. Moses and the Torah are not mentioned, and Christ's ascent is of a different order.<sup>110</sup> (2) While the Psalm may be related to the festival of Pentecost this proves little as to whether the descent is before or after Christ's ascent. The ascended Lord and the outpouring of the Spirit with spiritual gifts at Pentecost could be joined without implying Christ's descent after his ascent (cf. Acts ii). (3) The text itself gives no indication that the descended one comes in the form of the Spirit, but simply suggests that Christ departs from heaven. The Spirit is not mentioned.<sup>111</sup> (4) This passage would be unique in the Pauline Corpus if it meant Christ left his heavenly throne to give gifts.<sup>112</sup> (5) Finally, according to ii 6 the believers are already with Christ in the heavenlies. There is no need for Christ to descend; believers have ascended with him. What evidently is needed is a statement that the believer's exalted life cannot be separated from the humble and obedient life of him who descended to the lower parts of the earth.

It is probable, then, that the descent precedes the ascent, pointing to Christ's entry into the realm of humanity at its deepest level, including death.<sup>113</sup> Perhaps the imagery was latent in the Psalm itself. As God descended from Sinai and identified Himself with a group of former slaves, wandering with Israel through the wilderness, defeating her enemies, and ultimately ascending Zion in victory, so too Christ descended from heaven, identifying himself with mankind, defeating the powers of this world, including death, and ascending in victory.<sup>114</sup> Thus, to say "he ascended," implies that he descended. The victory indicated by the triumphant procession was won in the arena of human existence. The exalted and ascended Lord, and hence the Church who is united to him, cannot be separated from the cross of reconciliation (ii 16).

Vs. 10: ὁ καταβὰς αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ ἀναβὰς ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, The αὐτός is emphatic: "he who descended, this very one, is also he who ascended above all the heavens,"<sup>115</sup> By affirming in this

way the continuity of the person who descended and ascended, the author shows the continuity of that person's function and mission. The descent points to Christ's humility, meekness, his patience and forbearance in love. It is this humble one who descends to the very depths of human existence and thereby encounters and destroys man's innate hostility towards God and his fellow man; it is this one who fulfills the Psalm verse and ascends on high above all the heavens.

The contrast between εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς and ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν is cosmic in proportion.<sup>116</sup> Christ's descent and ascent leaves no aspect of the creation untouched; his mission is all-embracing. The contrast between γῆ and οὐρανοί recalls i 10 where the mystery of God's will is defined as gathering all things in heaven and earth under Christ's headship.<sup>117</sup> Christ's mission is to establish a new cosmic order and initiate God's rule. If Christ's descent means his identity with man's plight, he does not shed his humanity in his ascent. Christ not only died for the Church, but was exalted for the Church. The New Adam not only defeats the spiritual powers, but also establishes a new divine order in which believers, Gentile and Jewish, now live in peace and unity. But the character of this exalted life cannot be separated from him who descended in love and humility. It is this descended one who ascended above all the heavens to fill all things.

ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα, The conjunction ἵνα may denote either purpose or result, and sometimes both.<sup>118</sup> Here, as often in Jewish thought, when actions of the divine will are in mind, purpose and result merge.<sup>119</sup> The clause may be said to indicate the "intended result" of Christ's descent and ascent. Τὰ πάντα is possibly limited in scope, referring to either the Church or to the evil powers. But in view of the contrast between earth and heaven, the entire cosmos is the preferable reference (cf. i 10; Col i 20).<sup>120</sup> The author possibly uses πληροῦν to identify the omnipresence of God with that of Christ (Jer xxiii 24). If



God is "above all, through all, and in all" (vs..6), Christ who has ascended to His right hand is also present with Him. As seen earlier God's omnipresence, his immanence and nearness, is often thought to be mediated to the world through divine qualities and powers.<sup>121</sup> Sometimes these are conceived as a totality such as Wisdom or Logos or Spirit. In Col i 19 and ii 9 we saw that just such a totality dwells in Christ and is mediated through him.<sup>122</sup>

Here the context concerns Christ's descent and ascent, and the imagery is probably best described as that of a king who by visiting all his domain establishes his rule and sets up his standard, thus filling it with the glory and blessings of his victory.<sup>123</sup> Of course, such victory means judgment for those who refuse to submit to the new order. Considering that behind this king stands God's full authority, the association with God's immanence via πληροῦν, becomes more understandable. In its application to the Christ event, this imagery bears a redemptive bias. Through his redemptive acts Christ mediates God's fullness to all things in revelation and for salvation. In Christ's kingly visitation, God's kingdom comes near for blessing and for judgment. The idea, then, goes beyond that of the mere "extent" of Christ's presence and power to seeing its effect on its object. "All things" is viewed in its need for redemption and reconciliation. To make this clearer, we render the phrase "make all things full," or "fulfill all things."

Vs. 11: καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφῆτας,<sup>124</sup> The αὐτός is intensive; it is this descended and ascended one who now acts. If Christ as the heavenly Lord takes on God's attributes and his redemptive mission is in this way viewed as God's act, then the correlation between God's grace and Christ's gift is made clear. What God does in Christ towards believers, Christ makes manifest in the Church through the diverse ministries and services that he grants and constitutes.<sup>125</sup> But again, the gifts that the ascended Lord brings to the Church

cannot be separated from the character and function of the descended servant's earthly ministry. It is significant that the gifts listed can so easily describe Jesus' ministry. He too was an apostle sent by the Father, a prophet who spoke forth the divine word, bringing as an evangelist glad tidings, guiding and protecting his flock as the Good Shepherd, instructing them as a teacher in the ways of God revealed through Scripture.<sup>126</sup> This ministry of Jesus is even now active in the Church as the exalted Lord has given some men to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and teachers.<sup>127</sup>

The author's starting point is the universal Church and he lists gifts prevalent throughout the Church. Unlike I Cor xii and Rom xii, which enumerate persons and activities, Ephesians only mentions persons. These are, however, spiritually endowed persons, whose God-given talents and activities have a specific direction and hence provide a life-long service. The service these persons bring to the Church (be it prophecy, evangelism, etc.) defines their authority and office, not vice versa.<sup>128</sup>

τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, First in order and rank come the apostles.<sup>129</sup> Ἀποστόλος is derived from ἀποστέλλω, "to send," and denotes generally one who is sent or commissioned, i.e. an authorized envoy or emissary. While use of the term is fluid in the NT writings, it probably indicates here semi-technically a person who has seen and been commissioned by the risen Lord.<sup>130</sup> So as the Father sent Jesus, the exalted Lord now sends those to whom he appeared, to preach and found churches. Their commission is confirmed through the signs and wonders that they work and more profoundly in the existence of the churches they establish.<sup>131</sup> Besides the Twelve, the most obvious member of this group is Paul. But it is likely that the group was wider still, including such figures as James, the Lord's brother (I Cor xv 7, Gal i 19), Barnabas (I Cor ix 6, Acts xiv 14), Andronicus and Junias (Rom xvi 7), and perhaps Silvanus (I Thess ii 6).

Eph ii 20 and iii 5 show that the apostles along with the prophets form the Church's foundation and are set apart to receive the mystery of Christ. This stress on the wider circle of the Church's foundation is coupled with a stress on Paul's apostleship to the Gentiles. This double emphasis suggests that the letter intends to substitute for face to face contact with the Apostle Paul and thus to establish its readers securely on the Church's apostolic and prophetic foundation. Whether this intention entails that the apostles belonged to the past generation is less certain.<sup>132</sup> The apostles could have been an existing class without being an ongoing class.

τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, Second come the prophets, which here as in ii 20 and iii 5 refers to <sup>Christian</sup> NT prophets.<sup>133</sup> <sup>Christian</sup> The NT prophets were highly esteemed in the early Church being ranked second only to the apostles (I Cor xii 28; cf. also Rom xii 6).<sup>134</sup> This esteem is also reflected in Ephesians. The prophets stand beside the apostles as foundation stones of the Church (ii 20) and as special recipients of the mystery of Christ (iii 5). This assessment agrees well with the view of the prophet as the Spirit's mouthpiece for imparting mysteries and revelations of God's will.<sup>135</sup> While this included predictions about the future, the gift had a much broader base, i.e. addressing God's Word to the various and particular needs of the Christian community. Thus the prophet exhorts, comforts, consoles, and generally discloses the divine will for particular situations. Prophets were sometimes but not necessarily, itinerant.<sup>136</sup> Their usual locus of activity was the worship gathering and their usual audience, the community of believers.

τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς, Next come the evangelists.<sup>137</sup> The term εὐαγγελιστής occurs only three times in the New Testament: here, Acts xxi 8 in reference to Philip, and II Tim iv 5, where Timothy is exhorted to do the work of an evangelist. As the term itself suggests, their function is to announce the glad tidings of Christ. Also the



examples of Philip and Timothy indicate involvement in bringing the gospel to unbelievers and aiding in the establishment and subsequent care of churches. In this way their function is like that of the apostles. R. N. Flew states, "...every Apostle is an Evangelist, but every Evangelist was not an Apostle."<sup>138</sup> The distinction perhaps arose as more and more apostleship entailed having been an eyewitness to the resurrected Christ. Since the evangelist's preaching necessarily relied on the apostolic witness, they had a vested interest in the preservation of apostolic tradition and were perhaps considered its guardians. Only later, however, was the term specifically applied to the four Gospel writers.<sup>139</sup> Harnack may be correct that the evangelists are mentioned here because "the epistle is addressed to churches which had been founded by non-apostolic missionaries, and not by Paul himself..."<sup>140</sup>

τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους, Next the author states that some are given to be shepherds (or pastors) and teachers. Only here in the NT writings does ποιμένες denote Church leaders, whom many scholars identify with the bishops and elders (cf. Acts xx 28; I Pet v 2f).<sup>141</sup> The term still retains a metaphorical element and indicates overseeing the spiritual welfare of the flock. It has connotations of guidance, leadership, protection and care. The shepherds are closely followed here by the teachers. A teacher's function is to instruct others in Christian truth and doctrine, especially through expositing the OT Scriptures.<sup>142</sup> Such instruction involves relating Christian truth to the whole and on-going life of the community and its members. Both terms are governed by a single article and this suggests that the two functions to some extent overlap and complement one another.<sup>143</sup>

In listing these gifts, the author plainly includes what he considers the most important gifts for the Church. While clearly diverse, they also bear common features. We suggested that the gifts are characteristic of Jesus' own loving service. Cambier suggests that they all presuppose

knowledge, while Barth finds a common point in the function of "speaking."<sup>144</sup> These points are not mutually exclusive and one may justifiably speak as Barth of a ministry of the Word, or more in line with Ephesians, a ministry of the Gospel. But how are we to understand this hierarchal structure of the Church? That some gifts are more important than others could possibly be deduced from the Body image; life is impossible without certain organs. But this does not mean that other gifts are forgotten. If what is true of Jesus' ministry impinges on and defines the character of the gospel ministries, then what is true of them impinges on and defines the giving of all gifts.<sup>145</sup> If there are diverse gospel ministries, different in kind and measure, this variety can be expected to permeate the entire life of the Church. If there is a unity in character and purpose among the diverse gospel ministries, then there is unity in all ministry. The purpose of these gifts is ultimately applicable to any gift, though in different measure. The starting point for understanding the giving of special gifts, then, is that of humble service to others.

Vs. 12: Πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων εἰς ἔργον διακονίας εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, The author now sets forth the immediate purpose for which Christ gave some to be apostles, others to be prophets, etc. This is done "with a view to equipping the saints for a work of service towards building up the Body of Christ."

As the article suggests, the accent falls on τὸν καταρτισμὸν. Καταρτισμός, a NT hapax<sup>ον</sup>legomena, comes from καταρτίζω. The basic idea of the word group is "to put in order," "to make fitting."<sup>146</sup> From this emerge connotations such as "mending," "restoring," "perfecting," "preparing," "equipping."<sup>147</sup> Καταρτισμός is used as a technical medical term for "setting bones";<sup>148</sup> even here one discerns the general idea, "to put in order." In Eph iv 12, the saints are put in order, i.e. made ready and fit for service to the Church. One detects here the author's wholistic thinking: having made himself a gift in his descent, the ascended Lord



gives gifts to men, so as to make them gifts and so forth. The totality of Christ's giving some to be apostles, etc. (vs. 11), embraces the totality of the gift of service given to each Christian (vs. 7). The gifts of apostleship, prophecy, etc. are not substitutes for Christ's presence, but the mode of his being present.<sup>149</sup> So while it may be through the agency of apostles, prophets, etc., it is ultimately Christ who equips saints and provides in the appropriate measure, all that is necessary εἰς ἔργον διακονίας.

The term διακονία is derived from διακονέω, which originally meant "to wait at table."<sup>150</sup> From this it came to mean "to provide or care for," and then more generally, "to serve."<sup>151</sup> Distinct from other Greek terms for serving, "διακονέω has the special quality of indicating very personally the service rendered to another."<sup>152</sup> Even so in Greek thought it bore negative connotations. While service to the state acquired a measure of dignity, it was thought better to be served (i.e. rule) than serve.<sup>153</sup> In the NT writings we find both the specific sense, waiting at table (e.g. Luke xvii 8, John xii 2), and the general sense, loving assistance and service rendered to neighbors (e.g. Mark xv 41, Matt xxv 42f, xxvii 55).<sup>154</sup> The latter category acquires a more technical orientation when such service is linked to a particular office, such as the deacon (e.g. I Tim iii 10, 13). But even more important is the new estimation of service. Whoever wishes to be great must become a διάκονος, since "the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many" (Mark x 25, Matt xx 28, cf. Luke xxii 27). The concept of service attains its deepest theological expression in the sacrificial death of Jesus.

Διακονία indicates the activity of διακονεῖν or the discharge of a διάκονος.<sup>155</sup> In the New Testament it denotes the original sense of (1) waiting at table (Luke x 40). This may be the meaning at Acts vi 1, though it could refer more broadly to (2) material, especially financial



support.<sup>156</sup> This latter usage is common in the undisputed letters of Paul regarding the collection for Jerusalem (Rom xv 31, II Cor viii 4, ix 1, 12, 13). The supervision of material support perhaps gave early rise to (3) the office of deacon (cf. Phil i 1). In Rom xii 7 διακονία might bear this sense.<sup>157</sup> The term is also related to (4) the service of church leaders. This is undeniable in Acts i 17, 25 where it indicates the ministry of apostleship. Elsewhere, however, the dimension of office is gathered more by association than any technical usage. In Rom xi 13, for instance, it is not Paul's ministerial status that he glorifies to provoke the Jews, but the service, i.e. the actual evangelization of the Gentiles. In any case, διακονία has a broader sense denoting (5) "any 'discharge of service' in genuine love."<sup>158</sup> Such service can be rendered by angels (Heb i 14), by one individual to another, e.g. Mark to Paul (I Tim iv 11), or by the Church (Rev ii 19) in diverse ways (I Cor xii 4).

In Eph iv 12 the question is whether (4) or (5) is intended. Abbott favors (4) when he states: "...in a connexion like this, where offices in the Church are in question, διακονία can only mean official service; and this does not belong to the saints in general."<sup>159</sup> This view requires a comma between the first and second prepositional phrases. But had the official ministry been intended, it is odd that, as the most general of the three descriptions, εἰς ἔργον διακονίας is not listed first.<sup>160</sup> The anarthrous construction of the phrase is also surprising, were the official ministry in view.<sup>161</sup> With many modern scholars we find it more natural to omit the comma and take the two phrases closely together.<sup>162</sup> As Christians are created in Christ for the good works that God has prepared (ii 10), so too God grants the saints the grace whereby Christ equips them for such a good work of service.

εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Being equipped for a work of service looks towards and finds its goal in the upbuilding of Christ's Body, the Church. Having shown the connection between the first

two phrases it is grammatically much simpler to take all three phrases in succession, than to introduce a scheme of co-ordination for which the text gives little indication.<sup>163</sup> The first phrase looks to the second, the second to the third, allowing the deepest and ultimate object to come last. Thus neither becoming a specific gift like an apostle, nor being equipped generally for a work of service is an end in itself, but the means whereby Christ's Body is built up. As Salmond puts it: "These Apostles, prophets, etc. are the means provided by Christ whereby all the members shall be made capable of performing their several parts in order that at last the whole church may be built up in its completeness as the body of Christ."<sup>164</sup>

Οἰκοδομή occurs 18 times in the New Testament, and has primarily two senses: (1) what is built and (2) the process of building.<sup>165</sup> In the only occurrences outside the Pauline Corpus it refers to the various structures of the Jerusalem temple (Matt xxiv 1, Mark xiii 1, 2). Otherwise it is used figuratively. Under (1) Paul uses the term along with an agricultural image for the Church (I Cor iii 9). The Church is God's field and His building. The apostles are God's fellow workers in building the Church, or planting and watering the field. In II Cor v 1, it describes the heavenly body, not made of hands, which the believer receives at death or probably the resurrection.<sup>166</sup> Under (2) we see that Paul's authority is given to him for spiritual upbuilding, not for tearing down (II Cor x 8, xii 19, xiii 10). But it is equally clear that the term can depict the proper purpose of all Christian activity. Thus, Christians should exercise discreet judgment in relation to their "weaker" brethren (Rom xiv 19, xv 2). "Building" in such places connotes more than the addition of knowledge, but the enduring strength of love. As I Cor viii 1 suggests knowledge puffs up, while love builds up. This contrasts two types of increase; one is an inflation of the ego which will ultimately collapse under the weight of its own arrogance and pride. The other is an enduring strength that comes only from the exercise of genuine and steadfast love.



This close relation between love and building underlies the use of οἰκοδομή in I Cor xiv. Following the love hymn of ch. xiii, οἰκοδομή occurs with παράκλησις and παραμυθία (xiv 3). Of these three it stands alone as the criteria by which individual charismata are evaluated (xiv 5, 12), and also by which the entire worship service is guided and conducted (xiv 26). The term, then, is theologically comprehensive, depicting spiritual enhancement in every aspect.<sup>167</sup>

In Eph ii 21 πᾶσα οἰκοδομή denotes the Church in the process of being built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, growing into a holy temple in the Lord.<sup>168</sup> The metaphor is not pinned down to a specific application, such as the congregation or believer.<sup>169</sup> Whatever is built on, whether of Gentile or Jewish origin, is shaped and fitted, and grows into a holy temple in the Lord. The idea is not simply that more Christians are added, but that each stone, each section, or room, has its place in the overall design, and progresses towards perfection.<sup>170</sup> Even here, growth in quantity is not divorced from growth in quality.<sup>171</sup> In Eph iv 29, however, οἰκοδομή bears the broader meaning of a process of spiritual enhancement.<sup>172</sup> Vs. 25 shows that the process in view is not adding new members to the community, but further enhancing the reality which makes the community what it is. As an expression of love, the impartation of grace, this process should be neither aimless nor abstract, but proper to its object; it should "fit the occasion."<sup>173</sup>

In iv 12 and 16, οἰκοδομή is a nomen actionis, and refers to the building process and not the completed result.<sup>174</sup> But what does it mean to say that the Body of Christ is "built up?"<sup>175</sup> Some scholars think that the objective-historical construction of the Church is in view, i.e. the missionary-numerical growth of the Church.<sup>176</sup> Support for this view might be sought in ii 21, where the Church is seen under construction and increasing towards becoming a holy temple. But there the building is the activity of God or perhaps Christ. Here the activity while inspired by



Christ and ultimately dependent on him is more closely associated with the functions of individual members.<sup>177</sup> Such upbuilding probably does include the Church's numerical growth, but it is unlikely that the idea is confined to this. Our author knows and uses οἰκοδομή in the comprehensive sense of spiritual enhancement (iv 29), and this meaning is likely here and in vs. 16. Indeed, the latter verse makes explicit that the upbuilding occurs in love.<sup>178</sup>

If it is not so much the numerical increase of Body members, then in what sense does the Body increase? In the following verse, the idea is linked with unity and maturity, while in vs. 16 the idea of growth is connected.<sup>179</sup> Especially vs. 16 stresses the activity of individual members intimating that "building up" is a strengthening of the Body that comes from the Body members functioning and exercising properly. Christ inspires and feeds those ministries listed, enabling them to communicate his inspiration and nourishment to other members so they might likewise exercise their function properly, and so create harmony, co-ordination, and growth throughout the whole. If this framework only becomes explicit in vs. 16, then here it is enough to stress that this Body is Christ's. Any such upbuilding of his Body concerns a fuller integration between the person who acts through his various members (Christ acting through Christians), and the person who as a whole is acted upon (the Corporate Christ, the Church). The Church cannot be conceived apart from its union with Christ, nor can the unity between its members. This double aspect is important and the Body concept depicts the unity the Church has with Christ and in Christ. So when this Body of Christ receives upbuilding, what receives enhancement is that particular unity of the Church within Christ. This is even clearer as we review the goals of this upbuilding in vs. 13.

Vs. 13: μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα κ.τ.λ., The entire process whereby gifts are given to equip the saints to serve in the building up of Christ's Body (=the upbuilding process), is

itself neither endless nor aimless. It is provided and continues "until all of us as a whole reach the journey's end at the unity that comes with our believing and our knowing the Son of God, at a man mature and full-grown, at a ripeness of age that properly belongs to the fullness of Christ." The use of *μέχρι* without *ἄν*, but with the subjunctive, shows an affinity with a purpose or final clause.<sup>180</sup> But affinity is not identity and the temporal condition placed on the upbuilding process should not be overlooked.<sup>181</sup> This process is effective until certain hopes are realized and goals attained. The absence of *ἄν* probably indicates that the result is not a mere hypothetical possibility, but expected and certain.<sup>182</sup> The ground of this certainty lies in the execution of the divine will. The efforts of believers are not in themselves sufficient to effect this final aim; yet those involved do have an important role. Gnülka summarizes well: "Das einleitende 'bis wir' (*μέχρι*) zeigt neben einer Finalität auch eine Zeitliche Dehnung und damit einen Prozess an, der aber nicht zwangsläufig über die Beteiligten kommt, sondern an dem sie sich zu beteiligen haben."<sup>183</sup>

Church goals are also intimated by *καταντάω εἰς*. The words mean literally "to come to" or "arrive at a destination," then figuratively "to attain something" or "reach a goal."<sup>184</sup> The three phrases beginning with *εἰς* are co-ordinate in construction and parallel in thought.<sup>185</sup> They do not represent three different stages of attainment (as stops on a journey) nor are they different destinations reached at the same time. The three goals give us different perspectives on the same theme; the first is further clarified by the second, the second by the third.

Just when this journey is completed or how the destination is reached is not stated. While the temporal connotations of *μέχρι* are indefinite, an eschatological perspective is likely.<sup>186</sup> This is supported by the motif of perfection and maturity, and the fact that only the Church as a whole (*οἱ πάντες*) attains this goal. If with the Christ event the new



eschatological age has broken into the old, this new age has still only begun to appear.<sup>187</sup> Our author does not only anchor the Church's faith in the past, but also orients believers to the future. The whole upbuilding process seems to belong specifically to a period of overlapping ages. The Church is the primary place where the new age makes its presence known to the world and its powers available. But the Church is still in the world and subject to its dangers. Christ, then, has made provision to enable the Church to live in a manner worthy of its calling and to move towards its God-given destiny.

The Church attains its final destiny not as individuals, but as a consolidated whole, οἱ πάντες. The article tends to contrast the whole with the part and so supports a corporate meaning.<sup>188</sup> We should not translate "everyone" or "all of us," but "all of us together," "all of us as a whole," or even "the whole of us." This does not exclude individual attainment of the possibility of such individual attainment apart from the whole community. This perfecting process is not achieved piecemeal, but all the members of the Church arrive at their final destination together.

εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ,<sup>189</sup> The Church as a whole is to attain the oneness and harmony that comes with and arises from Christians believing and knowing the Son of God. In view is not a oneness between what we believe and what we know (as if the problem were epistemological), but the harmony and concord of the Church.<sup>190</sup> Nor is it likely that πίστος means a body of doctrine.<sup>191</sup> As in vs. 5, it indicates the community's common response of trust, commitment, and confidence in its Lord. While this faith has a specific shape and content, this is not determined by set formulae, but by the living experience of its object, the person to whom such trust and confidence are committed. Similarly, knowledge does not refer to the intellectual grasp of abstract principles, but the cognitive apprehension of



experience. As K. Sullivan says of ἐπὶ γνῶσις in the Pauline Corpus:  
 "This is not merely thought about an Uncaused Cause transcending creation,  
 but recognition of a Person and willingness to obey him."<sup>192</sup>

The object of both faith and knowledge is Christ, the Son of God.<sup>193</sup>  
 The articles before both faith and knowledge point to the definite faith  
 and knowledge that Christians have already experienced and which is  
 directed towards ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. In the Pauline Corpus the title de-  
 notes the special relation between God as Father and Jesus Christ as  
 Son.<sup>194</sup> Though not used abundantly it is connected to nearly every aspect  
 of Christ's mission. It occurs in contexts concerning Christ's parousia  
 (I Thess i 10); his final subjection of all things to God (I Cor xv 28);  
 his resurrection (Rom i 4, cf. Gal i 16); his pre-existence and incarna-  
 tion (Gal iv 4, Rom viii 3f, Col i 13); his suffering and death (Rom v 10,  
 viii 32, Gal ii 20). Elsewhere it indicates, as Schweizer puts it, "the  
 content of the Gospel or of proclamation" (Rom i 3, 9; II Cor i 19, Gal i  
 16).<sup>195</sup> In its only occurrence in Ephesians it seems a fitting and preg-  
 nant description of the comprehensive object of faith and knowledge. The  
 Father of the Lord Jesus Christ destines Christians to sonship through His  
 beloved, whose blood means redemption and forgiveness (i 3ff). Christ as  
 the New Isaac offers himself willingly to death and thus provides access  
 to the Father (ii 14ff). The author prays to the Father of Glory that  
 their eyes may be opened to the riches of salvation and the power mani-  
 fested in Christ's exaltation (i 15ff); he bows before the Father from  
 whom every family in heaven and on earth is named, to ask that his readers  
 might be filled with Christ's love (iii 14ff). It is with reference to  
 this one God and Father of all things (iv 6) that Christ as the New Adam,  
 the New Isaac, fulfills the Psalm in his descent and ascent and acts with  
 the Father's full authority, fulfilling all things. This exalted and  
 royal Son provides what is necessary to build up his Church until it  
 reaches the unity that comes with and arises from believing and knowing

him. Since this believing and knowing is ultimately a response to his mission, the unity that emerges from such faith and knowledge cannot be separated from the character and attributes of his person manifested in his mission as God's Son.

When the ultimate character of this goal is kept in view, the state of affairs envisioned could be likened to that in Jer xxxi 31-34 or Isa xi 6-9. In any case, the accent falls on τὴν ἐνότητα.<sup>196</sup> In iv 3, this unity concerns unity both among Church members, and with Christ through the Spirit. Here too, faith and knowledge not only bind us to each other but also to the Son of God. The more Christians believe in and know Christ as the Son who descended in all humility and meekness, with patience, forbearing them in love, the more eagerly they will maintain the unity that the Spirit creates with-in Christ. In iv 3, this unity is to be maintained, not created. In effect, "maintaining the unity of the Spirit" involves a built-in enhancement or growth factor; it is teleological. In vs. 13 its "telos" or goal becomes clear in that the unity of the Spirit either weakens or strengthens in ratio to the continual refinement and development of the faith and the knowledge of God's Son. In turn, any advance towards the unity that comes with and arises from believing in and knowing God's Son is to be seen in an ever deepening awareness of and zeal for the unity of the Spirit.

The implication here is that disunity appears where believers are faithless towards God's Son and ignorant of his love that surpasses knowledge. Such faithlessness and ignorance is not a private affair but is manifested in relation to one's brothers. Because of such failings the unity must be maintained and worked at in the bond of peace. The goal here is that the Church will fully realize the oneness and harmony that comes with and emerges from its faith in and knowledge of God's Son, and so be perfectly united with-in Christ. This is even clearer when the author clarifies that believers as one Body mature into a Perfect Man.

εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, This phrase's point of reference is much disputed, scholars being divided into three camps: (1) Some scholars refer the phrase to the individual Christian.<sup>197</sup> All Christians are to attain perfect manhood, i.e. become perfect men. (2) Other scholars refer it to the exalted Christ. This proposal takes different forms: (a) Schlier thinks that the Body (=trunk) moves towards and arrives at its heavenly Head, i.e. Christ, the Perfect Man.<sup>198</sup> (b) Barth, rejecting Schlier's proposed gnostic framework argues that the Church is now seen as a welcoming or wedding procession going out to meet the exalted king at his parousia.<sup>199</sup> (3) But many scholars would agree with Schweizer's assessment that "man den 'vollkommen Mann' schwerlich anders als kollektiv verstehen kann."<sup>200</sup> In this case, the Perfect Man is the whole Church, or better, the Corporate Christ.

In determining the alternative best suited to the context the following points are germane:

(i) The author uses οἱ πάντες not πάντες. We have already noted how the article here stresses the whole over against the part and so supports a corporate interpretation. The author does not state explicitly from what viewpoint we should understand this "whole" of which the individuals are parts, but leaves it to be inferred from the context. The mention of Christ's Body in the previous verse provides the most probable reference. It is as members of Christ's Body that all of us as a whole arrive at the stated goal, a man full-grown and perfect.<sup>201</sup> This point speaks strongly against view (1). Had the author wished to speak of the individual's attainment of the goal after he has just emphasized through οἱ πάντες that we attain this goal only as a corporate whole, then he certainly would have needed to state that all of us together attain εἰς ἄνδρα τελείους. Any attempt to solve this problem by labeling the expression an abstraction, (i.e. perfect manhood) falls short, since with



οἱ πάντες the abstraction would more easily apply to the corporate whole than the individual part.

We are left, then, with views (2) and (3), and the use of οἱ πάντες offers little to choose between them. It could refer to the Body reaching its full-grown and adult manhood (3), or the Body as the trunk reaching its Head (2a), or perhaps the Body as the Bride meeting her perfect husband (2b).

(ii) The author does not say we all together "become" a "perfect man," but "attain to," "come to" or "reach to" a perfect man. This point has been used against the corporate interpretation (3). For instance, Van Roon states:

...it is, however, carrying exegesis too far when the words μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες...εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον are in fact translated as 'until we all together...become a single perfect man.'

The three adjuncts belonging to the verb καταντᾶν, all introduced by εἰς are indicative of purpose. But this does not mean that καταντήσωμεν means 'to become.' Each time, the matter concerns an aim that must be realized.<sup>202</sup>

Schlier and Barth also find support for their respective positions in their understanding of καταντάω.<sup>203</sup> But while καταντάω does literally and metaphorically indicate the arrival at a destination, it really makes no comment as to the process whereby the goal is attained.<sup>204</sup> Taking into account the figure of Christ's Body one readily sees that this Body arrives at a full-grown man through a process of maturing. The movement is not, then, from not being a corporate person to being a corporate person, but from being a corporate person to being a mature corporate person. The use of καταντάω cannot be said to favor any alternative over the other.

(iii) The author says εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, not εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα τέλειον. Percy states that the "artiklose ἄνδρα τέλειον" cannot denote a distinct figure.<sup>205</sup> We agree that the anarthrous construction makes it difficult to ascribe the phrase to a definite individual. But it does not prohibit a reference to a distinct kind of person or figure.

While the identity of this person is left to be inferred from the context,<sup>206</sup> a perfect man is clearly distinct from an imperfect one, or even a perfect woman or perfect child. Thus in terms of identity the phrase is indefinite, but the kind of person pictured is quite concrete and distinct.

This point favors (1) or (3) over (2). If (1) were intended, then the identity of the individual Christian is immaterial to the point being made. If (3) were intended, the identity of the corporate person would be secondary to the kind of corporate person that is being pictured. The identity of this indefinite figure could be left to the context. But if (2) were intended, the language is strained. For under this view the identity of the Perfect Man cannot be considered secondary to the kind of person pictured. One would have expected the article in this case, and in fact references to Christ himself elsewhere in the verse have the article (cf. also vs. 15 where Christ is the Head).

(iv) The author says εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, not εἰς ἄνθρωπον τέλειον. The noun ἀνὴρ refers generally to an adult male as opposed to a female or a child, and unlike ἄνθρωπος it rarely denotes "humanity" or "mankind."<sup>207</sup> The adjective τέλειος in conjunction with ἀνὴρ and in contrast to νήπιος (vs. 14) means "fully developed," "mature," "full-grown."<sup>208</sup> The accent is on the full development of a person from childhood to adulthood. It is a person whose faculties are fully integrated and operative, and whose potentialities are fully actualized. For a Jew, however, such physical maturity cannot be separated from one's relation to God. The unity and maturity of a body-person is ultimately God's gift, and should not be separated from the connotations of completeness and wholeness in relation to God. The Full-grown Man, fully mature and united is in whole and part "holy and blameless before Him" (i 4), "without spot or wrinkle" (v 27).

The use of ἀνὴρ rather than ἄνθρωπος has been variously assessed. Scholars who take the "one new man" of ii 15 corporately for the Church understand iv 13 to mean that this person reaches adulthood.<sup>209</sup> Others object to this scheme; van Roon states: "...it is not very likely that the ecclesia of Eph. 4:13, which is the γυνή of Gen. 2:24 in Eph. 5:31, should be so unequivocally regarded as ἀνὴρ of Eph. 4:13."<sup>210</sup> Barth too questions the masculinity of the expression: "Yet why should Paul speak of a perfect 'man' if in reality he means a perfect bride? While in Eph 2:15 he used the Greek term denoting 'man' in general (anthropos), in 4:13 he chose the noun anēr which distinguishes a male adult from a woman or child."<sup>211</sup> Barth further notes that ἄνθρωπος "includes women and it describes humans in contrast to animals, spirits, plants."<sup>212</sup> Murray also seems to reject a corporate interpretation because we do not find ἄνθρωπος, but ἀνὴρ.<sup>213</sup> Even most of the gnostic texts that Schlier brings forth speak of an ἄνθρωπος τέλειος, not ἀνὴρ τέλειος.<sup>214</sup>

We must be careful here to distinguish the issues involved. The objection of van Roon and Barth largely stems from identifying Christ's Body with Christ's γυνή in v 22-33 (see ch. iv). It is, of course, possible that in varying contexts the author uses Church images that conflict when juxtaposed. But granting a preference for consistency we note that in v 22-33 the author argues from the Body of Christ concept, not to it.<sup>215</sup> The starting point is the unity of Christ and Church; if Christ is the Head, the Body is not the Bride per se, but Christ and Church united, the whole Body of him who is the Head.

More serious than a possible conflict in the "sex" of Church images, is the objection that ἀνὴρ is inappropriate to indicate a corporate humanity. This objection stems from a failure to distinguish between a corporate type and a corporate image (or picture). It is true that ἄνθρωπος can mean "mankind" in a way that ἀνὴρ cannot. In fact, we suggested that in ii 15 ἄνθρωπος does designate "one new mankind,"



i.e. one new kind of man, a group type.<sup>216</sup> We call this a group type to avoid the misunderstanding that arises from calling it a corporate person. The word "corporate" often evokes the idea that some are this part of the person and others are that part, an idea more readily expressed by the Body of Christ image. Now if as suggested οἱ πάντες picks up the Body of Christ imagery, then ἀνὴρ readily continues this corporate picture.<sup>217</sup> Here the choice of ἀνὴρ over ἄνθρωπος actually enhances rather than detracts from the author's corporate vision of the Church. Ἄνθρωπος, besides lending itself more readily to an abstract interpretation, also lacks the nuance of maturity and adulthood which ἀνὴρ bears. The use of ἀνὴρ speaks for view (3), not against it.

(v) The author relates ἀνὴρ τέλειος to the theme of unity. This occurs implicitly through the Body of Christ concept and also explicitly in the preceding co-ordinate phrase τὴν ἑνότητα τοῦ πιστέως κ.τ.λ. The parallel is not as van Roon suggests between "knowing the Son of God" and "being a perfect man," but between "the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God," and "a perfect man who manifests such unity in his members." Similarly, the contrast between ἀνὴρ τέλειος in the singular and νήπιοι in the plural,<sup>218</sup> suggests that the individual babes who mature into perfect men do so only as they attain as a whole to a single perfect man.<sup>219</sup> Thus where we moderns speak of unity being strong or weak, our author describes the varying degrees of unity and disunity in terms of maturity and immaturity. This point, which is lost under views (1) and (2), favors view (3).

The above considerations make alternative (3) the solution<sup>\*</sup> most congenial to the context. This view is also congenial to the overall theological perspective of our author. As proposed the Body of Christ concept conveys the author's New Adam theology. The "full-grown man," then, pictures Christ's Body in its complete state of redemption, the perfected corporate humanity of the New Adam. This picture envisions the unity both

among believers, and between Christ and believers. Similar to the Body concept, the Perfect Man translates for the readers the author's *wholistic* thinking into a corporate image. It shows the Church fully mature in its organization under one life principle, one person, Christ himself. This is a good example of what has come to be known as corporate personality.

εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, The author now more precisely defines the ἀνὴρ τέλειος. The first question is whether ἡλικίας means age or stature. Evidence outside the NT writings suggests that "age" was the more common meaning, varying in connotation from "the age of strength" to "legal maturity."<sup>220</sup> Here τέλειος and νήπιοι favor age, and μέτρον does not necessarily rule this out.<sup>221</sup> Scholars who prefer "stature" generally maintain that καταντάω and πλήρωμα have spatial connotations.<sup>222</sup> However, καταντάω is placed under a temporal condition (μέχρι) and πλήρωμα is a semi-technical term which may or may not exert its spatial (or for that matter its temporal) connotations. On the whole the evidence favors the idea of age and so describes a person in the prime of life, full of strength and fully developed.<sup>223</sup>

The words τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ recall i 23.<sup>224</sup> There the phrase indicated the relation between Christ's Body and Christ as the Head. Christ, the New Adam, fills the Church with the powers and attributes of his new humanity, even as the Head functions as the vehicle whereby exaltation, life, and blessings are mediated to the Body. Here too τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ refers to the totality of the divine qualities and powers of the new humanity revealed in Christ and communicated through him to the Church. In i 23 πλήρωμα defined σῶμα; here it defines the σῶμα that attains to ἀνὴρ τέλειος. While possible, it is unlikely that τὸ πλήρωμα defines the Church's goal per se. Had the author written μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the meaning would be plain: "the measure of maturity proper to Christ's Body." But what would be

missing and what is the likely reason for choosing πλήρωμα, is any indication that the Church's movement towards its goals comes from an inward dynamic whose source is Christ.<sup>225</sup> The Church attains its goals as the result of being constantly filled with Christ's qualities and powers. From iii 19 we learned that this filling is an ongoing process and that these qualities and virtues may be summed up in "love." Thus while the Church participates in achieving its goals it does not attain them by its own efforts. Even the activity involved in believing and knowing the Son of God is a response to Christ filling the Church with the totality of his own humanity, namely love. This inner dynamic of Christ at work in, among and through Christians creates unity and moves the Church to its goal, "the full measure of maturity that belongs to, or better, that properly comes to the totality that emerges from Christ, the New Adam, filling believers with the attributes and powers of his humanity."

Vs. 14: ἵνα μηκέτι ὤμεν, Vss. 14-15 form a syntactical unit governed by the conjunction ἵνα. The entire clause stands in co-ordination with the μέχρι-phrase in dependence on the thought of vss. 11-12.<sup>226</sup> Vss. 14-15, then, define from a different perspective the purpose for which Christ gives gifts and services for building up the Church. While vs. 13 limits and defines the upbuilding process by presenting the Church's final and ultimate destiny, vss. 14-15 depict the purpose of the upbuilding process in terms of what is now needed for the Church to attain its eschatological vision. This change in perspective allows the author not only to define further the purpose of the upbuilding process, but also to clarify what change or movement is intended by the statement that the Church "arrives at" its goal of unity. Picking up the idea of maturity from vs. 13, this movement is described negatively in vs. 14 and positively in vs. 15.

νήπιος, In moving towards the goal of being a ἀνὴρ τέλειος, the Church cannot remain immature, subject to deceit and error. Christ



provides gifts and services to build up the Church so that Christians might no longer be νήπιοι.<sup>227</sup> The term can merely denote young children or legal minors (cf. Gal iv 1-3). But it is also used pejoratively for what is immature, childish, or infantile (cf. I Cor iii 1f, xiii 11, Rom ii 20, Heb v 12f). The childish characteristics tapped on here are helplessness, instability and gullibility. The term pictures the Church in a weak state of unity, caused by the immaturity of its members.<sup>228</sup> Their helplessness, instability and gullibility not only affect them individually but cause division and strife.

κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας, Here the metaphor shifts; yet the change in figure brings out the qualities of immaturity. As babes are helpless and unstable in the face of the harsh elements of the world, they are, like small boats unable to hold a steady course, at the mercy of the waves and wind.<sup>229</sup> Thus they are tossed by waves and whirled to and fro by every wind of the teaching. Rengstorf and Merklein are probably correct that τῆς διδασκαλίας refers to Christian teaching.<sup>230</sup> The warning, then, is as Rengstorf avers, "against being swayed by each variable wind with the claim of being doctrine and of bringing the will of God as such."<sup>231</sup>

ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης,<sup>232</sup> It is possible to take ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων with the participles and so indicate the element or atmosphere in which the tossing and whirling occurs.<sup>233</sup> Against this, however, is the change of metaphor indicated by κυβεία. The term originally meant dice-playing and from there comes the idea of "trickery" or sleight of hand."<sup>234</sup> While some scholars understand the term here as "chance" or "fickleness,"<sup>235</sup> it more likely carries a derogatory meaning, showing how the teaching is perverted by the trickery of men.<sup>236</sup> The words ἐν πανουργίᾳ probably further describe the men who deal falsely in the dice-play. Πανουργία originally denoted "a readiness for anything,"<sup>237</sup> In the NT writings it

always has the evil connotation of "cunning craftiness" (cf. Luke xx 23, II Cor xi 3). The phrase introduced by *πρός* defines that with a view to which the craftiness is effective. *μεθοδεία*, appearing only here and vi 11 in the New Testament, means "scheming," "plotting," or "wile."<sup>238</sup> The scheming is further defined by *πλάνη*, which means "error," "straying or wandering from the truth."<sup>239</sup> Thus the idea is that of the : scheming that strays from the truth, "the deceitful or mendacious scheme."

The verse may be paraphrased: "in order that we might no longer be babes, being tossed by waves and whirled to and fro by every wind of what is taught by the sleight of those men with a (= who have a) cunning cleverness for the deceitful device." This interpretation suggests a warning against false prophets and teachers. Since the early Church was constantly plagued by some such false teaching, the author perhaps had no specific situation in view. In any case, the indictment is too general to deduce who these people are or what they taught.

Vs. 15: *ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ*,<sup>240</sup> The author now depicts in positive terms the change described negatively in vs. 14. *Ἀληθεύω* probably bears its usual meaning "to speak the truth."<sup>241</sup> Even so, "speaking the truth" probably represents the person's total disposition to the truth. In Jewish thinking mastery over speech can epitomize mastery over one's total moral behavior. A good example is Jam iii 2: *εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει, οὗτος τέλειος ἀνὴρ, δυνατὸς χαλιναγωγεῖν καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα* (cf. vss. 3-12; Matt xii 34; also Rom ii 13f). To speak the truth, then, is a mark and condition of maturity and growth. It involves a resisting of one's own proneness to evil or the vain, empty arguments of others (cf. v 6), and a sticking to the facts, thus allowing the truth to determine and characterize the speech act. The discipline implied here concerns one's inward disposition especially as it bears on relating to others. The proper mode and means of such relating is indicated by the medium of this truth-speaking, i.e. love.<sup>242</sup> *Ἐν ἀγάπῃ*

does not simply limit the speech to a certain kind, "loving speech," but more comprehensively shows the medium through which truth is communicated, "speaking the truth in and through love." This does not mean that "truth" has no content. Behind the "truth" of "speaking the truth," stands the "word of truth" (i 13) and "the truth in Jesus" (iv 21).<sup>243</sup> Believers, then, speak the truth of Jesus in and through mutually sharing the love of Jesus. Thus while "speaking" epitomizes the believer's moral activity in relation to others, "in love" defines this so as to make love the language of truth.

Such emphasis on love is common in the Pauline Corpus generally and Ephesians particularly.<sup>244</sup> In Gal v 22 love heads the fruits of the Spirit and perhaps comprehends them all.<sup>245</sup> In I Cor xii 31 love is "the more excellent way" while in Rom xii 10 it fulfills the law. Above the other virtues, the Colossians are to put on "love which binds everything in perfect harmony" (Col iii 14). In Ephesians it is in love that God destined believers to sonship through Christ (i 5); on account of the abundant love with which He loved believers, God unites them with Christ in his exaltation (ii 4f). Not surprisingly, then, God's love in Christ, the "beloved," is the basis for morality. As "beloved children," believers are to imitate God and walk in love even as Christ loved them and gave himself for them (v 1f). Here a clear link exists between Christ's love and his sacrificial death. This sacrificial love creates a bond between Christ and the Church (v 25) whose union now defines human marriage such that love of one's wife is nothing less than love of oneself. Even with such a bond established, love must be nurtured and fostered (cf. v 29) and continually expressed in the believers' mutual forbearance (iv 3). To this end, Christ has equipped the saints so that they might avoid error and speak the truth in and through love, growing in their mutual relationships so that the whole Body may upbuild itself in love (iv 11-16). Little wonder, then, that the author rejoices over the love his readers



show toward all the saints (i 15), or why he prays that they, being rooted and grounded in love, may know the knowledge-surpassing love of Christ (iii 17ff). Fittingly he closes with a blessing on "all who love our Lord Jesus Christ with undying love" (vi 24). Love forms the basis of all genuine moral conduct whether human or divine.

αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα, "Speaking the truth in love" involves an organic life (cf. iv 25) that moves toward its God-given destiny. Growth is not something other than ἀληθεύοντες ἀν' ἀγάπῃ, but a way of defining the latter conceptually, and more specifically, teleologically. In contrast to the aimless activity of babes, Christians are to grow and mature.

With most scholars and in line with ii 21 we take αὐξήσωμεν to be intransitive.<sup>246</sup> Schlief, however, objects to this interpretation:

Gewöhnlich versteht man das αὐξάνειν...τὰ πάντα noch vom Wachsen des Leibes Christi, der Kirche, als solchen. Αὐξάνειν bzw. αὐξεῖν wird dabei als Intransitivum genommen und τὰ πάντα verstanden. Dann wäre freilich als das Ziel, das Christus bei seinen 'Gaben' vor Augen hatte, nichts anderes erwähnt als das, was schon V. 12 gesagt war. Der Gedankengang wäre dann, verkürzt wiedergegeben, der: Christus gab seine Gaben zum Aufbau des Leibes, damit wir als reife Christen in jeder Beziehung zu ihm hinwachsen, von dem her der ganze Leib seinen Aufbau besorgt. V. 14f. würde V. 12f nur wiederholen und V. 16 würde den Gedanken vom Wachstum des Leibes zum drittenmal formulieren. Anders ausgedrückt: in dem μέχρι καταντήσωμεν...εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, V. 13, wären wir schon bei dem angelangt, was dann V. 15 mit αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτόν nochmals gesagt ist, obwohl dieses letztere in einem von V. 13 abhängigen Finalsatz steht und also doch das Ziel auch jenes καταντᾶν angibt. So verstanden, wäre V. 15 eine Tautologie.<sup>247</sup>

If Schlief is correct and αὐξάνω is transitive, then τὰ πάντα is its direct object. In this case, τὰ πάντα would refer to either the Body of Christ (cf. I Cor xii 19), or to the cosmos, "those things in heaven and on earth" (cf. i 10, iv 10). Van Roon refers it to Christ's Body such that Christians cause "the whole structure" to grow into him who is the Head.<sup>248</sup> But this view makes vs. 16 mostly redundant (though perhaps not utterly void of meaning). Schlief applies τὰ πάντα to the cosmos, "the All":

Der ganze Ausdruck meint dann soviel wie: das All wachsen lassen zu ihm hin, der da ist das Haupt, Christus. Damit ist aber auch klar, was das letzte Ziel des erhöhten und seine 'Gaben' gebenden Christus ist: seinen Leib, die Kirche, so aufzubauen, dass in ihm und durch ihn und im Vollzug seines Wachstums auch das All sich zu Christus hin erhebt.<sup>249</sup>

This has the final consequence: "dass das All sein Haupt in Christus hat and sein Leib bei Christus ist..."<sup>250</sup> Schlier bases this striking identification between the cosmos and Christ's Body on Eph i 10. He interprets "gathering up of all things under Christ's headship" to mean that the All is incorporated into Christ's Body and so attains final salvation. It is debatable whether the author held this view.<sup>251</sup> Schlier fails to distinguish between the headship of the cosmos and headship of the Church. Bringing all things under Christ's authority and rule, and thus bringing the cosmos to its God-intended unity, can be and is distinguished from being Christ's Body.<sup>252</sup>

Other considerations are also against this interpretation.<sup>253</sup> (i) It forces σῶμα to mean two different things in vs. 16, first the Church, then the cosmos.<sup>254</sup> Yet the author does not make this distinction clear. (ii) Αὐξάνω would have a different meaning here than in ii 21. (iii) Nowhere else in Ephesians or the New Testament is it said that "the All" grows. (iv) Other NT instances of αὐξάνω as transitive have God as subject. (v) If τὰ πάντα is not often used adverbially, this does not exclude the possibility. Eph i 23 is, at least, debatable.<sup>255</sup>

(vi) Finally we note that vss. 14-15 do not simply further explain the purpose of the upbuilding process, but also give a new perspective from which to examine that purpose. In vs. 15 the growth motif expresses a teleological movement toward a unified center or goal. The question, then, is what grows? Schlier asserts that it cannot be Christ's Body since according to vs. 13 the Body has already attained perfection.<sup>256</sup> This overlooks the eschatological picture painted by vs. 13 and ignores the change of perspective in vss. 14-15. Vs. 13 places a temporal condition on vss. 11-12 so as to make the Church's final destiny the aim and



goal of the upbuilding process. Vss. 14-15, in co-ordination with vs. 13, define the purpose of vss. 11-12, only now showing that the upbuilding process is the Church's means of participating in the attainment of its eschatological destiny. So if vs. 13 envisions the Church attaining its final destiny, then vss. 14-15 picture what living with that eschatological vision means for the Church's ongoing historical life. If Christians are to build up Christ's Body until it attains to perfect manhood, then this entails that Christians "no longer be babes." Growth, then, emerges as the positive content of participating in the movement indicated by *καταντάω*. It says positively what "no longer being babes" says negatively. If the immaturity of "babes" describes the Church as weak and feeble in its unity, then "growing into him" depicts the teleological movement from weak unity within Christ to strong unity within Christ. We paraphrase: "that we as members (weak and immature as they may be) of Christ's Body might grow into him with respect to all things, into him who is the Head." Thus in vs. 15 it is Christians as Body members who grow, and this "growth" is intransitive.

Taking *αύξάνω* as intransitive raises two questions: (i) into whom or what do Body members grow, and (ii) with reference to what do we grow? The first question is answered by *εἰς αὐτόν*; the second by *τὰ πάντα*. (i) The words *εἰς αὐτόν* are further defined by the relative clause, *ὃς ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός*, and so *αὐτόν*, in some sense at least, refers to Christ. Also noteworthy is the mention of *ἡ κεφαλὴ* before *Χριστός*. This confirms that the Body image is already in mind in the earlier part of the verse. It seems unlikely, however, that *αὐτόν* could refer directly to Christ as the Head. The idea of a body growing into its head would have been as incomprehensible to the author's readers as to us.<sup>257</sup> Attempts to avoid this problem by taking *εἰς* as "unto" or "in relation to" have been unsuccessful.<sup>258</sup> In ii 20 *αύξάνω εἰς* clearly means "grow into." So how, then, are we to understand *αὐτόν*?



A more satisfactory solution is to be found in a corporate interpretation of εἰς αὐτόν. Best writes:

To grow up (and the word αὐξάνω is used of a child growing up) is to achieve maturity, to become an adult, to attain εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον. But the Church does not merely grow up; it grows up into Christ. This surely implies more than that the Church grows up to resemble Christ. We have already encountered, with reference to baptism, the phrase εἰς αὐτόν (Χριστόν). Christians are baptized into Christ; this, we saw, meant that they entered into the corporate personality which is Christ. Our present passage conveys the same conception of corporate personality; such is the full-grown man of v. 13; such underlies the teaching about the Church as the Body of Christ. We may, therefore, conclude that it is true also of the present use of the phrase αὐτόν.<sup>259</sup>

As already suggested, the author is thinking in corporate categories, largely dominated by the Body of Christ image. The idea, then, is that the members develop in their unity and integration with the person who is this Body. We have here a tension between what is and what will be, the indicative and the imperative. As Best states: "The Church is in Christ, yet it is not perfect; to that it must grow. A status is conferred, yet at the same time there must be a moral effort to attain that status, to make it reality towards the world outside the Church."<sup>260</sup> The thought, then, is similar to vs. 13. Only there the author stresses the final destiny towards which the Body moves, the Perfect Man. Here he explains what it means for the Body to participate in the attainment of its ultimate destiny: we as immature members of the Body grow into a ἄνδρα τέλειον.

But how could αὐτόν convey so powerful a thought? How was the reader to know that the corporate goal envisioned here is the ultimate eschatological reality of the Church? The use of αὐξάνω with its teleological implications and vs. 13 itself prepare the reader for this. But the author leaves no room for doubt, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός. As seen earlier ἡ κεφαλὴ represents the whole person in its exalted mode of existence, the goal and source of the Body's life.<sup>261</sup> Here especially it is the member par excellence as it defines the corporate αὐτόν in a particular dimension, namely its heavenly eschatological reality. The

Body grows up into the corporate person who is then wholistically typified by the Head functioning as the eschatological goal of the Body's life.

(ii) With reference to what, then, do Christians grow into the Corporate Christ? In taking αὐξάνω as intransitive τὰ πάντα must be an accusative of reference or respect. Most scholars simply translate "in all respects" or "in every way." But Meyer is correct that "the article has not generally been attended to."<sup>262</sup> He interprets the more definite phrase as "in all points of our growth." Similarly one could refer it to the Body, "with reference to the whole of its parts." But these renderings while plausible, verge on redundancy. Another possibility exists, however. Τὰ πάντα in Ephesians usually refers to everything in the cosmos, to things in heaven and on earth (cf. i 10, 11, iii 9, iv 10, cf. i 22-23). Perhaps we are to grow up into Christ with respect to all things, whether on earth or in heaven.<sup>263</sup> Having warned the readers against being swayed to and fro by the wiles of worldly men, he affirms that Christians are to become more and more what God intends them to be in relation to the world in all its facets. This does not mean that the world is the focal point of growth, nor the standard whereby growth is measured. Christians do not grow with reference to all things as if the Body were expanding to fill all things. Rather we grow up into Christ with reference to all things. The Church remains distinct from the cosmos, though it exists within it. The image, then, is essentially inward. The Body grows up and matures into the Full-grown Man whose relationship to all things in heaven or on earth is what God intends, the Man who shares the promised blessing of having all things under his feet (cf. i 22-23).

ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, χριστός,<sup>264</sup> As already mentioned ἡ κεφαλὴ defines the corporate αὐτόν in its heavenly and eschatological mode of being. This point bears even more force when we observe the link between κεφαλὴ and τὰ πάντα. Christ as κεφαλὴ easily denotes the ultimate

goal of the Church, because he is now by his exaltation the eschatological Head of all things (cf. i 22-23). As the New Adam Christ has introduced a new cosmic order in which all things are put under his feet. But above everything of which he has been made Head, he has been made Head in a special sense to the Church. Even now Christ's Body enjoys the blessings that the New Adam bestows by virtue of his new position at the right hand of God. This privileged position with Christ manifests itself in the one new kind of man who is neither Gentile nor Jew. The unity of the one Body expresses the Church's unity with its one Lord who has made the two one. But even more, this Body, whose members are often weak and immature, is to grow up into the Full-grown Man in its relation to all things, things on earth or in heaven. The unity between the Church as Christ's Body and Christ as the Head will then be complete, a corporate man totally integrated within himself and to his environment.

As the Head, then, Christ is functionally identified with the whole Body as the goal of growth. Such a functional identity does not mean "being identical." The Church as Christ's Body does not become the Head; it rather participates in the life and blessings with which the Head fills it. So, growing into Christ means sharing ever more fully in that life and those blessings until the Church attains full maturity in all that God intended man to be in the world. Christ as this Head may be so identified with the goal of the Church's growth because as this Head he mediates God's gift of life to the Body, filling it with the qualities and powers of his existence, and thus enabling it to grow.

Vs. 16: ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα, With an elaborate physiological metaphor the author summarizes the general thrust of the preceding verses. The main points are clear: the Head is the source of the Body's unity and growth; each member plays its role in the Body's ongoing life; the Body thereby builds itself up in love, indicating a qualitative rather than quantitative increase. But the details of the passage are often difficult



to untangle. Barth comments: "In the original language the diction and syntax of this verse are 'rather incomprehensible.' A word by word translation of the whole clause would be totally obscure."<sup>265</sup> Barth describes the text as a mixture of architectural, physiological and sociological ideas which almost defies explanation.<sup>266</sup>

Clearly, however, the physiological image of the Church dominates the verse's construction and presentation. The architectural language used, bears on the Body conception. This is possible because of the tendency in the ancient world to correlate the two images using one to explain the other. Any sociological conceptions arise naturally from the application of the metaphor to a social reality. By and large we have physiological imagery before us.

The words ἐξ οὗ indicate that Christ is the source of Church unity and growth. Strictly speaking the masculine relative pronoun refers to Χριστός, not κεφαλή. Howard and Caird conclude from this that the Head is not linked in any physiological sense to what follows.<sup>267</sup> This overstates the pronoun's significance. The pronoun does focus attention on Christ's person as opposed to the anatomical position of the Head. Such a focus is natural when dealing with a metaphor, but even more plausible if the physiology reflects Semitic influence.

The Head represents the whole person in a particular function, and it is this personal function that our author indicates by describing Christ as Head. The wholistic interrelation between a bodily function and the person who functions facilitates the oscillation between the metaphor and the reality that it depicts. Here the function or activity in view is that of being the source of unity and growth. As the head indicates the whole person receiving necessities of life such as air, food, light, sound, and communicating these to the body so as to engage it in the process of unity and growth, so Christ as the Head receives for the whole Church, the Corporate Christ, what is necessary for divine life and communicates this

to the whole Body so as to involve the Church in unity and growth. Such engagement may be considered passive since without the Head's activity, life would be impossible. But as the feet when walking elicit an appropriate response from the hands, so too Christ's actions as Head require a response from the Body members.

The broad activity of growth, being practically synonymous with the process of life itself, requires a response from the members which is nothing other than their own proper activity for the maintenance of the whole. (This probably made it easy for the author to adapt the popular idea of an organism.) So if, by functioning as Head, Christ communicates to the Church what is necessary for its life, its unity and growth, then each member, to participate in the life of this Body (as so engaged by the activity of the Head), must provide its own proper activity that promotes in its own measure the unity and growth of the whole.

From this viewpoint the Body's unity with its Head now expresses the members' unity with the person who is this Body. If the Head (acting as the source of unity and growth) typifies the whole person, then being a member of the Body who is this person means responding appropriately to the activity of that person which is represented by the Head. Thus the unity of the Head and Body is in fact the total integration of the Body members with the person whose activity is indicated wholistically by the Head. The unity of the Body entails the members' unity with the person who is this Body in the mode of being its Head. From the acting and functioning of this Head, all the Body is united and grows.

πάν τὸ σῶμα, These words refer to the whole Body as involved in the growth process. What such engagement entails is soon clear in the ensuing participles. Meanwhile we note that the Head itself is engaged in this process. Πάν τὸ σῶμα includes the Head as any member representing the whole also represents itself.<sup>268</sup> If the feet indicate the person as walking, then obviously the feet partake in the action of walking. The

feet stand along with the other members as participants in the action that the feet represent. Thus in our case, πᾶν τὸ σῶμα has not lost sight of the Head who is the acting source of the growth. That the feet or the head represent the whole person in their respective functions, suggests they are "model" participants in their respective activities. Here the whole Body is engaged in growth: as the acting source of that growth, the Head also models proper participation in that process.

συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβασζόμενον, The whole Body being involved in the growth process requires the members to be continually joined together and united. Growth, then, is manifested in the unity of the Body, and the unity of the Body manifests its growth. This joining of unity and growth shows that unity is not static but moves towards its proper end, which as we will see is to build itself up in love.

Συναρμολογούμενον is formed from σύν and ἀρμολογέω.<sup>269</sup> This compound form appears only in Ephesians (cf. ii 21) and sources dependent on it. So possibly the author himself added σύν to the verb.<sup>270</sup> The simple form, ἀρμολογέω, does occur in non-Christian sources and has roots in architectural phraseology. After the analogy of λιθολογέω, τριμματολογέω, and μιλλτολογέω (cf. also φηφολογέω), ἀρμός, which generally denotes a fitting or connection, is combined with -λογέω to denote "fitting together," "to join."<sup>271</sup> Robinson states:

Ἀρμολογεῖν, then, represents the whole of the elaborate process by which stones are fitted together: the preparation of the surfaces, including the cutting, rubbing and testing; the preparation of the dowels and dowel-holes, and finally the fixing of the dowels with molten lead.<sup>272</sup>

Since ἀρμός could also refer to joints of the body (IV Macc x 5, Heb iv 12), the application to Body imagery is more easily understood.<sup>273</sup> The use of building imagery in a physiological context is also not surprising. The body itself could be considered a building (II Cor v 1f). By using συναρμολογέω, then, the author expounds on his Body imagery.



Συμβιβασόμενον is the passive present participle of συμβιβάζω which in non-Biblical Greek literally means "to cause to stride together."<sup>274</sup> It can also mean "to bring together" as in the reconciliation of persons, or in philosophical usage "to compare" or "infer" and eventually "to show," "to expound," "set forth." In the LXX the term means "to teach" or "to instruct" someone with regard to something. In the New Testament, the Greek understanding, "set forth," is attested in Acts ix 22, and the LXX understanding, "instruct," in Acts xix 33.<sup>275</sup> In Col ii 2 the meaning of συμβιβάζω is debated, though most modern exegetes opt for "to hold together," or "unite."<sup>276</sup> This is certainly the meaning in Col ii 19, which forms an inexact parallel to Eph iv 16. Two aspects of unity, "contacts" and "bindings," are the means whereby all the Body is ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβώζομενον, that is "supplied and compacted," "nourished and united."<sup>277</sup>

In Eph iv 16, συμβιβωζόμενον again has the sense of "being brought together," "compacted," or even "knit together." Ἐπιχορηγούμενον in Col ii 19 is replaced by συναρμολογούμενον, although the idea of "support" persists in the following prepositional phrase.<sup>278</sup> Some scholars distinguish the use of the two participles. Whitaker takes συναρμολογούμενον to indicate the structural attachment of the trunk to the Head and συμβιβασόμενον to indicate the progressive adaptation of the Body to the Head's will.<sup>279</sup> In contrast, Abbott thinks both terms mean essentially the same, only the first pertains more to the figure of the Body and the latter to the persons that figure represents.<sup>280</sup> But while the terms may be synonyms, some concession must be made to their respective connotations. In this regard, the present tense is of note; the participles indicate ongoing activities of the growth process. Thus, συναρμολογούμενον pictures the continual adaptation and joining of the members in their relation to each other. If the hand grows, the arm must be adapted and joined together in proportion, Συμβιβωζόμενον with its

connotations of "striding together," "bringing into harmony," accents the mutual co-operation and co-ordination necessary for continual growth. As the Body grows and matures it is continually being fitted and shaped to the changing needs of its members, becoming more and more co-ordinated in its functioning.

διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας With most scholars we take this phrase with the participles as describing the agency effecting the joining together and compacting of the Body.<sup>281</sup> This view is also favored by the parallel passage, Col ii 19, where διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων precedes and so clearly defines the ensuing participles. Ἀφῆ has been taken to mean "sensation," "ligament," "joint," or "contact."<sup>282</sup> The simplest and best attested meaning is "contact," "touch," or "grip." In antiquity body unity was thought to be effected by "contact" and "attachment."<sup>283</sup> In Col ii 19 these aspects are represented respectively by ἀφαί and σύνδεσμοι. To be sure, Lightfoot in applying ἀφαί to the Body, speaks of "joints" or "junctures."<sup>284</sup> But the terminology is misleading in so readily bringing to mind elbows, knees, and the like, all of which may be considered separate body members. But ἀφῆ can be considered as a "joint" only in that various contact points exist between the members themselves.<sup>285</sup> Through such contact the movement of joining together and uniting the members is effected. As Beare states, the verse pictures "the way in which the vital forces make their way through the body by an endless succession of 'contacts.'"<sup>286</sup>

τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας, In secular Greek the simple forms χορηγέω and χορηγία denote the monetary provision for a chorus at a public festival.<sup>287</sup> From there they came to indicate "making provisions" for any purpose, such as an army or expedition.<sup>288</sup> Ἐπιχορηγέω appears in the Papyri as a technical term indicating the obligations a husband is contracted to provide for his wife, e.g. food and clothing.<sup>289</sup>

In II Cor ix 10 God is said to supply the seed to the sower and bread for food. In Gal iii 5 the verb and in Phil i 19 the noun are connected with the supplying of the Spirit. In Col ii 19, the verb occurs in a context about supplying the Body, and may be associated with the idea of nutriment.<sup>290</sup> The context does not explicitly mention eating, but the idea of growth makes such a reference plausible. Another possibility is to link the term with the giving of the Spirit (Gal iii 5, Phil i 19). Perhaps, then, the Head is seen in its function of breathing; in Lam iv 20 the Messiah is called the "breath of our nostrils."<sup>291</sup> Air, breath, i.e. the Spirit is certainly a necessity for growth. But this too remains somewhat speculative. The idea of growth makes plausible a reference to the necessities of life. This need not be confined to nutriment or air, but nor should it exclude these. We indicate this broad spectrum by the rendering, "life-support."

In Eph iv 16 the life-support clearly refers to what Christ supplies in his function as Head. In view of this Abbott takes the words to mean "through every part being in touch with the ministration."<sup>292</sup> This interpretation has the advantage of making clear that the "provision" which effects the joining and uniting comes from Christ, the Head. The difficulty is understanding what "touching of the supply" actually means. It cannot mean every member touches the Head. While some members touch the Head, others do not. But through members touching one another what is provided by the Head is communicated throughout the Body. It is better, then, to understand the words as "every life-supporting contact," or more broadly, "every contact point that furnishes the life-support which comes from the Head."<sup>293</sup> If the Head represents the whole through its activity as the source of the Body's growth, then the Body, so represented, must respond by organizing and engaging itself in accordance with the Head's function. Thus being joined and united by every contact that furnishes what Christ as Head provides, involves the activity of every Body member.



κατ' ἐνέργειαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου μέρους,<sup>294</sup> Since the phrases show no indication of the coming verb, it is best to take them with what precedes.<sup>295</sup> The words indicate the standard mode of operation according to which members are joined together and united, adapted and co-ordinated, by means of every contact that communicates the life-support of the Head. The unity effected through such life-supporting contacts is effected "in accordance with an activity that is in a measure proper to each individual part."<sup>296</sup> The unity caused by the distribution of the life-support through contact points occurs in accordance with the proper activity of the Body's members. Ἐνέργεια indicates the "working," "activity" or "inward operation" that occupies the whole Body, but which occurs in a measure proper to each part.<sup>297</sup> Having received from other members the necessary life-support, an individual member performs its vital function in a measure appropriate to the activity or operation in which the Body is engaged. As it functions properly it comes into contact with other members, so as to communicate its contribution to the life-support of others. In this manner the members are joined and united in the common life process of the Body, and as the needs of the Body change, as they do in growth, there is allowance for inner adjustment and a bringing into harmony of the various parts. What becomes clear, however, is that this whole process begins with the Head's activity and function.

As suggested earlier, πᾶν τὸ σῶμα includes Christ as κεφαλή, to the extent that as the source of the Body's unity and growth it stands with the other members as the recipient of its own function. So what has been said may to some extent be applied to the Head. Indeed, it is the supreme model of what being a Body member means. As with the other members, the Head's activity brings it in contact with other members, so as to communicate the life-support necessary for their activity, which in turn supplies others and so forth throughout the Body. By its function, then, the Head continually adapts and co-ordinates its own activity to

meet the changing needs of the other members so as to bring about unity and growth. Of course, unlike other members, the Head's specific function and activity is to supply the necessities on which the Body's life depends. So the measure of the Head's activity must be sufficient to supply the measure necessary for the activity of each individual member (cf. vs. 7). Clearly no member can have a measure greater than the Head's since all other members depend on it. Also the means whereby the Head is itself supplied belongs to a different order. The author thinks in wholistic terms. The Head indicates the whole person as the source of the Body's growth and unity. But the ultimate source of a person's growth lies not within the Body, but within God. Thus, the Head depends not on the Body for its life-support, but on God. What Christ receives from God, he, so to speak, puts in bodily form; that is, he functions as the Head of the Body and is thus joined and united to believers. As such he communicates his divine life to all who participate as members of the Body, inspiring them to function in a measure appropriate to his gift, such that they share in effecting the unity of the whole. The Body is one and many, united in diversity, and this living unity manifests itself in the Body's growth.

τὴν αὐξήσιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται, The progression of thought is from the Head to all the Body, to the activity of individual members, to the growth of the Body. Despite the grammatical form "the Body makes effective for itself the growth of the Body," the Body as a whole is primarily a passive concept. The activity comes from individual members to the whole, and it is the inward process that effects growth. This also helps explain use of the middle voice, ποιεῖται.<sup>298</sup> The Body makes effective for itself the activity of its members, as they respond appropriately to the Head acting as the source of the growth. Thus, the growth that occurs by virtue of the Head's provision is manifested in the members "being joined and united, etc." Again, unity and growth are two

perspectives on the same phenomenon, the living Body. Bodily growth is manifested in a living unity; Bodily unity is not static but expresses itself in the living process of growth.

εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ,<sup>299</sup> The phrase recalls the upbuilding of Christ's Body in vs. 12. The envisioned growth aims for the complete spiritual enhancement of the whole, with and in Christ, that occurs in love. The phrase ἐν ἀγάπῃ, though defining more specifically οἰκοδομή, has a dominating position. Love as we have seen earlier, builds up; it is also that through which we speak the truth. The phrase here specifically shows that this upbuilding and growth is intensive, not extensive. Neither the building up of the Body nor its growth should be limited to simply an increase in size, e.g. the Gentile mission.<sup>300</sup> It depicts rather the continual strengthening of that bond or union that exists between Christ and believers and among themselves.

This is not to deny a place to the Gentile mission in the Body's increase. That Gentiles are now fellow members of the Body through the Gospel may well be considered as growth in the Body. But in view of what has been seen throughout this passage, the addition of new members is much more likely an increase, not in the Body's size, but in its unity. The inclusion of new members always involves an increased recognition of the love that Christ has shown to all men, Gentile or Jewish. But the acknowledgment of another as a fellow Body member also entails an acknowledgment of one's interdependence on the function of that member. It entails a deepened awareness of the unity of the whole, organized around one life principle. Such increase is only possible as believers participate more fully in the love that Christ has demonstrated and made available through the cross. Thus the primary point here is not evangelism, but the unity of the Spirit. As the community learns to forbear one another in love and maintain the unity of the Spirit through the bond of peace, as they speak the truth in love, expressing in their lives the love of Christ insofar as



they are so gifted and equipped to do, so then the community will strengthen its union with Christ and manifest his love through loving one another.

NOTE ON ἀλλήλων μέλη (iv 25)

In iv 25 we have an allusion to the Body of Christ concept in the words ἀλλήλων μέλη. After a discussion of putting off the old man and putting on the new man, who is created after God in the righteousness and holiness of the truth, the author concludes: Διὸ ἀποθέμενοι τὸ ψεῦδος λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐσμέν ἀλλήλων μέλη. The "putting off the lie" clearly recalls the "putting off the old man" (vs. 22), and "speaking the truth to one's neighbor" corresponds to the behavior expected of the new man created after God ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας. The imperative λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν alludes to Zech viii 16. There it concerns the factual and truthful dealing with one's neighbor in a judicial sense and in accordance with the Law.<sup>301</sup> But in Ephesians the legal context has been replaced by fellowship in Christ's Body, "because we are members of one another." The new man does not stand in isolation, but in a corporate whole. If a law governs our speaking it is the law of love, the truth manifested in Jesus.<sup>302</sup> Being members of one another, possessing and recognizing the same life as new men, means speaking the truth in deference to the truth expressed in Jesus. But if falsehood is inappropriate because we share the same life, it is also inappropriate because it destroys the unity of the Body and interrupts the ebb and flow of our mutual dependence. As Chrysostom states: "If the eye sees a serpent, does it deceive the foot? if the tongue tastes what is bitter, does it deceive the stomach?"<sup>303</sup>

The brief allusion to the Body concept is informative. It shows how dominant the Body concept is in the author's thinking. The ease with which the author refers to the idea and argues from it suggests that it was a common tool for expressing his understanding of Church unity, conveying both racial solidarity and organic unity.

### III. CONCLUSION

In Eph iv 4-16 the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  concept has a dominating and significant role. This is visible in the term's mere numerical presence occurring at key points, vss. 4, 12, and 16. But more importantly, it sets the tone for the entire paraenetical section. It even emerges in an almost off-handed way as the basis for moral behavior (iv 25), as well as generally setting the framework for the discussion of inner-Church behavior. In vss. 4-16 the Body concept gives the pericope inner cohesiveness, being related to central themes as the Spirit, upbuilding, maturity, fullness, growth, and perhaps the cosmos. This suggests that the author found in this idea a reliable and familiar tool for expressing his presuppositions about the Church, its relation to Christ, and its inner structure. We make the following brief observations:

(1) The Body depicts a unity that is a given. The importance of unity as a theme in this exhortation is clearly stated when the author calls on his readers to maintain "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." This unity is a given which is to be maintained, not created. The reference to "one Body" follows in a confessional type statement concerning the focal points of Church unity. Living in a manner worthy of the Christian calling involves recognizing the divine grounds of Church unity. The strategic positioning of "one Body" gives it a dominating position over the entire discussion of the given grounds of unity, vss. 4-16. Nowhere is it stated that the Body is formed by the activity of its members; its unity is always a given in which the Church can mature and grow.

(2) The Body depicts a twofold unity. The "unity of the Spirit" is not simply that effected between believers, but also between believers and the one Spirit. The same holds true of the Body concept: it depicts the unity between believers, and between Christ and believers. As in the earlier chapters, we suggested that this twofold unity is understood in

terms of Semitic corporate personality. These ideas take on specific shape in the author's New Adam theology.

This concept especially gives coherence to the grouping of the Body, Spirit and hope in vs. 4. It is also likely the New Adam concept lies behind the references to the Full-grown Man (vs. 13) and the Church's growth into the Corporate Christ with respect to all things (vs. 15). Thus the Body concept offers the author a convenient tool for expressing the solidarity between Christ as the New Adam and the Church as a new humanity. As we suggested in ch. II, the author combines the racial solidarity usually associated with  $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\varsigma$ , with the Greek idea of organic wholeness usually associated with  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ . The combination is unusually rich and suggestive, allowing the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  concept to convey the author's Semitic presuppositions. Thus, unity in the Body also means unity with Christ who is this Body. But it also allows the author to show that equality does not mean sameness, but diversity. Nor does unity with Christ mean exact identity, but a functional identity in which Christ remains distinct as Head.

(3) The one Body stands in relation to the one Spirit. In contrast to I Cor xii 1-27 (but cf. Rom xii 3-8), there is little mention of the relation between the Body and the Spirit. The two occur together in the creedal statement of vss. 4-6, but afterwards the Spirit is not explicitly mentioned in the pericope. The occurrence of the Body concept before the Holy Spirit in vs. 4 has occasioned some discussion. But once  $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  is seen as referring to the Corporate Christ, this difficulty is largely overcome. The "one Body" portrays the Church in its living relation to Christ. It is likely that the Spirit animates the Body. However, the point is not the body/soul dichotomy, but the possession of a body by the life-giving Holy Spirit. The image is of God acting through His Spirit to bring life to and lay claim on the person as a totality; and this person is none other than the crucified and exalted Christ. As such, Christ as the New Adam has become a life-giving Spirit. As believers are



incorporated through faith and baptism into Christ, they share in the one Spirit.

The Spirit is probably also closely linked to Christ's giving of the gifts and the equipping of the saints. However, vss. 9-10 do not refer to Christ's descent in the Spirit, but his humble descent into human existence. Thus the spiritual gifts of the exalted Christ cannot be separated from the sacrificial love shown in the life of Jesus. Perhaps the Spirit is identified with the "life-support" provided by the Head, and communicated through Church members filling their appointed tasks according to the grace given them. If so, the Spirit could be linked to the Head's function of breathing. But the point, while suggestive, lacks concrete evidence and remains speculative.

(4) The Body depicts a diverse unity. If the "one Body" of vs. 4 still has in view the unity between Gentile and Jewish Christians, it also prepares for the discussion of diverse gifts. In vs. 7 we discovered that God grants grace to each Christian in accordance with the measure that Christ gives. The author then shows that Christ gives not one gift, but "gifts" to men by citing Ps lxxviii. The gifts he lists in vs. 11 pertain to ministries active throughout the universal Church. These ministries with their similarities and differences are a continuation of the one ministry of Jesus. When it is seen that these functions are given "to equip the saints for a work of service to edify the Body of Christ," it becomes clear that every Christian is called to serve according to the measure of grace that he has received. The Church as the Body of Christ is a structured unity with a diversity of functions, each given to enhance the whole. This point is driven home in vs. 16. Working in a measure proper to itself each member is joined and united to other members by means of the contacts through which it communicates the Head's life-support. But it can do so properly only as each member likewise provides its necessary function that contributes to the Body's life. Thus are

diversity and mutual dependence necessary for the unity and growth of the whole.

(5) The Body depicts a unity that may be built up, mature and grow. If in Eph ii 21 οἰκοδομῇ depicts a numerical and extensive addition to the Church, in Eph iv 12 and 16 it refers to the comprehensive and intensive spiritual enhancement of the Church in relation to Christ. This includes adding new members, but is not confined to that. Even numerical increase is to be seen as the building up of the love of Christ manifested in the Church. This concerns both aspects of unity which the Body of Christ indicates: unity with other members, and with the person who acts through those members. This upbuilding process gives a historical perspective on the Church, implying that the Body had not yet reached its intended goal. The Church is Christ's Body, but not yet all that Christ's Body can and will be.

This perfected state of the Church is expressed by ἄνθρωπος τέλειος. "Attaining to the Perfect Man," refers to the Church as Christ's Body attaining to a "Full-grown Man." Here we noted a clear link between unity and growth or maturation. Maturing means to become more united, to be a full-grown person whose members are fully integrated with one's will and whose will is fully aligned with God's will. We saw this link between unity and growth in vss. 15-16 as well. Bodily growth is manifested in the Body being joined and united, responding appropriately to the activity of the whole person whose activity is represented in the functioning of the Head. Bodily unity is, then, not static, but expresses itself dynamically in the living process of growth. Thus, unity and growth are two perspectives on the same phenomenon, the living Body. What growth brings especially to expression, is the Body's teleological destiny of attaining perfection. Such perfection no doubt includes an increase in membership as in the Gentile mission, but belongs itself under the rubric of unity; a

growth that attains to the unity that comes from believing and knowing the Son of God, that builds itself in love.

While the Church has its role in attaining this goal, the stimulus for the process, and any real hope for success, clearly lies in Christ, who as Head fills the Body with the attributes and powers of his own life. Thus the Church is not to remain as babes tossed to and fro, but grow up into him with regard to all things, whom is the Head. We agree with Schlier that in vs. 15, εἰς αὐτόν should refer to Christ in this corporate dimension as the Body of Christ. But the idea is not, as Schlier suggests, that the Church causes all things to grow in our corporate unity with Christ into the Full-grown Man. Possibly τὰ πάντα simply means "in every respect." But the author has repeatedly emphasized God's (vs. 6) and Christ's (vs. 10) universal Lordship. We grow into the Corporate Christ with regard to all things in heaven or on earth. This means the Church more and more expresses corporately the new humanity of the New Adam. Thus Christ as Head points to the exalted mode of being toward which the whole Body moves with regard to all things. Again this growth is intensive, not extensive; the Body does not become the cosmos, but matures inwardly in its relation with Christ which has consequences for its relation to the world. This growth is linked above all to the truth of Christ expressed through sharing his love.

(6) The Body finds the source of its unity and growth in its Head, Christ. As in Eph. i 22-23, the author views the organic Head/Body relation through his Semitic presuppositions. The Body is a God-willed unity whose members may indicate the whole person in a particular function. The author views this person from the perspective of the Head, functioning to provide what is necessary for the Body's unity and growth, i.e. its life. The author adapts the Greek idea of an organism because he could view the Body as engaged in the activity that the Head represents. Thus participation in the Body is seen as participation in the activity of the person whose



activity is represented wholistically by the Head. In this way, the Head serves as the model of the activity in question, and as the enabling source whereby other members in their own measure may emulate the model.

There are hints of this throughout the pericope. The qualities of Christian existence mentioned in vss. 2-3 are readily seen in the life of Christ. But it is equally clear that without the grace that God grants Christians according to Christ's gift, their ability to exercise these qualities would be sorely limited. Also the various ministries mentioned in vs. 11 may be viewed as a continuation of Jesus' ministry. But again it is clear that Christ himself gives these. Or again, if we speak the truth in love, we certainly follow Christ's example. But Christ is also the source of the truth we speak and the love through which we speak. So too Christ as the Head exemplifies what it means to be joined and united to the Body. But the Head does this in its function of providing everything necessary for other Body members to participate in the ongoing life of the Body. Thus participation in the unity and growth of the Body is a manifestation of participation in the person who is indicated and identified by the function of the Head. Thus the unity of this Body means unity with the person who is this Body.

(7) The Body is primarily a passive concept. In earlier chapters we discovered that the Body is primarily passive, the recipient. In this pericope the passive character of the Body also emerges. This is, of course, less clear in vs. 4 with the short expression "one Body." Even here, the term indicates the Corporate Christ who is quickened by God acting through His one Spirit. It is tempting to see God breathing the Spirit of life onto the Head of the Body of the New Adam. Be that as it may, the passive character of the Body is seen in vs. 12 where the Body is built up by the activity of members inspired by Christ. Also in vs. 16 we saw that σῶμα is primarily passive. The activity of the members is stressed, but this stands over against the whole which receives the benefit

of the activity. Also, even the activity of individual members is a response to the Head's activity. The whole Body is seen as passively engaged in the activity represented by the Head. Thus even as a totality of individual members acting out their proper roles, the Body does not represent a corporate agent, but a corporate recipient. For this bodily activity defines not the outward content of obedience, either corporately or individually, but its inward character. The totality of individual members responding to and engaged in the activity of Christ as Head, defines and demonstrates the Body's receptivity of and dependence on the Head's life-support.

#### IV

### THE BODY OF CHRIST AND THE BRIDE OF CHRIST EPHESIANS v 22-33

Eph v 22-33 is rich in material relevant to our investigation. As part of a Christian Haustafel the pericope concerns marital relationships. In this regard, we find our first instances of κεφαλή and σῶμα referring to persons other than Christ or the Church. Also important here is the μία σὰρξ union described in Gen ii 24 and quoted at vs. 31. In this framework the marital relation is continually compared to the Christ/Church relation. In the portions concerning Christ and the Church we find statements of direct importance to our inquiry. In vs. 23 Christ is called κεφαλή τῆς ἐκκλησίας and then σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος; in vs. 30 we learn the reason for Christ's continual nurture and care for the Church is ὅτι μέλη ἐσμέν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. These quite obvious points deserve fuller treatment. But also the appearance of σῶμα Χριστοῦ in a context concerning marriage raises questions about its relation to the μία σὰρξ union of Gen ii 24 and the author's nuptial imagery. To better understand these problems and probe their possible solution, we proceed to an exegetical study of the context and text.

#### CONTEXT

Eph v 22-33 forms the first section of a larger block of ethical exhortations that extend through vi 9. This material may be divided into three sections of reciprocal sets: (1) wives and husbands, v 22-33; (2) children and fathers, vi 1-4; and (3) slaves and masters, vi 5-9. This cluster of exhortations differs in form and content from what precedes and follows, and may be removed without destroying any train of thought. This strongly suggests that we are dealing with some type of traditional formulation. Finally, this block of material shows similarities to other passages in the New Testament (e.g. Col iii 18-iv 1; I Tim ii 8-15; Tit ii 1-10; I Pet ii 13-iii 7; cf. also Rom xiii 1-7;



Tit iii 1f) and in the Apostolic Fathers (e.g. Did iv 9-11; Barn ixxx 5-7; I Clem xxi 6-9; Pol. Phil. iv 2-vi 3).<sup>1</sup> These passages have tended to be gathered and scrutinized under the general rubric, Haustafeln.<sup>2</sup> Since Eph v 22-vi 9 stands squarely in this circle of passages, a brief survey of the character, background, and motivating factors in the development of the NT Haustafeln will enhance our understanding of the context.

### Excursus: The NT Haustafeln<sup>3</sup>

W. Schrage defines the general character of the Haustafeln in this way:

Unter Haustafeln verstehe ich wie üblich diejenigen parännetischen Stücke, die sich formal durch ihre Geschlossenheit und übersichtliche Disposition von der sonst mehr lockeren, regellosen und eklektischen Aufreihung der ntl. Mahnungen abheben und die inhaltlich vor allem das Verhalten der verschiedenen Stände zu ordnen versuchen.<sup>4</sup>

The most extensive and well known NT examples of the kind of paraenetical material described by Schrage are Col iii 18-vi 1; Eph v (21)22-33; I Pet ii 13-iii 7.<sup>5</sup> Studies on these texts have revealed a fairly stylized form of exhortation: (1) a direct form of address, usually in the nominative case with the article, e.g. αἱ γυναῖκες; (2) an exhortation in the imperative mood that treats the addressee's relation to his or her social counterpart, e.g. ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν; (3) a theological motive or reason why the prescribed behavior is to be followed, e.g. ὡς ἀνῆκεν ἐν κυρίῳ.<sup>6</sup> Also characteristic is the grouping of exhortations into reciprocal pairs such as wives and husbands, slaves and masters (though contrast I Pet ii 13-25). When such coupling occurs the subordinate class is routinely addressed first.<sup>7</sup> Finally, a particular injunction may be emphasized and reinforced through popular moralisms, Christological formulations, or Old Testament examples or quotations.<sup>8</sup>

Such stylization suggests that the passages in question are indebted to common traditional materials and cannot be considered as mere ad hoc compositions.<sup>9</sup> Still, the application of these materials is not rigid or

inflexible, and there is a noteworthy variety of expression and freedom of movement.<sup>10</sup> Thus, in outlining the traditional character of the NT Haustafeln we again agree with Schrage:

Die Haustafeln sind also weder ein unwandelbarer Topos neutestamentlicher Ethik -etwa ihr unveränderlicher, anaufgebbbarer Kern, der stereotyp wiederholt worden wäre- noch bieten sie eine bloss aus dem Augenblick heraus entworfene und auf einmalige Situationen zugeschnittene ad-hoc-Ethik. Sie verbinden vielmehr Traditions- mit Situationsbezogenheit, Konvention mit Flexibilität, und jeder urchristliche Lehrer wird die beiden genannten Momente verschieden miteinander verbunden haben.<sup>11</sup>

Recognition of the traditional character of the NT Haustafeln increases the importance of determining its background.<sup>12</sup> J. E. Crouch has recently suggested that the NT house codes have roots in Hellenistic Judaism.<sup>13</sup> Crouch shows that Hellenistic Judaism adapted the stoic *καθῆκον* schema, whose roots go back to the "unwritten laws" of Greek society.<sup>14</sup> This Hellenistic model lists duties pertaining to reverence for the gods, honor of country and parents, duty to family and friends.<sup>15</sup>

Recognizing the universal concern of the pagan model, Hellenistic Judaism incorporated this into its proclamation of ethical monotheism and possibly linked it to its own universal scheme of Noachian laws.<sup>16</sup> The main texts are Philo, Ap. pro Iud. vii 1-9, cf. Decal. 165ff; Jos. Ap. II 190-219; and ps. Phocylides 175-227. The Jewish formulators naturally made certain modifications.<sup>17</sup> There is no revering of pagan gods, but obedience to the one Creator and His divine Law. Also the distinction between submissive and superior persons now appears and their social duties are discussed in terms of reciprocal behavior. Finally non-stoic ideas of submission of women, and the threefold scheme of wives, children and slaves become prominent and associated with this Hellenistic-Jewish version of divine Law. Thus, regarding form and to some degree context Crouch brings forth important parallels from Hellenistic Judaism to the NT Haustafeln.

More recently, Schrage has pointed to yet another characteristic of the NT formulations that has parallels in the ethical pronouncements of



that era; i.e. Mimesis-Gedanke.<sup>18</sup> This is the idea that ethical behavior finds its motivation and basis in the example and model of the divine. For the Stoics this idea is incorporated into their elaborate system of cosmic pantheism, wherein all things and structures were graded manifestations of divinity. In this way they find a "natural" basis and norm for ethics in the example of the divine. Thus, one should relate to his country ὡσανεὶ δεῦτερος θεός, or honor his parents ὡς θεῖον τινα τύπον.<sup>19</sup> Persons in authority are also expected to conform to divine patterns or principles of behavior. Thus, according to Dio Chrysostomus, it is God whom rulers "must always imitate in discharging their responsibilities directing and conforming their ways as far as possible to his [i.e. God's] pattern."<sup>20</sup> The same idea is present when Libanios states that the excellence of marriage is proved through the example of the gods, or when according to Seneca, Chrysippus defines marriage in relation to Jupiter Gamelios and Genethlios.<sup>21</sup>

Schrage goes on to show how Philo knew and to some extent took over these ideas.<sup>22</sup> To be sure, such Mimesis thinking is not prevalent in those Hellenistic-Jewish texts that Crouch has shown most nearly resemble the NT Haustafeln. Still the value of Schrage's thesis lay not so much in one to one parallels as in indicating a widespread atmosphere in which ethical pronouncements were considered to have their motivation and basis in the divine. Hellenistic thinking found its starting point in the natural order, of which the gods were ultimately representatives. Not surprisingly, Hellenistic Jews would replace conformity to divine beings who manifest a divine principle of nature with conformity and obedience to the divine Law given and revealed by the one God. But both are caught up in the same quest for a divine basis for ethical conduct, and in this quest the NT Haustafeln also participate.

We conclude, then, that Hellenistic sources, primarily those of Hellenistic Judaism, provide the most informative background for the NT house



codes. Here, parallels to the NT material are found as to the form, content, and quest for a divine ethical motivation.<sup>23</sup> The question now arises as to what motivating factors lay behind the emergence of this kind of exhortation. In view of the variety and complexity of the data, it is unlikely that a single reason will suffice as an explanation.<sup>24</sup> Several factors were probably involved; some general, others perhaps more specific, all interrelated. We outline several relevant factors:

(1) The NT Haustafeln belong to the NT ethical tradition and share its basic motivations. A need of any religion involving concepts such as "repentance," "new creation," and "freedom," is to expound the implications of its faith for everyday living. This is especially so with Christianity since Christ is proclaimed Lord of the world. The Haustafeln, as other ethical portions of the New Testament, represent attempts to answer the question: "How does one live out his faith in Christ's Lordship in the multifaceted position of being in the world?"

(2) The parousia did not occur. Dibelius thinks the waning belief in an imminent parousia caused the Church to orient itself to everyday problems.<sup>25</sup> This view has rightly been criticized and by itself could not explain the rise of the NT Haustafeln.<sup>26</sup> Still, a distinction exists between a belief in an imminent parousia and the fact that it did not occur. The point here is not the intensity of a belief, but what would happen as each day passed; problems, both new and old would arise and need answering.

(3) Related to the second factor is a third, Church growth. As time passed, the Church grew in numbers. Such an increase in numbers makes more pressing the temptation; if not the necessity, to formalize common answers to common problems.

(4) A fourth factor is the Gentile mission. Large numbers of Gentile converts would only intensify the pressure created by a growing Church. Perhaps these people needed instruction in matters commonplace in Jewish quarters. The possibility of misinterpreting the Gospel of freedom on Hellenistic presuppositions may, as Schroeder and Crouch argue, have also played a role here.<sup>27</sup> In any case, these people would have special need of instructions for social living whose motive lies, not in conformity to pantheistic gods or universal nature, but in the worship of Christ as Lord.

With factors like these involved, the framers of the Haustafeln adapted materials from Hellenistic Judaism that held an universal appeal as answers

to similar problems. Their unique contribution was to transform the materials in view of the revelation of Christ as Lord. By placing Christ at the very center of ethical motivation, the whole network of ethical realities (e.g. the understanding of the self, models for behavior, how one comes to know a moral principle, etc.) makes a decided shift.<sup>28</sup>

Neither the natural order nor the Torah serves as the ultimate divine standard, but the love of God in Christ. Christ's Lordship over all things and his rule of love are seen to permeate everyday relations and structures of the world. So the Christian is not called to flee the world, nor simply acquiesce to it, but allow Christ's Lordship and his rule of love to penetrate its very fabric. So a new perspective is given from which the Christian may view and decide what is proper in the Lord.

#### The Ephesian Haustafel

We turn now to some particular problems surrounding the Eph. Haustafel. We note the following: (1) its relation to Col iii 18-iv 1; (2) the motivation for its inclusion; (3) the concentration on wives and husbands; (4) its relation to vs. 21.

(1) The Col. and Eph. Haustafeln are closely related. Both address the same classes of people in the same order. Of the 324 words of the Eph. Haustafel, 70 are also in the Col. version of 117 words.<sup>29</sup> On such evidence some scholars, e.g. Mitton, conclude that Ephesians has borrowed and expanded the Col. Haustafel.<sup>30</sup> But differences are also noteworthy, and theories of literary dependency when pressed become less straightforward.<sup>31</sup> Still, the theory that Colossians and Ephesians simply use a common tradition differently, will not suffice in any simple form. For one cannot separate the problem of this text from the larger issue of the interrelation of Colossians and Ephesians. This issue is beyond the bounds of our subject matter, and it will suffice here to make three general observations: (a) a close relation exists between the Col. and Eph. Haustafeln, but the contours are not altogether clear; (b) Ephesians



makes its own use of the traditional material, whether derived directly from Colossians or otherwise; (c) in using this material, our author respects its overall structure and his expansions occur within that framework.

(2) What motivated the author to include this material in his letter? Of course, the motives listed above for all the NT house codes have a role here. But what may be ascertained from this particular occurrence of a Haustafel? The treatment is too general to discern any immediate problem among the readers. The author was just as likely trying to avoid problems as to respond to them. Perhaps one key is noting that the author limits his discussion to the Christian household. Why is this? Certainly the Christian's relation to government authorities is important and in fact belonged to the haustafelliche genre.<sup>32</sup>

We suggest that the author has a theological concern for the household. This has largely been denied of late, at least in the sense that the author intends to establish the family as the place or the main form of "menschlichen Zusammenslebens."<sup>33</sup> With such criticism we agree. Still, the household is an important place for such living and as such it may be the object of theological reflection. Theological concern for the household does not limit Christian living to the household, but extends it into the household. The Gospel of peace must penetrate one's most immediate, intimate and private relationships; even here worship of Christ's Lordship must be seen in one's concrete relations to others.<sup>34</sup>

(3) Related to the second question is a third: Why is such a large amount of material devoted to the section about marriage? Scholars have tended to answer this question in one of two ways.

(a) This section receives so much space because marriage is not really the focal point. Rather the author sees in marriage a symbol for the Christ/Church relation, and so uses it as a springboard to expound on Christ and the Church.<sup>35</sup> The difficulty here is that the text suggests just the opposite procedure, i.e. the marital relation is viewed from the



standpoint of the Christ/Church relation, and not vice versa. Thus, the Christ/Church relation always falls under the domain of ὡς and καθὼς, and so forms the starting point of the comparisons.

A modified version of this view might suggest that the Christ/Church relation begins as the comparative point of departure, but that in vs. 31 (= Gen ii 24) the procedure is reversed. Thus, a kind of dialectical train of thought emerges, the Christ/Church relation informing the husband/wife relation and vice versa. This modified view brings out what was probably the case: there was a certain interplay between relations, images and metaphors.<sup>36</sup> But granted such a conceptual interplay, this does not in itself explain the text's main emphasis. Only when an allegorical interpretation of Gen ii 24 is made the key to understanding the author's overall intention does this dialectical approach answer our question. And then, the answer is essentially the same as above: human marriage is a springboard for an extended teaching about Christ and the Church, and this teaching is uppermost in the author's mind. But granted an allegorical interpretation of vs. 31, it is not at all clear that such a sweeping conclusion could be made.

(b) The second view is that marriage is the text's focal point.<sup>37</sup> The amount of material is due, then, either to the author simply being carried away with his statements about Christ and the Church,<sup>38</sup> or to his taking time to unfold what he thinks to be a special revelation about the marital relation.<sup>39</sup> The latter seems more probable, but in either case the statements about Christ and the Church are introduced to explain marriage, not vice versa.<sup>40</sup>

If the marital relation is the pericope's focal point, then the amount of material devoted to it may also imply that this relation plays a key role in the structure of the household. Such a key position may have been considered self-evident, or have been inferred from Gen ii 24. From this text and a knowledge of its context, we can see that marriage

is (i) instituted directly by God through an act of creation; (ii) prior in time to the other household relations; and (iii) the basis on which new households are founded. It is true that the author never draws any of these implications directly. Perhaps in this respect the traditional framework was somewhat limiting. Thus, if the author wishes to claim the household for Christian living, he must make that claim abundantly clear as to marriage.

Under view (b), then, the Christ/Church relation appears not for its own sake, but in the process of extending the Gospel of peace into this important household relation. In claiming marriage for Christian living the author orients the readers in haustafelliche fashion to the revelatory models of Christ and the Church: i.e. he tells his readers about marriage by describing Christ and the Church in nuptial imagery. The force of the comparisons is not so much in exact correspondence as in the new motive they provide for proper marital relations.

While a final decision on this matter must be delayed until our detailed exegesis, our study of the NT Hhaustafeln and our author's motives for using such material make a strong prima facie case that (b) is the proper view. One issue that has emerged rather clearly, however, concerns the interpretation and function of Gen ii 24 in vs. 31.

(4) A final problem concerns the place and role of vs. 21. Some scholars take the verse as the conclusion of vss. 18-21; others consider it a caption for the entire Hhaustafel.<sup>41</sup> The issue has generally focused on the grammatical role of the participle. Sampley states:

...either ὑποτασσόμενοι is understood as a participle dependent on the previous finite verb (namely πληροῦσθε in v. 18) or it is asserted that participles in a paraenetic section such as this can take on an imperative function without reference to any other finite verb.<sup>42</sup>

Since the imperative function is largely conceded today, the first view has fewer proponents.<sup>43</sup> But can the question be so readily answered in this manner?<sup>44</sup>



Whether vs. 21 belongs to the following or not, its participial form links it to the preceding participles (which may also be taken as imperatives). The verbs' dative objects form a conceptual chiasmus:

- Aa "addressing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs,"
- Ba "singing and making melody to the Lord with all your heart"
- Bb "always and for everything giving thanks in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to God the Father"
- Ab "submitting to one another in the fear of Christ."

AaAb refer to actions towards fellow Christians while BaBb refer to actions done unto the Lord and God. The first three participles picture the Spirit-filled life (vs. 18) as one of worship; each concerns or implies inspired speech.<sup>45</sup> In this context would ὑποτάσσεσθαι show that such inspiration provides no license to disorder or overbearance towards one's fellow believer?<sup>46</sup> Such mutual submission is, then, essential to worship and must be seen, along with inspired speech, as characteristic of the Spirit's activity.

Taken in this way vs. 21 may be related to vss. 19-20 in both form and content. But vs. 21 also supplies the verb for vs. 22, suggesting a close connection to what follows.<sup>47</sup> J. M. Robinson has recently shown that a conventional association exists between injunctions about inspired speech, and those about submission, especially on the part of women (cf. I Cor xiv 32ff).<sup>48</sup> This convention may be detected here when our author moves from inspired worship which entails mutual submission, to the Haustafel which begins with the submission of wives. It helps explain how the verb of vs. 22 may be inferred from vs. 21, while at the same time it bears a more specific content than in vs. 21. In vs. 21 ὑποτάσσεσθαι is a blanket term for the respect and service of all Christians towards one another. But in vs. 22f it indicates the Church's and wife's submission to Christ and to the husband respectively.<sup>49</sup> This more specific content is not readily transferred to Christ or to the husband.



Vs. 21, then, is not so much a title for the Haustafel, as a bridge from the preceding context. The Haustafel does not so much provide examples of mutual submission as, more pointedly, examples of how inspired worship of the Lord is to penetrate the most intimate structures of human existence. We now turn to an analysis of Eph v 22-33.

#### ANALYSIS OF EPH v 22-33

Eph v 22-33 presents a unified pericope, distinguishable from what precedes and follows. The pericope discusses the reciprocal relations between wives and husbands. The summary statement in vs. 33 addresses both husbands and wives, showing clearly that the exhortations should not be disjoined.<sup>50</sup> Within this unified framework it is fairly certain that an inner structure exists. But scholars differ on just how this is to be outlined. The diverse proposals largely show "whether the commentator attributes pre-eminence to the husband/wife topic or to the statements on Christ and the Church."<sup>51</sup> So Batey, taking the Christ/Church relation as the starting point offers this outline: "Ephesians 5:21-33 divides itself into three sections which treat the sovereignty (vss. 21-24), love (vss. 25-27), and unity (vss. 28-33) of Christ in relation to the Church."<sup>52</sup> But this overlooks that vss. 25-27 and vss. 28-30 both concern the husband's relation to his wife, and both describe this relation in terms of love.

Batey's structure also limits the understanding of vs. 31 to a proof text for the argument in vs. 29f.<sup>53</sup> Now we do not deny that the Scripture quotation does relate to vss. 28-30 in this way. The question is whether it also has some relation to the exhortation to the women, and hence a function in the pericope's overall structure.<sup>54</sup> We have already suggested that the marriage topic is the text's focal point. The problems that Batey's outline raise are largely solved when this topic is allowed to determine the passage's structure. Anticipating the results of our exegesis, we offer the following outline: (1) exhortation to the

wives (vss. 22-24); (2) exhortation to the husbands (vss. 25-30); (3) the Scripture quotation and the significance of its interpretation (vss. 31-33).

## EXEGESIS

### A. The Exhortation to Wives

Vs. 22: αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ,<sup>55</sup>

The subordinate class of the reciprocal set is addressed first. Γυνή refers to either (a) the female as opposed to the male, or (b) the wife.<sup>56</sup> To the latter category also belong references to a bride or betrothed; especially Jewish custom regards a bride as already legally bound.<sup>57</sup> The usage here is marital rather than sexual, and this view is reinforced by ἰδίους.<sup>58</sup> The focus, then, is not so much on the female's station in society, but her marital relation. The call to be subject to their husbands reflects an attitude towards the wife's role and purpose that was widely known and probably generally accepted.<sup>59</sup> But especially in Judaism is the wife considered dependent on the husband for her general well-being and life's necessities.<sup>60</sup> So proper respect and submission were, if for no other reason, deemed appropriate. But with the words ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ the exhortation is lifted to a new plane. The phrase compares a woman's submission to her husband with that to Christ, her Lord.<sup>61</sup> Possibly ὡς denotes the comparative manner in which submission is to proceed: "in the like manner that you submit to the Lord."<sup>62</sup> In this case vs. 32a introduces the comparison between the husband and Christ to justify like treatment on the basis of a like relation. But vs. 23b qualifies the comparison in such a sweeping way that the justification loses its force, making vs. 24 read like a last ditch effort to secure the husband's position, justification or not.

It is better to take ὡς as indicating the characteristic quality of the wife's subjection to her husband: "as a wife who is subject to the Lord." Here the comparison of vs. 23a justifies not the manner of treatment, but the fact that husbands are due submission. The qualification



of vs. 23b does not erase this fact of the husband's headship of the woman. The characteristic quality of the woman's subjection is based on the wife's subjection to the Lord; this is her experiential point of departure. This explains how the Church serves as the wife's model, for both Church and wife are subjected to Christ. Thus, the characteristic qualities of the wife's subjection to Christ, its whole-heartedness, its joy, its love, its free willingness, these qualities are also to characterize her submission to her husband.<sup>63</sup>

Vs. 23: ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός,<sup>64</sup> This verse attempts to justify that wives owe respect and submission to their husbands. But as Gnllka comments: "Auffallend ist, mit welcher Selbstverständlichkeit die Begründung vorgetragen wird, als wäre sie schon bekannt."<sup>65</sup> This "selbstverständlichkeit" is even more surprising since, apart from I Cor xi 3, antiquity offers no parallel to the expression κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός.<sup>66</sup> Perhaps κεφαλὴ replaces κυρίως here and simply denotes "the power to rule."<sup>67</sup> If so, the justification lies in a simple affirmation of the husband's authority in analogy to Christ's. But the rarity of the expression gives reason to ask whether the term has a more specific content, i.e. it not only affirms the authority but also describes its nature and character.

The author probably chooses κεφαλὴ here because he wishes to compare the marital relation to that between Christ and the Church. As seen in i 22f, iv 15f, the Head/Body metaphor is an important description of the Christ/Church relation. Barth even suggests that the application of these terms to the husband and wife is original to Ephesians.<sup>68</sup> But it is unlikely that the straightforwardness of the formulation owes nothing to traditional ideas. We find a similar, though not identical, formulation in I Cor xi 3: παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστὶν, κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ, κεφαλὴ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ θεός. In an earlier discussion we saw that man's headship is depicted here in a two-fold manner: (1) it derives from the fact that woman was created from



man; (2) it resides in the fact that woman was created for man.<sup>69</sup> κεφαλή was an apt term for expressing these aspects in their determinative dimension; i.e. with κεφαλή the ideas of source and goal are brought to bear as present and effective rule and authority. We saw further that this meaning plays a role in our author's κεφαλή/σῶμα concept, which he relates, of course, to Christ and the Church.

We now note that I Cor xi 1-2 reads: "I commend you because you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions even as I have delivered them to you." This has significance for vs. 3, as Sampley asserts:

Immediately after he mentions their holding fast the traditions that he has delivered them, Paul embarks on a statement that, given the context of v. 2, may be considered either as a tradition that he has already delivered to them, or as one that he now adds to those he has communicated in the past.<sup>70</sup>

In either case it is quite possible, if not likely, that the statements in I Cor xi 3 had become widely known. If so, this would help explain the straightforwardness of the Eph. statement.

But while I Cor xi 3 provides the closest parallel to Eph v 23, the differences between the two passages are noteworthy:

(1) The context is different. I Cor xi 3ff discusses the role of women in the worship service; Eph v 22ff, the marital relation.<sup>71</sup>

(2) The statements as a whole differ. I Cor xi 3 describes a hierarchy of analogous relations, descending in authority from God to Christ, Christ to man, and man to woman. But Eph v 23 makes a comparison, modeling the husband's headship of the wife after Christ's headship of the Church.

(3) In Ephesians the connotation of κεφαλή is expanded to incorporate the σῶμα concept. In I Cor xi 3 κεφαλή occurs without σῶμα.<sup>72</sup> But in Ephesians, wherever κεφαλή describes Christ, σῶμα emerges in context as a description of the Church. The description of the husband as κεφαλή probably implies that the wife is his σῶμα. The comparison to Christ and the Church strongly suggests this, and vss. 28-30 and the quotation of Gen ii 24 support the inference.<sup>73</sup>

If κεφαλή bears in its perspective the added notion that the woman is the σῶμα, why has the author chosen this particular image to describe

the marital relation? If the answer essentially lies in the author's interpretation of the marital relation via the Christ/Church relation, the question remains whether anything about the marital relation facilitated the author's choice to interpret it by the Head/Body image, as opposed to the cornerstone/building image, or even the Bridegroom/Bride image. The most plausible answer is that the κεφαλή/σῶμα image is used to interpret and inform the μία σὰρξ conception of Gen ii 24.<sup>74</sup> But can the influence of Gen ii 24 be justified so early in the passage? There are several factors whose cumulative effect suggest that this was the case. But before the force of these can be felt, a brief look at Gen ii 24 and its interpretation at the time of Ephesians is necessary.

---

#### Excursus: Gen ii 24 and Marriage

In its original context Gen ii 24 serves as an aetiological conclusion to the Yahwistic account of God's creation of woman from man.<sup>75</sup> The account intends to answer from whence comes this powerful bond between the sexes which supercedes even that between child and parent.<sup>76</sup> The answer is that God created woman from man in response to his need for companionship. The text's aetiological function implies that the author intends to expound on a reality contemporaneous with his writing.<sup>77</sup> Indeed, while the verse points to Eve's creation from Adam, the man of vs. 24 is not Adam himself (Adam never left his father or mother), nor the woman, Eve, but any and every man and woman who marry. So by basing its conclusion on God's act of creation, the text sanctions the sexual bond as a structure of creation and validates marriage as a divine ordinance.<sup>78</sup>

For our purposes, the important aspect is the one flesh relation. This relation is based on woman's creation from man. Finding the meaning of the sexual bond in the creation of man and woman was evidently widespread.<sup>79</sup> Here the sexual impulse and ensuing bond are understood from man's need of social companionship. So the stress falls on the likeness and suitability of the woman to meet man's needs.<sup>80</sup> The "This at last is



bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh" is in contrast to the man's relation to the animals. This might suggest that the one flesh idea simply refers to the human sexual relation.<sup>81</sup> But the formulation "bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh" is also used for kinship and familial ties in general (Gen xxix 14; II Sam xix 13, 14; cf. Judg ix 2; II Sam v 1; I Chr xi 1). Thus for some scholars the one flesh idea simply points to the emergence of a new household.<sup>82</sup> But a compromise between these two positions is possible. The sexual relationship is thought to provide the basis for the new household. The one flesh idea, then, points to the corporate unity between man and woman; they become a corporate personality.<sup>83</sup>

What kind of structure, if any, is this new unity envisioned to have? We should note first that God is the center of activity in the passage. Second to God, it is the man who acts in response to God's acts. God creates the animals, and man exercises his divine-given authority in naming them. God creates the woman from man, and the man responds with joy at someone so like himself. Yet the man also assumes a posture of authority over the woman by naming her.<sup>84</sup> What characterizes the woman is her willingness to follow God's lead and her silence before the man.<sup>85</sup> The man's active posture and the woman's passive posture is also reflected in Gen ii 24.<sup>86</sup> It is the man who leaves his parents and cleaves to his wife. These postures, then, are rooted in God's act of creation. Both the affinity of man and woman, and the man's authority over the woman, rest on the unity established through God's act of creation. This is especially clear, when exercising his authority by naming the woman, the man refers to the unity established in God's act.

Thus, we note three aspects of Gen ii 24 that seem implicit in its original context: (1) it represents a divine sanction of marriage based on the order and structure of creation; (2) it depicts the profound unity between man and woman as forming a corporate person. (3) Finally, it implies an active posture for man and a passive posture for woman.



Later Judaism saw generally in the creation story of Adam and Eve and particularly in Gen ii 24, a divine sanction for marriage. In Tob viii 5ff, for instance, Tobias prays before consummating his marriage to Raguel and bases his petition for marital blessings on the fact that God made "Adam and gavest him Eve his wife." This strongly suggests that the marital relation was thought to be revealed in the creation account as a divine ordinance. In Jub iii 1ff, the creation story is used to justify aspects of Mosaic Law. The statements about the creation of woman and the citation of Gen ii 24 bear only slight embellishments.

...and He brought her to him; and he knew her, and said unto her, 'This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she will be called (my) wife; because she was taken from her husband.' Therefore shall man and wife be one, and therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh. (iii 6-7)<sup>87</sup>

Here the sexual overtones of the one flesh union are clearer. Also the unity of the couple is expressly stressed.

Also in Hellenistic Judaism the creation story is used in understanding the union between man and woman. Josephus recounts how God created Adam and formed woman out of Adam's πλευράν (Ant. I 34-36). When Eve is presented, αὐτὴν ἐγνώρισεν ἔξ αὐτοῦ γενομένην. One suspects a word play here between "recognized her" and "knew her" (i.e. sexually). In any case the sexual overtones are clear as Josephus immediately proceeds to explain how "Eve" means "mother of all living."<sup>88</sup> Philo also describes the first meeting of man and woman. Both the man and woman are gladdened seeing their mutual likeness, ἔρως δ' ἐπιγενόμενος καθάπερ ἐνὸς ζώου διὰ τὰ μέρηματα διεστηκότα συναγαγὼν εἰς ταύτὸν ἀρμόττεται (Op. Mund. 151-52; cf. Quaest. in Gen. I 26, 28). Ἔρως emerges here as a binding force and desire, but the picture is far from romantic. It leads ultimately to bodily pleasure, the beginning of wrongs and violation of law.

This negative assessment probably influenced Philo's allegorical interpretation of Gen ii 24. In Leg. All. II 49 (cf. Gig. 65) the mind

represents the active male principle who abandons God (the Father of the universe) and God's excellence and wisdom (the Mother of all things) and cleaves to the passive female principle, sense-perception ἵνα γένωνται μία σὰρξ καὶ ἐν πάθος οἱ δύο. The allegory shows how the one flesh idea could point to a union between the divine and the mundane. There is little to suggest any connection with Eph v 22-33.<sup>89</sup>

More noteworthy for our purposes is Philo's application of Gen ii 24 to human marriage. In Quaest. in Gen. I 29 he states:

Why does Scripture say, 'Wherefore man shall leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife and they shall be two in one flesh'? Scripture commands man to act toward his wife with the most extreme exaggeration in partnership, so that he may endure to abandon even his parents. Not as though this is proper, but as though they would not be causes of goodwill to the wife. And most excellent and careful was it not to say that the woman should leave her parents and be joined to her husband- for the audacity of man is bolder than the nature of woman- but that for the sake of woman man is to do this. Since with a very ready and prompt impulse he is brought to a concord of knowledge. Being possessed and foreseeing the future, he controls and stills his desires, being fitted to his spouse alone as if to a bridle. And especially because he, having the authority of a master, is to be suspected of arrogance. But woman, taking the rank of servant, is shown to be obedient to his life. But when Scripture says that the two are one flesh, it indicates something very tangible and sense-perceptible, in which there is suffering and sensual pleasure, that they may rejoice in, and be pained by, and feel the same things, and much more, may think the same things.

Here two points seem fairly clear. (1) As suggested earlier, Gen ii 24 posits an active posture for man and a passive posture for woman. Philo now makes explicit the man's authority and the woman's obedience.<sup>90</sup>

(2) Also for Philo the one flesh union was something concrete and "sense-perceptible." This union not only involves more than a simple physical act, its very nature is more than physical, because it includes the minds as well as the bodies of the partners.

In the Rabbinic writings the first man is often considered to be androgynous.<sup>91</sup> Thus for many Rabbis a man was thought incomplete without a wife and some taught that "God's image was present only after marriage and the uniting of male and female into one whole man."<sup>92</sup> Gen ii 24 was



generally accepted as a divine sanction for marriage. Even so its usage is limited to legal proscriptions about incest and fornication with beasts. Still the seriousness with which the one flesh union could be taken is shown when Rabbi Jose of Galilee takes in and cares for his divorced wife and her disabled husband in accordance with the verse "...and not hide yourself from your own flesh" (GenR xvii 3).<sup>93</sup>

Since human marriage belongs to this world, it was not held in high esteem among the Gnostics. The Gnostics often recounted and embellished the creation story to reveal the origin and destiny of man.<sup>94</sup> But marriage as a human institution, even if regarded as a "great mystery," never receives divine sanction and remains a poor analogy for spiritual union.<sup>95</sup> In Exeg. Soul Gen ii 24 describes the spiritual union between the repentant soul and the heavenly bridegroom sent by the Father.<sup>96</sup> Unlike "fleshly" union where the partners are enslaved to desire, the soul and her consort "become a single life," thus explaining why the prophet says of the first man and woman, "they shall be one flesh." That "one flesh" could define a spiritual union in a context that contrasts spiritual and fleshly marriage shows how deeply ingrained is the idea that "becoming one flesh" means "becoming one life." In Ap. John the one flesh union again signifies the saving union between the Gnostic and his divine counterpart.<sup>97</sup> When the great archon raises up the woman through whom the Epinoia of light appears, the veil of ignorance is removed and Adam recognizes his own substance, i.e. his heavenly origin. So he abandons his father and mother, which presumably refer to the powers of this world, and unites with his helper, the heavenly consort.<sup>98</sup> In this myth the active role belongs to the woman who represents the Epinoia of light or Sophia. Man's rule over woman is a sign of the archon's curse and elsewhere the story of Eve coming from Adam's rib is considered a ploy to keep woman subject to man and hence both in darkness.<sup>99</sup> Normal human reproduction is also the evil archon's work: "He planted in Adam a desire of seed,



so that it is this through which marital intercourse brings forth a likeness from their counterfeit spirit."<sup>100</sup> This circle of ideas seems far removed from Eph v 22-33.<sup>101</sup>

In Mark x 2-9 and Matt xix 3-12, Gen ii 24 is used with Gen i 27 in the discussion on divorce. The passages state that the permission to divorce granted by Moses was a concession due to man's hardness of heart. God's true desire is revealed in the Torah's teaching about creation:

ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς· ἕνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα /καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ/, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν· ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ μία σὰρξ. ὁ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω.  
(Mark x 6-9)

Gen ii 24, then, sanctions marriage as the result and fulfillment of God's intention and activity. As D. Hill avers: "The creator made the two sexes and made them for marriage."<sup>102</sup> In God's eyes marriage creates an inviolable bond between the partners; they are not two but one person.

This teaching probably influenced Paul's counsel on marriage.<sup>103</sup> I Cor vii shows how seriously he viewed the oneness of the marital bond. We note the following features:<sup>104</sup> (1) In the marital bond, the body of each partner belongs to the other. Thus marriage must be real and involve the full conjugal rights of the partners. Temporary suspension was conceded for a period of prayer, but only after mutual agreement (vii 3-7). (2) Like Jesus, Paul views the marital bond as permanent. He grants that a Christian might accept a divorce initiated by a non-believer, but the Christian is not to initiate divorce (vii 12-16). (3) The marital bond is of such intimacy that the couple shares one another's feelings and anxieties. Paul suggests how this could interfere with one's relation to the Lord (vii 32-35). (4) The marital bond brings such mutual identification that an unbelieving partner is brought in some sense into the sphere of sanctification, i.e. into the Church (vii 14ff).<sup>105</sup> For Paul, then, the marital bond is intimate and inviolable, involving the mutual

identification of the partners. Influence by the one flesh concept seems likely.<sup>106</sup>

Paul actually quotes Gen ii 24 in I Cor vi 15-20. Here the union with the Lord is contrasted to and shown to be exclusive of sexual union with a harlot. While the pericope in places is unclear, if not puzzling, several important points are sufficiently plain: (1) The bodies of Christians are united to Christ as μέλη Χριστοῦ. The language is suggestive of the Pauline σῶμα Χριστοῦ concept.<sup>107</sup> Being a member of Christ describes a union with Christ that embraces the Christian's body. (2) Here σῶμα stands for the whole person in a particular dimension. The whole point is that what one does in or through the body effects who one is as a Christian, i.e. one's Christian self.<sup>108</sup> (3) Paul states that to fornicate with a prostitute is to become with her ἐν σῶμα. Σῶμα, then, is used as a synonym for σάρξ, which occurs in the upcoming quotation of Gen ii 24b.

(4) The σάρξ μία union with the harlot is more than a mere physical act, but involves divorcing oneself from Christ (ἄρας) and identifying oneself with the harlot.<sup>109</sup> Possibly the prostitute here is a temple prostitute.<sup>110</sup> The sexual act would then involve consecration in the name of the temple god. Even so, the Corinthian enthusiasts might wonder how such a temporary and isolated event could have such grave consequences.<sup>111</sup> Here the force of Gen ii 24 is to be felt; it points to an aspect of created existence. Whatever appearances may be, the God who sustains the created order reveals in Scripture that "the two shall be one flesh." In other words, "Do you not know that this is the way it is as to sexual relations in the world that God has created and presently sustains; the two become one flesh."

(5) Finally, Paul states that the person who clings to the Lord is ἐν πνεῦμα. As with ἐν σῶμα and σάρξ μία, ἐν πνεῦμα indicates the corporate union of two persons.<sup>112</sup> Σάρξ possibly has an evil connotation

here and so is set in the sharpest contrast to πνεῦμα. But while such an exegetical twist is possible, it is not probable. The problem is not becoming one flesh, but how and with whom one becomes one flesh. Best suggests that πνεῦμα was chosen to show that union with Christ is not the result of "physical union."<sup>113</sup> Jewett, however, thinks the idea is that the prized possession of the enthusiasts, namely the Spirit, belongs to those who cling to Christ and flee fornication.<sup>114</sup> These reasons are not mutually exclusive and a third is also possible. Paul may have avoided σῶμα because for him only the Church is one body with Christ; only as a member of that Body is the individual one spirit with Him.

In summary, by the time of Ephesians, Gen ii 24 was being used in various ways. Philo could interpret it allegorically, while early Gnostics had perhaps already begun to incorporate the text into their cosmic myths. But by and large Gen ii 24 was still applied to human marriage.<sup>115</sup> The features implicit in its original context were now being explicitly drawn out: (i) the verse is considered a divine ordinance for marriage; (ii) it indicates the profound bond between man and wife that makes them a corporate person; (iii) it implies the man's authority and the woman's submission. Thus Gen ii 24 could evoke an entire network of ideas from which one would view the marital relation. Marriage was from this view an aspect of God's created order.

Our author uses Gen ii 24 in the house code section about husbands and wives. The verse could apply allegorically to Christ and the Church as the revelatory models for the marital relation. Even so, it cannot be severed from the author's genuine concern for human marriage. In this context Gen ii 24 naturally evokes the associated ideas of divine ordinance, corporate unity, and authority/submission, and so exerts on the entire discussion the attitude that marriage is an order of creation.

Also favoring this view is the recent work of Sampley.<sup>116</sup> He discerns in Eph v 22-31 a conventional pattern found among NT ethical formulations



about women's submission. The elements of the pattern are:

...(1) a statement that women should be submissive, and (2) a reference to Torah as a means of supporting the concern with the subordination of women. In the first element, the verb is consistently ὑποτάσσομαι and is always related to women. It is in the second element that the author has freedom to adapt the form to his own purposes, but there is a common element that sets some limits to that freedom: the reference ought, in some way, to ground the subordination in Torah.<sup>117</sup>

Eph v 22-31 certainly seems to follow this pattern. When applied to the whole discussion and range of the marital relationship, it is natural that such an appeal to Scripture would come towards the end of the Haustafel.

Thus, in calling the man the head of the woman, the author approaches the marital relationship from the perspective of Gen ii 24 as an order of creation. We may summarize our argument in this manner:

(1) Gen ii 24 is quoted later in the passage and this reveals the author's general mindset and framework from which he views marriage.

(2) There is a tendency within the New Testament to support the call for a woman to be submissive with an allusion to the Old Testament.

(3) The closest parallel (I Cor xi 3ff) to vs. 23a occurs in a context that defines the man/woman relation on the basis of creation.

(4) The understanding of κεφαλή required for this interpretation is that which we have seen at work in the author's κεφαλή/σῶμα concept elsewhere in Ephesians.

(5) This gives us a reasonable answer as to why the author actually uses the Head/Body metaphor, rather than some other. (Perhaps, too, the author faced the question as to how a man and woman could be one flesh, yet the man be in authority. The Head/Body provides a ready answer.)

Finally, elsewhere in Ephesians the Head/Body concept has been used to express a New Adam theology.<sup>118</sup> This, too, may play a role here. Christ as the New Adam is the pivotal point of all human relationships because he fulfills and thereby defines what man is. It is natural that he should become the model for social relations. The Head/Body concept was used to illustrate the relation between this New Adam and the new humanity that issues from him. This new solidarity now interprets even

one of the most profound expressions of solidarity in the created order, i.e. the one flesh unity between husband and wife. This does not mean, however, that Adam and Eve are directly in view.<sup>119</sup> We must distinguish between the order of creation which is everywhere manifest in marriage and the creation story itself. While the account of the first couple reveals and institutes the marital relation, the husband and wife have their own direct participation in that order.<sup>120</sup> So the author may speak of marriage as a created order without mentioning Adam and Eve, because every man is Adam and every woman Eve by virtue of participating in the created order the first couple initiated.

ὥς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, The author now interprets the husband's headship in light of Christ's headship of the Church. As suggested by the supporting καί, the construction ὥς καί as well as ὥς...οὕτως καί (vs. 24), and καθὼς καί (vs. 25, 29) probably bears a comparative rather than causal meaning.<sup>121</sup> The comparison here substantiates the fact of the husband's headship. In the Haustafel-genre, however, such comparisons also indicate a standard or model to which to conform. So, while here and elsewhere in the passage comparisons are grammatically at hand, the conceptual background shows that these comparisons to the Christ/Church relation provide a motivating basis for the injunctions. The comparison of the husband's headship to Christ's is not then introduced to simply establish the similarity of the two, but also to qualify and inform the former by the latter.

In calling Christ the Head of the Church, the author introduces his Head/Body concept with regard to the Christ/Church relation. In earlier discussions we saw how κεφαλὴ and σῶμα form a single organic metaphor. The authority of the Head does not rest on the brain's control of the limbs. Rather on Semitic anthropological assumptions, the Head represents the whole body as the source and goal of its existence, that which fills it with life and blessings, and gives it growth and unity. Ultimately the

Head/Body metaphor shows that Christ's authority over the Church is the full expression of his unity with the Church.

The order of creation must now be viewed through this order of salvation.<sup>122</sup> The headships of the husband and Christ are comparable. The authority of each is a function of his own nature whereby he is enabled through a divine act to unite with his partner as the mediating source and goal of the partner's life and well-being. But the two rest on different presuppositions; one on God's act of creation, the other on His act of salvation. The former is now modeled and transformed by the latter. The quality whereby Christ stands apart from the husband is precisely that which calls the husband to a radical new understanding of his relation to his wife. This provides a key to the difficult clause, vs. 23c.

αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος,<sup>123</sup> These words may be taken either as (a) an apposition to Christ and his headship, or (b) as an independent proposition. The absence of a conjunction or finite verb favors (a). Also the use of σώμα favors the suggestion that the author is defining the κεφαλή concept. But this view is open to serious objections. The apposition implies that the husbands are in some sense, at least, saviors of their wives.<sup>124</sup> This is not altogether impossible, for in vss. 25ff husbands are called to imitate the saving love of Christ. But if this is in a "certain sense" possible, it still seems improbable. The pronoun αὐτός serves to set Christ and his headship apart from the husbands'. Had the intention been to include husbands in such an unusual statement, one would have expected αὐτοί. Another objection concerns the ensuing conjunction ἀλλά. View (a) requires this to be understood syllogistically or perhaps resumptively.<sup>125</sup> Again, this is not impossible, but neither is it likely. For such reasons many scholars opt for view (b). This view clearly sets Christ apart from the husbands, and allows ἀλλά to have its usual adversative force.<sup>126</sup> To be sure, one might have expected some conjunction, perhaps καί, or even ἀλλά followed by πλὴν.



Without such indicators, the words, even as an independent proposition must be construed closely to the preceding statement. Thus, while view (b) presents the fewest difficulties, the question remains as to how the statement qualifies the husband's relation to the wife. Before we may answer, a brief study of σωτήρ is necessary.

Σωτήρ is a nomen agentis, and falls within the circle of meanings that pertain to σώζω and σωτηρία.<sup>127</sup> But unlike these the recipient of the saving action is usually personal and only rarely impersonal. Hence σωτήρ denotes a sense of dependency, however momentary, on the part of the recipient of the saving action. This also implies the superiority of the one who saves.<sup>128</sup> Except in the degenerate uses, the term seems to imply some kind of real action, or perhaps a series of actions.<sup>129</sup>

In the Greek sphere σωτήρ designates with virtually the same range of meaning both gods and men (especially rulers).<sup>130</sup> It denotes one who brings deliverance or aid to individuals, cities, armies, etc. in times of danger and distress, a "deliverer," "saver of life," "benefactor."<sup>131</sup> More broadly it refers to one whose deeds uphold a city or even the cosmos, a "preserver" or "protector."<sup>132</sup> Interestingly there are no direct instances of σωτήρ referring to mystery deities. Most scholars, however, think that this can be safely assumed, and to this extent, σωτήρ had probably already gained the connotation of "giver of life."<sup>133</sup>

In the LXX and Judaism generally, σωτήρ designates God as the deliverer and helper of His people.<sup>134</sup> His acts of salvation and deliverance touch all levels of life, individual and corporate, political and eschatological. Occasionally the term refers to men, but when this occurs, it is fairly clear that the person is God's agent.<sup>135</sup> The term is not, however, used of the Messiah.<sup>136</sup> Even so, the LXX and Judaism provide the most natural antecedent to NT usage.<sup>137</sup> Early Christians tended to apply predicates of God to the exalted Christ.<sup>138</sup> Also important is that the name "Jesus" literally means "Yahweh is salvation." Perhaps this prompted, or at least facilitated the use of σωτήρ in Greek speaking areas.<sup>139</sup>

The NT use of σωτήρ has largely been colored by the Christian experience and understanding of salvation. When the term applies to Christ the context sometimes accents what he saves us from. Here we find a cluster of ideas, centering more or less on sin, e.g. forgiveness or cleansing of sins, abolition of death, ransom for all, redemption from iniquity, purification, escape from corruption, or the defilement of the world (Acts v 31; xiii 23-38; I Tim ii 3; II Tim i 10; Tit ii 13; Jude 25; II Pet i 3-11; ii 20).<sup>140</sup> At other times the context focuses on what may be called eternal glory, e.g. transformation into a glorious body, godliness and glory, eternal life, entrance into the eternal kingdom, washing of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit (Phil iii 20, II Pet i 3-11, II Tim i 10, Tit i 3, iii 4-7). The underlying presupposition of this twofold usage is the divine act of Christ's death and resurrection.<sup>141</sup> By this act Christ liberates from sin and its trappings and reveals the hope of eternal glory.

In Eph v 23c this twofold usage of σωτήρ comes to full expression. Most scholars agree that vss. 25-27 clarify what it means for Christ to be σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος.<sup>142</sup> The point of departure is clearly Christ's loving and sacrificial death. Thereby the Church is sanctified and cleansed from all impurity, probably in baptism. This is done so that Christ might present the Church to himself in glory (ἐνδοξον). Thus both aspects of the term's meaning emerge; it denotes he who saves believers from the impurity of sin and for their presentation in glory.

In contrast to other NT occurrences of the term, Eph v 23c calls Christ the savior τοῦ σώματος.<sup>143</sup> Σῶμα naturally refers to the Church, but why does the author introduce the term at all? He probably intends to define and refine what he means by Christ's headship of the Body.<sup>144</sup> Both κεφαλή and σωτήρ suggest superiority over and the dependency of the object governed. If σωτήρ points readily to a specific act on which salvation rests, κεφαλή stresses the immediate, yet authoritative, unity

between subject and object. Joining σωτήρ and σῶμα brings out that Christ's headship of the Church continually reflects Christ's salvific act in its ongoing effectiveness.<sup>145</sup> It is unadvisable, then, to separate Christ's headship of the Body from his salvation of the Body. For Christ has no headship of the Church without being its savior, he who loved the Church and gave himself for it. This reveals the basis of His authority over and concern for the Church. So in saying that Christ is the savior of the Body, the author is not saying he is more than the Head, but telling what kind of Head he is.

But if σωτήρ defines Christ's headship in terms of his saving function, then it also indicates that Christ's unity with the Church (which is based on Christ's functional identity with the Church as its Head) has its center in this saving function. So in saying Christ is the savior of the Body, the author shows that it is in their corporate bond with Christ that believers find their salvation. It points to Christ's love and self-sacrifice for the Church wherein he establishes a bond of salvation, representing the whole Body as its Head.

Finally it is now clear why Christ's headship is far superior to the husband's, indeed of a different order. Christ's bond to the Church is an order of salvation; the man's is an order of creation. Both are God-given bonds, and as long as God upholds this creation, its orders and structures must be respected. But creation is now to be seen from the perspective of its final fulfillment in salvation. Thus the oneness of Christ and Church interprets and informs; it gives new meaning to the oneness of husband and wife. The purpose of the comparison, then, is not simply to establish the similarity between husbands and Christ, but to establish the perspective from which the husband and wife relation is to be viewed. And that perspective is the saving relation of Christ to the Church.

Vs. 24: ἀλλὰ ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ,<sup>146</sup> As mentioned above, ἀλλά bears an adversative force.<sup>147</sup> Vs. 24 is not so



much a conclusion or even summary of the exhortation, as a continuation of the justification of vs. 22, which began with vs. 23. Vs. 23ab introduces a comparison between the husband and Christ. Vs. 23c ensures that this comparison will be understood properly from the perspective of salvation. Even so, the new salvation in Christ does not destroy human relationships; it interprets and transforms them through the model of Christ and the Church. Thus, vs. 24 reiterates the force of vs. 23 and so justifies vs. 22. This does not mean nothing new is said. In vs. 23 ἐκκλησία was introduced only secondarily as the object of Christ's headship. Now the Church becomes an explicit model for the wife. The idea here centers on the character of the Church's relation to Christ; the Church is subject to Christ. To be sure, the Church does Christ no favor by yielding to him; his Lordship does not depend on it. But what in a very real sense does depend on it is the ongoing vitality of the love-relation between Christ and the Church. The Church does not create this relationship through its submission to Christ. It rather recognizes and confesses thereby that Christ has created this relationship through his saving love. Thus, to say that the Church is subject to Christ is to indicate that the ongoing vitality and life of the Church only fully emerges through its ongoing confession of his Lordship in every phase of its life. The author now applies this to the wives' relation to their husbands.

οὕτως καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντί, The vitality of the marital relation only fully emerges through the free subjection of the wife to her husband. As we saw with Christ and the Church and as we learn later, this submission is in truth a response to the husband who gives himself to the wife in love. But the ἀλλά is significant here also. The wife cannot expect salvation from her husband and the focus is on the duties, not the rights of the partners.<sup>148</sup> Otherwise the discussion would degenerate into a kind of doctrine of works. To be subject ἐν παντί to her husband means that the wife is to freely accept his

authority, and so be his wife in all matters. Gniska suggests that ἐν παντί stems from the Church's submission to Christ.<sup>149</sup> This is, of course, correct, but it may also be noticed that since the husband and wife are one flesh, this bond must permeate the whole of their existence. Since the husband is the authoritative figure in that one flesh union, this authority is to penetrate the whole of the wife's existence. This is qualified only in that the author interprets the one flesh relation from the perspective of Christ's saving relation to the Church. He finds the model for the wife's behavior in the Church, and this model serves as a basis or touchstone because the wife is in fact a member of that Church. Probably, then, the wife's subjection to her husband cannot be separated from the Church's subjection to Christ. If it were, i.e. if the husband demanded her to commit some sin, and the wife unwittingly submitted to the request, she would not be submitting to her husband as one who submits to the Lord or as the Church submits itself to Christ.

#### B. The Exhortation to the Husbands

Vs. 25: οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας,<sup>150</sup> The author now addresses the husbands and bids them to love their wives. Then, by way of definition he compares the husband's love to that of Christ's sacrificial love for the Church. The call to love one's wife was probably not unique to Christianity.<sup>151</sup> What does appear unique is that the husband's authority, just established in the preceding exhortation, is now interpreted precisely in terms of love. The use of ἀγαπάω in this regard may have been informed by traditions stretching back to the LXX Lev xix 18. Even so, the word can hardly be void of its rich Christian heritage, which has its starting point in the self-giving love of God and Christ.<sup>152</sup> To what extent ἀγάπη should be consciously contrasted to the more sexually oriented ἔρως is variously assessed.<sup>153</sup> In this context, it seems clear that (1) ἀγαπάω is in no way confined to sexual love and (2) in no way excludes, but rather clearly includes the sexual love of the marital

relationship.<sup>154</sup> Normal sexual love, which is God-given and part of the creation He sustains, is now informed and transformed by the breaking in of a new order of salvation. This new order affirms marital love in all its aspects, including sexual love, but also calls the partners to a new understanding of marital love as revealed in the model of Christ and the Church. Thus, the husband's love is now defined by Christ's sacrificial love.

καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτόν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, Christ loved the Church and offered himself on her behalf.<sup>155</sup> ἠγάπησεν in the aorist tense, though perhaps ingressive,<sup>156</sup> points to a particular act as the parallel ἑαυτόν παρέδωκεν confirms. In view is Christ's sacrificial death as that which reveals and demonstrates Christ's love for the Church.<sup>157</sup> The Church is explicitly cited as the object of Christ's love and self-offering. This is unique in the New Testament, raising the question as to what is meant by ἡ ἐκκλησία.<sup>158</sup> Earlier we saw that ἐκκλησία denotes the eschatological gathering, gathered under the banner of Christ.<sup>159</sup> It is the new humanity inaugurated by the New Adam. The reference here cannot be restricted to Israel or Jesus' disciples in any way that excludes the Gentile readers. In v 2 practically the same formulation occurs only with ἡμᾶς as the object, and the context make clear that this includes the Gentile readers. Also in ii 16 Christ reconciles both Gentile and Jew through the cross, and in i 4ff all believers are chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world to be holy and blameless before God. Has the author simply read the Church back into the history of Jesus? We think not.

It is equally clear that Gentile believers are incorporated into an originally Jewish blessing (ii 11-22, iii 6). But the Israel to which Gentiles are joined is the true Israel now defined via the author's Christology (ii 12, cf. i 12).<sup>160</sup> This provides a link between OT and NT believers based on their faith in the promised Messiah. This link is more easily understood when we note the author's wholistic thinking. The work



and person of Christ is inclusive of the history that he determines. But we are concerned with an eschatological event based on the eternal will of God (i 4ff, iii 11). The history determined by this event includes not only what follows from it but also what leads up to it. Thus for our author Israel and the Church belong to the same historical totality determined by Christ. Israel expresses what it meant to be a gathering gathered under Christ prior to the eschatological event of his death and resurrection. So for Christ to love and die for this Israel meant to love and die for the Church, for this Israel depicts the Church in its pre-eschatological mode of being.

The Church now stands on this side of Christ's eschatological event and appropriately attains a new mode of historical manifestation. The revelation that Gentiles also share in the benefits of Christ's death and resurrection shows that Christ's love and death for Israel indicates nothing less than God's decision to love all men.<sup>161</sup> The unity between Jew and Gentile marks the new eschatological and spiritual structure of the Church so as to make clear the Church's dependence on the history of Israel, and its independence from the dominion of the Law. Thus when re-defined Christologically, Israel's history becomes the history of faith, and Christ's love for this faithful Israel indicates God's electing love for any and all believers in Christ, i.e. for the Church.

Vs. 26: ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι, This verse begins an extended statement about the purpose of Christ's love and self-offering. Emphatic in position, αὐτὴν picks up the αὐτῆς of vs. 25b and so denotes the Church. The purpose of Christ's act of love and self-offering is to sanctify the Church. Ἀγιάζω has cultic associations stemming from OT usage, hence "to set apart for a sacred use," "to consecrate."<sup>162</sup> The idea was connected with Israel's election, especially as this was linked to the Exodus and ensuing Sinaitic covenant.<sup>163</sup> This does not mean the idea is void of moral import.

Commenting on the priestly Holiness Code, Eichrodt states:

The holy God wills not only to separate his elect out of the world for his service by sanctifying them - separation being the normal meaning of holiness, when predicated of Man - but also to see the immaculate purity of his own nature; that which separates him from the sinful impurity of human living, reflected in a holy people.<sup>164</sup>

In the NT writings such sanctification shows less concern for things, places, or rites, as for life in the Spirit.<sup>165</sup> Here as in the Old Testament, holiness is pre-ethical, but "it demands behavior which rightly responds to the Holy Spirit."<sup>166</sup> Also of possible importance is that in later rabbinic tractates, שְׂדֵק has replaced קֶנֶה in expressing betrothal.<sup>167</sup> This usage probably arose from viewing God's appropriation of Israel as a nuptial covenant.<sup>168</sup> In Eph v 26 ἀγιάσῃ refers to an act of Christ that has a positive content for the Church, i.e. its election, separation from the world, and position of favor. This may be seen in the exaltation of believers in the heavenly places, in its description as a holy and spiritual temple, or in its character as a witness of God's wisdom. But if this is correct, a double nuance need not be excluded. The nuptial context readily lends itself to comparison with the Rabbinic formulations.

In contrast to ἀγιάσῃ, καθαρίσας is more negative in content.<sup>169</sup> The "cleansing" or "purification" occurs simultaneously with the sanctification.<sup>170</sup> From what the Church is cleansed is never directly stated. Vs. 27 gives some descriptive phrases that deal primarily with the bodily purity of the Bride. But the image is best taken figuratively in reference to the removal of moral and spiritual impurity, namely sin. The cleansing takes place in or perhaps through the bath of the water, τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος.<sup>171</sup> The articles suggest that a specific bath is in mind, and most scholars conclude that baptism is in view.<sup>172</sup> The idea of a corporate baptism probably stems from the nuptial imagery of the Bridal bath.<sup>173</sup> Sometimes this is denied because it implies that, contrary to custom, the Bridegroom administers the Bridal bath. But in Ez xvi Yahweh

ceremonially washes Jerusalem, having betrothed her, entered into a marital contract and claimed her for His own.<sup>174</sup> Thus, as with ἀγιάζω, a double reference is possible, and hence baptism is viewed as a corporate event through nuptial imagery.

The phrase ἐν ῥήμα is variously interpreted. Some scholars connect it to (a) τῷ λουτρῷ, others to (b) καθάριας, and still others to (c) ἀγίαση.<sup>175</sup> If the connection is not clear, neither is its meaning. Schlier thinks it indicates Christ's name in the baptismal formula.<sup>176</sup> In contrast, Barth proposes on the basis of Rabbinic parallels that it is a declaration of love which seals the marriage.<sup>177</sup> Other possible references are to the gospel, or the confession of the subject baptised.<sup>178</sup> But whatever the connection, the action centers on Christ. While this does not altogether exclude a change of reference, it makes it unlikely. If anyone says this word, it is Christ.<sup>179</sup>

Vs. 27: ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἐνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, The purpose of Christ's love and self-offering for the Church is further elucidated. The connection to what precedes and what follows is not altogether clear. The Church's presentation in glory (ἐνδοξον) would seem to presuppose its sanctification and purification. Even so the ultimate source of the presentation must reach back to Christ's love and self-offering.<sup>180</sup>

Christ himself presents the Church to himself. The nuptial imagery is strained at this point. Usually the person who handles the Bride's affairs presents her to the husband. This person was often the Bride's father. The closest parallel to this use of παρίστημι is in II Cor xi 3, where Paul acts as the Bride's friend or father (cf. I Cor iv 14f) and will present the Bride to Christ. But here Christ prepares, presents and receives the Bride for himself. This is not without precedence as Ez xvi shows. There Yahweh is the foster-father and bridegroom in a manner similar to here.<sup>181</sup>



Christ presents the Church to himself ἑνδοξόν. According to iii 21 there is to be glory in the Church forever, and according to i 12 Christians are to live to the praise of God's glory. Here the Church is depicted in all her bridal splendor and radiance.<sup>182</sup> This receives further definition in the following clause.

μὴ ἔχουσιν στίλον ἢ ρυτίδα ἢ τι τῶν τοιούτων, Here the author depicts what the Church will not have. She will be perfect, without spot or wrinkle or anything of the kind. Some scholars suggest that the reference is to old age.<sup>183</sup> Thus the Church is to be ever young and full of perpetual life. But vs. 27c which contrasts vs. 27b does not mention youth any more than vs. 27b mentions old age.<sup>184</sup> More probable is Sampley's proposal that purity traditions which originally applied to priests and sacrificial animals had been taken over into marital discourse, especially concerning divorce.<sup>185</sup> Such defects would not only cause the Church to be unclean, but also to be put away.

ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡ ἁγία καὶ ἄμωμος, Christ presents the Church to himself glorious, not to find fault with her, but that she might be holy and spotless. Ἀλλά ties the clause closely to vs. 27b, making the two clauses co-ordinate and dependent on παραστήση. Vs. 27c says in positive terms what vs. 27b says in negative terms. The change from a participial construction to a ἵνα-clause, perhaps precludes the misunderstanding that the Church is already without blemish.<sup>186</sup>

Thus far we have noted the author's use of nuptial imagery. To obtain a better picture of what he intends to say through this imagery, an inquiry into its background is necessary.

#### Excursus: The Ephesian Nuptial Imagery<sup>187</sup>

Our author never calls Christ the husband or Bridegroom, nor the Church the Betrothed, Bride, or wife.<sup>188</sup> Rather he compares the saving relation between Christ and the Church and the marital relation between husband and wife. But in making this comparison, the author describes the

Christ/Church relation in nuptial imagery, suggesting his awareness of the NT idea of the Bride of Christ. This image would have greatly facilitated the comparison with human marriage; especially to a mind that thinks corporately, such an image would bear a quite realistic vitality and power.<sup>189</sup>

For the background of this imagery we turn first to the OT idea of the marriage between Yahweh and Israel. The concept probably had its roots in the widespread idea of a marriage between a god and a land or city, whose children were the population.<sup>190</sup> Hosea was apparently the first to adapt this to Yahweh and Israel.<sup>191</sup> But other prophets used it as well and with a variety of emphases. As Gnllka states:

Die Palette reicht von den zärtlichen Tönen, die Ez. 16, 1ff anklingen lässt, über die Schmeichelworte Jer. 2, 2 bis hin zum schockierenden prophetischen Handeln eines Hosea, der Buhlerinnen zu Frauen nimmt, um Israel seine Untreue gegen Gott vorzudemonstrieren....<sup>192</sup>

The point of comparison lies in the idea of a covenant, i.e. the covenant between Yahweh and Israel is conceived as a marriage covenant.<sup>193</sup> Within this framework, Yahweh always takes the initiative, whether for marriage or divorce. Israel and/or Judah are usually pictured in their faithlessness to the ever faithful husband Yahweh. So in content the image largely has a negative force.<sup>194</sup> There are, however, more positive eschatological uses which look forward to the joyous and festive covenant renewal and remarriage (cf. Isa lxi 10; lxii 4, 5).<sup>195</sup> Still, in the prophetic conception the Messiah is not prefigured as the Bridegroom.

Of the OT passages which may have influenced Eph v 25-27, special attention should be drawn to Ez xvi 3-14.<sup>196</sup> Three points are of note: (1) Throughout, Yahweh is the actor. He saves Jerusalem from being abandoned like an unwanted child, provides for her growth, then later betroths or marries her.<sup>197</sup> In Ephesians Christ saves the Church and he himself presents it to himself. (2) Yahweh washes the young bride. In Ephesians Christ cleanses the Church "in the bath of the water with a word."



(3) Yahweh dresses and decks the Bride with fine clothes and jewelry.... "And your renown went forth among the nations because of your beauty, for it was perfect through the splendor (בְּהִדְרָא) which I had bestowed upon you" (Ez xvi 14). In Ephesians, Christ presents the Church to himself in glory (ἐνδοξον), without spot or wrinkle or any such thing. These points of contact are not so exact as to prove literary dependency. Also, unlike Ephesians, Ezekiel's positive treatment quickly becomes the basis for his criticism of Jerusalem, and so heightens the negative impact of a betrayed covenant.<sup>198</sup> Still the points are sufficient to suggest a traditional milieu of ideas which our author could adapt to his own purposes.

The marriage of Yahweh and Israel is singularly absent in Qumran, Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical writings.<sup>199</sup> Naturally the image remains available by virtue of its presence in the OT Scriptures, but also by the NT era, the Song of Songs and Ps xlv were being allegorically referred to Yahweh and Israel.<sup>200</sup> Also widespread use of nuptial imagery in Rabbinic literature suggests the ongoing influence of the OT image.<sup>201</sup> The Rabbis often likened the revelation at Sinai to a wedding or betrothal ceremony. With God as the Bridegroom and Israel the Bride, Moses serves as the Bride's friend and the Torah as the marital contract.<sup>202</sup> Sometimes the marriage occurs at Sinai (e.g. Pirke R. El. 41), but more often the Sinaitic covenant indicates the betrothal as in DeutR iii 12:

When a Jew betroths a woman, who has to pay the writing of the document of betrothal? Our Rabbis have learnt thus: Documents of betrothal and marriage are written only with the consent of the two parties, and the bridegroom pays the fee. And this we learn from God from his betrothal of Israel at Sinai, as it is written, And the Lord said unto Moses: Go unto the people and betroth / קדשתם / them today and tomorrow (Ex. xix 10).<sup>203</sup>

The text further relates that Moses' lustrous countenance is his reward for writing this marital contract, i.e. the Torah. Of note here is how God's betrothal to Israel justifies a Jewish marital custom. Elsewhere the actual wedding with its festive feast is stated to occur in the days of the Messiah (e.g. ExR xv 31, LevR xi 2).<sup>204</sup> But the Messiah is not



pictured as the Bridegroom.<sup>205</sup> So in Rabbinic Judaism, as in the OT prophets, nuptial imagery depicts God's covenant relation to Israel. It is thus (a) associated with God's acts of salvation which may be viewed from the perspective of the Exodus or of the future consummation; and (b) it pictures the present effectiveness and relevance of God's salvific acts as a currently binding marital bond and covenant to which God is ever faithful.

Beyond OT and Jewish traditions, the background of Eph v 25-27 is frequently sought in the widespread idea of a hieros gamos. This appears to have varied and interrelated forms. Often human representatives ritually imitate the union of divine beings to insure divine blessings. As B. A. Brooks states:

Annually the revival of Nature at the Spring season was believed to result from divine union, and was celebrated by more or less elaborate ritual, the divine union often being enacted by votaries. This form of sympathetic magic was common and furnished a major reason for the maintenance of sacred prostitutes in connection with ancient temples. By magical rites which often included actual intercourse with a sacred votary, it was believed possible to insure fertility of crops, to secure offspring with divine sanction, or to feel one's self assimilated to the deity.<sup>206</sup>

This conception is very old and widespread among fertility cults. We also find the idea of a god having sexual relations directly with a human being. While this too was widespread in the Orient, it has particularly deep roots in Hellenistic soil.<sup>207</sup> Here sexual union between the divine and human produces a child with supernatural powers. The most famous example is Zeus's union with Alcemene (the wife of Amphitryon) who subsequently gave birth to Hercules. This form of myth probably underlies the hieros gamos of the mystery religions, and perhaps appears in a much truncated form in Wisdom and Sirach.<sup>208</sup> Philo also shows familiarity with the concept when he demythologizes it into moral categories.<sup>209</sup> Later in Gnosticism we find an array of divine syzygies.<sup>210</sup> Although the outlines are not always clear, generally the syzygy between the divine sōter and the fallen sophia portrays the salvation effected when a person marries his angelic

counterpart.<sup>211</sup> The Gnostics came to express this redemption from "evil matter" either in asceticism or promiscuity.<sup>212</sup>

Also human marriage, and not simply ritual intercourse, found its model in divine marriages. In Athens Zeus and Hera served as the prototypical ideal for normal human marriage. Here the hieros gamos denotes, not cultic traffic with prostitutes, but "contract marriages sacred to Zeus and Hera," the accent being on personal fulfillment rather than fertility.<sup>213</sup> Similar ideas may also be implied by Plato (Resp v 458E), although more certain are the later statements of Seneca and Libanius which, as already noted, are informative of the Haustafel-genre. Less certain, but possible evidence is the portrayal of Dionysus and Ariadne in the "bridal chamber" of Villa Igem.<sup>215</sup> Also in a later Gnostic work, Baruch, aspects of human marriage are patterned after the heavenly union of Elohim and Eden.<sup>216</sup> But while clear enough, this evidence is not over abundant. Perhaps in Hellenistic as well as Jewish circles the tendency was to find the impulse and bond of normal human sexual relations in the creation of man (cf. Plat. Sym. 190-193).

Certainly the varying hieros gamos conceptions form a broad framework from which the union of divine figures are readily understood as important for human affairs. But important differences exist between these conceptions and Eph v 25-27. These myths presuppose an atemporal framework of which Ephesians knows little. Christ and Church are brought into relation through the historical death of Jesus and this salvation event is not repeated yearly, but once and for all.<sup>217</sup> Also Eph v 22-33 shows little concern about the union of the divine and human so as to reproduce supernatural offspring. If offspring of this union are implied at all, they represent in covenantal terms, "children of promise" (cf. Gal iv 28), not supernatural heroes such as Hercules.<sup>218</sup> Also unlikely is that human marriage is thought to parallel the participants in ritual intercourse, since these human representatives were hardly married in the secular sense.

In Ephesians Christian marriage is much more than ritual. Nor do the gnostic syzygies help us, since these primarily concern the individual's release from imprisonment in evil matter.<sup>219</sup> Little in Ephesians suggests the influence of this gnostic motif.<sup>220</sup> The strongest parallel is the arrangement of human marriage on the model of divine marriages. This is of conceivable influence, perhaps by way of the Haustafel-genre.

In NT nuptial imagery the bridegroom is Christ rather than Yahweh. In the Synoptic Gospels this "appears not so much as a doctrine imparted, but in occasional references, which must have been understood by some at least of the early hearers and readers."<sup>221</sup> Thus Mark ii 18-20 reports that unlike the disciples of John the Baptist and the Pharisees, fasting is inappropriate for Jesus' disciples: "Can the wedding guests fast while the bridegroom is with them? As long as they have the bridegroom with them they cannot fast (vs. 19). In Matt xxii 1-14 and xxv 1-13 the eschatological marriage feast comes to the fore. These texts stress "the present crisis for the messianic community in the light of the apocalyptic nature of the Kingdom."<sup>222</sup>

In John iii 25ff the image contrasts the diminishing ministry of John the Baptist and the growing ministry of Jesus. John depicts his relation to Jesus as the Bridegroom's friend: "He who has the bride is the bridegroom; the friend of the bridegroom who stands and hears him, rejoices greatly at the bridegroom's voice; therefore this joy of mine is now full" (vs. 29f). In Rev xix 6ff the seer envisions the great marriage banquet at the wedding of the Bride and the Lamb of God. The Bride, whose righteousness and splendor contrasts the degenerate harlotry of Babylon, is the New Jerusalem, the Church.

Several factors become clear in these passages. Christ is the central figure, i.e. the Bridegroom. While it is debatable whether Jesus himself made this identification, the application was probably early. Not only does the passing manner in which the image is often introduced speak for this, but also the image's widespread basis in Mark, John, the special source of Matthew, Revelation and as we shall see, Paul.<sup>223</sup> This suggests



that the contours of the image are defined under Jewish rather than purely Hellenistic influence. Also favoring this is the general future orientation of the image, which may well imply that the OT image was mediated to the NT writers through an apocalyptic environment.<sup>224</sup>

If these passages consistently point to Christ as the Bridegroom, they vary as to the status of believers.<sup>225</sup> Sometimes believers are cast individually as "wedding guests" (Mark ii 18-20; Matt xxii 1-14; xxv 1-13); other times more corporately as the Bride (John iii 25ff; Rev xxi 9; xxii 17); and once as both (Rev xix 7-9). This variation is perhaps explained by the ambiguous relation which the Christian believers originally held with Israel. If the Messiah was to marry Israel, there would be occasion to depict the Christian's special participation in the marriage event without identifying the believers with the Bride. But as the Church emerged more and more as a distinct entity, it became more and more plausible to depict it as the true Bride.

The nuptial image also occurs in the undisputed letters of Paul. Scholars disagree whether a marriage takes place between Christ and the believer in Rom vii 4 or between Christ and the Church in Gal iv 21-33.<sup>226</sup> If these texts are allowed, they show how in Paul Christ and the believer or Church are already married. Particularly in Gal iv 21-33, is the concept of the New Jerusalem interpreted in terms of the new covenant. Also to be mentioned here is I Cor vi 12ff, where Christ's relation to the believer is found incompatible with that of the believer and a harlot.<sup>227</sup> But there Christ parallels the harlot, and the believer cleaves to him. Is Christ the Bride in this instance?<sup>228</sup>

If these texts are questionable, beyond dispute is II Cor xi 2ff:

I feel a divine jealousy for you, for I betrothed you to Christ to present you as a pure bride to her one husband. But I am afraid that as the serpent deceived Eve by his cunning, your thoughts will be led astray from a sincere and pure devotion to Christ.

Here Paul serves as the Bride's father (cf. I Cor iv 14f) and is active in

the betrothal. The occasion of the betrothal was Paul's preaching of the gospel to the Corinthians. Since betrothal was legally binding, Paul urges the Corinthians to remain faithful to and pure for the congregation's one and only husband Christ. The consummation of the marriage will take place at Christ's coming. In the Corinthians' betrothed relation to Christ, the Corinthian church is comparable to Eve. That Eve was already married when she sinned does not hinder the comparison because both marriage and betrothal involve a legally binding marital covenant. Some scholars conclude from this comparison that the Church is a second Eve.<sup>229</sup> But several points speak against this: (1) Here Paul presents the Corinthian church to Christ. In the Adam/Eve story, God presents Eve to Adam. (2) It is not the whole Church, but the local congregation that is betrothed. A second Eve could only stand for the whole Church, and even as God's representative as apostle, Paul cannot possibly mean that he betrothed the entire Church.<sup>230</sup>

In summing up, then, three themes are fairly consistent in the NT use of nuptial imagery. (1) Christ is the central figure of the imagery. (2) Participation in the marriage event, whether as guest or bride, pictures participation in the salvation that Christ brings, i.e. marriage depicts a salvation event. (3) The Church or the local congregation may be explicitly conceived as the Bride of Christ. When consideration is given to both the variety and similarities in the NT usage, along with its broad basis in the NT writings, it may reasonably be assumed that the image has Jewish roots. In this regard the OT picture of Israel and Yahweh is the most likely and natural antecedent.

The nuptial imagery of Ephesians stands within this NT tradition. Christ is the central figure, while the Church is his Bride; the marital process clearly depicts the process of salvation. Still, several points need explanation.

(1) Christ's death obtains a central place in the imagery. This is unique in the NT usage though Revelation hints at it when Christ is called the Lamb of God. How, then, was Christ's death so readily incorporated into the nuptial imagery? Schlier has brought forth a variety of gnostic texts which portray divine syzygies, but these do little to explain how Christ's death could be understood as such a syzygy.<sup>231</sup> In contrast Chavasse and Gnllka think that Eve's creation from Adam's rib explains this.<sup>232</sup> This, of course, requires that Christ's death and Adam's sleep be analogous. While this is possible, there is little to suggest that it was in the mind of our author. What we do find is a certain ambiguity of terminology, which vacillates between Christian and nuptial imagery, e.g. the baptism and the Bridal bath. It is more profitable, then, to recognize that according to the early Church Christ's death establishes a new covenant.<sup>233</sup> Occasionally it is even paralleled to the events of the Exodus.<sup>234</sup> Once considered as establishing a covenant, the OT and Jewish nuptial imagery, which has its starting point here, is easily and readily applied. This also explains the vacillation of the terminology; the common point is the covenant relationship.

(2) Another question concerns the manner and extent that Christ's saving events are correlated to the events of the marital process. The difficulty here is that the author does not work out the details of his imagery, but leaves them to be inferred from a sometimes ambiguous context. We have suggested that Christ's death initiates a covenant bond that is pictured as a marital bond. But in vss. 26-27 the Church is clearly in the process of being married; she is being made ready for her husband; the wedding ceremony has already begun. This makes better sense when we recognize that according to Rabbinic custom the marital covenant becomes binding at betrothal. Taken in this way vss. 25-27 vividly picture a marital process that begins with the acquisition of the Bride and ends with the consummation of the marriage in the Bride's presentation to her



husband, Christ. After the pattern of Ez xvi Christ himself makes her ready; if he is her betrothed, he is also the father or friend who presents her to himself.

This still leaves unanswered whether from the author's perspective the marriage has already taken place or awaits future consummation.<sup>235</sup> The question is compounded in that the time in which salvation is realized in believers is expressed in the New Testament both as present and future.<sup>236</sup> Ephesians is no different in this regard. If believers are already saved and in the heavenly places, they are also sealed to a "day of redemption" and must presently wage a spiritual battle. If our passage pictures the saving bond between Christ and Church as a marital covenant, the author does not state in what stage of marital process he presently envisions Christ and the Church to be. The main point is that this marital covenant with Christ exists and has important implications for human marriage. So for our purposes we may leave the question open. For whether betrothed or married the Church's future is an outworking of the once and for all bond established by Christ's sacrificial death. Whether betrothed or married, the Head/Body metaphor provides a convenient means to apply the Christ/Church relation to the one flesh relation of marriage. Also whether betrothed or married, we prefer to speak of the Bride of Christ. If betrothed, the Bride remains faithful to the marital covenant already established and is caught up in the joyous process that leads to its consummation. If married, the wife remains the Bride who lives in the immediacy of the event and is ever caught up in the joyous process of becoming the man's wife in all things.

(3) A third question concerns how Christ and the Church become the prototypes for human marriage. There are several possibilities, which are not really exclusive of one another. There is, for example, what we may call "reciprocal metaphor." Best describes the situation in this way:

In some respects Yahweh treats Israel as a good husband would treat his wife. If this is accepted, it is the simplest

thing to say to wives and husbands; behave to one another as do Yahweh and Israel (Christ and the Church). Such an argument may not be perfectly logical but it is perfectly natural since a great deal is known about the mutual relationships of Christ and the Church, e.g. he loved her and gave himself for her; she obeys him.<sup>237</sup>

This approach becomes even more cogent if we allow here a secondary influence from Hellenistic conceptions.<sup>238</sup> As seen above, the evidence, while not overwhelming, is sufficient to argue that human marriages could be considered copies of divine marriages.<sup>239</sup> Also these ideas were common to the house code form.<sup>240</sup> The influence of these concepts need not have been in the area of metaphysics for them to have facilitated the kind of reciprocal metaphor that Best describes. But a third factor also emerges. Hellenistic Judaism took over stoic ethical codes replacing the pagan gods with the Torah as the source of proper behavior. We see NT evidence of this in that house code injunctions often include a reference to or example from the Old Testament, particularly the Pentateuch. Also we have seen (quite independently of the Haustafel) that Gen ii 24 could be used as a divine sanction of marriage. So Adam and Eve were probably the prototype of the marital relation; a prototype based on creation as revealed through the Torah.

Now in applying the nuptial imagery to Christ and the Church, and in bringing this to bear on the house code injunctions, the author actually does two things. First, human couples are to model neither pagan gods nor the human examples in the Torah, but Christ and the Church.<sup>241</sup> A second point follows: the order of creation is no longer interpreted by the Law, but by the Christ event, i.e. the order of salvation. Christ and Church do not replace Adam and Eve as the representatives of the human race through whom God historically initiated the created order of the sexes. This order is still present in every man and every woman. But Christ and the Church do replace Adam and Eve where the latter couple was thought to embody the revelation of the Torah to which all persons must conform.<sup>242</sup>

Thus, the Christ event is the new principle of interpreting the structures of this world, even the Torah.

We think these factors adequately explain the comparison between the Christ/Church relation and human marriages. A reciprocal metaphor would have been quickly appropriated in an atmosphere that looks to divine realities for models of behavior, whether revealed in divine marriages or examples sanctioned by the divine Law.

(4) Since the creation account plays a role in the comparison, some scholars think that the Church is viewed as the New Eve.<sup>243</sup> But the Church is never called this and the idea is not necessary. Certainly, there is a sense in which the Church may be compared to Eve. She, as the representative of every woman, was created from Adam for him, and the Church too is created from Christ for him. Thus, Eve is a type of the Church in the sense that she represents every woman, and clearly the Church is presented as a woman here. But this is quite different from stating that Eve is a type of the Church, in the sense that Adam is a type of Christ. For the latter involves the nature of Adam's actions in relation to all people. Nothing suggests this relation with regard to Eve and the Church. At least, the author never draws this conclusion.

Vs. 28: οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ἀγαπᾶν τὰς ἑαυτῶν γυναῖκας ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα.<sup>244</sup> οὕτως looks back to the preceding statements rather than forward to ὡς.<sup>245</sup> In this way ὀφείλουσιν obtains a Christological context; the prime and motivating example of the husband's love is Christ's loving relation to the Church.<sup>246</sup> The words ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα indicate the characteristic quality that should be displayed in the husband's love for his wife. The idea is not that the husband loves his wife "as he loves his own body," nor "as if she is his own body," nor again "since she is his own body."<sup>247</sup> Rather, "husbands ought to love their wives as ones who are their own bodies," or again, "as men whose wives are their own bodies." Thus the quality that is to



characterize the husband's love is his unity with his wife. He is to love his wife in a manner fitting to her being his own body.

The unity of the husband with his wife is indicated in the expression, τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα. In vs. 23 Christ and the husband are designated as heads; the Church is also indicated as Christ's Body. Now the circle is made complete and the wife is depicted as the husband's body. Here as in vs. 23 the influence of the one flesh conception may be felt. To be sure, unlike the designation of the husband as head, the designation of the wife as the husband's body is not unique as a few Greek and Rabbinic parallels show.<sup>248</sup> But how widespread the idea was is difficult to say.

To call the wife the husband's body clearly evinces a close relationship. But the nature of that relationship is not clear. For the Gentile readers σῶμα in this context could have had a negative sense. When Plutarch describes the husband/wife relation as soul/body, the husband's rule over an often unruly subject is probably in mind.<sup>249</sup> Also the use of σῶμα as property in the case of a slave could well point to the idea of possession. Indeed, this idea could conceivably be present in our text in ἑαυτῶν. Assuming our author is aware of these connotations, we must then ask about his own understanding of σῶμα. This was probably informed through the general Semitic understanding of man, as well as the example of Christ as man par excellence. The interchange of σῶμα, ἑαυτόν and σάρξ points in this direction, indicating that σῶμα represents the whole person. Thus in the immediate context, vs. 28b becomes very important in explaining his understanding of the kind of relationship at stake in calling the wife σῶμα.

ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἑαυτόν ἀγαπᾷ, The sentence, as Sampley has pointed out, shows resemblance to the love command of Lev xix 18.<sup>250</sup> But its immediate purpose is to define the nature of the bond that is depicted through τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα. Σῶμα could have too many different connotations to leave this to chance: "He who loves his wife loves

himself." The unity that is to characterize the husband's love for the wife is a corporate unity, a unity of the whole person to the other, the seeing and identifying of one's self in the other person. Thus, self-love is introduced to illustrate neither love's nature nor its motivation, but the intensity of the bond between husband and wife.

Vs. 29: οὐδεὶς γὰρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν, The conjunction γὰρ probably has an explanatory meaning and may be translated "now" or "why": "Why nobody ever hated his own flesh."<sup>251</sup> Ἐμίσησεν is a gnomic aorist and points to a general principle or characteristic.<sup>252</sup> The verse does not explain the motive or cause of the husband's love for his wife, but rather the simple incompatibility of the one flesh bond with hatred. Hatred is uncharacteristic and contrary to the nature of the union between husband and wife, for the bond between them is virtually the same as that between a man and himself. Since it is uncharacteristic and unnatural for a person to relate to himself in overt acts of hatred, the same applies to a man's relation to his wife, for they are one flesh. The introduction of σὰρξ probably anticipates the upcoming Scripture quotation.<sup>253</sup> Of course, the thought of Gen ii 24 has been shown to be implicit in much already said. The change to σὰρξ here reflects the interchangeability of σῶμα, ἑαυτόν and σὰρξ. This is important for it indicates the importance of Gen ii 24 for those places where synonyms for σὰρξ occur.

ἀλλὰ ἐκτρέφει καὶ θάλπει αὐτήν, If hate is uncharacteristic of a person's relation to himself, or any part of himself (i.e. his wife), then the terms ἐκτρέφω and θάλπω depict what is characteristic of this relationship.<sup>254</sup> These terms occur together only here in the New Testament. As they share the same object, αὐτήν, they probably convey a single thought. This all but excludes a reference to the Eucharist, for as Best shows, only ἐκτρέφω could really be applied to that thought.<sup>255</sup>

The background of the terms is not altogether clear. Ἐκτρέφω occurs in vi 4 and θάλπω occurs in I Thess ii 7; both refer to the care of children. Since the position of a woman in the household was often considered like (or no better than) a child's, this background is quite plausible.<sup>256</sup> The husband was responsible not only for the physical well being, but also the spiritual nurture and instruction of the family.

Since the usage finds a parallel in Christ's continual nurture and care for the Church, the words were possibly chosen because of Christ's relation to the Church. We have already seen in a different context how Christ provides the ἐπιχορηγία (iv 16) to the Church. In this vein, Schlier has gathered evidence that shows the use of τρέφω in cosmological and political contexts.<sup>257</sup> But these texts are an unlikely background for the idea here. If one sees the starting point in the broader nuptial imagery as it relates to Christ and the Church, then Ez xvi 1-14 seems a more likely candidate. As Barth states:

The way in which the Foster Father and Bridegroom Yahweh treats the foundling girl Jerusalem (Ez. 16:1-14) shows which details of caring for the baby, child, and adolescent were repeated when a bride was washed, fed, and dressed up in splendor.<sup>258</sup>

καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Again the marital bond is compared to that between Christ and the Church. In vs. 29 σὰρξ could conceivably refer to either oneself or to one's wife as a part of oneself. Now by making the Church the object of Christ's nurture and care, the author shows that to whatever extent self-love plays a role here, it is defined by Christ's relation to the Church. In this context self-love no longer means that the self is the object of one's love but the subject. It is not a loving of oneself, but a loving with the giving of oneself to another. This has its purest and most perfect example in Christ's love for the Church. In vs. 25 Christ's love and self-offering for the Church was considered as a once and for all event; here his nurture and care are continual. Thus the love that bound Christ to the Church is continually



present to the Church in his ongoing nurture and cherishing concern. This point seems clear in what follows.

Vs. 30: ὅτι μέλη ἐσμέν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ.<sup>260</sup> The reason is now given for Christ's continual love, nurture and care for the Church: "because we are members of his Body." In stressing membership in Christ's Body the author indicates that unity with Christ is the basis of his continual nurture and care for the Church. It is of note that μέλη stands in an emphatic position. Why does the author change from ἐκκλησία to μέλη τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ? We detect a twofold significance.

(1) In couching his statement in these terms the author reminds his readers that unity with Christ is necessary not only for the continual love and nurture of the Church, but that its very existence depends on him.<sup>261</sup> Through his love and self-offering Christ binds himself to believers and so constitutes the Church by his unity with believers. By continually nurturing and caring for the Church, Christ sustains what constitutes the Church, i.e. the unity established with believers through his death. This means that the sacrificial love wherein Christ effected the unity between himself and believers, making them members of his Body, is ever operative in his loving maintenance and sustainment of the relation established thereby.

(2) In pointing to the believers' membership in Christ's Body, the author not only points to him who binds himself with believers, but also points out that it is believers to whom he binds himself. Everything said about Christ's relation to the Church applies to every community member.<sup>262</sup> This is not intended to isolate the individual believer from the community, however. If the change shows the relevance of what is said of the Church to each believer, it does so by pointing to his participation and membership in the community which emerges from Christ's loving union with believers, i.e. the Church as the Body of Christ.

### C. The Scripture Quotation, Its Significance and Application

Vs. 31: ἀντὶ τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.<sup>263</sup> The verse is a quotation from LXX Gen ii 24. Earlier we discussed the saying's original context and general history. We also saw how it serves as a divine ordinance of marriage and its importance to the whole passage. Here we may focus on the verse's place in the author's train of thought. A key issue is how one interprets the phrase ἀντὶ τούτου. The LXX differs, rendering ἔνεκεν τούτου for the Hebrew לְכֵן . Still, the meaning is essentially the same and we may translate "for this reason," "on account of this," "therefore," etc.<sup>264</sup> The difficulty is not the phrase's translation but its point of reference. What is its antecedent?<sup>265</sup>

Since the phrase is part of the quotation it perhaps does not have any immediate syntactical function, but simply points to the context of Gen ii 24. Sampley has shown that a Scripture quotation or example would have been expected in the Haustafel.<sup>266</sup> Still this solution seems unlikely. Without an introductory formula the reader or listener would have already made some kind of connection. While the expectancy of a Scripture reference would have aided the reader to apply that reference to the whole passage once it was recognized, the reader would have been well into the quotation before this could happen. This is doubly the case since the words belong to no known edition of the LXX.<sup>267</sup> More likely then, the words are intended to make some kind of connection with what precedes.

The most immediate and natural point of reference is vs. 30. The major objection is that this seems limiting.<sup>268</sup> We have already shown that Gen ii 24 relates to the wife's submission to her husband as well as the husband's unity with his wife. This implies that the antecedent should prepare the reader for a statement justifying the thrust of the whole passage, which is the interpretation of marriage after the

Christ/Church model. But actually vs. 30 does prepare the reader for this. As seen above, the change to μέλη makes the statements concerning Christ and the Church relevant to all Church members. Thus, in finding the antecedent of ἀντὶ τούτου in vs. 30, the reader is prepared for a statement in vs. 31 about the relevance of the Christ/Church model to all believers. We suggest, then, that ἀντὶ τούτου refers to the relationship established by Christ with the Church. The quotation is thus interpreted by this relationship and hence becomes a justification for the preceding statements about human marriage.

Several important consequences follow from this view. First, the quotation primarily concerns human, not divine marriage. The appearance of σὰρξ in vs. 29 already suggests that in vs. 31 human marriage cannot be excluded.<sup>269</sup> But more importantly we should note that if Christ's relation to the Church is the starting point, ἄνθρωπος will not refer directly to him, but to any prospective husband. The same, of course, was true in Adam's case: he did not leave his father and mother either, and hence the reference could not be directly to him. Here, Christ and the Church replace the first couple (probably via fulfillment) as the interpretive models of marriage. Of course, Christ and the Church do not replace Adam and Eve in their historical function of initiating the created order. Rather it seems that all aspects of creation, including marriage, find their ultimate and intended focus in Christ, which implies, of course, his saving relation to the Church. Thus, the order of salvation, represented by Christ's saving relation to the Church, now interprets, even in its most pristine form, the order of creation which the first couple represented. Since the order initiated by Adam and Eve was still thought to be present in the current social structures of marriage, there was no need to mention the first couple explicitly.

A second point follows. Σὰρξ μία is not to be directly (which in this case means allegorically) interpreted of Christ and the Church, but



rather of the union of man and wife. This is not to deny that the author finds a point of contact between the one flesh idea and the Christ/Church relation. What, then, is the nature and basis of this contact? Because σάρξ and σῶμα are used as synonyms, the author may simply have seen a parallel between his σῶμα Χριστοῦ concept and the μία σάρξ relationship. If so, it is clear that σῶμα Χριστοῦ interprets μία σάρξ and not vice versa. Thus, μία σάρξ does not represent a higher or more intimate union than σῶμα Χριστοῦ or κεφαλὴ/σῶμα.<sup>270</sup> While this is true, it is likely in view of vs. 32 that μία σάρξ was also thought to typify the prototypical relationship between Christ and the Church. To understand this more fully we proceed to the next verse.

Vs. 32: τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, It is generally acknowledged among NT scholars that μυστήριον does not indicate something mysterious or hard to understand, but points to a once hidden, yet now revealed divine secret.<sup>271</sup> Likewise μέγα does not define the density or unintelligibility of the mystery, but rather its magnitude, i.e. its rich significance, or far reaching importance.<sup>272</sup> The primary question, then, concerns the content of this once hidden, now revealed secret.

In the Pauline Corpus, Robinson notes three uses of μυστήριον:

(1) its employment to designate the eternal secret of God's purpose for mankind, hidden from the past but revealed in Christ; comp. in this epistle /Eph. 7 i 9, ii 4, 9, vi 19; Col. i 26f., ii 2, iv 3; Rom. xvi 25; I Cor. ii 1, 7; (2) a more general use of the word in the plural, I Cor. iv 1, xiii 2, xiv 2; (3) the use of the singular for some particular secret of the Divine economy or of the future; as in Rom. xi 25 τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο (the partial blindness of Israel, which has been figured by the olive tree), I Cor. xv 51 ἰδοὺ μυστήριον ὑμῶν λέγω (of the last trump).<sup>273</sup>

While the idea's background is disputed, R. E. Brown is largely successful in producing parallels to NT usage from the era's Semitic literature.<sup>274</sup> Especially in Apocalyptic and Qumran literature we find a broad usage of the idea in relation to problems of evil, the workings of the cosmos, God's will and providence, and in Qumran, the interpretation of Scripture.<sup>275</sup>

μυστήριον is quite prominent in Ephesians, occurring six times (i 9; iii 3, 4, 9; v 32; vi 19). Apart from v 32, it clearly concerns God's plan or will for the world or man as revealed in Christ. Using the different genitives attached to the noun in Ephesians, Bieder summarizes its usage in this manner: "Es geht bei diesem Geheimnis, allgemein gesagt, um den göttlichen Willen, der auf Christus bezogen ist und im Evangelium verkündigt wird."<sup>276</sup> Eph v 32 stands apart from these texts because of its unique context in the house code discussion of marriage. The term's meaning here is largely governed by how one interprets the following explanatory clause.<sup>277</sup>

ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.<sup>278</sup> The post-positive particle, δέ, is explanatory and may be translated "that is."<sup>279</sup> But what does the clause explain? Most scholars take it to explain τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο. This view requires that μυστήριον refer to (a) the Scripture text, which evidently has a deeper meaning, or (b) the institution of marriage, which foreshadows the relationship of Christ and the Church.<sup>280</sup> In content the proposals differ little, for the Scripture text is in fact an ordinance for marriage. Both suggest that the author sees in marriage a starting point for understanding Christ and the Church. But formally the views differ and most scholars prefer (a). There is little to suggest that marriage was commonly understood as a mystery. While an exact parallel to (a) is lacking, there is evidence that Scripture passages were thought to have deeper meanings, and these so interpreted could be called mysteries.<sup>281</sup>

Thus, the mystery is best understood in some relation to the Scripture quotation. The question is, what kind of relation? It seems abrupt to immediately change from interpreting marriage in light of Christ and the Church, to interpreting Christ and Church in light of marriage. More likely, the author sees in Gen ii 24 a prefigurement of Christ and the Church, and yet at the same time interprets the text in light of Christ

and the Church, not vice versa. In this case, the mystery is neither the text nor marriage, but rather the marriage text as understood in light of Christ's saving relationship to the Church.<sup>282</sup>

The most informative antecedent to such a hermeneutical procedure is in the Qumran writings. Generally stated, the sect regarded interpretation of the Law as a mystery entrusted to them by God.<sup>283</sup> More particularly, however, their peshar exegesis of the OT Prophets provides an informative parallel. Perhaps the clearest example is in 1QpHab VII 1ff:

...and God told Habakkuk to write down that which would happen to the final generation, but He did not make known to him when time would come to an end. And as for that which He said, That he who reads may read it speedily, interpreted this concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of His servants the Prophets.<sup>284</sup>

The text is representative of the Qumran exegetical procedure which was apparently formulated after the raz-peshar pattern found in Daniel.

F. F. Bruce describes this procedure:

The raz was communicated by God to the prophet, but the meaning of that communication remained sealed until its peshar was made known by God to His chosen interpreter. The chosen interpreter was the Teacher of Righteousness, the founder of the Qumran community....The revelation, we may say, was divided into two parts, and not until the two parts are brought together is its meaning made plain.<sup>285</sup>

In labeling this procedure raz-peshar, however, one factor is easily obscured: the raz is made known in the peshar. The prophetic text may be considered a puzzle or enigmatic code, and the peshar may break the code. But the mystery, the raz, is neither the "code" nor the interpretive "key":<sup>286</sup> it is the interpreted meaning of the text, or the text understood through peshar. Thus, for the Qumran sect, the mysteries of the Prophets and the Law were probably not considered to be deeper meanings heaped on a literal meaning. They are the text's once hidden, but now revealed actual meaning. Evidently, the hermeneutical light by which the sectarians were enabled to discover these secrets was the idea that all prophecy speaks of the end-time in which they considered themselves to be living.<sup>287</sup> We can see here an important point of contact with Eph v 22-33.



Both places interpret Scripture on the basis of a hermeneutical principle that lay outside Scripture. For the Qumran community this seems to be the community's eschatological consciousness; for Ephesians it is the eschatological Christ-event.

In what manner then do Christ and the Church form the author's point of departure? Perhaps he understood the words of Gen ii 24 as a prophecy uttered by Adam, which now attains its final and ultimate fulfillment in Christ and the Church.<sup>288</sup> Since the fulfillment of the prophetic marriage ordinance occurs in Christ's saving relation to the Church, marriage itself must be interpreted in light of the reality of Christ and the Church. But it is also possible that Gen ii 24 was simply thought to indicate the created order of marriage. Since Christ in saving the Church fulfills God's purpose for man, he must also fulfill the created structures of man's existence, of which marriage is one. So marriage, as an order of creation reaching back to Adam and Eve, points beyond itself to the order of salvation. Important here is that this prefigurement of Christ and the Church in marriage arises only when Christ and the Church provide the basis for understanding marriage. Only in the face of the reality of Christ's saving relation to the Church does it become clear that the marital relation is a shadow of it.

Of the two options, we prefer the more general reference to the created order of marriage. In either case, Christ and the Church provide in a peshar-like fashion the basis for the author's interpretation of the marital ordinance and hence marriage itself. Because Christ and the Church bring fullness of meaning to Gen ii 24 as the marriage ordinance, they interpret and define what marriage is. Thus, the mystery is not so much that the text refers to Christ and the Church, as it is that Christ and the Church determine what the text means.

If we are correct in understanding *μυστήριον* as the revealed interpretation of the marriage ordinance in light of Christ and the Church,

then the question as to what vs. 32b explains is raised anew. Abbott, whose interpretation of the mystery approaches ours, suggests that the clause shows that the mystery refers not simply to marriage, but marriage as compared to Christ and the Church.<sup>289</sup> But this solution as with all proposals that suggest that the clause defines τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο faces an important objection. If vs. 32b defines τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο, then the πλὴν of vs. 33 implies that there is something nonessential about this secret revealed by God in relation to the author's "practical" exhortations to husbands and wives. It is most unlikely that the author would say this revealed secret of God refers to Christ and the Church, and then immediately turn and say "in any case" or "nevertheless."

We suggest, then, that vs. 32b defines not τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο, but the entire sentence: τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν. With this clause the author indicates the direction towards which he sees the profound significance of this mystery leading.<sup>290</sup> The once hidden, but now revealed interpretation of the marriage ordinance in light of Christ and the Church, is far reaching and significant; significant, that is for the understanding of Christ and of the Church. Under this view ἐγὼ is important, not because the author is arguing against someone,<sup>291</sup> nor because it indicates that he goes beyond the text's literal meaning,<sup>292</sup> but because it points to Paul (whether the author be Paul or not), who as the receiver of the revelation, perceives its implications for Christ and for the Church. This proposal also accounts for the occurrence of the second εἰς. As Gnilya notes, this preposition is troublesome to those who view the clause as referring solely to the mystery.<sup>293</sup> Instead the author states that the mystery which he has received has significant implications with regard to Christ and with regard to the Church.

What are these implications? The author never explicitly says, for his main objective is to draw out the implications of the interpretation for marriage. Still we may speculate what a few of these might be. There

is no reason to assume only one implication, for he calls this mystery great and profound. We point to three likely aspects:

(a) To interpret marriage in light of Christ and the Church implies Christ's Lordship over creation and the orders of creation. The Church is a community, then, that must view creation and its orders in light of the order of salvation brought and sustained by Christ.

(b) It is also clear that Christ <sup>s</sup>supercedes the Torah and any pantheistic philosophical construct or god, as that which reveals man's proper relation to creation and its current structures. As the community which confesses his Lordship, the Church must look solely to him as the guiding light whereby it discovers its role and place in the world.

(c) Finally, and primarily, to interpret marriage in light of Christ and Church, presupposes Christ's intimate bond with the Church. Christ, then, is constantly proclaimed as he who loves and cherishes the Church, and the Church is she who receives his love in loving submission. To interpret marriage in light of Christ and the Church is to imply the reality of the gospel, Christ's saving relationship to the Church.

These are a few possible aspects which the author may have had in mind, as may be deduced from the preceding discussion. Perhaps there are more. The author seems satisfied to direct the reader to these possibilities and does not dwell on them. He rather returns to the main subject of marriage.

Vs. 33: πλήν καὶ ὑμεῖς οἱ καθ' ἓνα ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα οὕτως ἀγαπάτω ὡς ἑαυτόν, ἣ δὲ γυναῖκα ἵνα φοβῇται τὸν ἄνδρα. The verse represents a concluding summary of the exhortation to the husbands and wives. Πλήν here means "only" or "in any case" and is used to conclude the discussion and accent what is essential.<sup>294</sup> Whatever other ramifications interpreting marriage in light of Christ and the Church might have for the understanding of Christ and of the Church, clearly it is also important for the understanding of marriage. Thus, the presence of πλήν supports our interpretation of vs. 32.

The καὶ shows that the mystery is clearly "also" important for understanding human marriage. The term suggests that the pattern of Christ and



Church has not been forgotten. If so, the καί may suggest that the primary aspect of the mystery's significance lay in how it proclaims Christ's love for the Church and the essential character of the Church as submissive to him. Thus, while Christ and Church are not explicitly mentioned in the verse, the author draws on the essential content of the preceding verses. If the exhortation to the husbands is based on Lev xix 18, this may imply Christ's fulfillment of this command in his love for the Church.

In vs. 28 we found ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα; here we have ὡς ἑαυτόν. But as in vs. 28, the words do not indicate a standard for love, but the characteristic quality of love. Thus it points to the bond that love creates and upon which love continues to rest. Husbands are to love their wives as men whose wives are part of their very selves.

The injunction ἵνα φοβῇται may pick up ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ from vs. 21.<sup>295</sup> There the mutual relations of the Church are conducted in the fear of Christ. Since the wife has been correlated to the Church, she is to fear her husband. Whether fear may be interpreted as "revere" or "respect" has recently been questioned by Barth.<sup>296</sup> But Barth himself recognizes that there are different dimensions to fear depending on the person or thing feared. To translate "revere" or "respect," seems to adequately interpret the particular dimension of fear in view.

## CONCLUSION

We now draw out several implications from our exegesis of Eph v 22-33.

(1) We first note the author's anthropological use of σῶμα, σάρξ and ἑαυτόν. These three terms are practically interchangeable. All three terms are primarily passive, i.e. they indicate not the agent of action, but the recipient of action; not what acts, but what is acted on. It is not by accident that all three are closely linked to γυνή whose passive posture is defined in vss. 22-24. All three words seem to point to the "whole person." Some hesitation is necessary here, however, for all

three help to define the unity between husband and wife. Thus, the words are relational; they point to the whole person in relation to another; or perhaps more accurately, the whole person to which they refer seems to be the corporate person that the married couple makes up.

This conclusion is also implied in the use of κεφαλή for the husband. The term points to the husband in a particular function in relation to his wife. This relation, then, is pictured as organic, which on Semitic presuppositions means functional more than physical. As head, the husband is the whole body in terms of being the authoritative source and goal of the woman's well-being and livelihood. The wife is the whole body in terms of her submissive receptivity of the man's headship.

The starting point for this concept is the unity between husband and wife. The husband's headship occurs only in his unity with his wife. Without this unity there is no headship over the wife. Also the wife is the husband's body only as she is united to him, which here implies her subjection to his headship. This is why κεφαλή occurs only in the discussion of the wives, and σῶμα/σάρξ primarily in the discussion of the husbands. In each case, the author points to that which he thinks is pivotal for the one flesh unity of the couple. For the wife, one flesh unity implies his headship of the body, and so she should submit to him. For the husband, the one flesh unity with his wife implies that she is his own body and he should love her accordingly.

(2) Our exegesis has confirmed our earlier suggestion that human marriage is the focal point of the passage, and that this is interpreted in view of Christ and the Church. Thus, the basis for these exhortations does not lie in anthropological assumptions. Even the use of κεφαλή/σῶμα as outlined above stems primarily from the author's own conception of the Christ/Church relationship in terms of κεφαλή/σῶμα. We have seen, then, that κεφαλή/σῶμα actually interprets σάρξ μία. This makes it quite unlikely that the origin of the σῶμα concept lies in the μία σάρξ

relationship. Naturally the author could find a parallel here because of the synonymity of σῶμα and σάρξ.<sup>298</sup>

(3) We may now turn to direct statements about the Christ/Church relation.

In vs. 23 Christ is called the Head of the Church, and this headship is then defined in terms of his being the Savior of the Body. Thus, both κεφαλή and σῶμα occur here and describe the Christ/Church relation. As to κεφαλή we have shown that this points to Christ representing the whole Body in a particular mode of being, the authoritative source and goal of the Body's existence. This is further defined here by calling the Christ the σωτήρ. Both κεφαλή and σωτήρ describe the superiority of the acting agent and the dependency of the passive recipient. Σωτήρ tends to point to a definite act or series of acts. The dependency, then, could be only momentary. But κεφαλή points to a permanent dependency in relation to the body. Thus, the terms complement one another, suggesting that Christ's ongoing rule of the Church is a function of uniting and saving love.

As to σῶμα, the Body is viewed passively as the recipient of salvation, that which is saved by Christ. The passivity of the Body is now linked to the submission of the Church implying the Body's obedience or subjection to the Head. The basis of this submission is, however, the Head's unity with the Body. In the natural and physical body, such a response is immediate and natural. The head engages the whole body in its actions, which represent the behavior of the whole person. In pointing to the body as the natural recipient of the head's representative acts, the author suggests the passive posture of the Church. Thus, as the body is naturally included and engaged in the head's actions, so the Church is naturally included in Christ's actions. For the body, however, this inclusion is based on the physiological response of the whole to the part, a response that is natural and immediate. So too, the Church as Christ's



Body should respond to Christ in submission, naturally and immediately. Thus, to the extent the Body concept is associated with submission, the point is not the Church's reaching out to the world as Christ's limbs. The metaphor is inward, pointing to the character of obedience, not its content. This, of course, fits the context, which concerns the character of the wife's submission to her husband.

Since the Body receives salvation, perhaps the Body was considered to be lost.<sup>298</sup> But while this deduction is plausible, the thrust of the statement is elsewhere. In calling Christ the Savior of the Body the author affirms that the center of Christ's headship of the Church (unlike the husband's of the wife) lay in his saving relation to the Church. It is not so much the Church that is lost as individual believers. In saving these people Christ establishes with them the corporate bond, namely the Church as his Body. In doing this, Christ functions as the Head of the Body, i.e. he acts for the whole Body in its need of salvation. Since the act whereby Christ establishes this saving bond is not something different from saving believers, Christ may be called the Savior of the Body. In other words, in describing the Body as the recipient of salvation, the author points not so much to the lostness of the Church, as to the act whereby Christ identifies his own body with believers in their need of salvation.

We saw a similar usage in ii 16, where σῶμα also pointed to Christ's identification with Gentiles and Jews in their need of reconciliation to God. Apparently the author takes what Christ gave for believers, namely his own body, and makes this into a unified picture of those for whom Christ died. The point of the picture is to show their unity with Christ in terms of Christ's saving act. To make the connection even stronger, he uses κεφαλή to show that in identifying his own body with believers, Christ is the Body which is the Church in the mode of being its authoritative source and goal, i.e. its Head. In other words, κεφαλή defines what

it means to say that this Body is Christ's Body. So, in vs. 30, when the author states that we are members of Christ's Body, this means more than that we are members of the community of salvation, though it certainly implies that (cf. iv 25). It also points to the community's dependence on him who created it by establishing a saving bond between himself and believers. Throughout the passage, Christ's love and self-sacrifice for the Church are the focal point of this bond. This seems to capture its essential nature.

(4) Use of both the Body imagery and nuptial imagery in one passage raises the question of their interrelation. Throughout Ephesians we have seen how  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  indicates a corporate personality. This idea of corporate unity makes the Head/Body concept a convenient tool for interpreting the structure of the one flesh union of marriage. Both ideas concern a solidarity that expresses itself in a corporate personality. Of course in each case the solidarity rests on different presuppositions. It is not the acts of creation, but those of salvation that establish the unity between Christ and the Church: Clearly neither sexual union, nor physical descent, nor blood relation binds believers to Christ. These are at best analogies for the spiritual bond between Christ and his Church. In an earlier chapter we suggested that "love" is a category that well describes the spiritual bond envisioned. Now with the author's nuptial imagery this aspect comes to vivid expression. The central idea is the marital covenant that Christ's love and self-offering establishes. Whether it indicates betrothal or actual marriage, Christ's death is a covenant-making event that leads to the union of Christ and Church. Perhaps this idea of covenant solidarity underlies the Body of Christ concept itself. In giving his body to believers Christ establishes a covenant relationship that manifests itself corporately as the Body of Christ. The Body would then be a powerful image for the covenant community whose life depends on Christ's bodily acts of love.

In any case, the Bride of Christ adds its own dimension to the Body of Christ concept. It suggests that the Church may be considered a corporate person in its own right. The author does not seem to draw any concrete conclusions from this. The quasi-independence of the Church arises in the context of its submission to Christ and its reception of his saving acts. There is little to point to the Church's missionary activity in this regard.

On the whole, the Body of Christ idea holds this view at bay and points out that this quasi-independent existence is at root the corporate Christ. The Church has no existence apart from her unity with Christ. Within that unity she has a quasi-independence. Thus, to call the Bride the Body points not to the Church's corporate distinctiveness from Christ, but its corporate unity with Christ. What, then, the Bride of Christ imagery adds, is the aspect of choice. The Body's submission to the Head can only point to the natural consequences of an organic relation. But when joined with the Bride of Christ idea, the aspect of free choice fully emerges, and the union of Christ and Church emerges as that between two distinct personalities. The image of the Bride of Christ has then, in Best's words, "taken us, perhaps, further into the relationship of Christ and the Church than any other because it shows us both sides of that relationship: dependence and obedience on one side; love and unity upon the other."<sup>299</sup>



## CONCLUSION

Our purpose has been to describe the use and function of the Body of Christ concept in Ephesians. To this end we have exegeted the relevant passages and provided summaries at the end of each chapter. We now draw attention to the image's incorporation into the letter's thematic concerns, its common characteristics and related concepts, and finally, some further observations and areas for research.

### I. Christ's Supremacy and the Church's Unity

In our introduction we suggested three thematic concerns which any statement of the letter's occasion and purpose must incorporate:

(i) Christ's supreme position in the cosmos, (ii) the character and unity of the Church, and (iii) Paul's prayerful concern as the imprisoned Apostle to the Gentiles. These themes have a common focal point in the revelation of the mystery of Christ. Of these three, only Paul's unique role as the Apostle to the Gentiles is not directly related to the Body concept.<sup>1</sup> Our interest lies in the first two themes.

In Eph i 10 the mystery of God's will is defined as "to subordinate and co-ordinate all things under one Head in Christ." Christ is the focal point from which all things proceed and to which they lead. We found it likely that ἀνακεφαλαιόομαι is conceptually related to κεφαλή. Christ is the κεφαλή, the supreme ruler who brings cosmic unity. Resort to a Macroanthropos scheme is unnecessary to explain this formulation. Christ as κεφαλή rules the cosmos as its creative source and eschatological goal; the cosmos is not his Body. The author desires his readers to gain a deeper insight into this Lordship and in praying for his readers to know the hope and riches of their salvation he expounds on the power at work in believers, the power by which God raised and enthroned Christ above every spiritual power in this world and the next. Alluding to Ps viii 6, he states in vs. 22 that God has put all things under Christ's

feet. Christ, then, rules as the New Adam; his headship over the cosmos is not viewed apart from its redemptive benefits for man. In fulfilling Ps viii, the New Adam establishes a renewed cosmic order in which man gains his God-intended glory, no longer being subject to the cosmic powers. For this reason, Christ's headship of the Church is the highest expression of his headship over all things. The Church is the new humanity of the New Adam; the special recipient of those divine acts whereby Christ's supreme rule over all things is revealed and established.

The character of the Church is, then, immediately involved in the subject of Christ's supremacy over the world. The Church is the eschatological totality of God's people who share in the benefits and attributes of Christ's exalted position. In ii 1-10 this participation is viewed as the sharing of Christ's life, and thus of the events that determine this life's specific qualities and powers. The believer's exaltation, then, is a participation through faith in Christ's own exaltation. This is conceptually possible in terms of Semitic corporate personality, shaped here by the author's New Adam theology.

This unity with Christ, however, receives its social-historical expression in the unity of the Jews and Gentiles in Christ. Christ in his person is the eschatological peace; he destroyed what formerly divided mankind, the Law-in-its-effect-on-the-flesh. This division between Gentile and Jew goes deeper than mere racial tension. It concerns God's people and God's non-people. Thus in the reconciliation of Gentile and Jew, we see the historical expression of man's reconciliation in Christ to God. Christ brings both the Gentile and Jewish believer to life in himself to be one and the same new kind of man. He reconciles both together in one Body to God through the cross. Sharing the one Spirit both Gentile and Jew have access to the Father. The mystery of Christ is thus defined as the unity of Gentiles and Jews in Christ. In Christ through the Gospel, both share the same inheritance, the same promise, the same Body. As new



men, they both belong to the new humanity of God's family, and share a common life. This probably represents more than the first stage of cosmic reconciliation. It reveals a new structure for humanity. The separation of Jew and Gentile belonged to the era when God's people stood under the Law and while the Gentile nations were subject to cosmic powers. But now the New Adam has nullified the Law with death, united mankind, restoring man to his rightful place in the cosmos. The unity of the Church then is directly linked to Christ's supremacy; at stake is the all-sufficiency of his work on the cross. Thus, through the Church consisting of Gentiles and Jews God makes known to the cosmic powers his multifold wisdom manifested in Christ.

As the new humanity of the New Adam, believers must walk in a manner worthy of their calling. The unity given must be maintained in the bond of peace in which it was established. Again, the cosmic perspective is not forgotten. The Church's unity is ultimately based on the one God and Father of all things. This supreme God grants each Christian the grace to serve, according to the measure of Christ's gift. In correspondence with Scripture Christ ascends on high, leading a host of captives and giving gifts to men. The Christ who fulfills all things is he who supplies the Church's diversity. The operation of the gifts are, then, confirmation of Christ's exalted presence in the Church. However, the exalted character of Christ's ascent cannot be separated from the humility and meekness of his descent. To share in the exalted life of Christ cannot be separated from Christ's own ministry; it means, then, not to be served, but to serve others in love. The gifts listed in vs. 11, then, are seen to equip others for service so that the whole Body may be edified. This upbuilding process has its ultimate goal in the Church's perfect maturity and unity. The Church reaches the Full-grown Man, the Corporate Christ, the perfected new humanity of the New Adam. Again κεφαλή indicates the exalted mode of existence towards which the Church strives in love, no longer being



immature and gullible, but growing up into the Corporate Christ, manifesting Christ's new life with regard to all things.

The Church, then, must distinguish itself from the world and its pagan ways, living the truth manifested in Jesus, putting on the new man created in Christ. Resisting ungodly ways, believers must imitate God, loving and forgiving as God in Christ loved them. Thus walking in the light believers must allow the reality of their worship to permeate the most fundamental relations of the home. In v 22-33, the unity of Christ and the Church interprets the marital relation. This understanding of this order of creation has profound implications for Christ and the Church. It implies Christ's Lordship over creation and its structures. Christ supercedes the Torah or any philosophical construct or pagan god in revealing man's proper relation to creation and its current orders. It also implies Christ's intimate bond and saving relationship with the Church. Thus as the community that confesses his Lordship, the Church must look solely to him as the guiding light whereby it discovers its role and place in the world. The spiritual struggle continues and is real. The encouragement of Ephesians is not that this struggle will soon end, though end it will. Rather in Christ the victory has been won, and by receiving and expressing his sacrificial love the power to overcome is available and manifest.

This brief overview helps us to see the significance of the author's Body concept. The idea appears in key places with an important function. In i 22-23 the Body concept defines the solidarity between the New Adam and his new humanity. It confirms the distinction between Christ's headship of all things, and his special headship of the Church. The latter entails a special God-willed unity which incorporates the Church in the redemptive event of Christ's exaltation. This provides a conceptual framework for understanding how believers are exalted with Christ; they share the same exalted mode of life as members of his Body.

In ii 16 and iii 6 the Body concept points to the social unity in the Church. We determined that in ii 16 the one Body refers to the Church. What Christ gave to the Church in his death, his body, has become the image for what he gave it to, the Church. Thus, Gentiles and Jews belong together in one Body as fellow recipients of reconciliation. Thus, they are partakers of a common life, that of the New Adam (perhaps seen positively as the New Isaac who sacrifices himself willingly, making the blessings of Abraham available to all through the Gospel). The emphasis in each of these passages lies on the solidarity between Gentile and Jew. It is a non-accidental unity involving the solidarity of a single life. The Body concept points to Christ as the source of that life.

Still the unity established in the Body must be maintained. In iv 4 "one Body" stands first in a sevenfold acclamation of focal points of Church unity. It indicates the Corporate New Adam who is quickened and endowed by the Holy Spirit, moving towards the one hope of eschatological glory. The Body concept suggests that this unity involves diversity. The various gifts and services are given to strengthen the unity of believers with Christ and one another, i.e. to build up Christ's Body. In this way the Body attains maturity and grows, building itself up in love.

In v 22-33 the Body concept combines with nuptial imagery to interpret the one flesh union of marriage. Christ as the Head is now called the Savior of the Body, and he nourishes and cherishes the Church because Christians are members of his Body. Here especially the Body describes the character of the Church's obedience to Christ's love.

Throughout, then, the term appears in significant places with a key role. In a comprehensive manner we may say that the term denotes the Church's twofold unity with-in Christ. Christ as the New Adam implies a solidarity with Christians and a solidarity between Christians in Christ. The author's Body concept functions as a useful tool for communicating the corporate unity which he envisions the Church to have. The Body, then,



denotes the Corporate Christ, the corporate humanity of the New Adam. We find it likely that the author has filled a popular Body concept with his own Semitic presuppositions about man. This provides a convenient vehicle for communicating the wholistic presuppositions underlying his conception of corporate personality. The outworking of this adaptation may be seen by listing the underlying associations which the author's usage evokes and the concepts to which the image is specifically linked.

## II. The Church as the Body of Christ

### A. Underlying Characteristics

The author uses the Body concept to define the Church. Here we sketch the major associations that underpin his conception.

1. The Body denotes the Church as a God-willed unity. The Body's unity ultimately resides in God's will. With the human body this concerns God's creation of man as a bodily creature. The unity of the body, then, lies in the unity of the person standing as a creature before God. In Ephesians it concerns the new creation, the order of salvation. This God-willed unity is revealed in the redemptive acts of Christ. It is of note here that the Body image appears in passages related to the revelation of Christ in relation to Scripture. In i 20-23 Christ sits at God's right hand (Ps cx i) and has all things under his feet (Ps viii 6). Here the Body concept denotes the solidarity between this exalted one and the Church. In ii 14-18, we learn that with Christ's coming, peace is announced to those who are far and those who are near (Isa lii 7 and lvii 19). Christ reconciles both Gentile and Jew, being together as members of one Body, to God through the cross. In iii 6, it is an explicit revelation of the divine Spirit that in Christ Gentiles and Jews belong to the same Body. In iv 4-16 Christ ascends and gives gifts. Thus the diversity of the Body is suggested in the plural "gifts." In iv 25 believers are to speak truthfully to one another (Zech viii 16) because they are members of one another. And in v 22-33 the marital one flesh union (Gen ii 24) of



creation is interpreted by Christ's sacrificial love for the Church as the Savior of the Body.

These passages make plain that the Body concept is associated with the redemptive events of Christ, his descent, death, resurrection, ascent, enthronement. But also the revelatory content of these events may be seen in that the event always forms the basis of the Scripture interpretation. This suggests, then, that the believers participation in these events also belongs to their revelatory nature, since the Scriptural interpretation of these events belongs specifically to the community which participates in them. Thus, the unity depicted by the Body concept is considered a God-willed, divinely revealed unity, based on the character of Christ's bodily redemptive acts. This means the Church's unity lies in the God-willed unity of Christ's person. The Church is included and revealed in Christ's person. Thus, this unity is always a given, and never created by believers.

2. The Body denotes the Church as the outward manifestation of Christ. Ephesians follows the OT view that the body is the outward manifestation of man; it is the whole person on the outward side as a created being before God. When the popular metaphor is seen from this viewpoint, the corporate Body is always the Body of Christ. Even when we find the expression the one Body, it is always the one Corporate Christ who is in view.

But of note here is how the idea of outward manifestation is applied not to the Church extending out into the world, but inwardly to the unity of the Church. The Church is the outward manifestation of Christ in the unity of the Body members. Thus, the Body's unity expresses its members' integration with the Person who is this Body. This idea is enriched by the combination of two types of solidarity, that seen in  $\sigma\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$  with its connotation of racial unity and that of the popular metaphor with its idea of diverse members under a single life principle. Both ideas are used by

the author. The Body denotes the unity of Gentiles and Jews and the unity of members diversely endowed for service. Equality and diversity characterize Christian existence, both of which are the outward expression of the Church's unity with Christ.

3. The Body denotes the Church in a passive and responsive posture. The author shares the OT and LXX view that man as body is passive, he who is acted on, not who acts. This is a prevalent idea throughout Ephesians. The Body receives the blessings and benefits that come from the Head; it is filled (i 23), reconciled (ii 16), built up (iv 12), saved (v 23), nurtured and cared for (v 29f). Even where the activity of the Body is envisioned, this is of a responsive character. In iv 16, the members respond appropriately and in proper measure to the head's provision of life-support, adapting and co-ordinating themselves, effecting growth. In v 23, the Church is the model for the wife's submission. The Body denotes the Church's natural and trusting response to the Head's loving acts of salvation. It denotes, then, the responsive character of obedience, not the content.

4. The Body denotes the Church as the corporate manifestation of Christ, passively engaged in Christ's function as the Head. Viewed wholistically, a body member can represent the whole person in a particular function. This idea can be joined with that of the body as a passive totality. In this manner the body is passively engaged in the function of the person indicated by the individual member. It is likely that in adapting the popular metaphor the author applies this scheme to the Head/Body relation. The Body is the corporate totality passively involved in the Head acting as its determinative source and goal. This allows the Head to be functionally identified with the Body, and the Body's unity to be seen as integration with Christ as he engages the Body in his life-supporting function as Head. It also explains why the Body is always the whole Body, and not just the trunk: the Body engaged in the Head's

function obviously includes the Head whose function typifies the whole. Its functional identity with the other members is the basis for its representation. Thus, the scheme points to a functional identity between two modes of self, the active and passive. This is applied to Christ's individual and his corporate self. This means that the Head/Body relation is a refinement of the Body concept, defining what it means to say this is the Body of Christ. If the Body is the corporate manifestation of Christ, then the Christ who is manifested corporately in the Body is He who is this Body as its Head. If the unity of the Body corporately expresses the Body's unity with Christ, then this unity is dependent on the Body's receiving and appropriately responding to Christ functioning as Head.

These associations are largely unspoken, to be gleaned from the author's usage and probable background for usage. These interact, however, with specific relations to other concepts.

## B. Specific Relations

The abundant use of the Body concept brings it into relation with other concepts which interact and sometimes mutually interpret one another.

1. The Body and All Things: As already seen Christ's headship of the Church is the highest expression of his headship of all things. Here we note that neither Christ nor the Body are identified with the All. Christ is the Head of the cosmos, but the Church is his Body. As such it stands apart from the cosmos as the special recipient of Christ's saving acts of love. The Church is also not a mini-cosmos that expands to fill the world, but the new humanity of the New Adam who has all things under his feet. The Church's growth does involve its relation to the cosmos in that attaining perfection, it more and more exemplifies the New Adam's relation to the world. This involves being distinct from the world's ungodly ways and no longer enslaved to its powers. Throughout, God's and Christ's sovereignty over the cosmos serves to highlight the salvific benefits of God's act in Christ. Ephesian's view of the future is determined from



this inward perspective. While the struggle goes on, the Church's participation in the unfolding consequences of Christ's victory is assured. This worldview is not essentially negative; rather the Church's unique position in the world belongs to God's plan to gather all things under one Head in Christ.

2. Body and Fullness: In i 23 πλήρωμα/πληροῦν defines the Head/Body relation. Πλήρωμα is a semi-technical term denoting the totality of divine attributes, graces and powers. These are mediated to the Church through Christ who is himself filled by God. The Body, then, is that which is filled by the Head that is filled by God. The Head indicates the whole Body in the mode of being filled with God's attributes and powers. As these are mediated from Head to Body, the Body manifests and exhibits the loving presence of Christ. Again the cosmic framework accents the special salvific import of the statements for the Church. Christ as Head is exalted over all things, being utterly filled with God's full authority and presence. The Body even now shares in the Head's exalted mode of existence. Still the Body is to be strengthened and enhanced until it reaches the full measure of maturity that comes from being filled with the attributes and powers of Christ's humanity (iv 13). What above all characterizes this new mode of existence is love. That which binds Christ to believers is his love for them as himself. The Body is the fullness, the totality that results from and is exhibited by the loving presence among believers of him who as the Head of this Body is filled with God's love with respect to all things in every way.

3. The Body and Spirit: The Body and Spirit appear together in ii 16-18 and iv 4. The relation between them is not explicitly described, but the close conjunction of the terms in iv 4 suggests that some link is assumed. Elsewhere in Ephesians the Spirit refers to the eschatological down payment (i 13) that seals us to the day of redemption (iv 30). It is likely then that in relation to the Body it is the Holy Spirit who

animates the Corporate Christ. Thus the starting point is not the body/soul dichotomy, but man's relation to God who through his Spirit brings life to and lays claim on man as a totality. The man in view is the New Adam whom the Spirit quickens and lays claim on especially as to his crucified body. Christ as the New Adam, then, has become the life-giving Spirit, and incorporation into his Body means sharing the reality of that life-giving power. Thus, the unity of Gentile and Jew in one Spirit points to the new humanity in which all men through Christ have access to the Father.

4. The Body, the New Man, and the Full-grown Man: The author's New Adam theology is expressed in the ideas of the new man and perfect man. These ideas while related, reflect different viewpoints. The new man is a group type, the Christian, created in Christ, the New Adam, and bearing Christ's image. There is only one new kind of man, and this contrasts with the former division between Gentile and Jew. The new man is a member of Christ's Body, representing the Church only in the sense that an individual can typify the characteristics of the whole. The perfect or Full-grown Man is not a group type, but a group image. It indicates the corporate whole, and specifically Christ's Body in its final state of perfection. In this way the Church's corporate maturity and perfection is linked to its twofold unity with-in Christ. Thus, the Body concept and the Full-grown Man picture from different angles the corporate humanity of the New Adam, in whom the one new kind of man is created and now lives.

5. The Body and Building: In ii 21, οἰκοδομή depicts the process of building Gentiles into the Church, thus imaging the Church's historical evolution from a Jewish community to one including Gentiles. This community has one apostolic and prophetic foundation with Christ himself as the cornerstone. The Body image portrays the unity of Gentiles and Jews from the perspective of their inclusion in the redemptive events of Christ. This is especially plain in ii 16, where Gentile and Jew belong to the

same Body which Christ reconciles to God through the cross. In iv 12 οἰκοδομή and σῶμα are combined, giving again a historical perspective on the Church. Only here, οἰκοδομή has a more comprehensive sense, denoting the entire spiritual edification of the Church. This upbuilding concerns the continual strengthening of Body unity in and through love, being linked to the ideas of maturity and growth (iv 13, 16). Thus the Church as Christ's Body is not complete in its unity; in the fellowship inspired by the diverse ministries and services it is built up in love, moving toward its eschatological vision of perfection.

6. The Body and Growth: As already seen, Church unity is not static, but expresses itself in the living process of growth. This is visible also in ii 21 where "all building" grows into a holy temple. Even here the inclusion of the Gentiles involves a joining together that effects a transformation towards holiness. Also with regard to the Body, growth brings to expression the Church's teleological destiny of attaining perfection. Thus as Body members, believers are no longer to be childish and helpless, but are to grow up into the Corporate Christ with regard to all things. More and more the Church is to express corporately the new humanity of the New Adam who is the Head. Here especially growth is linked to unity, as different windows on the same reality, the living Body. Christ as the Head functions as the source of this life, providing all the necessities for unity and growth. He thus defines the Corporate Christ wholistically, representing the whole Church in his function. Being a Body member entails, then, receiving and responding appropriately to the will of Christ's person as defined by the Head. Christ, then, provides the model and enabling source whereby the members are engaged according to the measure of their gift to participate in the life of this growing person. Growth, then, is intensive, not extensive. The Body does not expand to fill the cosmos, but matures inwardly in relation to Christ. While this process has consequences for the Church's relation to the



world, the growth concerns above all the deepening of the reality of God's love. Christ is the prime example of this love, and the source from which Christians are enabled to emulate this love.

7. The Body and its Savior: In v 23 Christ's headship of the Church is defined as Savior of the Body. The Body, then, is viewed passively as the recipient of salvation. As the human body is naturally included and passively engaged by the head's actions, so too the Church is naturally included and involved in the redemptive actions of the Savior. If the human body's response is natural and immediate, so too the Church responds in submission, naturally and immediately. The metaphor points to the inward character, not outward content, of obedience. The passage goes on to define in nuptial imagery this salvation as his loving sacrificial death. This love binds Christ to the Church in its need for salvation, nurture and care, as the personal function represented by the Head is bound to that person's totality, his Body. Here, we think the foundation of the Head/Body imagery is clear. Christ's loving identification of his body with the Church defines his function as the Head who mediates salvation to the Body. In other words Christ's body given on the cross and raised to glory is the whole Body in a particular mode of being. That mode of being is Christ's function as the Head. Christ as Head typifies in his body the sacrificial character of love, and the Body defines the unreserved faith and trust of submission as the natural and immediate response to that love.

8. The Body and Bride: Also in v 22-33, the Body concept is linked to nuptial imagery. This imagery pictures Christ's loving death as a covenant-making event that unites Christ and Church. This idea of covenant solidarity perhaps underlies the Body concept itself. If so, the Body of Christ would be a powerful image for the covenant community whose life depends on Christ's bodily acts of love. The Bridal imagery, however, suggests that the Church is a corporate person in its own right, responding in the obedience of faith to her Lord. The Body concept,

however, indicates that such quasi-independence is based on the Church's unity with Christ. The Church, then, appears as a distinct entity only in its union with Christ as the Corporate Christ. What the nuptial imagery especially brings to the idea is the aspect of choice. Thus the natural and immediate response of the Body to the Head is now seen as the Church's choice to accept in obedient faith the love Christ offers.

### III. Further Observations and Areas for Research

A. An Inward-looking Metaphor: At several points in the exegesis we saw that the Body concept while pointing to something real, is itself a metaphor. We suggest it is an "interaction" metaphor, an image that evokes a series of associations which interact with the object described and so effect our perception of reality.<sup>2</sup> The various points described in section II form a starting point for this discussion.

In interpreting for today the very real corporate reality of the Church in its relation to Christ, that is, the corporate personality which the Body metaphor points to and describes, one perhaps finds a viable alternative in speaking of Christ's mystical Body. However, the author does not himself speak in this way, and there is always the danger of deducing from the image elements foreign to the author's understanding of the Church. A specific example is the common idea that Christ's Body reaches out in service to the world. The idea, while noble, leads to an identification between Christ and the Church that goes beyond the framework of the author's conception. In Ephesians the Body metaphor is applied to the inner reality of Church unity. It concerns the Church's relation to the world only in that the latter occasionally forms an indirect framework for accenting this inner reality. Even the idea of outward manifestation, which belongs to the author's understanding of the Body, is not applied to the Church's witness to the world, but to the unity of Church members as an expression of their unity with Christ. This is not to downplay the Church's role in the world, or to suggest that its

outward witness is unimportant. It does mean that our understanding of that mission should not be based on a misinterpretation of the author's Body concept.

B. *Parallels in the Pauline Corpus:* Throughout our study we have drawn attention to parallels in the Pauline Corpus. (We discuss the Body concept in the Pauline Corpus briefly in Appendix C.) In defining the Church as the Body of a person and more specifically as that of a historical person, Christ, Ephesians stands apart from non-Christian parallels and firmly within the Pauline tradition. Still we note some obvious points of difference and development: (1) In contrast to I Corinthians, the Body concept is not specifically related to the sacraments. What is said in Ephesians about the Body has been conceivably influenced by the author's understanding of the sacraments, but this is never made explicit. Perhaps the sacraments belong to the same framework, offering a different perspective on the same reality. This would explain the compatibility and the absence of any direct or explicit link. (2) Also in contrast to Cor xii and Rom xii the Body image is explicitly applied to the universal Church; Christ is designated as Head and the Body now grows. In these points, Ephesians largely agrees with Colossians. We suggested that the ingredients of this Body concept are present in a latent and uncombined form in the undisputed letters. The circumstances that gave rise to their combination is an area for further research, taking one into the problem of the concept's development.

(3) In Ephesians, however, we have a highly developed concept. This is seen in two ways: (a) the author frequently argues from the Body concept (i 23, iv 25, v 30). His usage also suggests that it was a familiar tool for communicating his ideas about Christ's solidarity with the Church. (b) The development is also seen in the abundance of new relations with other concepts. The Body is now filled by the Head who is filled by God. The Body is said to be built up until it attains to the Full-grown Man.



Christ is now called the Savior of the Body, and the Body is linked to the Bride who is the special recipient of Christ's love. This high degree of development suggests a later stage than the concept in Colossians. How much later is more difficult to say. We note nothing here (or in Colossians) that necessarily excludes Paul as the author of these ideas. The decision must be weighed on the probabilities of and demonstration of reasonable circumstances for Paul making such developments, or for a Pauline disciple adapting the Pauline Body concept. This too calls for further research.

C. The Semitic Orientation of the Body Concept: We have noted throughout how the author transfuses the common Body metaphor with Semitic presuppositions. In this way, it becomes a vehicle for communicating the Semitic concept of corporate personality, from which he views the Christ/Church relation. This points to further areas for research.

(1) What other Semitic ideas are found in Ephesians? To some extent this research is already under way. Kuhn has discussed the presence of Semitisms in our author's style, finding parallels in Qumran.<sup>3</sup> Mussner has also discussed the Qumran influence on aspects of Ephesians.<sup>4</sup> Brown has discussed the Semitic background of *μυστηρίον* and others have suggested the same for *οἰκοδομή*.<sup>5</sup> These factors have an important bearing on the authorship and origin of Ephesians. But still lacking is a more comprehensive study on Ephesians and Semitic influence. Such a study must incorporate not just individual terms and phrases, but the Semitic pattern of thinking in totalities. This might yield important results on the overall structure and unfolding argument of Ephesians.

(2) Another area for further study is the ongoing assessment and interpretation of Semitic wholistic thinking. Since the idea of corporate personality has been recently questioned, we offer in Appendix A a brief explanation of our understanding of the concept. But what is needed goes beyond the important historical analysis of the idea.<sup>6</sup> A more

philosophical analysis is needed of the concrete type of synthetic thinking of which corporate personality is one aspect. Such an analysis could well reveal that this type of thinking is not necessarily primitive, but offers its own valid perception of reality.

D. Love as the Operative Mode of Solidarity: Throughout we have seen that the Body concept portrays the Church's solidarity with and in Christ. Especially visible in the idea is the common life which Christ and Christians share. This life and solidarity is best pictured as the life of love. This provides an appropriate framework for grasping the thrust of the Body concept. Love is rooted in God who shows his love to man in Christ. Love is that which binds Christ to the Church and believers to one another. As suggested, the Body concept indicates two modes of a person's self. At the root of this presentation we perhaps find Christ fulfilling the love-commandment in the sacrifice of his body on the cross. Christ loves his neighbor as himself by giving himself for and to his neighbor. This provides a framework for understanding the functional identity between Christ's individual and corporate self. As the recipient of Christ's love, the neighbor is incorporated into the person Christ is by virtue of Christ's binding himself through his death and resurrection to the neighbor in love. The Body image always points to Christ's loving offer of himself, his body, as bound to all who receive and participate in that love. So the Body is the corporate expression of Christ's self-giving love, seen in the ever increasing fellowship of believers loving one another in unity with and in Christ. This Body, then, denotes the Church in its twofold unity with-in Christ as the special recipient of his love.



## APPENDIX A

### CORPORATE PERSONALITY: TOWARDS A DEFINITION

The expression "corporate personality" was coined and made popular by H. Wheeler Robinson, especially in a 1936 article, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality."<sup>1</sup> The expression is not itself Biblical, but a shorthand description of Hebraic thinking about the individual and his relation to society. In his article Robinson delineates four characteristics of the conception, which de Fraine conveniently summarizes:

1. "Corporate personality" has an extension going beyond the present moment in both the past and the future.

2. It is an eminently real concept which transcends the purely literary or ideal personification, making the group a real entity entirely actualized in each of its members.

3. The idea is extremely "fluid" in the sense that the human mind passes quickly back and forth (sometimes quite unconsciously) from the individual to the collectivity and vice versa.

4. Finally the "corporate" idea persists even after the development of a new individualistic emphasis within it.<sup>2</sup>

This thought pattern appears in various ways, involving a variety of relationships; e.g. the father and his family, a master and his servants, a king and his people, an ancestor and his descendants. Describing such relationships with the phrase "corporate personality," especially accents the predominance of one person who rules, dominates, embodies or otherwise represents the group.

Robinson's work stood in a stream of literature by scholars such as J. Pederson and A. R. Johnson.<sup>3</sup> In these works there is a notable breaking away from the so-called Greek categories that had hitherto largely determined the understanding of man in the OT and NT writings. The conclusions of these scholars have gradually been reinforced and refined by later investigations.<sup>4</sup> The characteristics of corporate personality have been traced through the OT to, at least, the NT writings. We need not detail these arguments, but point out the main features of the evidence.

Scholars find support for the presence of this pattern of thinking in primarily three areas: (a) They point to certain linguistic data such as when a term can oscillate between an individual and collective meaning (e.g. אָדָם = Adam and/or mankind), or when singular and plural nouns or pronouns are unexpectedly interchanged (e.g. Num xx 14-21). Such data apparently reflect a thought pattern that moves easily between the individual and social realms. (b) Scholars also point to passages in which actions have consequences for a group that go beyond what we moderns consider the normal range of cause and effect. Here group members form a



closely knit unit that may extend as a whole both horizontally in the present (e.g. Num xvi 1-35) and vertically into the past or future (e.g. II Sam xxi 1-9).<sup>5</sup> Perhaps the most famous example is the story of Achan (Josh vii 24ff). There God judges Israel for the sin of Achan, and the nation destroys both Achan and his family. We discuss this passage shortly. (c) Finally, support is found in the abundant use of corporate images that suggest Israel is a living organic unity, e.g. a vine, a sheep, the daughter of Zion, or the wife of Yahweh.<sup>6</sup> Use of such images is itself not unique, but when coupled with (a) and (b) their abundant presence does point to a concrete type of synthetic thinking, aptly described as "wholistic."<sup>7</sup>

The case for corporate personality has been received with a fair measure of approval among Biblical scholars. Only recently has it been seriously questioned by J. R. Porter and J. W. Rogerson.<sup>8</sup> Porter examines the use of the idea in legal contexts and finds other explanations more satisfactory. Rogerson, building on Porter's work, criticizes the anthropological theories upon which Robinson based much of his work. We shall briefly examine these criticisms.

In studying the application of corporate personality to legal contexts, Porter has shown that Hebrew law is quite adept at fixing individual guilt.<sup>9</sup> He also argues that a theory of corporate personality is unnecessary to explain those places where guilt or the consequences of guilt are extended beyond the individual. For our purposes, his two most important examples are the story of Achan (Josh vii 24f), and David and the census (II Sam xxiv 11f).<sup>10</sup> We shall discuss the latter case first.

At II Sam xxiv 11f David has the option of three punishments for his sin of taking a census: a three year famine, persecution by his foes, or three days of pestilence. David chooses the last and the punishment is subsequently effected. According to A. R. Johnson this shows that "the whole royal house or the very nation itself may be involved with the king in the condemnation that follows on any trespass."<sup>11</sup> For Porter, however, the text evinces, not the "psychic unity" of nation and king, but a personal punishment of David by reducing his honor and strength through reducing that over which he rules:

If his people were decimated by famine, war or plague, he would lose much of his greatness: in the ancient Semitic world, a man's honour, influence, strength and importance were almost as vital to him as life itself. Thus, in the episode under consideration, there is, in fact little, or no idea of the group being involved in the guilt of its leader.<sup>12</sup>

In this understanding of the episode, Porter is particularly indebted to D. Daube.<sup>13</sup> Daube distinguishes between "communal responsibility" and

"ruler punishment":

Briefly, in the case of communal responsibility proper, the community as a whole is deemed to be tainted by and answerable for the crime of any member (for example, a city may be answerable for a murder committed in its midst), while in the case of ruler punishment, the community suffers, not as answerable for the crime of a member, but as the property of a guilty ruler (for example, a sinful king may be punished by the plague decimating his people).<sup>14</sup>

Daube also describes positive corollaries, called "communal merit" and "ruler reward,"<sup>15</sup> and admits that the ideas are often mixed or blended. Thus, in the instance of a family curse (or blessing), it is seen as ruler punishment by the person cursed, but communal responsibility by the descendants cursed.<sup>16</sup> But such a blending at least suggests some overriding conception or framework of which these are expressions.

Returning to Porter's (and Daube's) explanation of David's punishment, we grant that the issue centers on a punishment of David. But why is this a punishment of David? To say it is because the land and the people are considered his property, merely pushes the question back a step. Why is David's honor, strength, influence and greatness wrapped up in his property, such that it is as "vital as life itself?" Clearly this shows a bond or identification of these things with David's personhood, his self-understanding. This bond is recognized by God (and his prophet) and David, the principal characters of the story. If the nations' recognition of this bond is not clearly stated, then their recognition is not crucial or at issue in the story. Thus while Porter is correct that personal guilt may not be transmuted from David to the nation, there is nonetheless a functional identification of David with the nation. This identification is recognized by the parties involved, and entails sharing the punitive consequences of the sin, though not personal guilt for the sin. Assuming for the moment that the owner-property bond is applicable in this case, Porter's solution is not really an alternative to corporate personality, but a re-statement of a fundamental issue that corporate personality addresses; i.e. from whence comes this intense identification between a person and his socio-economic domain?

We now turn to the story of Achan. The destruction of Achan's entire family as the result of his personal guilt is sometimes cited as an example of the family being considered the primary social unit rather than the individual and an example of corporate personality. In contrast Porter offers two alternative explanations. The first is "ruler punishment," i.e. Achan's family and goods were considered his property and thus forfeit.<sup>17</sup> This proposal, however, raises as many questions as it answers. Why



should property share the same fate, rather than be transferred to some service of the offended party, i.e. God? Also, if the punishment of Achan's family and belongings somehow increases Achan's punishment, then a bond between them must be presupposed. This is especially so since Achan himself is destroyed and cannot "personally" experience the ongoing loss of dignity, etc. which, for instance, David did in the former example.

Porter prefers a second alternative. Here Achan's family and property were destroyed because they were "infected" by the holy objects that Achan had stolen.<sup>18</sup> Such a quasi-material understanding of holiness was common at that time and in this case may be a viable alternative to corporate personality. Still this conception does not answer all questions. There is no indication that anyone other than Achan touched the stolen objects. If contamination was communicated through Achan himself, why was just his family and property destroyed? Had he been in contact with no one else during the intervening period? Also if the devoted objects were buried under Achan's tent, why was not the ground considered contaminated? These questions must be faced if Porter's thesis is to be taken seriously. (It is unfortunate that Porter does not discuss Dan vi 24 where Daniel's accusers and their wives and children are thrown into the lions' den. Here the ideas of property and holiness are not readily apparent.)

Other aspects of the Achan story cannot be explained by a quasi-material conception of holiness, namely corporate responsibility: "Israel has sinned, they have transgressed my covenant which I commanded them" (vii 11). Why is Israel held responsible for the sin of Achan? The whole nation has certainly not been in contact with the defiling objects; yet the whole nation is defiled. Achan's sin does not simply attack Israel's holiness; it undermines it such that a renewal of holiness is necessary (vii 13). In God's eyes, then, Israel is a corporate entity, and the effects of an individual's action are visited upon the whole. Porter recognizes the presence of corporate responsibility here, but does not address the question of its basis.<sup>19</sup> A thought pattern is evinced here that moves easily between the social and individual realms.

Unlike Porter whose work is primarily exegetical, Rogerson focuses mainly upon H. W. Robinson's use of the phrase, "corporate personality." Accepting Porter's work as evidence that other explanations are possible, Rogerson criticizes Robinson's use of the idea as ambiguous, expressing two different things: "(i) corporate responsibility and (ii) psychical unity between members of the same social group, in which the limits of an individual's personality are not clearly defined."<sup>20</sup> Rogerson has no real



objections to the first definition although he offers no explanation of it. He rather goes on to show Robinson's use of the second definition is dependent upon the erroneous theories of Levy-Bruhl about primitive consciousness, and upon unwarranted assumptions about the differences between Hebrew and Western thought.<sup>21</sup> Rogerson shows that primitives could distinguish well between the individual and society and that parallels to this "mental process of primitives" are found in modern experience. "In the interests of clarity" Rogerson suggests that the phrase "corporate personality" be abandoned altogether.<sup>22</sup> He does admit, however, that it is possible to redefine the term and apply it to certain lineage or descent groups of a common ancestor. This admission is rather striking in view of the importance of this motif to Biblical materials.<sup>23</sup>

Many of the criticisms of Porter and Rogerson are well taken. Certainly scholars must be open to different alternatives and avoid "common-place" explanations.<sup>24</sup> However, we do not think they have made a sufficient case to warrant a wholesale abandonment of the idea or the phrase, "corporate personality." Rogerson is correct to criticize Robinson's use of Levy-Bruhl. But the idea or the phrase does not stand or fall with Robinson's formulation. The phrase and the idea for which it stands have had a certain history of debate and refinement. It is unfortunate that Rogerson does not mention the work of J. Pedersen, who has studied Israel's culture, using the Hebrew language as his starting point. Quite independent of Robinson's work Pedersen demonstrates the presence of the general idea, although he does not use the phrase "corporate personality."<sup>25</sup> Rogerson also fails to note the work of J. de Fraine, who criticizes Robinson's use of Levy-Bruhl's theories, yet adapts and redefines the conception according to Biblical usage.<sup>26</sup> We believe, then, that it is possible to offer a definition of corporate personality within the limits of the Biblical texts themselves.

To begin we note that while Porter and Rogerson acknowledge the presence of "corporate responsibility" they do not reflect seriously upon the implications of this idea for corporate personality. The concept of corporate responsibility (and merit) implies at a minimal level that the community is conceived as a united whole, such that one member may include or represent that whole in their actions. Generally this involves a three-fold circle of recognition: Party A who is offended and punishes (or is pleased and blesses), e.g. God; Party B who in the eyes of Party A offends and deserves punishment, e.g. Israel; and Party C, the actual individual who represents Party B in the commitment of the offense, e.g. Achan. Even at this minimal level, then, we find a basis for corporate representation

where the individual represents the whole group in his actions and involves them in the consequences.

But also at this minimal level we see a basis for corporate personification. When the community eradicates Party C, it does not simply remove a bad influence. It cleanses itself as a whole of its corporate offense, and Party A recognizes it as such. This evinces a consciousness within the group of being an historical entity and living unity. This helps explain the Hebrew's tendency to speak and think of the community as a person or living organism through corporate images such as a vine, sheep, the wife of Yahweh, or the daughter of Zion and perhaps even through its references to the community's soul or heart.<sup>27</sup> Such personifications often go beyond mere literary device and are imbedded in the community consciousness serving to identify and make the community aware of its historical being and unity.

The Hebrew's keen awareness of the community as a living unity is better grasped when it is seen to reflect a mode of thinking about the One and Many that has its point of departure in the arena of historical reality. This may be contrasted generally with Greek thinking in which the search for unity is achieved by abstracting a transcendent universal from a group of particulars. With Semitic thinking, however, unity is discovered through a phenomenological association in which the many particulars are combined or synthesized into a group totality that in turn is present and active in each group member.<sup>28</sup> Probably at an early stage of Hebrew history this type of thinking grew theological roots, and became interwoven with the conviction that the ultimate unity of all things lies in the one God who creates and rules all things.<sup>29</sup> This meant that, unlike the Platonist who found the One or prototype in a transcendent principle or idea, the Hebrew was capable of finding the One within the same arena as the Many, namely history. Thus, for example, the oak tree does not participate in Platonic fashion in the idea of oak treeness, but rather in the life of the first oak tree that God created. This habitual tendency to find the One, the prototype, in the realm of history means that the unity between the One and Many is generally perceived through some kind of historical dependency or association such as legal or blood ties. This sense of historical dependency, then, serves to intensify the Hebrew's awareness of belonging to a greater united whole, whose ultimate source is an act of God.

This wholistic thinking is particularly evident in what we believe is justifiably called a "corporate personality." The clearest examples of the idea concern key ancestral figures such as Adam or Abraham, whose

life and actions relate directly to the destiny of their descendents, or royal figures such as David, whose life and rule represent and determine the fate of the whole nation. It is not unlikely, however, that such ancestral and royal characteristics are but two dimensions of a more basic social paradigm, the family. As de Fraine suggests: "In both cases the 'corporate personality' assumes the character of a 'father'; he is either the royal pater familias who rules over an existing group or he is a patriarchal ancestor whose life is prolonged in a number of generations."<sup>30</sup> Once the idea became established, however, it would have easily been transferred to any person who, in representing and implicating a group in his actions, creates a corporate image that identifies the group with his person, and makes it aware of its historical being as a living and united whole.

The idea of a corporate personality, then, both combines and transcends those of corporate representation and personification. It goes beyond simple personification because the corporate image is in fact (or fiction) a historical personality who serves as the group "type," that identifies and characterizes the group as a group. It goes beyond simple representation, because this personality not only manifests and exemplifies the group type, but also makes this type a historical reality and thus a viable possibility for others. A corporate personality, then, is not only a person who represents a group, but who also through his personhood supplies the necessary conditions for the group's existence and unity. Thus, as long as the group exists as a united and identifiable whole, it expresses the personality of this individual precisely in that dimension where his personhood has supplied the necessary conditions for the group's ongoing life and unity, namely in its corporate self-identity.

In conclusion, we essentially agree with de Fraine's definition:

The term "corporate personality," then, expresses two things: first of all, that a single individual is truly corporate, that is to say, functionally identified with a community; secondly, that despite this "corporate" characteristic he remains an individual person (be it only in his deportment).<sup>31</sup>

De Fraine, however, insists on a "real physical connection between the representing member and the body."<sup>32</sup> This was no doubt often the case as with the blood-bond of an ancestor and his descendents. But this seems an unwarranted restriction on the idea, and tacitly implies that only physical bonds are real (certainly a modern point of view). But there are other bonds, such as ownership bonds between a man and his property, which included his slaves and perhaps even his family, or covenant bonds between a king and his people. We suggest, then, while "being functionally



identified with a community" is a constant feature of the idea, the basis for this identification may vary from place to place.

We have outlined here a definition of corporate personality, taking corporate responsibility, a phenomenon that both Porter and Rogerson acknowledge, as a starting point. In some ways, then, our definition is quite different from H. W. Robinson's, who first used the term. Certainly we do not rely upon the theories of a primitive consciousness that is incapable of distinguishing the individual and society. Nor is it necessary to shun examples from our modern era since a certain continuity in human existence is likely. But even so this definition is indebted to the English scholar who along with Pedersen and Johnson was among the first to venture into this area. Their basic insight was to see the concrete and wholistic quality of Hebrew thought over against the more abstract and speculative thinking of Greek philosophy. We believe, then, that the phrase and idea of "corporate personality" is still a useful and important tool for Biblical studies. In a general way it points the reader to an area of Biblical studies that focuses on and enlightens the question of the One and Many in general and of man and society in particular: Of course, as with many expressions used in a technical sense, it is important to define how one employs it, and where one stands in the debate on issues involved. The purpose of this Appendix has been to aim towards such a definition.

## APPENDIX B: ΣΩΜΑ

Our aim here is to focus on those uses of σῶμα that may bear on the Body of Christ image in Ephesians.<sup>1</sup> In the interests of proper perspective and thoroughness we begin with an outline of the major uses and connotations of σῶμα as it relates to man. Then we shall discuss the term's use in social and cosmic contexts.

### I. Man and Σῶμα

#### The Greek World

From the earliest stages of Ionian philosophy down through the often bizarre syncretisms of later Hellenism, Greek thought is largely characterized by its quest for the ultimate reality that lies behind the world of changing appearances, the divine principle that brings eternal order to this temporal chaos, the ideal form that impresses a specific shape on amorphic matter, the unity that gives substance and cohesion to the multiplicity of the phenomenal world.<sup>2</sup> In his yearning for a permanent order in the chaotic world of flux and change, the Greek often sees his essential self as a reflection of the eternal order, standing apart from his ever changing environment. Even when this view is rejected its problems tend to set the perimeter of the debate. Like the cosmos itself, man is seen as a unique blend of the eternal and temporal, the spiritual and material, and as such can be understood in terms of himself, a microcosm. It is not surprising then that even on the popular level such fundamental philosophical categories as form and matter or the one and many permeate and often attain paradigmatic expression in the Greek's understanding of man in general and the body in particular.

By the Christian era σῶμα had had a long history and gained a wide variety of meanings. Indeed, while our main concern is man and the body, we must note that σῶμα did not always refer to human beings. It is applied to various animals, living or dead, and less frequently, to plants.<sup>3</sup> Nor does the term always refer to living (or once living) entities. It denotes physical elements, mathematical shapes and practically any three dimensional object or solid.<sup>4</sup> The Stoics later distinguished between three kinds of bodies: the continuous, the composite, and the diverse.<sup>5</sup> Only the first, the continuous, was usually, though not always an organic body.<sup>6</sup> Thus while σῶμα was an important anthropological term its usage was not confined to that domain. The human body was a body among bodies.

Significantly we first meet the term σῶμα in Homer where it denotes the "corpse" or "carcass" of a man or animal (Il. 7, 79; 18, 161).<sup>7</sup> From Hesiod (Op. 540) on, the term's use for the living body of a man

(or animal) is attested. But "corpse" also persists so that on through the NT era, σῶμα could refer to the "living" or "dead" body of a person. The significance of this is summed up by Käsemann: "Die Lebendigkeit des σῶμα dürfte im Griechentum nicht die konstitutive, sondern nur ein wesentliches; wenn auch nicht unbedingt erforderliches Moment des Begriffes bilden."<sup>8</sup> This passive and external quality of σῶμα helps explain the term's extension to inorganic bodies, and also many of its characteristics as a living body. It is applied to the whole person insofar as he lives in the phenomenal world. Thus, in Plato (Theaet. 167b) the body is the object of care of the physician as a plant is of the husbandman. If the physician is not concerned directly with the soul, he still administers aid to a "living" or "ensouled" body, i.e. the person as a living corporeal being. This idea often occurs when the stress falls on man's physical nature or material circumstances, and it underlies the references to slaves, soldiers, prisoners, or to persons when counted.<sup>9</sup> Since man encounters himself as a physical being, σῶμα may replace the reflexive pronoun.<sup>10</sup> In all these cases the term has a passive character; it is the whole person who as a physical being is acted on, whether the action stems from within or without.

As "corpse" or "physical being" σῶμα marks the boundary of human individuality in relation to the phenomenal world. It defines the individual, not as a personality, but as a distinct material object amid the world of objects. As a part of the world man qua body undergoes the conditions of the temporal realm, such as life, health, imprisonment, sickness, death. So the term establishes the person as a particular instance of the stuff of this world. The underlying motif here is probably that of form and matter. The body is both together; it is man as a specific material shape, as organized matter. The accent may fall on either the material or the formal aspect.

The material aspect is most clearly seen when the Greek distinguishes body and soul. On both the popular and philosophical level σῶμα was contrasted to the soul, spirit, or mind of man. The soul's superiority to the body may well go back to the departure of the life-breath at death.<sup>11</sup> Once the life-breath was seen as man's essential self, it was easily linked to man's rational capabilities, and deemed the appropriate ruler of man's lower being, his body. Especially Plato, with his arguments for the soul's immortality, stamps this understanding with a philosophical framework that achieved widespread influence.<sup>12</sup> This led to a negative judgment on the body that is succinctly expressed in the Orphic slogan: σῶμα σῆμα. The body, then, has little to do with one's real (eternal) self; it



belongs to this transitory world, a fetter or prison from which one is released at death.<sup>14</sup> While not all schools of thought adopted this view, its problems set the perimeters of the debate. The question is not "whether" the soul is superior to the material body, but "how."

The formal aspect is seen when the Greek distinguishes the body's form and its material content. In contrast to its material composition *σῶμα* represents the self-contained and organized totality; the content in its living form. When among the Stoics the categories of form and matter gave way to a new concern for the power that unites the material, the nature of the material content became less important than the characteristic in which bodies act or suffer.<sup>15</sup> A body becomes any material totality that is capable of acting or suffering as a united whole. Here the problem of form and matter is not so much abandoned as offered a new solution. The idea of unity and totality that is implicit in the idea of form has become the new starting point. So whether viewed as matter impressed with a particular shape, or as matter attracted and attached by a permeating power, the body stands in relation to its content as a self-contained and united totality. The body, then, is harmonious and united in composition, and it is hardly surprising that disease was often thought to result from the improper balance or discord of the body elements.

The body is also a united totality in relation to its various bodily functions. The question here is not what a body is, but how it works; i.e. not the nature of composition, but rather the functional relation between the whole and its *μέλη* or *μέρη*.<sup>16</sup> If the catchword for the preceding category was "totality," the word here is "unity." The body is a living, interrelated and harmonious whole, whose members are united and diverse. Some members rule while others are ruled; there is a common sympathy of feeling, experience, and interdependence.<sup>17</sup> This unity of the body reflects divine providence. Thus when Xenophon (*Mem.* I iv 6ff) explains how the body members are wonderfully adapted to their different functions, he sees in this a theological argument of design. These ideas of a united organism rarely occur for their own sake, but rather in such arguments from design or even more often in analogies and comparisons of the human body to the state or cosmos. In this regard the body and its members served as perhaps the most influential paradigm of unity. Thus while *σῶμα* was a self-contained individualizing term, it was commonly used to picture man in his unity with other men and the world.

Of importance to our study is the relation between *σῶμα* and *κεφαλή*.<sup>18</sup> In secular Greek *κεφαλή* bore many connotations, indicating not only the "head" of a man or beast, but almost anything high, first, supreme or

extreme. It denoted, for example, "the prow of a ship," "the top of a wall," "the capital of a pillar," the beginning or end of a month, the source or mouth of a river.<sup>19</sup> Thus κεφαλή had latent associations with ἀρχή and τέλος.<sup>20</sup> Κεφαλή could also represent the whole person.<sup>21</sup> This meaning is clear in maledictions that name the head, but obviously aim at the well being of the entire person. The whole person is also indicated in phrases of endearment: ἡθεῖη κεφαλή means "beloved person."<sup>22</sup> So in κεφαλή one encounters the man; in it is man's life.<sup>23</sup> As early as Homer the term is used in a manner similar to ψυχή.<sup>24</sup> Van Roon rightly calls a man's head "the crux of existence."<sup>25</sup> This also is clear when the head is contrasted to other body parts. In such cases, σῶμα can mean "trunk,"<sup>26</sup> with the head standing out as the body's "prominent and determinative" member.<sup>27</sup> Often in Greek thinking the head is thought to house the authoritative principle, τὸ ἡγεμονικόν.<sup>28</sup> This view goes back at least to Plato (*Tim.* 44DE), who compares the spherical cosmic body and the human head. He defines the head as ὃ θειότατόν τ' ἐστὶ καὶ τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν πάντων δεσποτοῦν. The other body members were given to serve (primarily for locomotion) and in this service to the head the body finds its *raison d'être*. Also in this line stand the physiological assessments of Hippocrates and Galen.<sup>29</sup> The brain, ὁ ἐγκεφαλός, is the center of the organizing powers of the body; or to use Plato's image, the head is the ἀκροπολίς τοῦ σώματος.<sup>30</sup> The head's prominent position over the other body members provided a starting point for comparative sayings and was applied in a variety of social-political and cosmic contexts.<sup>31</sup>

## The Jewish World

### A. The OT and LXX

In turning to Biblical literature we are first struck by the fact that OT Hebrew has no consistent equivalent to the Greek σῶμα concept.<sup>32</sup> The term is used for no less than 12 different Hebrew roots, the most frequent being רִשָּׁא. Only occasionally, then, did the LXX translators find in the Hebrew texts the milieu of ideas that σῶμα evokes.<sup>33</sup> This was due to the different anthropological assumptions reflected in the Greek and Hebrew cultures. For the wholistic minded Hebrew, the starting point for understanding man lies not in philosophy, but theology. Unlike Greek thought, Hebrew thought never makes man a self-contained object of philosophical reflection, but always sees him in relation to the one God who created both him and his world.<sup>34</sup> Unlike the Greek, then, the Hebrew views his essential self as a part of the surrounding world, which is God's good creation. For him all words pertaining to the constitution of human existence are capable of describing the fundamental relation between the



"whole man as a part of creation" and God the Creator.<sup>35</sup> The distinctions so important to the Greek, simply do not occur or have a different basis and framework.

We see this, for instance, in the Hebrew's understanding of body and soul. Pedersen outlines this understanding:

The Israelites are quite able to distinguish between soul and body, as when Isaiah says: 'He shall consume both soul and flesh' (10, 18). But no distinction is made between them as two fundamental forms of existence. The flesh is weaker, as that which withers and disappears; the soul is the stronger. The soul is more than the body, but the body is a perfectly valid manifestation of the soul...the body is the soul in its outward form.<sup>36</sup>

Even here, however, this understanding has an essential theological dimension. As Käsemann rightly stresses: "Was 'Fleisch' ist, geht nicht ohne weiteres aus seiner natürlichstofflichen Vorfindlichkeit und ihren allgemein erkennbaren Attributen wie Sinnlichkeit, Endlichkeit, Schwäche hervor, sondern aus der Tatsache des göttlichen Handelns an ihm."<sup>37</sup> Bodily existence for the Hebrew represents the mode in which man was created by God.

This view of man as a creature before the creator is also important for understanding the body and its members. Unlike the Greek, the Hebrew does not analyse the body's parts and members in terms of their interrelation, but juxtaposes man's different functions in parallelism. This has been labeled "stereometry" of expression. As Wolff defines it, "stereometric thinking pegs out the sphere of man's existence by enumerating his characteristic organs, thus circumscribing man as a whole... Different parts of the body enclose with their essential functions the man who is meant."<sup>38</sup> But such stereometric thinking also implies wholistic thinking, or as Wolff calls it "synthetic" thinking:

Stereometric thinking thus simultaneously presupposes a synopsis of the members and organs of the human body with their capacities and functions. It is synthetic thinking, which by naming the part of the body means its function... The member and its efficacious action are synthesized. With a relatively small vocabulary, through which he names things and particularly the parts of the human body, the Hebrew can and must express a multiplicity of fine nuances by extracting from the context of the sentence the possibilities, activities, qualities or experiences of what is named.<sup>39</sup>

The feet, then, denote the man standing or running, the eyes seeing, the ears hearing, and so forth. As such the different body members depict different aspects of the whole person in relation to God, other men, or the world.

Finally, this Hebrew perspective is important for understanding man's relation to other men and the world. For the Greek the body was an individualizing term, frequently associated with *ὄρις*, "boundary."<sup>40</sup> But



for the Hebrew the various terms for the body, e.g.  $\text{גִּשְׁתִּי}$  or  $\text{גִּשְׁתִּי}$ , can also be used in an extended sense for blood relations, or even all living creatures,  $\text{כָּל-בְּשָׂר}$ .<sup>41</sup> Once again the theological perspective is important and is perhaps best summed up by J. A. T. Robinson:

The flesh-body was not what partitioned a man off from his neighbor; it was rather what bound him in the bundle of life with all men and nature, so that he could never make his unique answer to God as an isolated individual, apart from his relation to his neighbor. The basar continued, even in an age of greater religious individualism, to represent the fact that personality is essentially social.<sup>42</sup>

The use of  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  in the LXX is more restricted than in Greek culture generally. It is not used for plants or inorganic bodies and references to animals are rare; Gen xv 11; Job xl 32 and xli 15. The occasional use for visionary creatures (Dan vii 11, Ez i 11, 23) as well as human-like angels (Dan x 6) suggests that a distinction between heavenly and earthly spheres cannot be rigidly held.<sup>43</sup> Even so the term in the LXX first and foremost denotes man in his corporeal existence.

$\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  appears in the LXX mostly where man is acted on by himself or others; whether alive or dead he is part of the phenomenal world.<sup>44</sup> Especially as a translation of  $\text{גִּשְׁתִּי}$  it denotes man's objective corporeal being, e.g. in ritual, sex, sickness, death, healing and perhaps resurrection.<sup>45</sup> If such usage has parallels in Greek thought, the difference in context cannot be overlooked. The LXX shares the Hebrew conviction that this world is ultimately God's creation, and man's identity and destiny is bound up with this Creator and His creation.  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ , then, denotes not simply man's physical being, but that physical being as the outward manifestation of his finite and created selfhood. As such, the term is passive and receptive. But notably  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  does not appear where  $\text{גִּשְׁתִּי}$  or  $\text{גִּשְׁתִּי}$  denotes blood relations or all living creatures. It remains an individualizing term.

Only in LXX works outside the Hebrew canon does anthropological dualism clearly emerge. Soul and body occur together in Prov xi 17 but the parallelism shows that each represents the whole person (cf. Wis i 4). In Macc xi 30 and Wis viii 20 body and soul complement one another such that only both together denote the whole person, but this does not involve a negative judgment. A negative view is apparent, however, when in IV Macc xiii 13 (contrast II Macc vii 37) one may willingly sacrifice the body because the soul is God's real gift (cf. also Wis ix 15). The Greek concern over the body's material composition is not reflected in the LXX, but the idea of "form" may be present at LXX Dan iv 16:  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\rho\acute{o}\sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\omega\theta\eta$  (cf. Dan x 6).<sup>46</sup> But

this is better understood from the Hebrew notion of "outward manifestation" than the Greek idea of "organized form." The idea of totality does appear when a person suffers torture or disfigurement (II Macc vii 7, iv 7; IV Macc iv 20). Here the μέλη stand over against the totality which is the σῶμα. However, this totality finds its starting point neither in the body's material content nor in its functional organization, but more concretely in the person who as a corporeal being actually suffers. The idea of an interrelated organism does not occur in the LXX, nor is the term used in comparisons that presuppose that meaning.

Only rarely does the LXX associate κεφαλή and σῶμα. This is not surprising in view of Hebraic assumptions about man and the subsequent lack of a consistent equivalent for the Greek σῶμα. The significance of κεφαλή in the LXX requires its own special treatment.

Κεφαλή generally translates רֶאִשׁ.<sup>47</sup> The Hebrew term bears two major meanings: (a) the anatomical, which may be associated with certain extensions as "top" or "sum"; and (b) the temporal or spatial sense of what is first.<sup>48</sup> Κεφαλή and רֶאִשׁ share a number of meanings: the "head" of a man or beast; the "top" of a mountain or tower or ladder; the "beginning" of a month or river.<sup>49</sup> Still, the words are not exact equivalents. If this occasions a number of different translations of רֶאִשׁ, it also allows for broadening the connotations of κεφαλή.<sup>50</sup>

We may recognize Hebrew stereometric thinking when κεφαλή is joined with ποδάς to indicate the whole body (Lev xiii 12, Job ii 7, Isa i 6) or with οὐραί to denote "high and low," or "great and small" (Deut xxviii 13, 14; Isa ix 14, xix 15). More often and more significantly κεφαλή wholistically defines the whole person in a particular mode of being or activity. Outwardly κεφαλή represents man in his experience of life's blessings and judgments. It is where man meets with anointing, blessing, exaltation, cursing, revenge or recompense.<sup>51</sup> Inwardly the head is where man makes known such attitudes and states as humiliation, rebellion, ritual dedication, or scorn.<sup>52</sup> If Greek thinking occasionally provides parallels to such usage, these do little more than form a base on which the LXX broadens the idea both numerically and dynamically.

Κεφαλή is sometimes placed with σῶμα for the purposes of location (Lev xix 27-28; cf. also xix 9; Dan vii 27; Ep Jer 22). There is no idea of an organism, however. To be sure, the vital significance of the head for life is recognized (e.g. I Chr xii 19). Unlike losing an arm or leg, losing the head means loss of life. A body without its head is a corpse (I Chr x 9ff, Judith xiii 6ff). But, the head is not in Plato's terms, the "acropolis of the body." The psychic activities of reason and will, or the



authoritative principle are not attributed to the head; but generally confined to the heart.<sup>53</sup> If the head may legitimately be called the "crux of existence" then, this means that it is the primary vehicle for receiving and manifesting those realities and experiences vital to man's existence in the world. Thus the head is primarily an organ of mediation; here outward realities are communicated to the person and inward realities are expressed to others.

## B. Judaism

### (1) Hebrew Sources

The Qumran material generally preserves the OT view of man and generally calls for little comment.<sup>54</sup> Of some importance, however, is 1QH VIII 32ff:

...my soul languishes even to death. My strength has gone from my body and my heart runs out like water; my flesh is dissolved like wax and the strength of my loins is turned to fear. My arm is torn from its socket /and I can/ lift my hand /no more/; My /foot/ is held by fetters and my knees slide like water; I can no longer walk. I cannot step forward lightly, /for my legs and arms/ are bound by shackles which cause me to stumble. The tongue has gone back which Thou didst make marvelously mighty within my mouth; it can no longer give voice.<sup>55</sup>

This particular set of woes is well summed up in vs. 32: *כִּי בְשָׁרִי מְעוּזִי מְגֻזָּה*. Here the body representing the outward side of man as a created being is joined with the member that represents the person in a specific function. In OT fashion the list of members pictures stereometrically the person in his disability, and points wholistically to the person who is manifested in bodily functions. But now the body stands over these member-functions as a totality. When strength leaves the body, this is manifested in the disability of bodily functions. So any particular body member is capable of denoting the whole body as engaged in that member's function. When the psalmist states, "I cannot raise my hand," he means that this physical being has not the capacity to engage in the function of lifting its hand. In other words, while it may not imply that the person cannot see, for instance, it is nonetheless a statement about his entire body-capacity and not just that of his arm. This approaches the Greek idea of an organism, but its basis is quite different.

In the Rabbinic writings *גוף* emerges as the primary term for the body.<sup>56</sup> If Hellenistic influence is felt when body and soul are distinguished, then the influence of the Old Testament has not been totally abandoned. Body and soul undergo separation at death, but reunion at resurrection; thus man experiences judgment as a whole with body and soul united.<sup>57</sup> Interest in the material makeup of man is seen in speculations over the composition of Adam out of the dust from various parts of the



world.<sup>58</sup> But the interest is strictly apologetical and certainly does not evince concern for the Greek problem of form and matter. The Rabbis also speculated on the number of body members (or bones), but nothing here suggests the Greek idea of an organism. When this number of members is compared to the number of positive commands of the Torah, we do perhaps find an echo of the wholistic identification of member and function.<sup>59</sup> Finally, the head occasionally has a central role, e.g. Shab 61a: "one who desires to anoint his whole body must anoint his head first, because it is the king of all the limbs."<sup>60</sup>

## (2) Greek (and Latin) Sources

Only in Philo and Josephus do we find reference to organic bodies or plants.<sup>61</sup> Otherwise σῶμα denotes a human or animal body. Outside Philo the use for animal is rare and even there the term usually denotes man.<sup>62</sup> So we see here the same tendency of the LXX to confine σῶμα to its anthropological connotations. The sense, "corpse," is also well attested and the idea of man as a physical being persists.<sup>63</sup> But unlike the LXX these categories do not dominate the term.

Development along Hellenistic lines is clearly seen with regard to body and soul and the body organism. Generally man consists of body and soul, and the body is consciously contrasted to the superior soul.<sup>64</sup> We even find the thoroughly Greek view of the body as a garment to be shed or a prison from which to be released.<sup>65</sup> As a whole, however, the body/soul distinction is assimilated into the Jewish doctrine of creation and redemption. If body and soul separate at death they are reunited in resurrection; or if the soul is itself immortal, it is nonetheless subject to judgment.<sup>66</sup> Philo, however, can posit a third heavenly element that is fully transcendent.<sup>67</sup> This idea, of course, was later taken over and developed in Gnosticism.<sup>68</sup> At work here is the typically Greek concern to separate the essential ego from this world. While the distinction between the body's form and content is fairly rare,<sup>69</sup> the idea of an organism is more broadly attested. In Ep.Ar. 154-157 the author argues from the body's wondrous design to God's infinite resourcefulness. Notably, however, the various parts and functions are not bound together by nature, but θεῖα δύναμις (157). In Philo and Josephus, the body organism often appears in comparisons and analogies.<sup>70</sup>

Finally, the head is now set over the body as its principal member. This is most clearly seen in Philo: τὸ ἡγεμονικώτατον ἐν ζῳῳ κεφαλὴ (Op. Mund. 119).<sup>71</sup> In Platonic style the reason's abode in the head is likened to that of a king's (Leg.All. III 115). Also the mind's rule of the soul is likened to the head's rule of the body (Som. I 125ff), If one

destroys the head of a creature, he destroys the other parts; so too the head is their τέλος (Sacr.AC. 115). Κεφαλή is also associated with heaven; the head's upright position distinguishes man from other creatures and indicates the heavenly source of his true nourishment (Det.Pot.Ins. 85). Josephus as well as Philo distinguishes head and body, and both use this relation in comparative statements.<sup>72</sup>

In summary, Judaism generally follows the lead of the LXX in making σῶμα largely an anthropological term. Only in Philo may this seriously be questioned. The influence of Hellenistic views is especially felt with regard to the body and soul and the body and its members, especially the head. The usage is not, of course, uniform. If in Qumran we find a continuation of OT views, in Philo and Josephus we discover a fairly thoroughgoing capitulation to Hellenism.

### The New Testament

#### A. Books apart from the Pauline Corpus

Of the 141 NT instances of σῶμα, only 51 fall outside the Pauline Corpus.<sup>73</sup> Usage follows the anthropological orientation of the LXX. The term does not appear for inorganic bodies or plants and instances for animals are rare (Jas iii 3; Heb xiii 11; Luke xvii 37). By far the most prevalent use is for corpse and corporeal being, constituting approximately 60% of the term's occurrences.

We find the meaning, "corpse," especially with regard to the burial of Jesus' crucified body (Mark xv 42-47, pars.). Also in connection with Christ's death, man as an objective corporeal being appears when Jesus is anointed before his death for burial (Mark xiv 8, Matt xxvi 12). This objective aspect is also present when the body is the recipient of clothing (Matt vi 25; Luke xii 22f; Jas ii 16); of healing (Mark vi 25); of washing (Heb x 22); of death or destruction (Matt x 28; Luke xii 4; John ii 21); or of resurrection (Matt xxvii 52; John ii 21; cf. Acts ix 40). In Rev xviii 13 we find the idiomatic meaning, "slaves." Of special note is that σῶμα may now be offered in sacrifice for others (Heb x 5; I Pet ii 24). This usage was anticipated in the Maccabean literature, but there the body stands along with or in contrast to the soul (II Macc vii 37; IV Macc x 4, 20). Here the offering of the body is paramount to offering oneself. Schweizer is probably correct in suggesting that this meaning has been influenced by the eucharistic texts (Mark xiv 22 par.).<sup>74</sup>

The contrast between body and soul (or spirit) is fairly infrequent. At Matt x 28 and Luke viii 5 the distinction appears, but differently from Greek conceptions. While the body can be destroyed in a way that the soul cannot, the soul is not in itself immortal, but subject to hell as



much as the body. In Jas ii 26 we learn that a body without a spirit (breath?) is dead. Only at Heb xiii 11 is the idea of the body as the soul's prison hinted.

Also the Greek contrast between form and matter is missing. Σῶμα does take on the idea of a totality in contrast to its members. In Jas iii 2ff we learn how control over the tongue entails control over the whole body.<sup>75</sup> Matt v 29-30 (cf. Mark ix 43-47) is different; if a body member, e.g. the eye, causes one to sin, then it is better that the member be removed than the whole body enter hell. The parable is best understood on the basis of wholistic thinking.<sup>76</sup> The body member such as the eye represents the person in a particular activity, a specific function. This is clear because the eye does not sin, but the person. But now (cf. 1QH viii 32ff) the person whom the eye represents is viewed as the totality of his body members, the σῶμα. The body, then, indicates the person's total capacity for bodily action and in this instance that means his capacity for life. It is not the person in action, but the person's total capacity for action as subject to the consequences and judgment of its particular actions. Notably, particular actions may be described wholistically as individual member-functions, e.g. the eye = the person serving; so the individual member depicts the whole body as engaged in a particular mode of activity. In relation to this active member the body becomes oriented to that function as a passive participant, reaping the consequences of the person's engagement in that activity.

In these NT writings κεφαλή usually denotes the head of a person and usually that of Jesus.<sup>77</sup> In reference to LXX Ps cxvii 22, Jesus becomes κεφαλή γωνίας (Mark xii 10 par.; 1Pet ii 7). Κεφαλή is also used in describing a demonic beast (Rev xvii 3). Generally, then, the usage follows that of the LXX, although the idea of "chief" or "leader" does not occur.

Thus outside the Pauline Corpus, the NT understanding of σῶμα and κεφαλή follows OT and LXX lines. Two important developments may be noted: (a) the body may now be the object of self-sacrifice; and (b) the body may stand in relation to an individual member as the totality passively engaged in the personal function represented by that specific member.

#### B. The Pauline Corpus

Σῶμα occurs some 90 times in the Pauline Corpus, and it is a word of theological importance.<sup>78</sup> While scholars generally agree that Pauline anthropology is more Jewish than Greek, the question remains, what kind of Jew. For even among the Jews of Paul's day views varied.

In discussing the resurrection body Paul mentions the different natures of various organic, e.g. plants, or inorganic bodies, celestial



bodies such as the sun, moon, or stars. In Col ii 17 we find the popular σῶμα/σκία contrast.<sup>79</sup> Apart from these references and those to the eucharistic loaf and Church, σῶμα generally refers to man as a living body. Certainly some instances point to man's mortality (Rom vii 24; viii 10,11), but the contexts and qualifying words show that σῶμα does not itself denote a corpse. In Rom vii 4 (cf. Col i 22) it denotes Christ's crucified body. But here the point is not Christ's corpse, but his living body given to death in self-sacrifice.<sup>80</sup>

By far the majority of instances refer to man as a corporeal being. Perhaps the classic example is Rom xii 1: παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν. Here σῶμα is the believer's vehicle for personal service (cf. Phil i 20); grammatically it could be easily replaced by the reflexive pronoun.<sup>81</sup> Even where the body is simply the object of suffering or self-inflicted discipline, one finds this underlying idea of service (Gal vi 17, I Cor ix 27). But if man as a physical being may give himself to the glory of God (I Cor vi 20, cf. Rom vi 13) he may also yield himself to sin (Rom vi 6) and be geared for death (vii 24). Only through the Spirit of Christ does one overcome the "deeds of the body."

As a physical being man is involved in physical relations, especially sex (I Cor vi 13ff). We discuss this passage elsewhere and simply note here how man's sexual actions engage the whole self, and that σῶμα is interchangeable with σῶψ.<sup>82</sup> The whole self is also involved when man as a physical being is resurrected. The impact of the resurrection widens the horizons of the term's usage. Σῶμα cannot be relegated to the earthly sphere; resurrected existence is a bodily existence. Thus in the Pauline texts, man as a corporeal being is equivalent to man as a "created being." It implies all the advantages and shortcomings of being a part of this world or the next world.

Certain passages imply a distinction between body and soul (or spirit). In II Cor xii 2f Paul contemplates with indifference the possibility that his spiritual ecstasy was outside the body. Such indifference is sometimes taken to mean an indifference to a body-spirit dichotomy.<sup>83</sup> This is possible, but so is the reverse. If for Paul σῶμα meant the human "ego," he could hardly be indifferent to the nature of this ecstasy. (Perhaps Paul was less interested in anthropology than either his opponents or modern scholars.) Other passages where a contrast might be inferred are I Cor v 3, vii 34, II Cor v 6-10, I Thess v 23. Not all of these are equally convincing. I Thess v 23, for instance, concerns a rhetorical, if not liturgical, phrase.<sup>84</sup> II Cor v 6ff certainly approaches the Greek view, but at the crucial point in vs. 10 the believer stands before the judgment

seat of Christ and is judged according to τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος. One recalls here Jewish parallels about the soul and body receiving judgment together. In any case, the body is important to one who is and will be before Christ.

Paul shows no concern over the problem of form and matter. Only I Cor xv 35ff provides an instance comparable to the Greek idea of form. In vs. 36f Paul describes how the body of a seed is transformed by God into the body of the plant. There is then a variety of bodies as nature shows: "For not all flesh is alike, but there is one kind for men, another for animals, another for birds, and another for fish. There are celestial bodies and there are terrestrial bodies" (vs. 39f). So too man has a natural (ψυχικός) body and a spiritual (πνευματικός) body. Paul wishes to show here that there are different kinds of bodies. Σῶμα and σὰρξ are best understood as synonyms that point to the differing outward manifestations of men, animals, etc.<sup>85</sup> This is why Paul can so easily move from σὰρξ to δόξα in vs. 40. So the resurrection body is the outward manifestation of the spiritual life of the new creation, just as the present body is that of the old creation. The thought approaches the Greek idea of form, but the basis is different.

Μέλη can sometimes represent the whole person as a physical being and so function as a synonym for the body (e.g. Rom vi 12).<sup>86</sup> Paul also uses body and members in comparisons and/or analogies to the Church (see Appendix C). In the undisputed letters κεφαλή occurs infrequently. The heaping of coals on the head (Rom xii 20) reflects OT usage (cf. Prov xxv 22). In I Cor xii 21 the high and prominent head is contrasted to the low and subservient feet. Even so the starting point is their mutual dependence and the head has no special function with regard to the body. In I Cor xi 3f κεφαλή does take on theological significance when Paul makes a word play on the term's various connotations in discussing women wearing veils. We examined this passage in ch. I.

From this brief survey it is clear that for Paul σῶμα is primarily an anthropological term. The accent falls on man as a corporeal being, suggesting that Paul understands σῶμα in terms of the Hebrew רֶשֶׁת. Certainly in I Cor vi 13ff the terms are interchangeable and σῶμα even takes on a relational dimension that it never had in the LXX. Unlike σὰρξ, however, σῶμα is not confined to the earthly sphere; it will be resurrected. The point of departure here is, of course, the resurrected body of Christ. On the whole we may state that for Paul bodily existence means created existence, whether in reference to the old or new creation.<sup>87</sup>



Perhaps the most vexing problem in Pauline anthropology concerns the body and soul distinction. Was Paul dualistic or wholistic in his thinking about man? Sometimes the problem has been approached by asking whether Paul thinks as a Greek or Jew. But Judaism could also think dualistically and without the consequences of Platonic idealism. Recently R. H. Gundry has studied the relevant Pauline material and criticized the presuppositions of the wholistic position.<sup>88</sup> We do not have space here for an in depth discussion and must be content with a few observations.

Paul does not present us with a systematic treatment of his views on anthropology. The difficulty is that popular language does not always adequately reflect philosophical assumptions. One must weigh the various occurrences and take into account common or idiomatic expressions. In Greek and later in the LXX it was common for *σῶμα* to replace the reflexive pronoun. Are we to build an entire anthropology on Rom xii 1? On the other hand, I Thess v 21 speaks of spirit, soul, and body. Are we to assume from this rhetorical statement that Paul is a trichotomist? In the same vein we should recognize that the question whether *σῶμα* can represent the whole person is not the same as whether he is wholistic or dualistic in his thinking. Indeed, on a philosophical level the question may not have interested Paul.

This does not mean, however, that Paul was simply indifferent to the subject on other levels. As stated above, bodily existence is for Paul created existence. Man without a body is not the man God created. Anything less than bodily redemption does not redeem the man God created. This does not speak against dualism per se, but it does emphasize that Paul's starting point is the unity of man. In other words, whether Paul is a monist or dualist, he is most certainly a wholist. The realm in which Paul's wholism is important is that of morality. What we do as corporeal beings is what we as persons do. Wherever else man might be considered dualistically for Paul man is a united whole in moral action. Again this does not argue against dualism per se, but it does insist that man is first and foremost a creature before the creator God.

When discussing the moral implications of the body, its future resurrection becomes pivotal (cf. I Cor vi 13ff). Still this tells us little more than man without a body is not man. If God is to judge and raise man, it must be man, which means he must have a bodily existence. But in one aspect, at least, the wholistic implications of *σῶμα* become decisive. In giving his body on the cross, Christ gives himself (cf. Rom vii 4, I Cor xi 24). It seems inconceivable that Paul would deny this. To be sure, this does not speak against duality as much as against the idea of an inward



aspect of man's relation to God that can be radically divorced from moral action.

To this extent, at least, Paul is wholistic. His concern falls into the arena of theology and ethics, not metaphysics. One suspects the influence of the Old Testament here, where the particular is a manifestation of the whole. So if Paul could distinguish the body from the soul or human spirit, he could do so only on the presupposition of man's total unity as a creature before God.

## II. World, Society, and Σῶμα

The different connotations of σῶμα were used in a variety of comparisons and analogies. Our efforts here are limited to those instances where σῶμα is used or implied in cosmic and social contexts. These provide the most hopeful background for understanding the Body of Christ concept in Ephesians. Although κεφαλή often appears to have an independent history, we consider it appropriate to include such references here rather than devote a separate appendix to the term. To do justice to the variety and amount of material, we first offer a brief historical overview of the term's usage in such contexts. We then outline and give examples of the various points of departure (body/soul, body/member, etc.) along with that to which the comparison or analogy is made (e.g. cosmos, state). Then we sketch some of the ideas that σῶμα evokes in such applications. Finally, brief consideration is given to six areas of special concern.

### A. Historical Overview

Possibly the cosmic and social-political use of σῶμα has been influenced by Indo-Iranian All-God speculations.<sup>89</sup> The famous "Purusasūkta" or "hymn of man" (Rig Veda x 90), for example, tells how the gods created the world from a sacrificed primeval giant. Keith comments: "his head became the sky, his navel the air, and his feet the earth. The moon sprang from his mind, the sun from his eyes, Indra and Agni from his mouth, the wind from his breath, the four castes from his mouth, arms, thigh, and feet in order or dignity."<sup>90</sup> Such Macroanthropos conceptions stress the cosmic unity established in the All-God. The theological viewpoint is distinctly pantheistic. While the head is the first and highest member and so equated with the skys or heavens, it is simply listed with the other members, having no special function.<sup>91</sup>

In Greek sources the idea that the cosmos is a living and ensouled being is very old. As early as Thales the world is thought to be permeated by a divine soul and this idea persists in varying forms from then on.<sup>92</sup> Related to, perhaps underlying, the idea of an ensouled cosmos is the widespread correlation between the structure of the cosmos and that of man.

In the 5th century B.C. Democritus explicitly formulates the principle that man is a 'microcosm'.<sup>93</sup> Apparently σῶμα was not used in the original formulations. At least it does not appear in reference to the cosmos before Plato's era. Once the Macro-microcosm correlation was established, it is not surprising that σῶμα was eventually taken up in this connection. Still, the starting point is not the body and its members, but the outer-inner structure of body and soul. For Plato the cosmic body is not a human body at all, but a perfect circle (Tim 33A-34A). Nor does σῶμα itself depict the universe as a living being, but the world's outward and physical aspect. Only as governed by the divine soul is the cosmos a living creature, even a second θεός (Tim 34AB).

Σῶμα also occurs in social-political comparisons during this period.<sup>94</sup> By Plato's time the term commonly refers to the city-state with the point of comparison in practically any connotation of the Greek σῶμα concept (body/soul, body/members, body/head, body as physical being).<sup>95</sup> Usually the idea of unity occurs or is implied, and the term is already well on the way to being the paradigm for proper social-political relations.

The early and middle Stoics developed the pre-Socratic idea of an ensouled cosmos according to their thoroughgoing monism. Diogenes Laertius reports: ὅτι δὲ καὶ ζῷον ὁ κόσμος καὶ λογικὸν καὶ ἔμψυχον καὶ νοερὸν καὶ χρύσιππος θησιν...καὶ Ποσειδώνιος.<sup>96</sup> Such statements about the cosmos had by this time attained significant religious overtones. Zeus was identified with the cosmos and the cosmos was called God.<sup>97</sup> Only fragmentary evidence indicates that σῶμα entered into these speculations. Chrysippus, for example, taught that the cosmos is a perfect body, but its members are not perfect (v. Arnim, Stoic.vet.fr. II, 173; cf. Plut. II 1054F). In arguing that the cosmos is a body endowed with divine reason, Posidonius introduces the threefold distinction between bodies that are continuous, those composed of adjacent parts, and those formed from distinct bodies.<sup>98</sup> How and when κεφαλή began to play a key role in these speculations is uncertain?<sup>99</sup> At least by the 1st century B.C. statements like Orphic Frag. 168 were describing Zeus as the head and center who contains within his body the cosmos which originated from him.<sup>100</sup> Surprisingly, however, use of κεφαλή/σῶμα in social-political comparisons is rare outside Latin and Hellenistic Jewish sources and attested only in Plato (Leg. XII 964DE) and Plutarch (Galb. IV 3, I 1054e).

During the 1st century B.C. the Latin corpus was often compared with the cosmos or the state. Cicero uses the analogy of the human body to



refute the Platonic idea of God's spherical rotation (Nat.Deor. I x 24), while Virgil suggests that the body/soul dualism expresses the metaphysical dualism of the cosmos (Aen. VI 724f). Often the term is applied to the state or empire. The most famous example is Livy's account of Agrippa Menenius (II xxxiii 8). If here the metaphorical element is plain, in many places it is so remote that a concrete point of comparison (other than the implicit notion of unity) is difficult to discern. The caput/corpus concept also appears in political comparisons, but curiously not in cosmic texts. In Seneca, the emperor is now called both the head and the soul of the empire, and the empire his body (Clem. I iv 3ff, II ii 1). In cosmic contexts the body/soul and the body/members ideas obtain a new moral emphasis (Ep. lxxv 24, xcii 30, xcv 52).

This later stoic blending of metaphysics and religious morality is prominent in Epictetus (Diss. II v 25ff). Plutarch's use of  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  in political and cosmic comparisons also generally portrays stoic influence. But the philosophical mysticism of the gnostic oriented Corpus Hermeticum has roots in Platonic dualism.  $\Sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  describes the cosmos as the second god, and the Macro-microcosm correlation is often pronounced. If the usage is "purely cosmic," the religious significance of cosmic statements cannot be overlooked.<sup>101</sup> Still this Macrocosm is not a Macroanthropos of the Indo-Iranian type. This latter scheme does appear in the magic papyri with little alteration.<sup>102</sup>

When we turn to the Old Testament and LXX we find little corresponding to Greek comparisons to a society and the cosmos.  $\psi\ddot{\alpha}$  can be used to indicate marital union or the community of created beings.<sup>103</sup> But  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  does not appear here and the organism concept is missing. Israel is said to gather in Jerusalem  $\tau\eta\ddot{\alpha} \psi\ddot{\alpha}$  (Ez iii 1; Neh viii 1; LXX:  $\omega\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ), but again the body concept is missing. In Dan vii 11 the identifying of the beast with the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  (LXX:  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ ) that is burned is only secondary elaboration (cf. IV Ezra xi 45, xii 23f). But  $\psi\ddot{\alpha}$  does occur in social-political contexts. In contrast to the tail the head denotes superiority and in Apocalyptic the heads of visionary beasts represent the kings of kingdoms. More importantly  $\psi\ddot{\alpha}$  can mean "chief" or "ruler" without any application of a body.<sup>104</sup> This usage persists in the LXX, Qumran, and Pseudepigrapha.

Parallels to Greek usage are also rare among the Rabbis. The closest parallel is LevR iv 6: "'Israel is a scattered sheep' (Jer. 1, 17). Just as with a lamb, when it is hurt on the head or on any other limb, all its limbs feel it, even so is it with Israel: if (only one) of them sins,



all of them feel it" (cf. also Mek Ex xix 6). More frequent are speculations about the nature and shape of the first man, Adam.<sup>105</sup>

At the crossroad between Hellenism and Judaism stands the Alexandrian, Philo. Philo reflects popular scientific (largely stoic) opinion in calling the cosmos the largest material body (Plant. 7, Aet.Mund. 102). The Macro-microcosm correlation also appears (Migr.Abr. 219; Rer.Div.Her. 155),<sup>106</sup> and a Macroanthropos scheme perhaps underlies the identification of the Logos as "the head of all things" (Quaest. in Ex. ii 117).<sup>107</sup> If the Logos is allegorically represented by the High Priest, it is not identified with a historical person. In social-political contexts, Philo describes the unity of Israel as "one body" (Spec.Leg. III 131; cf. Virt. 103). Elsewhere the head and body depict the good man, city, or nation in relation to the larger populace (Praem.Poen. 114, 125). The relation here is notably more moral and spiritual.<sup>108</sup> κεφαλή is also used with ζῷον to indicate the member par excellance (Vit.Mos. II 30). Josephus also uses the body and head/body concepts in various political, military and geographical contexts, but the cosmic use is missing.<sup>109</sup>

Apart from the Pauline Corpus we do not find the σῶμα metaphor in the New Testament. Rev xvii 3 does echo common apocalyptic imagery in its use of κεφαλή. The body idea in the Apostolic fathers generally reflects Pauline influence (I Clem xxxvii 5f, xlvii 7, Ign. Tr. xi 2; Sm. i 2).<sup>110</sup> At II Clem xiv 2-4 the statements take on a more gnostic flavor when the Church is interpreted on the basis of Gen i 27. Schweizer is probably correct in suggesting "such speculations were directly stimulated by Eph. 5:23-32."<sup>111</sup> Also O.Sol. xvii 15-17 may betray gnostic influence when the head/member idea is used soteriologically.<sup>112</sup>

In Gnosticism cosmological schemes are transformed into salvific schemes of metaphysical anthropology.<sup>113</sup> Cosmology and personal salvation find a concrete point of contact in the Gnostics' throughgoing dualism of spirit and matter, which permeates their understanding of man. Here we find a variety of myths tapping on essentially separate motifs such as the Macrocosm conception, the Macroanthropos speculation, the Primal Man, and a Redeemer-revealer figure.<sup>114</sup> In describing the world of aeons or the relation between Redeemer and redeemed, the body conception could take up practically any of these various motifs.<sup>115</sup> Of special note is how the head takes on an increasing and sometimes independent significance.<sup>116</sup> In Greek fashion the body can denote "outward form" or be understood as a "garment."<sup>117</sup> A full combination of the various motifs, however, does not appear very early (c. A.D. 200).<sup>118</sup> Moreover, those places where the body concept occurs generally show Christian influence.<sup>119</sup>

## B. Points of Departure

Our overview has shown that σῶμα, μέλη, and κεφαλή are used in a variety of extended contexts. Not only does the point of departure vary (e.g. body/soul, body/members), but also that to which the comparison is made (e.g. state, cosmos). In this section we will outline in more detail the major points of departure and their various applications.

### 1. The body/rational soul relationship may describe:

(a) cosmic relationships: (i) the material cosmos and its divine ruling principle. This conception is very old and often linked to the Macro-microcosm correlation. A good example is in Plato, Phileb. 29B-30C. Here Plato argues from the lesser human body, composed of the four elements, to the greater cosmic body. Σῶμα here does not represent the whole of either man or the cosmos (30A). Having established the cosmos as a body, Plato then shows from the lesser human soul the existence of the world soul. The cosmos is a visible and material body, engulfed and ruled by a divine rational soul (cf. Tim. 30A-34C). Such thinking was prevalent in both Greek and Latin circles (Xenoph. Mem. I iv 17f; Sext. Emp. Math. IX 85; Vergil. Aen. VI 724f). The idea is also present in Philo (Migr.Abr. 219-20; Rer.Div.Her. 155; Abr. 74, 272; Fug. 108-113). Seneca (Ep. lxxv 24a) uses it as a basis for moral exhortation. Sometimes the mind or reason is distinguished from the soul and this too comes to play in cosmic contexts (Plato, Tim. 30B; Philo, Abr. 272; Corp.Herm. XI 4b). This has no effect on the meaning of σῶμα, however.

(ii) the visible and invisible heavens. The same outward perspective is present when Plato (Tim. 36E) depicts the visible heavens: καὶ τὸ μὲν δὴ σῶμα ὁρατὸν οὐρανοῦ γέγονεν, αὐτὴ δὲ ἀόρατος μὲν, λογισμοῦ δὲ μετέχουσα καὶ ἁρμονίας [Ψυχῇ].

(iii) the Demiurge and his more excellent Son. Evidently Basilides (Hipp.Ref. VII xxiv 1f) used Aristotle's conception of the body/soul relation to depict the Demiurge's relation to his superior Son:

Ὁν λόγον οὖν Ἀριστοτέλης ἀποδέδωκε περὶ τῆς  
 ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος πρότερος, Βασιλείδης περὶ τοῦ  
 μεγάλου ἄρχοντος καὶ τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν υἱοῦ διασαφεῖ...  
 Ὡς οὖν ἡ ἐντελέχεια διοικεῖ τὸ σῶμα, οὕτως ὁ υἱὸς  
 διοικεῖ κατὰ Βασιλείδην τὸν ἀρρήτων ἀρρητότερον θεόν.<sup>120</sup>

The Demiurge has been identified with the cosmos as its body, while by Aristotle's doctrine of entelechy his Son is the superior world soul.<sup>121</sup>

(b) political relationships: (i) the city-state and its polity. Isocrates (Or. vii 14, cf. xii 138) offers a good example: ἔστι γὰρ ψυχὴ πόλεως οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ πολιτεία, τοσαύτην ἔχουσα δύναμιν ὅσῃ περ ἐν σώματι φρόνησις. As the harmony and well-being of the



body depends on the rule of the rational soul, so too the state depends upon its polity which has the power of deliberation (cf. also Plato, Gorg. 464B). The same starting point may also underlie Livy's statements about the law (I viii 1f) and Dionysius' statement about the chief magistrates and senators (Ant.Rom. XIII xi 5).

(ii) the emperor and the empire. Seneca (Clem. I v 1) uses the body/soul concept to describe Nero's relation to the empire:

Nam si, quod adhuc colligit, tu animus rei publicae tuae es, illa corpus tuum, vides, ut puto, quam necessaria sit clementia; tibi enim parcis, cum videris alteri parcere. Parcendum itaque est etiam improbandis civibus non aliter quam membris languentibus, et, si quando misso sanguine opus est, sustinenda est manus, ne ultra, quam necesse sit, incidat.

In good stoic fashion, the soul rules and is the center of the body's unity. This is probably why the metaphor is so hardened. For the Stoics, the state could itself be considered a "diverse" body whose unity lay in some principle; here the emperor's personal rule.<sup>122</sup> Do we have, then, a comparison between the emperor's human body and the "diverse" body of the state? Indeed, there might even seem to be an identification between them, for harm done to the state is harm done to the emperor. But such a conclusion goes beyond the text. Certainly Nero's personal soul is not identified with the soul of the state. In stating that Nero is the soul of the state, Seneca refers to Nero as holding the office of emperor. The office of emperor replaces the polity or law as the uniting and ruling force of the state. In calling the state his body, then, there is no identification with Nero's personal body. The unity of soul and body is simply comparable to that of an emperor and his empire. The personal pronouns emerge, then, not from identifying Nero's body with that of the state, but from identifying Nero as emperor.

(c) household relationships: (i) slave and master. For Aristotle (Pol. I, 1255b 10f) some parts by nature rule and others are ruled; such is the case with the soul and body. Moreover what is bad and inappropriate for one part inadvertently affects the other part adversely. Aristotle applies this idea to a master and his slave: τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ συμφέρει τῷ μέρει καὶ τῷ ὅλῳ καὶ σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ, ὃ δὲ δοῦλος μέρος τι τοῦ δεσπότης, οἷον ἐμψυχόν τι τοῦ σώματος κεχωρισμένον δὲ μέρος.<sup>123</sup> The slave is a part of his master, i.e. a part of his σῶμα.<sup>123</sup> For Aristotle this meant that the slave was the tool or instrument of the master. But assuming that this relation is held according to nature, a bond of common interest and friendship exists between master and slave.

(ii) wife and husband. Plutarch uses the body/soul relation in discussing marriage (Praec.Coniug. 33-34, II 142EF):



κρατεῖν δὲ δεῖ τὸν ἄνδρα τῆς γυναικὸς οὐκ ὡς δεσπότην κτήματος ἀλλ' ὡς ψυχὴν σώματος, συμπαθοῦντα καὶ συμπεφυκότα τῇ εὐνοίᾳ. ὥπερ οὖν σώματος ἐστὶ κήδεσθαι μὴ δουλεύοντα ταῖς ἡδοναῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις, οὕτω γυναικὸς ἀρχεῖν εὐφραίνοντα καὶ χαριζόμενον.

Immediately after this Plutarch applies the stoic threefold distinction of bodies. For him it is not whether the couple makes up one body, but what kind of body they make up. The living, ensouled body is the ideal.

(d) (perhaps) military relationships: Plutarch (Pomp. 51, I 646B) describes how Caesar acquired his army: αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ὡς σῶμα τὴν στρατιωτικὴν δύναμιν περικείμενος. The point of comparison seems to be the body enwrapping the soul. Perhaps the body supplies the soul with the physical means (the "muscle") to enact its will and desire.

2. The body/members relationship may describe:

(a) cosmic relationships: (i) the cosmos and its elements. In reporting on the Egyptians' cosmogony, Diodorus Siculus (I, 11, 5f) relates how the physical world is derived from the nature deities, the sun and moon, and consists of five elements:

διὸ καὶ τὸ μὲν ἅπαν σῶμα τῆς τῶν ὅλων φύσεως ἐξ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης ἀπαρτίζεσθαι, τὰ δὲ τούτων μέρη πέντε τὰ προειρημένα, τὸ τε πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ πῦρ καὶ τὸ ξηρόν, ἔτι δὲ τὸ ὑγρόν καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον τὸ ἀερῶδες, ὥπερ ἐπ' ἀνθρώπου κεφαλὴν καὶ χεῖρας καὶ πόδας καὶ τᾶλλα μέρη καταριθμοῦμεν, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κόσμου συγκεῖσθαι πᾶν ἐκ τῶν προειρημένων.

The point of comparison is body unity; notably the head has no special function. But while σῶμα realistically denotes the physical universe, this cosmic body is only compared with the human body, not identified with it. Perhaps Diodorus himself supplied the comparison. Eastern influence is more clearly seen in the magic papyri ( PLeid V, Preis. Zaub. XII 243; Macrob. Sat. I 20, 17).

(ii) the cosmos and its parts (e.g. humans). The idea that the cosmos is a giant body, containing all other bodies was probably widespread (e.g. Philo, Plant. 7; Corp.Herm. II 2, XI 4B; cf. Plato, Tim. 30D, Chrys., v. Arnim, II 173). The later Stoics base moral exhortations on man's membership in this cosmic body. Epictetus (Diss. II v 24-29) in dealing with the problem of suffering, argues that man must undergo the risks of belonging to a greater whole as a foot in the body. Man is a part of the state of men and gods, which is itself a small copy of the universal state. One should not fret over misfortune (27): ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἐν τοιοῦτῳ σώματι, ἐν τούτῳ τῷ περιέχοντι, τούτοις τοῖς συζῶσιν μὴ συμπίπτειν ἄλλοις ἄλλα τοιαῦτα. One suspects here the

mixing of two originally separate ideas: (a) that of the ensouled cosmos and (b) that of the political metaphor (cf. Sen. Ep. xcv 52, xcii 30).<sup>124</sup> Still the world is compared to the human body because it too is a body. While there is a structural analogy between these two, perhaps even a hierarchy of being, they are not identical. Man is a microcosm and the world a Macrocosm; both are bodies, but the world is not a Macroanthropos.

(iii) the heavens and its parts (e.g. stars). In Quaest. in Ex. II 74 Philo comments: "...the heaven itself is a harmony and union and bond of all these things which are in heaven, just as the limbs which are arranged in the body are all adapted (to one another) and grow together." The element of metaphor is clear and the point of comparison is the body's unity and harmonious growth.

(iv) the unknown Father and the Pleroma. A Macrocosm scheme underlies statements in the gnostic tract, The Gospel of Truth xviii 30:

...the Father, this perfect one who created the All, in whom the All is and whom the All lacks, for he had withheld in himself their perfection which he had not given to the All. The Father was not envious. For what envy is there between him and his members μέλος?<sup>125</sup>

The All refers to the aeons who make up the Pleroma. The ontological unity between the Father as body and the aeons as members excludes envy as a motivation for withholding knowledge and actually is the basis for salvific knowledge. The world of aeons, then, has taken the nomenclature usually preserved for the cosmos, i.e. it is a giant body. Whether this evolution of the Macrocosm concept also entails that this body is a Macroanthropos is less certain. Nothing in the context suggests it.

To this text we may compare Tripartite Tractate 73, 28-74, 18. The Father who emanates the Totalities (73, 19-28) is probably to be identified with the Aeon of the Truth. This Aeon is described in its unity and multiplicity by a series of three analogies. It is like a spring or a root or "like a human body, which is partitioned in an indivisible way into members of members, primary members and secondary, great and small."<sup>126</sup> The element of metaphor is distinct here.

(b) political relationships: (i) a city and its citizens. For Plato (Resp. V 463Cf) the best city is that which ἐγγύτατα ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἔχει. In view is the unity and sympathy of an ensouled body; at 464B Plato refers back to this passage: Ἀλλὰ μὴν μέγιστόν γε πόλει αὐτὸ ὁμολογήσαμεν ἀγαθόν, ἀπεικάζοντες εἰς οἰκουμένην πόλιν σώματι πρὸς μέρος αὐτοῦ λύπης τε πέρι καὶ ἡδονῆς ὥς ἔχει (cf. also VIII 556E). Aristotle also uses the political metaphor (Pol. I 1253a 19ff, V 1302b 35, cf. III 1231b 5) and Dio Chrysostom takes up similar ideas in discussing the political problems at Tarsus (xxxiv 20, 22; xxxix 5).<sup>127</sup>



Sometimes the emphasis is simply on the body's oneness and the element of metaphor is remote (Liv. XXXIV ix 3; Jos. Ant. VII 66, Bell. V 279).

(ii) an empire (kingdom) and its citizens. The most famous and widespread example is the fable of Menenius Agrippa (Liv. II xxxiii 8; Dion. Hal. Ant.Rom. VI 1ff; Plut. Cor. 6, I 216BC). The fable has a moralistic point; as the other body members need the stomach, so in the empire the citizens need the senate. While the body's interdependency is stressed, notably the senate's rule is likened to the stomach nourishing the whole body. In other words, the understanding of political rule and order are at issue. Similar ideas may also be present when Livy (XXVI xvi 5-12) relates that Capua was not to have "corpus nullum civitatis nec senatum nec plebis concilium nec magistratus esse." In any case, the scheme is not confined to the fable and sometimes the element of metaphor is quite remote (Vergil. Aen. XI 313; Liv. XXIV ix 3; Plut. Sol. 13, I 88c, Philop. 8, I 360c; Philo, Spec.Leg. III 131, cf. Virt. 103). Amputation is a regular theme in discussions for or against capital punishment (Cic. Phil. VIII 5; Sen. Ira II xxxi, 7; Jos. Bell. I 507).

(iii) a geo-political entity and its parts. In Tris. II 231f Ovid speaks of the vast body of the empire in which no part is weak. Josephus (Ant. XIV 312) describes τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας σῶμα as recovering from a serious illness.<sup>128</sup> At Bell. IV 406 he compares the geographical spread of sedition to the bodily spread of sickness: καθάπερ δὲ ἐν σώματι τοῦ κυριωτάτου φλεγμαίνοντες πάντα τὰ μέλη συνενόσει· διὰ γοῦν τὴν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει στάσιν καὶ ταραχὴν ἄδειαν ἔσχον οἱ κατὰ τὴν χώραν πονηροὶ τῶν ἀρπαγῶν... The movement is from the part to the whole. The principal member, which represents the capital, is unnamed here; in Bell. III 54 it is the head.

(c) military contexts: Of military discipline, Josephus (Bell. III 104) states:

τοσοῦτον δ' αὐτῶν τὸ πρὸς τοὺς ἡγεμόνας πειθήνιον, ὥς ἐν τε εἰρήνῃ κόσμον εἶναι καὶ ἐπὶ παρατάξεως ἐν σῶμα τὴν ὅλην στρατιάν. οὕτως αὐτῶν συναφεῖς μὲν αἱ τάξεις, εὐστροφοὶ δ' εἰσὶν αἱ περιαγωγαί, ὀξεῖαι δ' ἄκοαί μὲν παραγγέλμασιν, ὀψεις δὲ σημείοις, ἔργοις δὲ χεῖρες.

One might suggest that ἐν σῶμα could be replaced by εἷς ἄνθρωπος. Still, the following list of parts, ears, eyes, hands makes σῶμα appropriate. All the ears of the soldiers function as one ear, all the eyes function as one eye and so forth, so that the army is itself one body. The point of comparison is the body's co-ordinated and united response to outward stimuli. The unity results from discipline and like many examples presupposes proper management (cf. also Bell. III 270, V 279).



(d) household relationships: In Frat.Amor. II 478C-479A Plutarch finds in the human body nature's paradigm for brotherly relations.<sup>129</sup> Although the fable of Molione's Siamese twin sons is considered incredible, nature itself teaches how the body is divided into twin parts σωτηρίας ἔνεκα καὶ συμπράξεως κοινῆς οὐ διαφορᾶς καὶ μάχης (478D). The number of brothers is also insignificant, since even if a creature existed with three bodies and a hundred hands, its members being joined could do nothing independently (478E). Brothers who quarrel are like feet tripping over one another or hands unnaturally entwined and twisted (478F). When the elements of moist and dry, cold and hot, are in agreement in the body they engender a pleasant temperament and harmony; when in strife, they cause sickness and death. So too concord among brothers assures the soundness and flourishing of family and household. But as diseases in the body prompt cravings for improper foods, so too slander and suspicion against kinsmen bring evil associations (478F-479A).

(e) spiritual relationships: The texts in this category are Christian or show Christian influence. Clement's use (I Clem xxxvii 5f, xlvi 7, cf. Pol. xi) of the body/member concept continues the Pauline emphasis on moral and social responsibility. This aspect is missing in the gnostic sources that apply the idea to the Redeemer and redeemed.<sup>130</sup> In the Acts of John 100, the Redeemer embraces the redeemed in one form (μίαν μορφήν) on the cross.<sup>131</sup> If this form is not yet visible to the redeemed, it is because οὐδέπω τὸ πᾶν τοῦ κατελθόντος συνελήφθη μέλος. What exactly μέλος refers to is uncertain. It could refer to the as yet ungathered members of a fallen Primal Man figure, or perhaps to the pneumatic angelic seeds that came down with the Redeemer and who have not yet been comprehended by their counterparts (i.e. those who have the higher nature).<sup>132</sup> Though σῶμα does not occur, it is implied in the associated terms μέλος, εἶδος and μορφή. The use of "form" instead of body reflects Greek presuppositions.<sup>133</sup>

In the same vein is Pantaenus' comment on LXX Ps xviii 5 (Cl. Al. Ecl.Proph. lvi 1-4). Pantaenus introduces the idea of the Lord's body through the terms σκηνῶμα and σκηνή. This association of terms suggests the Greek idea of the body as the dwelling place for man. Pantaenus is perhaps indebted to Pauline traditions when he lists the body members.<sup>134</sup> If the head is only listed alongside other members at first, then a few lines later it is associated more directly with the sun.<sup>135</sup>

(3) The body/head relationship may describe:

(a) cosmic relationships: (i) the world and its highest part, the heavens. PLeid V (Preis. Zaub. XII 243) takes up Indo-Iranian ideas

with little alteration; of the παντοκράτωρ it states: ...καὶ οὐρανὸς μὲν κεφαλή, αἰθήρ δὲ σῶμα γῆ πόδες τὸ δὲ περί σε ὕδωρ ὠκεανός ...σὺ εἶ κύριος, ὁ γεννῶν καὶ τρέφων καὶ αὖξων τὰ πάντα.<sup>136</sup>

As Schlier states: "The individual parts (elements) of the world are members of the god which bears the whole cosmos in itself."<sup>137</sup> But again, the head is simply listed along with other members (cf. also Diod. S. I, 11, 5f; Macrobi. Sat. I 20, 17). While it is equated with the heavens, it has no decisive function. Indeed, to suppose such a decisive function would obscure the saying's pantheistic presuppositions. The earth is no less god than the heavenly sky. Cosmic unity is the point of the scheme.

(ii) the cosmos and its divine ruling principle, the Logos. Indo-Iranian sources possibly lie behind Orphic Frag. 168:

Ζεὺς πρῶτος ἐγένετο, Ζεὺς ὕστατος ἀγρικέραυνος,  
Ζεὺς κεφαλή, Ζεὺς μέσσα, Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα τέτυκται...  
πάντα γὰρ ἐν Ζηῳὸς μεγάλῳ τάδε σώματι κεῖται...ὧδε  
μὲν ἀθανάτην κεφαλὴν ἔχει ἡδὲ νόημα· σῶμα δὲ οἷ  
περιφεγγές, ἀπείριτον, ἀστυφέλικτον, ἄτρομον,  
ὀβριμόγυιον, ὑπερμενές ὧδε τέτυκται.<sup>138</sup>

But the fragment goes beyond Eastern ideas in giving κεφαλή added significance. The head is now called ἀθανάτην and closely linked to νόημα. This suggests the influence of stoic Logos thinking.

Even clearer is Philo's description of the world's head (Quaest. in Ex. II 117): "The head of all things is the eternal Logos of the eternal God under which, as if it were his feet or other limbs, is placed the whole world, over which He passes and firmly stands." The head has been identified with the divine Logos of stoic philosophy in a Macrocosm scheme.<sup>139</sup> Since Philo elsewhere associates the Logos and Heavenly-ideal Man perhaps the Heavenly Man and Macrocosm ideas were being combined. The impetus for such a combination could lie in Indo-Iranian Macroanthropos speculations. If so, the influence is not thoroughgoing. The element of metaphor is still present: "as if it were his feet or other limbs" (cf. Diod. S. I 11, 5f). Also Philo's conception never collapses into pantheism. His OT roots (and perhaps also his Platonic idealism) go too deep to abandon God's ultimate transcendence.

(b) political relationships: (i) a city-state and its guardians. At Leg. XII 964DE Plato compares the defense of the city-state to the defense of the body by the intelligent man's head. The young and senior guardians correspond respectively to the senses and understanding of the head, while the city at large corresponds to the body-vessel (κύτος).<sup>140</sup> The two aspects of the head, i.e. the senses and understanding, effect the salvation of the whole state: οὕτω δὲ κοινῇ σώζειν ἀμφοτέρους



ὄντως τὴν πόλιν ὅλην (965A). The comparison rests on the Platonic understanding of the head as the seat of reason.

(ii) an empire, kingdom and its ruler. The use of caput/corpus to denote a leader of a political domain is common (Cic. Mur. 51, Flac. 42; Sen. Clem. I iv 3, II ii 1; Curtius X ix 1ff). The element of metaphor is sometimes remote and in Tacitus (An. I 13) caput by itself means "ruler." In a Hellenistic Jewish text (TZeb 9) the head/members scheme accents the God-willed unity of Israel: μὴ σχισθῆτε εἰς δύο κεφαλὰς, ὅτι πᾶν ὃ ἐποίησεν ὁ κύριος κεφαλὴν μίαν ἔχει. ἔδωκε δύο ὠμούς, χεῖρας, πόδας, ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ μέλη τῇ μιᾷ κεφαλῇ ὑπακούει.<sup>141</sup> Notably all the body members are explicitly said to "obey" the one head. The head is the source of the body's unity by virtue of its rule.

(iii) a group of kings and the king par excellance. Philo (Vit.Mos. II 30) uses κεφαλή/ζῶον to flatter Philadelphus of the Ptolemies: ὅσα γὰρ εἰς ἔδρασεν οὗτος ἐπαινετά, μόλις ἐκεῖνοι πάντες ἄνθρωποι διεπράζαντο - γενόμενος καθάπερ ἐν ζῷ τὸ ἡγεμονεῦον κεφαλὴ τρόπον τινὰ τῶν βασιλέων. Ptolemy excels others in the qualities that make a good ruler. Κεφαλή does not mean "ruler," but indicates what is outstanding, prominent and excellent. Thus Ptolemy is the ruler par excellance, who through his character and actions embodies those qualities of leadership to which other kings should aspire.

(iv) a country and its capital. Josephus (Bell. III 54) relates that Judea was divided into eleven districts, ὧν ἄρχει μὲν βασιλείον τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα προανίσχουσα τῆς περιόικου πάσης ὥπερ ἡ κεφαλὴ σώματος.

(c) military relationships. Plutarch (Galb. iv 3, I 1054E) perhaps relies on a Latin saying (cf. Livy, V xlvii 5) in applying the body/head scheme to an army and its general.<sup>142</sup> Galba is asked to lead the insurgent army of Gauls, that is παρασχεῖν ἑαυτὸν ἰσχυρῷ σώματι ζητοῦντι κεφαλὴν.

(d) moral and spiritual relationships: (i) a city, nation, or human race and respectively a good and wise man, city or nation. Philo (Praem. Poen. 114) states that the good man, city or nation stands above the rest ὥπερ κεφαλὴ σώματι τοῦ περιφαίνεσθαι χάριν, οὐκ ὑπὲρ εὐδοξίας μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς τῶν ὁρώντων ὠφελείας.<sup>143</sup> The others may gaze upon the head and thereby benefit from its higher level and example of life and in some sense acquire that life for themselves. The visibility of the head in its superior position is noteworthy here. In mentioning that a nation could fill this role, he perhaps indicates that Israel's headship over



the nations is found in its moral and spiritual character, not in political dominion. Is this a re-interpretation of Deut xxviii 13? Such a re-interpretation does occur a few lines later (125).

(ii) descendent vices and the progenitor of vice. In discussing the whole array of base appetites and qualities of man, Philo (Congr. 61) finds allegorically the epitomy and source of these in Esau: κεφαλὴ δὲ ὡς ἡτοῦ πάντων τῶν λεχθέντων μερῶν ὁ γενάρχης ἐστὶν Ἡσαΐ. Esau represents vice par excellence. But here a definite link exists between vice par excellence and the other vices. This is indicated by the application of head/creature to the concrete relation of the progenitor, Esau, and his descendants, which in turn is taken allegorically. Κεφαλὴ connotes the idea of "source" (cf. Apc. Abr. xxiv).

(iii) Redeemed and Redeemer. The organic unity of head and body is present when Ignatius (Tr. xi 2) associates a head/member scheme with Christ's passion. As the head does not come alone at birth, but includes the other body members, so too Christians are united to Christ, the Head, in his passion. Less certain is the soteriological statement in the O. Sol. xvii 15-17: "...they received my blessing and lived, And they were gathered to me and were saved; because they became my members, and I was their Head. Glory to Thee, Our Head, O Lord Messiah."<sup>144</sup> If in these passages the adjunct of a body is missing, this does occur in the Tripartite Tractate (118, 28-37). After distinguishing three types of mankind (the spiritual, the psychic, and the material), the author describes the response of each to the Savior. Of the spiritual he states: "The spiritual race, being like light from light and like spirit from spirit, when its head appeared it ran toward him immediately. It immediately became a body of its head. It suddenly received knowledge in the revelation" (cf. also Cl. Al. Ecol. Proph. lvi).<sup>145</sup> The organic unity between head and body now describes the ontological or pneumatic unity between Redeemer and redeemed. Head probably means "source" in this context.<sup>146</sup> The organic aspect seems completely eclipsed elsewhere. At Cl. Al. Exc. Theod. xlii 2f a distinction exists between Christ, who is the Head, and Jesus, who is the "shoulders of the seed." The pneumatic Christ (the Head) takes up the pneumatic seeds that constitute the body of Jesus and carries them into the Pleroma. The body, then, is not an embracing organism, but a garment which the Redeemer puts on.<sup>147</sup> In the so-called Naassene Sermon (Hipp. Ref. vii 35) the upper man is identified with the "head of the corner" because in the head (κεφαλὴ) is the brain (ἐγκέφαλος) that gives character. If in the head we find the substance that "loses itself as world," the idea of the body (or torso) is missing.<sup>148</sup>

4. The body as a physical being or object may be used as follows:

(a) The body/physical relation describes a state and its wise ruler (Plato, Resp. VIII 567C). A tyrant purges a city of its best people. In contrast the ruler's relation to the state ought to be like the physician's care of the body (cf. Theaet. 167C). The body as a whole stands apart as the object of care.

(b) The body/wrestler relation describes a besieged city and attacking general (Onosander, Strat. xlii 6). By securing a firm hold on one part of the body, a general, like a wrestler, can subdue τὸ πᾶν σῶμα τῆς πόλεως.<sup>149</sup> The interrelatedness of the body is important and the whole body is seen as the recipient of action.

(c) The body as a corpse describes a ravaged city (Jos. Bell. V 27): πανταχόθεν δὲ τῆς πόλεως πολεμουμένης ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιβούλων καὶ συγκλύδων μέσος ὁ δῆμος ὥσπερ μέγα σῶμα διεσπαράσσετο.

### C. Comparative Associations of the Body

Naturally different body characteristics are accented according to the context and basic point of departure. Here is a brief overview of associations that often appear or are considered important.

1. The body is visible and material. This aspect appears especially in cosmic contexts (e.g. Plat. Tim. 30A-34C, 36E; Diod. S. I 11, 54; Sex. Emp. Math. IX 78ff; Vergil. Aen. VI 724f; Sen. Ep. lxxv 24). This material world body is distinguished from the invisible divine soul that permeates it. Even so, this body is not chaotic matter, but organized matter. For this reason the cosmic body can be thought perfect, whether its individual parts are perfect or not (Plat. Tim. 34B, Chrys., v. Arnim II 173). When the formal aspect is eclipsed, the body is almost identical to matter (Sen. Ep. lxxv 24); when the material aspect is missing, it becomes visible form (Tri.Tract. 66, 14).

2. The body is ruled by the rational soul or mind. The rational soul's rule of and unity with the body is a frequent paradigm for the relation between what rules and what is ruled (Isoc. Or. vii 14, xii 138; Plat. Tim. 34C; Xen. Mem. I iv 17; Arist. Pol. I, 1255b 10f; Sen. Clem. I v 1; Plut. Praec.Coniug. 33, II 142E; Hipp. Ref. VII xxiv 1f).

3. The body is a unity. The body is composed of diverse parts, members, or even other bodies, united together in one whole (Plat. Phileb. 29B; Diod. S. I 11, 5-6; Philo, Plant. 7; Plut. II 478C-479A; Tri.Tract. 73, 28ff). A sympathy of feeling exists between members (Plat. Resp. V 463Cf, 464B; Sex. Emp. Math. 78-85; Plut. Sol. 13, I 33C; Sen. Ira II xxxi 7), and members need each other for proper function (Liv. II xxxiii 8, Dion. Hal. Ant.Rom. VI 1ff; Plut. Cor. 6, I 216BC). Control over one limb leads



to control over the whole body (Onosander, Strat. xlii 6); a disease spreads from one member to all (Jos. Bell. IV 406). Sometimes the point is simply being ἐν σῶμα (Philo. Spec.Leg. III 131, cf. Virt. 103; Jos. Bell. III 104, 270, V 279, Ant. VII 66; Plut. Phil. 8, I 360C; Ign. Sm. i 2; cf. Liv. XXIV ix 3).

4. The body is strong. The body can be closely associated with strength and power (Vergil. Aen. 313; Ovid, Tris. II 231f; Plut. Phil. 8, I 360C). The body provides the substance and "muscle" necessary to enact the decisions of its leading member (Dion. Hal. Ant.Rom. III 11, 5; Sen. Clem. I iv 3; Plut. Pomp. 51, I 646B).

5. The body is subject to disease. Bodily health depends on the unity and harmony of its constituent elements and parts. When this harmony is absent illness results (Plat. Resp. VIII 556E; Dio Chrys. Diss. xxxiv 22, xxxix 5; Plut. II 479A). The spread of disease through the body presupposes its interrelatedness (Dio Chrys. Diss. xxxiv 20; Jos. Bell. IV 406). But peace brings recovery (Jos. Ant. XIV 312). This idea is often associated with revolution and political turmoil.

6. The body stands as a whole over the part. Occasionally the body makes the member what it is (Arist. Pol. I 1253a 19ff). This view is also present where amputation of a member for the sake of the whole is considered seriously (Cic. Phil. VIII v 15; Epic. Diss. II v 25ff; cf. Jos. Bell. I, 507; Sen. Ira II xxxi 7).

7. The body grows in proportion and harmony. The body's unity may involve the dynamic process of development and harmonious increase (Arist. Pol. V 1302b 35; Philo. Quaest. in Ex. II 74, cf. Virt. 103; cf. also Dio Chrys. Diss. xxxiv 22, xxxix 5).

8. The body is often a passive recipient or object acted on. The body is the object of the physician's care (Plat. Resp. VIII 567C, Theaet. 167C) or care for oneself (Sen. Ira II xxxi 7; Jos. Bell. I 507). Also, whether disease arises from within or without, the body is the object of its attack (see above C. 5). Or again, a wrestler subdues the body of his opponent (Onosander, Strat. xlii 6).

9. The body acts and reacts as a united, co-ordinated whole. Only rarely does the body itself act and even here the character rather than the source of action is stressed (Jos. Bell. III 270). Usually the body reacts to stimuli from within or without. This united and co-ordinated response seems to have become a paradigm for the formation of a body (Liv. XXIV ix 3; Jos. Bell. III 104, V 279; Tri.Tract. 118, 34-35).

10. The body and head are united and this relation is variously expressed. (a) The head is simply a member among members. While it is



united to the body and listed first, it has no special function (Diod. S. I 11, 5f; Preis. Zaub. XII 243; Macrobi. Sat. I 20, 17; Cl. Al. Ecol. Proph. lvi). The Macroanthropos scheme links it to the heavens.

(b) The head is the most prominent and supreme member. It stands above the rest of the body (Jos. Bell. III 54); from its high position the eyes can view the other members (Plat. Leg. XII 965E) and they can view it (Philo, Praem.Poen. 114). In this regard the head is the body member par excellance; an example to be followed, a likeness to be molded into (Philo, Vit.Mos. II 30, Praem.Poen. 114; cf. Sen. Clem. II i 3).

(c) The head is an organ possessing capacities vital to the body as a living organism. In the head are the powers from which all the other members are ψυχήμενος (Philo, Praem.Poen. 125; for a connection between caput and animus, see Sen. Clem. II i 3 and also I iv 3-vi). Through the head the body is protected and defended (Plat. Leg. XII 965E); through it comes good health (Sen. Clem. II i 3). Without a head the limbs are in disarray (Curtius X ix 1ff) and the members obey the one head (TZeb 9). A strong body requires the superintendence of the head (Liv. V xlvi 5; Plut. Galb. 4, I 1054E; Sen. Clem. I iv 3). When identified with the Logos, the head is the seat of the body's administration (Philo. Quaest. in Ex. II 117; cf. Orphic Frag. 168).

(d) The body as a trunk is attached to the head. This occurs especially in Gnosticism where the spiritual elect form a body for the Redeemer who is the head (Cl. Al. Exc.Theod. xlii 2f; Tri.Tract. 118, 28-37; O.Sol. xvii 14). If κεφαλή formally retains the sense, "source," the idea of "ontological correspondence" replaces "organic communion."

(e) Finally, both caput and κεφαλή can be applied to a ruler without the further adjunct of a body or its members. Unlike caput, however, κεφαλή does not have this meaning apart from OT influence.

#### D. Six Areas of Special Concern

Here we note some points that require special consideration.

1. Macrocosm and Macroanthropos. A distinction exists between the Greek idea of the world being a gigantic organism and the Eastern idea of it originating from and being a gigantic man. To be sure, since man was considered the highest example of an organism, the distinction often seems vague. Still, the "body" of the Greek Macrocosm is not necessarily a human body. If arguments sometimes proceed from the lesser human body to the greater cosmic body, this is because man is made in the image of the cosmos, not vice versa. Also the Greek Macro-microcosm scheme generally focuses on the inner structure of existence that involves mind, soul, body. This may legitimately be called a Macroanthropos conception. Even

so, it must be distinguished from the Eastern conception that sees the world created of the various parts of a God-Man. Here the world elements are identified with body parts, e.g. the head, eyes, feet.

Perhaps the delineation of these body members, besides picturing cosmic unity, also corresponds to ancient scientific views on man's elemental make-up. But essentially the Eastern concept sees the cosmos made in the image of man. Though not wholly adequate we have distinguished these views by using Macrocosm for the Greek concept and the Macroanthropos for the Eastern concept. If the Eastern ideas lay behind the Greek ideas, then under philosophical reflection they have undergone such development that the distinction still holds. Possibly these conceptions meet on Egyptian soil (cf. Diod. S. I 11, 5f; Philo, Quaest. in Ex. II 117).

2. The redeemed-Redeemer myth. The Religionsgeschichteschule reconstructed from gnostic sources a redeemed-Redeemer myth that was thought to provide the origin of Paul's  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  concept.<sup>150</sup> The reconstructed myth relates how the Heavenly Man with his gigantic body fell to earth and was imprisoned in matter. Only his head escapes, while remaining body fragments are left behind constituting the divine element in the elect individual. The Heavenly Man (the head) then returns in the form of the Redeemer, imparts the saving "gnosis" that frees the fragments from their material imprisonment, and gathers them to himself as their head. Thus, wearing the reunited body, he (the head) ascends once again into the Pleroma, i.e. the heavenly sphere.

Essential to this reconstruction is the conflation of various concepts such as the Macro-microcosm correlation, the Macroanthropos scheme, the Primal Man or Urmensch myth, and the gnostic Redeemer-revealer. More recent studies by Colpe and Schenke have shown that these ideas were not combined in any comprehensive way before the 3rd century systems of the Manichaeans.<sup>151</sup> Thus while the body concept can be applied to these individual strands and partial conflations, it does not provide the necessary linchpin for reconstructing a comprehensive myth.

3. Three types of bodies in Stoicism. The Stoics sometimes made a threefold distinction between bodies:  $\tau\omega\nu \tau\epsilon \sigma\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu \tau\acute{\alpha} \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \eta\nu\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha \tau\acute{\alpha} \delta\acute{\epsilon} \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\pi\tau\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu \tau\acute{\alpha} \delta\acute{\epsilon} \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \delta\iota\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\tau\omega\nu$  (Sex. Emp. Math. IX 78). The distinction may be traced back to Chrysippus and Posidonius and is attested in Seneca, Plutarch and others (v. Arnim II 367, 1013; Sex. Emp. Math. IX 78-85; Sen. Ep. cii 6; Plut. Praec. Coniug. 34, II 142E, Def. Orac. 29, II 426A). (a) The first category is that of unified bodies. These are bodies controlled by attraction ( $\xi\xi\iota\varsigma$ ) and characterized especially by "sympathy," the most common example being living



creatures such as man. In his arguments for God, Posidonius also distinguishes between unified bodies held together by mere attraction (ἔξις), e.g. stones and sticks, those by organic structure (φύσις), e.g. plants, and those by soul (ψυχή), e.g. animals. The sympathy of the cosmos as shown, for example, in the tides, proves that it is a unified body. Since its structure contains all structures, its own structure must be of the highest order. Posidonius thus concludes that the cosmos is intelligent, virtuous and immortal. In a different vein, Plutarch compares the unified body to the intimate union of an ideal marriage of loving partners.

(b) The second category is that of the composite body. This is a body formed from adjacent parts into a single structure, e.g. a ship, house, or tower. Plutarch compares this to a marriage for a dowry or children.

(c) The third category is that of the diverse body. This is a body composed of separate and distinct bodies, e.g. an army, flock, chorus, fleet, populace, or senate.<sup>152</sup> Notably ἐκκλησία can be listed here (v. Arnim II 367; Plut. Def.Orac. 29, II 426A). Seneca (Ep. ci 6) relates that such bodies are united by virtue of iure aut officio. Plutarch (Praec.Coniug. 34, II 142E) compares this to couples who share the same bed and cohabitate, but do not really live together. In a positive vein he uses the idea to show that the universe may consist of many worlds: ἐκατὸν ὄντας ἐνὶ χρῆσθαι λόγῳ καὶ πρὸς ἀρχὴν συντετάχθαι μίαν (Def.Orac. 29, II 426A).

The common idea behind these distinctions is that a body acts and suffers as a united totality and varies according to the nature and power of the unity between its parts. In each case, the creature, ship, or army is a body and not merely compared to a body. Use of the body metaphor in political contexts may, as Knox suggests, indicate an extension of the "unified body" category beyond the cosmic application of Posidonius and Chrysippus.<sup>153</sup> But just as possible is that the threefold distinction reflects a philosophical refinement on popular usage. Armies, cities and such were perhaps compared with the human body, because these too were bodies, though composed differently.

4. The use of κεφαλή in the LXX. Because the LXX reflects its OT background, its use of κεφαλή in comparisons never appears with σῶμα. We may outline this usage briefly:

(a) The head stands alongside another body member (tail, feet) to wholistically denote superiority or stereometrically denote completeness (Deut xxviii 12-13, 43-44, Isa i 5-6, ix 14-15, xix 15). Of these passages, Deut xxviii 12-13 is especially important. Israel's relation to the world of nations is stereometrically pictured under the figure of an



animal. The head and tail wholistically depict what is high and low, i.e., the functions of prominence and subservience:

...εὐλογήσῃ πάντα τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου· καὶ  
δανειεῖς ἔθνεσι πολλοῖς, σὺ δὲ οὐ δανειῇ· καὶ ἄρξεις  
σὺ ἐθνῶν πολλῶν, σοὺ δὲ οὐκ ἄρξουσιν. καταστήσαι σε  
κύριος ὁ θεός σου εἰς κεφαλὴν καὶ μὴ εἰς οὐρὰν, καὶ  
ἔσῃ τότε ἐπάνω καὶ οὐκ ἔσῃ ὑποκάτω...

The saying recurs in Judaism. If Jub i 16 links repentance to the promise of Israel's privileged position, then I En ciii 11 echoes the irony felt over an unfilled promise. In Philo (Praem.Poen. 125, cf. 114) the headship of Deut xxviii 13 concerns moral and spiritual life, not political dominion. The wise and good man or people stands in relation to the world as the κεφαλή τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους, which in turn is considered a σῶμα. Philo has conflated the OT image with the stoic body concept. But it is not a human body and the distinction between the tail and other members allows Philo to distinguish between those who truly partake of the head's life and those who do not. The head rules not as the center of the nervous system, but as the source of life, the ideal body member that manifests the raison d'etre of each member.

(b) In apocalyptic visions the head(s) of a beast denotes the king(s) of a kingdom (Dan vii 6; Rev xviii 3). In the Apc. Abr. xxiii the "heads" are directly joined to their bodies, and perhaps, as Schweizer suggests, the idea of an organism has a role here.<sup>154</sup>

(c) Finally, the head denotes a leader without the implication of a body. When the idea of the head as denoting the whole person in a particular dimension is combined with the idea of what is first, the road is paved for the meaning "chief" or "ruler."<sup>155</sup> The starting point is not, then, the head's anatomical rule over the body, but the determinative character of who is first. Batey states: "In a patriarchal social structure where leadership depended on seniority or priority of being, the association of 'first' with 'leadership' was instinctive."<sup>156</sup> While this title was usually given to men, God too may be called "head": אֵלֹהֵינוּ רִאשׁוֹן לְכָל לְאֻמָּה (I Chr xxix 11). There is no trace here of a Macrocosm or Macroanthropos.

The LXX uses a variety of terms where ὡς means "chief" or "ruler": ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος, ἡγουμένους, ἀρχων, ἀρχηγός. Although usually used in the anatomical sense, κεφαλή also belongs to this list and at points is practically interchangeable with ἀρχή (Judg xi 11, A x 18, A xi 8, 9; Ps xvii 44; Isa vii 8f).<sup>157</sup> In this way κεφαλή takes on a more representative character; "what is first" rules and bears in itself the determinative force of what follows. Numerous examples of this meaning

are found in Qumran (e.g. 1QM II 1-3). In Jub ii 23 the twenty-two "heads of humanity" point to the process of God's election. These "heads" were those who carried the promised seed, and the cessation of this process is correlated to that of God's works of creation, and hence the link between Israel and the Sabbath. Finally, TZeb 9 probably represents a conflation of head as ruler with the popular body metaphor.

In conclusion we note that all three of these strands were still in use during the NT period.

5. Rabbinic Adam speculation. The Rabbis speculated on Adam's body in two ways:<sup>158</sup> (a) Adam is cosmic in stature. Originally Adam's body (golem) stretched out horizontally and vertically to fill the whole world (GenR viii 1, xxi 3, xxiv 2; Sanh 38b; Hag 12a; PesikR 23; cf. also Apc. Abr. xxiii). (b) Adam includes in himself all his descendants. When Adam was still a mass (golem) he saw all the righteous descendants of his body (ExR xl 3). Interestingly the body members listed are all parts of the head. Here, to know one's origin means to know what part of Adam's body one came from. In a different vein, the brotherhood of mankind may be indicated in that the dust from which Adam was made came from all parts of the earth (Sanh 38ab). Though not dealing with Adam's body, M. Sanh 4, 5 teaches what it means that God created a single man. First it teaches that man cannot be viewed individually in isolation of his descendants. It also teaches about the peace and brotherhood of mankind, and proclaims the greatness of the Holy One, in that He causes all to bear the seal of the first man, while each remains different.

Finally there are speculations about the abode of pre-existent souls. Not until all the souls in guf are disposed of, will the Messiah come (Yeb 63b). Guf may refer to Adam's body.<sup>159</sup> Elsewhere (GenR xxiv 4; cf. LevR xv 1) the saying is associated with "The Book of the Generations of Adam" which was thought to contain the names of Adam's descendants. But the term guf does not appear in these places, and elsewhere (Yeb 63a; Nid 13b) the guf-saying appears without mention of Adam. It would be hasty, then, to assume that this refers to Adam's body. It probably refers to the abode of pre-existent souls.

6. Metaphor and reality. Our survey has shown the various ways  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  is used outside its normal application to human beings or animals. How one relates these extended usages to reality is a problem. Often we find particles of comparison that indicate the comparative manner in which the ideas are used. In other places, however, such particles are missing, and it is unclear whether the reference is metaphorical or literal. When a metaphor we may often detect a simple elliptical simile. But we should

also expect what Max Black calls "interaction metaphors."<sup>160</sup> These are instances in which the metaphorical term, in our case  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ , evokes a system of commonplace connotations that interact with the entity described, e.g. the cosmos or empire, and thus organizes our perception of the entity. It is, of course, difficult to determine the exact point at which such metaphors become so hardened through repeated usage that they no longer evoke the associated ideas and simply pass into literal usage. As to the body concept this problem is even more complicated. Three points contribute to this complexity: (a)  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  need not denote an organic body; (b) the human body may sometimes be used in such comparisons precisely because the other entity has the quality of being a body; (c) mythological and religious statements are notoriously difficult to relate to reality. Only careful examination of each instance can yield a satisfactory explanation. While such detailed analysis has not been possible in our survey, we have generally indicated where a comparative element was evident or remote.



## APPENDIX C

### ΣΩΜΑ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ IN THE PAULINE CONTEXT

Since Ephesians stands in the Pauline tradition, other instances of σῶμα Χριστοῦ in that tradition are important background for its use in Ephesians. Outside Ephesians, σῶμα Χριστοῦ serves or is implied as an image for the Church at I Cor vi 15, x 17, (xi 29), xii 12-27; Rom xii 4f; Col i 18, 24, ii 19, iii 15.<sup>1</sup> These texts present a threefold problem: (i) the use of the image in context; (ii) its origin; and (iii) its development in Colossians. Space prohibits a full discussion of this complex problem, and we must be content with a brief overview. To this end, we first focus on the passages in the undisputed letters, and then address several questions raised by the idea's use. Since in Colossians (be it by Paul or his disciple) the idea is already well established, we discuss origin here. Then we will sketch the idea's development in Colossians. The overview will hopefully provide the broader Pauline context in which Ephesians uses σῶμα Χριστοῦ.

In Paul's undisputed letters the Body of Christ image appears only in I Corinthians and Romans. We discuss the texts in order of appearance.

I Cor vi 15: οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν μέλη Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; The passage concerns how the believer's union with Christ excludes sexual union with a harlot. While σῶμα Χριστοῦ does not appear, the idea is implied in μέλη Χριστοῦ.<sup>2</sup> Here the Body concept points to a unity between Christ and believers, and Paul's Hebraic assumptions about man are clear. Σῶμα indicates the whole person who is implicated in moral action. Bearing the relational quality of σὰρξ, ἐν σῶμα parallels the σὰρξ μία of Gen ii 24b. As use of this Scripture shows, the unity involved rests on God's will as expressed in the structure of creation and redemption respectively. Still the personal union of Lord and believer is not called one body or one flesh, but ἐν πνεύμα. The choice of words avoids the idea that such union is sexual and brings home that true spirituality entails fleeing fornication.<sup>3</sup> Perhaps too, only the Church's unity with Christ is rightly called ἐν σῶμα. If so, personal spiritual union with the Lord cannot be severed from the social morality of being a member of Christ's Body, the Church.

Paul's realistic language here has led some scholars to argue that believers are literally members of Christ's own crucified and resurrected body.<sup>4</sup> In support of this claim the ἐν πνεύμα of vi 17 is often linked to the σῶμα πνευματικόν of xv 44f.<sup>5</sup> So, like the bodily union of the believer and harlot as "one flesh," the union of the believer's body with Christ's resurrected body is "one spirit." Being one spirit means being

one spiritual body. But union with Christ is not limited to union with his resurrection body. I Cor vi 19f links the Spirit's presence to Christ's redemptive purchase, i.e. his death. Spiritual union with Christ involves union with his death, which for these scholars must mean union with his crucified body. But if the "one spirit" of vi 17 includes union with Christ's crucified body, the spirituality of this union cannot rest solely on the spiritual character of the resurrection body. The identification of ἐν πνεύμα and σῶμα πνευματικόν is, then, unlikely.

I Cor x 17: ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοί ἐσμεν, οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν. Here the Body concept is associated with the eucharistic loaf that represents Christ's crucified body. Paul argues that the union manifested in the eucharist is incompatible with that manifested in cult meals. Paul's argument has a horizontal and vertical force. Behind ritual meals is a cultic reality that binds participants together in fellowship. Such is the case with Christians; such was the case with Israel; so too with pagan meals. While idols are not real gods and meat offered to them is nothing, sharing in a pagan ritual still binds one to those under the influence of demons and hence to the demons themselves. This explains vs. 17 and also vs. 18, where κοινωνοί means "fellow communicants."<sup>6</sup>

Vs. 17 points to a similar unity. Since there is one loaf which represents Christ's body, we, the many, are one Body both with and in Christ. "Ἐν σῶμα refers not to Christ's personal body but to the Church as an entity united with-in Christ. This is confirmed in that all together as a whole, οἱ πάντες, partake from the one loaf.<sup>7</sup> The loaf representing Christ's body stands over against the whole which as a unity is sustained and nourished through the rite. In xi 17-34, failure to discern this unity is a failure to recognize Christ's presence at the meal. In this case, one reaps judgment. Here Paul simply points to the incompatibility of this communion with pagan idolatry, where the unity which a cultic meal effects, reaps unwitting communion with demons and the Lord's jealousy.

Thus while there is a relation between τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ and ἐν σῶμα, they are not identical. The one loaf is stressed because Paul wishes to establish the link between sharing in a cult meal and the twofold unity that occurs when people worship. The one loaf, then, confirms the reality of the "one Body," not as its cause, but as a parallel aspect that points from a different viewpoint to Christ's presence at the meal. If the presence of him who gave his body on the cross is proclaimed and affirmed in the breaking of one loaf, then the unity that is manifest in the communicant's common participation in the rite, proclaims and affirms

their unity with the Christ who is present. When the eucharist is recognized as a God-given institution, then plainly the unity that Christ sustains and nourishes by his presence in the meal is also divinely willed. Thus as in vi 15ff this God-willed unity is incompatible with any ungodly union. There it contrasts union with a harlot; here the fellowship sustained by demonic beings in pagan rites. Assuming the σῶμα idea was at hand, it is natural for Paul to use it in this way.<sup>8</sup>

I Cor xi 29: ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων κρίμα ἑαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα. The meaning of τὸ σῶμα is disputed, being interpreted as: (a) the presence of Christ's body in the eucharistic loaf; (b) the Church; and even (c) a reflexive pronoun.<sup>9</sup> If the reference is to the Church then this is to be understood along the lines discussed in x 17. While this fits the context well enough, for our purposes the question may be left open.

I Cor xii 12-27: καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἓν ἐστὶν καὶ μέλη πολλὰ ἔχει, πάντα δὲ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος πολλὰ ὄντα ἓν ἐστὶν σῶμα, οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός... Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους. The context concerns the unity and diversity of spiritual gifts. Our text is preceded by a discussion of diverse gifts, ministries, and works inspired respectively by the one Spirit, Lord, and God (vss. 4ff), and followed by another list of offices and functions that God appoints in the Church (vss. 28ff). Several features of the text are noteworthy:

(1) The text concerns the Church's inner unity. The Corinthians were troubled by divisiveness, as the broader context testifies. Ch. xi addresses the disunity manifest in their celebration (or rather desecration) of the eucharist. Ch. xiii promotes love as the better way, while ch. xiv distinguishes the proper use of prophecy and glossolalia. Apparently the Corinthians prized spiritual gifts more for spiritual status than spiritual service. Paul counters this tendency by discussing the unity and diversity of the spiritually endowed Church as σῶμα. While ἐκκλησία and σῶμα are not explicitly identified, this is implied when vs. 18, ὁ θεὸς ἔθετο... ἐν τῷ σώματι, is interpreted at vs. 28 as ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. The discussion, then, centers on the Church's inner unity and structure, not its place and role in the world.<sup>10</sup>

(2) This inward Church unity has two dimensions, the unity of believers with Christ and the unity between believers in Christ. (a) Both the enigmatic ὁ Χριστός of vs. 12 and the σῶμα Χριστοῦ of vs. 27 point to the vital unity between Christ and the Church. While this is not stressed in vss. 13-26, it is still an important presupposition. The Church relates to believers as a body to its members, not in its social



organization, but in its unity with the one Lord. How, then, do we understand ὁ Χριστός (vs. 12c), individually or corporately? The comparison is most naturally completed: "and so the Christ is one and has many members, etc." (cf. i 13, vi 15). If so, Christ is best viewed corporately. The oneness of Christ's individual person or body cannot be at issue since this is accounted for in vs. 12ab.<sup>11</sup> Christ and Church are identified, not identical. Semitic corporate personality provides the most likely religious model for understanding how Christ may be corporately identified with, yet individually distinct from the Church.<sup>12</sup>

(b) United to their Lord believers are united to one another. This also has two aspects, equality and diversity. The first is stated negatively: old racial and social distinctions have lost their power. Whether Jew or Greek, slave or freeman, all believers alike share in one Spirit and belong to one Body (vs. 13). But if former differences do not prohibit Church unity, neither does the diversity of spiritual gifts. This second aspect is clear in the dictum: the body is not one member, but many (vs. 14). Unity does not mean sameness, but entails a rich diversity. The μέλη are pictured synthetically as body functions. The body has many functions and each member-function is important. Such interdependence excludes jealousy and pride and promotes care and sympathy.

(3) The Body's unity is not the result of nature, but God's creation. Paul takes the popular Hellenistic metaphor about the body and its members,<sup>13</sup> and shapes it after his own presuppositions. Thus when stressing the importance of a member-function, he appeals not to the law of an organism, but to God's act of creation: ὁ θεὸς ἔθετο τὰ μέλη, ἕν ἕκαστον αὐτῶν, ἐν τῷ σώματι καθὼς ἠθέλησεν...ὁ θεὸς συνεκέρασεν τὸ σῶμα. This reflects Paul's OT background. In OT thinking body members indicate the whole person engaged in a particular function, while the body denotes the outward side of the whole person as a created being. In 1QH VIII 32ff and Matt v 29f these two ideas are joined such that the body as a totality is now implicated in individual member-functions.<sup>14</sup> If this approximates the Greek idea, it has a different basis. The body and members describe, not an organism distinct from the person, but the person himself from different perspectives: the person who acts in specific functions, and the person who passively shares in the result of his own actions.

Something like this is at work in I Cor xii. The starting point is God's will. For instance, the hand's importance rests ultimately on God's placement of this member in the body. Any further implication that it is needed for gathering food, etc., reflects God's intended unity. This has even more force when the contact point between members and body is

recognized to be the person whom God has created. The unity of the body members expresses the God-willed integration of the person with the totality of his created capacities, i.e. with his body. So in line with this Paul begins with the God-willed unity of the person who is this Body. The Body of Christ image, then, expresses both unity with Christ and unity between his members as the God-willed unity of the Corporate Christ.

(4) This twofold unity is a spiritual unity. According to vs. 11 the one Spirit operates all the gifts and distributes them to believers. The synthesis of body member and function plainly corresponds to the believer and his spiritually endowed role in the Church. This spiritual dynamic is reflected concretely in baptism and perhaps also in the eucharist (xii 13).<sup>15</sup> Thus Paul roots spirituality in the redemptive acts wherein Christ is declared Lord and the sacrament(s) wherein the believer confesses this Lordship. The Spirit, then, is the sanctifying and creative power of God that cleanses and refreshes believers, enlivening and inspiring fellowship in the Church. Christ is not identified with the Spirit in Greek fashion as the soul of the body.<sup>16</sup> The Spirit relates to the Body as the divine gift that enables a person as a body to serve God in all his member-functions. This is turned inward here; such service demands recognition of the order and unity that God has established in the Body. So the Spirit is the power whereby members are united to the totality that is Christ's Body and the agent whereby Christ acts towards his Body through the Spirit-given functions of individual members.

Rom xii 4-5: καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι πολλὰ μέλη ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει προᾶξιν, οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, τὸ δὲ καθ' εἷς ἀλλήλων μέλη. In vs. 3 Paul warns against pride and self-conceit and urges all to take up the responsibility that God has given them, no more, no less. The sense of a divine-willed proportion and harmony is echoed here: ἐκάστῳ ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέρισεν μέτρον πίστεως. In vss. 6-8 he discusses the χαρίσματα, and how one should not overstep one's gift. Thus the passage is similar to I Cor xii and presents much the same viewpoint. We note in passing how the μέλη are now clearly defined by their προᾶξιν, and also that solidarity between members is expressed as ἀλλήλων μέλη. But notably, we no longer find σῶμα Χριστοῦ but ἐν σῶμα ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ. Does this mean that the "one body" is not the Body of Christ? Compared to I Corinthians the σῶμα Χριστοῦ concept is plainly less pronounced. The words might simply indicate that this Body's unity, unlike that of a polis or the cosmos, lies in their common relation to Christ. However, we cannot simply dismiss the texts of I Corinthians (even if the Romans



themselves were not aware of them), for they reveal Paul's mindset towards the Church and the twofold unity implied in the Body concept. Thus the Body which they are in Christ is none other than Christ's Body. The grammatical formulation here was probably chosen to emphasize the Body's unity while avoiding the awkward phrase "one Body of Christ."<sup>17</sup>

Paul's usage raises several questions: (a) Does Paul apply the image to the local congregation or the universal Church? While I Cor xii and Rom xii clearly concern the local situation, Paul probably applies a universal concept to his readers' special needs. In support of this we note how the Body image is closely associated with baptism and the eucharist (I Cor x 17, xii 13, cf. xi 29). These sacraments reflect the believer's involvement in Christ's redemptive acts and cannot be limited to the local congregation. Also, if we limit the image to the local church, we must take seriously the possibility that Christ has more than one Body. We find it more likely that the *ὁμείζ* of I Cor xii 27 refers to the Corinthians as *ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ* (I Cor i 2). Thus even as they are a manifestation of the whole Church as it is at Corinth, so too are they Christ's Body as it is at Corinth.<sup>18</sup>

(b) Is the Body of Christ a metaphorical or ontological description of the Church? In I Cor xii and Rom xii the use of *καθάπερ/οὕτως* indicates that a comparison is made. Perhaps the comparison is between two kinds of bodies. At the time there were bodies other than human ones such as armies, houses, or the cosmos.<sup>19</sup> But more likely the comparison is between two dimensions of personhood, the Church as the corporate totality of Christ and a body as the outward manifestation of a person. This was facilitated by filling the political metaphor with Semitic assumptions. But the Church is plainly not a human body. If the Church is not a human body, then it is not in any literal or historical sense the crucified body of Jesus. Possibly it could be the resurrection body of Jesus, since one may speculate as to its exact character. But as baptism implies a union not simply with the resurrected Christ but with the crucified Jesus, this solution does not suffice. We can say that the Church is in the crucified and resurrected Jesus; we might even say that the Church that is in this crucified and resurrected body is itself a body having its unifying principle in that selfsame crucified and resurrected body; but we cannot say that it is this crucified and resurrected body without making a formidable leap.<sup>20</sup> It is best, then, to regard the image as an interaction metaphor.<sup>21</sup> The image evokes a series of associations that interact with our understanding of the Church and so influence our perception of its reality. The associations usually evoked by the Hellenistic



metaphor are now enhanced and informed in that the Body of Christ points to the particular person whose bodily acts are determinative for the life of the whole. The Body of Christ, then, depicts not a society, but a corporate personality.

(c) What is the origin of Paul's  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$   $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  concept?<sup>22</sup> The question affords no easy answer. If in his anthropology Paul reflects his OT heritage, the same cannot be said in any direct manner about  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$   $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ . The few approximations that appear in the Hebrew Bible and LXX are insufficient to explain Paul's terminology. This has forced scholars to look elsewhere for the image's conceptual-linguistic background.

Some scholars seek the concept's origin in popular Hellenistic ideas that depict a society, state, or the cosmos as a body.<sup>23</sup> But while this background helps explain the interrelation of Church members, it does not clarify the deeper idea of their relation with Christ. For Paul, the Church is not simply a "body," but the "Body of Christ," i.e. the body of a person.<sup>24</sup> An adequate model for this unity between Christ and Church characterizes most other efforts to explain the concept's origin. Linguistic-conceptual parallels are sought in varied sources: Apocalypticism, Gnosticism, Rabbinic Adam speculation, Paul's Damascus experience, Semitic corporate personality, the eucharistic loaf, the Bride of Christ.<sup>25</sup> Generally each background can be criticized on the lack or lateness of linguistic parallels and/or material differences in the conceptual framework. But if there is no completely satisfactory solution, there has been progress. Several points about the ongoing discussion can be made:

(1) There has been a shift in understanding what the search for the "origin" means.<sup>26</sup> Most scholars now recognize the inadequacy of simply pointing to a linguistic parallel and thinking the problem solved. There is growing recognition that several factors were at work. The idea is a Pauline creation at least in that Paul uses the expression uniquely.

(2) Congruent with this methodological shift, scholars have sought to understand the concept in relation to Paul's Christology. This step began with earlier gnostic proposals, but was inevitable once the deficiency of the Hellenistic metaphor was seen. Here progress has been made in viewing the idea from Semitic corporate personality.<sup>27</sup>

(3) There are factors for which every theory must account.<sup>28</sup>

(a) Paul's use of  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  is often synonymous with  $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota\varsigma$ , even denoting a person's solidarity with another. (b) Paul does use the Hellenistic metaphor. His use is unique, but the Hellenistic concept does form a bridge between himself and his readers. (c) Paul twice (I Cor x 17, I Cor xii 13) and perhaps a third time (I Cor xi 29) uses the idea along with

sacramental language. If this is an unlikely source for the idea, any solution must at least explain the congeniality of the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$   $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  concept and the sacraments. (d) As (c) suggests, the idea must be set in the broader context of Paul's thinking about Christ and the Church. Here an adequate conceptual model is necessary to explain the related phrases and ideas that point to the same underlying reality. Of the diverse proposals we find Semitic corporate personality the most likely candidate. The idea is broad enough to embrace a variety of Christological and ecclesiological formulations, and narrow enough to give this variety a conceptual cohesion. (e) Finally,  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$   $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  evokes a two-dimensional image of unity: (i) unity with Christ and (ii) unity in Christ. The "unity in Christ" may be further divided into "equal solidarity" and "interdiversity." Only the latter is necessarily linked to the Hellenistic metaphor. Thus, a solution which explains both the Christian's solidarity with Christ and with his fellow Christians is preferable over that which explains just one or the other. Again the category of corporate personality points in the right direction.

The Body of Christ concept is developed in Colossians.<sup>29</sup> In the changed situation the stress now falls on the unity between Christ and the Church. The equation  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha = \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$  is now made explicit regarding the Church universal (contrast I Corinthians and Romans). But the social aspect is not missing (i 24, ii 19, iii 15) and the image retains its inward perspective. Even when the Body grows (ii 19), it grows together in its unity with and in Christ. Thus the new motif of growth reflects the familiar theme of a twofold unity with Christ and between believers. Also new is the stress on Paul's role in the Body (i 24). What Paul suffers in his flesh, helps fill the quota of Messianic woes that the community must endure before Christ returns in glory. Here service to Christ is defined as service on behalf of his Body, the Church. If Paul's special function is accented, the Body image itself suggests that his is not the only role. All Christians are to put on love and allow Christ's peace to rule in their hearts. To this responsibility they are summoned, not as isolated individuals, but as living body members united to Christ and one another (iii 15).<sup>30</sup> As in I Corinthians and Romans the idea points inwardly to the Body as the recipient of its members' functions.

Of course, the most striking new feature is the designation of Christ as  $\eta$   $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\eta}$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  (i 18). That the author moves so easily from Head/Body (i 18) to "his Body" (i 24) suggests that both places present the same concept from different perspectives. The

Head/Body defines what it means to say the Body is Christ's. As the Body member par excellence, the Head rules as the Body's source and goal, providing unity and life-support and hence promoting growth (ii 19). We suggest the author has conflated previous Pauline ideas about the Head and the Body. Once Christ was labeled κεφαλή and the Church σῶμα Χριστοῦ, it is natural in view of popular ideas that the two would eventually be joined. But how are they joined? Does σῶμα now mean trunk in relation to κεφαλή, or is the conflation only superficial and non-organic? There is, however, a third possibility. Both Paul's Head and Body concepts show Semitic influence. If Colossians brings these two together, could not the ensuing relation also reflect Semitic assumptions? If so, Head and Body may be organically related in that they represent the whole person from different perspectives. Since Ephesians may or may not depend on Colossians, we leave this question open here. But it receives further attention regarding Ephesians.<sup>31</sup>



## NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

<sup>1</sup>We must take seriously the word "fairly" as the problems of Eph i 1 illustrate. Fortunately, the texts in Ephesians where σῶμα appears are relatively stable. We deal with textual problems as they arise.

<sup>2</sup>See below, pp.10-16.

<sup>3</sup>Beyond discussions in NT Introductions, Bible dictionaries and commentaries, see the bibliographies in Kümmel, Introduction, 350f and Barth, 407-9. See also B. M. Ahren, "Who wrote the Pauline Epistles?" Bible Today 1 (1964) 254-60; B. Reicke, "Caesarea, Rome and the Captivity Epistles," in Apostolic History and the Gospel, ed. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, 277-86; A. van Roon, The Authenticity of Ephesians; J. A. T. Robinson, Redating the New Testament; J. Knox, Philemon Among the Letters of St. Paul.

<sup>4</sup>Among scholars upholding Pauline authorship (though some stress the role of Paul's amanuensis) are: Abbott, Alford, M. Barth, Benoit, Bruce, Caird, Cambier, Cerfaux, Dodd, Feuillet, Foulkes, Gaugler, R. M. Grant, Guthrie, Haupt, Hort, Meyer, Murphy-O'Connor, Mussner, Percy, J. A. Robinson, J. A. T. Robinson, van Roon, Salmond, J. N. Sanders, Schille, Schlier (in his commentary), Scott, Synge and Wescott. Among those who deny Pauline authorship are: Allan, Beare, Bultmann, Conzelmann, Dibelius-Greeven, Fischer, Gnilka, Goodspeed, Hammer, Harrison, Houlden, Käsemann, J. Knox, W. L. Knox, Kümmel, Martin, Marxsen, Masson, Merklein, Mitton, Moffatt, Nineham, Perrin, Pokorný, Sampley, and Schweizer. Among those who leave the question open are Ahren, Cadbury, Chadwick, Jülicher, McNeile and Williams.

<sup>5</sup>See Beare, 601; Gnilka, 17f; Houlden, 252ff; Kirby, 165; Kümmel, Introduction, 361; E. Käsemann, "Epheserbrief," RGG<sup>3</sup> II 520; J. Murphy-O'Connor, in "Who wrote Ephesians?" Bible Today 18 (1965) 1201-9, argues that Paul's amanuensis was a converted Essene.

<sup>6</sup>Beyond the references in n. 5 see K. G. Kuhn, "Der Epheserbrief im Lichte der Qumrantexte," NTS 7 (1960-61) 334-46 (trans. in Paul and Qumran, ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor, 115-31, cited as PQ) (references will be to PQ), and K. Beyer, Semitische Syntax im NT I, Studien zur Umwelt des NT 1 (1962) 294f (cited from Gnilka, 32). Van Roon (204f) places the author (=Paul) in Caesarea to help explain the Semitic flavor of the letter. The midrash character of iv 9-10 is maintained by Barth, Beare, Caird, Gnilka, Houlden, and others.

<sup>7</sup>H. J. Cadbury, "The Dilemma of Ephesians," NTS 5 (1958/59) 101.

<sup>8</sup>Outlays of the parallel materials are found in E. J. Goodspeed, The Key to Ephesians; C. L. Mitton, The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose (cited as EE); Moffatt, Introduction; F. O. Francis and J. P. Sampley, Pauline Parallels.

<sup>9</sup>Among those who affirm the Pauline authorship of Colossians are: Bruce, Caird, Dibelius-Greeven, Kümmel, Martin, Moule, Fuller, Grant, and Guthrie. Among those who deny it are: Conzelmann, Lohse, Marxsen, Bornkamm, Käsemann, Perrin, and Schweizer. For literature see Kümmel, Introduction, 335 and the various other Introductions and commentaries.

<sup>10</sup>See, e.g., Lohse, 181, who presupposes a Pauline school tradition located in Ephesus. Cf. Conzelmann, Schweizer and others.

<sup>11</sup>μυστηρίον and οἰκονομία are also frequently mentioned. See esp. Mitton, EE, 86-97; Allan, 18-22; also Caird, 14-15.

<sup>12</sup>See, e.g. J. Coutts, "The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians," NTS 4 (1957/58) 201-7; Synge, 69-76. G. Schille, in "Der Autor des Epheserbriefes," TLZ 82 (1957) 325-34, and Marxsen, Introduction 187, believe the two letters rely on common liturgical traditions. Holtzmann in his Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosserbriefe (1879) and more recently P. N. Harrison, "The Author of Ephesians," Studia Evangelica II 595-604, think that Colossians has been reworked by the author of Ephesians (cf. Masson). See also, W. Munro, "Col. iii 18-iv 1 and Eph. v 21-vi 9: Evidence of a Late Literary Stratum?" NTS 18 (1972) 434-47.

<sup>13</sup>For discussion and literature on these points, see the Introductions, esp. Kümmel, and commentaries, esp. Barth. Other references are cited where such proposals have direct bearing on our study.

<sup>14</sup>Rome is the traditional view with Barth, Bruce, Caird, Guthrie, Schlier and Scott among recent adherents. Among scholars who opt for Caesarea are Reicke, J. A. T. Robinson and van Roon. The imprisonments are variously dated: Bornkamm and Kümmel place Paul in Caesarea c. A.D. 56-58 and in Rome c. A.D. 58-60. Barth, Bruce and J. A. T. Robinson push this forward about two years, Caesarea c. A.D. 58-60, and Rome c. A.D. 60-62. In St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, G. S. Duncan has argued that the Captivity Epistles were written during an imprisonment in Ephesus c. A.D. 54-57.

<sup>15</sup>Goodspeed (The Key to Ephesians, xivf) suggests Ephesus and dates it c. A.D. 90-95 (JBL 70, 1951, 286). Cf. Allan 29, 39; see also Gnllka, (cont.)



20f and Kirby, 168f. Kümmel (366) is less specific on both counts, conjecturing Asia Minor c. A.D. 80-100. Moffatt (Introduction, 395) dates it c. A.D. 75-85 and Mitton (EE, 260f), c. A.D. 87-92. A 2nd century date has been abandoned by scholars today.

<sup>16</sup>See, e.g., Moffatt, Introduction, 391. Contrast Gnilka, 6f.

<sup>17</sup><sup>46</sup>  $\alpha^* B^* 424^C$  1739 omit the place name. For a full review of this issue see E. Best, "Ephesians i. 1," in Text and Interpretation ed. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson, 29-41.

<sup>18</sup>Best, op.cit., 29; Gnilka, 6f; contrast Marxsen, Introduction, 192.

<sup>19</sup>See, e.g. Abbott, vii; Bruce, 13; Foulkes, 40; Gnilka, 6; Houlden, 249f; Martin, Foundations, II 233. Cf. Schlier, 31f; Scott, 122.

<sup>20</sup>There is little dispute over this point. Percy's discussion (Die Probleme, 179-252) has been influential in making this point known, though not all share his conclusions; see also van Roon (100-212) on Eph's style.

<sup>21</sup>Kuhn, in PQ, 115-31.

<sup>22</sup>"Ephesians and Acts," in Studies in Luke-Acts, ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martin, 288.

<sup>23</sup>Käsemann (RGG<sup>3</sup> II 517) describes Ephesians as "ein brieflich nur eingekleideter Traktat mit einheitlichen Thema und systematischer Gliederung." Beare, (605) calls it an "essay" and considers the book an attempt to formulate a philosophy of religion and history (604). Moffatt (Introduction 388) calls the work an "epistolary homily," "a manifesto of Paul's mind upon the situation," "a pamphlet or tract for the times." Abbott, Barth, Caird, Bruce, Houlden, Samply, Sanders and others adopt more of a general or circular letter format. Recently M. L. Stirewalt ("The Form and Function of the Greek Letter-Essay," in The Romans Debate, ed. K. P. Donfried, 175-206) outlined a literary genre which he calls a "letter-essay." While Eph does not fit neatly into the characteristics of this type, there is sufficient reason to question rigid either/or categories.

<sup>24</sup>J. N. Sanders, "The Case for the Pauline Authorship" in Studies in Ephesians, ed. F. L. Cross, 16; Bruce, 15.

<sup>25</sup>Schlier, 21, 27.

<sup>26</sup>Goodspeed, The Meaning of Ephesians and The Key to Ephesians; J. Knox, op.cit.; Mitton, EE. See also D. E. Nineham, "The Case Against the Pauline Authorship" in Studies in Ephesians, 21-35; and Allan.

<sup>27</sup>See esp. Kirby; also Dahl, Schille, Coutts and Pokorný stress this theme.



<sup>28</sup>H. Chadwick, "Die Absicht des Epheserbrief," ZNW 51 (1960) 145-54.

<sup>29</sup>Käsemann, RGG<sup>3</sup> II 517f; Kümmel, 364; Martin, Foundations II, 233; cf. also M. Fischer, Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes.

<sup>30</sup>Cf. Moffatt, Introduction, 393 and Martin, Foundations II, 237-8.

<sup>31</sup>A fairly recent proponent of this traditional view is W. L. Knox (161f) and "Parallels to the N.T. Use of  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ ," JTS 29 (1938) 243-46.

<sup>32</sup>C. Colpe, "Zur Leib-Christi-Vorstellung im Epheserbrief," BZNW 26 (1960) 174. Portions of our survey are much indebted to Colpe's article.

<sup>33</sup>For the points of this paragraph, see Christus, 39ff.

<sup>34</sup>Leib und Leib Christi.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid. 138-86.

<sup>36</sup>Der Leib Christi.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid. 44; Colpe, 175.

<sup>38</sup>Percy (Leib Christi, 50, cf. 39, 44, 49) calls this passage along with Col i-22 "den Schlüssel zum Verständnis dieses Gedankens."

<sup>39</sup>Ibid. 52f.

<sup>40</sup>Schlier, "Die Kirche nach dem Brief an die Epheser," in Die Kirche im Epheserbriefe, H. Schlier and P. V. Warnach, 82-104, esp. 84-85. This shift is also present in his commentary, 90-96. That Schlier perhaps had Percy's criticism in mind is suggested by Colpe, BZNW 26:175.

<sup>41</sup>Schlier, 92.

<sup>42</sup>Mussner, Christus, Das All und die Kirche, 113-73 (cited as CAK).

<sup>43</sup>"Corps, Tête et Plérôme dans les Épîtres de la Captivité," RB 63 (1956) 5-44 (trans. in Jesus and the Gospel II 51-92). (References are to the French article.)

<sup>44</sup>Ibid. 24.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid. 25ff.

<sup>46</sup>" $\Sigma\omega\mu\alpha$   $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  im Epheserbrief," EvTh 20 (1960) 457.

<sup>47</sup>Schweizer has written extensively on the subject: "Die Kirche als Leib Christi in den Paulinischen Homologumena," TLZ 86 (1961) 161-74; "Die Kirche als Leib Christi in den Paulinischen Antilegomena," TLZ 86 (1961) 241-56; "The Church as the Missionary Body of Christ," NTS 8 (1961) 1-11 (refs. to German articles are cited from Neotestamentica, 272-316);

(cont.)

The Church as the Body of Christ; TDNT VII 1024-44, 1045-94.

<sup>48</sup>Schweizer, NTS 8:10.

<sup>49</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1078.

<sup>50</sup>Colpe, BZNW 26:176.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER I

<sup>1</sup>P. T. O'Brien, "Ephesians I: An Unusual Introduction to a New Testament Letter," NTS 25 (1978/79) 504.

<sup>2</sup>Van Roon, 111f.

<sup>3</sup>In adopting the longer reading B. Metzger (A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, 602) states: "The shorter reading καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντες τοὺς ἁγίους (p<sup>46</sup> κ\* A B P 33 1739 al) appears to be the result of an accident in transcription, occasioned by homoeoarcton (τὴν...τὴν)."

<sup>4</sup>Ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ is best taken with vs. 18. Cf. Gnllka, 90.

<sup>5</sup>Scott, 155.

<sup>6</sup>The grammatical disposition of κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ., is disputed. It was popular among older commentators to attach it to τοὺς πιστεύοντας, thus indicating the basis of faith (see Meyer for discussion). But this view introduces a rather abrupt change of subject, i.e. the origin of faith (cf. Abbott), and also requires the ensuing discussion to be subservient to a subordinate participle. This would be extremely awkward. Another view takes the phrase with τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος κ.τ.λ. In this case it describes the power at work in believers as that which "corresponds" to God's working in Christ (Alford; also apparently Beare, Bruce, and Schlier). A third possibility is to allow some connection with εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς. Here κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ. denotes the basis of knowing the preceding statement. This allows the ensuing discussion to center upon God's act in Christ as an act of revelation. Meyer confines this to "knowing what is the power," while Gnllka takes it with all three τίς clauses. Abbott thinks it matters little to decide the point. On the whole we favor the third alternative since our knowing the power at work in us does not simply correspond to God's work in Christ, but also has its basis in this act. The distance between εἰδέναι and the κατὰ phrase is not really an insurmountable objection, since the idea of knowing is clearly carried to each τίς clause. Whether the κατὰ phrase belongs to all three adjuncts remains an open question.

<sup>7</sup>This reflects Semitic thinking. Cf. Pederson, Israel I-II, 115: "The Israelite does not argue by means of conclusion and logical progress. His argumentation consists in showing that one statement associates itself with another, as belonging to its totality." See Appendix A, 333 n. 7.

<sup>8</sup>Gnilka considers ἡμεῖς at vs. 3 to reflect a "Bekenntnisstil." It is true that ἡμεῖς πάντες should not be confined to Jewish Christians. Still, it cannot exclude them ("Bekenntnisstil" notwithstanding), which is important in view of the strong contrast that emerges between Gentiles and Jews in vss. 11ff. The change from ὑμεῖς to ἡμεῖς shows the author's identification as a Jew with the plight of his Gentile readers. If Paul is not the author, the author (whether Gentile or Jewish) is speaking through his Jewish teacher. Contrast Mitton; see also R. A. Wilson, "'We' and 'You' in the Epistle to the Ephesians," Studia Evangelica II 676-80. The idea is probably present in i 11; see O'Brien, NTS 25:513, n. 64, who offers a brief list of the alternatives.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Gnilka, 118; Schlier, 109.

<sup>10</sup>We speak of an "exaltation" as a shorthand expression for "resurrection and session .." Barth (232-38) and Mitton (88-90) discuss the resurrection separately from the session. This is informative, but overlooks the unity of the enthronement picture. Resurrection and session are two dimensions of one movement (see below p. 36).

<sup>11</sup>A variant reading of vs. 5, συνεζωοποίησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (p<sup>46</sup> B pc vg<sup>c1</sup>), and the undisputed reading of vs. 6, have led Scott (164) and Barth (220) to see the verse combining unity between Gentiles and Jews and unity with Christ. But the variant probably arose from dittography (Metzger, Textual Commentary, 602). This conclusion is supported by the general use of συν-compounds in the Pauline Corpus (see n. 13 below) and the context (see Schlier and Gnilka). As the parallels with i 20ff suggest, the author stresses participation in God's act in Christ. We agree that this event includes all believers and has social implications; but these do not come into proper view until ii 11.

<sup>12</sup>For discussion and literature see Best, 44-64 and Grundmann, TDNT VII 786-93; T. C. Tannehill, Dying and Rising with Christ.

<sup>13</sup>The "in Christ" formula is frequent in Ephesians and a uniform interpretation may be impossible. See Bultmann, Theology of the NT II. 177; Barth, 69-71; Gnilka, 66-69; J. A. Allan, "The 'In Christ' Formula in Ephesians," NTS 5 (1958/59) 54-62; also in general Best, 1-33; and Oepke, TDNT II 541-43. In Ephesians the formula appears often in the threefold  
(cont.)



arrangement: God does x to us in Christ (cf. Gnllka, 67; Barth, 70; Best, 5). While some scholars (e.g. Allan) take this in a purely instrumental sense, the idea of incorporation is probably present. Bultmann (II 177) states with regard to i 4: "'Chosen in Christ' seems to have a special meaning: through the fact that Christ was chosen before all time by God, believers in him are also chosen." Cf. Barth, 78 (on i 3) and Best, 5. Union with Christ is actually the presupposition of the instrumental dimension: God does x to Christ and hence to us by virtue of our union with Christ.

<sup>14</sup>This uniqueness is reflected in vs. 6 by omitting ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ and ὑπεράνω πάντων κ.τ.λ. and including ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Believers are not only with Christ, but in him, making Christ distinct as the Lord of their life. Cf. Abbott, 50. At ii 10 believers are said to be "created in Christ" and in ii 15, Christ creates the Gentile and Jew in himself with one new kind of man in view (see below Ch II, 132-35). Cf. Eph v 14.

<sup>15</sup>Barth, 236. This was believed to have happened to Enoch, Elijah, and others.

<sup>16</sup>Tannehill in Dying and Rising with Christ shows how the "with Christ" motif depicts the believer's eschatological transferal from the old aeon of Adam to that new aeon of Christ. While Tannehill does not discuss Eph ii in detail, the same general network of ideas is probably operative. The act in view affects not only man's moral and spiritual condition, but his position before God and in the world.

<sup>17</sup>For this translation of τέχνη ὁργῆς see Abbott, 44f.

<sup>18</sup>The believer's exaltation becomes visible in a renewed moral vitality. The moral dimension emerges in παρατώμασιν (ii 1,5), ἁμαρτίαις (ii 1), ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς, περιπατέω (ii 2, 10) and ἀναστρέφω (ii 3).

<sup>19</sup>E.g. Schlier, Conzelmann, Gnllka. Cf. Col ii 12 (also Rom vi 3f; Tit iii 5, Jn iii 5). Unlike Col ii 12, our text does not mention baptism, nor is dying or being buried with Christ referred to (though this may be implied). Also unlike Col ii 12 (cf. Rom vi 3-4), the author uses active rather than passive verb forms. In this our text is like II Cor v 14, where little justifies a reference to baptism. Schille (Frühchristliche Hymnen, 57f) and J. T. Sanders ("Hymnic Elements in Ephesians 1-3," ZNW 56, 1965, 214-32) think a baptismal hymn underlies the text. But it is a large step from linking a hymn to a rite, to identifying the hymn's content with the rite itself.

<sup>20</sup>Barth, 232ff. Barth distinguishes this from baptism.

<sup>21</sup>Barth, 232ff. The closer parallels in the Pauline Corpus, esp. Col ii 12 restate the question more than answer it.

<sup>22</sup>M. Fischer, Tendenz und Absicht, 123ff. Cf. Bultmann, I 140ff.

<sup>23</sup>Schlier, 111; cf. also Käsemann, Leib, 143; Schille, Hymnen, 57f; Conzelmann, Dibelius-Greeven. To link the heavenly ascent and baptism Schlier turns to the O.Sol. (e.g. xi 1ff). Not all scholars concur with Schlier in his "gnostic" interpretation of the O.Sol. (see J. H. Charlesworth, "The Odes of Solomon - Not Gnostic," CBQ 31, 1969, 357-69) or its linking of the heavenly ascent and baptism (see D. E. Aune, The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology, 166-74).

<sup>24</sup>P. Pokorný, "Epheserbrieff und Gnostische Mysterien," ZNW 53 (1962) 160-94 (174).

<sup>25</sup>Pertinent to this discussion, though not directly concerned with Eph ii 4-7 are Best, 46-58, and Tannehill, 70f.

<sup>26</sup>Cf. Barth, 236 n.134. See also Mussner, CAK, 91-94.

<sup>27</sup>Mussner, CAK, 93f. Cf. also Ed. Schweizer, "Dying and Rising with Christ" in New Testament Issues, ed. R. Batey, 176; Tannehill, 14-20, 71f. Although A. Schweitzer does not deal with Eph ii 4-7 his chapter on dying and rising with Christ in The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, 101-40, provides pertinent material.

<sup>28</sup>Mussner (CAK, 93) cites e.g. Dan vii 27, I En cviii 12; Wis v 15f; Rev iii 21.

<sup>29</sup>Mussner, "Contributions Made by Qumran to the Understanding of the Epistle to the Ephesians," in PQ, 159-78; see also Gnilka, 123ff; Aune, Cultic Setting, 30-44; and also (unavailable) H. W. Kuhn, Enderwartung und Gegenwärtiges Heil (SUNT 4) 44-188.

<sup>30</sup>Mussner, PQ, 175.

<sup>31</sup>Cf. Gnilka, 126.

<sup>32</sup>See Appendix A, 332-39.

<sup>33</sup>Coutts, NTS 4:205. Cf. Macpherson, 162f.

<sup>34</sup>The correlation of Urzeit and Endzeit in Jewish theology has long been recognized. See, e.g. the important study of H. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit, 367-71. See also J. Jeremias, TDNT V 765-73; Aune, Cultic Setting, 37-44; G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology II,  
(cont.)

169f; R. H. Charles, Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity, 316-18. The relation of this to Christology has been variously assessed; see the results of B. Marmorstein, "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," WZKM 35 (1928) 242-75, 36 (1929) 51-86; Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, 137-53, 166-81; and R. Scroggs, The Last Adam. The issue centers on the influence of an Urmensch-redeemer myth which Marmorstein and Cullmann essentially affirm and Scroggs ultimately denies. We agree with Scroggs (xv) that the influence of a Primal Man myth is at best secondary. Scroggs overlooks how the correlation between Urzeit and Endzeit provides a framework for comparing Adam and the Messiah. If the Messiah is merely, in Scroggs' words (57), "a symbol for God's act" in the days of the Messiah, we still have in this a conceptual basis for an Adamic Christology. For in an atmosphere which correlated Urzeit and Endzeit and saw the occurrence of the Messiah as an initiation of the Endzeit, the Messiah, once he was considered to have a specific character, mission and function, would naturally be compared to the character, mission and function of the main figure of the Urzeit, Adam. Whether this correlation between Adam and the Messiah actually appeared outside Christianity, is, then, less important than that the seeds for the correlation already existed (though some such correlation probably did exist, as hinted in TLev xviii). More importantly by the time of Ephesians the undisputed letters of Paul had already established this correlation (Rom v; I Cor xv; and probably Phil ii 5-11). The Gospel tradition also seems aware of it (cf. Mk i 13; Lk iii 38); see Jeremias, TDNT I 141. Some scholars link the Son of Man conception and the Pauline last Adam conception. For discussion see, e.g. M. Black, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," SJT 7 (1954) 170-79; Cullmann, Christology, 166ff; Jeremias TDNT I 142f; Colpe, TDNT VIII 470ff; Borsch, The Son of Man in Myth and History, 240ff; Marshall, The Origins of New Testament Christology, 78; T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, 233f. See also A. Vögtle, "Der 'Menschensohn' u. die Paul. Christologie," Studium Paulinorum Congressus Internat. Catholicus (1961) 212-14; and for a negative view Scroggs, 102.

<sup>35</sup>Aune, Cultic Setting, 37-44.

<sup>36</sup>Conzelmann, 63; Dibelius-Greeven, 64.

<sup>37</sup>Schille, Hymnen, 103 n.4; R. Deichgräber, Gottes hymnus und Christohymnus in der frühen Christenheit, 161-65; J. Ernst, Pleroma und Pleroma Christi, 105-8.

<sup>38</sup>J. T. Sanders, ZNW 56:214-32; Barth, 153f.



<sup>39</sup>Sanders, ZNW 56:220. He interprets these texts in terms of a gnostic redeemer myth.

<sup>40</sup>Deichgräber, Gottes hymnus, 162.

<sup>41</sup>Gottes hymnus, 161; Barth (153) calls it a resurrection Psalm.

<sup>42</sup>Gottes hymnus, 161.

<sup>43</sup>Sanders, ZNW 56:220.

<sup>44</sup>Schille, Hymnen, 103 n.4.

<sup>45</sup>Deichgräber, Gottes hymnus, 164.

NOTE: Numbers skip from 45 to 48.

<sup>48</sup>We leave open whether Eph i 20ff literarily depends on I Cor xv 20ff, or shares a common tradition.

<sup>49</sup>Deichgräber, Gottes hymnus, 165; Schille, Hymnen, 103 n.4.

<sup>50</sup>Barth, 154.

<sup>51</sup>Ernst, 107.

<sup>52</sup>For these and other criteria for discerning hymns, see Schille, Hymnen, 16-20; Barth, 7; and Martin, Foundations II, 260-61.

<sup>53</sup>Sanders (ZNW 56:220-23) offers a complex thesis. He notes the correlation between Eph i 20ff and ii 4ff, and suggests that both passages rely on Col ii 9ff. While Col ii 9ff may not be a hymn, its mention of baptism evinces a liturgical background. That Eph i 20ff is so closely related to both I Cor xv 20ff and Col ii 12ff is for Sanders "evidence enough to show that elements that originally belonged to the preaching could be taken into liturgy" (222). But while Sanders believes that both Eph i 20ff and ii 4ff bear hymnic features, he leaves open whether our author drew on an independent Christian hymn (which also underlies Col ii) or has worked his statements into a hymnic form (223). Gniska (93f) also argues that Church instruction has been adapted to liturgical use and stresses our text's dependence on I Cor xv 20ff. His solution approaches Sanders' second alternative. But for Gniska the situation is much more fluid. He does not mention dependence on Col ii 9ff; nor does he speak of its "hymnic form," but of a Christian creed whose form has not altogether crystallized.

<sup>54</sup>Cf. Gniska, 93f. While Gniska speaks of a "Credo," we prefer "hymnic form." The distinction between creeds, hymns and liturgies is not clearcut in NT scholarship. See Bultmann, "Bekenntnis und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrus," Coniectanea Neotestamentica 11 (1947) 9

(cont.)

(quoted in Martin, Foundations II, 260). According to Bultmann, creeds are generally shorter and narrower in scope than hymns. Perhaps the broader rubric "liturgy" or "liturgical poetry" would best describe Eph i 20-23. But to help distinguish this from liturgical prose, the term "hymn," despite its rather broad application, is still useful.

<sup>55</sup>Sanders, ZNW 56:216.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid.

<sup>57</sup>OT poetry and hymnic literature is characterized by the thought parallelism of its lines. This has been recognized since Robert Lowth's classic De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum Praelectiones (1753) (trans. in 1829 by G. Gregory). More recently the importance of word-pairs as the dominant element of this parallelism has been accented; see, e.g. W. Whallon, Formula, Character, and Context, esp. 139-210; W. R. Watters, Formula Criticism and the Poetry of the Old Testament, BZAW 138 (1976); and N. K. Gottwald, IDB III 831ff. Watters (2-38) offers a useful survey of formula criticism.

<sup>58</sup>Watters, Formula Criticism, 96.

<sup>59</sup>Long tours usually occur in a series of parallel lines, but sometimes the terms are listed one after another, e.g. Isa iii 2-3. Watters (109) counts 25 such lists in Isaiah alone and calls this phenomenon a "violation of economy." Cf. also Ps viii 8f.

<sup>60</sup>This type of simulation characterizes the use of OT Scriptures in the Hodayot. See S. Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran, 301-15, esp. 305.

<sup>61</sup>Cf. Barth, 152; Bruce, 41.

<sup>62</sup>The aorist form ἐνήργησεν is attested by  $\kappa\eta\lambda\delta\gamma\pi\lambda$ , while the perfect is read by BAp $\epsilon$ . The perfect is preferable. The aorist would have easily arisen by copyists assimilating the tense to the following aorist participles. The reverse process is not so easily understood. See Abbott, 31; Gnilya, 94 n.4; Beare, 633.

<sup>63</sup>The article gives the phrase an almost official air. See Salmond, 277; Beare, 634; Barth, 152; Westcott, 26. Our point is not to stress a particular form of Messianism, but that any official capacity envisions the Christ's relation to his people. Even as a personal name it is not devoid of content.

<sup>64</sup>Schlier (86) cites: Acts iii 15, iv 10, v 30, x 40 xiii 37;  
(cont.)

I Thess i 10; I Cor vi 14, xv 15; II Cor iv 14; Gal i 1; Rom iv 24, viii 11; Col ii 12; I Pet iii 21; cf. Col i 18. . There are others of course.

<sup>65</sup>See J. A. T. Robinson, IBD IV 43-53; E. W. Saunders, IDB Suppl 739-41; and L. Coenen/C. Brown, DNTT III 259-309 (and literature cited).

<sup>66</sup>Staab, 127; cf. Bruce, 41.

<sup>67</sup>The nature of Christ's death is alluded to in i 7 and ii 13ff. The idea of the cross, then, is probably not too far away. Cf. Scott, 156f.

<sup>68</sup>Schlier (86) suggests that the resurrection is "nur die Voraussetzung und der Übergang zur Erhöhung." But the literary associations with I Cor xv place these ideas in the same traditional matrix. Resurrection already implies victory over a foe, namely death, and expresses implicitly what the ascension says explicitly.

<sup>69</sup>For discussion see D. M. Hay, Glory at the Right Hand, SBLMS 18, 19-21. See also A. A. Anderson, The Book of Psalms II, NCB 767-72; C. A. Briggs and E. M. Briggs, The Book of Psalms II, ICC 373-81; M. Dahood, Psalms III, AB 17b, 112-20; J. H. Eaton, Psalms, 261-63; A. Kirkpatrick, Book of Psalms, 660-71; E. J. Kissane, The Book of Psalms, 509-15; H. J. Kraus, Psalmen 2, 752-64; W. S. McCullough, IB IV 587-91; S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship I, 63-64; A. Weiser, The Psalms, OIL, 692-97. The Hasmonean theory has been largely abandoned, but see R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, 630.

<sup>70</sup>Hay, Glory at the Right Hand, 35.

<sup>71</sup>Hay, 33. (Hay's OG = LXX).

<sup>72</sup>Hay lists the relevant texts (45f), and in an Appendix (163ff) cites them. There are 22 occurrences of the Psalm listed. The Psalm was probably interpreted Messianically during Jesus' time. However, the Rabbinic writings do not so interpret it until the latter half of the 3rd cen. Billerbeck (Str-B IV 452-65) thinks Christian apologetics caused the Psalm's fall in popularity among the Rabbis.

<sup>73</sup>Hay (110f) argues that Jesus continually encountered Messianic hopes based on exercising political and military power. With his interpretation of Ps cx perhaps Jesus (or the Evangelist) refuted an Hasmonean interpretation. See also A. H. McNeile, The Gospel according to Matthew, 328; David Hill, The Gospel of Matthew NCB 307f; S. E. Johnson, "The Gospel according to St. Matthew," IB VII 526; V. Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark, 2nd ed., 490f; F. C. Grant, "The Gospel according to St. Mark," IB VII 849f; J. M. Creed, "The Gospel according to St. Luke," IB VIII (cont.)



355g; F. W. Beare, The Earliest Records of Jesus, 213f.

<sup>74</sup>Taylor, Mark, 492f.

<sup>75</sup>The authenticity of the saying is often denied. For discussion see Hay, 64ff; Beare, Earliest Records, 232f. E. Norden (Agnostos Theos, 194f, 272) regards the Psalm allusion in Mark xiv 62 as material from an early Christian confession. N. Perrin (Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, 173ff) regards the verse as a Christian peshar built on Ps cx and Dan vii 13. For a recent defense of the saying's general authenticity, see Borsch, Son of Man, 391-394. For pre-Christian association of the Psalm and the Son of Man, see Hay, 26.

<sup>76</sup>Hay (45) identifies the following functions of the Psalm's use in early Christian literature: "(1) vindication or glory of Jesus, (1a) glory or empowerment of Christians, (2) support for Christological titles, (3) subjection of powers to Jesus, (4) intercession or priesthood of Jesus." These points form the framework of Part II of Hay's book.

<sup>77</sup>For discussion see: A. T. Lincoln, "A Re-examination of 'the Heavenlies' in Ephesians," NTS 19 (1972/73) 458-83; H. Odeberg, The View of the Universe in the Epistle to the Ephesians; Barth, 102f; Gnllka, 63-66; Mussner, CAK, 9-12; van Roon, 213-15; Schlief, 45-48; and H. Traub, TDNT V 538ff.

<sup>78</sup>Schlief (45) speaks for most scholars when he states: "Offenbar ist mit ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις immer ein 'Ort' engeben, gleich gültig, ob das Substansiv maskulinisch oder neutrich zu verstehen ist."

<sup>79</sup>Bauer, 306; Mussner, CAK, 11-12; Lincoln, NTS 19:471.

<sup>80</sup>Abbott, 32; Robinson, 150.

<sup>81</sup>Cf. Meyer, 344.

<sup>82</sup>Schlief (88) connects the two ages to πάντος; he fails, however, to see the implications this has for understanding the nature of these spiritual powers.

<sup>83</sup>See the bibliography in Barth, 413f. See also W. L. Knox, esp. chs. 2, 3, and 7; Str-B III 581ff; Delling, TDNT I 488f; Grundmann, TDNT II 284ff; Foerster, TDNT II 1-20, 571ff; III 1096f; Conzelmann, Outline, 17-18; G. E. Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament, 400-2; Schlief, "The Angels according to the New Testament" in The Relevance of the New Testament, 172-92. The list here may be compared to other NT lists: e.g., Rom viii 38; I Cor ii 6-8; Gal iv 3, 9; Col i 16, ii 8; Eph vi 12. Ἀρχή and ἐξουσία sometimes refer to earthly powers (e.g. Tit iii 1, cf. Rom x (cont.)

iii). Abbott (33) thinks our passage has earthly and spiritual powers in view. But the context does not concern Christ's role in creation (contrast Col i 16), but his exaltation in the heavenly places. Here Christ's rule is defined vertically, making reference to earthly powers unnecessary, since authority over the highest powers includes authority over subordinate ones. Also other references in Eph ii 2, iii 10, and vi 12, focus on spiritual powers. Only in vs. 22, then, does the reference become all-inclusive.

<sup>84</sup>Caird, 46. See also his detailed treatment, Principalities and Powers.

<sup>85</sup>See, e.g. Schlier, 88; and Lincoln, NTS 19:472.

<sup>86</sup>Since ancient times names were believed to carry psychological, social and religious power. For literature and discussion, see Bauer, 574; Bietenhard, TDNT V 242-82; Bietenhard/Bruce, DNTT II 648-56. Cf. also Silva New, "The Name, Baptism, and Laying on of Hands," in The Beginnings of Christianity V, ed. F. Jackson and K. Lake, 121-40.

<sup>87</sup>Mitton (72f) and Caird (47) (from different perspectives) think the names are named by men: "every spiritual being invoked or venerated by men." But what would it mean for a person to invoke or worship a name, (other than the Lord's) in the coming age? Our view avoids this difficulty, allowing God to be the subject of the main verbs throughout vss. 20-22 (and probably vs. 23, see below p. 111).

<sup>88</sup>For this paragraph, cf. Bietenhard, TDNT V 253-54 and DNTT II 649.

<sup>89</sup>Ibid. Cf. also Anderson, Psalms (73-150), 945. It is likely that the stars were considered here as celestial beings.

<sup>90</sup>See, e.g. C. Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, OTL, 158f.

<sup>91</sup>Cf. the statement from the Cyrus Cylinder: "(Then) he /Marduk/ pronounced the name of Cyrus..., King of Anshan, declared him (lit.: pronounced /his/ name) to be(come) the ruler of all the world." The translation is from Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts, 315 (see also J. Muilenburg, "Isaiah 40-66," IB V 523).

<sup>92</sup>Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 158; Muilenburg, IB V 523. As the parallelism suggests, the calling by name and the surnaming are two aspects of one act, i.e. the surnames are given as part of the name by which God calls Cyrus. This may also help explain Phil ii 9-10. To confess Jesus Christ is Lord is to confess that his name is "Lord Jesus Christ."



<sup>93</sup>Sasse, TDNT I 207. By this we do not intend to minimize differences in eschatology. I Cor xv looks to a future resurrection for believers, while Ephesians speaks of the believer's co-resurrection with Christ that is manifested in the coming ages.

<sup>94</sup>For discussion see: Anderson, Psalms 1-72, 100-4; Briggs-Briggs, Psalms I, 61-67; Dahood, Psalms I, 49-52; Eaton, Psalms, 44-46; Kissane, Psalms, 32-35; Kirkpatrick, Psalms, 35-41; Kraus, Psalmen I, 65-73; W. R. Taylor, "The Book of Psalms," IB IV 48-53; Weiser, Psalms, 139-46; and C. Westermann, The Psalms: Structure, Content, and Message, 97f.

<sup>95</sup>Eaton, Psalms, 45; cf. H. Ringgren, The Messiah in the Old Testament, SBT 18 (1956) 19f. See also Mowinckel, Psalms in Israel's Worship I, 167.

<sup>96</sup>Eaton, Psalms, 45.

<sup>97</sup>Matt xxi 16 places Ps viii 2 on the lips of Jesus, and is not of immediate concern. If genuine, it is the only evidence prior to the resurrection that indicates a messianic interpretation. Since the quotation agrees with the LXX rather than the MT, T. W. Manson (Sayings of Jesus, 221) rejects its authenticity.

<sup>98</sup>C. H. Dodd (According to the Scriptures, 32-34) suggested that Ps viii 4-6 belonged to an early collection of Scriptural testimonia concerning Christ. But even granting this thesis, there is some question as to just what constitutes an allusion to the Psalm. E. Best (I Peter, NCB, 148f) and E. G. Selwyn (The First Epistle of St. Peter, 206ff) discuss I Pet iii 21 without mention of Ps viii.

<sup>99</sup>It is not clear whether Paul himself joins the two Psalms or whether he relies on a traditional combination as Dodd (Scriptures, 32-34) suggests. In either case the obvious link between them is the idea of subjection, the recurrent motif being "under his feet." In Ps cx, however, "under his feet" echoes an ancient custom of treating ones enemies (cf. Josh x 24; see, e.g. J. Bright, "The Book of Joshua," IB II 607). In Ps viii, the phrase forms part of a paraphrase of Gen i 26, 28, where הָרַג might be more literally rendered "to tread or trample" as in trampling grapes under foot for wine (cf. von Rad, Genesis, OTL, 58). Also what is subjected differs in the Psalms. Ps cx refers to the king's enemies (hostile nations); Ps viii refers to animals, birds, etc. (the earthly creation). Possibly the two Psalms developed independently, each extending its reference to include the cosmic spiritual powers. Then, recognizing this, Paul or someone before him, applied both to Christ.

(cont.)



But more probably the link existed not so much in what is subjected under foot, as in under whose feet it is subjected, namely the Messiah's.

<sup>100</sup>The rendition of Ps viii 4-6 follows the LXX rather than the MT. For discussion of the passage, see ad loc.: F. F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Hebrews, NICNT; M. Dods, "The Epistle to the Hebrews," ExGT IV; T. Hewitt, The Epistle to the Hebrews TNTC; J. Moffatt, The Epistle to the Hebrews, ICC; H. W. Montefiore, Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, BNTC; A. C. Purdy, "The Epistle to the Hebrews," IB XI; T. H. Robinson, The Epistle to the Hebrews, MNTC. See also Dodd, Scriptures, 19-20, and Borsch, Son of Man, 236-38.

<sup>101</sup>For discussion, see references in n.100. Perhaps there is an oscillation between man and Christ as man's representative.

<sup>102</sup>Dodd (Scriptures, 19 n.1) argues that Christ's being crowned with honor and glory has been prepared for by the citation of Ps cx 1 at i 13. This does seem more likely than a reference to Christ's baptism or transfiguration. For discussion see the commentaries cited in n.100.

<sup>103</sup>Caird, Apostolic Age, 99.

<sup>104</sup>M. Dods (ExGT IV 262f) states with respect to Ps viii in Heb ii that "to our author the scope of the 'all' has been enlarged by the event." In the case of I Cor xv the incorporation of some type of "Son of Man" conception seems likely. The Christ/Adam contrast within such a highly visible apocalyptic background, the association of Ps cx 1 and Dan vii in the gospels, and the actual mention of "man" and the "son of man" in Ps viii 6, all support the suggestion. Of course, the phrase "Son of man" does not appear in the Pauline Corpus and some scholars consider the absence of the phrase means the absence of the idea. But other scholars (e.g. Borsch, Son of Man, 241) believe that terms like "one man," "the man," the "last Adam," and "second man" probably reflect the best translation of an originally Semitic "Son of Man" concept. While we recognize the likelihood of a Son of Man conception having a role here, for our purposes it is not urgent to press the matter. Nor does this likelihood exclude other possible influences. For example, Colpe (BZNW 26:182f) argues that Paul interprets his Son of Man conception in terms of the Hellenistic Heavenly-ideal Man as found, for instance, in Philo. This is quite possible. But when he attempts to deduce from this a Macroanthropos scheme, he goes beyond the evidence. Another alternative may lie in the mysterious character of Melchizedek. In 11QMelch 10 Melchizedek is considered an heavenly being who judges the evil angels (see A. J. B. Higgins, "Is the Son of Man Problem Insoluble?" in Neotestamentica et Semitica, ed. E. E. (cont.)

Ellis and M. Wilcox, 85-87). Would not the Messiah who is after the order of Melchizedek (Ps cx 4) be of the same character? This was perhaps connected to the priestly traditions about the Messiah as found in TLev xviii, where the Messiah defeats Beliar and is implicitly contrasted to Adam (Borsch, Son of Man, 236 n.1, mentions this possibility). It is also noteworthy that Ps viii is closely linked to the Priestly account of creation in Gen i (Anderson, Psalms 1-72, 100). While this is highly speculative, it does point out how much in this area we do not know. Such traditions as these, or others we know nothing about, may influence the interpretation of these Psalms. Nor need these be mutually exclusive of Son of Man traditions. Especially under the impact of a crucified and resurrected Christ, one might expect a certain clustering of Messianic materials, having their center in the event and the person of Christ rather than any coherent tradition history.

<sup>105</sup>Some scholars find grounds here for rejecting Pauline authorship, e.g., Mitton, 75; contrast H. Ridderbos, Paul, An Outline of his Theology, 330.

<sup>106</sup>K. L. Schmidt, TDNT III 513; L. Coenen, DNTT I 305. For further discussion see the respective bibliographies.

<sup>107</sup>Bultmann, I 38f; Ridderbos, 328; Coenen, DNTT I 296f; T. M. Taylor, "Kingdom, Family, Temple, and Body," Interpretation 12 (1958) 175ff; also J. Murphy, "'Ekklesia' and the Septuagint," AER 139 (1958) 381-90; and "The use of 'ekklesia' in the New Testament," AER 140 (1959) 250-59, 325-32.

<sup>108</sup>Cf. Coenen, DNTT I 292f; Murphy, AER 139:389.

<sup>109</sup>G. E. Wright, "The Book of Deuteronomy," IB II 468.

<sup>110</sup>Cf. Murphy, AER 139:384ff; Coenen, DNTT I 293. See, e.g. Ps xxii 23, 26; lxxxix 6; xlix 1.

<sup>111</sup>Cf. Schmidt, TDNT III 527.

<sup>112</sup>Schmidt, TDNT III 529.

<sup>113</sup>Murphy, AER 139:382.

<sup>114</sup>Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People II, 429 n.12 (430).

<sup>115</sup>Murphy, AER 139:387f.

<sup>116</sup>Cf. Schmidt, TDNT III 517f; Conzelmann, Outline, 255.

<sup>117</sup>Ridderbos, 328.

<sup>118</sup>Cf. Coenen, DNTT I 298.

<sup>119</sup>Ibid.

<sup>120</sup>Schmidt, The Church: Key Bible Words, 12f (=TDNT III 508).

<sup>121</sup>Cf. Coenen, DNTT I 298f.

<sup>122</sup>Among those who find Paul's point of departure in the whole Church are Schmidt, TDNT III 506; Bultmann, I 94; Conzelmann, Outline, 255; and Ridderbos, 238. Prominent among those who argue that the local congregation is the starting point are Cerfaux, The Church in the Theology of St. Paul (ET 1959) 109ff and Campbell, Three New Testament Studies, 41-54.

<sup>123</sup>For localized refs. in the singular, see I Thess i 1; II Thess i 1; I Cor i 2, iv 17, vi 4, xi 18, xiv 4, 5, 12, 19, 23, 28, 35; II Cor i 1; Rom xvi 1, 5, 23; Phil iv 15; Phm 2; in the plural, see I Thess ii 14; II Thess i 14; I Cor viii 1, 18, 19, 23, 24, xi 8, 28, xii 13; Gal i 2, 22; Rom xvi 4, 16. The universal Church seems to be in view at I Cor x 32, xi 22, xv 9; Gal i 13; Phil iii 6, and perhaps I Cor xii 28. But these universal references are disputed by Cerfaux. He confines I Cor x 32 and xi 22 to local refs. and contends that I Cor xv 9, Gal i 13, and Phil iii 6 refer to the community in Jerusalem. For criticism of Cerfaux's view, see Ridderbos, 329.

<sup>124</sup>G. Ladd, Theology, 537. R. P. Shedd (Man in Community, 135f) calls this "Hebrew terms of extension."

<sup>125</sup>Cf. Schmidt, TDNT III 506.

<sup>126</sup>Ridderbos (330) fails to bring this point out.

<sup>127</sup>Cf. Best, 132f; Lohse, 69ff; Moule, 78ff.

<sup>128</sup>Cf. Lohse, 76; Moule, 85. It is not so important to determine whether ἐν means "in" or "among," as to recognize that ὑμεῖς refers to the Colossians, who were largely Gentile Christians. For whether it is the Gospel as preached among the Gentiles (Lohse) or Christ's pneumatic presence (e.g. Bornkamm, TDNT IV 820), it involves God's acceptance of people who previously stood (or were thought to stand) outside the scope of God's redemptive activity as revealed in the Torah.

<sup>129</sup>This by no means lessens the importance of the local congregation, but, in fact, enhances it. The process of the Church becoming what it is occurs precisely in the arena of history, and in this arena the basic structures of that end-time community take shape. Thus the individual cannot by-pass the local community for the Church universal. The local community is a manifestation of the Church as an eschatological totality. To divorce oneself from this is to divorce oneself from the totality; to  
(cont.)



deny communal fellowship at this particular level is to deny the communal nature of the eschatological community as such.

<sup>130</sup>The καὶ is omitted by D<sup>2</sup> Ψ and the majority of constant witnesses, along with vg<sup>ms</sup> sy sa<sup>mss</sup> bo<sup>ms</sup>; Cass. However, most of the better texts retain it, p<sup>46</sup> κ A B C (Ⲛ D\* F G) 6 33 81 104\* 365 615 1175 1271<sup>s</sup> 1739 1881 al lat sa<sup>ms</sup> bo.

<sup>131</sup>Cf. Scott, 200.

<sup>132</sup>See below, pp. 251-314.

<sup>133</sup>The intense present effectiveness of Christ's exaltation is striking here. The author views the future not as an imminent parousia, but the "day of redemption" to which believers are already sealed (iv 30). The end is a consummation towards which the Church moves, striving in its inward unity and purity. This understanding was perhaps prompted by reflection on the Church's dynamic nature. The Church is the end-time assembly, only it is this in the mode of becoming it. The end is not yet, and believers must continue in these evil days (v 16) the struggle with the powers of "this present darkness" (vi 12). Ephesians encourages believers not that this struggle will soon end, but that in Christ they have power to survive and persevere these struggles because Christ has won the decisive victory.

<sup>134</sup>As already seen this new humanity results in a new empowered life of spiritual morality (ii 1-10) and, as will be seen, is manifested in the unity of Gentiles and Jews (ii 11-22).

<sup>135</sup>For the first view, see, e.g. Mussner, CAK, 30f; cf. also Hanson, 127; Best, 146; Bruce; Beare. For the second, see Caird, 48; Salmond, 280; G. Howard, "The Head/Body Metaphors in Ephesians," NTS 20 (1974) 353. The third view is held by Schlier, Warnach, Barth, Meyer.

<sup>136</sup>Meyer, 345; cf. also Alford, Beare, Ellicott, and Roels, God's Mission, 105.

<sup>137</sup>Salmond, 280. For discussion of the appositive see, e.g. Robertson, A Grammar, 398-401; H. W. Smyth, Greek Grammar §916, 976-90; W. S. Lasor, Handbook of New Testament Greek II, 201. H. P. B. Nunn, A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek, 40-41.

<sup>138</sup>Salmond, 280; see also L. Radermacher, Neutestamentliche Grammatik H<sub>z</sub>NT 1 (1925) 116.

<sup>139</sup>Apart from refs. to the LXX, this is the only example with two accusatives listed by Lidd-Scott (=Hdt.1. 107). G. B. Winer (A Grammar (cont.))

of the Idiom of the New Testament, s.v.) cites εἰς γυναῖκα δίδωμί σοι αὐτήν (Niceph Constant, 18) as an example of the general increased usage of the double accusative in later Greek. Bauer (193) cites PLille 28, 11, III BC: αὐτοῖς ἐδώκαμεν μεσίτην Δωρίωνα. But while possible, the word order favors Δωρίωνα as a simple appositive. MM also lists PLille 28, 11 as well as some later refs. Cf. also Smyth, Greek Grammar §1614. Δίδωμι + two accusatives occurs in Josephus and Philo. One suspects the influence of the LXX in many places (e.g. Jos. Ant. vi 44, 66; Philo, Leg. All. III 175; Sacr. AC. 9). The marital idiom also occurs (Jos. Ant. v 168; Philo, Mos. I 59). There also seems increased usage of δίδωμι with the cognate δωρεάν and similar words.

<sup>140</sup>When listing verbs that normally take two accusatives, grammarians (see our Bibliography) never list δίδωμι. Only Winer and Smyth (see n.139 above) actually cite examples using our verb when discussing minor points of the predicate accusative.

<sup>141</sup>Van Roon, 179; cf. Barth, 157f. Cf. the translations of the AV, RSV, NEB, JB, Moffatt.

<sup>142</sup>Meyer, 345; Howard, NTS 20:353; cf. NIV.

<sup>143</sup>See above, pp.5, 34.

<sup>144</sup>Cf. BDB, 680f.

<sup>145</sup>Num xiv 4 reads: δῶμεν ἀρχήρον; Neh ix 17: καὶ ἔδωκαν ἀρχήν; Deut i 15: κατέστησα αὐτοῦς ἡγεῖσθαι ἐφ' ὑμῶν χιλιάρχους, κ.τ.λ.; and Deut xxviii 13: καταστήσαι σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου εἰς κεφαλὴν καὶ μὴ εἰς οὐράν.

<sup>146</sup>Cf. H. St. John Thackery, A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek I, 39.

<sup>147</sup>Cf. Best, 146 n.2; for one of the better discussions see Eadie, 98-99.

<sup>148</sup>See the grammars listed in the Bibliography, s.v.

<sup>149</sup>Mayser, Grammatik II 2, 461. Cf. Robertson, A Grammar, 632-33.

<sup>150</sup>B1-D §230; Turner, Grammar of NT Gr. III, 270, and others.

<sup>151</sup>Winer, Grammar of the Idiom, 403.

<sup>152</sup>Cf. Best, 146; Eadie, 99. It might be suggested that ὑπέρ represents the Hebrew לְ. Unlike the case of δίδωμι, however, there is no evidence that ὑπέρ was ever influenced in this manner. The LXX consistently uses ἐπί when it renders לְ with the idea of superintendence (cont.)

(cf. Ex xviii, Deut i 15). Also our author uses ἐπί when this meaning is in view (iv 6) and ὑπέρ when the comparative idea is in mind (iii 20). In i 23 the dative case specifies the domain of κεφαλή. Cf. Ex vii 1; also Hos ii 2 (i 11).

<sup>153</sup>Mussner, CAK, 30f.

<sup>154</sup>Gnilka, 97 n.2; Schlier, Christus, 55 n.1.

<sup>155</sup>Cf. Barth, 176-79.

<sup>156</sup>E.g. Olshausen, ad loc. This view does recognize if a comparison is in view, it involves more than a claim to headship (see below, p.62); but the view ignores the cosmic context.

<sup>157</sup>See Meyer, Eadie, for criticism of such transpositions.

<sup>158</sup>Best, 146.

<sup>159</sup>If πάντα again means "every head," this disposition solves little.

<sup>160</sup>The meaning would then be: God appointed Christ Head with respect to the Church, above everything with respect to which He appointed someone head. The comparison would be between Christ's headship of the Church and let us say, Michael's headship of the angels, or Satan's headship of the evil hosts (assuming, of course, God appointed him).

<sup>161</sup>Whether one defines this as two distinct but related headships, or one headship with two dimensions (or perhaps domains), is less important than recognizing the unique character of Christ's headship of the Church in relation to the cosmos. Howard (NTS 20:353f) especially misses this point.

<sup>162</sup>See Appendix B, 342-73, passim.

<sup>163</sup>For discussion see Schlier, TDNT III 679f; Brown, DNTT II 159ff; F. F. Bruce, 1 & 2 Corinthians, NCB, 103ff; H. Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, 183f; Craig, "The First Epistle to the Corinthians," IB X 124ff, F. W. Grosheide, First Epistle to the Corinthians, NICNT, 249ff, J. Hering, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians, 102ff; Moffatt, I Corinthians, MCNT, 151ff; Robertson and Plummer, I Corinthians, ICC, 229ff; J. Weiss, Der Erste Korintherbrief, 269ff; Barrett, I Corinthians, ad loc.; S. Bedale, "The Meaning of κεφαλή in the Pauline Epistles," JTS n.s. 5 (1954) 211-15; W. Schmithals, Gnosticism in Corinth, 237-43; M. D. Hooker, "Authority on her Head; an Examination of I Cor. xi 10," NTS 10 (1963/64) 410ff; W. J. Martin, "I Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," Apostolic History and the Gospel, 231-41.



<sup>164</sup>While κεφαλή has the connotations of "origin" and "source" (and as we shall suggest further, "purpose" and "goal"), it is nevertheless supremacy and authority that is the issue here. These broader connotations provide a conceptual basis for understanding this authority, not a replacement for it. Thus one should hesitate to translate simply "origin" or "source," as Bruce, op.cit., 103 and Bedale, JTS n.s. 5:211ff.

<sup>165</sup>Thus it is not σῶμα but εἰκών and δόξα as related to God's creative acts, that are pivotal to the argument. Cf. Schlier, TDNT III 679f.

<sup>166</sup>This generally recalls OT and LXX usage (see App. B, 346f, 356, 371-73). Paul does bring out a nuance less clear in those writings, i.e. the idea "goal" or "purpose of being." Κεφαλή itself had latent associations with τέλος. Especially in an atmosphere that correlates Urzeit and Endzeit would the ideas intermingle and define one another. Here purpose defines what shows a being's true nature to be continually dependent on its source.

<sup>167</sup>Perhaps pictured here is an archetypal Man who is the beginning and end of every man. Cf. Bruce, 1 & 2 Corinthians, 182; Conzelmann, I Corinthians, 183; J. Weiss, Der Erste Korintherbrief, 269f. Conzelmann thinks that κεφαλή and εἰκών are identified in terms of substance. But κεφαλή with its OT connotations of priority of being need not imply an identity via substance. If Schlier (TDNT III 679) defines woman's relation to man as ontological, it depends on how one understands "ontological." In her dependency on man, woman is ontologically distinct from man. The relation between them cannot be construed simply as substance, since God's acts give woman's "substance" a distinct ontological shape. The key then concerns God-willed relations, which may or may not be related via substance. This is why Paul can move so easily between divine and human figures.

<sup>168</sup>The literature on the hymnic nature of Col i 15-20 is abundant. H. S. Gabathuler in Jesus Christus, Haupt der Kirche - Haupt der Welt provides a critical history of interpretation. For a convenient bibliography see Lohse, 41. Cf. also C. F. Burney, "Christ as the ARCHE of Creation," JTS 27 (1926) 160-77 (cf. Davies, 150-9); B. Vawter, "The Colossians Hymn and the Principle of Redaction," CBQ 33 (1977) 66-81. For a recent criticism of this approach see J. C. O'Neill, "The Source of the Christology in Colossians," NTS 26 (1979) 87-100.

<sup>169</sup>The ideas of pre-existence, mediation of creation, and certain key terms, εἰκών, πρωτότοκος, ἀρχή, are largely explained from

(cont.)

Hellenistic-Jewish sources. In particular the verses show an affinity with Philonic Logos conceptions and Jewish Wisdom speculations. But the mention of the resurrection (vs. 18b) and the reconciliation of all things (vs. 20) are distinctly Christian motifs. See, e.g. Lohse, 41ff; Schweizer, Neotestamentica, 293ff; Martin, 65; and in general Gabathuler. Attempts to prove an inner Jewish background (Burney, Lohmeyer) or to demonstrate dependency on a Gnostic Urmensch conception have generally failed. More and more scholars suggest that the categories of "Hellenistic," "Gnostic" and "Jewish" cannot in every case be rigidly maintained. Some scholars (e.g. Martin, Ernst) see the ideas here as incipient or proto-Gnosticism. But, it is often difficult to distinguish between a truly "gnostic" tendency and what was adopted and used differently by those later sects.

<sup>170</sup>Schweizer, Neotestamentica, 295, NTS 8:7; Käsemann, Essays, 149ff; Lohse, 53; Martin, 59; Ernst, 77; and others.

<sup>171</sup>Schweizer, Neotestamentica, 314; TDNT VII 1076; NTS 8:10-11.

<sup>172</sup>A popular view going back to E. Norden (Agnostos Theos, 251) is to divide the passage into two strophes: (1) Christ and creation (vss. 15-17 or 18a) and (2) Christ and the Church (or perhaps 'new creation') (vss. 18a or 18b-20). Among recent proponents are Lohse, 41ff; Hegermann, 92f; J. M. Robinson, "A Formal Analysis of Colossians I 15-20," JBL 76 (1957) 270-87; P. Ellingworth, "Colossians I. 15-20 and its Context," ExT 73 (1961/62) 252. Bammel ("Versuch zu Kol 1:15-20" ZNW 52, 1961, 88ff) also adapts a twofold structure, but detects an elaborate chiasmus (cf. Houlden, 157-62). More recently Schweizer (Neotestamentica, 293ff) has argued for a threefold structure with the captions of creation (vss. 15-16b), preservation (16d-18a), and redemption (18b-20). Martin (64) and Ernst (72-83) also opt for this view. For our purposes, the question hinges on where one places vs. 18a in the arrangement, with the preceding cosmic statements, or the ensuing salvific statements.

<sup>173</sup>See n.170 for those who take the verse cosmically. J. M. Robinson (JBL 76:280-82) opts for transposition and Masson (ad loc.) for elimination.

<sup>174</sup>Cf. N. Kehl (Der Christushymnus im Kolosserbrief, 28-51, esp. 43) who discusses this possibility, but opts for a "Grundform" that includes vss. 13-14 and 17-18a. Käsemann (Essays, 152ff) and Vawter (CBQ 33:74ff) suggest that vss. 13-14 belong to a first redaction, but do not discuss this as to vss. 17-18a.

<sup>175</sup>For the essential unity between the Body concept of the undisputed letters and of Colossians, see Benoit, 18ff; Best, 115-38; Percy,

(cont.)



Leib Christi, 47ff. The issue hinges partly on how one understands the concept in the undisputed letters; e.g., Hegermann (Schöpfungsmittler, 138ff) affirms the agreement, but believes a Macroanthropos scheme underlies both. Others see the influence of the Macroanthropos scheme as a later post-Pauline development, providing the rationale for Col's universal picture of the Church. Instead of the false teachers' "physical understanding of Christ's permeation of the cosmos," the author reinterprets the Macroanthropos scheme in Pauline terms, "relating it to the Church's mission to the world" (Schweizer, NTS 8:9; cf. Lohse, ad loc.). But if the Church is universal, it cannot be immediately identified with the cosmos. Demonic beings, unbelievers, inanimate nature, not to mention the difficulty of seeing what dying and rising with Christ would mean to good angels, strongly suggest that the Church is best understood as redeemed humanity. So how was the cosmic scheme limited in this way? Schweizer acknowledges that the impetus comes from Paul (NTS 8:8f). If so, where is the influence of the Aion conception? Schweizer finds this in Christ penetrating the world through the gospel. But if Christ has been identified with the world-penetrating Logos, this need not entail the author's (or for that matter the false teachers') adaption of an Aion scheme. Hellenistic Judaism is familiar with a world-penetrating principle without the added adjunct of a Macroanthropos scheme. Besides, in the Aion scheme, the Logos permeates the Body; there is little here to suggest that the cosmos is permeated by the Head-Logos by means of a body. For this, Schweizer (Neotestamentica, 314f) again points to Paul's view of the body and significantly not to the Aion scheme. Thus, in its essential ingredients, the Col Body concept is independent of the Macroanthropos concept. We have proposed that the Church's cosmic role and implications are best seen, not as the result of a re-interpreted Macroanthropos scheme, but as the outgrowth of a New Adam theology. The Church as Christ's Body has cosmic implications because the corporate Christ represents the new redeemed humanity, man restored to his proper position in the world. Unlike the Aion scheme, this places man's relation to the cosmos, esp. the cosmic powers, and his relation to his fellow man, esp. the unity between Gentiles and Jews, within the framework of Christ's redemptive work as the New Adam. See below, pp.71-91.

<sup>176</sup>See below, 100-2.

<sup>177</sup>Cf. Moule, 92ff; also below, 101.

<sup>178</sup>Benoit (39) proposes this view, but see Ernst's criticism (101ff).



<sup>179</sup>Van Roon (290) argues that κεφαλή "is a messianic predicate that presupposes humiliation and sorrow." Attractive as this is, the term seems too general to bear such specific theological weight. To be sure, the author could have recognized the Messianic import of the word in LXX Ps xviii and the other places van Roon cites. But this is different from positing a widespread Messianic usage, having a specific content.

<sup>180</sup>Cf. Lohse, 99ff.

<sup>181</sup>Bedale, JTS n.s. 5:214.

<sup>182</sup>Historically a Christology of divine appointment preceded that of pre-existence. It does not necessarily follow, however, that pre-existence is theologically extraneous to or imposed on a theology of appointment. Pre-existence could well be the logical consequence of appointment. Cf. M. Hengel, The Son of God, 67ff. Caird (175-76) denies that Christ's pre-existence is in view at Col i 15-20.

<sup>183</sup>For the use of σκία/σῶμα, see Best, 121. Best rightly notes that a reference to the Church is not only unnecessary, but grammatically difficult. The question, then, hinges upon whether the author intended a certain play on words. Lohse (116f) considers the choice of σῶμα over εἰκὼν as significant; cf. Martin, 91f.

<sup>184</sup>Cf. Lohse, 116-17. Lohse rightly sees that the accent is on the "definitive end of the regulations," but goes too far in denying their former conditional status as promise. The shadow/reality imagery is congenial to this, and the mention of τῶν μελλόντων.

<sup>185</sup>The fall of man or creation is not mentioned in Col i 15-20 or elsewhere in Colossians. Yet the very concept of reconciliation implies the world's degenerate nature. As it is unlikely that the author thought God created the world in its present evil state, the idea of a "fall" is probably a silent presupposition of the letter and the hymn. That God acts to secure the salvation of creation shows that God has the power and authority to accomplish his intended purpose for creation. Reconciliation becomes an essential component of that purpose once the world is seen as subjected to sin, death, and chaos.

<sup>186</sup>Cf. Lohse, 121; Beare, 204f; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1074.

<sup>187</sup>Lohse, 122; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1074; contrast Dibelius and Scott.

<sup>188</sup>See above, pp. 65-67.

<sup>189</sup>The image reflects ancient popular physiology. Lightfoot (ad loc.) has gathered the evidence from medical texts of the era. Semitic (cont.)

presuppositions about man may also have a role here. Cf. Caird, 200. See below pp.77-91 and ch. III.

<sup>190</sup>Best, 127-28.

<sup>191</sup>Cf. Lohse, 121.

<sup>192</sup>For discussion and literature see: Schlier, TDNT III 681f; Hanson, 123ff; Barth, 89ff; Ernst, 100ff; Mussner, CAK, 64-71.

<sup>193</sup>Hanson, 123.

<sup>194</sup>For examples see Schlier, TDNT III 681f.

<sup>195</sup>Ibid. This explains how the term comes to mean "repeat," and "bring to a conclusion." The latter suits the context at LXX Ps lxxi 20 (Θ and Quinta) and Barn v 11, better than "the gathering of things" (contra Schlier).

<sup>196</sup>E.g. Hanson, 123; Käsemann, Romans, 360f; cf. Barrett, Romans, 251; Black, Romans, 162.

<sup>197</sup>For a survey of the alternatives see Barth, 89ff. Cf. above n.192.

<sup>198</sup>RSV, Bauer, 55f; Mitton, 56f; Robinson, 32f. Conzelmann (61) attempts to combine the ideas "renew" and "unite."

<sup>199</sup>Barth, 91; Ernst, 192; Schlier, TDNT III 682; B. Rigaux, "Révélation des mystères et perfection à Qumran et dans le NT," NTS 4 (1957/58) 256; Benoit, "L'unité de l'Église selon l'Épître aux Éphésiens," AnBib 17 (1963) 65.

<sup>200</sup>The view goes back to the Fathers: Tertullian, Irenaeus, Jerome, Ambrosiaster. Cf. Thomas. The Peshitta, Old Latin, and Vulgate translate "instaurare" or "recapitulare." Hanson (123f) and Mussner (CAK, 64-71) are among recent proponents. For discussion, see Barth, 90.

<sup>201</sup>Cf. Burney, JTS 27 (1926) 176; Holliday, Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the OT, 329.

<sup>202</sup>Ernst, 192; Gnllka, 80; Schlier, TDNT III 682; Barth, 91.

<sup>203</sup>Davies (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 57) thinks that Rabbinic speculations on Adam's body underlie the usage here. Cf. also M. Black, "Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," SJT 7 (1954) 176. But these parallels are not strictly to the point: Eph i 10 concerns not only "essential oneness of mankind," but also things in heaven. Hanson (123ff) maintains that the idea of representation forms the basis of the verse. But as Gnllka (80) points out: "das wiederstreitet dem Kontext, nach dem Christus nicht das All repräsentiert, sondern ihm gegenübersteht." Nor is  
(cont.)



it likely that Christ is considered a Macroanthropos. The verb does not actually mean "to gather into one place." But granting such a meaning, it is unlikely that Christ could be so extensively identified with the cosmos, which is otherwise subjected to him (i 22) or in contention with him (vi 10ff).

<sup>204</sup>Schlier, TDNT III 690; Mussner, Best, and others.

<sup>205</sup>Cf. Roels, God's Mission, 66.

<sup>206</sup>The Second Man from Heaven probably refers to the resurrected Christ (Scroggs, Last Adam, 88; Bruce, 1 & 2 Corinthians, 153). Cullmann (Christology, 167ff), Moffatt (I Corinthians, 262f), and others relate I Cor xv 45ff to the Philonic contrast between the Heavenly-ideal Man and the earthly first man (Leg.All. I 31f; Op.Mund. 134ff). For a different view see Scroggs, 87f, 115ff. See also B. A. Stegmann, Christ, the Man from Heaven.

Wisdom and Adam are already associated in Wis x 1ff, where Wisdom saves Adam, the father of the world, giving him strength to "rule all things." Also of note is I En xlix 1-4 where Wisdom fills the Elect One (i.e. the Son of Man) (cf. Lohse, 48). If the New Adam theology is linked to the Son of Man, then this facilitates this figure's assumption of Wisdom's cosmic attributes. In Philo the concepts of Wisdom, Logos, and the Heavenly Man or the Man after the image, are interlaced (Leg.All. 146f) (on the problem, see A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Philo's Heavenly Man," NT 15, 1973, 301-26).

That Christ is brought into close association with these ideas is evinced elsewhere in the NT; I Cor i 30, Jn i 1-14. Also most scholars agree that Col i 15ff shows influence from Wisdom or Logos motifs. See Martin, 65; Lohse, 45ff; Kehl, Christushymnus, 61-85, 99ff; F. B. Craddock, "All things in Him," NTS 12 (1965/66) 78-80; Moule; Caird; Schweizer; and others. The difficulty is moving from this general environment to specific links and literary dependency.

<sup>207</sup>Apparently Philo makes something like this series of associations in calling the Logos the Head of all things (Quaest. in Ex. II 17), being allegorically identified with the High Priest who wears the cosmos as his robe. Kehl (Christushymnus, 96f) denies the statement's authenticity; van Roon (271 n.1) denies the presence of a Macroanthropos conception. Kehl's arguments seem insufficient and van Roon overlooks the mention of "feet and other limbs." Still, it is transporting a lot into this text to identify the High Priest with the Heavenly Man. The allegorical context should not be ignored.



<sup>208</sup>Schweizer, Neotestamentica, 282 and van Roon, 290.

<sup>209</sup>See above, p45f. LXX Ps cix refers to the triumphant lifting of the Messiah's "head," which contrasts the defeat of enemy heads. "Lifting the head," understood from Hebrew anthropology, means more than the anatomical gesture. It denotes in this context the person's exaltation in victory. Cf. van Roon, 289f.

<sup>210</sup>Bauer, 587. A form of ὁστις occurs 4 times in Ephesians (i 23, iii 12, iv 19, vi 2) and in each case it carries this qualifying force. Cf. Roels, 234 n.22.

<sup>211</sup>Lightfoot, 157, 198-201; Barth, 186-92.

<sup>212</sup>Barth, 188.

<sup>213</sup>Barth, 190.

<sup>214</sup>Cf. e.g. Barth, 28f; 183ff. See below ch. IV, 298, 309f.

<sup>215</sup>See Appendix B, 364-66, 369.

<sup>216</sup>See Appendix B, 364-66, 369.

<sup>217</sup>Cf. Appendix B, 365f, 371f.

<sup>218</sup>Schlier, 92.

<sup>219</sup>Schlier, Christus, 46.

<sup>220</sup>Schlier, Christus, 42-48.

<sup>221</sup>Schlier, 92.

<sup>222</sup>Cf. Colpe, BZNW 26:176.

<sup>223</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1075-77 and generally in Neotestamentica, 293-301; cf. Schlier, 93. Both scholars rely on Orphic Frag. 168, but differ on how this was understood by the Colossian opponents.

<sup>224</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1077 n.491.

<sup>225</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1075f.

<sup>226</sup>Ibid. Cf. also Gniska, 102-105.

<sup>227</sup>See Appendix B, 358-69.

<sup>228</sup>Ridderbos, Outline, 382f.

<sup>229</sup>Benoit, RB 63:22-31.

<sup>230</sup>Benoit, 24f; cf. Dupont, Gnosis, 450ff.

<sup>231</sup>Ridderbos (381 n.66) considers such a combination unlikely. But he simply ignores the cross-cultural environment in which our author writes.

<sup>232</sup>See Appendix C, 375-82.

<sup>233</sup>Best, 95-106; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1072; Neotestamentica, 287-90; Shedd, 157ff; Percy, 40-44; Gnilya, 101; J. A. T. Robinson, 58ff. See also Appendix C, 378, 381f.

<sup>234</sup>See above, pp.65-70.

<sup>235</sup>See generally J. de Fraine, Adam and the Family of Man, and Appendix A.

<sup>236</sup>See Appendix A for a definition.

<sup>237</sup>The rationale for finding love as the basis for such a corporate relationship may well have been suggested by re-interpreting the love-commandment via Christ's sacrificial love displayed on the cross.

<sup>238</sup>See Appendix B, 369.

<sup>239</sup>Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 24; Schlier, TDNT III 679.

<sup>240</sup>He That Cometh, 70. Cf. Pedersen, I-II, 174.

<sup>241</sup>See Appendix B, 373.

<sup>242</sup>See Appendix B, 346-7.

<sup>243</sup>Jacob, TDNT IX 624ff. H. W. Robinson ("Hebrew Psychology," The People and the Book, ed. A. S. Peake, 353-82) speaks of a diffusion of consciousness. But this view is exaggerated; for criticism see A. R. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, 1-2, 37-87. Cf. also J. Pedersen, I-II, 99-181; J. A. T. Robinson, 11-16; and H. W. Wolff, Anthropology of the Old Testament. See Appendix B, 344.

<sup>244</sup>Cf. Wolff, Anthropology, 8; and generally 10-79.

<sup>245</sup>See Appendix B, 343-46.

<sup>246</sup>E.g. IQH VIII 32ff, Matt v 29-30. See Appendix B, 347, 350.

<sup>247</sup>Can one also say that without the Body there can be no Head? The usual way this question is framed implies that the Head needs the Body for its life and vice versa. This shows that the questioner still sees the Body as the trunk. In fact the Body is always the whole Body, including the Head, and so the question is tautologous. Without the Body there would be no Head, because the whole Body always includes the Head. Without  
(cont.)

the Church, Christ cannot have a relation to the Church. But this differs from saying Christ needs the Church. That draws conclusions from the image that the author would not have drawn.

<sup>248</sup>For literature see the bibliographies in Delling, TDNT VI 286, 298; Barth, 414-17; J. D. Baldwin, DNTT I 744; Ernst, xii. In addition to works cited there, see also A. Anwander, "Zu Kol. 2, 9," BZ 9 (1965) 278-80; P. D. Overfield, "Pleroma: A Study in Content and Context," NTS 25 (1978/79) 384-96; R. Yates, "A Re-examination of Eph. I, 23," ExT 83 (1972) 146-51.

<sup>249</sup>Lightfoot, 257; C. F. D. Moule, "'Fullness' and 'Full' in the New Testament," SJT 4 (1951) 79; Schippers, DNTT I 733; Ernst, 1; Delling, TDNT VI 283 n.1.

<sup>250</sup>B1-D §109(2); Delling, TDNT VI 298 n.1.

<sup>251</sup>Cf. Lightfoot, 257-58; Robinson, 256-58.

<sup>252</sup>Lightfoot, 257-73.

<sup>253</sup>Robinson, 255-63.

<sup>254</sup>E.g. Barth, 206; Yates, ExT 83:146; Ernst, 3, 288.

<sup>255</sup>Delling, TDNT VI 298f; cf. Ernst, 2-3.

<sup>256</sup>Ernst, xx.

<sup>257</sup>As early as Thales we find the idea, πάντα πλήρη θεῶν (Arist., An. I 5, 411a 7; cf. Plato, Leg. X 899B). The statement reflects the Pre-socratic attempt to discover the world's single divine Urstoff. The plural θεῶν suggests that each thing is full as a particular manifestation of the one ultimate element. In contrast to Platonic idealism and Aristotelian teleology, the Stoics renewed the philosophical search for a material basis for the world. See Ernst, 7f; F. Copleston, A History of Philosophy I, Part I, 38-44, 54-63, Part II, 129-44, 165-81; W. K. C. Guthrie, The Greek Philosophers, 22-42.

<sup>258</sup>The Stoics are especially indebted to the cosmology of Heraclitus of Ephesus, who identified the Urstoff with Fire and linked this to the Logos. Copleston, I, II 132f.

<sup>259</sup>Ernst, 11; Overfield, NTS 25:309; van Roon, 229. Knox (163) speculates that cosmic use of πλήρωμα goes back to Posidonius, but offers no proof. It seems likely that the cosmic use in the Corpus Hermeticum had a prehistory. Still, only in post NT texts does πλήρωμα appear with a cosmic content.



<sup>260</sup>Cf. Ernst, 14f; Overfield, NTS 25:309f; Delling, TDNT VI 300.

<sup>261</sup>Ernst, 15.

<sup>262</sup>Dupont (458, cf. 437f) rightly takes πλήρωμα as passive here.

<sup>263</sup>E.g. Cor. Herm. IX 4; see Ernst, 18; Dupont, 460.

<sup>264</sup>Overfield, NTS 25:384f.

<sup>265</sup>Cf. Iren. Adv. Haer. I, I 3; Hipp. Ref. VIII 9-10; Epiph. Haer. xxxi 10, 13; 13, 6. See Overfield, NTS 25:385ff.

<sup>266</sup>Cf. Lohse, 359.

<sup>267</sup>E.g. Epiph. Haer. xxxi 16, 1; Cl.Al. Ex. Theod. 22, 4; 42, 1; Iren. Adv. Haer. I, I, 1, 3.

<sup>268</sup>Cf. Lohse, 57; Overfield, NTS 25:386.

<sup>269</sup>For the myth as a whole in the Valentinian systems see e.g. Iren. Adv. Haer. I, I 1-7; Hipp. Ref. VI 29-36; Cl.Al. Ex. Theod. 29-68; Epiph. Haer. xxxf. The Tripartate Tractate seems to be based on the Valentinian system; H. W. Attridge/E. H. Pagels, The Nag Hammadi Library (=NHL), 54f.

<sup>270</sup>Cf. Overfield, NTS 25:386.

<sup>271</sup>Lohse, 57.

<sup>272</sup>Lightfoot, 267.

<sup>273</sup>Ibid.

<sup>274</sup>Cl.Al. Ex. Theod. 64. Cf. Barth, 202.

<sup>275</sup>We do not deny the religiosity of Greek philosophy. But while the philosopher in describing the world and its principles points to the ideal life, he does not claim a system of salvation whose origin transcends the world as known through reason.

<sup>276</sup>This involves, of course, the larger problem concerning the origin of Gnosticism. See esp. R. McL. Wilson, Gnosis and the NT and The Gnostic Problem.

<sup>277</sup>Wilson, Gnosis and the NT, 56f; Best, 148; Ernst, 48.

<sup>278</sup>E.g. Ecc iv 6; LXX Ps xxiii 1. See Delling, TDNT VI 299; Ernst, 22ff.

<sup>279</sup>Note here the customary Jewish expression for all things, "heaven and earth." Cf. Ernst, 28.

<sup>280</sup>Ernst, 28; Bieder, TDNT VI 370-72. The understanding of πνεῦμα as the power that holds all things together, τὸ συνέχον τὰ πάντα, probably stems from stoic speculations. Still the motivation is altogether different, and there is no attempt to identify God and world through filling it with the divine substance. The spirit remains subject to God, being the instrument of His perception.

<sup>281</sup>LXX Isa vi 1, 3; Ez xliii 5, xliiv 4; Hab ii 14; Pss xxxii 5, lxxi 19; Sir xlii 15-16; cf. Ps xlvii 11; Num xiv 21. See Ernst, 24-30.

<sup>282</sup>Hab ii 14; Num xiv 21; cf. also 1QM XIX 4.

<sup>283</sup>Angels are even needed to bring prayers to the Most Holy (Tob xii 15).

<sup>284</sup>Cf. Ernst, 28f.

<sup>285</sup>Ernst, 29.

<sup>286</sup>Ernst, 31f. Πλήρωμα does not occur often and then with secular meanings.

<sup>287</sup>Cf. Delling, TDNT VI 289; Ernst, 33; Dupont, 470f. This is incorporated into his Platonism. Perhaps Posidonius had already prepared this path; see Copleston I, II 204. But Philo had a vested interest because of Jewish belief in a transcendent creator God.

<sup>288</sup>E.g. Post.Cain. 14; Vit.Mos. II 238; Quaest. in Gen. IV 130. Even the titles "God" and "Lord" designate the two main powers or attributes of God in creation and rule, rather than titles of God in Himself (Som. I 62). Cf. Knox, 50 n.3. See also, Delling, TDNT VI 289f; Ernst, 34f; Sandmel, Philo, 91f.

<sup>289</sup>Philo attempts to synthesize the insights of philosophy with those of revealed religion. Cf. Knox, 27f; Sandmel, Philo, 124; Copleston I, II 202f.

<sup>290</sup>For differences between Logos and Sophia in Philo, see A. J. M. Wedderburn, NT 15:301-26.

<sup>291</sup>Cf. Knox, 164. For further texts and discussion see Kleinknecht, TDNT IV 88-90. God, of course, transcends His powers, attributes, and the Logos. If, e.g. God is called light, then the word (Logos) "light" is πληρεστάτος, i.e. He fills the "word" with the power to generate light (Som. I 75 on Gen i 3). Cf. Schweizer, Kol. on i 19, ad loc.

<sup>292</sup>Cf. Delling, TDNT VI 299. Contrast Ernst, 31.

<sup>293</sup>Cf. Knox, 164 n.7.

<sup>294</sup>Knox, 51.

<sup>295</sup>Ibid. Cf. Sandmel, Philo, 93.

<sup>296</sup>For texts and discussion see Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 170f.

<sup>297</sup>Besides the Shekhinah (dwelling), there is the Word (Memra), the Great Glory, the Holy Spirit, and others. Cf. Caird, 181.

<sup>298</sup>See J. T. Marshall, HDB IV 487-89; s.v. Encyclopedia Judaica XIV 1349-54; Ernst, 37-40. The term on occasions has universal overtones: the Shekhinah shines like the sun over the world (Sanh 39a) and is everywhere (Baba bat 25a). If it appears to Moses in a thorn bush, this shows that there is no place it cannot be (NumR xii 4; ExR ii 5, Shab 67a). But it also refers to the divine presence manifested at any given place or time. It dwells pre-eminently in Israel or the temple (Ber 7a; Shab 22b; NumR vii 8; Mek Ex xii 1). But also more personally, it is present among any ten who gather for prayer, when two study, or one meditates on the Torah (ExR ii 2, Ber 6a). It watches over the sick (Shab 12b) or rests between a worthy man and wife (Sot 17a). Especially when associated with charismatic individuals, is it linked to Ru'ah ha-Kodesh.

<sup>299</sup>For discussion of NT texts, see Ernst, 66ff; Overfield, NTS 25:390ff.

<sup>300</sup>Overfield, NTS 25:390f.

<sup>301</sup>M. Hooker, "John's Prologue and the Messianic Secret," NTS 25 (1978/79) 54ff. Hooker suggests that "full of grace and truth" echoes two of what later Rabbis considered exposition of God's thirteen attributes in Ex xxxiii 19 and xxxiv 6.

<sup>302</sup>Πλήρωμα occurs in I Cor x 26 in a citation of LXX Ps xxiii 1. At Rom xi 12, 25 it denotes the "full number" of Gentiles and Jews, whereas in xiii 10 love is the "fulfillment" of the Law. Also in xv 29 Paul promises to come ἐν πλήρωματι εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ; these are the blessings of the new life in Christ. In Gal iv 4 πλήρωμα denotes the completion of a time period. See Ernst, 68-81; Overfield, NTS 25:391. In these cases, it is not so much the term as the new context of the Christ event that determines its theological import.

<sup>303</sup>Even in Col and Eph the terms do not always bear the semi-technical sense. At Col i 25 and iv 17 the verb means "fulfilling" a divine task. In Col i 19 it denotes being filled with knowledge and insight in all wisdom; and in Eph v 18, with the Spirit as opposed to wine. Πλήρωμα  
(cont.)



also has at Eph i 10 its ordinary temporal meaning; see Moule "'Fullness' and 'Fill' in the New Testament," SJT 4 (1951) 82; Overfield, NTS 25:391.

<sup>304</sup>Van Roon, 299.

<sup>305</sup>Best, 140.

<sup>306</sup>Cf. Best, 148; Wilson, Gnosis and the NT, 57. The idea may, then, be more personal than spatial. In the NT a person may be filled with joy (Acts xiii 52; Rom xv 3; II Tim i 4), wisdom (Acts vi 3, cf. Lk ii 40), knowledge (Rom xv 14, cf. Col i 9), faith (Acts vi 5, xi 24), grace (Acts vi 8, cf. Jn i 14), the Holy Spirit (Acts vi 3, 5; vii 55; xi 24; Eph v 18). Cf. Dupont, 469.

<sup>307</sup>For the hymnic character of Col i 15-20, see above p.65f.

<sup>308</sup>The soteriological starting point lies in the incarnated Christ, i.e. the man Jesus. This probably evinces a New Adam theology; cf. Martin, 59; R. H. Fuller, Foundations of New Testament Christology, 215f; Houlden, 47; Ridderbos, 388; van Roon, 245.

<sup>309</sup>It is simpler to take πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα as subject throughout the verse than to supply "God." Making God the subject supposedly avoids the harshness of an impersonal πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα reconciling all things and allows a smoother transition to the masculine participle, εἰρηνοποίησας. Cf. Lightfoot, Lohmeyer, G. Schrenk, TDNT II, 741; Delling, TDNT VI, 303f; Mussner, CAK, 58 n.89; Roels, 237f; Martin, 60. But this too has difficulties. It requires πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα to be the subject of κατοικήσαι, thus causing κατοικήσαι and ἀποκαταλλάξαι to depend on the same verb but to have two different subjects (Schweizer, Kol. ad loc.). If πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα is a periphrastic expression for God, then the subject of reconciliation is impersonal in grammatical form, but not actuality, and the transition to the masculine participle may be considered as constructio ad sensum. See Abbott, 128; Dibelius, 13; Percy, Problem, 76 n.22; Lohse, 57; Munderlein, NTS 8:266; van Roon, 245 n.1.

<sup>310</sup>G. Munderlein (NTS 8:266) argues that εὐδοκεῖν ἐν is a special phrase "zur Bezeichnung des gnädigen wohlgefallens Gottes gegen Menschen das gleichzusetzen ist mit Erwählung." Grammatically this requires the phrase to be a Semitism and Munderlein (268f) translates: "Denn ihn erwählte sich die ganze Fülle zur Wohnung." For criticism, see Lohse, 59 n.193. For our purposes it is sufficient to note that εὐδοκεῖν implies election, even if indirectly.

<sup>311</sup>This is the most generally accepted view; Abbott, Alford, Beare, Best (141), Caird, Houlden, Knox (163f), Lohse, Martin, Moule (165),  
(cont.)

Overfield (393), Schweizer, Scott and others. While these scholars often differ in detail, the fundamental starting point is the relation between God and Christ. Other interpretations vie for acceptance. Among the Church Fathers Severianus and Theodoret refer the term to the Church, and Schleiermacher argues similarly on the basis of Rom xi 12, 25, 26; see Abbott, 219f. Another ancient view refers the term to the cosmos; this has modern support in Dupont (474) and Roels (238f). Based on the stoic idea that God fills and is filled by the cosmos, Benoit (RB 63:34-38) refers the term to the God-cosmos (cf. Ernst's discussion, 83-94). In Christ the totality of Being resides; he represents the God-intended unity between God and cosmos, the new creation that constitutes le cadre of redeemed humanity (37f). But πλήρωμα as the God-cosmos is not attested before the Corpus Hermeticum and even there the usage is not uniform (cf. Tractate VI 4, where a clearcut dualism emerges). The absence of this meaning in earlier texts must be coupled with the fact that the stoic use of πληροῦν and πλήρης had long since been taken up by Hellenistic Judaism and applied in a somewhat different direction. When the Hellenistic-Jewish background of Col i 15-20 is noted, it is likely that the term, even if borrowed from popular philosophy, would assume the Jewish presuppositions of the verb. Benoit (36f) admits that the author has adjusted the idea to the Biblical perspective of a transcendent God, but fails to see that such admission calls into question the pantheistic conception on which his thesis rests, i.e. the reciprocal filling of God and cosmos. Nor does this view explain the use of πᾶν very well. Notably these other interpretations require God or Christ to be supplied as subject of the verse. Despite the difficulties of the generally accepted view it remains the best alternative.

<sup>312</sup>Perhaps gnostic ideas have influenced the language here and in Ephesians. As in Gnosticism the terms are related to a divine reality which is communicated to believers, and involves a redeemer figure who, e.g., in Eph iv 8-10 descends and ascends. Still it is difficult to define what gnostic influence might mean; important differences remain. While in Eph iv 8ff we do have a descending and ascending redeemer, there is no suggestion that this descent and ascent are actually from and to the πλήρωμα (Hegermann). This point is compounded by the further absence of the characteristic idea that the πλήρωμα is restored to its original unity. Also it has not yet been shown that the Gnostics would have ever spoken of a reconciliation of τὰ πάντα or connected the descent-ascent motif with filling τὰ πάντα (cf. Schweizer, TDNT 1072 n.74; Neotestamentica, 304; Lohse, 60 n.205). Finally, the gnostic conceptions are

(cont.)

ultimately based on ontological dualism of substance; i.e. spirit and matter, which is foreign to the ethical dualism of godly and anti-godly will, in Colossians and Ephesians. Perhaps these terms are used polemically against such gnostic views. If so, the polemic is waged against an early stage of the gnostic conception. Very little suggests the more advanced idea in the minds of either the author or the readers.

<sup>313</sup>The origin and exact nature of the Colossian "philosophy" continues to be a source of debate. See the introductions and excurses of the commentaries and literature cited there. The syncretistic character of the teaching is usually acknowledged, though scholars divide over whether it is an esoteric Judaism or proto-Gnosticism. In either case certain believers had difficulty finding significant cosmic content in the Christian teaching of forgiveness of sins (cf. Lohse, 130). The author presses home the inseparability of the uniqueness of Christ's person and the all sufficiency of his work. Upon this inseparability rests the sufficiency and dynamic of the gospel. We have suggested that a New Adam theology provides a framework for relating Christ's reconciliation of God and man to that of the cosmos.

<sup>314</sup>Lohse (130) states: "...only through submissive worship of angelic powers is the way opened to Christ who is enthroned beyond the powers and principalities." Even so, the insight and wisdom implied in such submission does not come from the gospel of Christ's person and work, thus making its adherents superior to other Christians. However, F. O. Francis in "Visionary Discipline and Scriptural Tradition at Colossae," *LexThQ* 2 (1967) 71-81, argues that the problem is not submissive worship of angels, but the desire to share heavenly worship with angels. But the Apocalyptic materials on which Francis bases his view, also show angels "instructing" and "revealing" important knowledge to man. So submission to angelic teaching should not be denied.

<sup>315</sup>Stauffer, *TDNT* III 119; Kleinknecht, *TDNT* III 123; Bauer, *s.v.*; cf. H. S. Nash, "Θελότης - Θεότης (R. 1:20; Col. 2:9)," *JBL* o.s. 18 (1899) 1-34.

<sup>316</sup>For a survey of the options, see Moule, 92-94. For the Greek Fathers and others, *σωματικῶς* is a synonym of *οὐσιωδῶς* (for discussion, see Lightfoot, 182), but this is unlikely. Others interpret "as an organized body." This could be taken cosmically of the whole network of cosmic powers (Käsemann, Benoit). But as Moule (93, cf. 166) states: "a single adverb is a slender peg on which to hang so mighty a thought as 'organization' in Christ of all those powers." The same point could be  
(cont.)



made against a reference to the Church, though the context is more congenial to this view (Ernst, 102f; Lohse, 100f). Others interpret, "actually," "in concrete reality, not mere seeming" (Schweizer, TDNT VII 1077; Jerevell, Imago Dei, 223f). But the issue is not the reality of Christ's humanity (cf. Carson, 64), but the scope and effectiveness of his salvific work. Finally, Moule mentions "assuming a bodily form," "becoming incarnate." One would expect, however, the perfect rather than present tense of the verb. But despite this difficulty, this is the most probable view. Esp. in view of the Pauline view of the body, the accent is on the outward side of Christ as man (see Appendix B, 350-54). The present tense is used because the issue concerns not when, but how the fullness that dwells in Christ is made available to believers. The term, then, points to the bodily history of Christ proclaimed in the gospel as that wherein the believer is filled.

<sup>317</sup>Peake (ExGT III 524) refers καὶ back to ὅτι. But it is unlikely that the verse denotes an additional reason independent of that in vs. 9. Nor is a temporal sequence appropriate. The most natural reading is that of logical consequence, "and so."

<sup>318</sup>Cf. Abbott, Lohse, Scott, Ernst (103-5), and others.

<sup>319</sup>The periphrastic construction of ἐστὲ πεπληρωμένοι allows the author to center the idea of "being filled" on the phrase ἐν αὐτῷ. Grammatically the phrase could refer to either πλήρωμα or Christ. While Christ is the most natural reference, Christ is viewed here as the one in whom all the fullness dwells bodily; he is πεπληρωμένος (Abbott, 249).

<sup>320</sup>Cf. Gnllka, 182; Schlter, 168; Ernst, 120; Barth, 368, 377; Overfield, NTS 25:394.

<sup>321</sup>The participles possibly belong to the ensuing ἵνα clause (so Meyer; cf. Beare). Barth (371f) takes the participles as imperatives, but this seems out of context. For the usual construction, see Abbott 96-98.

<sup>322</sup>Various proposals have been offered to explain the use of τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος. Barth (395f) offers a convenient list of alternatives. Van Roon (265) is probably correct to interpret the four dimensions with the object of the parallel infinitive, γινῶναι, i.e. the knowledge surpassing the love of Christ. This suggests that the dimensions concern transcendence and vastness, an idea prevalent in Wisdom literature (cf. Feuillet, Christ Sagesse, 292-317).

<sup>323</sup>Cf. Beare, 679; Mitton, 134.

<sup>324</sup>With Best (144), we note that this fullness is also already available to believers in Christ.

<sup>325</sup>To avoid this construction p<sup>46</sup> B and 463 read: ἵνα πληρωθῇ πάν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. But this can hardly explain the majority reading of κ A C D G it vg etc. Cf. Metzger, Textual Commentary, 604.

<sup>326</sup>The RSV translates: "That you might be filled with all the fullness of God." But one might have suspected ἐν rather than εἰς for defining the content with which believers are filled (cf. v 18). Most scholars take εἰς in the sense we have suggested; Abbott, Barth, Bruce, Foulkes, Meyer, Mitton, Robinson, Salmond, Scott, Dupont (473), and others.

<sup>327</sup>Cf. e.g. Barth, 373; Gnllka, 190; Robinson, 87; Roels, 253.

<sup>328</sup>τοῦ Θεοῦ has been variously defined. For discussion see Ernst, 120ff. The major alternatives are the fullness (a) that God bestows, (b) that He possesses, or (c) that He is. Of these (a) is probably the best alternative, although with such a stress on finality the distinctions admittedly become blurred. What God bestows is clearly none other than that totality of attributes, powers, blessings, etc. that He possesses by virtue of being so characterized; e.g. God bestows the love that He possesses by virtue of being a loving God. What is to be rejected is the idea that believers become God.

<sup>329</sup>To show how "God's 'fullness' and 'filling' possess a qualitative and dynamic character rather than only a quantitative and spatial nature," Barth (373) translates, "may you become so perfect as to attain the full perfection of God." One wonders whether the idea of "perfection" really meets this requirement. "Perfection" is no more "dynamic" than "fullness," and it suffers the possibility of being limited to the moral sphere.

<sup>330</sup>This, of course, agrees with the general theological viewpoint of Ephesians: God's act of salvation is always His act in Christ (cf. Gnllka, 190). But even in the prayer, the believer is presupposed to be a man in Christ. And more specifically the author prays for the indwelling of Christ in the faithful heart and desires his readers to experience and know the love of Christ. Thus at the center of the relation between God and believers, stands Christ.

<sup>331</sup>See below ch. III, 202-204, 223f.

<sup>332</sup>Cf. Mitton, 15ff; see below ch. III, 218-23.

NOTE: Numbers skip from 332 to 336.

<sup>336</sup>See esp. Yates, ExT 83:146-51; Ernst, 108-20.

<sup>337</sup>Ibid. Also see Overfield, NTS 25:393; Moule, 167-69.

<sup>338</sup>A. E. N. Hitchcock, ExT 22 (1910/11) 91; Moule, 168; also ExT 60 (1948/49) 53, 224.

<sup>339</sup>Moule, 168.

<sup>340</sup>Abbott, 38; cf. Best, 144, n.1.

<sup>341</sup>This seems to be the view of H. Chadwick, "Die Absicht des Epheserbriefes," ZNW 51 (1960) 152.

<sup>342</sup>The view is admirably presented by J. A. Robinson, 42-47; see also Beare, 636-37; Yates, ExT 83:146-51; Overfield, NTS 25:393. Abbott (37f) takes both the noun and verb as active.

<sup>343</sup>Both aspects of the argument are presented by J. A. Robinson, 42-47; 255-59. Yates (ExT 83:149-51) gives a good summary of the linguistic arguments. For criticism of this view see Best 142-43; Barth, 205-10.

<sup>344</sup>Best, 142. The Hellenistic metaphor might occasionally suggest that the body supplies power to the head (cf. Sen. Clem. I iv 3), but generally it indicates the body's need of the head; see Appendix B, 363-66, 368f. Elsewhere in Col and Eph, the latter aspect is followed.

<sup>345</sup>Cf. Prat, The Theology of St. Paul II, 283 . See above pp.78 ff; also n.247.

<sup>346</sup>Yates, ExT 83:150.

<sup>347</sup>V. Warnach, Die Kirche, 12-14; Schlief, 96-99; also Die Kirche, 89-90; Ernst, 114-20.

<sup>348</sup>Warnach, Die Kirche, 13.

<sup>349</sup>Warnach, Die Kirche, 14.

<sup>350</sup>Schlief, 99.

<sup>351</sup>Warnach, Die Kirche, 13; Schlief, 99.

<sup>352</sup>Ernst, 118-19. Schlief's resort to the 0.Sol. is called into question because the Syriac is probably based on τελείωσις; cf. Delling, TDNT VI 300; Ernst, 62.

<sup>353</sup>Both Benoit (37) and Ernst (116) admit that the author has adapted this philosophic concept to his Jewish presuppositions of a transcendent God, but they fail to appreciate how such admissions call into question the very pantheistic identity of substance on which they base their theories.



<sup>354</sup>E.g. Lightfoot, 255ff; Best, Knox, Thornton, J. A. T. Robinson. Cf. also Barth, 158-59, 200-10; Hanson, 127ff; Foulkes, Gniska, Scott, Delling.

<sup>355</sup>See above, pp.89-91.

<sup>356</sup>E.g. H. v. Soden, 111f. So too, apparently Barth, 208.

<sup>357</sup>Best, 147; cf. Eadie, 108.

<sup>358</sup>See above, pp. 78, 97, and Appendix B, 365f, 369.

<sup>359</sup>On the use of the middle, see B1-D §316-17. Yates (ExT 83:146f) offers a convenient summary of the problem with regard to πληροῦν. Abbott, Barth, Gniska, Delling, and others take the term with an active sense. So the RSV: "of him who fills all in all."

<sup>360</sup>S. Hanson (127ff), F. Prat (Theology of Paul I 287, 295 n.1, 298 n.2, 303) and Fr. Montgomery-Hitchcock ("The Pleroma as the Medium of the Self-revelation of Christ," Exp VIII 24, 1922, 135-50) stress the use of the middle voice.

<sup>361</sup>See the summary in Dana-Mantley, §154; cf. Moule, Idiom Book, 24.

<sup>362</sup>Yates, ExT 83:149; Benoit, RB 63:42 n.4.

<sup>363</sup>Benoit, RB 63:42f.

<sup>364</sup>Best, 143f.

<sup>365</sup>Cf. Moule, Idiom Book 33; Dana-Mantley §96 (2).

<sup>366</sup>Moule (168) uses the phrase in reference to Christ as the πλήρωμα: we find it a fitting description of Christ as πληρούμενος.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER II

<sup>1</sup>For a recent history of interpretation see W. Rader, The Church and Racial Hostility.

<sup>2</sup>For further discussion see below, pp.142-53; cf. Barth, 297.

<sup>3</sup>See above, ch. I, 20ff.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Schlier, 119.

<sup>5</sup>Barth, 275.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Abbott, 56.

<sup>8</sup>The article suggests a particular promise, i.e. Messianic salvation. Schniewind/Friedrich, TDNT III 583; Behm, TDNT III, 130; Abbott, 58; Folkes, 81. For Jewish expectations about the promised Messiah see Grundmann/Hesse/van der Woude/de Jonge, TDNT IX 493-527.

<sup>9</sup>Note the progression from Christological to soteriological to theological estrangement. Cf. Barth, 256. See also Gaugler, 103.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. Schlier, 121.

<sup>11</sup>Cf. Gaugler, 102.

<sup>12</sup>On the problem of understanding Israel's relation to the Church, see Barth, The Broken Wall; P. Richardson, Israel in the Apostolic Church. W. Rader also discusses this problem throughout his book on ii 11-22. Israel here defines the people of God (Gutbord, TDNT III 387). If we are forced here to speak of a "true" Israel, this is because our author, having defined Israel according to his Christology, looks at its entire history from that perspective. See below ch. IV 281.

<sup>13</sup>See below, 121f.

<sup>14</sup>The Law and Christ are not natural opposites, but become so when each is seen as the means to salvation, i.e. the basis of man's relation to God. The contrast between flesh and Spirit is more complicated. It is frequent in the Pauline Corpus and carries various connotations. (See Burton, Galatians, ICC, 486-95 for a concise treatment; see also Schweizer, TDNT VI 428-30 and the literature cited therein.) Basically the contrast springs from OT roots where man, who is flesh, is weak and contingent, and God, who is Spirit, is strong and eternal. In many places, such as Rom viii 1ff and Gal v 17ff, the contrast carries definite ethical overtones denoting two different modes of existence. Flesh-centered existence spells death and thus is bad; Spirit-centered existence spells life and hence is good. This falls short, however, of a metaphysical dualism in which the material is evil and the immaterial is good. The flesh is not in itself evil, but an inadequate and inappropriate basis for life. This use is clearly in mind at ii 3. In ii 11ff, however, this basically ethical contrast receives eschatological import. As such, the flesh represents the mode in which the old age manifested itself in the old kind of man, while the Spirit denotes the mode in which the new age manifests itself in the new kind of man.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. P. Stuhlmacher, "'Er ist unser Friede' (Eph 2.14) Zur Exegese und Bedeutung von Eph 2, 14-18" in Neues Testament und Kirche (Fs. Rudolf Schnackenburg), ed. J. Gnllka, 337-58.

<sup>16</sup>Kirby, 156f, 169, 170 n.85 (=189); cf. also G. Giavini, "La structure litteraire d'Eph. II 11-22," NTS 16 (1969/70) 209-11.

<sup>17</sup>For criticism, see R. Martin, Reconciliation, 169; also Rader, The Church and Racial Hostility,

<sup>18</sup>Schlier, Christus, 18.

<sup>19</sup>Schlier, Christus, 23 n.3.

<sup>20</sup>Christus, 18. In his commentary (123) Schlier reservedly accepts Schille's thesis and speaks of an "uminterpretierter Text" (127).

<sup>21</sup>G. Schille, Frühchristliche Hymnen, 24-31.

<sup>22</sup>Schille, 24-5.

<sup>23</sup>Schille, 25 n.7, 30.

<sup>24</sup>Schille, 26ff.

<sup>25</sup>R. Deichgräber, Gottes hymnus, 165-67.

<sup>26</sup>Deichgräber, 165f.

<sup>27</sup>Deichgräber, 166.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>J. T. Sanders, The New Testament Christological Hymns, 15; also ZNW 56:214-32.

<sup>31</sup>Sanders, Christological Hymns, 14.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., 14.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., 15 n.1.

<sup>34</sup>Martin, Reconciliation, 172-76.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., 173.

<sup>36</sup>K. M. Fischer, Tendenz und Absicht im Epheserbrief, 131-137.

<sup>37</sup>Fischer, 432.

<sup>38</sup>Fischer, 76ff, 137.

<sup>39</sup>Gnilka, 147-52; cf. also "Christus unser Friede" in Die Zeit Jesu, 190-207.

<sup>40</sup>Gnilka, 149.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid.



<sup>42</sup>Gnilka, 151.

<sup>43</sup>Gnilka, 149.

<sup>44</sup>Martin, Reconciliation, 135.

<sup>45</sup>Gnilka (149f) and Fischer (76ff, 137), while approaching it differently, agree on this point. Sanders does not state his position clearly.

<sup>46</sup>Gnilka, 148. For further criticism, see Stuhlmacher, in Neues Testament und Kirche, 337-58. Stuhlmacher stresses that the hymnic proposals do not do justice to the Isaiah citation.

<sup>47</sup>See below, p.128.

<sup>48</sup>Cf. R. McL. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, 38f; E. Yamauchi, Pre-Christian Gnosticism, 47f. See below, 129ff.

<sup>49</sup>Robinson, 58, 160; Barth, 262.

<sup>50</sup>Gnilka, 138.

<sup>51</sup>Foerster, TDNT II 400f.

<sup>52</sup>Cf. Gnilka, 138.

<sup>53</sup>See Foerster, TDNT II 411; also Gaugler, 107.

<sup>54</sup>Gnilka, 138f; Foulkes, 81; v. Rad, TDNT II 405f. See Str-B III 587.

<sup>55</sup>Bauer, 227; cf. also v. Rad, TDNT II 405f.

<sup>56</sup>Cf. Barth, 74.

<sup>57</sup>This may also aid in understanding the link between peace and access. The terms are also related in Rom v 1-2. In both places peace occurs prior to access and functions as a pre-requisite: i.e. no peace, no access. (R. J. McKelvey, The New Temple, 112 n.1, compares this to I Chr xxii 8.) In Romans the individual's peace with God is in view, though even here we should not give the term an inner psychological meaning (e.g. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans, 132; C. H. Dodd, Epistle to the Romans, 73). In Ephesians ii 14-18 peace with God expresses itself in the Messianic peace of the nations. McKelvey (111f) links this to the ensuing temple imagery, since in OT thinking access to God is bound up with the temple cult at Zion (Isa ii 4; Mic iv 3; I En xc 29-33; Sib Or iii 755-76). Whether these concepts are as closely related as McKelvey believes is difficult to prove and beyond the scope of this study. But the designations of the Christian community as "a holy temple in the Lord" (vs. 21) and as "a dwelling place of God in the Spirit" (vs. 22), do suggest strong religio-social implications for both ἡ προσαγωγή and ἡ εἰρήνη.

<sup>58</sup>Cf. Foerster, TDNT II, 415.

<sup>59</sup>Schlier, 124; Gnilka, 139; Schille, 26; Fischer, 133f; and others.

<sup>60</sup>Gnilka, 139.

<sup>61</sup>E.g. Best, 152.

<sup>62</sup>Abbott, 60. Cf. Robinson, 160.

<sup>63</sup>Barth, 262; Caird, 57.

<sup>64</sup>B1-D §138 (1); cf. §263 (4).

<sup>65</sup>Ev is probably emphatic, "one and the same." This allows the *iva* clause to modify all the participles:

<sup>66</sup>Abbott, 61; Salmond, 294; cf. Gnilka, 139.

<sup>67</sup>Schneider, TDNT IV 625. Cf. Bauer, 508.

<sup>68</sup>Bauer, 865; Abbott, 61; Schlier, 124.

<sup>69</sup>For discussion see Mussner, CAK, 82-84. Cf. also 1QH II 21.

<sup>70</sup>Abbott (61) takes the genitive as appositive: "the partition which consisted in the fence." See also Mussner, CAK, 81. Even so μεσότοιχον focuses more closely on the hostile barrier that results from the Law being considered a φραγμός.

<sup>71</sup>See above, 124f.

<sup>72</sup>Schlier, Christus, 18-26, 36 n.1.

<sup>73</sup>Schlier, 188.

<sup>74</sup>Schlier, 129.

<sup>75</sup>Schlier, 130.

<sup>76</sup>Cf. Gnilka, 140; Barth, 12-18; Hanson, 143-46; Wilson, Gnosis and the NT, 38f; Yamauchi, Pre-Christian Gnosticism, 47f.

<sup>77</sup>Gnilka, 142, 149.

<sup>78</sup>Gnilka, 151.

<sup>79</sup>Robinson, 59f; Scott, 171; McKelvey, The New Temple, 109f; Mitton, EE, 231f; and others.

<sup>80</sup>McKelvey, The New Temple, 110f.

<sup>81</sup>Barth, 291; Gnilka, 150; Abbott, 63; Salmond, 295; Scott, 173f; Gaugler, 109; and most recent commentators.

<sup>82</sup>Abbott, Gnilya, Barth and most commentators. Van Roon (128, 133, 372), Schlier, Scott, and Robinson take everything from "enmity" on with καταργήσας. But ἔχθραν is better suited to λύσας (cf. Abbott).

<sup>83</sup>Mussner, CAK, 83 and most scholars. J. H. A. Hart ("The Enmity in His Flesh," Exp VI 3, 1901, 135-41) takes "enmity in his flesh" as a circumlocution for circumcision (cf. also Coutts, NTS 4:205). Another possibility is "the enmity among his flesh (=kindred)." The absence of a participle defining the phrase makes these views difficult.

<sup>84</sup>That is, most who take "the enmity" with λύσας also take "in his flesh" with that verb. We prefer the minority opinion represented by Gnilya, 141; Roels, 126f.

<sup>85</sup>So most contemporary commentators. The Church Fathers present a united front on taking δόγμα as a reference to Christ's decrees. The history of this problem is discussed throughout Rader's book. For this use of ἐν see Robertson, A Grammar, 589, or Moule, Idiom Book, 79.

<sup>86</sup>For discussion see Barth, 287f; Burton, Galatians, 443-60, esp. 458 for the legalistic aspect. Cf. also Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 147ff.

<sup>87</sup>Abbott, 62; Salmond, 295. Gaugler (109) renders: "ausser Geltung setzte."

<sup>88</sup>Roels (128ff) presents a list of alternatives. The corporate interpretation can be divided into (a) the Church as the Corporate Christ, or (b) the Church as a corporate entity such as the Bride of Christ. Roels wishes to divide the group-type interpretation into (a) the individual Christian or (b) the new nature. But this latter distinction is much more difficult to define than the former. This is because for the author the individual was quite capable of representing the new type of nature. Indeed Christ himself could be considered the example of the new man, and Christians are to be like him.

<sup>89</sup>Roels, 130f; Barth, 309-11; Hanson, 148; Gaugler, 113; Schlier, Christus, 27-37, (esp. 35).

<sup>90</sup>At iv 24 the new man contrasts the "old man," and could easily be rendered the "new nature." Col iii 10 offers a good parallel, only νεός occurs instead of καινός. But the difference seems minimal; cf. R. A. Harrisville, "The Concept of Newness in the NT," JBL 74 (1955) 69-79. The same type of thought is found at II Cor v 17 and Gal vi 15 where the individual becomes a "new creation" in Christ. Indeed, Gal vi 15 contrasts  
(cont.)



the new creation to both circumcision and uncircumcision.

<sup>91</sup>Best, 153; Abbott, 65; contrast Martin, Reconciliation, 187; Caird, 57.

<sup>92</sup>Cf. Best, 153.

<sup>93</sup>Foerster, TDNT III, 1025.

<sup>94</sup>Foerster, TDNT III, 1023-35.

<sup>95</sup>The majority of manuscripts, including  $\kappa^2$  D G  $\Psi$ , latt, Mcion and Epiph read  $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$ . For the text see p<sup>46</sup>  $\kappa$  A B F P 33 104 326 1175 1739 1881 pc. Earlier editions of Nestle read  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ . We retain the rough breathing mark simply to make clear the reference to Christ. Barth (296f) discusses the other possibilities, such as "flesh" (which however is feminine) and the "cross" (which as yet has not been introduced). Perhaps  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$  was chosen because the reference is to Christ in his corporate dimension and hence it allows a certain remove that could not be communicated by the mere reflexive. On the other hand,  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$  could at times be used for the reflexive pronoun.

<sup>96</sup>Mussner, CAK, 94-96; Kirby, 157ff; Meuzelaar, Der Leib des Messias, 66-70. See Str-B II 421-23; III 519.

<sup>97</sup>While our interpretation does not hinge on the matter,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta\upsilon\omicron$  probably is to be taken with B1-D  $\S$ 275 as "utrumque, ('each of the two')." Mussner (CAK, 87) puts undue weight on the issue.

<sup>98</sup>Caird, 81, 205-6; Moule, 119-20; Martin, 106f; and for a negative appraisal, Barth, 537-45.

<sup>99</sup>Cf. M Sanhiv 5, where every man bears the group-type which is represented by Adam.

<sup>100</sup>Best, 153; Roels, 131 n.123.

<sup>101</sup>Van Roon (336) uses similar language for the old and new man in Eph iv, but takes ii 15 as a corporate image.

<sup>102</sup>While the author may have distinguished these events, they go together. Crucifixion is the epitome of what Christ's incarnation comes to mean, and so too the resurrection is the epitome of the exaltation.

<sup>103</sup>Cf. GnIlka, 142.

<sup>104</sup>Still vs. 16 is not an inference from vs. 15b (contra Abbott, 65), but a parallel perspective on the same event. It is not the logic of the syllogism, but of overlapping totalities.

<sup>105</sup>Büchsel, TDNT I 258f; Barth, 265; Gaugler, 114f; Abbott, 66; and most other scholars.

<sup>106</sup>B1-D §275.

<sup>107</sup>Cf. Hanson, 11f, also 5-7 and 57f.

<sup>108</sup>J. Schneider, TDNT VII 275-77.

<sup>109</sup>Cf. Beare, 659.

<sup>110</sup>Since ἀποκαταλλάσσω and καταλλάσσω are usually linked to Christ's death, and since ἐν αὐτῷ probably refers to the cross, ἀποκτείνας is best seen as an aorist of identical action.

<sup>111</sup>For discussion see Barth, 297.

<sup>112</sup>Bauer, 93f.

<sup>113</sup>Barth, 297.

<sup>114</sup>So most commentators.

<sup>115</sup>Beare, 659.

<sup>116</sup>Friedrich, TDNT II 718; Barth 294f; Conzelmann. Schlier opts for the ascension of Jesus; Caird for the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost; Gnllka, the coming of Christ in the preaching of the gospel by the Apostles. Mussner (101), Mitton and Gaugler refer it to the incarnation. Another possibility, though rarely followed, is the resurrection. For a list of options, see Schlier, 137; Barth, 293-95.

<sup>117</sup>Barth, 294.

<sup>118</sup>Robinson, 65, 162; Schlier, 137 n.7; Gnllka, 145; Simpson, 63 n.29; N. A. Dahl, Kurze Auslegung, 36; Stuhlmacher, 347f; Mussner, CAK, 101.

<sup>119</sup>Friedrich, TDNT II 708f.

<sup>120</sup>Friedrich, TDNT II 715f.

<sup>121</sup>Muilenburg, IB V 675; Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 330.

<sup>122</sup>Str-B III 587. For discussion see Stuhlmacher, 347f.

<sup>123</sup>Martin, Reconciliation, 191.

<sup>124</sup>Cf. Stuhlmacher, 353.

<sup>125</sup>The presence of ὑμεῖς is hard to reconcile with an emphasis on deflating the Gentiles' arrogance at preceding the "near," as Martin (191ff) and others suggest. It is the author's wonder at the kind of gracious God who would include Gentiles in His plan of salvation that

stands against any pride on the part of Gentiles. If he intends to polemicize directly against an actual situation in which Gentiles are boastful and arrogant, then by adding ὕμῃς he has unwittingly put wood on the fire.

<sup>126</sup>Abbott, 67; Salmond, 297; Schlier, 139 n.1; Gaugler, 119; contra Gnilka, 146, and Schille, 30 n.40.

<sup>127</sup>Abbott, 67; Robinson, 162; Salmond, 298; cf. also Gnilka, 146.

<sup>128</sup>Cf. Meuzelaar, 60.

<sup>129</sup>Cf. Scott, 174; Schlier, 140.

<sup>130</sup>So most scholars. Against Scott, 175.

<sup>131</sup>Cf. Hanson, 94-98, 146f.

<sup>132</sup>Scott (175) correctly discerns that the phrase is not speaking "of the means by which we make our approach," but wrongly refers it to "the new attitude of worship which is now possible for all men."

<sup>133</sup>We may infer ὄντες or another οἱ, but just as likely ἐν denotes an "accompanying circumstance" (cf. Mk i 23). The spatial connotation of the preposition shows that the Spirit stands over the Gentile and Jew as a reality that possesses them.

<sup>134</sup>Cf. above, pp. 119 and 127 n.57.

<sup>135</sup>Percy, Die Probleme, 317.

<sup>136</sup>Van Roon, 299.

<sup>137</sup>Die Probleme, 289; cf. 109, 281, 317, 382.

<sup>138</sup>Die Probleme, 281.

<sup>139</sup>Ibid.

<sup>140</sup>Van Roon, 299.

<sup>141</sup>Ibid.

<sup>142</sup>Van Roon, 300.

<sup>143</sup>Ibid. (Van Roon's "HP" = Pauline Homologumena).

<sup>144</sup>Percy, Die Probleme, 281.

<sup>145</sup>Barth, 300.

<sup>146</sup>Percy, Leib Christi, 39.

<sup>147</sup>Percy, Die Probleme, 281f.

<sup>148</sup>Die Probleme, 382.



- <sup>149</sup>Percy, "Zu den Problemen des Kolosser- und Epheserbriefes," ZNW 43 (1950/51) 192.
- <sup>150</sup>Cerfaux, The Church in the Theology of St. Paul, 326.
- <sup>151</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>152</sup>Percy, Die Probleme, 284.
- <sup>153</sup>Die Probleme, 281.
- <sup>154</sup>Barth, 312f.
- <sup>155</sup>Barth, 265.
- <sup>156</sup>Barth, 300 n.205.
- <sup>157</sup>Van Roon, 298ff.
- <sup>158</sup>Van Roon, 298 n.5.
- <sup>159</sup>Van Roon, 298.
- <sup>160</sup>Van Roon, 299.
- <sup>161</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>162</sup>Van Roon, 300.
- <sup>163</sup>Percy, Die Probleme, 281.
- <sup>164</sup>Zerwick, 66.
- <sup>165</sup>Schlier, 135. Cf. even van Roon, 302.
- <sup>166</sup>Scott, 173.
- <sup>167</sup>J. A. T. Robinson, The Body, 47.
- <sup>168</sup>Fischer (51) suggests that such an ambiguity arises only when one compares Eph ii 16 too closely to Col i 22.
- <sup>169</sup>Meuzelaar, 56 n.5.
- <sup>170</sup>Abbott, 66.
- <sup>171</sup>Salmond, 296.
- <sup>172</sup>Karl Braune, Lange's Commentary, 94.
- <sup>173</sup>Fischer, 51.
- <sup>174</sup>See below, p. 158f.
- <sup>175</sup>Abbott, 66.
- <sup>176</sup>See above, pp. 132-35. For discussion see Roels, 128f.
- <sup>177</sup>Hanson, 148.

<sup>178</sup>See above, 132-35; cf. Best, 153; Meuzelaar, 66-70; and Gnifka, 142.

<sup>179</sup>Robinson, 65.

<sup>180</sup>Dahl, Kurze Auslegung, 36.

<sup>181</sup>Salmond, 297; Meuzelaar, 56 n.5.

<sup>182</sup>Robertson, A Grammar, 417; B1-D §472.

<sup>183</sup>Robertson, A Grammar, 782f; B1-D §272, §416 (6).

<sup>184</sup>Cf. Robertson, A Grammar, 589; Moule, Idiom, 75. MM call it the "maid of all work."

<sup>185</sup>See Metzger, Textual Commentary, 621f.

<sup>186</sup>For a somewhat different approach, see Meuzelaar, 51-57.

<sup>187</sup>Coutts (NTS 4:201-7) suggests that Colossians depends on Ephesians. For our purposes it is sufficient to note that the passages reflect a milieu of similar ideas that emerge in different forms and for different purposes.

<sup>188</sup>If the passive voice is read in Col i 21, the recipients of reconciliation are implied in the verb. If the active is read, the direct object must be supplied from the context. But in Eph ii 16, the recipient of reconciliation is noted explicitly as the verb's direct object. As such the character of this recipient gains significance.

<sup>189</sup>Cf. Abbott, 67; Schille, Hymnen, 30; van Roon, 300.

<sup>190</sup>The author, then, is not merely repeating a structural formation of verb, object, prepositional phrase.

<sup>191</sup>We understand conceptual and grammatical as practically synonymous in this context. Words that grammatically belong together reflect a conceptual unit that stands in relation to other conceptual units. These units in relation to each other, constitute the sentence as a completed thought.

<sup>192</sup>Contrast Fischer and van Roon respectively.

<sup>193</sup>See above, p.136.

<sup>194</sup>Abbott seems to adopt this meaning: "and consequently reconcile both, now one body, to God by the cross..." (Underlining mine.)

<sup>195</sup>Cf. above, pp.133, 136.

<sup>196</sup>See above, p.137f.

<sup>197</sup>See Appendix B, 341, 345, 350, 368.

<sup>198</sup>See above, ch. I, 82-91.

<sup>199</sup>Earlier (ch. I, 26,46) we suggested that the New Adam theology provides a broad framework under which various Christological themes may be clustered. Christ may be identified, compared and contrasted with various key figures or offices to the extent that they contribute to understanding the restoration of man to his God-intended glory and inheritance.

<sup>200</sup>For a recent history of interpretation, discussion of the evidence and bibliography see J. Swetnam, Jesus and Isaac, AnBib 94.

<sup>201</sup>For discussion see G. Vermes, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism, 193-227; Swetnam, Jesus and Isaac, 23-85; J. E. Wood, "Isaac Typology in the New Testament," NTS 14 (1968) 583-89; P. Q. Davies and B. D. Chilton, "The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition History," CBQ 40 (1978) 514-46.

<sup>202</sup>Vermes, Scripture, 208. Vermes (202-4) believes the Akedah arose from interpreting Gen xxi in association with the Suffering Servant of Isa liii. Best (Temptation and Passion, 172) is less certain about this. Swetnam (78) thinks the Akedah was linked to vicarious expiation of sin through Jewish attempts to form a theology of martyrdom, but that the association was intensified by reaction to Christian claims about Christ. Davies and Chilton (CBQ 40:514-46) think the idea of sacrifice is late. But Isaac's willingness to die as a sacrificial victim was probably early.

<sup>203</sup>Vermes, Scripture, 193-218; Swetnam, Jesus and Isaac, 23-85.

<sup>204</sup>Vermes, Scripture, 201.

<sup>205</sup>M. Black, "The Messiah in the Testament of Levi xviii," ExT 61 (1949/50) 158; see also Best, Temptation and Passion, 170. We agree with Best that if the passage as a whole is of Christian origin, (which is by no means certain) then it shows how Christ and Isaac were linked at an early period.

<sup>206</sup>Of course, Christ's identification with the Church was not limited to his crucifixion, but included his exaltation (cf. i 23). Σῶμα forms the line of continuity between death and resurrection. Perhaps this was influenced by the author's understanding of the sacraments.

<sup>207</sup>For cornerstone as opposed to keystone, see McKelvey, "Christ The Cornerstone," NTS 8 (1961/62) 352-59. Jeremias, of course, champions the view, "keystone"; see e.g. TDNT I 791-93, IV 274-75. Cf. Barth, 317-19.

<sup>208</sup>Scott, 181; cf. Barth, 327, and others.

<sup>209</sup>This is the usual view. The sentence lacks a verb; see Abbott and Barth for discussion of the problems. Gnllka (162) sees the verse as a device for introducing Paul into the discussion.



<sup>210</sup>Vss. 2-7 form the first; vss. 8-12 the second, and vs. 13 the third.

<sup>211</sup>For literature and discussion see Bornkamm, TDNT IV 802-28; Robinson, 234-40; Lightfoot, on Col i 26; W. Bieder, "Das Geheimnis des Christus nach dem Epheserbrief," TZ 11 (1955) 329-43; R. Brown, The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament; C. C. Caragounis, The Ephesian Mysterion; F. Mussner, "Contributions Made by Qumran to the Understanding of the Epistle to the Ephesians," PQ, 159-163. According to Moule (81) μυστήριον had three basic uses during the NT era: "(1) an initiatory rite and its theological meaning, (2) a divine secret, divulged by God, (3) a secret, or something mysterious, generally." In the Pauline Corpus, the term's use shows considerable flexibility; it generally falls under the second definition. Formerly thought to be derived from the mystery religions, most scholars now think the idea has Jewish roots; see esp. Brown, The Semitic Background and the various studies in PQ. Esp. in Apocalyptic and Qumran literature is there a keen interest in the revelation of God's mysteries relating to the nature of the cosmos or evil, or perhaps the time-table of last events, or even Scripture interpretation. The idea of a divine "secret plan" was probably common in 1st cent. Judaism.

In the undisputed letters the term's use is less developed (cf. Brown, 61), but in Col. and Eph. it becomes important for Christology. Indeed, Kuhn sees in this what distinguishes Ephesians' use from the Qumran texts (PQ, 119). Still only twice does it appear absolutely (iii 3, v 32), and even then, the context points to a fairly concrete reference. So the term's specific value should be determined by its context (cf. Martin, 71). At i 9 it concerns the disclosing of God's will to bring all things under one head in Christ; while in iii 3, 5, 9, it is the revealing of Christ in whom both Gentiles and Jews share salvation. This is closely related to the preaching of the gospel (vi 19, cf. iii 6). Eph v 32 stands apart from these as a special Scriptural mystery which, however, has implications for Christ and the Church, see below ch. IV, 303-8. The term then relates especially to the revelation of Christ in all its cosmic, eschatological, and historical import.

<sup>212</sup>For literature see O. Michel, TDNT V 151-52; W. Tooley, "Stewards of God," SJT 19 (1966) 74-86; and esp. J. Reumann, "'Stewards of God' - Pre-Christian Religious Application of οἰκονόμος in Greek," JBL 77 (1958) 339-49; "Οἰκονόμος = 'Covenant'; Terms for Heilsgeschichte in early Christian Usage," NT 3 (1959) 282-92; and "Οἰκονομία - Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan Heilsgeschichte," NTS 13 (1966/67) 147-67. Among the commentators see esp. Abbott, Lightfoot on Col i 25 and in his Notes on the Epistles, Mitton, and Barth. Originally, οἰκονομία denoted the position of an οἰκονόμος or the discharge of this office. From this the term attained numerous uses; Michel, TDNT V 151f; (cont.)

Reumann, NTS 13:150. In the Pauline Corpus, it occurs 6 times. At I Cor ix 17 it clearly means "stewardship," (for detailed analysis, see literature cited). At I Tim i 4 it is usually rendered "divine training." In Col i 25 and Eph i 9, iii 2, 9 the term seems invested with cosmic interest. This probably occurs through its close link to the "mystery." Esp. in Ephesians the question is whether it means "plan of salvation" or "the administration of such a plan." With Reumann, Barth, Bieder, Schlier, Gnllka, and others we favor the latter. Whether God, Christ, the Church, or a particular apostle executes or administers this plan, only the context can decide (cf. Reumann, NTS 13:154f).

<sup>213</sup>κ\* A 424<sup>C</sup> 1739 1881 Origin Ambrosiaster<sup>1/2</sup> Hilary Jerome al omit πάντες after φωτίσαι. We retain the word on the authority of p<sup>46</sup> κ<sup>C</sup> B C D G K P Ψ 33 81 614 Byz Lect it vg syr<sup>p,h</sup> cop<sup>ca,bo</sup> goth arm al. See Metzger, Textual Commentary, 603. Had the word been added to give φωτίσαι an expressed accusative, one would expect other variant readings, such as αὐτούς or something similar.

<sup>214</sup>The sentence contains no significant textual problems. For minor variant readings see the apparatus of Nestle-Aland<sup>26</sup>.

<sup>215</sup>There are primarily two interpretations of οἰκονομία here: (1) God's plan of salvation, or (2) the administration of such a plan. But (2) may be subdivided into (a) God's special administration of grace to Paul, or (b) Paul's administration or stewardship of the divine grace given him. View (2b) is the most likely (cf. Col i 25). But possibly all these were closely interrelated (cf. Reumann, NTS 13:165 ).

<sup>216</sup>Some scholars think that the experience under discussion is Paul's conversion (e.g. Merklein). While possible, this is not necessary. The circle of mystery bearers includes the prophets. If, as is probable, these are NT prophets, then clearly reception of the mystery does not constitute the Apostolic grace and office. That is, the reception of the mystery is a necessary ingredient, but not a sufficient ingredient for Apostleship. Of course, Paul himself may have received this mystery with his calling, while others may have received it apart from their initial call. Cf. Bieder, TZ 11:329.

<sup>217</sup>Goodspeed (Meaning, 42f) believed the referent of προέγραψα was the undisputed letters of Paul (cf. Mitton). Thompson refers it to an earlier unknown letter. Others find the reference within the letter itself, e.g. i 9-10, Scott; or ii 11-22, Schlier. We prefer a general reference to chs. i-ii. For the construction, συνεσίς ἐν τῷ μυστήριῳ,  
(cont.)



cf. 1QH II 13, XII 13; see Kuhn, PQ, 118f. Cf. also II Tim ii 7.

<sup>218</sup>So most scholars.

<sup>219</sup>The many problems and implications of this verse go beyond the scope of this thesis and we refer the reader to the commentaries and the appropriate articles. Noteworthy, however, is that Barth (331) believes that the verse's parallelism indicates a hymnic fragment. This makes the unwarranted assumption that our author is not capable of highly stylized parallelism.

<sup>220</sup>The letter, whether by Paul or not, was clearly intended to substitute for the presence of the Apostle.

<sup>221</sup>With most scholars, we understand εἰς as an epexegetical infinitive. See, e.g. Abbott, 83; Barth, 336; Schlief, 151.

<sup>222</sup>Schlief, 61; cf. Bieder TZ 11:335f.

<sup>223</sup>As i 9-10 suggests, the historical implications of the mystery cannot be divorced from its cosmic implications. How, then, does this cosmic dimension relate to the unity of the Gentiles and Jews in Christ? While full discussion is beyond the scope of this thesis, we may at least, point in the direction that our answer lies. As stated, the author has reflected theologically on the religio-social division between Gentile and Jew: the division represents the general state of alienation and hostility between man and God. Christ has reconciled this division in its dual aspects and he has abolished its root cause, the Law-in-its-effect-on-the-flesh, or in a word, sin. But it is also clear from Eph ii 1ff that man as a sinner stands under the dominion of the principalities and powers. In view of this, it seems reasonable that if the division of Gentile and Jew reflects man's alienation from God, it also reflects his subjugation to the principalities and powers. As we have learned, Christ as the New Adam restores man to his proper position in the universe, and hence restores cosmic order. It is not insignificant that God's wisdom is revealed through the Church, consisting of Gentiles and Jews, to principalities and powers (iii 10). In this way the unity of Gentiles and Jews in Christ bears witness to the eschatological event whereby Christ establishes cosmic unity. Cf. and contrast Brown, Semitic Background, 58-60.

<sup>224</sup>Bauer, 774.

<sup>225</sup>For Barth (337) Ephesians states "that no Gentile can have communion with Christ or with God unless he also has communion with Israel." But Barth (130-33) wrongly identifies this Israel too closely with the  
(cont.)



historical nation. Gentiles and Jews are one only in Christ, as clearly seen in ii 18. There the Gentiles and Jews either are believers, or have the one Spirit outside faith. The latter alternative is most unlikely.

<sup>226</sup>Bauer, 109.

<sup>227</sup>For further discussion, see P. L. Hammer, "A Comparison of KΛĒRONOMIA in Paul and Ephesians," JBL 79 (1960) 267-72; Foerster, TDNT III 767-85; Eichler, DNTT II 295-304, and the bibliographies therein. Hammer believes the inheritance is future, therefore non-Pauline. Gn̄ilka (168) and Merklein (Das Kirchliche Amt, 206) say it is present, and hence non-Pauline. Barth (115-119) speaks of "the presence of the future" with regard to the general eschatology in Ephesians, but describes iii 6 as "the hope for the future" (338). At i 14 the inheritance is future, but also suggests its presence in the ἀρραβών. It is also present in that it is perceived by the "eyes of the heart" (i 19). At v 5 the traditional association of the inheritance with the Kingdom points to a future reference, while the present tense of ἔχω suggests a present reference. Other aspects, e.g., ἐκκληρώθημεν at i 11, suggest a present reference and have caused some scholars to take the future implications of i 14 as the aftereffects of a traditional formula. But while this is possible, it is unnecessary. If the author took seriously the presence of the inheritance in the mode of its ἀρραβών, he could reflect on its present effects without assuming its total realization.

<sup>228</sup>1QS IV 23; 1QH XVII 15; 1QpPs 37 III 2; CD III 20, (v 6). See Aune, Cultic Setting, 30-44.

<sup>229</sup>Cf. Caird, 65.

<sup>230</sup>See above, 118; also Caird, 56f.

<sup>231</sup>Bauer, 778.

<sup>232</sup>So Abbott, Gn̄ilka, Salmond, Schl̄ier, and others.

<sup>233</sup>E.g. Barth, 338.

- <sup>234</sup>Cf. Abbott, 83.

<sup>235</sup>Schniewind/Friedrich, TDNT II 583.

<sup>236</sup>The threefold description adds emphasis; cf. Abbott, Scott, and others. Contrast Barth, 338.

<sup>237</sup>·Εν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is not instrumental, but points to the place where Gentiles and Jews have these attributes of being fellow-heirs, etc. Cf. Rom xii 5. Contrast Gn̄ilka, 168.

<sup>238</sup>The OT has no exact equivalent for ἐπαγγελία, but the idea is present; see Hoffmann, DNTT III 69.

<sup>239</sup>Foerster, TDNT II 779ff; Schniewind/Friedrich, TDNT II 579f.

<sup>240</sup>Cf. S. Baruch lvii 2, lix 2, xlvii 6; CD III 2ff. Similar ideas are found in Philo (e.g. Abr. passim). Cf. also Rom ii 25ff, iv, ix 6ff. For the proselyte's status see Str-B I 924ff, II 715ff, III 98ff; Moore, Judaism I, 323ff; Kuhn, TDNT VI 727-42.

<sup>241</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1080. συσσωματοποιεῖν appears in Ps. Arist. Mund. 396A 14. Robinson (169) thinks that the verb would imply συσώματος, not σύσσωμος. But Robinson also states: "In later Greek ἄσωμος, ἑνώσωμος are found side by side with ἀσώματος, ἐνώσωματος." This is significant since συσώματος does occur, meaning "fellow-slave," Suppl. Epigr. Graec. vi 721.

<sup>242</sup>Abbott, however, disagrees.

<sup>243</sup>For the Fathers' use of the term see Lampe, s.v.

<sup>244</sup>"Σύσσωμα Eph. 3, 6," ZNW I (1900) 85-86.

<sup>245</sup>See Gundry, Sōma, 10. Cf. Rev xviii 13. The inscription in Suppl. Epigr. Graec. vi 721 might support this view. But the word there is συσώματος, not σύσσωμος; the significance of this difference is difficult to judge (cf. Robinson, 169).

<sup>246</sup>Preuschen, ZNW 1:86.

<sup>247</sup>Ibid.

<sup>248</sup>Preuschen (ZNW 1:86) claims that the Fathers overlooked the legal character of συγκληρονόμος and so mistook σύσσωμα as referring to the Body of Christ.

<sup>249</sup>Moffatt's rendering "companions" may reflect this interpretation.

<sup>250</sup>Foerster (TDNT III 781) notes that συγκληρονόμος is an adjective here. The attributive effect is not easily rendered in English: "co-inheritable persons, co-body (or concorporate) persons, and co-promise-participating persons.

<sup>251</sup>Gnilka, 168.

<sup>252</sup>Barth, 337.

<sup>253</sup>Cf. Mitton.



<sup>254</sup>See pp. 161-63. One could even align the threefold blessing in Gen xii 1ff to the threefold description here: the land (=kingdom) as inheritance, the great people as Christ's Body, and the promise as the blessing.

<sup>255</sup>See below, ch. IV, 265-73, 298.

<sup>256</sup>Schlier (61) is, in a sense, correct to interpret the verse in accordance with the Body of Christ concept, but fails to see that this concept points beyond itself. To be sure, σῶμα makes its own contribution quite apart from its interpretive value, but its primary function is to communicate the Semitic presuppositions underlying the author's New Adam theology.

<sup>257</sup>An explicit polemic against Gnostics is unlikely (contra Pokorný).

### NOTES TO CHAPTER III

<sup>1</sup>Robinson, 105.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Caird, 78; Scott, 215.

<sup>3</sup>The exhortation is linked to the preceding chs. by οὖν (cf. Rom xii 1). Thus the imperative is based on the indicative. Cf. Gnllka. 196.

<sup>4</sup>For καλέω and κλησιν see Schmidt, TDNT III 491ff. Barth (427) and Beare (683) opt for the lexically questionable rendering "vocation."

<sup>5</sup>See Bauer (509f) for μέτα as denoting attendant circumstances (cf. Abbott 105; B1-D §198). The imperatival impact of the participles may be explained by their link to ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι (cf. Abbott, 106). Some scholars believe the participial form denotes an imperative; e.g. Gnllka, 198 n.5.; Barth, 427, 327 n.23. Cf. also D. Daube, "Participle and Imperative in I Peter," in Selwyn, First Epistle of St. Peter, 467-88.

<sup>6</sup>Scott, 203.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Beare, 683.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. below, p. 227f.

<sup>9</sup>As usual an infinitive accompanies σπουδάζω (Bauer, 763; B1-D §392). The participle portrays the zeal and eagerness that is to mark the readers' efforts to keep the unity of the Spirit (cf. Abbott, 106; Robinson, 92; Barth, 428; Beare, 684). Τηρέω has as many nuances as the English "keep" (cf. Bauer, 814f). It often means "observe," esp. as regards the Law or some teaching (e.g. Mt xxiii 3; Jn viii 51f; Rev ii 26).



Here it means "preserve from harm or disturbance," or perhaps "to watch over or guard." Cf. Beare, 684.

<sup>10</sup>Some exegetes take πνεῦμα here to mean the human spirit of the community, e.g. Ambrosiaster, Anselm, Calvin, de Wette, Estius, Gaugler, and Haupt. But in i 13; ii 18, 22; iii 5, 16; iv 30; v 18; and vi 18 the author intrinsically binds the life of the believing community and the life of the Holy Spirit. The author has in view, then, the state of affairs brought about by the Spirit's dwelling among believers.

<sup>11</sup>Eadie, 278; cf. Scott, 203.

<sup>12</sup>Murray, 63; cf. Barth (465), Meyer, Abbott, Synge.

<sup>13</sup>As quoted in Abbott, 107.

<sup>14</sup>The phrase goes best with τηρεῖν since τηρέω τινα ἐν τινι is a common construction (Bauer, 815). Here it is τηρέω τι ἐν τινι. But this unity has a personal character in that it involves all believers and the living God who dwells among them in the Spirit (cf. ii 22). So the variation is understandable. The construction also favors rendering ἐν instrumentally.

<sup>15</sup>See above, ch. II, 119f; 137f; 161f; 167.

<sup>16</sup>Cf. above, ch. I, esp. 43-91; also ch. II, 167 n.223.

<sup>17</sup>Cf. Moule, 124.

<sup>18</sup>Liddell-Scott, s.v. 1701; Bauer, 785; Barth, 428f; also G. Rudberg, "Syndesmos," Coni Neot 3 (1937) 19-21 (cited from Gnllka, 200).

<sup>19</sup>Lightfoot, 198f; Scott, 56.

<sup>20</sup>Cf. Beare, IB IX, 219 and Lightfoot, 223 respectively.

<sup>21</sup>Käsemann (Leib Christi, 151ff) and Pokorný (ZNW 53:185) suggest a gnostic background, but the evidence adduced is not compelling (Gnllka, 199 n.4). Gnllka (199f) thinks σύνδεσμος has its background in a Macroanthropos scheme, which the author has historicized and referred to the Church. He finds his starting point in ii 14-18, where our author supposedly re-interprets a cosmic hymn that saw Christ as "der die ganze Welt in zusammenfassende Anthropos." Gnllka points to Macroanthropos speculations in Philo, where the Logos is called the Head of all things (Quaest. in Ex. II 117) and the δεσμός of all things (Fug. 112). However, Philo consistently uses δέσμος in such cosmic contexts, not the more physiological σύνδεσμος. This is surprising if a Macroanthropos scheme actually underlies this usage. While Philo calls the Logos the head and the δέσμος

of all things, it exceeds the evidence to say he considered the head the  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$  of the world. As opposed to this cosmic scheme, we argued in chs. I-II that a New Adam theology better explains the author's Christology and ecclesiology. Granted the possible influence of the Philonic Logos doctrine, the author in adapting it need not have brought an Aion myth with it. Even in Philo the two ideas are essentially distinct. Thus, while Gniska may be correct that  $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\delta\epsilon\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$  introduces the Body of Christ concept, we disagree that this reflects a re-interpreted Macroanthropos scheme.

<sup>22</sup>Gniska, 200.

<sup>23</sup>The trinitarian structure, Spirit-Son-Father, while implicit misses the point. For the movement, Church-Lord-God, see Gniska, 201; Schlier, 188; cf. Abbott and Robinson.

<sup>24</sup>Gniska, 200; Barth, 466. Dibelius (ad loc.) supplies  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon$  to continue the imperative mood. But vs. 4 goes more naturally with vss. 5-6 and it is difficult to understand "one Lord" and "one God" as imperatives (cf. Schlier, 186; Abbott, 107f).

<sup>25</sup>For general discussion see O. Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions, esp. 20, 51; J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, 3rd ed., esp. 25f; V. H. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confessions, 44f; E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, 251-53, esp. n.831; Knox, 194; Hanson, 148ff; Dupont, Gnosis, 344. See also E. Peterson,  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ , (cited from Neufeld).

<sup>26</sup>For discussion see Neufeld, 34-41; Stauffer, TDNT III 94-109; NT Theology, 242-44; Barth, 465-67; Beare, 685-86; (also E. Peterson,  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ , 276-99).

<sup>27</sup>For discussion see, "Shema, Reading of," Encyclopedia Judaica XIV 1370-74; Str-B IV i 189-207; Schlürer, History of the Jewish People, rev. ed., II 454f; Neufeld, 35f.

<sup>28</sup>Conzelmann, I Corinthians, 144; Stauffer, NT Theology, 251 n.821. For the interaction between Jewish monotheism and the God of Hellenistic philosophy, see M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism I 261-67.

<sup>29</sup>Conzelmann, I Corinthians, 144.

<sup>30</sup>For texts, see Neufeld, 36-37; Stauffer, NT Theology, 251 n.821; (Peterson,  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ , esp. 277, 281, and 288).

<sup>31</sup>Stauffer, NT Theology, 251.



<sup>32</sup>Dibelius, 79. Dibelius and also Beare (686) detect stoic influence. But such ideas had already been incorporated into Hellenistic Judaism; cf. Gnika, 202f; Schlief, 185. Stauffer (NT Theology, 252 n.831) sees here a conflation of Jewish and Christian formulae.

<sup>33</sup>Neufeld, 44f; Cullmann, Confessions, 20, 51. Contrast Stauffer, NT Theology, 252 n.831.

<sup>34</sup>Staab, ad loc.

<sup>35</sup>Contrast Conzelmann, Outline, 87.

<sup>36</sup>J. Coutts, "Ephesians I. 3-14 and I Peter I. 3-12," NTS 3 (1957) 127.

<sup>37</sup>Stauffer, NT Theology, 251. See also R. R. Williams, "Logic Versus Experience in the Order of Creedal Formulae," NTS 1 (1954) 42-44. Our point is not that the order is illogical, but that vs. 4 is vague out of this context.

<sup>38</sup>Barth, 462f; Schlief, 185f.

<sup>39</sup>Barth, 465. This is the last of six points about "one God" (464ff).

<sup>40</sup>Dibelius, 79. Meyer (439) interprets ἐν instrumentally. But how are we called by the one hope, if as Meyer holds τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν gives rise to this hope. Eadie (259) suggests that ἐν "denotes a state of rest subsequent to previous motion. They had been called to hope, and in that hope they now were." Abbott (108) thinks ἐν shows "that the hope was an essential accompaniment of their calling." Burton (Galatians, 20f) offers the simplest solution; believers are "called to be in one hope."

<sup>41</sup>Burton, Galatians, 20-21.

<sup>42</sup>Gnika, 201 n.4.

<sup>43</sup>See above ch. I, 43ff.

<sup>44</sup>Martin, 72. For the Urzeit-Endzeit correlation, see above, ch. I, 26 n.34. For the connection with Adam, see IQS IV 23; CD III 20, 1QH XVII 15, 4QpPs xxxvii, III, 1f; cf. also S. Bar. liv 19; Vit.Ad. xii 16, 47; Apc. Mos. xxxix; TLev xviii 10-12. Schweizer, Neotestamentica, 279.

<sup>45</sup>Cf. Minear, IDB II 642.

<sup>46</sup>Minear, IDB II 642.

<sup>47</sup>E. Hoffmann, DNTT II 243.

<sup>48</sup>Schlief (186) and Gnika (201) give καὶ a causal sense. But this makes καὶ awkward. The καὶ insinuates that the clause intensifies



or complements a thought expressed elsewhere. But the context offers no other "causes" to be intensified or complemented. B 323 326 pc lat sy<sup>p</sup> sa bo<sup>pt</sup>; Cyp omit καὶ, but the preponderance of evidence favors its inclusion.

<sup>49</sup>Cf. Ewald, 178; de Wette, ad loc.

<sup>50</sup>Contrast Calvin, ad loc.

<sup>51</sup>See above, ch. II 140f.

<sup>52</sup>Translation from Charles, 315.

<sup>53</sup>Cf. above, ch. II, 161ff. There we suggested that the New Adam figure had a positive comparison with Isaac as well as its negative association with Adam. Throughout we have proposed that such a conflation is possible because Christology was seen to have an eschatological function: i.e. Christ is seen in his function of establishing in the Endzeit conditions exemplified in the Urzeit. This naturally lends itself to comparison and contrast with Adam, but also encourages other comparison, contrasts and relations insofar as these too play in the process of eschatological redemption. Thus, the association of the Spirit and the New Adam may not have arisen as a direct result of comparing Christ with Adam; rather a previous linking of Spirit and Messiah may have brought new points of comparison and contrast with Adam to light.

<sup>54</sup>Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 217.

<sup>55</sup>N. Q. Hamilton, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, 15.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid.

<sup>57</sup>Benoit (RB 63:21) calls it Christ's individual body "grossi de tous les chrétiens."

<sup>58</sup>This is the majority view.

<sup>59</sup>Robinson, 93; also R. R. Williams, NTS 1:42-44.

<sup>60</sup>See above, ch. II, 174, 175.

<sup>61</sup>If so, one recalls Gen ii 7; cf. I Cor xv 45. See above, pp. 188ff.

<sup>62</sup>Bietenhard, DNTT II 514f; Foerster, TDNT III 1088-92; Cullmann, Christology, 195-237; Neufeld, 51-68. Boussett (Kyrios Christos, esp. 146f) and R. Bultmann (II 123ff) argue that the title arose in the Hellenistic community. Most scholars now favor a Palestinian origin and the influence of Ps cx is often mentioned; cf. e.g. Fuller, Foundations, 156-58, 184f; Marshall, Origins, 107f; Dunn, Unity and Diversity, 53.

<sup>63</sup>Schlier, 187; Gnllka, 201f.

<sup>64</sup>Robinson, 93; cf. Schlier, 187; Gniska 202.

<sup>65</sup>Contrast Whitely, Theology, 161 n.19.

<sup>66</sup>J. A. T. Robinson, "The One Baptism as a Category of NT Soteriology," SJT 6 (1953) 257-74. Contrast W. E. Moore, "One Baptism," NTS 10 (1964) 504-16.

<sup>67</sup>Cf. Coutts, NTS 3:126.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid.

<sup>69</sup>Among those rendering "all things" are Abbott, Robinson, Barth, Gniska. Among those interpreting "all Christians," are Scott, Dibelius, Schlier, Meyer, Martin.

<sup>70</sup>Gniska, 204.

<sup>71</sup>Robinson, 94.

<sup>72</sup>The article before  $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$  is possibly due to dittography and should be omitted with B D\* F G L P\* 082 6 326 1739 1881 2495 al co. But in favor of the article are p<sup>46</sup>  $\kappa$  A C (\*:h.t.) D<sup>2</sup>  $\Psi$  and the majority of mss. The article would accent reception of grace as a concrete experience. For our purposes the question may be left open.

<sup>73</sup>Gniska, 205.

<sup>74</sup>Schlier, 190ff; H. Merklein, Das Kirchliche Amt nach dem Epheserbrief, 57-117.

<sup>75</sup>Schlier, 191; Merklein, 62, 64.

<sup>76</sup>Cf. below, p. 207.

<sup>77</sup> $\Delta\epsilon$  contrasts "each one of us" to the One Church, i.e. Many to the One. Merklein (59) refers it to a small group and the whole.

<sup>78</sup>Merklein (59) finds this indicated in the change from  $\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  in vss. 1-4 to  $\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  in vs. 7. This seems weak grounds for so major a shift, esp. as the pronoun's proposed antecedent does not occur until four verses later. Nowhere else in Eph. does  $\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  refer to a select group of Church officers and it seems unlikely that vs. 7 is an exception.

<sup>79</sup>See below, pp. 208-13.

<sup>80</sup>Cf. Barth, 477-84; cf. below p. 210f.

<sup>81</sup>Gniska, 206.

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., Barth, 480.

<sup>83</sup>Gniska, 206.



<sup>84</sup>Merklein, 63. Contrast Gnllka, 206.

<sup>85</sup>Schlier (191) and Merklein (63f) find grounds here to limit vs. 7 to the officers of vs. 11. Merklein even speaks of an "Amtsgnade." But while χάρις δοθῆναι may be a technicus terminus for imparting a special grace, such a "gift of service" need not be confined to a distinct class. It may manifest itself in many diverse ways. This does not mean that some gifts do not have a certain structural priority, or that certain patterns of ministry cannot be expected. It does mean God's gift to serve is not limited to set patterns. We see this even among the gifts listed. An apostle is different from a prophet; also, not every apostle is like Paul, or every evangelist like Philip. On the word χάρις see, Conzelmann/Zimmerli, TDNT IX 372-402; H. H. Esser, DNTT II 115-23; J. Moffatt, Grace in the New Testament. These scholars essentially agree with our interpretation.

<sup>86</sup>Barth, 429f.

<sup>87</sup>This is the majority view.

<sup>88</sup>Τὸ μέτρον means here "measure," "proportion" or "size"; see Bauer, 515; Deissner, TDNT IV 632-34. Gnllka (206 n.1) points to Qumran parallels, 1QS IV 16, 24; 1QH XIV 19. For a different view, see Barth, 429f; cf. C. E. Cranfield, "Μέτρον Πλοτέως in Romans 12:3," NTS 8 (1961/62) 345-51.

<sup>89</sup><sup>2</sup> B C\* D<sup>2</sup> Ψ 082, most mss, sy and M Vict read καὶ ἔδωκεν. But the καὶ should be omitted with p<sup>46</sup> κ\* A C<sup>2</sup> D\* F G 33 1241<sup>S</sup> 2464 pc latt, Ir<sup>1at</sup> Tert.

<sup>90</sup>The subject of λέγει is disputed. Abbott, Robinson and others imply ἡ γραφή and render "it says." Salmond, Scott, Barth, Bruce and others make God the subject, "He says." For our purposes, it is sufficient to note that divine authority stands behind the verb, whether referring to "the writing" or God.

<sup>91</sup>W. R. Taylor, IB IV 354; A. A. Anderson, Psalms (1-72), 481; Eaton, Psalms, 169f.

<sup>92</sup>The captives are probably the Canaanite kings who fought against Israel, though a more general reference is possible; Anderson, Psalms (1-72), 492; Taylor, IB IV 357. Briggs and Briggs (Psalms II, 101) refers this to the rescue of captive Israelites. But unconvincing is G. V. Smith's attempt ("Paul's Use of Psalm 68:18 in Ephesians 4:8," Journ Evang Theol Soc 18, 1975, 181-89) to limit the reference to Levites.



<sup>93</sup>R. Rubinkiewicz, "PS LXVIII 19 (= EPH IV 8) Another Textual Tradition or Targum?" NT 17 (1975) 220.

<sup>94</sup>Rubinkiewicz, NT 17:221f; also Merklein, 65f.

<sup>95</sup>Translation cited from Caird, 74.

<sup>96</sup>E.g. Caird, 220f; Gnilka, 208f; Beare, 688.

<sup>97</sup>Rubinkiewicz, NT 17:219-24; cf. Merklein, 65f.

<sup>98</sup>Rubinkiewicz, NT 17:221.

<sup>99</sup>E.g. Abbott, Dibelius, Scott, Schlier, Gnilka, Barth, Bruce, Houlden, and others. Mitton (146f) remains cautious.

<sup>100</sup>The text is cited in Rubinkiewicz, NT 17:221. Rubinkiewicz (222) dates the passage ca. 150 B.C., but this seems optimistic. Still the passage contains nothing intrinsically Christian, and even if TDan is of Christian origin, the tradition behind this passage is conceivably quite early, if not pre-Christian.

<sup>101</sup>The author does not explain clearly who these captives are, and we are content with the uncertainty; cf. Mitton, 146f.

<sup>102</sup>The majority of mss. read κατέβη πρῶτον, including  $\kappa^2$  B C<sup>3</sup> K P  $\Psi$  88 104 181 326 pm f vg sy sa<sup>mss</sup>; Eus. This is best considered an interpretive gloss. Omit with p<sup>46</sup>  $\kappa^*$  A C<sup>\*</sup> D F G I<sup>vid</sup> 082 6 33 81 1241<sup>s</sup> 1739 1881 pc it vg<sup>mss</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> bo; Ir<sup>lat</sup> Tert Ambst. We also omit μέρη with p<sup>46</sup> D<sup>\*</sup> F G it; Ir<sup>lat</sup> Tert Ambst. UBS and Nestle-Aland include the term in brackets with  $\kappa$  A B C D<sup>2</sup> I  $\Psi$  082 pm f vg. But the omission is less easily explained than the addition. We know from ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις that the author can leave a μέρη or similar term to be implied.

<sup>103</sup>Cf. E. Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, 14, 144. Smith (Journ Evang Theol Soc 18:181-89) objects to this classification. We too disagree that the author simply offers a free rendering of the text. Still, his interpretation is best described as a pesher-type.

<sup>104</sup>Christ's ascent brings meaning to the Psalm verse. If the argument were intended to prove who ascended, it begs the question (cf. Zerwick, 167). The author rather intends to explicate the implications of Christ's "ascent according to Scripture."

<sup>105</sup>Cf. Robinson, 96.

<sup>106</sup>Cf. Merklein, 68.

<sup>107</sup>G. B. Caird, "The Descent of Christ in Ephesians 4, 7-11," Studia Evangelica II (TU 87, Berlin, 1964) 535-45; also his commentary, 73-75;

Abbott, 114-16; Kirby, 145f; D. E. Garland, "A Life Worthy of the Calling: Unity and Holiness: Ephesians 4:1-24," *Rev Exp* 76 (1979) 517-27; esp. 521-23.

<sup>108</sup>See above, p. 200. Merklein (68 n.49) points out that Targum does not explicitly mention a descent.

<sup>109</sup>Kirby, 145f; cf. also Beare, 689.

<sup>110</sup>Merklein, 68 n.49.

<sup>111</sup>Cf. Merklein, 68 n.49.

<sup>112</sup>Salmond, 326; Mitton, 148. We agree with Salmond that ii 17 and iii 17 are not convincing parallels.

<sup>113</sup>Robinson, Wescott, Dibelius, Scott and others refer εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς to Hades or the underworld. But this conflicts with Eph i 20f, iii 10, vi 12 where spiritual forces are in the heavenlies, or in the air (ii 2). It is better then to take the genitive as appositive, referring to the lower regions which make up "the earth." See Barth, Schlier, Gnllka, and others. For an older, but concise and useful treatment, see Salmond, 326f.

<sup>114</sup>This is made easier if 'ל'ד' מִן is emended to 'ל'ד' מִן אֶרֶץ (so RSV); but see A. R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Israel, 73.

<sup>115</sup>Αὐτός does not mean "the same"; this would require an article, ὁ αὐτός; Abbott, 116; Salmond, 327; Barth, 434 n.51. Barth's contention that the verse is an hymnic fragment has little to commend it.

<sup>116</sup>On ὑπεράνω cf. i 20. Use of the plural οὐράνιοι was common in Judaism; cf. also i 10 and Col i 16, both with γῆ. See Traub, TDNT V 497-543, esp. 517f.

<sup>117</sup>Cf. above, ch. I, 70-73.

<sup>118</sup>Moule, Idiom Book, 142f.

<sup>119</sup>Cf. Bauer, 378.

<sup>120</sup>Cf. Best, 149. For a synopsis of the options, see Ernst, 141ff.

<sup>121</sup>See above, ch. I, 95-99.

<sup>122</sup>See above, 99-102.

<sup>123</sup>Cf. Barth, 434; Robinson, 96. 1QM XII 10-18 and XIX 2-4 link Ps lxxviii 19 to God's victory over His enemies and the filling of the land with glory and His inheritance with blessing.

<sup>124</sup><sub>p</sub><sup>46</sup> amends the aorist to a perfect, δέδωκεν.



<sup>125</sup>As in i 22 ἔδωκεν has the pregnant sense, "constitute," "make," or "give to be"; cf. Barth, 435; van Roon, 179f; see above, ch. I, 57ff.

<sup>126</sup>Cf. Käsemann, Essays, 104; T. W. Manson, The Church's Ministry, 31. Interestingly, except for "evangelist," (but cf. Mk i 14f; Lk viii 1, Eph ii 17) the terms used can also refer in the New Testament to Christ: apostle = Heb iii 1 (the idea of Jesus having been sent is more common); prophet = e.g. Mk vi 4 par., 15; Mt xxi 11; Lk vii 16, xxiv 19; Jn iv 19, vi 14, vii 40, ix 17; shepherd = Mk vi 34 par., xiv 27 par.; Jn x 11, 14; Heb xiii 20; I Pet ii 25, v 4; teacher = e.g. Mk x 17, xii 14, 19; Lk xxi 7; Jn iii 2, 10.

<sup>127</sup>The articles in τοὺς μὲν...τοὺς δέ, serve as pronouns, "some...others," or "these...those"; B1-D §250; Robertson, Grammar, s.v., and most commentators. Merklein (73-75) objects, noting with B1-D (§250) and Mayser (II i 56f) that this usage fades during the NT era. But fading is not faded and the evidence shows a fluid state; cf. I Cor vii 7. When taken as pronouns, the articles may find their antecedent in the Ps citation, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. The author in vs. 11, then, does not simply apply the Ps verse, but also interprets it. By using ἔδωκεν in its pregnant sense and the articles as pronouns (creating a double accusative), he shows that receiving a gift means receiving what is necessary to be a gift to others.

<sup>128</sup>While one may speak of "officers," these were functionally defined. Cf. Mitton, 149; Caird, 75f; Robinson, 97f; Barth, 477-84.

<sup>129</sup>Cf. I Cor xii 28. For literature beyond the commentaries and studies on Eph., see C. K. Barrett, Signs of An Apostle, esp. 23-81; J. H. Schutz, Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority, esp. 22-34; W. Schmithals, The Office of Apostle in the Early Church; Bultmann, II 105f; Conzelmann, Outline, 45f; Ridderbos, Outline, 448-50; Whiteley, Theology, 169-204; D. Müller, DNTT I 126-37; M. H. Shepherd, Jr., IDB I 171f; Rengstorff, TDNT I 407-47; Burton, Galatians, 363-84; Lightfoot, Galatians, 92-101; Moule, Colossians, 155-59; Jackson and Lake, Beginnings of Christianity, V 37-59; J. A. Kirk, "Apostleship since Rengstorff: towards a Synthesis," NTS 21 (1974/75) 249-64. Further literature may be found in the bibliographies and notes of these studies.

<sup>130</sup>The NT use of ἀποστόλος was fluid (cf. Schutz, 34). We may distinguish three, possibly four usages: (1) a non-technical meaning denoting one who is sent (cf. Jn xiii 16, Phil ii 25, II Cor viii 23); (2) a technical meaning that identifies the term with the Twelve (Acts i 2ff);



(3) a semi-technical usage indicating a person who has seen the risen Lord and been commissioned by him (I Cor ix 6, xv 7; Gal i 19; Acts xiv 14; Rom xvi 7; I Th ii 6). But if I Cor iv 9 includes Apollos as an apostle and I Th ii 6 includes Timothy, then this suggests (4) a broader circle denoting those who have received a "special Christian commission." Cf. Moule, 155ff. Eph iv 11 probably has group (3) in view, although (4) is possible (cf. Best, 163ff).

<sup>131</sup>Cf. I Cor ix 1-3; II Cor xii 12; also Heb ii 4. On the subject, see Barrett, Signs of an Apostle.

<sup>132</sup>Mitton (6, 111), Houlden (312f), Gnifka (157), Ernst (177) and others think "the holy apostles and prophets" refer to a past generation. Contrast Barth, 314-17.

<sup>133</sup>This is the majority view. Contrast R. Brown, Semitic Background, 58 n.70.

<sup>134</sup>For general discussion beyond the commentaries, see Peisker/Brown, DNTT III 74-89; D. Hill, "On the Evidence of the Creative Role of Christian Prophets," NTS 20 (1973/74) 262-74; Krämer/Rendtorff/Meyer/Friedrich, TDNT VI 781-861; H. A. Guy, New Testament Prophecy; Ed. Schweizer, Church Order in the New Testament; H. Greeven, "Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus," ZNW 44 (1952/53) 1-43; W. H. Mare, "Prophet and Teacher in the New Testament Period," Bull Evang Theol Soc 9 (1966) 139-48. Ridderbos, Outline, 450-52; Ernst, 178-81.

<sup>135</sup>Cf. Friedrich, TDNT VI 848-61; also W. H. Mare, Bull Evang Theol Soc 9:139-48.

<sup>136</sup>Friedrich, TDNT VI 850. Cf. Ernst, 175.

<sup>137</sup>For literature beyond the commentaries see Friedrich, TDNT II 736-37; U. Becker, DNTT II 114; Shepherd, IDB II 181; Ridderbos, Outline, 459; D. H. Hadidian, "tous de evangelistas in Eph 4, 11," CBQ 28 (1966) 317-21; Ernst, 181-83.

<sup>138</sup>R. N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, 200.

<sup>139</sup>Contrast, however, D. H. Haridian, CBQ 28:317-21.

<sup>140</sup>Harnack, Mission and Expansion of Christianity I, 321 n.4.

<sup>141</sup>For literature see, J. Jeremias, TDNT VI 485-99; Beyreuther, DNTT III 564-68; Ernst, 183; J. G. S. S. Thomson, "The Shepherd-Ruler Concept in the OT and its Application in the NT," SJT 8 (1955) 406-8; Throckmorton, IDB III 668. Barth (438f) stresses the identification of the shepherds with the elders and bishops; see also Abbott, 118; Ridderbos, 455;

Jeremias, TDNT VI 498; Schlier, 197. Shepherd imagery is also used to define the mebaqqer of the Qumran sect (CD XIII 9); see B. E. Thiering, "MEBAQQER and EPISKOPOS in the Light of the Temple Scroll," JBL 100 (1981) 59-74.

<sup>142</sup>For discussion see Rengstorff, TDNT II 148-59; Wagenast, DNTT III 766-68; W. H. Mare, Bull Evang Theol Soc 9:139-48; Ridderbos, 452-54; Ernst, 184f; Greeven, ZNW 44:1-43; P. Parker, IDB IV 522f.

<sup>143</sup>Barth (438f) is among recent scholars who take the single article to mean that one person exercises both functions. Abbott, Caird, Jeremias, Gnilya and others think both gifts are confined to the local community. The construction could simply be a loose way of expressing additional gifts. We find it unlikely that shepherding and teaching are identical ministries; beyond this we leave the question open.

<sup>144</sup>J. Cambier, "La Signification Christologique D'Éph. IV 7-10," NTS 9 (1963) 266; Barth, 436, 481. Schlier (195ff) speaks of a special ministerial grace.

<sup>145</sup>Cf. T. W. Manson, The Church's Ministry, 31.

<sup>146</sup>R. Shippers, DNTT III 349-51; Delling, TDNT I 475; Bauer, 418; Abbott, 119; Robinson, 181f; Barth, 439; Lidd-Scott, s.v.

<sup>147</sup>Ibid.

<sup>148</sup>Bauer, 418; Abbott, 119.

<sup>149</sup>Cf. Barth, 54.

<sup>150</sup>For literature and discussion, see Hess, DNTT III 544-49; Beyer, TDNT II 81-93; H. Wagner, "Diakonie," RGG<sup>3</sup> II 162ff; C. E. B. Cranfield, "Diakonia in the New Testament" in Service in Christ, 37-48; W. Brandt, Dienst und Dienen im Neuen Testament (unavailable); Bauer, 184.

<sup>151</sup>Beyer, TDNT II 82; Hess, DNTT III 545.

<sup>152</sup>Beyer, TDNT II 81.

<sup>153</sup>Cf. Plato, Gorg. 518A; Beyer TDNT 82; Hess, DNTT III 545; Cranfield, "Diakonia....," 37.

<sup>154</sup>For NT usage, see Beyer, TDNT II, 85f; Hess, DNTT III 546f; Cranfield, "Diakonia....," 37-41.

<sup>155</sup>Cf. Beyer, TDNT II 87.

<sup>156</sup>Cf. K. Lake, "The Communism of Acts" in The Beginnings of Christianity V 148f. In any case, the daily distribution involved not



only "waiting on tables," but also the supervision and organization of the task. Beyer, TDNT II 84, 87.

<sup>157</sup>Cranfield, "Diakonia...", 38; Käsemann, Romans, 342; cf. Barrett, Romans, 7.

<sup>158</sup>Beyer, TDNT II 87.

<sup>159</sup>Abbott, 119; so too Meyer, Dibelius, Schlief, Merklein (76) and others.

<sup>160</sup>Abbott (119) tries to avoid this problem by making the preceding πρὸς-phrase "the ultimate purpose with a view to which the teachers, etc., have been given εἰς ἔργον διακ, εἰς οἶκ, κ.τ.λ." But the author did not write ἔδωκεν πρὸς τ. καταρ. τ. ἁγί. τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους κ.τ.λ.

<sup>161</sup>Salmond, 331.

<sup>162</sup>E.g. Barth, Beare, Bruce, Caird, Foulkes, Gnifka, Houlden, Mitton, Scott.

<sup>163</sup>Salmond, 331.

<sup>164</sup>Ibid. Cf. G. T. Montague, The Living Thought of Saint Paul, 201.

<sup>165</sup>Michel, TDNT V 144-47; Goetzmann, DNTT II 251-53. See also P. Viehnauer, Oikodome; J. Pfammatter, Die Kirche als Bau; B. Gärtner, Temple and Community in Qumran; R. J. McKelvey, The New Temple; Schlief, Christus, 49-60; Ridderbos, 429-45; Best, 160-68.

<sup>166</sup>Michel, TDNT V 146; Goetzmann, DNTT II 253. J. A. T. Robinson (The Body, 75f) and E. E. Ellis (Paul and His Recent Interpreters, 40ff) refer οἰκοδομή and σῶμα here to the Church. This is unlikely.

<sup>167</sup>Michel, TDNT V 140-42, 145.

<sup>168</sup>The translation of the anarthrous construction is debated. Schlief (143) and Dibelius (73) question the grammatical rule that says πᾶς needs an article to mean "all the" (but see Mitton, 115). But to render "all the building" suggests that a completed edifice changes from one kind of building to another. Αὐξάνω hardly denotes such a transformation (Best, 166). Οἰκοδομή probably refers to the process of building and the phrase means "all that is built," "every addition" (cf. Abbott, 72-75).

<sup>169</sup>Συναρμολογουμένη, derived from the masonry term, ἀρμολογέω (see Robinson, 260ff), favors individual believers as living stones (cf. I Pet ii 5). Percy (Die Probleme, 463) and Mitton (115) refer the expression to "every congregation." While possible, it cannot mean every



building of the temple precincts. This would require ἱερόν (= the temple complex), not ναός (= the shrine).

<sup>170</sup>Cf. Abbott, 75.

<sup>171</sup>Best, 168.

<sup>172</sup>Michel, TDNT V 145; Abbott, 143; Barth, 519.

<sup>173</sup>Cf. Scott, 223.

<sup>174</sup>Gnilka, 213.

<sup>175</sup>Schlier (Christus, 27ff) thinks the mixture of images points to a gnostic background; cf. Vielhauer, Oikodome, 141ff. But evidence from the Qumran writings suggests the imagery has Jewish roots; Mussner, PQ, 168-73; McKelvy, The New Temple, 108-23; Pfammatter, Die Kirche als Bau, 155ff. On this mixture of metaphors, cf. Barth, 440; Best, 150f; Ridderbos, 431f. But while we acknowledge the interaction of images, "the building grows," "the Body is built," in each one image dominates, the other serving to explain it. In Eph ii 20 the building image is to the fore, here it is the Body image.

<sup>176</sup>E.g. Schweizer, TDNT VII 1079.

<sup>177</sup>The Body is primarily a passive concept and its members' activities are responsive. Still the members do have this responsive role in the up-building process. Gnostic texts provide little parallel to this. It also speaks against the Church as a New Eve (Shedd, Man in Community, 163). Adam did not build Eve through Eve's members.

<sup>178</sup>Cf. I Cor xiii-xiv. The object in Eph iv 12, 16 is not, however, the ἐκκλησία, but Christ's Body, suggesting a particular perspective on the Church as the Corporate Christ.

<sup>179</sup>See below, pp. 233-43.

<sup>180</sup>B1-D §382:2.

<sup>181</sup>Gnilka, 114; contrast Schlier, 199.

<sup>182</sup>Abbott, 120; Salmond, 332.

<sup>183</sup>Gnilka, 114.

<sup>184</sup>Bauer, 415; Michel, TDNT III 623-25; Barth, 485ff; Montague, The Living Thought, 201.

<sup>185</sup>Robinson, Merklein, Schlier and others.

<sup>186</sup>In Acts xxvi 7 and Phil iii 11 καταντάω describes the attainment of the hope of resurrection.

<sup>187</sup>Cf. above, ch. I, 42f.

<sup>188</sup>B1-D §275:7; also Best, 148f.

<sup>189</sup>F G b; C1<sup>pt</sup> Lcf omit τοῦ υἱοῦ.

<sup>190</sup>Contrast Westcott, 63; cf. Barth, 487-89.

<sup>191</sup>Barth, 488.

<sup>192</sup>K. Sullivan, "Epignosis in the Epistles of St Paul," Stud. Paul. Cong. Inter. (1961) II (405-416) 414. See also Robinson, 248-54; and on γινώσκω, Bultmann, TDNT I 689-714. While it may be questioned whether ἐπίγνωσις always suggests "full and complete knowledge," the idea suits the context here.

<sup>193</sup>Barth (484-89) takes the Son of God as the subject or agent of faith and knowledge. For him vs. 13 describes a festival procession of an enthronement or marriage rite. In this way, he infers not only a movement of the Church to Christ, but also of Christ towards the Church (486). The meeting of such a regal person entails acquiring and sharing his attributes and qualities. Thus "faith and knowledge" are attributes of God's Son describing "Christ's 'faithfulness' to God and his 'knowledge' of the bride" (489). This thesis falls short at several points. (1) It is a precarious procedure to deduce from the Church's movement toward its destiny, Christ's movement toward the Church, and then make the latter the primary starting point. (2) Nothing here suggests that faith refers to the Son's faithfulness to God, or knowledge to his knowledge of the Bride. This reads too much into these words. (3) In iv 5 faith refers to the community's one faith as a focal point of unity (see above, p. 192f). The believers' faith is also in view at i 15, ii 8 and iii 12. (4) In i 18, the author prays that his readers might know what is the hope of his calling. In iii 19 he prays again that the readers might comprehend Christ's love which surpasses knowledge. Here knowledge relates to unity, since this occurs "with all the saints." (5) Finally, while ἐνότης is living and dynamic, it is inappropriate to make it an adjectival participle as Barth does.

<sup>194</sup>For discussion and literature, see Martitz/Fohrer/Schweizer/Lohse/Schneemelcher, TDNT VIII 334-97; Michel/Marshall, DNTT III 634-48; M. Hengel, The Son of God; W. Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God.

<sup>195</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VIII 384; cf. Hengel, The Son of God, 8ff, 93.

<sup>196</sup>Cf. Robinson, 178. Ἐνότης is an abstraction meaning "oneness," and connotes "concord" and "harmony." Cf. Bauer, s.v.; Liddell-Scott, s.v.



<sup>197</sup>E.g. Mussner, CAK, 62ff; Percy, Die Probleme, 321; van Roon, 319-25; Mitton, 154.

<sup>198</sup>Schlier, 200f. In contrast, Warnach (22, 67 n.85) argues from the gnostic framework for a "kollektiven" understanding.

<sup>199</sup>Barth, 489-96; also "Die Parusie im Epheserbrief, Eph 4, 13" in Neues Testament und Geschichte, 239-50.

<sup>200</sup>Schweizer, Neotestamentica, 304; Best, 149; Ernst, 141-47; Abbott, 120; Gnllka, 215; Du Plessis, Teleios, 188-93.

<sup>201</sup>The Body image interacts with what it represents such that the author constantly views the Church from this perspective. This interaction between "representing figure" and "represented matter" allows the author to speak, not of "all of us" (πάντες), nor "the whole" (τὸ πᾶν), but "all of us as a whole" (οἱ πάντες). Cf. Du Plessis, Teleios, 189f.

<sup>202</sup>Van Roon, 323.

<sup>203</sup>Schlier, 200f; Barth, 484-87, 495f.

<sup>204</sup>In I Clem xxiii 4 the term can denote the ripening of fruit.

<sup>205</sup>Percy, Die Probleme, 323.

<sup>206</sup>Cf. Best, 149.

<sup>207</sup>Jeremias, TDNT I 364-66; Barth, 494-96.

<sup>208</sup>Du Plessis, Teleios, esp. 188-93; cf. Barth, 489-92.

<sup>209</sup>Roels, God's Mission, 205.

<sup>210</sup>Van Roon, 322.

<sup>211</sup>Barth, 494.

<sup>212</sup>Barth, 494 n.309.

<sup>213</sup>Murray, 68.

<sup>214</sup>Schlier, Christus, 27ff; for criticism, see Barth, 495. In Acta Archelai 8:7 we do have a collective reference.

<sup>215</sup>See below, ch. IV, 302f.

<sup>216</sup>See above, ch. II, 132ff.

<sup>217</sup>Cf. II Esdras iii 1: καὶ συνήχθη ὁ λαὸς ὡς ἀνὴρ (ἡ'ἰ) εἰς κ.τ.λ. (= Ezra iii 1, cf. II Esdras xviii 1 = Neh viii 1). While "adulthood" is not stressed here, the passages do show that the term can be used as a metaphor for an assembly.



<sup>218</sup>Cf. Best, 148.

<sup>219</sup>Cf. Robinson, 101.

<sup>220</sup>Bauer, 345; Schneider, TDNT II 941-43; Schippers, DNTT I 92f.

<sup>221</sup>Abbott, 120.

<sup>222</sup>Cf. Schlier, 201; Dibelius, 82; Gnllka, 215.

<sup>223</sup>Even if ἡλικίας means stature here, it functions as a mark of maturity. Perhaps a broad rendering is appropriate, including age and size, e.g. "growth," "maturity."

<sup>224</sup>Cf. above, ch. I, 104. Some scholars take τοῦ πληρ. with μέτρον or ἡλικία, rendering "the full measure of maturity," or "the measure of full maturity" (cf. e.g. Bauer, 345). But in view of the article, it is best taken with Christ (cf. i 23). Also if Robinson (183) correctly renders μέτρον alone as "the full measure," the attributive rendering is redundant. For the options, see Abbott, 120f; Deissner, TDNT IV 633.

<sup>225</sup>Thus while Christ is the object of faith and knowledge, he is the subject or agent of the filling.

<sup>226</sup>Abbott, Westcott, Schlier, Gnllka, Barth; contrast Salmond.

<sup>227</sup>Bertram, TDNT IV 912-23; Braumann, DNTT I 281-83; Bauer, 537.

<sup>228</sup>Cf. Merklein (109) who states "dass νήπιοι κ.τ.λ. die gesamte konkrete (οἱ πάντες) gemeint hat."

<sup>229</sup>On the participles, see Bauer, 436, 653. Cf. Isa lxvii 20f; Jas i 6; Ju 12; Heb xiii 9.

<sup>230</sup>Merklein, 107; Rengstorf, TDNT II 161. Salmond, Robinson, Abbott and others take it as teaching in the abstract.

<sup>231</sup>Rengstorf, TDNT II 161.

<sup>232</sup>A adds τοῦ διαβόλου, probably to parallel vi 11.

<sup>233</sup>Ellicott, ad loc.; Salmond, 334. Contrast Abbott, 122.

<sup>234</sup>Bauer, 456; Abbott, 122; Barth, 443; Robinson, 184.

<sup>235</sup>E.g. Beare, 694; Caird, 77.

<sup>236</sup>For ἄνθρωπος in a derogatory sense, cf. Col ii 8, 22. These contrast the "men" who make up the Church and receive gifts from Christ (iv 8).

<sup>237</sup>Robinson, 184; Bauernfeind, TDNT V 722-27; Carson, DNTT I 412f.

<sup>238</sup>Michaelis, TDNT V 102f; Ebel, DNTT III 943; Bauer, 499; also Abbott, Robinson, Salmond. The word does not occur in pre-Christian Greek.

<sup>239</sup>Bauer, 665f; Braun, TDNT VI 228-53; Günter, DNTT II 457-61; also Salmond, 334f; Robinson, 185. Barth (443) translates "deceitful scheming."

<sup>240</sup>F G (perhaps depending on a Latin version) read ἀληθείαν δὲ ποιοῦντες. This is clearly an attempt to interpret ἀληθεύοντες.

<sup>241</sup>The lexicographical evidence favors this view; Gnilka, 217 (cf. Gal iv 7). The author's interest in speaking is evinced also in iv 25, 29, v 4, v 19 (cf. v 11). Of course many exhortations in chs. iv-v do not concern speaking and one may feel a broader interpretation is needed (cf. Abbott, 123). We suggest here "speaking" wholistically represents the whole person in his moral disposition.

<sup>242</sup>Salmond (335) takes ἐν ἀγάπῃ with αὐξήσωμεν, thus making it parallel to vs. 16, "upbuilding in love." This gives the verb three qualifiers, and the participle none. Taking the phrase with the participle gives the verse better symmetry and better parallels the participles in vs. 14.

<sup>243</sup>Cf. Gnilka, 217.

<sup>244</sup>For a good bibliography see Günter/Link, DNTT II 550f.

<sup>245</sup>Burton, Galatians, 314.

<sup>246</sup>Abbott, 123; Barth, 444; Best, 149f; Gnilka, 217 n.5; Merklein, 112; Meyer, 463; Salmond, 335.

<sup>247</sup>Schlier, 205f; cf. Howard, NTS 20:355.

<sup>248</sup>Van Roon, 219.

<sup>249</sup>Schlier, 206.

<sup>250</sup>Schlier, 207.

<sup>251</sup>For criticism, see Gnilka, 207.

<sup>252</sup>See above ch. I, 76ff.

<sup>253</sup>For points i-iv, see Merklein, 111f.

<sup>254</sup>Cf. Schlier, 209. The repetition of σῶμα avoids ambiguity. Αὐτοῦ would be far from its antecedent and easily linked to μέρους (cf. Robinson, 188; Salmond, 338).

<sup>255</sup>See above, ch. I, 112.

<sup>256</sup>Schlier, 205f.

<sup>257</sup>Best, 149f; Barth, 445.

<sup>258</sup>Cf. Meyer, 463.



<sup>259</sup>Best, 149f.

<sup>260</sup>Best, 150.

<sup>261</sup>See above, ch. I, 244; also Appendix B, 346f, 363-66, 371-73.

<sup>262</sup>Meyer, 463; cf. Abbott, 124.

<sup>263</sup>Cf. above, ch. I, 112.

<sup>264</sup>There are minor textual variants: D\* F G 6 1739 1881 pc omit ἡ before κεφαλή. We retain the article with p<sup>46</sup> κ A B C D<sup>c</sup> Ψ 082. Also κ<sup>2</sup> D F G Ψ 082 and most mss insert ὁ before Χριστός. We omit the article with κ\* A B C 6 33 81 1175 1241<sup>s</sup> 1739 1881 2464 pc. Interestingly p<sup>46</sup> reads τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

<sup>265</sup>Barth, 445.

<sup>266</sup>Ibid.

<sup>267</sup>Howard, NTS 20:354; Caird, 77f.

<sup>268</sup>G. H. Whitaker ("Συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζούμενον," JTS o.s. 31, 1930, 48f) thinks σῶμα is a trunk attached to the Head, while Caird (77f) denies an organic relation altogether. We find middle ground based on Semitic thinking; the head indicates the whole person in a particular function. Does this mean the Head grows? Roels (108), e.g. denies an organic relation precisely because it implies the head grows. Several points are relevant: (1) The author uses his organic imagery to convey a functional relation, not a physical one. Of course, in the human body functional relations are physically determined, but this does not lessen the idea's usefulness as a metaphor so long as there is some analogous determining factor, e.g. the Spirit, redemptive history, God's will. (2) The author may not have thought the head's involvement in the growth process entailed its increase in size or change in function. In comparison to the increase in size and change in function of the hands, feet, or sex organs, the head seems fairly stable. We must recall that mental development would not be specifically associated with the Head. (3) To remain constant in its function, the head must adapt itself and co-ordinate itself to the changing needs of a growing body. This is certainly not a crude picture of the exalted Christ. Christ is involved in the ongoing life of the Church and ever responsive to its needs. If Christ cannot be said to grow, then his relation to the Church certainly does. (4) Finally, the imagery is metaphorical and may be expected to break down at some points. Certainly the author knew that a head without a body can no more



live than a body without a head. But because of his wholistic approach only the latter can be deduced from his use of the metaphor.

<sup>269</sup>Robinson, 260-63; Maurer, TDNT VII 855f; Montague, The Living Thought, 206; Whitaker, JTS o.s. 31:48f; Barth, 272f; Bauer, 785.

<sup>270</sup>Cf. Barth, 273; Montague, The Living Thought, 206.

<sup>271</sup>Robinson, 261f; Maurer, TDNT VII 855.

<sup>272</sup>Robinson, 262.

<sup>273</sup>Robinson, 263. Contrast Abbott, 125.

<sup>274</sup>Delling, TDNT VII 763-66; Whitaker, JTS o.s. 31:48f; Bauer, 777.

<sup>275</sup>For texts and discussion, see Delling, TDNT VII 763.

<sup>276</sup>For discussion, see Lohse, 80f; cf. Martin, Moule, Scott.

<sup>277</sup>Lightfoot's discussion (198-201) remains a classic.

<sup>278</sup>The change is probably due to a shift in focus. In Col ii the Head/Body relation is more directly in view; while in Eph iv the Head/Body relation bears on the Church's diversity. Cf. Lightfoot, 200; also Beare, 695; Barth, 447.

<sup>279</sup>Whitaker, JTS o.s. 31:48f.

<sup>280</sup>Abbott, 125.

<sup>281</sup>Contrast Meyer, 465.

<sup>282</sup>For discussion, see Lightfoot, 198f. Lightfoot shows the improbability here of the meaning "sensation"; contra Meyer, 465. Robinson (186) links the term to ἄπτω, "to fasten, or tie," and points to a technical use of Hippocrates for "ligament" (Galen, Lex xix 87). But Lightfoot is on surer grounds, basing his interpretation on ἄπτομαι, "to touch." Cf. Abbott, 125f; Barth, 448f.

<sup>283</sup>Lightfoot, 198; Scott, 56, 214.

<sup>284</sup>Lightfoot, 199. Still this definition is closer to Abbott's than Robinson's. Only his application of "contact" to the body brings Lightfoot to render "joints."

<sup>285</sup>In contrast to false teachings and the wiles of error. Christians unite and join together through the true teachings and loving qualities that communicate Christ's life-support. Also in Col ii 19 the contacts and bands probably contrast the entangling false teachings and attitudes of the flesh. They refer to Christians bearing the qualities of Christian existence, the true teachings, attitudes, gifts and fruits of the Spirit.

By bearing these qualities Christians come into contact with and bind themselves to one another, promoting the unity and nourishment of the whole. This interpretation gains strength if Col iii 14 and Eph iv 3 retain the physiological metaphor (cf. Beare, IB XI 219).

<sup>286</sup>Beare, 695; cf. Barth, 448f.

<sup>287</sup>Robinson, 186-88; Lightfoot, 200.

<sup>288</sup>Bauer, 883; Barth, 448.

<sup>289</sup>Bauer, 305; Barth, 448; cf. Lohse, 122 n.62.

<sup>290</sup>E.g. Lightfoot, 200. Robinson (186-88) denies this. But in view is the supply necessary for growth, and nutriment is essential for growth. Cf. Best, 127 n.3.

<sup>291</sup>Cf. Barth, 450.

<sup>292</sup>Abbott, 126; Beare, 695.

<sup>293</sup>Cf. Barth, 449.

<sup>294</sup>F G it; Ir<sup>lat</sup> Lcf Ambst omit κατ' ἐνέργειαν. p<sup>46</sup> changes the reading to καὶ ἐνέργειας. The accepted reading is attested by κ A B C D Ψ 082. Another variant is the reading of μέλους by A C Ψ 365 pc a vg sy<sup>p</sup> bo. But μέρος is attested by p<sup>46</sup> p<sup>49</sup> κ B D F G 082. Μέρος was a common synonym for μέλος when speaking of parts of the body. See Schneider, TDNT IV 594-98.

<sup>295</sup>Contrast Salmond, 338; Gnilka, 220.

<sup>296</sup>The idea is not how the supply is distributed "according to the needs of each single part," (Barth, 449), but how each part's activity contributes to the Body's life-support. Abbott (127) links both ἐν μέτρῳ and ἐνὸς ἑκάστου μέρους directly to ἐνέργεια, "according to the proportionate working of each several part." But ἐνὸς κ.τ.λ. probably goes with ἐν μετρῳ. The whole phrase, then indicates a general operation which each member partakes of and contributes to. Abbott's view stresses each member's function; this view sees the member's proper function in relation to an activity operative throughout the Body in different measures.

<sup>297</sup>On the term, see Robinson, 241-47; Betram, TDNT II 652-54; Hahn, DNTT III 1147-52.

<sup>298</sup>If, as Schlier (209) contends, τοῦ σώματος referred to "den. Weltleib," one would expect the active, not middle voice.



<sup>299</sup> N D\* F G 2495 pc 2495 substitute αὐτοῦ for ἐαυτοῦ. But the reflexive is to be read with p<sup>46</sup> p<sup>49</sup> A B C D<sup>C</sup> Ψ 082 and most mss. The reflexive provides further evidence that the "building" is an intensive process of the Body. Body members working properly can be conceived as building up the Body; stones are only with great difficulty thought to build themselves into a building.

<sup>300</sup> Contrast, Schweizer, TDNT VII 1079; cf. Merklein, 97; Gnllka, 219ff.

<sup>301</sup> Cf. Quell, TDNT I 234.

<sup>302</sup> For the literature and discussion of Eph iv 21c, see Barth, 533-37; also the correspondence between Westcott and Hort (Westcott, 70-71).

<sup>303</sup> Cited from Foulkes, 133.

#### NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lohse, 154; Dibelius, 48.

<sup>2</sup> The term, derived from Luther (Martin, DNTT III 928), has limitations when applied to the whole of the NT phenomena; cf. W. Schrage, "Zur Ethik der Neutestamentlichen Haustafeln," NTS 21 (1974) 1-22, esp. 2. It is arbitrary, for example, to divide I Pet ii 13-iii 17 into a Gemeinde-tafel or Staatstafel (ii 13-17) and a Haustafel (ii 17-iii 17). Cf. Sampley, 'And The Two Shall Become One Flesh,' SNTSMS 16 (1971) 19 n.1; also Schweizer ("Traditional Ethical Patterns in the Pauline and Post-Pauline Letters and their Development," in Text and Interpretation, eds. Best and Wilson, 195-209, esp. 205) is too inclined this way. The entire passage is of the same stock. This naturally intensifies the question why Col. and Eph. focus on household members. See pp. 257-59. Schroeder (IDB Suppl. 546f) calls these "station codes," but this obscures that one person may have more than one station. For our purposes, we will speak of "house codes," but keep in mind the broader framework.

<sup>3</sup> For discussion see: J. E. Crouch, The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel, FRLANT 109 (1973); Daube, "Haustafeln" in The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, 90-105; also "Appended Note," in Selwyn, First Peter, 467ff; Dibelius, 48-50; A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, 52-57; W. Lillie, "The Pauline Housetables," ExT 86 (1974/75) 179-83; Lohse, 154-57; R. Martin, DNTT III, 928-32; K. H. Rengstorff, Mann und Frau in Urchristentum; Sampley, op. cit., 17-30; Schrage, NTS 21:1-22; D. Schroeder, IDB Suppl. 546f (unavailable: Die Haustafeln des Neuen



Testaments, unpub. diss. Hamburg, 1959); Schweizer, "Traditional Ethical Patterns...", 93-106; Selwyn, First Peter, 363-466; also E. Kähler, Die Frau in den paulinischen Briefen unter besonderen Berücksichtigung des Begriffs der Unterordnung, 88-97. Also unavailable are H. Weidinger, Die Haustafeln, Leipzig, 1928; and L. Goppelt, "Jesus und die Haustafel-Tradition" in Orientierung an Jesus (Fs. J. Schmid, 1973).

<sup>4</sup>Schrage, NTS 21:2.

<sup>5</sup>Sampley, 19; Schrage, NTS 21:2. Of the three texts Col iii 18ff is generally thought the oldest; see, Lohse, 156; Dibelius, 49; Crouch, 33; Schweizer, "Traditional Ethical Patterns...", 202-4; Martin, DNTT III 929. Sampley (24) questions this, but leaves the matter open.

<sup>6</sup>On the haustafeliche form, see Lillie, ExT 86:180; Schrage, NTS 21:2 n.2; Schroeder, IDB Suppl. 546; Sampley, 18-30; Crouch, 102-7.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Schroeder, IDB Suppl. 546; Martin, DNTT III 929.

<sup>8</sup>Sampley, 20f, 25f.

<sup>9</sup>This paragraph is largely indebted to Schrage, NTS 21:2f.

<sup>10</sup>Schrage, NTS 21:3; Sampley, 23; (Weidinger, 4). This flexibility speaks against the theory championed by P. Carrington (The Primitive Christian Catechism) and Selwyn (First Peter, 363ff), that the house codes originally belonged to a primitive catechism. If so, one would expect much more uniform and solidified presentations, esp. in the Pastorals (Schrage, 3).

<sup>11</sup>Schrage, NTS 21:3f.

<sup>12</sup>For literature see p. 252 n.3. For a history of the debate, see esp. Crouch, 9-36. Crouch shows that many differences stem from the way the religionsgeschichte question is posed: i.e. do the NT Haustafeln borrow from non-Christian and pagan (mainly stoic) sources (e.g. Dibelius, Weidinger) or are they a unique Christian development (e.g. Rengstorff, Schroeder)? But Crouch (147) reformulates the question: "(1) From whence did the material come which went into the formulation of the Haustafel? (2) What was the decisive impulse in the creation of the Haustafel as a Christian topos?" Crouch has more success answering the first question than the second. On the second question, see below, 255ff.

<sup>13</sup>Crouch, 76-101, 119; cf. Schrage, NTS 21:2, 7; Martin, DNTT III 931; Lohse, 156.

<sup>14</sup>Crouch, 37-101.

<sup>15</sup>E.g. Diog. L. VII 117-25, VIII 22ff; Arist. Pol. I 2; Sen. Ep. xciv 1ff; Plut. Lib.Ed. 10; Epic. Diss. II 10, III 7; also the excerpts of Hierocles in Stob. Anth. (see Crouch, 67-70); and Ps. Callisth. I 22, 4 (cited in Schrage, NTS 21:9).

<sup>16</sup>Crouch, 84-101; Martin, DNTT III 931.

<sup>17</sup>Crouch, 84-101, 148; cf. Lohse, 155; Dibelius, 49.

<sup>18</sup>Schrage, NTS 21:16ff.

<sup>19</sup>The first is from Hierocles (Praechter, 33f); the second is from Menander (Koerte, 805). For these and other texts see Schrage, NTS 21:16.

<sup>20</sup>Dio Chrys. Or. I 37; cf. Sen. Clem. I vii 1. See Schrage, NTS 21:17.

<sup>21</sup>Lib. (ed. R. Foerster, 1058, 11f); Sen. Frag. 46 (ed. Haase, III 428). For details and other texts, see Schrage, NTS 21:17.

<sup>22</sup>Schrage, NTS 21:17.

<sup>23</sup>Cf. Crouch, 146ff.

<sup>24</sup>For Crouch (149), the Col. Haustafel speaks against a fairly widespread enthusiastic movement. For criticism, see Schrage, NTS 21:5f; cf. Schweizer, "Traditional Ethical Patterns...", 202. This view overlooks a possible "offensives Moment" (Schrage, 5), hardly explains the inclusion of children, and makes difficult the address to persons in authority.

<sup>25</sup>Dibelius, 48f; cf. Beare, IB XI 225.

<sup>26</sup>Crouch, 21f; Schrage, NTS 21:9f.

<sup>27</sup>Crouch, 149; (Schroeder, Die Haustafeln, 89).

<sup>28</sup>Cf. Schrage, NTS 21:18ff.

<sup>29</sup>Sampley, 23.

<sup>30</sup>Mitton, 194; Kümmel, Introduction, 359.

<sup>31</sup>W. Munro (NTS 18:434-37) diagrams the sequence of dependency as Col→Eph→+ Eph v 21ff→+ Col iii 18ff. For criticism see Schrage, NTS 21:2 n.5.

<sup>32</sup>Schrage, NTS 21:2; cf. Barth, 755.

<sup>33</sup>Schrage, NTS 21:2 n.4; cf. Barth, 755.

<sup>34</sup>Cf. Scott, 235f; Houlden, 329.

<sup>35</sup>Beare, 716; cf. Chavasse, The Bride of Christ, 75.



<sup>36</sup>Gnilka, 274; Caird, 88. Our objection to this view is not the presence of a reciprocal metaphor, but the conclusion that here the metaphor's application to human couples is a secondary effect. Use of the NT nuptial imagery has here the purpose of defining what marriage is all about. J. Cambier ("Le grand mystère concernant le Christ et son Église. Éphésiens 5, 22-33," *Bib* 47, 1966, 43-90, 223-42, esp. 48) discerns here two levels, "d'étage parénétique et d'étage profond." But if viewed this way, marriage is plainly secondary to the author, his real interests lying in the Christ/Church relation.

<sup>37</sup>Roels, *God's Mission*, 140; Salmond, 365; cf. Abbott, 165; Schrage, NTS 21:19; Houlden, 330, 332; Dibelius, 95; E. S. Fiorenze, "Marriage and Discipleship," *Bible Today* 102 (1979) (2027-34) 2030; and generally Mitton, 197-210.

<sup>38</sup>As to vss. 26-27, Best (174), Bruce (115), and Scott (239) think the author forgets his immediate theme.

<sup>39</sup>Not every detail receives full treatment. The subjection of the Church is introduced casually (Best, 173), while vss. 25-27 depict Christ's saving acts in some detail. This is because Christ's saving of the Church is the basis on which the Christ/Church relation becomes a revelatory model for marital relations. Thus, those aspects of nuptial imagery that most clearly portray Christ's binding love for the Church receive the most attention.

<sup>40</sup>Most scholars agree that the marital duties are deduced from the Christ/Church relation. See, e.g. Dibelius, 95; Schrage, NTS 21:19; Best, 172f; Barth, 655; I. A. Muirhead, "The Bride of Christ," *SJT* 5 (1952) 186; H. Greeven, "Ehe nach dem Neuen Testament," NTS 15 (1968/69) 388.

<sup>41</sup>Joining the verse to vss. 18-20 are Salmond, 365; Bruce, 112f; Alford, 135; Wescott, *ad loc.* Cf. Cambier, *Bib* 47:45ff. Taking it as a title or caption are Sampley, 114; Gnilka, 274; Abbott, 163f; Caird, 88; Schlier, 251; Barth, 608f; Scott, 236.

<sup>42</sup>Sampley, 114.

<sup>43</sup>On the imperatival use of the participial, see B1-D §458 (2); J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of NT Greek* I 180ff, 232ff; Sampley, 114, n.1 and above p. 179 n.5.

<sup>44</sup>Some scholars concede that grammatically the verse more easily belongs to vss. 18-20, but contend that content-wise it belongs to vss. 21-33. See Abbott, 163f; Gnilka, 273f; Barth, 608.



<sup>45</sup>Cf. I Cor xiv 32. While the usage is not exactly parallel, it is informative. Mutual submission may point to the peace and order that should prevail in Christian fellowship, in or out of the worship service.

<sup>46</sup>Cf. Robinson, 122; Abbott, 162; Beare, 714; Salmond, 363. Many scholars think a worship service is in view; see ad loc. Barth, 582ff; Caird, 86; Gnilya, 270f; Scott, 234; Mitton, 191; Schlief, 246ff.

<sup>47</sup>Abbott, 164; Robinson, 204; Sampley, 114; Gnilya, 275 n.3. For the text of vs. 22 see below, p. 263 n.55.

<sup>48</sup>J. M. Robinson, "Die Hodajot-Formel in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums," BZNW 30 (1964) 194-235, esp. 223f. Robinson suggests that in I Cor xiv vss. 27-32 and 33-36 are linked by the "Stichwort" ὑποτάσσεσθαι. But in Eph v 21 he takes vs. 21 as an "Überschrift" and denies any "Stichwortartige Verbindung." But if Eph v 21 is related to vss. 18-20, the verb's absence in vs. 22 may point to vs. 21 not as an "Überschrift," but to ὑποτάσσεσθαι as a "Stichwort."

<sup>49</sup>This tension is also felt in comparing vs. 21 and 33. The repetition of "fear" might be seen to close the pericope, inclusio. But the choice of verb is understandable apart from this function (cf. vi 5), and had the author intended this he could have made the parallel closer. The terms not only have different subjects, but different forms; in vs. 21 the noun with a genitive adjunct, in vs. 33 the infinitive. To the extent vs. 33 loosely parallels vs. 21, it places the house-code injunction under the theme of vss. 18-21.

<sup>50</sup>Cf. Sampley, 26f.

<sup>51</sup>Barth, 655.

<sup>52</sup>R. Batey, New Testament Nuptial Imagery, 20; also "The MIA ΣΑΡΕ Union of Christ and the Church," NTS 13 (1966) 270-81.

<sup>53</sup>Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 31.

<sup>54</sup>Cf. Sampley, 96-102, 112-14.

<sup>55</sup>Variants may be divided into three groups: (1) those reading ὑποτασσέσθωσαν: κ A I P (℣Ψ) 6 33 81 104 365 1175 1241<sup>S</sup> 1739 1881 2464 2495 pc lat sy co; (2) those reading ὑποτάσσεσθε: (℣ D F G) 048, most mss; and (3) those lacking a verb, p<sup>46</sup> B, C1. (3) is preferable because it best explains the other readings. If vs. 22 began a Scripture lesson, a verb would become necessary (cf. Robinson). See Metzger, Textual Commentary, 608f.

<sup>56</sup>Oepke, TDNT I 776.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid.; Jeremias, TDNT IV 1099f.

<sup>58</sup>Cf. Gnllka, 275; Barth, 611.

<sup>59</sup>Antiquity saw a variety of views on woman's status, and in the same period, views could differ acc. to geographical area. During the Imperial era, there was a trend towards "women's rights." But Hellenistic Judaism retains the more conservative attitude of the Orient. On the subject, see Oepke, TDNT I 777ff; Barth, 655ff; Crouch, 107ff; W. H. Leslie, "The Concept of Women in the Pauline Corpus in light of the Social and Religious Environment of the First Century," Diss., Northwestern U. (1976); Kähler, Frau; H. F. Foster, "Jewish and Graeco-Roman Influences upon Paul's Attitudes toward Women," Diss., U. of Chicago (1933); E. and F. Stagg, Woman in the World of Jesus; E. V. Arnold, Roman Stoicism, 157-74; also, L. Goodwater, Women in Antiquity: An Annotated Bibliography. (Her Introduction provides a convenient survey of ancient attitudes.)

<sup>60</sup>Crouch, 108ff; Moore, Judaism II, 119-31; Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, 359-76; Leslie, op. cit., 335-88.

<sup>61</sup>Had the phrase referred to husbands as masters, one would expect τοῖς κυρίους.

<sup>62</sup>For the varied meanings of ὡς, see B1-D §453; Lidd-Scott, 2038-40; Bauer, 897ff; Barth, 611ff.

<sup>63</sup>For the element of free will in ὑποτάσσεσθαι as well as a general treatment, see esp. Kähler, Frau; cf. Barth, 708ff.

<sup>64</sup>The order, ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ, is reversed in B 104 365 1175 pc lat, Tert. We read the text of Nestle-Aland.

<sup>65</sup>Gnllka, 276.

<sup>66</sup>Barth (617f) refers to Arist. Pol. I, 1254AB, 1255B, but κεφαλὴ does not occur.

<sup>67</sup>Cf. Best, 179.

<sup>68</sup>Barth, 618.

<sup>69</sup>See ch. I, 65.

<sup>70</sup>Sampley, 80.

<sup>71</sup>Moffatt (I Corinthians, 152) and Robertson/Plummer (I Corinthians, 230f) refer the passage chiefly to married women. Cf. and contrast Barrett, I Corinthians, 248f.



<sup>72</sup>See ch. I, 65.

<sup>73</sup>See below, pp. 265ff; 296ff.

<sup>74</sup>Cf. Sampley, 113; Gnilya, 277.

<sup>75</sup>G. von Rad, Genesis OTL, 82f; J. Skinner, Genesis ICC, 70; H. Gunkel, Genesis, 13.

<sup>76</sup>Cf. von Rad, Gen. 82; Gunkel, Gen. 13; Skinner, Gen. 70f; Driver, The Book of Genesis, 43; H. E. Ryle, The Book of Genesis, 39.

<sup>77</sup>Von Rad, Gen. 83; Ryle, Gen. 34; Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, 136.

<sup>78</sup>Assuming the author validates a reality present at his writing, he probably intends to sanction this in its "proper state," i.e. marriage. Whether he also intended marriage to be monogamous is disputed. Cf. Driver, Gen. 43; contrast, C. A. Simpson, IB I 500.

<sup>79</sup>Gunkel, Gen. 13; Batey, NTS 13:274. See, e.g. Plat. Sym. 189-93. It is unlikely that the original Yahwistic account saw man as androgynous. See von Rad, Gen. 58; B. Vawter, On Genesis: A New Reading, ad loc.; contrast Gunkel, Gen. 13.

<sup>80</sup>Wolff, Anthropology of the OT, 94; Vawter, On Gen. 75; cf. von Rad, Gen. 80.

<sup>81</sup>Cf. Skinner, Gen. 71; Gunkel, Gen. 13. Von Rad (Gen. 82) thinks the resulting child is in view; for criticism, see Wolff, Anthropology of the OT, 93.

<sup>82</sup>Cassuto, Gen. 137.

<sup>83</sup>Cf. Vawter, On Gen. 75; Wolff, Anthropology of the OT, 93f; M. Gilbert, "Une Seule Chair," NRT 100 (1978) 75-78.

<sup>84</sup>Von Rad, Gen. 81; Wolff, Anthropology of the OT, 94; A. Feuillet, "La Dignité et Le Rôle de la Femme d'après Quelques Textes Pauliniens: Comparaison avec l'Ancien Testament," NTS 21 (1974/75) 165.

<sup>85</sup>Cf. Feuillet, NTS 21:165.

<sup>86</sup>Cf. Sampley, 112f.

<sup>87</sup>Cited from Charles, II 16. Underlining is ours.

<sup>88</sup>Cf. also Ap. II 203, where it is clear sexual relations transcend a mere physical act, involving the transfer of the father's soul.

<sup>89</sup>Sampley, 53.



<sup>90</sup>Philo reflects his Jewish background in calling a woman a servant or slave. Cf. Jeremias, Jerusalem, 367.

<sup>91</sup>E.g. Erub 18a, GenR xiv 7. See esp. Batey, NTS 13:271ff.

<sup>92</sup>Batey, NTS 13:272.

<sup>93</sup>Ibid.

<sup>94</sup>Their interpretations apparently promoted asceticism and licentiousness more than stable family life. Cf. Barth, 729 n.462. For texts and discussion, see esp. Schlier, 265-76; E. Pagels, The Gnostic Paul, 126-27.

<sup>95</sup>Cf. Gos. Phil. 31, 60, 61, 122. For discussion, see R. McL. Wilson, The Gospel of Philip, 95f, 118-23, 182-84. Wilson may be right to warn against taking these texts as a depreciation of marriage, but they hardly exalt it either. See also R. M. Grant, "The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip," Vigiliae Christianae 5 (1961) 129ff.

<sup>96</sup>Exeg. Soul 133, 1ff (= Foerster, II 106; NHL, 184). Union between the soul and heavenly consort is strictly a reunion (133, 5), as the androgynous soul became female in her fall (127, 25). Presumably the bridegroom, also called her brother, is the half that did not fall, though this is not explicitly stated. Cf. Gos. Phil. 71 where death is linked to Eve's separation from Adam.

<sup>97</sup>BG 59.1-60.15 (= Foerster, I 116); but see also the Coptic version, II 1.22, 20-23, 25 (= NHL, 111).

<sup>98</sup>This is the likely interpretation. BG 60.10 ends the Gen. citation with "for they will send out the consort of the Mother and raise her up." This might refer to the unknown Father and his consort, Barbelo, sending Christ to Sophia to restore the Pleroma. But "raise her up" just referred to Ialdabaoth's raising up the woman through whom the Epinoia of light appears. Also the Cop. ver. (II 1.23, 15) reads: "for they will send him his consort, and he will leave his father and his mother." It then identifies Sophia as she who "came down in innocence in order to rectify her deficiency." Cf. also Hyp. Arch. II 4.89, 5-30 (= Foerster, II 46; NHL, 154f) and Orig. World II 5.116, 20 (= NHL, 173).

<sup>99</sup>BG 61.10 (= Foerster, I 117); Orig. World II 5.116, 20 (= NHL, 173).

<sup>100</sup>BG 63.5 (= Foerster, I 117); cf. Cop. ver., II 1.24, 25f (NHL, 112).

<sup>101</sup>Exeg. Soul 133, 1ff and Ap. John, BG 60.5-10 (cf. Cop. ver. II 1.23, 15-20) are the only explicit citations of Gen ii 24 indexed in Foerster, II 350. A scanning of NHL has yielded no further explicit citations. The

ideas of syzygy and the bridal chamber are, of course, much broader and more frequent. The latter is found esp. in Gos. Phil.; cf. also The Questions of Mary (from Epiph. Pan. 26.8, 1-2 cited in Hennecke, I 339). In the Gos. Thom. 22 (Hennecke, I 513) when Jesus speaks of male and female becoming one, in view is annihilating the sex distinction. In Tri.Tract. I 5.122, 15 (NHL 91) we read: "the election shares body and essence with the Savior, since it is like a bridal chamber because of its unity and its agreement with him." Just how far back such speculations may be traced is uncertain. In many cases, the Eph. text is a likely starting point rather than the reverse. What is certain is Eph.'s concrete concern for human marriage as a divinely ordained institution. This stands in such contrast to gnostic speculations that influence from these quarters seems unlikely. At best such influence could be polemical, and even this is unnecessary and uncertain.

<sup>102</sup>The Gospel of Matthew NCB, 280.

<sup>103</sup>Batey, NTS 13:278; Moffatt, I Cor. 78; Barrett, I Cor. 162; Stauffer, TDNT I 651.

<sup>104</sup>Cf. Batey, NTS 13:278.

<sup>105</sup>Cf. Best, 77f.

<sup>106</sup>If for Paul sexual relations with a harlot entails a "one flesh" union, it is most likely marriage would also.

<sup>107</sup>A. J. M. Wedderburn ("The Body of Christ and Related Concepts in I Corinthians," SJT 24, 1974, 75) argues μέλη does not indicate that the believer's body is a member of Christ's Body, but that the Christian's body members are united to Christ. But one would expect a distributive, σῶμα ὑμῶν, if this were intended. For our view, cf. Barrett, I Cor. 148; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1070; Best, 75ff; Reuss, "Die Kirche als 'Leib Christi' und die Herkunft dieser Vorstellung bei dem Apostel Paulus," BZ NF, 2(1958)105.

<sup>108</sup>Contrast Gundry, Sōma, 51-80; cf. below, Appendix B, 347f.

<sup>109</sup>Even where body and soul are distinguished, Hellenistic Judaism sees more in sexual intercourse than the physical event (e.g. Jos. Ap. II 203). Contrast Gundry, Sōma, 64.

<sup>110</sup>Cf. Batey, NTS 13:279 n.2.

<sup>111</sup>R. Kempthorne ("Incest and the Body of Christ: A Study of I Cor. 6:12-20," NTS 14, 1968, 568-74) tries to avoid this difficulty by supposing the harlot of ch. vi is the same as the father's wife of ch. v. Cf. Gilbert, NRT 100:84ff.



<sup>112</sup>See esp. Best, 76ff.

<sup>113</sup>Best, 117 n.2. We take it that "physical union" refers to physical intercourse. Perhaps Best denies any physical union, in which case his view does contrast Jewett's (see below). But the believer's union is in some sense physical; for while σῶμα can mean person, it hardly excludes the physical body. The believer's physical side belongs to Christ as much as his inward Spirit. But this does not entail that Christ is physical, or that his union with believers is in every respect physical.

<sup>114</sup>Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms, 262.

<sup>115</sup>We find nothing to relate Gen ii 24 and Yahweh's marriage to Israel.

<sup>116</sup>Sampley, 96ff.

<sup>117</sup>Sampley, 97. As evidence Sampley cites I Cor xiv 33bf; II Cor xi 2ff; I Tim ii 8ff; I Pet iii 1ff; I Clem lvii 2ff. While not all of these are equally convincing, they are sufficient to show a general tendency in such contexts to seek authority from the OT.

<sup>118</sup>Cf. above ch. I, 83ff, ch. III, 232. Cf. Schweizer, TDNT VII 1079.

<sup>119</sup>Caird (88) goes too far in suggesting that "the argument is a midrash on Gen. 2:18-24."

<sup>120</sup>Cf. C. R. Taber, IBD Suppl. 575; O. J. Baab, IB III 283.

<sup>121</sup>Abbott, 166; Gnika, 279; Schrage, NTS 21:18; contrast, Schlier, 255.

<sup>122</sup>"Order of creation" and "order of salvation" are modern terms, used to capture unexpressed presuppositions of the author's thinking. Using such interpretive models, while precarious, is necessary for unearthing the author's thought.

<sup>123</sup>κ<sup>2</sup> D<sup>2</sup> Ψ, most mss (b m) vg<sup>ms</sup> sy have καὶ αὐ. ἐστίν. For the text, see p<sup>46</sup> κ\* A B D\* F G I<sup>vid</sup> 048 33 1175 1739 1881 pc lat; Cl.

<sup>124</sup>Cf. Scott, Robinson, Huby; Thornton, Common Life, 222.

<sup>125</sup>Cf. Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 21; Robinson, 205; Sampley 125f; Gnika, 278; Bauer, s.v.

<sup>126</sup>E.g. Abbott, Beare, Dibelius, Meyer, Barth, Best, 173f; Cambier, Bib 47:67.

<sup>127</sup>Foerster, TDNT VII 1004. For discussion, see Foerster/Fohrer, TDNT VII 1003-24; Schneider/Brown, DNTT III 216-21; Bousset, Kyrios Christos, 310ff; Cullmann, Christology, 238-45; Dibelius/Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, 100-3; Schlier, Christos, 72f.



<sup>128</sup>Foerster, TDNT VII 1004.

<sup>129</sup>Foerster, TDNT VII 1007.

<sup>130</sup>For texts and discussion, see Foerster, TDNT VII 1004ff; Schneider/Brown, DNTT III 216f; Lidd-Scott, 1751.

<sup>131</sup>Ibid. There was generally no effort to separate the human and divine realms in this regard (Foerster, TDNT VII 1006).

<sup>132</sup>Foerster, TDNT VII 1005.

<sup>133</sup>Ibid.; Dibelius/Conzelmann, Pastoral Eps. 101f.

<sup>134</sup>Fohrer, TDNT VII 1012; Schneider/Brown, DNTT III 217f; Cullmann, Christology, 239. In the LXX σωτήρ appears some 36 times, usually for יְשׁוּעָה or יְשׁוּעָה, and 7 times for יְשׁוּעָה. Philo shows Hellenistic influence when he interprets the Exodus event allegorically for the soul's salvation (Migr.Abr. 25; cf. Conf.Ling. 93). God is the "preserver of mankind" (e.g. Migr.Abr. 137; Spec.Leg. I 252) or the "upholder of the cosmos" (e.g. Spec.Leg. II 198). Also he possibly uses the term with the meaning "giver of life" (Leg.All. III 27; Conf.Ling. 93) (Dibelius/Conzelmann, Pastoral Eps. 102).

<sup>135</sup>In Judg iii 9, 15 the term is a terminus technicus for the judges (Fohrer, TDNT VII 1012). Josephus is an exception, referring the term only to human deliverers in Greek fashion (Foerster, TDNT VII 1014).

<sup>136</sup>Fohrer (TDNT VII 1013) thinks Zech ix 9 and Isa xlix 6 approximate this usage and Cullmann (Christology, 239) adds Isa xix 20. On the problem, see Dibelius/Conzelmann, Pastoral Eps. 101; Foerster, TDNT VII 1014.

<sup>137</sup>E.g. Cullmann, Christology, 241; Nock, Essays on the Trinity, ed. Rawlinson, 92; Foerster, TDNT VII 1020f; Bultmann, I 79; Cambier, Bib 47:65f.

<sup>138</sup>The trend was not confined to Christianity. See J. V. Chamberlain, "The Functions of God as Messianic Titles in the Complete Isaiah Scroll," VT 5 (1955) 366-72. But in the Qumran texts there is no real equivalent to our term. See Schneider/Brown, DNTT III 218.

<sup>139</sup>Schneider/Brown, DNTT III 221; Cullmann, Christology, 242f.

<sup>140</sup>Even Israel's delivery from oppression (Lk i 47, ii 11; cf. i 77) is largely linked to deliverance from sins.

<sup>141</sup>Cf. Cullmann, Christology, 257.

<sup>142</sup>E.g. Foerster, TDNT VII 1016; Best, 173f; Sampley, 125; Cambier, Bib 47:66 n.1; Barth; Schlier.

<sup>143</sup>Cf. Schlier, 254.

<sup>144</sup>Cf. Schweizer, TDNT VII 1080; Gnilka, 276f; Schlier, 254; Barth, 614f; contrast Foerster, TDNT VII 1016.

<sup>145</sup>We think it unlikely that σωτήρ means outrightly "preserver" or "protector." Still, a play on this meaning is possible. While σωτήρ does not occur in connection with the body metaphor, σωτηρία is linked in Plut. Frat.Amor. II 478D, and σώζειν in Plat. Leg. XII 964D-965E. See Appendix B, 363, 364f. If these ideas play a role (and this is not certain), it is to bring out the ongoing effectiveness of Christ's salvific act.

<sup>146</sup>B Ψ pc b; Ambst omit ἀλλά. While probably due to scribal error, the omission possibly reflects a desire to make the transition smoother.

<sup>147</sup>See above, p. 275.

<sup>148</sup>Foulkes, 154; Schrage 21:15.

<sup>149</sup>Gnilka, 149.

<sup>150</sup>F G ex lat? sy add ὑμῶν; D Ψ most mss (℣ P 629 1739 1881 2464 pc) add ἐαυτῶν. For the text see κ A B 048 33 81 1241<sup>s</sup> pc vg<sup>st</sup>; Cl.

<sup>151</sup>Crouch (111-14) and Sampley (30ff) relate the idea especially to Lev xix 18. Contrast Praecepta Delphica, Sylloge III 3.395: γυναικός ἄρχε (Schrage, NTS 21:13).

<sup>152</sup>Cf. Günther/Link, DNTT II 538, 542f; Stauffer, TDNT I 47ff.

<sup>153</sup>Cf. Barth, 621f, 715ff; Mitton, 200f; Stauffer, TDNT I 35; A. Nygren, Agape and Eros I; Günther/Link DNTT II 538ff. While ἀγάπη and ἔρωc are often too rigidly distinguished, use of the former here does point away from gnostic influence (Best, 172 n.1).

<sup>154</sup>Cf. Barth, 621f.

<sup>155</sup>The statement has a traditional ring (cf. Eph v 2; Gal ii 20); see Sampley, 35-37. Less certain is Barth's thesis that vss. 25bff are a paraphrased hymn or confession.

<sup>156</sup>Gnilka, 279.

<sup>157</sup>At Eph v 2 believers are the object of Christ's love and self-offering, and the sacrificial character of this act is explicitly brought out. The change in context is more easily understood if sacrifice was central to the covenant "marriage" of Yahweh and Israel (Chavasse, 29, 107).



<sup>158</sup>For a concise summary of views, see Gnilka, 279f; Schlier, 255f. See also Dahl, Das Gottes Volkes, 259f.

<sup>159</sup>See above, ch. I, 48-56.

<sup>160</sup>See above, ch. II, 118ff.

<sup>161</sup>Cf. above, ch. I, 24ff.

<sup>162</sup>See Procksch/Kuhn, TDNT I 88-115; Seabaas/Brown, DNTT II 223-32; Barth, 687ff.

<sup>163</sup>Procksch, TDNT I 91f; cf. Barth, 687f.

<sup>164</sup>Eichrodt, Theology II 373.

<sup>165</sup>Seabaas, DNTT II 228.

<sup>166</sup>Seabaas, DNTT II 230.

<sup>167</sup>Sampley, 42; Kuhn, TDNT I 97f.

<sup>168</sup>Barth, 689. The covenant formula "They shall be my people" and "I will be their God," may already be behind the nuptially oriented statements in S. of S. ii 16, vi 2; cf. also Jer xxxi 31-33.

<sup>169</sup>Gnilka, 280.

<sup>170</sup>Cf. Abbott, 168.

<sup>171</sup>Ritual washing is also linked to cleansing and sanctification in 1QS III 3f, 9; cf. 1QH XI 10-12 (Gnilka, 280). That λουτρόν does not here mean "laver," see Robinson, 205f.

<sup>172</sup>E.g. Abbott, Scott, Houlden, Salmon, Robinson, Gnilka, Mitton, Schlier. Barth (691-99) argues for baptism of the Spirit. But ὁδατος hardly refers to the Spirit here.

<sup>173</sup>Gnilka, 280; cf. Abbott, 168; Mitton, 202; Beare, 723.

<sup>174</sup>G. Fohrer, Ezekiel HAT, 86f; W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 206; A. Bertholet, Hesekiel KHAT, 59; C. L. Feinbery, The Prophecy of Ezekiel, 87. For W. Zimmerli (Ezekiel Her., 335ff), the action refers to Yahweh's betrothal to Israel, but he thinks that the allusion to washing is an interpolation. But the question remains how the interpolated text is to be understood, and with most scholars, we refer it to a bridal bath.

<sup>175</sup>For (a), see Caird, Gnilka, Robinson, Schlier; for (b), see Abbott, Salmond, Sampley, 133; for (c), see Barth, 624ff, 687ff; Cambier, Bib 47:75 n.1. Meyer and Dibelius leave the question open.

<sup>176</sup>Schlier, 257.



<sup>177</sup>Barth, 689.

<sup>178</sup>For the gospel, see, e.g. Caird, 89; Meyer, ad loc. For a confession, see Mitton, 203; cf. Beare, 723.

<sup>179</sup>Cf. Gn̄ilka, 282; Cambier, Bib 47:77.

<sup>180</sup>Cf. Schlier, 258.

<sup>181</sup>Sampley, 43; cf. Barth, 694, 679.

<sup>182</sup>Cf. Barth, 282ff. Of course, the Bride's outward appearance points more deeply to the Church as filled by Christ's glory. Cf. Best, 175.

<sup>183</sup>Schlier, 257.

<sup>184</sup>Barth (627f) shows that  $\rho\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  could result from a disease or an operation, or refer to a newborn's skin, as well as refer to old age. Old need not be excluded, but the point is broader, i.e. anything suggesting the Bride's imperfection.

<sup>185</sup>Sampley cites texts much later than Eph. (cf. m Ketub vii 7). But Eph. has plainly incorporated cultic language into its nuptial imagery (cf. v 2 and 25;  $\alpha\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  and  $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$  in vs. 26;  $\alpha\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha$  and  $\alpha\mu\omega\mu\omicron\varsigma$  in vs. 27c). Finally, the Rabbinic debate over  $\eta\grave{\iota}\eta\grave{\iota}$  was concurrent with Eph. Perhaps the author declares that Christ's purpose is not to seek for something  $\eta\grave{\iota}\eta\grave{\iota}$ , but to perfect his Bride. While husbands cannot perfect their wives, the point is relevant for husbands. A husband should not seek fault, but work for his wife's glorification.

<sup>186</sup>Barth, 628.

<sup>187</sup>For literature, see Barth, 668ff; Batey, Nuptial Imagery; "Jewish Gnosticism and the Hieros Gamos of Eph. 5:22-33," NTS 10 (1963) 121-27; Best, 169-83; Bousset, Kyrios Christos, 268ff; Chavasse, esp. 19-109; Feuillet, NTS 21:157-91; Gn̄ilka, 290-94; Jeremias, TDNT IV, 1099-1106; Muirhead, SJT 5:175-87; Sampley, 34-51; Schlier, 264-76; Stauffer, TDNT I 648-57.

<sup>188</sup>Cf. Roels, God's Mission, 140.

<sup>189</sup>Cf. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 335.

<sup>190</sup>Cf. Gn̄ilka, 290; Muirhead, SJT 5:176; Scott, 236f; Fohrer, Ezekiel, 84; Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 2f; B. Childs, Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture, 379.

<sup>191</sup>Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 335; Chavasse, 28; Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 4;

Jeremias, TDNT IV 1101; R. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, 571; H. G. May, IB VI 141.

<sup>192</sup>Gnilka, 290.

<sup>193</sup>Cf. Hos i-iii; Ez xvi 7ff, xxiii 4; Isa xlix 18, 1 1ff; liv 1; lxi 10, lxii 4f; Jer ii 2, xxxi 31ff. Gnilka, 290; Stauffer, TDNT I 654; Houlden, 330; McCarthy, OT Covenant, 32f; H. Schmidt, "Die Ehe des Hosea," ZAW 42 (1924) 245ff; Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 334. See also C. Kuhl, "Neue Dokumente zum Verständnis von Hosea 2 4-15," ZAW 52 (1934) 102-9; C. H. Gordon, "Hos. 2:4-15 in Light of New Semitic Inscriptions," ZAW 54 (1938) 277-80. Kuhl and Gordon offer a variety of texts about marriage contracts and divorce proceedings. An interesting point is the public pronouncement, "I am your man; she is my wife." Feuillet wishes to trace Hos ii 4 to Gen ii 23, but just as likely Hos. and Gen. drew on current marital concepts. The Sinaitic covenant perhaps represented the contracting of the marriage; cf. Jer ii 2; Jeremias, TDNT IV 1101. Batey (Nuptial Imagery, 4) claims the same for Hosea.

<sup>194</sup>Muirhead, SJT 5:176f; cf. Best, 169; Chavasse, 33; Schlier, 264.

<sup>195</sup>Cf. Chavasse, 33f; Best, 169.

<sup>196</sup>Cf. Sampley, 38ff.

<sup>197</sup>Ezekiel perhaps adapts a common folktale; see Fohrer, Ezechiel, 84; May, IB VI 142.

<sup>198</sup>Less certain is whether Ez xvi supports that the Church is the heavenly Jerusalem. Cf. Stauffer, TDNT I 657; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1079; Cerfaux, The Church, 350, 358ff.

<sup>199</sup>Only IV Ezra ix 26-x 59 is an exception and here the accent is on the woman and her son, i.e. the heavenly Jerusalem mourning over the destruction of the earthly Jerusalem. Presumably God is the husband, though this is not explicitly stated. Cf. M. A. Knibb/R. J. Coggins, The First and Second Books of Esdras, 220-35; J. M. Myers, I and II Esdras AB, 262-80; Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 53f.

<sup>200</sup>Best, 169; Chavasse, 35-45; Jeremias, TDNT IV 1102; Stauffer, TDNT I 654.

<sup>201</sup>For relevant texts, see Str-B I 501f, 517f, 969f, II 393, IV 822, 863, 926. See also, Jeremias, TDNT IV 1102; Stauffer, TDNT I 652; Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 9-11.



<sup>202</sup>Pirque R. El. 41; Mek Ex xix 17; DeutR iii 12; NuR xii 8. Cf. Str-B I 969f; II 393.

<sup>203</sup>Cf. DeutR iii 10. Sometimes the reference is not clear (NuR xii 8). S. of S. iv 8 is interpreted of both the exodus and exile (ExR iii 5).

<sup>204</sup>Cf. also Pesach 87a.

<sup>205</sup>It appears late in Tg. Ps xlv 3 and PesiqR 149a (Jeremias, TDNT IV 1102; The Parables of Jesus, 52). IV Ezra vii 26 is disputed (TDNT IV 1102). On a possible Messianic reference in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> lxi 10, see W. H. Brownlee, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," NTS 3 (1956/57) 12-30, 195-210; esp. ca. 205, and the negative response of Gnülka, "'Brautigam' - spätjüdisches Messiasprädikat?" TrThZ 69 (1960) 298-301.

<sup>206</sup>B. A. Brooks, "Fertility Cult Functionaries in the Old Testament," JBL 60 (1941) 230. See also B. W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament, 102ff; W. Harrelson, From Fertility Cult to Worship, 10f, 54ff; and generally, S. H. Hooke, ed. Myth and Ritual; S. N. Kramer, The Sacred Marriage Rite.

<sup>207</sup>Stauffer, TDNT I 653.

<sup>208</sup>Cf. Stauffer, TDNT I 654. If in Wis viii 2, 9, Solomon as king stands for the nation, we would have a precedent to NT nuptial imagery. But more likely, he represents any person who desires wisdom. Sir xv 2 refers to "the man who fears the Lord."

<sup>209</sup>Stauffer, TDNT I 654.

<sup>210</sup>See Boussett, Kyrios Christos, 268ff; Schlier, 266ff; Christus, 60-75.

<sup>211</sup>Boussett, Kyrios Christos, 268f; cf. Hauptprobleme, 267ff; Schlier, Christus, 70.

<sup>212</sup>E.g. Act. Thom. 14; Iren. Ad.Her. I 6, 4. See Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 75f; Barth, 742.

<sup>213</sup>On this see K. Kerényi, Zeus and Hera, 97-109. The quote is from p. 106.

<sup>214</sup>Schrage, NTS 21:17.

<sup>215</sup>Stauffer, TDNT I 653. The question is whether one may assume that because a sacred marriage is the prototype for sacred prostitution, it also justifies "ordinary" human marriage. Evidence for the latter seems scarce.



<sup>216</sup>Hipp. Ref. v 24, 2-27, 5. Batey (NTS 10:121-27) argues Eph. adapts for a different purpose the Weltbild of Baruch. But while the myth contains archetypal elements for marriage, it ultimately concerns man's estrangement in the world caused by the rift between Elohim and Eden. Not only marriage but also adultery, sodomy, and divorce find their raison d'etre in the myth. This is hardly the Weltbild of Eph v 25ff; there is no hint here that the primeval union of Christ and Church is responsible for the creation of the sexes, or man's estrangement.

<sup>217</sup>Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 3ff; Barth, 741f.

<sup>218</sup>Best (178 n.1) thinks ἐκτρέφω (vs. 29) may imply "children."

<sup>219</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1080 n.512; Mussner, CAK, 159.

<sup>220</sup>Cf. Best, 172-79; Cambier, Bib 47:51-55; Percy, Die Probleme, 328f; Gnllka, 291; Barth, 740ff; Mussner, CAK, 158f.

<sup>221</sup>Best, 169f.

<sup>222</sup>Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 38.

<sup>223</sup>Cf. Best, 169 n.5.

<sup>224</sup>Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 67. Jn iii 25ff is a likely exception. In Rev xix 6ff, xxi 9 both aspects seem to occur (cf. Jeremias, TDNT IV 1099).

<sup>225</sup>H. A. A. Kennedy ("The NT Metaphor of the Messianic Bridal," Exp VIII 11, 1916, 97ff) treats the Messianic wedding feast as a separate image than the Bride of Christ, and traces the feast imagery to Jesus. It is perhaps better to speak of a matrix of imagery variously used.

<sup>226</sup>Cf. Best, 52f, 170f; Chavasse, 67; contrast Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 17-19.

<sup>227</sup>See above, pp. 271f.

<sup>228</sup>Cf. ExR xxxiii 7f, where the Torah is the wife. Cf. also Wis viii 2, 9; Sir xv 2.

<sup>229</sup>E.g. Chavasse, 68f; cf. Schlier, 266.

<sup>230</sup>Cf. Best, 171.

<sup>231</sup>Schlier (264-76) discerns a threefold pattern in Eph v 22-33: (1) The Christ/Church relation emerges in the context of "des Geschehens einer 'Rettung'." (2) Christ and Church are the prototype of earthly marriage, and the earthly marriage re-enacts and actualizes this heavenly event. (3) The whole process occurs in the framework of an exegesis of

Gen ii (266, cf. 275). Schlier thinks this pattern can only be explained by gnostic and gnostic-influenced texts. But Schlier's thesis does not take into account: (1) The OT relation between Yahweh and Israel did represent a saving bond and was linked to a salvation event. To say this is only a metaphor overlooks that such metaphors point to the reality of Yahweh's relation to Israel. (2) Schlier does not take seriously the Gen ii imagery in II Cor xi 2ff. Here Gen ii imagery is linked to a Bride of Christ concept without any hint of earthly re-enactment of a gnostic heavenly syzygy. Thus, the presence of Gen ii imagery does not by itself point to a gnostic Weltbild. (3) The heart of Schlier's thesis is the second point (cf. Barth, 740). We find in Eph v little to support the idea that the salvation event is in human marriage nachvollzogen. Rather Christ's saving relation to the Church determines what human marriage means. To imitate Christ here is not to re-enact the salvation event, but to recognize his Lordship. Our criticism of Schlier's thesis is made even stronger when it is noted that important features of the gnostic syzygy idea are at best foggy in many of the texts Schlier puts forth and only clearly attested in later systems (cf. Gnllka, 291 n.5).

<sup>232</sup>Chavasse, 79f; Gnllka (293f) quotes Ps. Phil. Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, 32, 15, where Israel is identified with Adam's rib.

<sup>233</sup>Cf. I Cor xi 25; Mk xiv 24 par. See Behm, TDNT II 129ff; Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 225ff.

<sup>234</sup>Cf. II Cor iii 6-14; I Cor v 7f; Behm, TDNT II 130, 133f; Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 59f, 222ff.

<sup>235</sup>For the Church as already married (in Christ's death or exaltation), see Best, 175 n.2; Gnllka, 282; von Harless, von Hofmann, Haupt. For the consummation as future, Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 29; Barth, 677f; Foerster, TDNT VII 1016; Roels, 142; Muirhead, SJT 5:184. Schlier (260) and Feuillet (NTS 21:171) suggest that the author moves from marriage (vss. 22-24) to bridal imagery (vss. 25-27) and back to marriage (vss. 28-30).

<sup>236</sup>Cf. Best, 175 n.5.

<sup>237</sup>Best, 181; cf. Caird, 88.

<sup>238</sup>Cf. Gnllka, 294; Schrage, NTS 21:17ff.

<sup>239</sup>See above, p. 289.

<sup>240</sup>See above, p. 254.

<sup>241</sup>Cf. Barth, 624; Schrage, NTS 21:19.



<sup>242</sup>This is why Adam and Eve are not mentioned; the order of creation that Adam and Eve represent is present in every man and woman. But the revelatory model of what that revealed order means is now seen from the order of salvation in Christ.

<sup>243</sup>Chavasse, 72ff; Gnllka, 293f. For criticism, see Best, 180-82.

<sup>244</sup>κ ψ, most mss, sy<sup>p</sup>, Did and Epiphomit καὶ and read ὀφείλουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες. A D F G P 048<sup>vid</sup> 629<sup>pc</sup> lat; C1 read καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οφείλουσιν. For the text, see p<sup>46</sup> B 33 1175 2495 <sup>pc</sup> sy<sup>h</sup>. More likely καὶ was omitted to avoid the impression that Christ was "indebted" to love the Church, than inserted to correlate vss. 25ff and 28ff.

<sup>245</sup>Abbott, Barth, Gnllka, Best (177), Sampley (141) and others. Contrast Schlier, 260. In a context of back and forth comparisons οὕτως is an unusual term to introduce a change of subject. If the καὶ is original, our view is required.

<sup>246</sup>Otherwise the author has moved from Christological to anthropological grounds. Cf. Best, 177.

<sup>247</sup>For discussion, cf. Abbott, 171; Best, 177; Gnllka, 283f; Beare, 724; Mussner, CAK, 150 n.352; Barth, 630. The difference between our view and "since she is his body" is that it is not only the "why" but also the "how" that is addressed. The husband's love should manifest and display his unity with his wife.

<sup>248</sup>Cf. e.g., Plut. Praec. Coniug. 33-34, II 142EF (see below; App. B, 359f); Arist. Pol. I, 1254ab; Ber 24a (cited in Sampley, 33).

<sup>249</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>250</sup>Sampley, 32, 142.

<sup>251</sup>Cf. Dana/Mantey, A Manual Grammar, §213; Bauer, 151.

<sup>252</sup>Cf. B1-D §331; Barth, 633.

<sup>253</sup>Best (177), Barth, Schlier, Gnllka and others.

<sup>254</sup>Εκτρέφω can mean "nourish," "provide," esp. as to the "rearing" of children; Bauer, 246; MM, 199. Θάλπω means lit. to "keep warm" and so fig. to "cherish," "comfort," "care for"; Bauer, 350; MM, 283. Cf. Gnllka, 285; Barth, 246.

<sup>255</sup>Best, 178.

<sup>256</sup>This approach seems more likely than a direct reference to the "children of Christ and the Church" (cf. Best, 178 n.5). Betrothal and



marriage could occur at an early age, sometimes before puberty, and woman's position was often compared to a child's (cf. Jeremias, Jerusalem, 364f, 375).

<sup>257</sup>Schlier, 260f; Christus, 59, 70f. Contrast Gnllka, 285.

<sup>258</sup>Barth, 635.

<sup>259</sup>D<sup>2</sup> and most mss read κυρίως. For the text, see p<sup>46</sup> κ A B D\* F G P Ψ 048 33 81 104 365 1175 1241<sup>a</sup> 1739 1881 2464 2495 al latt sy co.

<sup>260</sup>κ<sup>2</sup> D F G (K) Ψ most mss lat sy<sup>(p)</sup>; Ir add ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ. For the text, see p<sup>46</sup> κ\* A B 048 6 33 81 1739\* 1881 2464 pc vg<sup>ms</sup> co; Hier. The shorter version could have arisen by homoeoteleuton (αὐτοῦ...αὐτοῦ). But more likely, a scribe has introduced Gen ii 23 (though there, the order is bones-flesh) in anticipation of Gen ii 24 in vs. 31. See Metzger, Textual Commentary, 609; Best, 178; Gnllka, 286.

<sup>261</sup>Cf. Barth, 636. This need not refer to the Eucharist as entertained by Cambier, Bib 47:79; Mussner, CAK, 154; Schlier, 261.

<sup>262</sup>Cf. Best, 178; Barth, 636; Gnllka, 285.

<sup>263</sup>B D\* F G omit the articles before πατέρα and μητέρα. For the text see p<sup>46</sup> κ A D<sup>2</sup> Ψ 048 most mss; Or. Omitting πρός and reading κ. προσκ. τη γυναικι αυ. are κ<sup>1</sup> (\*:-αυ) A (D\* F G: κολλ.) P 33 81 1241<sup>s</sup> pc latt. Omitting the entire phrase are 6 1739\*; Cyp Hier. For the text, see κ<sup>2</sup> B D<sup>2</sup> Ψ most mss; Or. These differences are minor, not effecting the text's overall meaning.

<sup>264</sup>Cf. Bauer, 73 and most commentators.

<sup>265</sup>Barth (638) lists four alternatives, but only the first and last are really viable.

<sup>266</sup>Sampley, 96-102.

<sup>267</sup>Mt xix 5 and Mk x 7 also read ἕνεκεν τούτου.

<sup>268</sup>Cf. Best, 179.

<sup>269</sup>Gnllka, 287 n.3.

<sup>270</sup>Cf. and contrast Best, 179.

<sup>271</sup>For literature see above ch. II, 164 n.211. The Latin rendering sacramentum (which at the time was quite accurate) eventually led to a sacramental view of marriage.

<sup>272</sup>Abbott, Barth, Schlier, Best (179), Sampley (87) and others.

- <sup>273</sup>Robinson, 300; see above, ch. II, 164 n.211.
- <sup>274</sup>Semitic Background, 33-69.
- <sup>275</sup>Brown, Semitic Background, 12-30.
- <sup>276</sup>Bieder, TZ 11:330.
- <sup>277</sup>Cf. Sampley, 87.
- <sup>278</sup>B K pc; Ir Tert Cyp Epiph omit the second εἰς. But the word's omission is more easily explained than its addition.
- <sup>279</sup>Cf. B1-D §447; Salmond, 374.
- <sup>280</sup>See, e.g. H. von Soden, "ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ und sacramentum in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten der Kirche" ZNW 12 (1911) 194; Dibelius, 95; Cambier, Bib 47:43f; Sampley, 90f.
- <sup>281</sup>Brown, Semitic Background, 65f.
- <sup>282</sup>Cf. Abbott, 174f; Kähler, Die Frau, 134.
- <sup>283</sup>Brown, Semitic Background, 24-27; cf. Mussner, PQ, 161f.
- <sup>284</sup>Translation from Vermes, DSS, 239.
- <sup>285</sup>Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts, 9. See also R. Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period, 38-45.
- <sup>286</sup>Cf. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis, 11.
- <sup>287</sup>Bruce, Biblical Exegesis, 9f; Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis, 43f; cf. C. Roth, "The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis," VT 10 (1960) 51f.
- <sup>288</sup>Cf. Jeremias, TDNT IV 1104f. But Gen ii 24 need not suggest a future union, but may denote a prophecy now fulfilled in Christ and the Church.
- <sup>289</sup>Abbott, 175.
- <sup>290</sup>Cf. Salmond, 374.
- <sup>291</sup>Contrast Bornkamm, TDNT IV 823; Sampley, 87-89.
- <sup>292</sup>Brown, Semitic Background, 65 n.190.
- <sup>293</sup>Gnilka, 288 n.2; contrast Barth, 646.
- <sup>294</sup>B1-D §449; cf. Robertson, A Grammar, 1187.
- <sup>295</sup>For a ἵνα-clause used as an imperative, see B1-D §387 (3).
- <sup>296</sup>Barth, 648-50.
- <sup>297</sup>Cf. Best, 177.

<sup>298</sup>Cf. Schlier, 255.

<sup>299</sup>Best, 179. Best, of course, refers to the Wife of Christ, but his words remain fitting.

#### NOTES TO THE CONCLUSION

<sup>1</sup>Contrast Col i 24; see below Appendix C, 382.

<sup>2</sup>Max Black, "Metaphor," in Philosophy Looks at the Arts, ed. J. Margolis, 216-35, esp. 228ff.

<sup>3</sup>Kuhn, PQ, 115-31.

<sup>4</sup>Mussner, PQ, 159-78; cf. also the other articles in PQ.

<sup>5</sup>Brown, Semitic Background; J. Plammatter, Die Kirche als Bau; B. Gärtner, Temple and Community in Qumran; R. J. McKelvey, The New Temple.

<sup>6</sup>For literature, see below, App. A, 332, ns.1-4. The ongoing analysis of wholistic thinking may reveal similarities as well as differences to other modes of thought. Cf. below, App. A, 333 n.7. This could be important for understanding the relation between the historical-functional categories of Semitic thinking and the cosmic-ontological categories of Gnosticism.

#### NOTES TO APPENDIX A

<sup>1</sup>In Werden and Wessen, BZAW 66 (1936) 49-62; also "Hebrew Psychology," The People and the Book, ed. A. S. Peake, 353-82; The Christian Doctrine of Man; The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament; The Old Testament, Its Making and Meaning.

<sup>2</sup>J. de Fraine, Adam and the Family of Man, 22.

<sup>3</sup>J. Pedersen, Israel I-II, 2nd ed.; A. R. Johnson, The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, 2nd ed.; The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, 2nd ed.; Sacred Kingship in Ancient Israel. For other early works see de Fraine, 20 n.28.

<sup>4</sup>See, e.g. Best, 203-7; de Fraine; B. J. le Frois, "Semitic Totality Thinking," CBQ 17 (1955) 195-203, 315-23; P. Kaufmann, "The One and the Many: Corporate Personality," Worship 42 (1968) 546-58; R. P. Shedd, Man in Community; H. Wansbrough, "Corporate Personality in the Bible. Adam and Christ - a Biblical Use of the Concept of Personality,"



New Blackfriars 50 (1969) 798-804; S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, I 42-46; T. Boman, "Hebraic and Greek Thought Forms in the New Testament," in Current Issues in the New Testament, eds. Klassen/Snyder, 1-22.

<sup>5</sup>See O. J. Baab, Theology, 57; also H. W. Robinson, BZAW 66:49ff; P. Kaufmann, Worship, 42:550f. A. R. Johnson calls this a "psychical whole" (e.g. One and the Many, 4), while Pedersen (I-II 271ff) speaks of a "psychic community." The term "psychic" might give the misleading impression that the Hebrews somehow had a sixth sense or that a single soul is somehow incarnated in x number of bodies. If "psychic" is used, it must be understood from the Hebrew נַפְשׁ , which is much broader than our term "soul."

<sup>6</sup>Cf. Best, 203.

<sup>7</sup>Since "synthetic" and "wholistic" are variously used, we offer a brief definition. By "synthetic thinking" we mean the mental process that seeks understanding by linking the object of investigation to a family group which provides the context of its definition. In contrast, scientific or analytic thinking seeks understanding by breaking the object of investigation into its component parts which are studied separately and provide the context of definition. Synthetic thinking, then, looks for membership, analytic for makeup. So understood, we may see that synthetic thinking can be further divided into "abstract" and "concrete," depending on how the family group provides the context of definition. (This point emerged in a discussion with Dr. Larry Lacy, Professor of Philosophy, Southwestern at Memphis.) For example, the Platonist on linking some particulars to a group (e.g. cows), then detaches from the group an abstract and transcendent idea (e.g. cowhood) in which each group member participates and of which it is an expression. But the Hebrew proceeds in a different direction; he solidifies the associated group of particulars into a concrete and historical totality or whole in which each group member participates and of which it is a manifestation. We may note here how Pedersen sounds superficially like a Platonist in his classic exposition of a Moabite. He states (I-II, 110): "The individual Moabite is not a section of a number of Moabitic individuals, but a revelation of 'Moabithood,' just as the individual cow is a fully qualified representation of 'cowhood'." However, what the Hebrew (and also Pedersen) means by "cowhood" is not the same as for the Platonist. For the latter it is a transcendent idea; for the former it is the totality of being a cow, which includes the entire species of cows, their characteristics and

history. Thus, while "synthetic" describes the general type of associative mental process, the term "wholistic" points more readily to the concrete direction towards which Hebrew thinking moves, what Pedersen (I-II 113) calls "striving after totality." By "wholistic thinking," then, we mean a concrete type of synthetic thinking.

<sup>8</sup>J. R. Porter, "The Legal Aspects of the Concept of 'Corporate Personality' in the Old Testament," VT 15 (1965) 361-80. J. W. Rogerson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality: A Re-examination," JTS 21 (1970) 1-16.

<sup>9</sup>Porter, VT 15:365-66.

<sup>10</sup>Porter, VT 15:367-74.

<sup>11</sup>Sacred Kingship, 3.

<sup>12</sup>Porter, VT 15:374.

<sup>13</sup>D. Daube, Studies in Biblical Law, 154-89.

<sup>14</sup>Daube, 154.

<sup>15</sup>Daube, 177f.

<sup>16</sup>Daube, 185f.

<sup>17</sup>Porter, VT 15:368f.

<sup>18</sup>Porter, VT 15:369ff.

<sup>19</sup>Porter, VT 15:371 n.3.

<sup>20</sup>Rogerson, JTS n.s. 21:6.

<sup>21</sup>Rogerson, JTS n.s. 21:esp. 7-13.

<sup>22</sup>Rogerson, JTS n.s. 21:14.

<sup>23</sup>Rogerson (JTS n.s. 21:14) objects to such a re-definition: "First, anthropologists are not clear what they mean by corporateness.... Second, not all lineage or descent groups have the features outlined above. Third, we probably know insufficient of the tribal and lineage system of the ancient Hebrews to make valid inferences from other societies to the Israelite society." What Rogerson does not consider is re-defining the term based on the Biblical texts themselves. Not to allow this certainly limits the use of technical terms within Biblical studies. Many terms, e.g. "myth," "eschatology," "narrative," point to a general area of study, in which the specialist may define his position more precisely.

<sup>24</sup>Cf. Porter, VT 15:361.



<sup>25</sup>See Pedersen, I-II. Rogerson (JTS 21:11f) does discuss A. R. Johnson and suggests he has simply tidied up his notes to avoid the charge of being unaware of the criticism of Levy-Bruhl's theories. To an extent this criticism is fair; cf. also N. H. Snaith, Review of The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, by Aubrey R. Johnson, JTS 44 (1943) 81-84. But Rogerson fails to address the heart of Johnson's work, based not on Levy-Bruhl (or Robinson's use of him) but on an exegesis of OT texts. It is here that one must determine whether the idea exists and whether the rubric "corporate personality" (which is not incidentally a phrase of Levy-Bruhl) is useful in describing it.

<sup>26</sup>De Fraine, esp. 32-42.

<sup>27</sup>Johnson (One and the Many, 9) speaks here of a community soul or heart in quite literal terms. He cites II Sam xix 14 as an example: "And he /David/ swayed the heart of all the men of Judah as one man." While "the heart" in the singular may go beyond a literary device, the idea is governed by the phrase "as one man." It is difficult to take "as" here in any other way than a particle of comparison, which suggests personification. Shedd (Man in Community, 29) calls this usage metaphorical.

<sup>28</sup>Le Frois (CBQ 17:195-203) calls this "totality thinking." Cf. Pedersen, I-II 109. See also p. 333, n.7.

<sup>29</sup>Cf. N. W. Porteous, Review of Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, by H. Wheeler Robinson, JTS 48 (1947) 76: "The Hebrew mind was much less concerned with secondary causes and found the unity of the world in the direct activity of God rather than in an interrelated system of causal law." Such a theological framework, once imbedded in Israel's religious tradition, would lend a certain staying power to its accompanying modes of thinking even in the ebb and flow of anthropological and psychological views through the course of history.

<sup>30</sup>De Fraine, 24.

<sup>31</sup>De Fraine, 21.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid.

#### NOTES TO APPENDIX B

<sup>1</sup>For exhaustive treatment, see esp. Käsemann, Leib; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1024-94. Excepting NT and LXX quotations, Greek citations are from the Loeb editions unless noted otherwise.



<sup>2</sup>For discussion, see, e.g. Bultmann, Primitive Christianity, 103-71; W. K. C. Guthrie, The Greek Philosophers; F. Copleston, A History of Philosophy I, I-II; E. Lohse, The New Testament Environment.

<sup>3</sup>E.g. Hom. Il. 3,23; Plat. Resp. 564A, Epin. 581Bff; and Arist. Part.An., Gen.An., passim.

<sup>4</sup>Plat. Tim. 46D; Arist. Metaph. 990a, 16f; Topica, 142b, 24f; Gorg. Fr. 11, 8 (Diels II, 281, 6f; cf. Schweizer, TDNT VII, 1027). Such usage was prevalent in art and esp. philosophy. The starting point is the body's external appearance, i.e. its "form," thus linking it to ἰδέα and σχήμα. But form is also linked to essential being, and so substance remains important. Thus the idea was prevalent that two bodies could not occupy the same space. Cf. Schweizer, TDNT VII 1031; Käsemann, Leib, 30.

<sup>5</sup>See below, p. 370f.

<sup>6</sup>Sext. Emp. Math. IX 78f.

<sup>7</sup>For further refs., Lidd-Scott, s.v.; acc. to Schweizer (TDNT VII 1025) only Il. 3, 23 is debatable.

<sup>8</sup>Käsemann, Leib, 25; cf. Schweizer, TDNT VII 1025.

<sup>9</sup>Xenoph. An. I, 9, 12; Cyrop. VII 5, 73; Demosth. Or. 9, 40; Plat. Leg. 908A; Aen. Tact. 1, 1; 2, 1; 32, 8; PLille 27, 17. For further texts and discussion see Schweizer, TDNT VII 1026, 1028, 1030; also Gundry, Sōma, 9-15.

<sup>10</sup>Eur. Or. 1075; Isoc. Or. 6, 46. For further texts, see Lidd-Scott, s.v.; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1026, 1030, 1032; Gundry, Sōma, 14.

<sup>11</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1026.

<sup>12</sup>Cf. Käsemann, Leib, 26ff; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1028; and generally, Copleston, I, I 232-41.

<sup>13</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1026. The epitomy of this view is seen in the doctrine of the soul's transmigration in re-incarnation. Later in Gnosticism, this reaches the extreme conclusion that the body, since composed of matter, is inherently evil.

<sup>14</sup>For refs., see Schweizer, TDNT VII 1026-1089 passim.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. Schweizer, TDNT VII 1033f; Käsemann, Leib, 43-47; also Copleston I, II 32f.

<sup>16</sup>μέλος has two principal meanings: (a) the member or limb of a body, and (b) a melody or song. Only (a) concerns our topic. μέρος

can mean "part," "portion," "fixed time." It occurs frequently with various prepositions to denote "partially." But in reference to σῶμα, μέλη and μέρη are largely synonymous, indicating the members and parts of the body. See Horst, TDNT IV 555-68; Schneider, TDNT IV 594-98.

<sup>17</sup>Plat. Resp. 591D, 463C; Prot. 330A; Plut. Sol. I 88c; Dion. Hal. Ant.Rom. VI 86, 1f; cf. Arist. Part.An. 645b 15.

<sup>18</sup>On this discussion, see Schlier, TDNT III 673-82; Munzer/Brown, DNTT II 156-63; van Roon, 275-93; Stephen Beale, "The Meaning of κεφαλή in the Pauline Epistles," JTS n.s. 5 (1954) 212ff. For further listings see Barth, 414ff.

<sup>19</sup>For these and other refs. see Schlier, TDNT III 673f.

<sup>20</sup>Beyond denoting the beginning and end of a month or river, these associations emerge in literary analysis. In Plato (Tim. 69B, Phileb. 66D, Gorg. 505D) the "head" of a speech denotes its conclusion. Cf. Aristoph. Pl. 649F. Philo (e.g., Vit.Mos. II 290) compares the τέλος of Scripture to the κεφαλή in a living creature. In contrast, Aristotle (Rhet. 1415b 8) calls an introductory summary the head of the main body of a speech. Cf. Plat. Phaedr. 264C. The link with ἀρχή receives marked development in the LXX and Gnosticism; Schlier, TDNT III 674.

<sup>21</sup>Schlier, TDNT III 674.

<sup>22</sup>Hom. Il. 23, 94; cf. 8, 281; for further texts, see Schlier, TDNT III 674.

<sup>23</sup>Schlier, TDNT III 674.

<sup>24</sup>Hom. Il. 17, 242; cf. 4, 162; Od. 2, 237; Schlier, TDNT III 674; Munzer, DNTT II 156.

<sup>25</sup>Van Roon, 275.

<sup>26</sup>This is attested from Hdt. II 66, 4 on; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1025-41 passim.

<sup>27</sup>Schlier, TDNT III 674.

<sup>28</sup>Munzer, DNTT II 157. Aristotle, Zeno, and Chrys. place the reason in man's heart, raising the question whether the head could be seen as prominent apart from its being the seat of reason.

<sup>29</sup>For texts and discussion see Barth, 186-88.

<sup>30</sup>Barth, 188.



<sup>31</sup>The contrast is also used in literary analysis (cf. p. 349 n.20) and in psychology (Philo, Quaest.in Gen. II 11). Som. I 128 belongs here as well (cf. Schweizer, TDNT VII 335; contrast Hegermann, 149f; Lohse, 54).

<sup>32</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1045; Käsemann, Leib, 1. Hatch-Redpath list 140 occurrences of σῶμα in the LXX. Of these 57 are in works outside the Hebrew canon. Of the remaining 83, 18 do not have a Hebrew equivalent. Of the remaining 65, 23 are renderings of גִּשְׁרָה ; 14 of the root גִּשְׁרָה (9 - גִּשְׁרָה ), 9 of גִּשְׁרָה ; 7 of the Aramaic גִּשְׁרָה ; 3 of גִּשְׁרָה ; 2 each of גִּשְׁרָה and גִּשְׁרָה ; 1 each of גִּשְׁרָה , גִּשְׁרָה , גִּשְׁרָה and גִּשְׁרָה ; and once in a paraphrase of גִּשְׁרָה .

<sup>33</sup>Cf. Schweizer, TDNT VII 1047.

<sup>34</sup>Käsemann, Leib, 23; cf. also W. Eichrodt, Man in the Old Testament, SBT 4 (1951) 28ff; and generally J. A. T. Robinson, The Body, 11-16.

<sup>35</sup>Cf. Jacob, TDNT IX 624ff, 630-31; Eichrodt, Theology, II 147-50.

<sup>36</sup>Pedersen, I-II, 170-71.

<sup>37</sup>Käsemann, Leib, 12.

<sup>38</sup>H. W. Wolff, Anthropology of the Old Testament, 8.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid. Our preference for the term "wholistic" is also stated in Appendix A, n.7. Aristotle also defines the body member in terms of its function (Part.An. 645b 14ff). The difference lies in linking this function to the whole person. This is, of course, what Wolff means, but there is a double synthesis: that between body member and function (which both Hebrew and Greek share) and between member-function and the whole man. We prefer to call this wholistic as the member denotes the whole person in a specific function.

<sup>40</sup>J. A. T. Robinson, The Body, 15.

<sup>41</sup>Baumgärtel, TDNT VII 106; Käsemann, Leib, 3, 6.

<sup>42</sup>J. A. T. Robinson, The Body, 15.

<sup>43</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1048.

<sup>44</sup>The term means corpse some 15-19 times, translating a variety of words; see Baumgärtel, TDNT VII 1045. This meaning is also present in the Greek works (e.g. Tob i 18, Wis xlii 14, I Macc xi 4). Notably, σῶμα never means corpse for גִּשְׁרָה ; at I Ki xvii 44 and IV Ki ix 36 we find σάρξ.

<sup>45</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1045, 1048. See, e.g. Lev xiv 9, xv-xvi passim, xvii 16, xix 28; Num viii 7, xix 7f; Prov iii 8, v 11, xi 17; Nah iii 3;



Job vi 4, xix 26A. The term also stands for the reflexive or personal pronoun (e.g. Prov xi 17; Sir li 2; Job vi 4, xix 26A, xxxiii 17; IV Macc xvii 1). In good Greek σῶμα stands for "persons" when the stress is on material possession or numerical unit, such as slaves or prisoners of war (e.g. Gen xxxiv 29; xxvi 6, xlvii 18; Neh ix 37; Tob x 11; II Macc viii 11, xii 26). Cf. K. Grobel, "Σῶμα as 'Self, Person' in the Septuagint," BZNW 21 (1954) 52-59.

<sup>46</sup>Cf. Best, 216.

<sup>47</sup>Schlier, TDNT III 674; S. Bedale, JTS n.s. 5:211.

<sup>48</sup>R. Batey, Nuptial Imagery, 24. Cf. BDB, 910f; Munzer, DNTT II 157.

<sup>49</sup>Cf. above p. 348f. Cf. BDB, 910f with TDNT III 673f.

<sup>50</sup>See G. Bertram, TDNT III 675 n.2.

<sup>51</sup>In the LXX, see: anointing = Ex xxix 7; Lev xiv 18, xxi 5; I Ki ix 3, 6; Ps xxii 5, cxl 5; blessing = Gen xlviii 14, xlix 26; Deut xxxiii 16; Prov x 6, 22, xi 26; Isa xxv 60; li 11; exaltation = Ps iii 4, cix 7, cxxvi 6; IV Ki xxv 27; cursing, revenge, and/or recompense = Judg ix 57B; I Ki xxv 39; II Ki i 16; III Ki 32f; II Chr vi 23; Ps vii 16, cxxxix 10; Lam iii 5; Jl iii 5, 7; Ez ix 10, xi 21, xvi 43.

<sup>52</sup>E.g. Lam ii 20; Judg vii 28; Ps lxxxii 13; Num vi 5ff; IV Ki xix 21.

<sup>53</sup>In Dan vii 28, iv 2, vii 15, the head is the place of divine dreams and visions. But this is not the result of an inward process, but a gift of God linked to the physical setting of the ideas (Eichrodt, Theology II, 146). So as with anointing and blessing, the head is "physically" the locus of revelation.

<sup>54</sup>See Meyer, TDNT VII 110-14; Lohse, TDNT IX 635-36.

<sup>55</sup>Translation from Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot, ad loc.

<sup>56</sup>Meyer, TDNT VII 116.

<sup>57</sup>E.g., Sanh 91ab; see Str-B I 581; Moore I 487f; II 384; Lohse, TDNT IX 637.

<sup>58</sup>Sanh 38a; GenR 8; cited in Davies, Paul, 53f.

<sup>59</sup>E.g. Mak 23b.

<sup>60</sup>Cf. Pirke R. El. 42 (24a); t Taan 2, 5. See Str-B III 446f; Horst, TDNT IV 559.

<sup>61</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1055f.

<sup>62</sup>TDNT VII 1051.

<sup>63</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1049.

<sup>64</sup>For texts and discussion of the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Philo and Josephus, see Schweizer, TDNT VII 1050-57; also Gundry, Sōma, 87-93.

<sup>65</sup>S. Bar xlix 3; I En xxii 8; Philo, Rer.Div.Her. 85; Som. I, 139; Migr.Abr. 9; Jos. Bell. II 154f. These and other refs. are in Schweizer, TDNT VII 1050, 1053, 1057.

<sup>66</sup>Cf. Bar ii 17; I En lxxi 11; xcvi 3, cii 4; S. Bar. xxx 2-5; Apc.Abr. xxxi 4; Jos. Bell. III 372, 374. For these and other texts see Gundry, 88-91; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1050, 1057.

<sup>67</sup>Op.Mund. 67; Leg.All. I 32f; see Schweizer, TDNT VII 1052.

<sup>68</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1056.

<sup>69</sup>Vit.Mos. II, 74; Ebr. 133; but cf. also Jos. Bell. III, 274. See Schweizer, TDNT VII 1056.

<sup>70</sup>See below, pp. 358-69 passim.

<sup>71</sup>Cf. Schlier, TDNT III 674.

<sup>72</sup>See below, pp. 364-66. Cf. also Apc.Abr. xviii 6.

<sup>73</sup>Calculations are based on Moulton-Geden. s.v.

<sup>74</sup>TDNT VII 1059. Less successful is Schweizer's attempt to separate the statements about the body and blood so as to find גוף behind σῶμα. More likely the Semitic idea of "flesh and blood" lies behind the expressions (Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 178). The words are used stereometrically to depict man as a physical being capable of death. The separation of body and blood, then, point not simply to the fact of death, but also to the sacrificial act.

<sup>75</sup>Cf. above, ch. III, 226; also Midr Ps 39 §2 (128a) (Str-B III 447f).

<sup>76</sup>Schweizer (TDNT VII 1058) thinks the passage shows more Greek than Hebrew influence. But he then says: "The body is the true I from which a single member can be severed for the salvation of the whole, though it can also influence or reveal the whole." This hardly suggests a Greek background.

<sup>77</sup>E.g. Mk xiv 3 par.; xv 19 par.; Mt xxvii 37; Lk vii 46; also Mt x 30; Lk xxi 18. Cf. Munzer, DNTT II 159.

<sup>78</sup>For a history of research, see Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms, 201-50. Gundry, Sōma in Biblical Theology, offers a recent discussion.

<sup>79</sup>Cf. Jos. Bell. II 28. See Best, 121.



<sup>80</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1060; see below App. C, 375 n.1.

<sup>81</sup>Cf. Best, 216; contrast Gundry, Sōma, 34-36. Elsewhere Gundry (29-33) argues that when σῶμα replaces the personal pronoun, it narrows the pronoun's scope to the physical body. But the question remains whether the physical body is a valid manifestation of the self. If so, being a body points wholistically to a dimension of selfhood.

<sup>82</sup>See above, ch. IV, 271f ; below, App. C, 375f.

<sup>83</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1060.

<sup>84</sup>Cf. Best, First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, 243f.

<sup>85</sup>Contrast Leitzmann, Korinther I/II, 84; cf. Barrett, I Corinthians, 371. If body actually meant form, varying acc. to content, then the point must be that there are different kinds of "forms." But in vs. 39 ὁρᾷ cannot be limited to "content," as the examples suggest a difference in "form" as well. The solution lies not in the Greek idea of form, but in the Hebrew idea of manifestation.

<sup>86</sup>Horst, TDNT IV 555-68.

<sup>87</sup>May we go further and say created existence means bodily existence? Probably. If Paul sees the body as the outward manifestation of a finite being's totality, then it is difficult to conceive of a being which this would not include except an infinite one, i.e. God. Still it seems possible that a being might be a shattered totality whose outward manifestation lacks vitality and whose inward reality is known only to God.

<sup>88</sup>Gundry, Sōma, esp. 3-15; 135-222.

<sup>89</sup>Cf. Best, 223f. The lines of influence are not clear; e.g. early Greek speculations could be parallel, but independent.

<sup>90</sup>A. R. Keith, The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads I, 81.

<sup>91</sup>Cf. van Roon, 276.

<sup>92</sup>Cf. Arist. An. 411a, 7; Diog. L. I 27.

<sup>93</sup>A looser correlation is probably older (cf. Schweizer, TDNT VII 1028) and the idea perhaps has roots in Indo-Iranian Macroanthropos speculations.

<sup>94</sup>This usage may have roots in Eastern cosmic conceptions (Best, 223e) but by Plato's era, it appears quite independently.

<sup>95</sup>See below, pp. 358-77.



<sup>96</sup>Dupont, 431 n.2.

<sup>97</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1035, 1037.

<sup>98</sup>See below, p. 370f.

<sup>99</sup>Misleading for our purposes is Bevan's rendering (Later Greek Religion, 39) of v. Arnim, III, 4, where Chrys. calls God "the head of the administration of the world." "Head" translates καθηγμένων not κεφαλή.

<sup>100</sup>Schlier, TDNT III 676; see below, p. 364.

<sup>101</sup>Cf. Schweizer, TDNT VII 1091.

<sup>102</sup>See below, p. 368f.

<sup>103</sup>E.g. Gen ii 24; Gen viii 17. Cf. above, p. 351.

<sup>104</sup>Schlier, TDNT III 675; also below, pp. 371-73.

<sup>105</sup>See below, p. 373.

<sup>106</sup>The scheme possibly underlies speculations about the High Priest's robe (Vit.Mos. II, 109-35; Spec.Leg. I, 80-97). At Fug. 110 the High Priest and his arguments correspond to the Logos/world, soul/body, and the wise man's understanding/virtues.

<sup>107</sup>Cf. Schlier, TDNT III 677; cf. the objections of van Roon, 271 n.5. See also Hegermann, Schöpfungsmittler, 58f; Kehl, Christushymnus, 96-98.

<sup>108</sup>The idea perhaps stems from stoic conceptions of the wise man. If so, such use of the head/body scheme may have been widespread in popular philosophy. The idea may also be related to the stoic Logos concept. What the Logos is to the cosmos, the wise man is to the human populace, and the head to the body. If so, the idea goes beyond a moral analogy to a cosmic principle. This is never spelled out, however, and remains speculative.

<sup>109</sup>See below, pp. 362, 365, 367.

<sup>110</sup>Cf. Schweizer, TDNT VII 1082f; Mersch, The Whole Christ, 213-26.

<sup>111</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1083.

<sup>112</sup>Cf. van Roon, 281; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1092; Schlier, TDNT III 678; Pokorný, Epheserbrief, 66.

<sup>113</sup>Cf. Käsemann, Leib, 65ff; van Roon, 284; Gnllka, 34; Schlier, TDNT III 677.

<sup>114</sup>Cf. Hanson, 113-16; Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms, 235-37; Gnllka, 34ff; van Roon, 266-74; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1093; Schenke, Der Gott 'Mensch', 69-71, 108f; Colpe, RGG<sup>3</sup> IV 720f.

- <sup>115</sup>See below, pp. 358, 361, 363, 366.
- <sup>116</sup>Cf. Käsemann, Leib, 74; Schlier, TDNT III 677f; van Roon, 284.
- <sup>117</sup>Käsemann, Leib, 87ff; Best, 244; see also below, 363, 366.
- <sup>118</sup>Schenke, Der Gott 'Mensch', 69-71, 108f; Colpe, RGG<sup>3</sup> IV 720; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1093f; van Roon, 284; Jewett, 236.
- <sup>119</sup>Best, 245; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1092, 1094.
- <sup>120</sup>MG XVI col. 3311. Contrast Tri.Tract. 66, 13ff, where the Son is "the body of the bodiless," and the stress is on outward form.
- <sup>121</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1091 n.618.
- <sup>122</sup>On the "diverse body" see below, 371.
- <sup>123</sup>One may suspect a word play on σῶμα (= body and = slave). Still, the comparison is not simply master = soul and slave = body (cf. Käsemann, Leib, 37). The slave is an extension of the master's body, i.e. the slave and master's body are both servants of the master's soul.
- <sup>124</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1038; cf. Käsemann, Leib, 46f.
- <sup>125</sup>Cited from Foerster, II 57.
- <sup>126</sup>Tri.Tract. 74, 13ff. Cited from NHL, 67.
- <sup>127</sup>The latter refs. have not to my knowledge been previously cited. Dupont cites xxxiii 16.
- <sup>128</sup>Schweizer (TDNT VII 1056) suggests this is a Latinism.
- <sup>129</sup>Cf. H. D. Betz, "De fraterno amore," in Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature, ed. H. D. Betz, SCHNT IV 238.
- <sup>130</sup>Cf. Best, 86; Hanson, 115.
- <sup>131</sup>For text, see Apocrypha Anecdota II, ed. M. R. James, V, 1, 20 (xiv 5f).
- <sup>132</sup>Cf. Schweizer, TDNT VII 1092; van Roon, 281; Pokorný, Epheserbrief, 65.
- <sup>133</sup>Best, 225.
- <sup>134</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1092; van Roon, 295.
- <sup>135</sup>Contrast Käsemann, Leib, 80f.
- <sup>136</sup>Cited in Schlier, TDNT III 676f.
- <sup>137</sup>Schlier, TDNT III 677.

<sup>138</sup>Orphicorum Fragmenta, ed. Kern, 201f (cited in Lohse, 53).

<sup>139</sup>Schlier, TDNT III 677.

<sup>140</sup>R. G. Bury (Loeb ed.) refers  $\kappa\acute{o}\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  to the skull; but the idea of the body is suggested by the "eyes" view of the whole state. This is very difficult if it means skull, for one cannot even see the front of one's face without a mirror. We follow the rendering in Collected Dialogues of Plato, ed. Hamilton/Cairns.

<sup>141</sup>Text cited from de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 99

<sup>142</sup>Dupont, 445; van Roon, 281.

<sup>143</sup>Cf. p. 358 above and p. 371f below.

<sup>144</sup>Charlesworth, Odes, 75.

<sup>145</sup>NHL, 89.

<sup>146</sup>Cf. Schlier, TDNT III 678.

<sup>147</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1092; cf. Best, 224.

<sup>148</sup>Cf. and contrast Schlier, TDNT III 678.

<sup>149</sup>A. S. Pease/J. B. Titchener obscure the point by rendering, "the whole structure."

<sup>150</sup>See W. Bousett, Hauptprobleme der Gnosis; R. Reitzenstein, Das Iranische Erlösungsmysterium, 116f; Studien zum Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland; W. Schmithals, Gnosticism in Corinth, esp. 25-85. Schlier (Christus) applied the gnostic explanation to Eph., but denied its influence in I Cor. and Rom. since they lack the head/body scheme. Käsemann, basically agreeing with Schlier on Eph., argues that a gnostic body/members concept underpins the usage in I Cor. and Rom. (Leib, 74-81; cf. Bultmann, I 166f). Our adumbration follows the head/body scheme.

<sup>151</sup>Colpe, Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule; Schenke, Der Gott 'Mensch'. Pokorný's attempt (Epheserbrief) to revive the gnostic explanation in modified form has not been successful. Cf. Gnllka, 36ff; van Roon, 273ff.

<sup>152</sup>Philo was perhaps familiar with this, Migr.Abr. 180; Det.Pot.Ins. 49. Bodies composed of a definite number (a choir) are distinguished from those of indefinite number (a crowd); see Schweizer, TDNT VII 1035. There is no undisputed evidence from the NT era that  $\sigma\acute{o}\mu\alpha$  could be attributed a genitive plural to denote a "body of people." On the debated text in Suppl.Epigr.Graec. 9 (1938) 8, 58, see T. W. Manson, "A Parallel to a



NT Use of  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ ," JTS 37 (1936) 385. For criticism see Schweizer, TDNT VII 1044; Jewett, 229; F. de Visscher, Les édits d'Auguste, 91.

<sup>153</sup>W. L. Knox, "Parallels to the N.T. Use of  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ ," JTS 29 (1938) 243.

<sup>154</sup>Schweizer, TDNT VII 1049.

<sup>155</sup>Cf. Schlier, TDNT III 675.

<sup>156</sup>Nuptial Imagery, 24.

<sup>157</sup>Bertram, TDNT III 675 n.2.

<sup>158</sup>Cf. Jewett, 241-45.

<sup>159</sup>See, e.g. Jewett, 243f.

<sup>160</sup>Max Black, "Metaphor," in Philosophy Looks at the Arts, ed. J. Margolis, 216-35.

#### NOTES TO APPENDIX C

<sup>1</sup>Schweitzer (Mysticism, 119, 188 n.1), Thornton (Common Life, 148), Dodd (Romans, 101f) and some others would include Rom vii 4. But the idea of "dying through the Church," is unlikely. See Schweizer (TDNT VII 1067), Best (52f), Käsemann (Romans, 189f), Michel, Black, Barrett, and others.

<sup>2</sup>See ch. IV, 271f.

<sup>3</sup>See ch. IV 272; cf. also Schweizer, TDNT VII 1070.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Thornton, Common Life, 253f, 298; Schweitzer, Mysticism, 127f; J. A. T. Robinson, The Body, 50ff; Benoit, RB 63:12f; Reuss BZ N.F. 2:104ff.

<sup>5</sup>E.g. Benoit, RB 63:13; Reuss BZ N.F. 2:106f.

<sup>6</sup>Barrett, I Corinthians, 235; cf. Moffatt, I Corinthians, 136.

<sup>7</sup>For this rendering of  $\sigma\tau\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ , see B1-D §275:7.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. Best, 91. The eucharist is not itself, then, the source of the idea. Still, the idea is closely linked to the sacraments, and so its source must be at least compatible with this association.

<sup>9</sup>E.g., for (a) see Barrett, I Cor. 274f; Jewett, 264; Thornton, 342ff; Schweitzer, TDNT VII 1068; for (b) see Moffatt, I Cor. 171ff; Best, 108ff; for (c) see A. A. T. Ehrhart, The Framework of the New Testament Stories, 256-74.

<sup>10</sup>Best, 110f, 113, 127, etc.; cf. F. W. Dillistone, "How is the Church Christ's Body," Theology Today 2 (1945) 65; Roels, God's Mission, 110.

<sup>11</sup>Mussner, CAK, 130.

<sup>12</sup>Cf. e.g. Best, 95-106; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1072; Neotestamentica, 287-90; Percy, Leib Christi, 40-44; Gnülka, 101; J. A. T. Robinson, 58ff; Benoit RB 63:5ff; Ridderbos, 362-95; de Fraine, 245-67; Barth, "A Chapter on the Church - the Body of Christ," Interpretation 12 (1958) 131-56; Dillistone, Theology Today 2 (1945) 56-68; and others. For the idea, see Appendix A and literature cited there.

<sup>13</sup>Most scholars concede at least a partial influence of the popular metaphor. Certainly "conversing" body members resemble the fable of Menenius Agrippa (Liv. II xxxiii 8; see App. B, 356, 362). We suggest the metaphor provided a tool for Paul to communicate his Semitic assumptions.

<sup>14</sup>See above, Appendix B, 344, 347, 350.

<sup>15</sup>Some scholars (e.g. Calvin, Schlatter, Käsemann, Leib, 176) refer vs. 13c to the eucharist. But contrast, Mussner, CAK, 137f; Barrett, I Cor. 289.

<sup>16</sup>Cf. Percy, Leib Christi, 10ff; Ridderbos, 372; Best, 97.

<sup>17</sup>Cf. Percy, Leib Christi, 6.

<sup>18</sup>Cf. Best, 104; Käsemann, Romans, 336.

<sup>19</sup>See Appendix B, 340, 354ff.

<sup>20</sup>Cf. Ridderbos, 362-67. One might justifiably speak of a "mystical Body" if the Church as a diverse body could be shown to be united to Christ's personal body. But Paul never clearly speaks of such union of bodies. Indeed, Paul has a different starting point than the stoic idea; for him the body is the God-willed unity of the created person. The body metaphor, then, offers him an opportunity to apply this to the corporate person, Christ, thus making the unity of the Church the corporate expression of its unity with Christ. This makes very unlikely Schlatter's rendering (Christus, 40ff; revived by Meuzelaar, 40) a "body that belongs to Christ." Cf. Best, 104; Jewett, 228; Percy, Leib Christi, 6.

<sup>21</sup>Cf. above, pp. 328, 373 ; cf. Best, 98-101; Minear, Images, 173ff; contrast Käsemann, Romans, 336.

<sup>22</sup>For concise overviews see Best, 83-95; Jewett, 227-50. The literature is immense; see the bibliographies of Colpe, BZNW 26:172f; Barth, 414-17; Schweizer, TDNT VII 1024 and also the listings in our bibliography.

<sup>23</sup>Knox, 160ff; also JTS o.s. 29:243-46; cf. Dupont, 427ff; Schlatter, Christus, 41.



<sup>24</sup>Cf. e.g., Percy, Leib Christi, 6; T. W. Manson, JTS o.s. 37:385.

<sup>25</sup>E.g., Apocalypticism = Schweitzer, Mysticism, 101ff; Gnosticism = Käsemann, Leib, 159ff; in a modified form Pokorný, EvTh 20:456-64; Adam speculation = Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 53-57; Jewett, 241-45; the Damascus experience = Mersch, The Whole Christ, 80-84, 139f; J. A. T. Robinson, 58; cf. Mussner, CAK, 139; corporate personality = see p. 378 n.12; the eucharist = esp. A. E. J. Rawlinson, "Corpus Christi," in Mysterium Christi (eds. Bell/Deissmann), 275ff; the Bride of Christ = Chavasse, 70-72; Shedd, Man in Community, 157-65. Of course, many scholars (including some already listed) find several factors at work: e.g. Cerfaux (The Church, 265ff) thinks Paul combined the stoic metaphor with the unity of the eucharistic loaf; cf. Mussner, CAK, 137f. Reuss (BZ N.F. 2:103-27) thinks Paul's second Adam idea is linked to sacramental unity. In contrast, van Roon (313f) combines predestined solidarity of the Elect and Messiah with the wife of Christ. Schweizer (Neotestamentica, 272-92) sees corporate personality, the eucharist and the stoic metaphor at work.

<sup>26</sup>Cf. esp. Schweizer, Neotestamentica, 272f.

<sup>27</sup>See above, p. 378 n.12 and ch. I, 83 n.233.

<sup>28</sup>Our list supplements that of Best, 93f.

<sup>29</sup>Since we discuss most of the Colossian texts above, we sketch here the main points of development. For Col i 18, cf. above pp. 52, 65-67; i 24, p. 52f; ii 19, pp. 69f, 238f; iii 15, p. 181.

<sup>30</sup>Benoit (RB 63:19f) refers the verse to the crucified body. For our view, see Schweizer, TDNT VII 1076; Lohse, 150. The phrase probably indicates the manner in which they were called, i.e. as body members united to Christ and one another. The recognition of this unity is an essential ingredient of allowing Christ's peace to rule. The peace, then, concerns that which rules between men, and living in the Body is itself a continual summons to that peace.

<sup>31</sup>See esp. ch. I, 77-91.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. TEXTS AND REFERENCE WORKS\*

- Aland, K. et al., eds. The Greek New Testament. 3rd ed. United Bible Societies. London, 1975.
- Box, G. H., ed. The Apocalypse of Abraham. London/New York, 1918.
- Braude, W. G., trans. Pesikta Rabbati. New Haven/London, 1968.
- Burton, E. de W. Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. Edinburgh, 1894.
- Buttmann, A. A Grammar of the New Testament Greek. Andover, 1873.
- Charles, R. H., ed. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. 2 vols. Oxford, 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Oxford, 1908.
- Charlesworth, J. H. The Odes of Solomon: Edited with Translation and Notes. Oxford, 1973.
- Conybeare, F. C. and Stock, St. G. A Grammar of Septuagint Greek. Grand Rapids, 1980. (repr. of Selections from the Septuagint, 1905).
- Dana, H. E. and Maney, J. R. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York, 1927.
- Danby, H., trans. The Mishnah. Oxford, 1933.
- Denniston, J. D. The Greek Particles. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1954.
- Epstein, I. The Babylonian Talmud. 6 vols. London, 1948-1952.
- Freedman, H. and Simon, M. Midrash Rabbah. 9 vols. London/Bournemouth, 1951.
- Friedlander, G., trans. Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer. New York, 1965.
- Gaster, T. H., trans. The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect. London, 1957.
- Grobel, K., The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel. New York/Nashville, 1960.
- Hamilton, E. and Huntington, C. The Collected Dialogues of Plato. New York, 1963.
- Hammond, N. G. L. and Scullard, H. H., eds. The Oxford Classical Dictionary. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1970.

---

\*Works cited in the list of Abbreviations are not repeated.

- Hennecke, E. et al., eds. New Testament Apocrypha. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1963.
- Holladay, W. L. A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids/Leiden, 1971.
- Holm-Nielsen, S. Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran. Acta Theologica Danica II. København, 1960.
- James, M. R. Apocrypha Anecdota, II. Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature, V 1. Cambridge, 1897.
- Jastrow, M. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. New York, 1950.
- de Jonge, M., ed. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, A Critical Edition of the Greek Text. Leiden, 1978.
- Kittel, R. Biblica Hebraica. Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, 1937.
- Kuhn, K. G. Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten. Göttingen, 1960.
- Lampe, G. W. H., ed. A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford, 1961-1968.
- Leaney, A. R. C. The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning. NTL. London, 1966.
- Lisowsky, G. Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament. Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, 1958.
- The Loeb Classical Library. Founded by James Loeb. Cambridge, MASS/London.
- Lohse, E., ed. Die Texte aus Qumran. München, 1971.
- Mayer, G. Index Philoneus. Berlin/New York, 1974.
- Mayser, E. Grammatik der griechischen Papyri der Ptolemäerzeit. 2 vols. Berlin/Leipzig, 1906-1934.
- McKeon, R., ed. The Basic Works of Aristotle. New York, 1941.
- Morrish, G. A Concordance of the Septuagint. London, 1970.
- Moule, C. F. D. An Idiom-Book of NT Greek. 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1959.
- Moulton, J. H. et al. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. vol. 1, 3rd ed. Edinburgh, 1908; vol. 2 (W. F. Howard) 1929; vol. 3 (N. Turner) 1963.
- Nestle, E., Aland, K. et al., Novum Testamentum Graece. 26th ed. Deutsche Bibelstiftung, Stuttgart, 1979.
- Nock, A. D., ed. and Festugière, A.-J., trans. Corpus Hermeticum. 2nd ed. 4 vols. Paris, 1960.
- Nunn, H. P. V. A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek. Cambridge, 1956.
- Odeberg, H., ed. 3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch. Cambridge, 1928.



- Pritchard, J. B. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. 2nd ed. Princeton, 1955.
- Radermacher, L. Neutestamentliche Grammatik. HNT 1. Tübingen, 1925.
- Rahlfs, A. Septuaginta. 2 vols. Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, 1935.
- Rengstorff, K. H. A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus. vols. 1-3. Leiden, 1973ff.
- Robinson, J. M. Fassimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices, I. Leiden, 1977.
- Roth, C., ed. Encyclopaedia Judaica. Jerusalem, 1971.
- Scott, W., ed. Hermetica. 4 vols. Oxford, 1924-1936.
- Singer, I., ed. The Jewish Encyclopaedia. New York/London, 1901-1906.
- Smyth, H. W. Greek Grammar. Rev. G. M. Messing. Cambridge, MASS, 1959.
- Thackery, H. St. J. A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek, I. Cambridge, 1909.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. "The Letter of Aristaeas." In An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek by H. B. Swete; rev. R. R. Ottley. New York, 1968. 551-606.
- Thrall, M. E. Greek Particles in the New Testament. Leiden, 1962.
- Unterman, I., ed. & trans. Pirke Aboth. New York, 1964.
- Vermes, G., trans. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Middlesex, 1962.
- Wilson, R. McL. The Gospel of Philip. New York, 1962.
- Winer, G. B. A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament. Andover, 1869.

## II. OTHER WORKS :

- Abbott, T. K. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians. ICC. Edinburgh, 1897.
- Ahren, B. M. "Who Wrote the Pauline Epistles?" Bible Today 1 (1964) 754-60.
- Aland, K. "The Problem of Anonymity and Pseudonymity in Christian Literature of the First Centuries," JTS 12 (1961) 39ff.
- Alford, H. The Greek Testament, III. 5th ed. Cambridge, 1880.
- Allan, J. A. The Epistle to the Ephesians. Torch Bible Paperbacks. London, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'In Christ' Formula in Ephesians," NTS 5 (1958/59) 54-62.



- Ambrosiaster. Das Corpus Paulinum des Ambrosiaster, ed. H. J. Vogels. Bonn, 1957.
- "Anatomy." Encyclopaedia Judaica. Vol. 2. Jerusalem, 1971, 930-34.
- Anderson, A. A. Psalms (1-72), (73-150). NCB. Grand Rapids/London, 1972.
- Anderson, B. W. Understanding the Old Testament. 2nd ed. London/Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1966.
- Anwander, A. "Zu Kol. 2,9," BZ 9 (1965) 278-80.
- Arnold, E. V. Roman Stoicism. London, 1911.
- Aune, D. E. The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity. NT Suppl 28. Leiden, 1972.
- Baab, O. J. The Theology of the Old Testament. New York/Nashville, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Marriage," IDB III 278-87.
- Bailey, K. E. Poet and Peasant: A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke. Grand Rapids, 1976.
- Baldwin, J. D. "Give way," DNTT I 743-44.
- Bammel, E. "Versuch zu Col I 15-20," ZNW 52 (1961) 88-95.
- Barr, J. Biblical Words for Time. 2nd rev. ed. SBT, o.s. 33. London, 1969.
- Barrett, C. K. The Epistle to the Romans. HNTC. New York/Hagerstown/San Francisco/London, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology. New York, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The First Epistle to the Corinthians. HNTC. New York/Hagerstown/San Francisco/London, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The New Testament Background. London, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Second Epistle Epistle to the Corinthians. HNTC. New York/Hagerstown/San Francisco/London, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Signs of An Apostle. London, 1969.
- Barth, M. The Broken Wall: A Study of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Chicago, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Ephesians 1-3, 4-6. 2 vols. AB 34-34a. Garden City, NY, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Chapter on the Church - the Body of Christ," Interpretation 12 (1958) 131-56.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die Parusie im Epheserbrief, Eph 4,13," in Neues Testament und Geschichte, ed. H. Baltensweiler and Bo Reicke. Tübingen, 1972, 239-50.

- Batey, R. A. New Testament Nuptial Imagery. Leiden, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Destination of Ephesians," JBL 82 (1963) 101.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jewish Gnosticism and the 'Hieros Gamos' of Eph. v:21-33." NTS 10 (1963/64) 121-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The ΜΙΑ ΣΑΡΞ Union of Christ and the Church." NTS 13 (1966/67) 270-81.
- Bauder, W. "Humility, Meekness," DNTT II 256-59.
- Bauer, W. "The Odes of Solomon." In New Testament Apocrypha, II, ed. E. Hennecke et al., 808-10.
- Bauernfeind, O. "πανουργία, πανούργος," TDNT V 722-27.
- Baumgärtel, F. "πνεῦμα," TDNT VI 359-68.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "σάρξ," TDNT VII 105-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "σῶμα," TDNT VII 1044-45.
- Beare, F. W. The Earliest Records of Jesus. Nashville, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Epistle to the Colossians," IB XI (1955) 133-241.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Epistle to the Ephesians," IB X (1953) 597-749.
- Becker, U. "Gospel, etc." DNTT II 107-115.
- Bedale, S. "The Meaning of κεφαλή in the Pauline Epistles," JTS 5 (1954) 211-15.
- Behm, J. "διατίθημι, διαθήκη," TDNT II 104-6, 124-34.
- Bengel, J. A. Gnomon Novi Testamenti. editio tertia. London, 1855.
- Benoit, P. "Corps, Tête et Plérôme dans les Épîtres de la Captivité." RB 63 (1956) 5-44. Repr. & trans. in Jesus and the Gospel, II, 51-92, London, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "L'horizon paulinien de l'épître aux Éphésiens." RB 46 (1937) 342-61, 506-25.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "L'unité de l'église selon l'épître aux Éphésiens." In Stud. Paul. Cong. Inter. AnBib 17: 57-77.
- Bertholet, A. Das Buch Hesekiel. Kurzer Handbuch zum Alten Testament, 12. Tübingen, 1897.
- Bertram, G. "ἔργον κ.τ.λ." TDNT II 635-55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "νήπιος, νηπιάζω," TDNT IV 912-23.
- Best, E. The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians. BNTC. London, 1972.

- Best, E. The Letter of Paul to the Romans. CBC. Cambridge, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul. London, 1955. (= Best)
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Temptation and the Passion: the Markan Soteriology. SNTSMS 2. Cambridge, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. I Peter. NCB. London, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Body of Christ," Ecumenical Review 9 (1957) 122-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ephesians i. 1," in Text and Interpretation, eds. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge, 1979, 29-41.
- Betz, H. D., ed. Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature. SCHNT 4. Leiden, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. Plutarch's Theological Writings and Early Christian Literature. SCHNT 3. Leiden, 1975.
- Bevan, E. R. Later Greek Religion. London, 1927.
- Beyer, H. W. "διακονέω, κ.τ.λ." TDNT II 81-93.
- Beyreuther, E. "Shepherd," DNTT III 564-68.
- Bieder, W. "Das Geheimnis des Christus nach dem Epheserbrief," TZ 11 (1955) 329-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "πνεῦμα," TDNT VI 368-75.
- Bietenhard, H. "ὄνομα, ονομάζω κ.τ.λ." TDNT V 242-83.
- Binns, L. E. The Book of Numbers. Westminster Commentaries. London, 1927.
- Bjerkelund, C. J. Parakalō. Form, Function und Sinn der parakalō-Sätze in den paulinischen Briefen. Bibliotheca theologica Norvegica, 1. Oslo, 1967.
- Black, M. Romans. NCB. London, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament. New York, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Messiah in the Testament of Levi xviii," ExT 60 (1948/49) 321f; and 61 (1949/50) 157f.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," SJT 7 (1954) 170-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Throne Theophany Prophetic Commission and the 'Son of Man'," in Jews, Greeks and Christians, eds. R. G. Hammerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. Leiden, 1976, 57-73.
- Black, Max. "Metaphor," in Philosophy Looks at the Arts, ed. J. Margolis. New York, 1962, 216-35.
- Bligh, J. "The Church and Israel according to St. John and St. Paul." Stud. Paul. Cong. Inter. AnBib 17: 151-56.



- "Body and Soul," Encyclopaedia Judaica, IV. Jerusalem, 1971, 1165f/
- "Body in Jewish Theology," The Jewish Encyclopaedia, III. New York/London, 1902, 283f.
- Bogdasavich, M. "The Idea of Pleroma in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians," Down Review 83 (1965) 118-30.
- Boman, T. "Hebraic and Greek Thought Forms in the New Testament," in Current Issues in the New Testament, eds. W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder. New York, 1962, 1-22.
- Bornkamm, G. Paul. Trans. D. M. G. Stalker. New York, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Studien zu Antike und Christentum, Gesammelte Aufsätze, II. Beiträge zur Evangelischen Theologie 28. Munich, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "μυστήριον, μυσέω," TDNT IV 802-28.
- Borsch, F. H. The Son of Man in Myth and History. NTL. London, 1967.
- Bousset, W. Hauptprobleme der Gnosis. Göttingen, 1907.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus. Trans. J. S. Steely. Nashville, 1970.
- Bowker, J. "The Son of Man," JTS 28 (1977) 19-48.
- Braumann, G. "Child, etc." DNTT I 280-83.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Exhort, etc." DNTT I 569-71.
- Braun, H. "πλανάω, κ.τ.λ." TDNT VI 228-53.
- Braune, K. "The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians," in Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scripture, trans. & rev. P. Schaff. Edinburgh, 1870.
- Briggs, C. A. and Briggs, E. G. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh, 1906.
- Bright, J. "The Book of Joshua," IB II (1953) 541-673.
- Brooks, B. A. "Fertility Cult Functionaries in the Old Testament," JBL 60 (1941) 227-39.
- Brown, R. E. The Semitic Background of the Term 'Mystery' in the New Testament. Facet Biblical Series, 21. Philadelphia, 1968.
- Brownlee, W. H. "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," NTS 3 (1956/57) 12-30, 195-210.
- Bruce, F. F. Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts. London, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Epistle to the Ephesians. Old Tappan, NJ, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Epistle to the Hebrews. NICNT. Grand Rapids, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1 & 2 Corinthians. NCB. London, 1971.

Bruce, F. F. "St. Paul in Rome. 4. The Epistle to the Ephesians," BJRL 42 (1967) 303-22.

Büchsel, H. M. F. "ἀλλάσσω, κ.τ.λ." TDNT I 251-59.

\_\_\_\_\_. "δίδωμι, κ.τ.λ." TDNT II 166-73.

Bultmann, R. Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting. Trans. R. H. Fuller. New York, 1956.

\_\_\_\_\_. Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. Trans. K. Grobel. New York, 1951, 1955.

\_\_\_\_\_. "ἀλήθεια, κ.τ.λ." TDNT I 238-51.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief," Coni Neot 11 (1947) 1-14.

\_\_\_\_\_. "γινώσκω, γινῶσις, κ.τ.λ." TDNT I 689-719.

Burkill, T. A. "Two in One: Notion of Carnal Union in Mark 10:8; 1 Cor 6:16; Eph 5:31," ZNW 62 (1971) 115-20.

Burney, C. F. "Christ as the APXH of Creation," JTS o.s. 27 (1926) 160-77.

Burton, E. de W. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. ICC. Edinburgh, 1921.

Cadbury, H. J. "The Dilemma of Ephesians," NTS 5 (1958/59) 91-102.

Caird, G. B. The Apostolic Age. London, 1955.

\_\_\_\_\_. A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine. HNTC. New York/London, 1966.

\_\_\_\_\_. Paul's Letters from Prison. New Clarendon Bible. Oxford, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology. Oxford, 1956.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Descent of Christ in Ephesians 4, 7-11," Studia Evangelica II (TU 87) Berlin, 1964, 535-45.

Calvin, J. Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians. Trans. W. Pringle. Grand Rapids, 1957.

Cambier, J. "La bénédiction d'Éph 1:3-14," ZNW 54 (1963) 58-104.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Le grand mystère concernant le Christ et son Église. Éphésiens 5, 22-33," Bib 47 (1966) 43-90, 223-42.

\_\_\_\_\_. "La Signification Christologique d'Éph iv 7-10," NTS 9 (1962/63) 262-75.

Campbell, J. Y. Three New Testament Studies. Leiden, 1965.

- Caragounis, C. C. The Ephesian Mystery: Meaning and Content. Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series, 8. Lund, 1977.
- Carrington, P. The Primitive Christian Catechism. Cambridge, 1940.
- Carson, D. A. "Cunning," DNTT I 412-13.
- Carson, H. M. The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians and Philemon. TNTC, 12. Grand Rapids, 1960.
- Casey, R. P. "Naassenes and Ophites," JTS 27 (1925/26) 374-87.
- Cassuto, U. A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. 2 vols. Jerusalem, 1944.
- Cerfaux, L. The Church in the Theology of St. Paul. Trans. G. Webb and A. Walker. Edinburgh/London/New York, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "En faveur de l'authenticité des épîtres de la captivité." Recherches Bibliques 5 (1960) 60-71.
- Chadwick, H. "Die Absicht des Epheserbriefes," ZNW 51 (1960) 145-53.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "All Things to All Men," NTS 1 (1954/55) 261-75.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ephesians," in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, gen. ed. M. Black. London/Edinburgh, 1962, 980-84.
- Chamberlain, J. V. "The Functions of God as Messianic Titles in the Complete Qumran Isaiah Scroll," VT 5 (1955) 366-72.
- Charles, R. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh, 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity. New York, 1963.
- Charlesworth, J. H. "The Odes of Solomon - Not Gnostic," CBQ 31 (1969) 357-69.
- Chavasse, C. The Bride of Christ: an enquiry into the nuptial element in early Christianity. London, 1939.
- Childs, B. S. Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture. Philadelphia, 1979.
- Chrysostomus, St. John. Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians and Homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians. Library of the Fathers, 5. Oxford/London, 1840.
- Coenen, L. "Church, Synagogue," DNTT I 291-307.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Brown, C. "Resurrection," DNTT III 259-309.
- Coggan, F. D. "A Note on Ephesians ii 14," ExT 53 (1942) 242.



- Colpe, C. Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule. FRLANT 78, Göttingen, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zur Leib-Christi-Vorstellung im Epheserbrief," Judentum-Urchristentum-Kirche. BZNW 26 (1960) 172-87.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Manichäismus," RGG<sup>3</sup> IV 714-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου," TDNT VIII 400-77.
- Conzelmann, H. Der Brief an die Epheser. Das Neue Testament Deutsch, 8. Göttingen, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament. Trans. J. Bowden. NTL. London, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Zimmerli, W. "χαίρω, κ.τ.λ." TDNT IX 359-415.
- Copleston, F. A History of Philosophy. Volume I: Greece and Rome. 2 parts. rev. ed. Garden City, NY, 1962.
- Coutts, J. "Ephesians I. 3-14 and I Pet I. 3-12," NTS 3 (1957) 115-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians." NTS 4 (1957/58) 201-7.
- Craddock, F. B. "All Things in Him," NTS 12 (1965/66) 78-80.
- Craig, C. T. "The First Epistle to the Corinthians," IB X (1953) 3-262.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Soma Christou," in The Joy of Study, ed. S. E. Johnson. New York, 1951, 73-85.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. A Commentary on Romans 12-13. SJT Occasional Papers, 12. Edinburgh, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Diakonia in the New Testament," in Service in Christ, eds. J. I. McCord and T. H. L. Parker. London, 1966, 37-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "μέτρον πίστεως in Romans 12:3," NTS 8 (1961/62) 345-51.
- Creed, J. M. The Gospel according to St. Luke. London, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Heavenly Man," JTS 26 (1925) 113-25.
- Cross, F. L., ed. Studies in Ephesians. London, 1956.
- Crouch, J. E. Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel. FRLANT 109. Göttingen, 1972.
- Cullman, O. Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History. Trans. F. V. Filson. London, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Christology of the New Testament. rev. ed. trans. S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall. NTL. Philadelphia, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Earliest Christian Confessions. Trans. J. K. S. Reid. London, 1949.

- Currie, H. H. and Lambert, J. C. "Headship," A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, I, ed. J. Hastings. New York/Edinburgh, 1906, 706-8.
- Dahl, N. A. Das Volk Gottes. Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums. Oslo, 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Atonement - an Adequate Reward for the Akedah? (Ro 8:32)," in Neotestamentica et Semitica, eds. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox. Edinburgh, 1969, 15-29.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Christ, Creation and the Church," in The Background of the New and its Eschatology, eds. W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_, et al. Kurze Auslegung des Epheserbriefes. Göttingen, 1965.
- Dahood, M. Psalms. 3 vols. AB 16-17ab. Garden City, NY, 1966.
- Daly, R. J. "The Soteriological Significance of the Sacrifice of Isaac," CBQ 39 (1977) 45-75.
- Daube, D. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Studies in Biblical Law. Cambridge, 1947.
- Davies, P. R. and Chilton, B. D. "The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition History," CBQ 40 (1978) 514-46.
- Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. 3rd ed. London, 1970.
- Deichgräber, R. Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen. SUNT 5. Göttingen, 1967.
- Delitzsch, F. Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. 2 vols. Trans. J. Kennedy et al. Clark's Foreign Theological Library, n.s. 42. Edinburgh, 1894.
- Deismann, A. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History. 2nd ed. Trans. W. E. Wilson, London, 1926.
- Deissner, E. F. K. "μετρον, κ.τ.λ." TDNT IV 632-34.
- Delling, G. "ἀρχω, ἀρχή, κ.τ.λ." TDNT I 478-489.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "πλήρης, πληρώω, πλήρωμα, κ.τ.λ." TDNT VI 283-311.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "συμβιβάζω," TDNT VII 763-66.
- Dhorme, P. L'Emploi métaphorique des noms de parties de corps en hébreu et en accadien. Paris, 1923.
- Dibelius, M. and Conzelmann, H. A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. Trans. P. Buttolph and A. Yarbo. Her. Philadelphia, 1972.
- Dibelius, M. and Greeven, H. An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon. 3rd ed. HZNT 12. Tübingen, 1953. (= Dibelius)
- Dihle, A. "ψυχή," TDNT IX 608-17, 632-35, 656-58.

- Dillistone, F. W. "How is the Church Christ's Body," Theology Today 2 (1945) 56-68.
- Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology. London, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. MNTC. London, n.d. [1932]
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ephesians." The Abingdon Bible Commentary, eds. F. C. Eiselen, E. Lewis, and D. G. Downey. New York/Nashville, 1929, 1222-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Message of the Epistles. Ephes.," ExT 45 (1933/34) 325-34.
- Dods, M. "The Epistle to the Hebrews." ExGT IV 221-381.
- Dörrie, H. "Hermetica," RGG<sup>3</sup> III 265.
- Driver, S. R. The Book of Genesis. Westminster Commentaries. London, 1904.
- Duncan, G. S. St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry. New York, 1930.
- Dunn, J. Unity and Diversity in the New Testament. London/Philadelphia, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Note on σωρεά," ExT 81 (1970) 349-51.
- Dupont, J. Gnosis, La Connaissance Religieuse dans les Epitres de Saint. Paul. Louvain/Paris, 1949.
- Eadie, J. A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians. 2nd ed. London, 1861.
- Eaton, J. H. Kingship and the Psalms. SBT 32. London, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Psalms. Torch Bible Paperbacks. London, 1967.
- Ebel, G. "Walk, etc." DNTT III 933-45.
- Ehrhart, A. A. T. The Framework of the New Testament Stories. Cambridge, Mass, 1964.
- Eichler, J. "Inheritance, etc." DNTT II 295-304.
- Eichrodt, W. Ezekiel: A Commentary. Trans. C. Quinn. OTL. Philadelphia, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Theology of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Trans. J. A. Baker. OTL. Philadelphia, 1961, 1967.
- von Eicken, E. et al. "Apostle," DNTT I 126-37.
- Ellicott, C. J. A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. 2nd ed. Andover, 1865.
- Ellingworth, P. "Colossians I. 15-20 and its Context," ExT 73 (1961/62) 252f.



- Ellis, E. E. Paul and His Recent Interpreters. Grand Rapids, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh, 1957.
- Ernst, J. Pleroma und Pleroma Christi: Geschichte und Deutung eines Begriffs der paulinschen Antilegomena. Biblische Untersuchungen Herausgegeben von Otto Kuss, 5. Regensburg, 1970. (= Ernst).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Das Wachstum des Leibes Christi zur eschatologischen Erfüllung im Pleroma," Theologie und Glaube 57 (1967) 164-87.
- Esser, H. -H. "Grace, Spiritual Gifts," DNTT II 115-23.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Humility, Meekness," DNTT II 259-64.
- Estius, W. Commentarii in omnes Pauli epistolas item in Catholicas, IV. Mainz/Paris/London, 1843.
- Ewald, D. P. Die Briefe des Paulus an die Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon. 2. verbesserte Auflage. KNT 10. Leipzig, 1910.
- Falkenroth, U. and Brown, C. "Patience, etc." DNTT II 764-72.
- Feine, P. "Ephesians 2:14-16," Theologische Studien und Kritiken 72 (1899) 540-74.
- Feuillet, A. Le Christ Sagesse de Dieu d'après les épîtres pauliniennes. Etudes Bibliques. Paris, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "La Dignité et le Rôle de la femme d'après quelques textes pauliniens: comparaison avec l'ancien testament," NTS 21 (1974/75) 157-91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "L'Église plérôme du Christ d'après Éph 1:23," NRT 78 (1956) 449-72, 593-610.
- Fiorenza, E. S. "Marriage and Discipleship," Bible Today 102 (1979) 2027-34.
- Fischer, K. M. Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes. FRLANT 111. Göttingen, 1973.
- Fitzer, G. "σύνδεσμος," TDNT VII 856-59.
- Flew, R. N. Jesus and His Church: a Study of the Idea of the Ecclesia in the Church. London, 1938.
- Foerster, W. "δαίμων, δαιμόνιον, κ.τ.λ." TDNT II 1-20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "εἰρήνη, κ.τ.λ." TDNT II 400-2, 406-20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "ἐξουσία, ἐξουσία, κ.τ.λ." TDNT II 560-75.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "ἐχθρός, ἐχθρα," TDNT II 811-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "κληρος, κληρώω, κ.τ.λ." TDNT III 758-69, 776-85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "κύριος, κυρία, κ.τ.λ." TDNT III 1039-58, 1081-98.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "σώζω, σωτηρία," TDNT VII 965-69, 980-1012.

- Foerster, W. "σωτήρ," TDNT VII 1013-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "σωτήριος," TDNT VII 1023-24.
- Fohrer, G. Ezechiel. HAT, erste reihe, 13. Tübingen, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "σώζω, σωτηρία," TDNT VII 970-80.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "σωτήρ," TDNT VII 1012-13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "σωτήριος," TDNT VII 1022-23.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "υἱός, υιοθεσία," TDNT VIII 340-54.
- Foulkes, F. The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians. TNTC 10. Grand Rapids, 1963.
- Foster, H. F. "Jewish and Graeco-Roman Influences upon Paul's Attitudes toward Women." Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1933.
- de Fraine, J. Adam and the Family of Man. Trans. D. Raible. New York, 1965.
- Francis, F. O. "Visionary Discipline and Scriptural Tradition at Colossae," LexThQ 2 (1967) 71-81.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Sampley, J. P. Pauline Parallels. Philadelphia, 1975.
- Friedrich, G. "εὐαγγελίζομαι, εὐαγγέλιον, κ.τ.λ." TDNT II 707-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "προφήτης, κ.τ.λ." TDNT VI 828-61.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Schniewind, J. "ἐπαγγέλλω, κ.τ.λ." TDNT II 576-86.
- le Frois, B. J. "Semitic Totality Thinking," CBQ 17 (1955) 195-203, 315-23.
- Fuller, R. H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. London, 1965.
- Gabathuler, H. J. Jesus Christ, Haupt der Kirche - Haupt der Welt: Der Christushymnus Colosser 1, 15-20 in der theologischen Forschung der letzten 130 Jahre. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 45. Zürich, 1965.
- Gärtner, B. The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. SNTSMS 1. Cambridge, 1965.
- Garland, D. E. "A Life Worthy of the Calling: Unity and Holiness: Ephesians 4:1-24," Rev Exp 76 (1979) 517-27.
- Gasque, W. W. and Martin, R. P., eds. Apostolic History and the Gospel. Grand Rapids, 1970.
- Gaugler, E. Der Epheserbrief. Auslegung neutestamentlicher Schriften, 6. Zürich, 1966.
- Gianini, G. "La structure littéraire d'Eph. II. 11-22," NTS 16 (1969/70) 209-11.
- Gibbs, J. G. Creation and Redemption: A Study in Pauline Theology. NT Suppl 26. Leiden, 1971.

- Gilbert, M. " 'Une seule chair' (Gn 2, 24)," NRT 100 (1978) 66-89.
- Gnilka, J. Der Epheserbrief. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament X, 2. Freiburg, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Brautigam' - spätjüdisches Messiasprädikat." TrThZ 69 (1960) 298-301.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Christus unser Friede - ein Friedens-Erlöserlied in Eph 2, 14-17," in Die Zeit Jesu. Freiburg, 1970, 190-207.
- Goetzmann, J. "House, etc." DNTT II 247-56.
- Goodspeed, E. J. The Key to Ephesians. Chicago, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Meaning of Ephesians. Chicago, 1933.
- Goodwater, L. Women in Antiquity: An Annotated Bibliography. Metuchen, NJ, 1975.
- Gordis, R. "Qohelet and Qumran - A Study in Style," Bib 41 (1960) 395-410.
- Gordon, C. H. "Hos. 2:4-5 in Light of New Semitic Inscriptions," ZAW 54 (1938) 277-80.
- Gore, C. St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. London, 1902.
- Grosheide, F. W. Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. NICNT. Grand Rapids, 1955.
- Gottwald, N. K. "Poetry, Hebrew," IDB III 829-38.
- Grant, R. Gnosticism. New York, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Historical Introduction to the New Testament. London, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Gospel according to St. Mark," IB VII (1951) 629-917.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip," Vigiliae Christianae 15 (1961) 129-40.
- Gray, G. B. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers. ICC. Edinburgh, 1903.
- Greenstone, J. H. Numbers with Commentary. Philadelphia, 1939.
- Greeven, H. "Ehe nach dem Neuen Testament," NTS 15 (1968/69) 365-88.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus," ZNW 44 (1952/53) 1-43.
- Grobel, K. "Σῶμα as 'Self-Person' in the Septuagint," in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. BZNW 21 (1954) 52-59.
- Grundmann, W. "δεξιός," TDNT II 37-40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "δύναμις, κ.τ.λ." TDNT II 284-317.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "ταπεινός, κ.τ.λ." TDNT VIII 1-26.



- Grundmann, W. "χρῖω, χριστός, κ.τ.λ." TDNT IX 493-580.
- Günther, W. "Lead Astray, Deceive," DNTT II 457-61.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Link, H.-G. "Love," DNTT II 538-47.
- Gundry, R. H. Sōma in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology. SNTSMS 29. Cambridge, 1976.
- Gunkel, H. Genesis. HKAT 3rd ed. Göttingen, 1910. (repr. 1964)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Göttingen, 1895.
- Gutbrod, W. "Ἰσραήλ, κ.τ.λ." TDNT III 369-91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "νόμος, κ.τ.λ." TDNT IV 1036-91.
- Guthrie, D. New Testament Introduction. 3rd ed. Downers Grove, ILL, 1970.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. The Greek Philosophers: From Thales to Aristotle. New York, 1960.
- Guy, H. A. New Testament Prophecy. London, 1947.
- Hadidian, D. Y. "tous de evangelistas in EPH 4,11," CBQ 28 (1966) 317-21.
- Hahn, H.-C. "Work, etc." DNTT III 1147-52.
- Hallie, P. P. "Stoicism," Encyclopedia of Philosophy, VIII, gen. ed. P. Edwards. New York, 1967, 19-22.
- Hamilton, N. Q. The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul. SJT Occasional Papers, 6. Edinburgh, 1957.
- Hamlin, J. "Bible Study V. The People of the Servant, Ephesians 4:1-7, 11-13." South East Asian Journal of Theology 7 (1965) 16-22.
- Hammer, P. L. "A Comparison of κληρονομία in Paul and Ephesians," JBL 79 (1960) 267-72.
- Hanson, S. The Unity of the Church in the New Testament: Colossians and Ephesians. Uppsala, 1946. (repr. Lexington, KY, 1963) (= Hanson)
- Harder, G. Paulus und Gebet. Neutestamentliche Forschungen, 10. Gütersloh, 1930.
- von Harless, G. C. A. Kommentar über den Brief Pauli an die Epheser. 2nd ed. Stuttgart, 1958.
- von Harnack, A. Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. Trans. & ed. J. Moffatt. London/New York, 1908.
- Harrelson, W. From Fertility Cult to Worship. Garden City, NY, 1970.
- Harris, M. J. "Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament," DNTT III 1171-1215.

- Harrison, P. N. "The Author of Ephesians," Studia Evangelica II. (TU 87) Berlin, 1964, 595-604.
- Harrisville, R. A. "The Concept of Newness in the New Testament," JBL 74 (1955) 69-79.
- Hart, J. H. A. "The Enmity in His Flesh," Exp VI 3 (1901) 135-41.
- Haupt, E. Die Gefangenschaftsbrieife. 8th ed. MeyerK 8. Göttingen, 1902.
- Hay, D. M. Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity. SBLMS 18. New York/Nashville, 1973.
- Hegermann, H. Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum. TU 82, Berlin, 1961.
- . "Zur Ableitung der Leib-Christi-Vorstellung," TLZ 85 (1960) 839-42.
- Hengel, M. Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period. 2 vols. Trans. J. Bowden. London, 1974.
- . The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion. Trans. J. Bowden. Philadelphia, 1976.
- Héring, J. The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. 2nd ed. Trans. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. London, 1962.
- Hess, K. "Serve, etc." DNTT III 544-49.
- Hesse, F. "χρίω, χριστός, κ.τ.λ." TDNT IX 496-509.
- Hewitt, T. The Epistle to the Hebrews. TNTC 15. Grand Rapids, 1960.
- Hicks, R. I. "The Body Political and the Body Ecclesiastical," Journal of Bible and Religion 31 (1963) 29-35.
- Higgins, A. J. B. "Is the Son of Man Problem Insoluble?" in Neotestamentica et Semitica, eds. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox. Edinburgh, 1969, 70-87.
- Hill, A. E. "The Temple of Asclepius: An Alternate Source for Paul's Body Theology," JBL 99 (1980) 437-39.
- Hill, D. The Gospel of Matthew. NCB. London, 1972.
- . "On the Evidence of the Creative Role of Christian Prophets," NTS 20 (1973/74) 262-74.
- Hitchcock, A. E. N. "Ephesians i.23," ExT 22 (1910/11) 91.
- Hodge, C. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians. New York, 1858.
- Hoffmann, E. "Hope, Expectation," DNTT II 238-44.
- . "Promise," DNTT III 68-74.
- Hofius, O. "'Erwählt vor Grundlegung der Welt' (Eph 1,4)," ZNW 62 (1971) 123-28.

- von Hofmann, J. C. K. Der Brief Pauli an die Epheser. Die heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments, IV 1. Nördlingen, 1870.
- Holtzmann, J. C. Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosserbriefe. Leipzig, 1872.
- Hooke, S. H., ed. Myth and Ritual: Essays on the Myth and Ritual of the Hebrews in relation to the Culture Pattern of the Ancient East. London, 1933.
- Hooker, M. D. The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the term 'Son of Man' and its use in St. Mark's Gospel. London/Montreal, 1967.
- . "Authority on her Head; an Examination of I Cor. xi 10," NTS 10 (1964) 410-16.
- . "John's Prologue and the Messianic Secret," NTS 21 (1974/75) 40-58.
- Horst, J. "μέλος," TDNT IV 555-68.
- Hort, F. J. A. Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians. London, 1895.
- Houlden, J. L. Paul's Letters from Prison. Westminster Pelican Commentaries. Philadelphia, 1977.
- . "Christ and Church in Ephesians," Studia Evangelica VI (TU 112) Berlin, 1973, 267-273.
- Howard, G. "The Head/Body Metaphors of Ephesians," NTS (1973/74) 350-56.
- Huby, J. Saint Paul, Les Épîtres de la captivité. 2nd ed. Verbum salutis, 8. Paris, 1947.
- Hunter, A. M. Paul and his Predecessors. Philadelphia, 1961.
- Jackson, F. and Lake, K. Beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. 5 vols. London, 1920-1933.
- Jacob, E. "ψυχή," TDNT IX 617-31.
- Jeffery, A. "The Book of Daniel," IB VI (1956) 341-549.
- Jeremias, J. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Trans. N. Perrin. London, 1966.
- . Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. Trans. F. H. and C. H. Cave. London, 1969.
- . The Parables of Jesus. rev. ed. Trans. S. H. Hooke. London, 1963.
- . "Ἀδάμ," TDNT I 141-43.
- . "ἄνθρωπος, ἄνθρωπινος," TDNT I 364-67.
- . "γωνία, κ.τ.λ." TDNT I 791-93.



Jeremias, J. "λίθος, λίθινος," TDNT IV 268-80.

\_\_\_\_\_. "νύμφη, νυμφίος," TDNT IV 1099-1106.

\_\_\_\_\_. "παράδεισος," TDNT V 765-73.

\_\_\_\_\_. "ποιμήν, κ.τ.λ." TDNT VI 485-502.

Jervell, J. Imago Dei: Gen 1, 26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen. FRLANT 58. Göttingen, 1960.

Jewett, R. Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 10. Leiden, 1971.

Johnson, A. R. The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God. 2nd ed. Cardiff, 1961.

\_\_\_\_\_. Sacral Kingship in Israel. Cardiff, 1955.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel. Cardiff, 1964.

Johnson, S. E. "The Gospel according to St. Matthew," IB VII (1951) 231-625.

Jonas, H. The Gnostic Religion. Boston, 1953.

de Jonge, M. "χρίω, χριστός, κ.τ.λ." TDNT IX 511-17, 520-21.

Kähler, E. Die Frau in den paulinischen Briefen; unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Begriffes der Unterordnung. Zürich/Frankfort, 1960.

Käsemann, E. Commentary on Romans. Trans. G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_. Essays on New Testament Themes. Trans. W. S. Montague. SBT 41. Naperville, 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen, 2 vols. Göttingen, 1960-1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. Leib und Leib Christi: Eine Untersuchung zur paulinischen Begrifflichkeit. Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie, 9. Tübingen, 1933.

\_\_\_\_\_. Perspectives on Paul. Trans. M. Kohl. NTL. London, 1971.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Epheserbrief," RGG<sup>3</sup> II 517-20.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Ephesians and Acts," in Studies in Luke-Acts, eds. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martin. Nashville, 1966, 288-97.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Das Interpretationsproblem des Epheserbriefes," TLZ 86 (1961) 517ff.

Kaiser, O. Isaiah 1-12. Trans. R. A. Wilson. OTL. Philadelphia, 1972.

Kaufmann, P. "The One and the Many: Corporate Personality," Worship 42 (1968) 546-58.

- Kearns, C. "The Church, the Body of Christ according to St. Paul," Irish Ecclesiastical Record 90 (1958) 1-11; 145-57; 91 (1959) 1-15.
- Kehl, N. Der Christushymnus im Kolosserbrief; Eine motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Kol 1, 12-20. Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien, 1. Stuttgart, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Erniedrigung und Erhöhung im Qumran und Kolossä," Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie 91 (1969) 364-94.
- Keith, A. R. The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads, I Harvard Oriental series, 31, 1925. Repr. Westport, CONN, 1971.
- Kelly, J. N. D. Early Christian Creeds. 2nd ed. London, 1960.
- Kempthorne, R. "Incest and the Body of Christ: A Study of I Cor. 6:12-20." NTS 14 (1967/68) 568-74.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. "The NT Metaphor of the Messianic Bridal," Exp VIII 9 (1916) 97-106.
- Kerenyi, K. Zeus and Hera: Archtypal Image of Father, Husband and Wife. Trans. C. Holme. Princeton, NJ, 1975.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. "A Parallel to the New Testament Use of σῶμα," JTS 13 (1962) 117.
- Kirby, J. C. Ephesians, Baptism and Pentecost: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of the Epistle to the Ephesians. London, 1968.
- Kirk, J. A. "Apostleship since Rengstorf: towards a Synthesis," NTS 21 (1974/75) 249-64.
- Kirkpatrick, A. F. The Book of Psalms. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge, 1902; repr. 1951.
- Kissane, E. J. The Book of Psalms. Dublin, 1964.
- Kittel, G. "δοκέω, δόξα, κ.τ.λ." TDNT II 232-37, 242-55.
- Kleinknecht, H. M. "θεός," TDNT III 65-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "θεῖος, θεϊότης," TDNT III 122-23.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "λόγος," TDNT IV 77-91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "νόμος, κ.τ.λ." TDNT IV 1022-35.
- Klöpffer, A. Der Brief an die Epheser. Göttingen, 1891.
- Knibb, M. A. and Coggins, R. J. The First and Second Books of Esdras. CBC. Cambridge/New York, 1979.
- Knox, J. Chapters in a Life of Paul. New York/Nashville, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Philemon Among the Letters of Paul: A New View of its Place and Importance. rev. ed. New York/Nashville, 1959.

- Knox, W. L. St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge, 1939.  
(= Knox)
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Parallels to the N. T. Use of σῶμα," JTS 29 (1938) 243-6.
- Köhler, L. "Christus im Alten und im Neuen Testament," TZ 9 (1953) 242f.
- Krämer, H. "προφήτης, κ.τ.λ." TDNT VI 781-96.
- Kramer, S. N. The Sacred Marriage Rite; Aspects of Faith, Myth and Ritual in Ancient Sumer. Bloomington, Indiana, 1969.
- Kramer, W. R. Christ, Lord, Son of God. Trans. B. Hardy. STB 50. Naperville, ILL, 1966.
- Krauss, H.-J. Psalmen. 2 vols. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament, 15. Neukirchen/Vluyn, 1961.
- Kümmel, W. G. Introduction to the New Testament. rev. ed. Trans. H. C. Kee. Nashville, 1975.
- Kuhl, C. "Neue Dokumente zum Verständnis von Hosea 2, 4-15," ZAW 52 (1934) 102-9.
- Kuhn, H. W. Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. Untersuchung zu den Gemeindefiedern von Qumran. SUNT 4. Göttingen, 1966.
- Kuhn, K. G. "ἅγιος," TDNT I 97-100.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Epistle to the Ephesians in Light of the Qumran Texts," in PQ, 115-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "προσήλυτος," TDNT VI 727-44.
- Ladd, G. E. A Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids, 1974.
- Laidlaw, J. "Body," HDB I 309.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Heart," HDB II 317f.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Psychology," HDB IV 163-69.
- Lake, K. and Lake, S. An Introduction to the New Testament. London, 1938.
- Latte, K. "Poimandres," RGG<sup>3</sup> V 424.
- Leenhardt, E. F. The Epistle to the Romans; A Commentary. Trans. H. Knight. London, 1961.
- Leslie, W. H. "The Concept of Women in the Pauline Corpus in light of the Social and Religious Environment of the First Century." Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1976.
- Lietzmann, D. H. and Kümmel, W. An die Korinther I.II. 4th enl. ed. HNT 9. Tübingen, 1949.
- Lightfoot, J. B. Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul. repr. Grand Rapids, 1957.



Lightfoot, J. B. Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon. 6th ed. London, 1882. (= Lightfoot)

\_\_\_\_\_. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. London, 1910.

\_\_\_\_\_. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. 2nd ed. London, 1869.

Lillie, W. "The Pauline Housetables," *ExT* 86 (1974/75) 179-83.

Lincoln, A. T. "A Re-examination of 'the Heavens' in Ephesians," *NTS* 19 (1972/73) 468-83.

Lock, W. The Epistle to the Ephesians. Westminster Commentaries. London, 1929.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Pleroma," *HDB* IV 1-2.

Lohmeyer, E. Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon. 13th ed. MeyerK 9. Göttingen, 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Das Proömium des Epheserbriefes," *Theologische Blätter* 5 (1926) 120-25.

Lohse, E. A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon. Trans. W. R. Poehlmann and R. J. Karris. Her. Philadelphia, 1971.

\_\_\_\_\_. The New Testament Environment. Trans. J. E. Steely. Nashville, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. "υἱός," *TDNT* VIII 357-62.

\_\_\_\_\_. "ψυχή," *TDNT* IX 635-37.

Longenecker, R. N. Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period. Grand Rapids, 1975.

Luhrmann, D. "Neutestamentliche Haustafeln und antike Ökonomie." *NTS* 27 (1980) 83-97.

Manson, T. W. The Church's Ministry. London, 1948.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Sayings of Jesus. London, 1949.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Servant Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus. Cambridge, 1953.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of its Form and Content. 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1935.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Parallel to a N.T. Use of σῶμα," *JTS* 37 (1936) 385.

Marchant, G. J. C. "The Body of Christ," *Evangelical Quarterly* 30 (1958) 3-17.

Mare, W. H. "Paul's Mystery in Ephesians 3," *Bull Evang Theol Soc* 8 (1965) 77-84.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Prophet and Teacher in the New Testament Period," *Bull Evang Theol Soc* 9 (1966) 139-48.

- Marshall, I. H. The Origins of New Testament Christology. Downers Grove, ILL, 1976.
- Marshall, J. T. "Shekinah," HDB IV 487-89.
- Martin, R. P. Colossians and Philemon. NCB. London, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. New Testament Foundations. 2 vols. Grand Rapids, 1975, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Reconciliation: A Study of Paul's Theology. Atlanta, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Epistle in Search of a Life Setting," ExT 79 (1968) 296-302.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Haustafeln," DNTT III 928-32.
- von Martitz, W. "υἱός, υἰοθεσία," TDNT VIII 334-40.
- Marxsen, W. Introduction to the New Testament: An Approach to its Problems. Trans. G. Buswell. Philadelphia, 1968.
- Masson, C. L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Colossiens. Commentaire du NT 10. Neuchatel, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Éphésiens. Commentaire du NT 9. Neuchatel, 1953.
- Maurer, C. "Der Hymnus von Epheser 1 als Schlüssel zum ganzen Brief," EvTh 11 (1951/52) 151-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "συναρμολογέω," TDNT VII 855-56.
- May, H. G. "The Book of Ezekiel," IB VI (1956) 41-338.
- McCarthy, D. J. Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions. Atlanta, 1972.
- McCasland, S. V. "The Way," JBL 77 (1958) 222-30.
- McCullough, W. S. and Taylor, W. R. "The Book of Psalms," IB IV (1955) 3-763.
- MacGregor, G. H. C. "Principalities and Powers: the Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought," NTS 1 (1954) 17-28.
- McKelvey, R. J. The New Temple. London, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Christ the Cornerstone," NTS 8 (1961/62) 352-59.
- McNeile, A. H. The Gospel according to St. Matthew. London, 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament. 2nd ed. rev. C. S. S. Williams. Oxford, 1953.
- MacPherson, J. Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. Edinburgh, 1892.
- MacRae, G. W. "Nag Hammadi and the New Testament," in Gnosis, fs. Hans Jonas, ed. U. Bianchi et al. Göttingen, 1978, 144-57.
- Merklein, H. Das Kirchliche Amt nach dem Epheserbrief. Munich, 1973.

- Mersch, E. The Whole Christ: The Historical Development of the Mystical Body in Scripture and Tradition. Trans. J. R. Kelly. London, 1939.
- Metzger, B. M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. United Bible Societies. New York, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paul's Vision of the Church," Theology Today 6 (1949) 49-63.
- Meuzelaar, J. J. Der Leib des Messias: Eine exegetische Studie über den Gedanken vom Leib Christi in den Paulusbriefen. Assen, 1961.
- Meyer, H. A. W. Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Epistle to the Ephesians. Trans. & rev. W. P. Dickson. London, 1884.
- Meyer, R. "προφήτης, κ.τ.λ." TDNT VI 812-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "σάρξ," TDNT VII 110-19.
- Meyrick, F. and Lambert, J. C. "Body," A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, I, ed. J. Hastings. New York/Edinburgh, 1906, 217-18.
- Michaelis, W. "ὁδός, κ.τ.λ." TDNT V 42-114.
- Michel, O. "καταντάω, κ.τ.λ." TDNT III 623-26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "οἶκος, κ.τ.λ." TDNT V 119-59.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Marshall, I. H. "Son, etc." DNTT III 607-66.
- Minear, P. S. Images of the Church in the New Testament. Philadelphia, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Hope," IDB II 640-43.
- Mitton, C. L. Ephesians. NCB. London, 1976. (= Mitton)
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose. Oxford, 1951. (= EE)
- Moffatt, J. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. ICC. Edinburgh, 1924.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. MNTC. London, 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Grace in the New Testament. London, 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 2nd rev. ed. International Theological Library. Edinburgh, 1912.
- Moloney, F. J. "The Re-interpretation of Psalm VIII and the Son of Man Debate," NTS 27 (1981) 656-72.
- Montague, G. T. The Living Thought of Saint Paul. An Introduction to Pauline Theology Through Intensive Study of Key Texts. 2nd ed. Beverly Hills, 1976.
- Montefiore, H. W. Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. BNTC. London, 1964.



Montgomery-Hitchcock, F. "The Pleroma as the Medium of the Self-revelation of Christ," Exp VIII 24 (1922) 135-50.

Moore, G. F. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, the Age of the Tannaim. 7th ed. 3 vols. Cambridge, MASS, 1927-1930.

Moore, W. E. "One Baptism," NTS 10 (1963/64) 504-16.

Moule, C. D. F. The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. Cambridge, 1957.

\_\_\_\_\_. "'Fullness' and 'Fill' in the New Testament," SJT 4 (1951) 79-86.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Neglected Features in the Problem of 'the Son of Man'," in Neues Testament und Kirche, fs. R. Schnackenburg. Frieberg, 1974, 413-28.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Note on Ephesians i. 22,23," EXT 60 (1948/49) 53.

Moulton, H. K. "Of," The Bible Translator 19 (1968) 18-25.

Mowinckel, S. He That Cometh. Trans. G. W. Anderson. Oxford, 1956.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Psalms in Israel's Worship. 2 vols. Trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas. New York/Nashville, 1962.

Münderlein, G. "Die Erwählung durch das Pleroma: Bemerkungen zu Kol i. 19," NTS 8 (1961/62) 264-76.

Muilenburg, J. "Isaiah 40-66," IB V (1956) 381-773.

Muirhead, I. A. "The Bride of Christ," SJT 5 (1952) 175-87.

Munro, W. "Col. iii 18-iv 1 and Eph. v 21-vi9: Evidence of a Late Literary Stratum?" NTS 18 (1972) 434-47.

Munzer, K. "Head," DNTT II 156-59.

Murmelstein, B. "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," WZKM 35 (1928) 242-75; 36 (1929) 51-86.

Murphy, J. L. "'Ekklesia' and the Septuagint," AER 139 (1958) 381-90.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of 'Ekklesia' in the New Testament," AER 140 (1959) 250-59; 325-32.

Murphy, R. E. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament Comparisons," CBQ 18 (1956) 263-72.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. "Truth: Paul and Qumran," in PQ, 179-230.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Who Wrote Ephesians?" Bible Today 18 (1965) 1201-9.

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis. London, 1968. (= PQ)

Murray, J. O. F. The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Ephesians. Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge, 1914.

Mussner, F. Christus, das All und die Kirche: Studien zur Theologie des Epheserbriefes. Trierer Theologische Studien, 5. Trier, 1955.  
(= CAK)

\_\_\_\_\_. "Contributions Made by Qumran to the Understanding of the Epistle to the Ephesians," in PQ, 159-78.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Die Geschichtstheologie des Epheserbriefes," Stud. Paul. Cong. Inter, AnBib 18:59-63.

Myers, J. M. I and II Esdras. AB 42. Garden City, NY, 1974.

Nash, H. S. "Θειότης-θεότης (R. 1:20; Col. 2:9)," JBL 18 (1899) 1-34.

Nauck, W. "Epheser 2, 19-22 - ein Tauflied?" EvTh 13 (1953) 362-71.

Neufeld, V. H. The Earliest Christian Confessions. Grand Rapids, 1963.

Nock, A. D. Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background. New York, 1964.

Norden, E. Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede. Leipzig/Berlin, 1913.

Nygren, A. Agape and Eros. Trans. P. S. Watson. London, 1953.

O'Brien, P. T. "Ephesians I: An Unusual Introduction to a New Testament Letter," NTS 25 (1978/79) 504-16.

Odeberg, H. The View of the Universe in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N.F. 1, Bd. 29, Nr. 6. Lund, 1934.

Oepke, A. "γυνή," TDNT I 776-89.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Leib Christi oder Volk Gottes bei Paulus," TLZ 79 (1954) 363ff.

Olshausen, H. Biblischer Commentar über sämtliche Schriften des Neuen Testaments, IV. Königsberg, 1840.

O'Neill, J. C. "The Source of the Christology in Colossians," NTS 26 (1980) 87-100.

Overfield, P. D. "Pleroma: A Study in Content and Context," NTS 25 (1978/79) 384-96.

Pagels, E. H. The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters. Philadelphia, 1975.

Parker, P. "Teacher," IDB IV 522-23.

Paterson, W. P. "Marriage," HDB III 262-77.

Peake, A. S. "The Epistle to the Colossians." ExGT III 477-547.

Pedersen, J. Israel, its Life and its Culture, I-II. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1946.

Peisker, C. H. and Brown, C. "Prophet," DNTT III 74-92.



- Percy, E. Der Leib Christi ( Σῶμα Χριστοῦ ) in den paulinischen Homologumena und Antilegomena. Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F. Avd. 1. Bd. 38. Nr. 1. Lund, 1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe. Acta reg. Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, 39. Lund, 1946.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zu den Probleme des Kolosser- und Epheserbriefes," ZNW 43 (1950/51) 178-94.
- Peri, I. "Gelingen zur Vollkommenheit. Zur lateinischen Interpretation von katantao in Eph 4, 13," BZ 23 (1979) 269-78.
- Perrin, N. A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology. Philadelphia, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The New Testament, An Introduction: Proclamation and Paraenesis, Myth and History. Chicago, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus. NTL. London, 1967.
- Peterson, E. ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ. Göttingen, 1926.
- Pfammatter, J. Die Kirche als Bau. Eine exegetisch-theologische Studie zur Ekklesiologie der Paulusbriefe. Analecta Gregoriana 110. Rome, 1960.
- Pfeiffer, R. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York, 1948.
- du Plessis, P. J. ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament. Kampen, 1959.
- Plummer, A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. ICC. Edinburgh, 1915.
- Pokorný, P. Der Epheserbrief und die Gnosis. Die Bedeutung des Haupt-Glieder-Gedankens in der entstehenden Kirche. Berlin, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Epheserbrief und gnostische Mysterien," ZNW 53 (1962) 160-94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Σῶμα Χριστοῦ im Epheserbrief," EvTh 20 (1960) 456-64.
- Porteous, N. W. Review of Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament by H. Wheeler Robinson. JTS 48 (1947) 75-78.
- Porter, J. R. "The Legal Aspects of the Concept of 'Corporate Personality' in the Old Testament," VT 15 (1965) 361-80.
- Prat, F. The Theology of Saint Paul, I-II. Trans. J. L. Stoddard, Westminster, Md, 1958.
- Preuschen, E. "σῶσσωμα Eph. 3.6," ZNW 1 (1900) 85-86.
- Procksch, O. "ἄγιος, κ.τ.λ." TDNT I 88-97, 100-15.
- Purdy, A. C. "The Epistle to the Hebrews," IB XI (1955) 577-763.
- Quell, G. "ἀλήθεια," TDNT I 232-37.



- von Rad, G. Genesis: A Commentary. Trans. J. H. Marks, OTL. London, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Old Testament Theology. 2 vols. Trans. D. M. G. Stalker. New York, 1962, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "δόξα," TDNT II 238-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "εἰρήνη," TDNT II 402-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "οὐρανός," TDNT V 502-9.
- Rader, W. The Church and Racial Hostility. A History of Interpretation of Ephesians 2:11-22. Tübingen, 1978.
- Ramaroson, L. "'L'Église, Corps du Christ' dans les écrits pauliniens: simples esquisses," Science et Esprit 30 (1978) 129-41.
- Rawlinson, E. J. "Corpus Christi," in Mysterium Christi, eds. G. K. A. Bell and A. Deissmann. London, 1930, 225-44.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon." A Commentary on the Bible, ed. A. S. Peake. London/Edinburgh/New York/Toronto/Paris, n.d. /1919/, 862-71.
- Reitzenstein, R. Das Iranische Erlösungsmysterium. Bonn, 1921.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Studien zum Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland. Leipzig, 1926.
- Rendtorff, R. "προφήτης, κ.τ.λ." TDNT VI 796-812.
- Rengstorff, K. H. Apostolate and Ministry: the New Testament Doctrine of the Office of the Ministry. Trans. P. D. Pahl. St. Louis, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Mann und Frau in Urchristentum. Köln, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "ἀποστέλλω, κ.τ.λ." TDNT I 398-447.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "διδάσκω, διδάσκαλος," TDNT II 135-65.
- Reumann, J. "Oikonomia = 'Covenant'; Terms for Heilsgeschichte in early Christian Usage," NT 3 (1959) 282-92.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "οἰκονομία - Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan Heilsgeschichte," NTS 13 (1966/67) 147-67.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Stewards of God' - Pre-Christian Religious Application of οἰκονόμος in Greek," JBL 77 (1958) 339-49.
- Reuss, J. "Die Kirche als 'Leib Christi' und die Herkunft dieser Vorstellung bei dem Apostel Paulus," BZ 2 (1958) 103-27.
- Richardson, P. Israel in the Apostolic Church. SNTSMS 10. Cambridge, 1969.
- Ridderbos, H. Paul: An Outline of His Theology. Trans. J. R. DeWitt, Grand Rapids, 1975.
- Rigaux, B. "Révélation des Mystères et Perfection à Qumran et dans le Nouveau Testament," NTS (1957) 237-62.

- Ringgren, H. The Messiah in the Old Testament. SBT 18. London, 1958.
- Rist, M. "The Revelation of St. John the Divine," IB XII (1957) 347-643.
- Robertson, A. and Plummer, A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. 2nd ed. ICC. Edinburgh, 1914.
- Robinson, H. W. The Christian Doctrine of Man. Edinburgh, 1911.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit. London, 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Old Testament, Its Making and Meaning. London, 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament. London, 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality," in Werden und Wesen. BZAW 66. Berlin, 1936, 42-62.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Hebrew Psychology," in The People and the Book, ed. A. S. Peake. Oxford, 1925, 353-82.
- Robinson, J. A. St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. 2nd ed. London, 1907.
- Robinson, J. M. "A Formal Analysis of Colossians I 15-20," JBL 76 (1957) 270-87.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Gnosticism and the New Testament," in Gnosis, fs. Hans Jonas, ed. U. Bianchi et al. Göttingen, 1978, 125-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die Hodajot - Formel in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums," Apophoreta, fs. Ernest Haenchen. BZNW 30 (1964) 194-235.
- Robinson, J. A. T. The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology. SBT 5. London, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Redating the New Testament. Philadelphia, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The One Baptism as a Category of NT Soteriology," SJT 6 (1953) 257-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Resurrection in the NT," IDB IV 43-53.
- Robinson, T. H. The Epistle to the Hebrews. MNTC. London, n.d. [1933]
- Roels, E. D. God's Mission, The Epistle to the Ephesians in Mission Perspective. Franeker, 1962.
- Rogerson, J. W. "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality: A Re-examination," JTS 21 (1970) 1-16.
- van Roon, A. The Authenticity of Ephesians. Trans. S. Prescod-Jokel. NT Suppl 39. Leiden, 1974.
- Roth, C. "The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis," VT 10 (1960) 51-68.
- Rubinkiewicz, R. "Ps LXVIII 19 (=EPH IV 8) Another tradition or Targum?" NT 17 (1975) 219-24.



- Ryle, H. E. The Book of Genesis. Cambridge, 1914.
- Ryrie, C. C. "The Mystery in Eph 3," Bibliotheca Sacra 123 (1969) 24-33.
- Sampley, J. P. 'And the Two Shall Become One Flesh': A Study of Traditions in Ephesians 5:21-33. SNTSMS 16. Cambridge, 1971.
- Sanday, W. and Headlam, A. C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. 5th ed. ICC. Edinburgh, 1902.
- Sanders, J. T. The New Testament Christological Hymns. SNTSM 15. Cambridge, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Hymnic Elements in Eph. 1-3," ZNW 56 (1965) 214-32.
- Sandmel, S. Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction. Oxford, 1979.
- Sasse, H. "αἰών, αἰώνιος," TDNT I 197-207.
- Saunders, E. W. "Resurrection in the NT," IDB Suppl 739-41.
- Schenke, H.-M. Der Gott 'Mensch in der Gnosis. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Diskussion über die paulinische Anschauung von der Kirche als Leib Christi. Göttingen, 1962.
- Schille, G. Frühchristliche Hymnen. 2nd ed. Berlin, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Der Autor des Epheserbrief," TLZ 82 (1957) 325-34.
- Schippers, R. "Age, etc." DNTT I 92f.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Fulness, etc." DNTT I 733-41.
- Schlatter, A. Paulus der Bote Jesu. Eine Deutung seiner Briefe an die Korinther. 4th ed. Stuttgart, 1969.
- Schleiermacher, F. "Über Kolss. 1, 15-20," Theologische Studien und Kritiken 5 (1832) 497-537.
- Schlier, H. Der Brief an die Epheser: Ein Kommentar. Düsseldorf, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief. Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie, 6. Tübingen, 1930. (= Christus)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Principalities and Powers in the New Testament. New York, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Relevance of the New Testament. New York/London, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "κεφαλή, ἀνακεφαλαιόομαι," TDNT III 673-82.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Warnach, V. Die Kirche im Epheserbrief. Beiträge zur Kontroverstheologie, I. Münster, 1949.
- Schmid, T. Der Leib Christi. Leipzig, 1919.
- Schmidt, D. H. "Die Ehe des Hosea," ZAW 42 (1924) 245-72.
- Schmidt, K. L. The Church. Trans. J. R. Coates. Bible Key Words. London, 1950.



Schmidt, K. L. "καλέω, κ.τ.λ." TDNT III 487-536.

Schmithals, W. Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians. Trans. J. E. Steely. Nashville, 1971.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Office of Apostle in the Early Church. Trans. J. E. Steely. Nashville/New York, 1969.

Schmitz, O. "παρακαλέω, παράκλησις," TDNT V 773-79, 788-99.

Schnackenburg, R. The Church in the New Testament. Trans. W. J. O'Hara. London/New York, 1966.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Gestalt und Wesen der Kirche nach dem Epheserbrief," Catholica 15 (1961) 104-20.

Schneemelcher, W. "υἱός, υἱοθεσία," TDNT VIII 392-97.

Schneider, C. "μεσότοιχον," TDNT IV 625.

Schneider, J. " (βαίνω), ἀναβαίω, κ.τ.λ." TDNT I 518-23.

\_\_\_\_\_. "ἡλικία," TDNT II 941-43.

\_\_\_\_\_. "σταυρός, κ.τ.λ." TDNT VII 572-84.

\_\_\_\_\_, and Brown, C. "Redemption, etc." DNTT III 216-21.

Schrage, W. "Zur Ethik der Neutestamentlichen Haustafeln," NTS 21 (1974) 1-22.

Schroeder, D. "Lists, Ethical," IDB Suppl 546-47.

Schrenk, G. "εὐδοκέω, εὐδοκία," TDNT II 738-51.

Schürer, E. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ. 2 vols. rev. & ed. M. Black, G. Vermes, and F. Millar. Edinburgh, 1973ff.

Schütz, H. G. and Motzer, J. A. "Body, Member, Limb," DNTT I 229-42.

Schütz, J. H. Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority. SNTSMS 26. Cambridge, 1975.

Schwietzer, A. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. Trans. W. Montgomery. London, 1931.

Schweizer, E. Der Brief an die Kolosser. Zürich/Neukirchen/Vluyn, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Church as the Body of Christ. Richmond, 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. Church Order in the New Testament. Trans. F. Clarke. London, 1961.

\_\_\_\_\_. Neotestamentica. Zürich, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Church as the Missionary Body of Christ," NTS 8 (1961) 1-11. (repr. Neotestamentica, 317-29).

- Schweizer, E. "Dying and Rising with Christ," in New Testament Issues, ed. R. Batey. London, 1970,
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zur Frage der Echtheit des Kolosser- und des Epheserbriefes," ZNW 47 (1956) 287. (repr. Neotestamentica, 429).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die Kirche als Leib Christi in den paulinischen Antilegomena," TLZ 86 (1961) 241-56. (repr. Neotestamentica, 293-316).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die Kirche als Leib Christ in den paulinischen Homologumena," TLZ 86 (1961) 161-74. (repr. Neotestamentica, 272-92).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "πνεῦμα, κ.τ.λ." TDNT VI 389-455,
- \_\_\_\_\_. "σάρξ, κ.τ.λ." TDNT VII 98-105, 108-10, 119-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "σῶμα, κ.τ.λ." TDNT VII 1024-44, 1045-94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Traditional Ethical Patterns in the Pauline and Post-Pauline Letters and their Development," in Text and Interpretation, eds. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge/London/New York/ Melbourne, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "υἱός, υιοθεσία," TDNT VIII 354-57, 363-92, 399.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "ψυχή, ψυχικός, κ.τ.λ." TDNT IX 637-56, 661-66.
- Scott, E. F. The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians. MNTC. London, 1930.
- Scroggs, R. The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology. Oxford, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Marriage in the NT," IDB Suppl 576-77.
- Seabaas, H. and Brown, C. "Holy, etc." DNTT II 223-32.
- Selbie, J. A. "Head," HDB II 316-17.
- Selwyn, E. G. The First Epistle of St. Peter. 2nd ed. London, 1947.
- Shedd, R. P. Man in Community: A Study of St. Paul's Application of Old Testament and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity. London, 1958.
- "Shekinah," Encyclopaedia Judaica, XIV. Jerusalem, 1971, 1349-54.
- Shepherd, M. H. Jr. "Apostle," IDB I 170-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Evangelist," IDB II 181.
- Shippers, R. "Right, Worthy," DNTT III 349-51.
- Simpson, C. A. "The Book of Genesis," IB I (1952) 439-829.
- Simpson, E. K. and Bruce, F. F. Commentary on the Epistles of Paul to the Ephesians and the Colossians. NICNT. Grand Rapids, 1957.
- Skinner, J. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. 2nd ed. ICC. Edinburgh, 1930.

- Smith, G. V. "Paul's Use of Psalm 68:18 in Ephesians 4:8," *Journ Evang Theol Soc* 18 (1975) 181-89.
- Smyth, K. "Heavenly Man and Son of Man in St. Paul," *Stud. Paul. Cong. Inter.* I. *AnBib* 17:219-30.
- Snaith, N. H. Review of The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, by Aubrey R. Johnson. *JTS* 44 (1943) 81-84.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Further Note on Ephesians ii.14." *ExT* 53 (1942) 325f.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Image of God," *ExT* 86 (1974) 24.
- von Soden, H. "ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ and sacramentum in ersten zwei Jahrhunderten der Kirche," *ZNW* 12 (1911) 188-227.
- Splett, J. "Body," Sacramentum Mundi, I. London, 1968, 233-35.
- Staab, K. Die Thessalonicherbriefe und die Gefangenschaftsbriefe. 3rd ed. Regensburger Neues Testament, 7. Regensburg, 1959.
- Stählin, G. "παρακαλέω, παράκλησις," *TDNT* V 779-93.
- Stagg, E. and Stagg, F. Woman in the World of Jesus. Philadelphia, 1978.
- Stanley, D. M. "Paul's Interest in the Early Chapters of Genesis," *Stud. Paul. Cong. Inter.* I. *AnBib* 17:241-52.
- Stauffer, E. New Testament Theology. Trans. J. Marsh. New York, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "ἀγαπάω, κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* I 35-55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "γαμέω, γάμος," *TDNT* I 648-57.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "θεός, θεότης, κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* III 90-92, 94-121.
- Stegmann, B. A. Christ, the 'Man from Heaven': A Study of I Cor. 15, 45-47 in the Light of the Anthropology of Philo Judaeus. Washington, D.C., 1927. (repr. Ann Arbor, MICH, 1980).
- Steinmetz, F. J. "'Parusie-Erwartung im Epheserbrief?' Ein Vergleich," *Biblica* 50 (1969) 328-36.
- Stirewalt, M. L. "The Form and Function of the Greek Letter-Essay," in The Romans Debate, ed. K. P. Donfried. Minneapolis, 1977, 175-206.
- Stuhlmacher, P. "'Er ist unser Friede' (Eph 2,14). Zur Exegese und Bedeutung von Eph 2, 14-18," in Neues Testament und Kirche, fs. Rudolf Schnackenburg. Freiburg, 1974, 337-58.
- Sullivan, K. "Epignosis in the Epistles of St. Paul," *Stud. Paul. Cong. Inter.* II. *AnBib* 18:405-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Mystery Revealed to Paul - Eph 3:1-13," Bible Today 1 (1963) 246-55.



- Surburg, R. F. "Pauline Charis: A Philological, Exegetical, and Dogmatic Study," Concordia Theological Monthly 29 (1958) 721-41.
- Swetnam, J. Jesus and Isaac. AnBib 94. Rome, 1981.
- Synge, F. C. St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: A Theological Commentary. London, 1941.
- Taber, C. R. "Marriage," IDB Suppl 573-76.
- Tannehill, R. C. Dying and Rising with Christ: A Study in Pauline Theology. BZNW 32, Berlin, 1966.
- Taylor, T. M. "Kingdom, Family, Temple and Body: Implications from the Biblical Doctrine of the Church for the Christian Attitude amid Cultral and Racial Tensions," Interpretation 12 (1958) 174-93.
- Taylor, V. The Gospel According to St. Mark, 2nd ed. London, 1966.
- Taylor, W. R. and McCullough, W. S. "The Book of Psalms," IB IV (1955) 3-763.
- Thiering, B. E. "MEBAQQER and EPISKOPOS in the Light of the Temple Scroll," JBL 100 (1981) 59-74.
- Thomas Aquinas. Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. Trans. M. L. Lamb. Albany, NY, 1966.
- Thompson, G. H. P. The Letters of Paul to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, and to Philemon. CBC. Cambridge, 1967.
- Thomson, J. G. S. S. "The Shepherd-Ruler Concept in the OT and its Application in the NT," SJT 8 (1955) 406-8.
- Thornton, L. S. The Common Life in the Body of Christ. London, 1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Body of Christ," in The Apostolic Ministry, ed. K. E. Kirk. London, 1946.
- Throckmorton, B. H. Jr. "Pastor," IDB III 668.
- Tooley, W. "Stewards of God," SJT 19 (1966) 74-86.
- Traub, H. "οὐρανός, κ.τ.λ." TDNT V 497-502; 502-43.
- Vawter, B. On Genesis: A New Reading. Garden City, NY, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Colossians Hymn and the Principle of Redaction," CBQ 33 (1977) 62-81.
- Vermes, G. Scripture and Tradition in Judaism. Haggadic Studies. 2nd rev. ed. Leiden, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Baptism and Jewish Exegesis," NTS 4 (1958) 308-19.
- Vielhauer, P. Oikodome. Das Bild vom Bau in der christlichen Literatur vom NT bis Clemens Alexandrinus. Dissertation. Heidelberg, 1939.

- de Visscher, F. Les édits d'Auguste découverts à Cyrène, Louvain, 1940.
- Vögtle, A. "Der 'Menschensohn' und die paulinische Christologie," *Stud. Paul. Cong. Inter. I.* *AnBib* 17:199-218.
- Wagenast, K. "Teach, etc." *DNTT* III 759-71.
- Wagner, H. "Diakonie," *RGG*<sup>3</sup> II 162ff.
- Wansbrough, H. "Corporate Personality in the Bible. Adam and Christ: a biblical use of the concept of personality," *New Blackfriars* 50 (1969) 798-804.
- Warnach, V. (see Schlier).
- Watters, W. R. Formula Criticism and the Poetry of the Old Testament. BZAW 138. Berlin/New York, 1976.
- Watts, J. D. W. The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah. CBC. Cambridge, 1975.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. "The Body of Christ and Related Concepts in I Corinthians," *SJT* 24 (1974) 74-96.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Philo's Heavenly Man," *NT* 15 (1973) 301-26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Problem of the Denial of the Resurrection in I Corinthians XV," *NT* 23 (1981) 229-41.
- Weiser, A. The Psalms. Trans. H. Hartwell. OTL. Philadelphia, 1962.
- Weiss, J. Christ the Beginnings of Dogma. London, 1911.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Der Erste Korintherbrief. Göttingen, 1910.
- Westcott, B. F. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. London, 1906.
- Westermann, C. Isaiah 40-66. Trans. D. M. G. Stalker. OTL. London, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Psalms: Structure, Content, and Message. Trans. R. D. Gehrke. Minneapolis, MINN, 1980.
- de Wette, W. M. L. Kurze Erklärung der Briefe an die Kolosser, an Philemon, an die Epheser und Philipper. Leipzig, 1947.
- Whallon, W. Formula, Character, and Context: Studies in Homeric, Old English, and Old Testament Poetry. Cambridge, MASS, 1969.
- Whitaker, G. H. "συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον," *JTS* 31 (1929/31) 48f.
- Whitely, D. E. H. The Theology of St. Paul. Philadelphia, 1964.
- Wikenhauser, A. Die Kirche als der mystische Leib Christi nach dem Apostel Paulus, 2nd ed. Münster, 1940.
- Williams, R. R. "Logic versus Experience in the Order of Credal Formulae," *NTS* 1 (1954/55) 42-44.
- Wilson, R. A. "'We' and 'You' in the Epistle to the Ephesians," *Studia Evangelica* II (TU 87) Berlin, 1964, 676-80.

- Wilson, R. McL. Gnosis and the New Testament. Oxford/Philadelphia, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Gnostic Problem: A Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy. London, 1958.
- Winward, S. F. A Guide to the Prophets. Richmond, 1969.
- Wood, J. E. "Isaac Typology in the New Testament," NTS 14 (1968) 583-89.
- Wolff, H. W. Anthropology of the Old Testament. Trans. M. Kohl. London, 1974.
- van der Woude, A. D. "χρίω, χριστός, κ.τ.λ." TDNT IX 509-10, 517-20, 521-27.
- Wright, G. E. "The Book of Deuteronomy," IB II (1953) 311-537.
- Yamauchi, E. M. Pre-Christian Gnosticism: A Survey of the Evidences. Grand Rapids, 1973.
- Yates, R. "A Re-examination of Eph. 1,23," ExT 83 (1972) 146-51.
- Young, E. J. The Book of Isaiah. 3 vols. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, 1965-72.
- Zerwick, M. The Epistle to the Ephesians. Trans. K. Smith. New Testament for Spiritual Reading. London, 1969.
- Zimmerli, W. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel. Trans. R. E. Clements. Her. Philadelphia, 1979.
- Zuntz, G. The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum. London, 1953.