



Durham E-Theses

The literary phenomenon of 'conflation' in the reworking of Paul's letter to the Colossians by the author of the letter to the Ephesians

Vankooten, George H.

How to cite:

Vankooten, George H. (1995) *The literary phenomenon of 'conflation' in the reworking of Paul's letter to the Colossians by the author of the letter to the Ephesians*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/5203/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

**THE LITERARY PHENOMENON OF 'CONFLATION'
IN THE REWORKING OF PAUL'S *LETTER TO THE COLOSSIANS*
BY THE AUTHOR OF THE *LETTER TO THE EPHESIANS***

INCLUDING A NEW SYNOPSIS OF THE GREEK TEXT OF BOTH LETTERS

THESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM, ENGLAND

By GEORGE VAN KOOTEN

Supervisor : PROF. J.D.G. DUNN, M.A., B.D. Glasgow, Ph.D., D.D. Cambridge
LIGHTFOOT PROFESSOR IN THEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

Candidate No : 946007110
Faculty : Faculty of Arts
Department : Department of Theology
College : St. Chad's College
Submission Date : 30th June, 1995

Home Address :
G.H. VanKooten,
Boerderijstraat 1,
2623 AR Delft,
The Netherlands,
Tel. 0031-15-567 297.

Address Oct. 1995-July 1996 :
Christ Church,
Oxford OX1 1DP.

Address University of Leiden :
Faculty of Theology,
P.O. Box 9515,
2300 RA Leiden,
The Netherlands,
Tel. 0031-71-272 572.



21 DEC 1995

**THE LITERARY PHENOMENON OF 'CONFLATION'
IN THE REWORKING OF PAUL'S *LETTER TO THE COLOSSIANS*
BY THE AUTHOR OF THE *LETTER TO THE EPHESIANS***

INCLUDING A NEW SYNOPSIS OF THE GREEK TEXT OF BOTH LETTERS

ABSTRACT

Title : The Literary Phenomenon of 'Conflation' in the Reworking of Paul's *Letter to the Colossians* by the Author of the *Letter to the Ephesians*. Including a New Synopsis of the Greek Text of Both Letters

Student : George H. VanKooten

Supervisor : Prof. Dr J.D.G. Dunn

Degree : Degree of Master of Arts

Date of Submission : 30th June, 1995

This thesis is concerned with the nature of the relationship of the *Letter to the Ephesians* (*Eph*) to Paul's *Letter to the Colossians* (*Col*).

The first three chapters seek to argue that this relationship should be designated as "literary dependent". In Chapter I the suggestion made by A.T. Lincoln (Dallas [Texas], 1990) that the contemporary redaction of the *Letter of Aristeas* by Josephus in his *Jewish Antiquities*, Book XII, §§ 11-118 is similar to the use the author of *Eph* made of *Col*, is exposed to critical review. Chapter II focuses on the phenomenon of repeated 'conflation' in *Eph*. This literary phenomenon entails that several 'Colossian' texts from different parts of *Col* are conflated by the author of *Eph* into one passage and is subjected to exhaustive analysis. It is argued that conflation is the main feature of the literary dependence of *Eph* on *Col* but does not occur in Josephus' reworking of the *Letter of Aristeas*. Chapter III continues the comparison between the method of reworking employed in the *Jewish Antiquities* and in *Eph* by pointing out that the fluctuation in verbatim agreement of one document with its source can be meaningful.

Chapter IV provides the new synopsis of both letters on which the whole examination is based. This synoptic overview is a desideratum since the previous synoptic editions of the Greek text of both letters by E.J. Goodspeed (Chicago, 1933) and C.L. Mitton (Oxford, 1951) are not accurate enough and unsuitable for research that focuses on the confluations of 'Colossian' verses in *Eph*.

The fifth and last chapter deals with the question why *Eph* is literary dependent on *Col* and shows that despite the literary dependence, the theology of *Eph* is distinctive in comparison with its source *Col*. The distinctiveness of *Eph*'s theology consists in a critical modification of the stress which *Col* places on Christ's already accomplished victory over the cosmic powers (*Col* 2.15). In order to safeguard an authoritative reception of his modification of *Col*, the author of *Eph* presented his letter as the parallel letter of *Col* alluded to in *Col* 4.16. The literary dependence on *Col* is necessary both to modify its content and to present his own writing as its parallel letter.

INDEX

INTRODUCTION :

The Nature of the Relationship between *Eph* and *Col*.
Summary of Lincoln's View and Outline of My Criticism
pp. 1-4

CHAPTER I :

Josephus' Reworking of the *Letter of Aristeas* in his *Jewish Antiquities*
pp. 5-14

CHAPTER II :

The Phenomenon of Conflation in *Eph*'s Reworking of *Col*
pp. 15-74

CHAPTER III :

The Sequence of Identical Words
pp. 75-79

CHAPTER IV :

A New Synoptic Overview of *Eph*'s Dependence on *Col*
pp. 80-109

CHAPTER V :

The Probable Reason for the Literary Dependence of *Eph* on *Col*

Chapter V.1 *Eph* 4.15 ἀξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα :
The Church's Active Influence on the Cosmos
pp. 110-119

Chapter V.2 *Eph* 3.3-4 καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε
ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ :
The *Letter to the Ephesians* As the *Letter to the Laodiceans*
pp. 119-122

BIBLIOGRAPHY

pp. 123-124

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My acknowledgements to the **Rotary Club of Leiden** (Holland), **District 1600 of Rotary International** and the **Rotary Foundation** (USA), who generously awarded me a *Rotary Foundation Scholarship 1994-95*, thereby enabling me to further my studies at Durham University. I would also like to express my gratitude for the warm hospitality extended by the **Rotary Club of Durham, District 1030 R.I.**, and by my Rotary counsellor Mr. T.F. Elton, OBE, QFSM and his lovely wife.

**INTRODUCTION: THE NATURE OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN *EPH* AND *COL*.
SUMMARY OF LINCOLN'S VIEW AND OULINE OF MY CRITICISM**

The nature of the relationship of the *Letter to the Ephesians (Eph)* to Paul's *Letter to the Colossians (Col)* is "(one) of the most fascinating of the various enigmas that surround the letter to the Ephesians" (A.T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 42. Dallas [Texas] 1990, p. XLVII). The majority of scholars regards *Eph* as dependent on *Col* (cf. H. Merkel, "Der Epheserbrief in der neueren exegetischen Diskussion" in *ANRW*, Teil II, Band 25, Berlin/New York 1987, pp. 3212-3220).¹ Those scholars, however, who argue in favour of a considerably extended literary dependence of *Eph* on *Col* (in particular W. Ochel and P. Benoit) have been criticised for exaggerating the dependency: "die 'Abhängigkeit' [ist] sicher zu stark gezeichnet; man wird doch eher an gedächtnismäßige Benutzung denken" (Merkel, p. 3214) and it is doubted "ob ein Schüler des Paulus eine derart mechanische Übernahme von Sätzen und einzelnen Wörtern nötig hatte" (Merkel, p. 3217). According to Merkel, the more plausible view is that the similarities between *Eph* and *Col* are best explained by 'recollection' rather than by literary dependence (Merkel, p. 3219).

The danger in stating the literary dependent nature of the relation between the two documents is that *Eph* could be considered as a very artificial patchwork creation which would not attribute any creativity and distinctive theological argumentation to its author. It seems, however, to be possible to take *Eph* as literary dependent on *Col*, while nevertheless doing justice to its own intentions, as I shall attempt to demonstrate. The first three chapters of what follows (pp. 4-77) deal with the literary dependence on *Col* and take their starting point in Lincoln's recent commentary on *Eph* (Dallas [Texas], 1990). The fourth chapter (pp. 78-107) gives a new synoptic overview of *Eph*'s dependence on *Col* on which the whole thesis is based. In the fifth and last chapter (pp. 108-120) I would like to propose in what sense *Eph* is a distinctive document, and how its dependency on *Col* as well as its distinctiveness can be explained at the same time.

In order to introduce the first three chapters in which it will be argued that the nature of the relation between *Eph* and *Col* one of literary dependence, I summarise briefly Lincoln's excursus on the matter as far as the main features are concerned (Lincoln, pp. XLVII-LVIII). According to Lincoln, the interdependence between *Eph* and *Col* is not due to extended exactly identical passages which occur in the same form in each letter; there are only six instances of more extended verbatim agreement (Lincoln, p. XLVIII). The interdependence is instead evidenced by similarity in overall structure (thematic sequence) in the parallel material although there is also material which is unique either to

¹ The *Letter to the Col* itself is considered by some scholars to be dependent in turn on other Pauline letters. See e.g. E.P. Sanders, "Literary Dependence in Colossians" in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 85 (1966), pp. 28-45 and M. Kiley, *Colossians as Pseudepigraphy*, Sheffield 1986, Chapter 3.2: "The Literary Dependence of Colossians on Philippians and Philemon", pp. 76-91.

Col or to *Eph* (Lincoln, pp. XLVIII-L). *Col* provided the basis for *Eph* which omits the interaction with the specific Colossian 'false teaching' (*Col* 2.1-3.4) as well as the greetings (*Col* 4.10-17) and "expands the rest of the material to make it more general and to adapt it to its own purposes" (Lincoln, pp. L-LI). Besides the similarity in overall structure there are **close terminologically similar phrases both inside and outside the parallel material** (Lincoln, pp. LI-LIII). Here the phenomenon of 'conflation' is an important characteristic of the interdependence between *Eph* and *Col*. Conflation occurs when the wording of two or more passages from different parts of *Col* are combined in one single passage in *Eph*. Another characteristic of the letters' interdependence is that the terms πλήρωμα and μυστήριον which occur in both letters are used in *Eph* with **different connotations** in comparison to *Col*, their focus being primarily christological in *Col* but primarily ecclesiological in *Eph*. This change in connotation, however, according to Lincoln (in disagreement with other scholars) does not apply to the terms σῶμα and οἰκονομία (Lincoln, pp. LIII-LV).

Having given this overview Lincoln concludes that the nature of the dependence should be designated as "in some sense a literary one" although this dependence is "free and creative" and "not a slavish imitation or copying" (Lincoln, p. LV). To illustrate this kind of interdependence Lincoln refers to Josephus' use of the *Letter of Aristeas* in his *Jewish Antiquities* as a parallel to *Eph*'s redaction of *Col*: "There is literary dependence as Josephus paraphrases his source, but there are only two places where there is a sequence of identical words (...). For the most part, it is only short phrases or individual words that are identical in the two works, and Josephus has omitted, conflated, and embellished material from his source in order to make his own particular points" (Lincoln, p. LV). At the end of his introductory chapter on the interrelationship between *Eph* and *Col* Lincoln again draws attention to Josephus' use of the *Letter of Aristeas* by saying that the reworking of *Col* by the author of *Eph* is an "actualization of authoritative tradition" in a way similar to the way in which Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* draws upon his source (Lincoln, p. LVIII). Lincoln does not work out this similarity any further but points at the study *Flavius Josèphe: Adapteur de la Lettre d'Aristée. Une Réaction Atticisante contre la Koinè* by A. Pelletier (Paris, 1962). Lincoln's suggestion that the redaction of the *Letter of Aristeas* by Josephus is comparable to the use the author of *Eph* made of *Col* is valuable since it provides us with a contemporary parallel which makes it possible to explore not only similarities in their methods of reworking a previous document but, also - as I would like to argue - features which are characteristic for each reworking in particular.

In order to describe clearly the nature of the relation between Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* and the *Letter of Aristeas* a short summary of the *Jewish Antiquities*, Book XII, §§ 11-118 will be given first. During the reign of the Egyptian king Ptolemy Phila-

delphus (285-247 BC) his librarian Demetrius of Phalerum proposes to include in the Royal Library a copy of the Jewish law which should be translated especially for that purpose (§§ 11-15). When Ptolemy approves of the plan and orders a letter to be written to the Jewish high priest in Jerusalem asking him to send translators for this sake to Egypt (§ 16), Aristeeas - one of the king's officials - succeeds in persuading him to free on that occasion the Jews who are held captive in Egypt (§§ 17-27). Their release is effectively brought about by a decree (§§ 28-33) and Ptolemy orders Demetrius to present him a memorial of the proposed translation (§§ 34-35) which besides Demetrius' written proposal concerning the copying of the Jewish writings (§§ 36-39) also includes a copy of the letter to Eleazar, the Jewish high priest (§§ 40-50), Eleazar's subsequent positive reply (§§ 51-56) and a description of the dedicatory offerings sent to Jerusalem which consist of a table and some mixing-bowls (§§ 57-84). The following paragraphs deal with the arrival of the Jewish translators at Alexandria (§§ 85-93) where a reception has been prepared in accordance with the Jewish customs (§§ 94-98). During a banquet which lasts for a period of twelve days, Ptolemy is delighted by a discussion with the translators about problems of moral philosophy (§§ 99-100). Then they set to work on the translation of the Jewish writings and after having completed the translation they order that the correct reading of the text should be preserved (§§ 101-109). Ptolemy rejoices when the translation of the laws is read to him and learns why this admirable legislation has nevertheless remained unknown to the historians and poets (§§ 110-113); after that he sends the translators home bestowing them with gifts for themselves and for the high priest, out of appreciation for the Jews (§§ 114-119).

I would like to review Lincoln's remarks about Josephus' reworking of the *Letter of Aristeeas* under three headings. Having consulted Pelletier's study on *Flavius Josèphe: Adapteur de la Lettre d'Aristée* Lincoln refers to (Lincoln, p. LV) and taken notice of his synoptic arrangement of the *Letter of Aristeeas* and Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*, Book XII, §§ 12-118 (Pelletier, pp. 307-327) I would like to question Lincoln's statement that "Ephesians' redaction of Colossians is similar to that which can be shown to have taken place in the case of Josephus' use of the *Letter of Aristeeas* in his *Jewish Antiquities*" (Lincoln, p. LV).

Firstly, my review deals with Lincoln's thought that "Josephus has omitted, conflated and embellished material from his source in order to make his own particular points" (Lincoln, p. LV). I will argue, however, that Josephus' pursuit of his own points did not change the contents of his source significantly; differences between source and reworking are only marginal (See Chapter I : "Josephus' Reworking of the *Letter of Aristeeas* in his *Jewish Antiquities*", pp. 5-14).

Secondly, Lincoln's remarks that one of the methods of Josephus' reworking was 'conflation' ("Josephus has omitted, conflated, and embellished material from his

source"). My argument will be that the phenomenon of 'conflation' - which is so characteristic of *Eph* - is totally absent in Josephus' reworking in stark contrast to *Eph* where I counted twenty-three instances of conflation (See Chapter II : "The Phenomenon of Conflation in *Eph*'s Reworking of *Col*", pp. 15-74).

Thirdly and lastly, I will comment on Lincoln's observation that Josephus' text is a paraphrase containing only short phrases and individual words which are identical with the original text except for two considerable sequences of identical words. This might be a parallel for the rare occurrence of sequences of identical words in *Eph*'s use of *Col* but in both cases the absence of more sequences has to be accounted for differently. On the other hand there is a positive result of the comparison between the *Jewish Antiquities* and *Eph* as regards the sequence of identical words since it shows that the measure of verbatim agreement of one document with its source can fluctuate throughout the document and that this fluctuation can have some meaning (See Chapter III: "The Sequence of Identical Words", pp. 75-79).

CHAPTER I : JOSEPHUS' REWORKING OF THE *LETTER OF ARISTEAS*
IN HIS *JEWISH ANTIQUITIES*

I.1 ADAPTATION OF THE SOURCE MATERIAL TO HIS *JEWISH ANTIQUITIES*

Four motives seem to have been decisive in Josephus' rewriting. The first motive is the formal adaptation of the *Letter of Aristeas* to Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*. While *Eph* is a reworking which is in *proportion* with its source, in the sense that it has the same size as *Col* and contains nothing but a reworking of *Col*, the *Letter of Aristeas* is only a small portion (*Jew. Ant.*, Book XII, §§ 12-118) taken up and inserted into the whole *Jewish Antiquities* which consists of twenty books in total; therefore the *Letter of Aristeas* (unlike *Col*) had to be adapted to a far larger 'context'. Josephus' rewriting is characterised by the fact that some passages from the *Letter of Arist.* have been omitted by Josephus. At least three of them have been omitted in order to make the material from the *Letter of Arist.* adaptable to the *Jew. Ant.*. These omitted passages are found in *Letter of Arist.*, §§ 1-8 (introduction), §§ 295-300 and §322 (end) and form in a certain sense the framework in which the story is presented.

§§ 1-8 are the introduction in which Aristeas addresses his brother and states that he compiled a clear and trustworthy narrative of his meeting with the Jewish high priest Eleazar during his mission for the translation of the Jewish law. The reason Aristeas sends his brother Philocrates such a personal account is his brothers' eagerness for learning and understanding, and his inclination towards the piety and law-abiding disposition of the Jews. Aristeas alludes in this introduction to a previous letter to Philocrates (*Arist.*, § 6: "I had previously sent you the account of what I regarded as the most memorable matters").

§§ 295-300 is a passage in which Aristeas addresses Philocrates again directly, stresses the reliability of his account since this is produced by accurate reference to the official royal records; he refers again to Philocrates' desire to learn what is of value.

§ 322 is the concluding paragraph in which the author addresses Philocrates for the last time and promises him to try to continue his narrative in a future writing (*Arist.*, § 322 "I will also attempt to write down the remainder of what is worthwhile").²

Although Josephus omits these passages he refers to the *Letter of Arist.* once indirectly and once explicitly which shows that he is well aware of the possibility that the readers of his *Jew. Ant.* could consult the *Letter of Arist.* as well. Josephus does not even try to impede their access to the *Letter of Arist.* by not mentioning his source, but refers openly to it. Having given the high priest's letter in which he positively replied to Ptolemy's request (*Jew. Ant.*, §§ 51-56) Josephus does not mention the translators' names

² See Pelletier, pp. 199-202 on the omissions of paragraphs and fragments of the *Letter of Arist.* by Josephus.

(ἐμοὶ δ' οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἔδοξεν εἶναι τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα πρεσβυτέρων, οἱ τὸν νόμον ἐκόμιζον ὑπὸ Ἑλεαζάρου πεμφθέντες, δηλοῦν) but refers to the end of the letter (ἦν γὰρ ταῦτα ὑπογεγραμμένα ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ - *Jew. Ant.*, § 57), although he does not mention here *where* this letter can be found; this list of names can be found in *Arist.*, §§ 47-50. Later, however, when he omits Aristeas' detailed description of the discussion held during the banquet (*Arist.*, §§ 187-292) and shortly summarises it, he explicitly refers for a comprehensive report to Aristeas' writing: τῷ βουλομένῳ τὰ κατὰ μέρος γνῶναι τῶν ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ ζητηθέντων εἶναι μαθεῖν ἀναγνόντι τὸ Ἀρισταίου βιβλίον, ὃ συνέγραψεν διὰ ταῦτα (*Jew. Ant.*, § 100).³ An important motive of Josephus' reworking is to establish a 'unity of composition' between the rest of his *Jewish Antiquities* and that part which he derived from the *Letter of Arist.* The unity of composition sought for is that which is characteristic for historiography. Therefore Josephus had to convert the 'letter genre' of the *Letter of Arist.* - which is composed as a letter to his brother Philocrates and wants to be understood as an eye-witness description - into a general piece of historiography written "in the belief that the whole Greek-speaking world will find it worthy of attention" (*Jew. Ant.*, Book I, § 5); he attained this by eliminating the personal conversational style of the *Letter of Arist.*⁴ Part of this implementation of a unity of composition is also the unification of style.⁵

I.2 JOSEPHUS' PURSUIT OF HIS OWN PARTICULAR POINTS OF EMPHASIS IN REDACTING HIS SOURCE

I.2.1 PRIMARY ASPECT :

A SOVEREIGN'S FAVOURABLE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE JEWS

The second motive which influences Josephus' rewriting is the pursuit of his own particular points of emphasis; there seem to be four different aspects to be mentioned (I.2.1-2.4). The purpose of Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* is to show the chain of sequences which link the Jewish race to the origins of humankind, which purpose can be found in Book xx, §§ 259-260, the conclusion of the *Antiquities*: "The present work contains the recorded history, from man's original creation up to the twelfth year of the reign of Nero, of the events that befell us Jews in Egypt, in Syria, and in Palestine. It also comprises all that we suffered at the hand of Assyrians and Babylonians, and the harsh treatment that we received from the Persians and Macedonians and after them the Romans." Pelletier refers for the purpose of the *Jew. Ant.* only to this conclusion of the *Antiquities*, but not to the beginning of this writing to which Josephus, however, explicitly refers in his conclusion:

³ See Pelletier, pp. 179 and 199.

⁴ See Pelletier, pp. 251-253 on 'unity of composition'.

⁵ See Pelletier, pp. 253-254: "Josèphe pousse le souci d'unité littéraire jusqu'à uniformiser le style" (p. 253).

"this was what I promised to do at the beginning of my history" (*Jew. Ant.*, Book XX, § 261: τοῦτο γὰρ ποιήσειν ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἱστορίας ἐπηγγειλάμην).⁶

At the beginning of his *Jew. Ant.*, Josephus explains that his motives to write a history are firstly the events in which he himself took part and secondly the "prevailing ignorance of important affairs of general utility" (Book I, §§ 1-4); he dealt with the war against the Romans in a separate volume (Book I, § 7) whereas he now embraces in the present work the "entire ancient history and political constitution, translated from the Hebrew records" meant for 'the whole Greek-speaking world' (Book I, § 5); he already contemplated writing on these topics when composing *The Jewish War*, but this project was delayed until his patron Epaphroditus managed to urge him to accomplish his task (Book I, §§ 6-9). Two further considerations besides these motives, which encouraged him to write his envisaged history, are "whether our ancestors, on the one hand, were willing to communicate such information [sc. about the Jewish history], and whether any of the Greeks, on the other, had been curious to learn our history" (Book I, § 9). Then Josephus refers to Ptolemy II. Philadelphus and the high priest Eleazar which were, according to Josephus, indeed representatives of such an exchange: "I found then that the second of the Ptolemies (...) was particularly anxious to have our Law and the political constitution based thereon translated into Greek; while, on the other side, Eleazar (...) did not scruple to grant the monarch the enjoyment of a benefit, which he would certainly have refused had it not been our traditional custom to make nothing of what is good into a secret" (Book I, §§ 10-11). Josephus regards this episode as an important example of Greek interest in and reverence for the Jewish law as well as an example of Jewish open-minded and magnanimous readiness to share its wisdom with the world. Josephus explicitly models his writing and its expectant reception on this episode, which he is going to describe later -as we know - in Book XII, §§ 11-118: "Accordingly, I thought that it became me also both to imitate the high priest's magnanimity and to assume that there are still to-day many lovers of learning like the king" (Book I, §12 κάμαυτῶ δὴ πρόπειν ἐνόμισα τὸ μὲν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως μιμήσασθαι μεγαλόψυχον, τῷ βασιλεῖ δὲ πολλοὺς ὁμοίως ὑπολαβεῖν). The moral lesson to be learnt from his writing is that "men who conform to the will of God, and do not venture to transgress laws that have been excellently laid down, prosper in all things beyond belief" (Book I, § 14). Josephus then implores his Greek readers to test whether the Jewish lawgiver Moses - who is considerably earlier than other, non-Jewish legislators - "has had a worthy conception of His [God's] nature and has always assigned to Him such actions as befit His power" (Book I, §15). So

⁶ See Pelletier, p. 200: "dans les *Antiquités*, Josèphe s'est proposé uniquement de montrer la suite, l'enchaînement des faits et gestes qui rattachent sa race aux origines même de l'humanité: les Juifs sont le seul peuple à posséder une *tradition suivie* qui remonte jusque-là" (with reference to Book XX, §§ 259-260).

Josephus' *Jew. Ant.* is a demonstration of 'the wisdom of our lawgiver Moses' (Book I, § 18), and an appeal to open-minded acceptance of this ancient wisdom as preceded by Ptolemy's favourable attitude towards the Jews. Josephus' *Jew. Ant.* is designed to "magnify the Jewish race in the eyes of the Graeco-Roman World" (Thackeray, p. VII), what was especially needed under Domitian's oppressive reign (81-96), the circumstances under which its first edition appeared in 93-94 AD; Josephus was confident that there was a demand for information about the Jews amongst the Greek reading public (Josephus himself trying to increase this demand by his positive reference to Ptolemy's interest in the law) and deliberately designed his 'Ιουδαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία (*Je-wish Antiquities*) as a counterpart to Dionysius of Halicarnassus' Ῥωμαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιο-λογία (*Roman Antiquities*).⁷

This shows that Josephus' use of the *Letter of Arist.* is positive because it is found useful as an example of a benevolent reception of Jewish thought by classical culture. Josephus pretends to extend even the information which was made available to Ptolemy since, according to Josephus, only that portion of the Jewish records which contain the law was translated and rendered to Ptolemy. "Josephus", as Thackeray notices, "does not mention that the version of the Law was followed up by translations, which he has freely used, of the rest of the Hebrew Scriptures".⁸ Josephus thus regards the publication of his *Jewish Antiquities* as the second major transfer of Jewish learning to the Greek-speaking world, justified by the previous transference made by Eleazar on the request of Ptolemy "who was so deeply interested in learning and such a collector of books" (Book I, § 10); on this alleged transference Josephus' enterprise was modelled and based. Josephus, as has partly already been mentioned, implores the readers of his *Jewish Antiquities* "to fix their thoughts on God, and to test whether our lawgiver has had a worthy conception of His nature and has always assigned to Him such actions as befit His power, keeping his words concerning Him pure of that unseemly mythology current among others" (Book I, §15). This apologetic criticism of Hellenistic mythology is also dominant in the *Letter of Aristeas*. At the end of his letter Aristeas addresses Philocrates by concluding "These matters I think delight you more than the books of the mythologists, for your inclination lies in the direction of concern for things that benefit the mind" (*Arist.*, § 322) and in his discussion with Aristeas (*Arist.*, §§ 128-171; no parallel in Josephus) the Jewish high priest Eleazar explains the uniqueness of Jewish monotheism in contrast to the inventors of polytheistic image worship and deification of equals: "Those who have invented these fabrications and myths are usually ranked to be the wisest of the Greeks" (*Arist.*, § 137). Thus Josephus' use of the *Letter of Aristeas* is absolutely in line with the letter's contents

⁷ See H.St.J. Thackeray, "Introduction" in *Josephus*, Vol. IV, London/New York 1930, pp. VII-XIX (esp. VII-X).

⁸ See *Josephus*, Vol. IV, p. 7 note d.

and does not contradict them; the *Letter of Aristeas* serves as an earlier model which is taken up to justify Josephus' initiative.

Remarkably, Pelletier in his study, which is exclusively devoted to Josephus' use of the *Letter of Aristeas*, hardly deals with the passage *Jew. Ant.*, Book I, §§ 9-13.

Once Pelletier points out that Ptolemy is such an important figure for Josephus that he is even mentioned in his introduction (Book I, § 10) together with Eleazar and Moses for the fact that out of interest in learning he was anxious to have the Jewish law translated into Greek. See Pelletier, page 206: "Aucune figure de l'antiquité païenne n'a paru plus attachante au Juif, historien d'Israël, que ce souverain exceptionnel (...) (le seul qui partage les honneurs de sa préface, avec Éléazar le grand prêtre et ... Moïse) ἐξαιρέτως ἐφιλοτιμήθη τὸν ἡμέτερον νόμον (...) εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν μεταβαλεῖν: il a mis à faire traduire notre Loi en grec tout son point d'honneur (*Ant.* I, 10). Discrète leçon pour les nouveaux maîtres!"

The second and last time Pelletier refers to the introduction to the *Jewish Antiquities* is as, in an excursion on the designation of the "Old Testament" in Greek, he refers to *Jew. Ant.*, Book I, § 13 where the designation τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα is used: μυρία δ' ἐστὶ τὰ δηλούμενα διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων ("The things narrated in the Sacred Scriptures are, however, innumerable"). See Pelletier, page 301: "Dans *B.J.* [*De Bello Judaico*] V 235, il [Josèphe] désigne le tétragramme divin par τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα. Mais il emploie la même expression pour L'Ancien Testament tout entier dans *Ant.* I 13: μυρία δ' ἐστὶ τὰ δηλούμενα διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων."

These are the only two references by Pelletier to this part of the introduction to Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*; surprisingly, he gives no treatment of the whole passage §§ 9-13, despite the fact that these paragraphs are the only passage in the *Jew. Ant.* where Ptolemy appears outside Book XII, §§ 11-118⁹ and which deals with Ptolemy's translation of the law. It is this introduction which is illuminating for the purpose of Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* and gives insight into the reason why the *Letter of Aristeas* was included in his history.

1.2.2 SECOND ASPECT: THE APOLOGY FOR JUDAISM

Once Josephus omits Aristeas' mention of anti-Semitic upheavals in Alexandria, whose mention would not have served the interest of the Jews resident in Rome since parallels for their suppression elsewhere could have aggravated and 'justified' the policy in Rome under Domitian (*Jew. Ant.*, Book XII, § 46; *Arist.*, § 37).¹⁰ This is similar to the case in which Josephus previously omitted the story of the golden calf and the breaking of the first tables of the Law (*Exodus* 32) in Book III, § 99, in order to avoid giving handle to

⁹ Later in his treatise *Contra Apionem*, Book II, §§ 45-47 - which was written after the *Antiquities* and was designed as a reply to criticisms of the *Antiquities* (see Thackeray, *Josephus*, Vol. I, p. XVI) - Josephus refers again to Ptolemy for the third and last time: "The highest compliment (...) which he paid us lay in his keen desire to know our laws and to read the books of our sacred scriptures" (Book II, § 45).

¹⁰ See Pelletier, pp. 201 and 270-271.

current rumours that the Jews worshipped animals, notwithstanding the fact that he promised to omit nothing in his dealing with the Scriptural records (Book I, § 17).¹¹

The purpose of repeating the story of Ptolemy's reverence for the Jewish law, both mentioned in the introduction to the *Jewish Antiquities* (Book I, § 10) and later in Book XII, is "d'obtenir pour sa nation de la part des empereurs plus d'estime et de ménagements".¹² It is Ptolemy in his effort to establish Alexandria as an intellectual centre who "avait reconnu que quelque chose manquerait à la culture des temps nouveaux aussi longtemps qu'on n'y ferait pas place à la littérature juive, spécialement à la Loi de Moïse".¹³ More than the *Letter of Aristeas* Josephus stresses that the Jews were treated with honour by the Ptolemies (*Arist.*, § 35; *Jew. Ant.*, § 45) and that they are absolutely reliable (*Arist.*, § 36; *Jew. Ant.*, § 46).¹⁴ This reliability is referred to as well in the continuation of the *Jewish Antiquities* immediately after the insertion of the *Letter of Aristeas* whose insertion Josephus ends by the conclusive words "These, then, were the things done by Ptolemy Philadelphus in appreciation and honour of the Jews" (*Jew. Ant.*, § 118; not in *Arist.*, § 321); he continues then by the phrase "They also received honour from the kings of Asia when they served with them in war" (*Jew. Ant.*, § 119), introducing the privileges granted to the Jews by the early Seleucid rulers in order to provoke feelings of confidence towards the Jews amongst his readers.

¹¹ See Thackeray, *Josephus*, Vol. IV, pp. XII and 362-63, note c.

¹² See Pelletier, p. 206.

¹³ See Pelletier, pp. 270-271.

¹⁴ See Pelletier, *ibidem*.

I.2.3 THIRD ASPECT: JOSEPHUS' PHARISAIC ORTHODOX 'CORRECTION' OF THE LETTER OF ARISTEAS

Josephus omits §§ 128-171 from the *Letter of Aristeas*, a passage in which the high priest Eleazar answers some questions raised by Egyptian delegates visiting Jerusalem amongst whom was Aristeas. Their inquiries concern the reasons for the Jewish purity regulations which designate some things as unclean for eating and touching. Eleazar's explanation is of an allegorical nature, which Josephus, probably due to his law-abiding Pharisaism, regards as a dangerous tendency towards undermining a strict observance of the law; therefore he was not interested in reproducing Eleazar's extended interpretation of the law's allegorical character and omitted it, just as he later omits a similar moral explanation of the purpose in washing someone's hands while saying prayers (*Arist.*, § 306). On another occasion Josephus also omits passages which could suggest the translators' participation in pagan worship and a kind of reverence for the law parchments which should be reserved for God himself (*Arist.*, §§ 293 and 177).¹⁵

I.2.4. FOURTH ASPECT: NECESSARY AND AUTOMATIC ADAPTATION TO THE CHANGED HISTORICAL SITUATION

That Josephus' rewriting happens in a later time than the *Letter of Arist.* was written and reflects therefore some new, contemporary interests can be shown in his rewriting of the agreement when the transcription of the law was finished; this agreement entails that "a curse should be laid (...) on anyone who should alter the version by any addition or change to any part of the written text, or any deletion either" (*Arist.*, § 311). The Greek text reads here: "ἐκέλευσαν διαράσασθαι, καθὼς ἔθος αὐτοῖς ἐστίν, εἴ τις διασκευάσει προστιθεὶς ἢ μεταφέρων τι τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ποιούμενος ἀφαίρεσιν", not envisioning any need to correct a corrupt text reading but just trying to prohibit any textual change preventively. However, Josephus - being aware of and confronted with texts which demanded correction - renders this passage as follows: "ἐκέλευσαν, εἴ τις ἢ περισσόν τι προσγεγραμμένον ὀρᾷ τῷ νόμῳ ἢ λείπον, πάλιν ἐπισκοποῦντα τοῦτο καὶ ποιοῦντα φανερόν διορθοῦν" (*Jew. Ant.*, § 109): "they ordered that, if anyone saw any further addition made to the text of the Law or anything omitted from it, he should examine it and make it known and correct it", explicitly reckoning with the need of text correction and showing that his circumstances were different from Aristeas' time: "Aristée 'patronne' une version grecque de la Loi, à une époque où l'on peut encore nourrir l'illusion qu'un texte en langue vulgaire, bien défendu par la vigilance des autorités compétentes, revêtu du prestige d' 'édition princeps' établie par les hommes les plus autorisés, et la seule 'déposée' à la Bibliothèque royale d'Alexandrie, peut

¹⁵ See Pelletier, pp. 200-201 and 271.

être définitive. Josèphe n'en est plus là." ¹⁶ This reflects contemporary interests; the same holds true for Josephus' avoidance or modernisation of the terms of some ancient institutions and for his maintenance of the philosophical and rhetorical vocabulary current amongst the cultivated public.¹⁷

I.3 THE 'ATTIC' CORRECTION

Another motive in Josephus' reworking of his source is his return to classical, Attic Greek, an inclination (sign of the 'réaction atticisante' of the first century) which appears not only in his vocabulary¹⁸, but also in his grammar¹⁹ and style²⁰. Josephus is so concerned with classical Greek that Pelletier could even subtitle his study "Flavius Josèphe Adapteur de la Lettre d'Aristée: *Une Réaction Atticisante contre la Koinè*".

I.4 RANDOM CHANGES OUT OF NEED TO CHANGE THE ORIGINAL SOURCE

Besides the need to adapt his source material to the *Jewish Antiquities* (I.1), the pursuit of his own particular points (I.2) and his 'Attic correction' (I.3), Josephus also changes his source at random. These changes are necessary just to avoid copying exactly from the *Letter of Aristeas* and only for variation. Three examples show the nature of these changes.²¹

Firstly, there occur instances in which the word order has been reversed, e.g. the word order of the phrase ἀφ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἕξ ("six from each tribe") and of λαβόντες τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ἀκριβές ("obtained an accurate translation"; *Arist.*, § 32) is changed into ἕξ ἀφ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς and into τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ἀκριβές λαβόντες (*Jew. Ant.*, § 39). This phenomenon also occurs in *Eph*'s rewriting of *Col*, namely in *Eph* 4.15 which changes τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτὸν (*Col* 1.20) into εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, in *Eph* 5.16 where τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι (*Col* 4.5) is changed into ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρὸν, and in *Eph* 6.9 where οὐκ ἔστιν προσωποληψία (*Col* 3.25) is turned into προσωποληψία οὐκ ἔστιν. These, however, are the only instances in which the author of *Eph* applies the method of changing word order; his characteristic and most favourite method is - as will be argued later - 'conflation'.

Secondly, cases are changed in order to make the text less monotonous, e.g. the second of two datives is changed for reason of variation into the genitive : καὶ ἠύξατο

¹⁶ See Pelletier, pp. 203-204.

¹⁷ See Pelletier, pp. 261-263, 263-268, 268-269 and 271.

¹⁸ See Pelletier, pp. 254-259.

¹⁹ See Pelletier, pp. 259-260.

²⁰ See Pelletier, p. 261.

²¹ See Pelletier, pp. 260-261.

πάν τὸ πλῆθος, ἵνα σοι γένηται καθὼς προαιρῆ διὰ παντός, καὶ διασώζη σοι τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ μετὰ δόξης ὁ κυριεύων ἀπάντων θεός ("The whole multitude made supplication that it should come to pass for you entirely as you desire, and that God the ruler of all should preserve your kingdom in peace and glory"; *Arist.*, § 45) is changed into καὶ τὸ πλῆθος εὐχὰς ἐποίησατο γενέσθαι σοι τὰ κατὰ νοῦν καὶ φυλαχθῆναί σου τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ ("the people offered up prayers that your plans may be realised and that your kingdom may be preserved in peace"; *Jew. Ant.*, § 55). A comparable variation can be found in *Eph*'s redaction of *Col* in *Eph* 4.2 where the triple use of the accusative in *Col* 3.12 (Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν [...] ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραῦτητα, μακροθυμίαν, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων) is modified by inserting καὶ and μετὰ : μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πραύτητος, μετὰ μακροθυμίας, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων.

Thirdly, adjectives and nouns of the same derivation are interchanged, e.g. *Arist.*, § 67 reads: μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ μαιάνδρου διάθεσιν ἐπέκειτο σχιστὴ πλοκὴ, θαυμασίως ἔχουσα, ῥομβωτὴν ἀποστελοῦσα τὴν ἀνὰ μέσον θεωρίαν ("After the arrangement of the [aforesaid] pattern there was superimposed a web with interstices, marvellously contrived, which made the central view rhomboid in shape"). The adjective ῥομβωτὴ ('made in the shape of a rhombus') is replaced by the noun ῥόμβος in *Jew. Ant.*, § 72: μετὰ δὲ τὸν μαιάνδρον πλέγμα τι σχοινοειδὲς περιῆκτο, ῥόμβω τὴν κατὰ μέσον ὄψιν ἐμφορῆς ("Next to the meander was carried round a network of rope-design, with a central panel shaped like a rhombus"). The same 'method of rewriting' appears in *Eph* 5.5 where several nouns from *Col* 3.5 (Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος, ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἣτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία) are changed into adjectives: πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης, ὃ ἐστὶν εἰδωλολάτρης, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.

Conclusion

Although Josephus changed the *Letter of Aristeas* "in order to make his own particular points" (Lincoln, p. LV) such changes happen only occasionally and are only marginal; the differences between source and reworking are nonessential. The main motives for changing and adapting the source material are firstly the insertion of the *Letter of Aristeas* into the *Jewish Antiquities* which entails the conversion of the 'letter genre' into historiography as well as the implementation of unity of composition and style. Secondly, Josephus' use of the *Letter of Aristeas* serves his own particular points, namely showing the favourable attitude of an earlier sovereign towards the Jews and delivering an apology of Judaism; these point are, however, not exclusively characteristic for Josephus in contrast to the *Letter of Aristeas* since they are the focus of the author of the *Letter of Aristeas* as well. Josephus' points are actually in line with the *Letter of Aristeas* and the main reason to make use of this document lies in the fact that Josephus regards the

episode narrated in the *Letter of Aristeas* as a precedent which justifies his transfer of Jewish learning to the Greek-speaking world as well as an appeal to this world to imitate Ptolemy's readiness to accept the Jewish wisdom; therefore explicit reference to the *Letter of Aristeas* could be made. The possibly Pharisaic orthodox 'correction' of some passages by omitting them and the adaptation of the *Letter of Aristeas* to the contemporary situation involve only minor changes. Besides that the 'Attic correction' is characteristic for Josephus' reworking as are some random changes. Therefore Josephus' reworking did not change the contents of his source significantly; except for some omissions - which seem to be his most characteristic method of reworking together with the 'Attic correction' of vocabulary, grammar and style - the texts of the *Letter of Aristeas* and the section in the *Jewish Antiquities* concerning run totally parallel.

CHAPTER II : THE PHENOMENON OF CONFLATION IN *EPH'S* REWORKING OF *COL*

In the previous paragraphs it became clear that Josephus changed his source due to a variety of reasons, omissions to convert the source material into the historiographical style of the *Jewish Antiquities* and the 'Attic correction' being the most important. Having criticised Lincoln's statement that "Josephus has omitted, conflated, and embellished material from his source in order to make his own particular points" (Lincoln, p. LV) since Josephus had scarcely "own points" to pursue which are dissimilar from the *Letter of Aristeeas* whose contents were regarded as a justification of his own project, it seems also necessary to assess Lincoln's mention of *conflation* as one of Josephus' methods to rework his source. The fact is that the *Jew. Ant.* is absolutely parallel to its source with the exception of some omissions and small additions. Although Josephus reworked his source it is a matter of fact that every parallel is found in the synoptic overview immediately in the other column, this parallel usually being as large as the original text although rephrased. The sequences of both texts is, as Pelletier's synoptic overview clearly shows (Pelletier, pp. 307-327), totally identical. There are neither summarisations of the omitted material (*Letter of Arist.*, §§ 83-171, 188-199, 203-292, 295-300 being the major omissions), nor are there confluations by means of which two or more different fragments from the *Letter of Arist.* are conflated into one single passage in Josephus' *Jew. Ant.* In contrast, conflation is a very important characteristic of the reworking of *Col* by the author of *Eph.*

In order to detect all cases of conflation in *Eph* it is necessary to design a new synoptic overview of the texts of *Col* and *Eph* which is therefore edited in Chapter IV, pp. 80-109. The two previous synoptic editions of the Greek text by E.J. GOODSPEED (*The Meaning of Ephesians*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1933; Part II, pp. 77-165) and by C.L. MITTON (*The Epistle to the Ephesians. Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose*, Oxford: OUP, 1951; Appendix I, pp. 279-315) are unsatisfactory and for the detection and the examination of confluations totally unsuitable. For a short introduction to my synopsis I might refer to Chapter IV. Due to the system I use which explains by single (<...>) and multiple brackets (<<...>>), <<<...>>> etc.) in the text of *Eph* itself where the text is probably dependent on *Col*, and which shows the measure of dependence by underlining both the 'Ephesian' head-text and the 'Colossian' parallels in the accompanying footnotes, it becomes perfectly possible to notice any conflation since confluations occur apparently there where units of brackets 'intermingle' (e.g. <<... <...> ...>>). Sometimes even a unit of single brackets (<...>) can reflect conflation; in that case the various 'Colossian' verses which cause the conflation are mentioned in the footnote concerning.

Conflations offer an excellent opportunity to unravel the methods with which the author of *Eph* wrote his letter and give deep insight into the development of the 'Ephesian' text in a way in which similarities between *Col* and *Eph* outside conflations do not. There is for instance a clear parallel between *Eph* 1.4 and *Col* 1.22 since both texts read the words ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.

Cf. *Eph* 1.4 καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ,

with *Col* 1.22 νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου, παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.

Since the phrase ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ does not occur in *Eph* 1.4 in the midst of a conflation because the single brackets are not surrounded in the synopsis by other, multiple brackets, it is more difficult to figure out why the attention of the author of *Eph* was drawn here to the phrase ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ in *Col* 1.22 than had it been part of a conflation. A 'conflational' context could have answered this question as it does in the case of the phrase διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ in *Eph* 1.7 which is derived from *Col* 1.20 and inserted in the sentence ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν <διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ>, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων which is in turn dependent on *Col* 1.13-14. In this case a reason can be given why *Col* 1.13-14 and 1.20 have been conflated, as will be explained under point one below.

I have been able to detect twenty-three instances of conflation which will be mentioned and analysed in the order in which they occur in *Eph* in order to give the fullest possible understanding of the growth of the 'Ephesian' text and of the methods of rewriting the prior document *Col* which are involved. The scholarly literature to be dealt with has been suggested by H. MERKEL's recent overview of the literary critical approach in the modern exegetical discussion on *Eph*.²² From the scholars mentioned there I leave those out who consider *Eph* to be either originally an authentic Pauline letter but later reworked and supplemented with interpolations (M. GOGUEL, "Esquisse d'une Solution nouvelle du Problème de l'Épître aux Éphésiens" in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 111, 1935, pp. 254-284 and *ibidem* 112, 1935, pp. 73-99) or an authentic Pauline letter even without later reworking and without literary dependence on *Col* (E. PERCY, *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*, Lund 1946 and A. VAN ROON, *The Authenticity of Ephesians*, Leiden 1974); the authors who are in favour of the dependence of *Eph* on *Col*, however, are E.J. GOODSPEED (various writings amongst which *The Meaning of Ephesians*, Chicago 1933 but lacking literary critical detail), W. OCHEL (*Die*

²² See H. Merkel, "Der Epheserbrief in der neueren exegetischen Diskussion" in W. Haase and H. Temporini (edd.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt (ANRW)*, Teil II, Band 25, Berlin/New York 1987, pp. 3156-3246, esp. pp. 3212-3220: "Weiterführung literarkritischer Arbeit".

Annahme einer Bearbeitung des Kolosser-Briefes im Epheser-Brief, in einer Analyse des Epheser-Briefes untersucht, Inaugural-Dissertation Marburg, Marburg 1934), C.L. MITTON (*The Epistle to the Ephesians. Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose*, Oxford 1951, originally PhD-thesis London) and P. BENOIT ("Rapports littéraires entre les Épîtres aux Colossiens et aux Éphésiens" in J. Blinzler, O. Kuss and F. Mußner, ed., *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*, FS J. Schmid, Regensburg 1963, pp. 11-22).

MITTON's study contains except for his synopsis surprisingly only some actual literary critical examination of the relation between *Col* and *Eph* (see Mitton, Chapter VI, pp. 55-67: "The Interdependence of Ephesians and Colossians") and mentions only seven cases of conflation while briefly commenting upon three of them (Mitton, pp. 65-66). The article by BENOIT presents a more or less extensive analysis of three 'Ephesian' passages in view of their relation to *Col*, namely the passages *Eph* 2.1-6, 2.11-12 and 4.17-24. The only comprehensive study is OCHEL's dissertation which deals with the dependence of the whole document of *Eph* on *Col*; a critical assessment of his analysis has, however, not yet been made.

It is clear therefore, that a new examination of the dependence of *Eph* on *Col* is a desideratum. The examination made in the following pages will focus on the conflations which could be derived from my synoptic overview since in comparison with 'normal parallels, conflations are more revealing as regards the nature of the reworking of *Col* by the author of *Eph*. During my analysis of these conflations I will wherever possible engage in discussion with MITTON, BENOIT and OCHEL, and will also refer extensively to LINCOLN's commentary since firstly this is the most recent commentary on *Eph* and secondly his depiction of the relationship between *Eph* and *Col* is the starting point of my thesis.²³ To distinguish more easily these discussions from my continual analysis of the conflations the discussion will be printed in a different text font.

(1) The sentence τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων (*Eph* 1.6-7) is compounded from

(a) τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (*Col* 1.13-14), a direct parallel in the opposite column; the noun υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ (*Col*) is replaced by the perfect passive participle ἠγαπημένος: 'the one loved by God' instead of the 'son of God's love'. The clause ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (*Col*), which qualified the υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, is literally copied. A minor change, however, is that the phrase ἄφεσις τῶν

²³ LINCOLN himself does not comment on BENOIT's article (which is only mentioned in the bibliographies at pp. XXX, XLVII and 83) and scarcely on OCHEL's study either; he only refers several times to Ochel's introduction and summary but not to his actual analysis at pp. 15-71; according to Lincoln Ochel's study is "an attempt for a thorough, though not always persuasive, analysis of Ephesians' editing of individual passages from Colossians" (Lincoln, p. LVI). That means that Lincoln does not deal explicitly with two important publications on the matter.

ἁμαρτιῶν is changed into ἄφεσις τῶν παραπτωμάτων, replacing the term ἁμαρτία with its synonym παράπτωμα;

(b) subsequently the author of *Eph* relies on *Col* 1.20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ. The 'pivotal point' between the two passages which links them together seems to be the 'redemption language', ἀπολύτρωσις and ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, found in *Col* 1.14, which language can also be found in *Col* 1.20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπο-καταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ.

Mitton, pp. 65-66, mentions only seven cases of conflation in total and comments on three of them. See for his commentary on *Eph* 1.6-7 Mitton, page 65 (point a): "In *Eph*. i.7 it is *Col*. i.14 which is being followed, but the word ἀπολύτρωσιν has enough similarity in meaning to εἰρηνοποιήσας in *Col*. i.20 to call to the writer's mind the phrase that follows it, and so διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ is introduced". To me, however, it is not the similarity in meaning between the words ἀπολύτρωσις and εἰρηνοποιήσας but more precisely the similarity between ἀπολύτρωσις and ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν on the one hand (*Col* 1.14) and other terms in *Col* 1.20 (namely ἀποκαταλλάσσειν, αἷμα and σταυρός) on the other hand, which terms belong more clearly than εἰρηνοποιήσας to the language of redemption.

Cf. also Ochel, pp. 20-22. According to Ochel both these derivations from *Col* 1.13-14 and *Col* 1.20, which deal with *redemption*, function now in *Eph* 1.6^b-8 as a clarification of God's *grace* which forms the main topic and the framework of the passage *Eph* 1.6b-8 since the term χάρις occurs twice in this passage and is in both cases elaborated by relative clauses:

τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων, κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει.

The sentence in which Ochel accounts for the use the author of *Eph* made of *Col* 1.20 (διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ) is, however, needlessly vague and stresses too much the alleged subordination of redemption to grace: "Der Unterordnung der für Kol in sich wertvollen Erwähnung unserer Erlösung unter den Eph-Gedanken von der großen göttlichen Gnade ist auch der Zusatz διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ in *Eph* 1,7 entsprungen" (Ochel, p. 21). The simplest explanation for the use of the phrase διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, however, seems to me the similarity in 'redemption language'.

Lincoln, pp. LII and 27-28, does not comment on the reason for the conflation of *Col* 1:13-14 and 1:20 as such: "1:6,7 incorporates *Col* 1:13,14, ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν ... τὴν ἄφεσιν, but (...) adds 'through his blood' in an apparent conflation with *Col* 1:20" (p. LII); cf. also p. 27: "To the notion of redemption is added the phrase 'through his blood'. This is not found in *Col* 1:14, although 'through the blood of his cross' does occur in *Col* 1:20".

(2) The sentence ^{1.15} Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ γὰρ, ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, ^{1.16} οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μνεῖαν ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, ^{1.17} ἵνα ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (...) δώῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ (*Eph* 1.15-17) is compounded from

(a) Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν, οὐ παύομεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ (*Col* 1.9), a direct parallel in the opposite column. The sentence structure Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς (...) οὐ παύομεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι ἵνα ... (*Col*) is copied and adapted by the author of *Eph*. The changes consist firstly in the change of the plural ἡμεῖς into the singular: Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν, οὐ παύομεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι (*Col*) is converted into Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ γὰρ, ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μνεῖαν ποιούμενος (*Eph*). Secondly, the phrase ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι ἵνα (*Col*) is changed into μνεῖαν ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, ἵνα (*Eph*): the verb προσεύχεσθαι is now 'spelled out' as μνεῖαν ποιεῖσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν; the words ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν which in *Col* belonged to the participle προσευχόμενοι (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι) are now in *Eph* constructed with the newly introduced participle εὐχαριστῶν (εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν).²⁴ Subsequently the sentence depending on the conjunction ἵνα is differently phrased since ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ (*Col*) is changed into ἵνα ὁ θεὸς (...) δώῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ (*Eph*)

²⁴ This participle is probably derived from *Col* 1.12 which belongs structurally to the preceding verses *Col* 1.9-11: Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς (...) οὐ παύομεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι (ἵνα πληρωθῆτε ... εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν), μετὰ χαρᾶς εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἰκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί and has now been changed in *Eph* 1.15-16 into Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ γὰρ (...) οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μνεῖαν ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου.

Pace Ochel, pp. 33-34, who thinks that the verb εὐχαριστεῖν has been derived from the verse *Col* 1.3 Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι, which the author of *Eph* applied, according to Ochel, when he made use in *Eph* 1.15-16 of the phrase ἀκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν etc. (*Col* 1.4) which immediately follows after the verb εὐχαριστεῖν (*Col* 1.3).

but the terms σοφία, which is quite rare in *Eph* (*Eph* 1.8, 1.17 and 3.10), and ἐπίγνωσις (which occurs in *Eph* only in *Eph* 1.17 and 4.13) reappear here.

(b) Lastly, the clause ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν in *Col* 1.9 (Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν, οὐ παυόμεθα etc.) is replaced by another since the author draws upon the clause ἀκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους in *Col* 1.4-5 Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι, <ἀκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους> διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. This clause is adopted with minor changes: firstly τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν (*Col*) becomes τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν; secondly the name Χριστός Ἰησοῦς (πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) is changed into ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς (πίστις ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ) and finally the phrase τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους (*Col*) is shortened to τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους. So *Col* 1.9 provides the framework in which *Col* 1.4-5 is inserted. The pivotal point seems to be the term ἀκούσας which both components have in common.

Lincoln does not comment on the conflation of *Col* 1.9 and 1.4-5 as such but only states that "(the) writer here [at the beginning of the thanksgiving period in *Eph* 1.15-17] combines wording from two parts of the parallel section in Colossians: 1:4 and 1:9" (Lincoln, p. LI), nor does he explicitly notice that *Col* 1.9 constitutes the framework in which *Col* 1.4-5 is inserted: "The introductory link with the *berakah* in 1:15 takes up the wording of Col 1:9; and the way the cause of thanksgiving is expressed is very close indeed to Col 1:4. The intercession introduced by the final clause with ἵνα in 1:17 takes up elements of the intercession in Col 1:9, also introduced by ἵνα" (Lincoln, p. 49).

Cf. Mitton, p. 65 (point b): "It seems likely that the word ἀκούω in Col. i.9 made a mental link, in the mind of the writer of Ephesians, with ἀκούσαντες in Col. i.4, and led to the incorporation of the phrases that follow it."

Cf. also Ochel, pp. 32-33, according to whom "die Worte aus Kol 1,9: ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν (...) eine Rückbeziehung auf die (...) Notiz von [Kol 1,4]: ἀκούσαντες κτλ sind. Der Vf [the author of *Eph*] mußte daher jetzt, wo er den Gedanken des ἀκούειν erstmalig vorbrachte, die Voraussetzungen seiner Vorlage Kol 1,9 in Kol 1,4 an dieser Stellen nachholen."

I disagree, however, with Ochel's overall interpretation of *Eph* 1.15-19^a (Ochel, pp. 32-37). The passage *Eph* 1.15-19^a can be divided between the introduction to the intercessory prayer (*Eph* 1.15-16 Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ γὰρ, ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μνεῖαν ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου) and the intercessory prayer itself (*Eph* 1.17-19^a ἵνα ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης, δώῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα

σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ, πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας [ὑμῶν] εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, καὶ τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ). According to Ochel the intercessory prayer in *Eph* 1.17-19^a does not contain parallels with *Col* (in contrast with the introduction to this prayer which is constituted by *Col* 1.9 and 1.3-4): "Für 1,15 f. ist somit eine gewollte literarische Anlehnung sowohl an Kol 1,9 (...) als auch an Kol 1,3 f. festzustellen (...). (...) Dagegen sind die eigentlichen Fürbitten (...) derart frei von gegenseitigen Berührungen, daß man die Eph-Fürbitte als eine selbständige Konzeption des Vf v Eph hinzunehmen hat" (Ochel, p. 36). Ochel regards the terms σοφία and ἐπίγνωσις in *Eph* 1.17 (ἵνα ὁ θεὸς [...] δώῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ) not even as reminiscences of the same terms in *Col* 1.9 (ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ), especially since other references to *Col* are absent in the intercessory prayer of *Eph* 1.17-19^a: "Jedoch sind (...) auch die Gemeinsamkeiten mit der koloss. Fürbitte selbst für Reminiszenzen zu geringfügig. (...) Gemeinsam haben beide Fürbitten nur die Begriffe ἐπίγνωσις und σοφία. Da diesen beiden der Eph- und Kol-Fürbitte gemeinsamen Begriffen in Eph andere Rollen zugewiesen sind als in Kol, so ist von einer Abhängigkeit nicht zu sprechen (...), zumal auch Berührungen mit anderen Kol-Stellen fehlen" (Ochel, pp. 36-37). But to me the intercessory prayer in *Eph* 1.17-19^a is not 'eine selbständige Konzeption' lacking any dependence on *Col*.

Firstly, it is very likely that the terms σοφία and ἐπίγνωσις in *Eph* 1.17 have been derived from *Col* 1.9 since *Col* 1.9 occurs in the directly parallel text and has beyond any doubt provided the framework for *Eph* 1.15-17. It is arbitrary to admit that the structure Διὰ τοῦτο κἀγὼ (...) οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μνεῖαν ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, ἵνα (*Eph* 1.15-17) is derived from Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς (...) οὐ παύομεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι ἵνα (*Col* 1.9), but to assume at the same time that the terms σοφία and ἐπίγνωσις which occur both in the ἵνα-sentence in *Eph* 1.17 are not copied from the ἵνα-sentence in *Col* 1.9. Cf. Lincoln, p. 49: "The intercession introduced by the final clause with ἵνα in 1:17 takes up elements of the intercession in Col 1:9, also introduced by ἵνα"; p. 56: the phrase "πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως is a variation on ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ (...) (*Col* 1:9)"; and p. 57: "This phrase [the phrase ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ] picks up on the language of the intercessory prayer-report in Col 1:9, 'knowledge of his will'".

Secondly, that the prayer *Eph* 1.17-19^a has not been composed independently from *Col* is also clear from the fact, that the fragment εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρο-

νομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις in *Eph* 1.18 is heavily dependent on several passages in *Col*, as will be shown in the next case of conflation.

(3) The sentence εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις (*Eph* 1.18) is primarily compounded from

(a) τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὃ ἐστὶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης (*Col* 1.26-27) on which the 'Ephesian' text is carefully modelled. The text is rewritten from the perspective of people coming to know (*Eph* 1.18 εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς) instead of God making them known (*Col* 1.26-27 τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι); the term ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης (*Col*) is changed into ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ and moved forward from the far end of the sentence²⁵; the neutral τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης is changed into the masculine ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης while the phrase ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν) is altered into ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις (τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις). Although *Col* 1.26-27 is not a directly parallel text in the opposite column, its use might be explained as follows: the fragment εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐλπίς etc. (*Eph*) is part of a sentence which extends over *Eph* 1.15-19:

^{1.15} Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ γὰρ, ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, ^{1.16} οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μνεῖαν ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, ^{1.17} ἵνα ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης, δώῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ, ^{1.18} πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας [ὑμῶν] εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, ^{1.19} καὶ τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ.

As we have seen under point 2 above, *Eph* 1.15-17 is primarily dependent on its direct parallel *Col* 1.9 (see point 2a) but inserts subsequently in that structure parts of *Col* 1.4-5 where the triad πίστις, ἀγάπη εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους and ἐλπίς occurs (see point 2b). The first two terms, πίστις and ἀγάπη, are 'copied' in *Eph* 1.15 while ἐλπίς follows in *Eph* 1.18.

²⁵ Cf. Lincoln, p. 59: "This notion of hope as that which is hoped for accords with the usage of the term in Colossians, where (...) Christ among the Gentiles is viewed as the hope of glory (1:27)"; Lincoln, however, does not notice explicitly that *Eph* 1.18 is dependent on *Col* 1.26-27 since he simultaneously refers to the term ἐλπίς in *Col* 1.5 and 1.23, and only speaks about 'accordance with' instead of 'dependence on'.

(b) Therefore, the second constituent component is *Col* 1.4-5 ἀκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. The triad πίστις, ἀγάπη and ἐλπίς, therefore, is copied from *Col* 1.4-5 and applied in the passage *Eph* 1.15-18.²⁶ Although the triad πίστις, ἀγάπη and ἐλπίς occurs not only in *Col* 1.4-5 but also in *I Thess.* 1.3 and 5.8, *I Cor.* 13.13 and outside the Pauline Corpus in *Hebr.* 10.22-24 as well, it seems nevertheless reasonable to regard the occurrence of this triad in *Eph* 1.15-18 as a derivation from *Col* 1.4-5 given the overall dependence of *Eph* on *Col*. Subsequently the term ἐλπίς - having been derived from *Col* 1.5 and inserted in *Eph* 1.18 - is extended by the use of another passage in *Col* where ἐλπίς occurs (there are in total only three ἐλπίς-passages in *Col* : *Col* 1.5, 1.23 and 1.27), namely the passage *Col* 1.27 γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὃ ἐστὶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης, as has been explained under point a above. It seems thus that the term ἐλπίς, whose use is given by the reliance on the triad πίστις, ἀγάπη and ἐλπίς in *Col* 1.4-5, leads to another dependence, now on *Col* 1.26-27. The genesis of *Eph* 1.18 seems therefore to start with the term ἐλπίς as its 'seed' since the triad πίστις, ἀγάπη and ἐλπίς is derived from *Col* 1.4-5 and now dominates the whole sentence *Eph* 1.15-19. Subsequently the term ἐλπίς is the pivotal point since it leads the author to consult *Col* 1.27 as well. The order of the components a and b which constituted *Eph* 1.18 should, therefore, be interchanged, since component b had in fact priority in its genesis. For that reason I would like to summarise after point c the genesis of the confluences two and three together and will put the various components in the right 'genetic' order.

(c) Besides being compounded by *Col* 1.26-27 and *Col* 1.4-5, the text under consideration seems also to reflect the use of another 'Colossian' verse: the phrase ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις (*Eph* 1.18) seems to point at *Col* 1.12 which is a closely parallel place. By a 'closely parallel place' I mean here that, since it is clear from *Eph* 1.15-17 that the author of *Eph* is primarily drawing upon *Col* 1.9 and takes this verse as a starting point for his rewriting, he has 'reached' *Col* 1.9 and focuses on *Col* 1.9 ff. Due to this focus several bits and pieces from *Col* 1.9ff. are copied in *Eph* 1.15ff. The phrase τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις (*Eph* 1.18) is an example of this 'borrowing' since it reflects εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἰκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ (*Col* 1.12)²⁷, a verse which was probably already used at the start of *Eph* 1.18 πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας [ὑμῶν] εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι κτλ since the verb φωτί-

²⁶ Cf. Lincoln, p. 55: "Faith, hope, and love are found together (...) in (...) Col 1:4,5"; he refers to *Col* 1.4-5 when he comments on the terms πίστις and ἀγάπη in *Eph* 1.15 but does not notice that the third term of the triad appears in *Eph* 1.18 (see Lincoln, pp. 54-55 and 59).

²⁷ Cf. Lincoln, p. 60: "Ephesians uses similar words to those in Col 1:12".

ζειν points to the noun φῶς in *Col* 2.12 εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί.²⁸ Other examples of the use of *Col* 1.9ff. by its 'Ephesian' parallel are e.g. the terms and phrases ἐπίγνωσις (*Col* 1.9-10/*Eph* 1.17), σοφία (*Col* 1.9/*Eph* 1.17), δύναμις (*Col* 1.11/*Eph* 1.19), κατὰ τὸ κράτος (*Col* 1.11/*Eph* 1.19; in *Eph* κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους) and δόξα (*Col* 1.11/*Eph* 1.18).

If we try to give a description of the genesis of the whole passage *Eph* 1.15-19 (the subject of the conflation two and three together) the following picture emerges.

It seems that the author of *Eph* firstly adopts as the structure for his passage *Eph* 1.15ff. the structure of *Col* 1.9 (see conflation no. 2a).

Cf. *Col* 1.9 Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς (...) οὐ πανόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι ἵνα ...

with *Eph* 1.15ff. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐγώ (...) οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μνείαν ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, ἵνα κτλ.

Secondly he inserts in this structure material from *Col* 1.4-5 (see conflation 2b).

Cf. *Col* 1.4-5 ἀκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

with *Eph* 1.15 ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους.

Thirdly the ἵνα-construction is extended in another way: while *Col* speaks about the believers being fulfilled (passive mode) with knowledge and wisdom (*Col* 1.9 ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ) and continues with an infinitive-construction περιπατῆσαι ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν, the author of *Eph* deals with the 'same' σοφία and ἐπίγνωσις but phrases the sentence from the perspective of God as their giver (active mode):

Eph 1.17-18 ἵνα ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης, δῶῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ, and subsequently mentions an extra object, namely πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν (in reliance on *Col* 1.12-13 εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ικανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί· ὃς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους?) and similarly concludes with an infinitive: εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς etc.

Fourthly he mentions and extends the third element of the triad πίστις, ἀγάπη and ἐλπίς (*Col* 1.4-5); having the two first terms already inserted in *Eph* 1.15 the author of *Eph* now completes this reference by mentioning the third element ἐλπίς: εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ (see conflation 3b).

That the mentioning of the terms πίστις (*Eph* 1.15), ἀγάπη (*Eph* 1.15) and ἐλπίς (*Eph* 1.18) should really be understood as a reference to *Col* 1.4-5, is underpinned by the fact that the terms πίστις, ἀγάπη and ἐλπίς occur in the same sequence in both letters :

²⁸ Cf. Lincoln, p. 58 on the phrase πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας: "Is the choice of the image of 'light' for knowledge related to the contrast between light and darkness in the Colossian thanksgiving period (*Col* 1:12,13), with which this Ephesian thanksgiving period has so much in common?"

Cf. *Col* 1.4-5 ἀκούσαντες (1) τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ (2) τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους διὰ (3) τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἣν προηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας

with *Eph* 1.15-18 Διὰ τοῦτο ἀγά, ἀκούσας (1) τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ (2) τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους (...) εἰς τὸ εἶδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστὶν (3) ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ.

Fifthly, the term ἐλπίς is subsequently dwelt upon with the aid of *Col* 1.26-27:

Cf. *Eph* 1.18 εἰς τὸ εἶδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις

with *Col* 1.26-27 τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὃ ἐστὶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης (see conflation 3a). This reliance on *Col* 1.26-27 also influences the style: the 'τί-style' of γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (*Col* 1.27) is implemented thrice in *Eph*: εἶδέναι ὑμᾶς (1) τίς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, (2) τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, καὶ (3) τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας.

Sixthly, within this last borrowing the author of *Eph* draws upon *Col* 1.12 as well (see conflation 3c):

Cf. *Eph* 1.18 τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις with *Col* 1.12 τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἰκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί.

Seventhly, and lastly, it seems if the author of *Eph* makes his text to resemble the 'Colossian' text even more by putting in some common terms and phrases (see conflation 3c). Besides ἐπίγνωσις (*Col* 1.9-10/*Eph* 1.17) and σοφία (*Col* 1.9/*Eph* 1.17) - just mentioned under point three above -, mention can be made of δύναμις and κατὰ τὸ κράτος/κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους, all in *Col* 1.11/*Eph* 1.19. The term δόξα occurs in *Col* 1.11 and *Eph* 1.18 but is actually already explained by the dependence of τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις (*Eph* 1.18) on *Col* 1.26-27 (τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὃ ἐστὶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης; see point five above).

This third example of conflation, which is so closely linked with the second example, makes quite clear what conflation entails and how it has to be accounted for: conflation is a tool to rewrite a text by using to a certain extent the same terms, phrases and structures but rearranging them; different bits and pieces are conflated to a new unity.

(4) The sentence κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανοῖς (*Eph* 1.19-20) is compounded from

(a) ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ (*Col* 1.11)²⁹ in the directly parallel text in the other column, the only place in *Col* where the term κράτος occurs (in *Eph* it occurs outside *Eph* 1.19-20 only once again, namely in *Eph* 6.10 where it takes the same form κράτος τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ: ἐνδυναμοῦσθε ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ; this phrase is likely to be a repetition of the same phrase in *Eph* 1.19-20). The phrase κατὰ τὸ κράτος (*Col*) is slightly changed in *Eph* 1.19-20 into κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους (*Eph*) by adding the term ἐνέργεια and placing it immediately after κατὰ; τὸ κράτος is now put in the genitive case after κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν so that the text reads κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους;

(b) ἀγωνιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει (*Col* 1.29). The rephrasing of κατὰ τὸ κράτος (*Col* 1.11) into κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους (*Eph*) is modelled on the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ in *Col* 1.29. This reliance includes even the relative clause ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν in the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (*Eph*) since it is similar to the relative clause τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν in κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ in *Col*. The combination of the noun ἐνέργεια and the verb ἐνεργεῖν occurs in *Col* only in *Col* 1.29 and in *Eph* exclusively in *Eph* 1.19-20, so it is clear that *Eph* 1.19-20 draws upon *Col* 1.29 here.

Cf. Lincoln, p. 182 where he comments on the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ in *Eph* 3.7: "Both terms [the terms ἐνέργεια and δύναμις] used for God's power are already present in the similar formulation *Col* 1:29 employs for the enabling of the apostolic ministry [ἀγωνιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει]. They occur also earlier in Ephesians in 1:19 (...) in connection with raising Christ from the dead [καὶ τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν]. Although Lincoln refers to the relation between *Eph* 1.19 and *Col* 1.29 he nevertheless nowhere notices the unique combination of ἐνέργεια and ἐνεργεῖν which occurs only in *Col* 1.29 and *Eph* 1.19-20;

and by (c) συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν (*Col* 2.12). It is obvious that the combination of the term ἐνεργεία with the phrase ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν in *Eph* is dependent upon *Col* 2.12³⁰, especially since the combination of the term ἐνέργεια and the verb ἐγείρειν occurs in *Col* only once in *Col* 2.12 and in *Eph* only in *Eph* 1.19-20. This is again a very

²⁹ Cf. Lincoln, pp. 60-61: "the language of the Colossian thanksgiving period appears to lie behind that of Ephesians, this time from the intercessory prayer-report in *Col* 1:11, ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ".

³⁰ Cf. Lincoln, p. 61: "*Col* 2:12 (...) also employs the term ἐνέργεια in connection with God raising Christ from the dead."

good example how an 'Ephesian' text is a conflation of three 'Colossian' fragments and also how conflation works: the author of *Eph* takes as his starting point in *Eph* 1.19-20 the phrase *κατὰ τὸ κράτος* in *Col* 1.11 (see point a above). Having copied this phrase he subsequently blends it with the phrase *κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν* derived from *Col* 1.29. It seems very probable that his attention was attracted by this phrase when he read the text of *Col* from *Col* 1.11 onwards looking for material which would be suitable to modify the copied phrase *κατὰ τὸ κράτος* with. The phrase *κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν* in *Col* 1.29 is the first instance of 'power language' like *δύναμις*, *κράτος* and *ἐνέργεια* after *Col* 1.11 and therefore the author of *Eph* immediately made use of it changing the phrase *κατὰ τὸ κράτος* (*Col* 1.11) into *κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους*. That *Col* 1.29 has been consulted is beyond any doubt since the combination of the noun *ἐνέργεια* and the verb *ἐνεργεῖν* in a following relative clause is unique both in *Col* 1.29 and in *Eph* 1.19-20 (see point b above). Then the term *ἐνέργεια* becomes a 'pivotal term' because the author of *Eph* draws upon *Col* 2.12 (as the unique combination of *ἐνέργεια* and *ἐγείρειν* clearly shows) which is the only other verse in *Col* where the term *ἐνέργεια* occurs. In this way the genesis of the conflation in *Eph* 1.19-20 becomes totally transparent.

(d) The sentence is continued with the clause *καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις* clause which is clearly derived from *Col* 3.1 *Εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος*. The only changes are, firstly, that the verb *καθῆσθαι* is changed into *καθίζειν*, while, secondly, the term *τὰ ἄνω* which describes in *Col* the heavenly location is replaced with the synonym *τὰ ἐπουράνια*. The slightly different wording of *ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ* (*Eph*) instead of *ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ* (*Col*) is possible because God is clearly and continuously the subject of *Eph* 1.17-23 (*ἵνα ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [...] δώῃ ὑμῖν [...] πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς [...] τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις κτλ*), while in the sentence *Col* 3.1 God has to be introduced for the first time. The leap from *Col* 2:12 (see point c) to *Col* 3.1 can easily be accounted for: besides the 'logical' sequence of resurrection from the dead (*Col* 2.12) and heavenly enthronement (*Col* 3.1) there is also an immediate literary cause to continue with *Col* 3.1 since the notion of resurrection occurs in *Col* not only twice in *Col* 2.12 (*ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν*), the text just drawn on, but lastly also in *Col* 3.1 - *Εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος*. For these two reasons the attention of the author of *Eph* was drawn to *Col* 3.1. Interestingly the same leap from *Col* 2.12 to *Col* 3.1 will be made again in *Eph* 2.6 *καὶ συνήγειρεν*

καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ but then in view of the believers instead of Christ (see conflation 7c below).

After conflation eight I will deal with Ochel, pp. 37-47; in these pages Ochel analyses *Eph* 1.19^b-2.10 which he considers to be a separate unit. Since the confluations four to eight 'range' from *Eph* 1.19 to 2.8 my comment on Ochel is postponed until after conflation eight.

(5) The texts under consideration in the confluations five to seven form together the uninterrupted text of *Eph* 1.22-2.5. The sentence καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἣτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (*Eph* 1.22-23) is compounded from

(a) καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος, τῆς ἐκκλησίας (*Col* 1.18) in the directly parallel text in the opposite column where the combination of the terms κεφαλὴ and ἐκκλησία also occurs. In *Col* this combination in once-only (*Col* 1.18) while in *Eph* it occurs except for *Eph* 1.22-23 also in *Eph* 5.23 (ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικὸς ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας); both 'Ephesian' places can be regarded as dependent upon *Col* 1.18;³¹

and (b) ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία (*Col* 1.24). It seems if the author of *Eph* reads further looking for information with the aid of which he can qualify the term ἐκκλησία. He finds this information in *Col* 1.24, the next place where the term ἐκκλησία occurs. The two other occurrences in *Col* are found in *Col* 4.15-16 where the local church community in Laodicea is meant, so the 'church' in general occurs in *Col* only in *Col* 1.18 and 1.24; these two verses are now combined together in *Eph*.³² The phrase τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία (*Col*) is now inverted by the author of *Eph* since the term ἐκκλησία is already part of his sentence and to elaborate on the ἐκκλησία he has to 'invert' the information provided by *Col* 1.24: instead of maintaining the term ἐκκλησία in the relative clause ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία which qualifies the term σῶμα (τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία) - which is impossible - he is forced to invert the structure of the sentence by putting the term σῶμα in the relative clause which now qualifies the ἐκκλησία: τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἣτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (*Eph*).

³¹ Cf. Lincoln, p. LIII: "1.22 takes up the designation of Christ as the head of the Church that occurs in *Col* 1:18."

³² Cf. Lincoln, p. 67: "Here in *Eph* 1:22, following *Col* 1:18, 24 where ἐκκλησία is used in apposition to σῶμα as a designation for the new community in Christ, the reference is to the universal Church"; and p. 70: "it is not surprising that the Church is now described as Christ's body [*Eph* 1.22 ἣτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ], particularly since on the two occasions ἐκκλησία is used of the universal church in *Colossians*, it is also identified as the body of Christ (cf. 1:18,24)."

(6) The sentence καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου (*Eph* 1.22-23) is compounded from

(a) the words τὰ πάντα which occur frequently in *Col* 1.16 (ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς and τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται), 1.17 (καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν) and 1.20 (καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν);

(b) ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτός πρωτεύων (*Col* 1.18), in which the phrase ἐν πᾶσιν can be found (cf. *Col* 3.11 [τὰ] πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός). Although the word πᾶς is very common in *Col* it is nevertheless highly probable that *Eph* draws here on the clause ἐν πᾶσιν in *Col* 1.18 since *Eph* 1.22-23 seems to be dependent on several elements in the passage *Col* 1.16-20;

and (c) ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι (*Col* 1.19); all the terms and phrases τὰ πάντα, ἐν πᾶσιν and τὸ πλήρωμα occur in the directly parallel text in the opposite column in *Col* 1.16-20 but are now conflated in the single phrase τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου (*Eph* 1.23).³³

(7) The passage ^{2.1} Καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν, ^{2.2} ἐν αἷς ποτε περιεπατήσατε κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας· ^{2.3} ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀνεστράφημέν <ποτε> ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν, ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν <διανοιῶν>, καὶ ἡμεθα τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ (...), ^{2.5} καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ - χάριτί ἐστε σεσφασμένοι - ^{2.6} καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (*Eph* 2.1-3 and 2.5-6) is compounded from several 'Colossian' passages.

The first sentence Καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν (*Eph* 2.1) is compounded by

(a) Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους (*Col* 1.21) in the directly opposite column and

(b) καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν (*Col* 2.13). This reworking suggests the following procedure: having reached in his reworking *Col* 1.16-20 (see conflation 6 above) the author of *Eph* takes *Col* 1.21 as his starting point (Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας ...). The direct address καὶ ὑμᾶς at the beginning reminds him of the start καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας in *Col* 2.13 and he decides to conflate the two passages. This

³³ Cf. Lincoln, p. XLVIII: "the hymnic material about the cosmic Christ in *Col* 1:15-20 has some striking parallels with the additional statement in Ephesians' intercessory prayer-report (1:20-23) about the cosmic Christ and his relationship with the Church."

can account for the sudden and otherwise not easily explicable leap in the attention of the author of *Eph* from *Col* 1.16-20 to *Col* 2.13.

The passage *Καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν* (*Eph* 2.1) copied from *Col* 2.13 functions now also as framework for the whole passage *Eph* 2.1-5 since this passage is exactly repeated in *Eph* 2.5: *καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν* (except for the change of the accusative *ὑμᾶς* into *ἡμᾶς*). The remainder of *Eph* 2.5 reads *καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ - χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι -* and can be traced back to *Col* 2.13 as well.³⁴

Cf. *Col* 2.13 *καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν, συνεζωποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ, χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα,*

with *Eph* 2.5 *καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ - χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι -*

The author of *Eph* copies not only the accusative clause *καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν* (leaving out, however, the phrase *καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν* since the term *ἀκροβυστία* is part of an argument in the passage *Col* 2.11-13 about *περιτομή*, *ἀκροβυστία* and *βάπτισμα* in which the author of *Eph* is not interested here³⁵; therefore during the first application of *Col* 2.13 in *Eph* 2.1 he replaces the dative *καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν* by the dative *καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν*, whereas during the second application of *Col* 2.13 in *Eph* 2.5 he leaves the phrase *καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν* even out³⁶, but also the verb

³⁴ Cf. Lincoln, p. 90: "Eph 2:1 (...) and Eph 2:5 (...) are dependent on Col 2:13 (...). This relationship with Colossians accounts best for the difficult *καὶ* (...) in both Eph 2:1 and 2:5. Only in Eph 2:1 does the second person pronoun agree with Col 2:13 [*Eph* 2.5 reads *καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς*] and in all three references the word order is slightly different. Eph 2:5, *συνεζωποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ*, (...) is dependent on Col 2:13, *συνεζωποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ*". To me, however, the *καὶ* at the beginning of *Eph* 2.1 and 2.5 (Lincoln, pp. 90, 92, 101) is better explained by referring primarily to *Col* 1.21 in the directly opposite column (see point a above) since *καὶ* is there even more explicitly at the beginning of the sentence than in *Col* 2.13 while the word order in *Eph* 2.1 *Καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς* is similar to *Col* 1.21 *Καὶ ὑμᾶς (...) ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους* as well.

³⁵ In *Eph* 2.11, however, the author of *Eph* picks up *Col*'s antithesis between *ἀκροβυστία* and *περιτομή*; this shows how careful his method of selection and application is; see conflation 9a and b below.

³⁶ Cf. W. Ochel, p. 44: "Beide Male [i.e., in *Eph* 2.1 and 2.5] herrscht wörtliche Uebereinstimmung mit *Col* 2,13 a, nur daß die im *Eph*-Zusammenhang nicht passende *ἀκροβυστία τῆς σαρκὸς* einmal (2,1) durch *ἀμαρτίαι* ersetzt ist, das andere Mal gestrichen ist, ohne daß ein Ersatzbegriff gesetzt wäre."

Cf. also Benoit, pp. 13-14 on the change of *τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν* (*Col* 2.13) into *τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν* (*Eph* 2.1): "On avait là [*Col* 2.13] *τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν*. Le deuxième élément de cette paire précisait le passé pécheur des Colossiens par leur condition païenne: ils étaient des incirconcés. Allusion tout à fait en place dans ce contexte qui traite de la circoncision et oppose au rite matériel et partiel du judaïsme la <<circoncision du Christ>> qui dépouille de tout le corps de chair (*Col* 2,11). L'épître aux Éphésiens, ayant laissé de côté ce thème polémique de circoncision-baptême, n'avait plus à évoquer le passé <<incirconcés>> de ses lecteurs (...). Elle substitue donc à *τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ* κτλ. une expression plus générale, pratiquement synonyme de la précédente" (p. 14).

συνεζωποίησεν³⁷, which has the accusative clause ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας as its object, while the phrase συνεζωποίησεν (...) σὺν αὐτῷ (*Col*) is specified as συνεζωποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ (*Eph*). This specification was not necessary in *Col* since the whole passage *Col* 2.8-15 is devoted to Christ (κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν· ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ etc.), while the author of *Eph* has to introduce Christ for the first time in the passage *Eph* 2.1-5. The phrase χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα (*Col*) is also transferred to *Eph* 2.5: χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι (*Eph*), which phrase is repeated again in *Eph* 2.8 τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ πίστεως. To summarise, it is clear that *Col* 2.13 has been consulted and forms the framework for the whole passage *Eph* 2.1-5 (see the double underlining above).

(c) The framework of *Eph* 2.1-5 which is constituted by *Col* 2.13, as has just been shown (point b), is subsequently supplemented with the words καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (*Eph* 2.6). This sentence seems to be dependent on *Col* 2.12 and 3.1 where the verb συνεγείρειν occurs (the only places in *Col*) which reappears in *Eph* only here in *Eph* 2.6.

See *Col* 2.12-13 ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας κτλ.

and *Col* 3.1-3 Εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος (...): ἀπεθάνετε γάρ, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυσται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ.

The first text, *Col* 2.12, immediately precedes *Col* 2.13 which, as we have seen under point b, constitutes the framework of *Eph* 2.1-5. The verb συνεγείρειν is therefore almost probably derived from *Col* 2.12 and subsequently expanded with the 'information' of the second text, *Col* 3.1-3,³⁸ which verses are thoroughly rewritten: **firstly**, the verb

Although Benoit is basically right he overlooks nevertheless the fact that the readers' past is actually designated as ἀκροβυστία in *Eph* 2.11 and that the antithesis between περιτομή and ἀκροβυστία found in *Col* 2.11-13 is used there (see Benoit, pp. 18-19 on *Eph* 2.11-12).

Lincoln, p. 93, notices the replacement of καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστία τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν but does not comment on this replacement: "ἀμαρτίαι (...) simply adds a synonym to 'trespasses'"; according to him this is just "another example of the redundancy of style of Ephesians" (p. 93).

³⁷ Cf. Benoit, pp. 11-18 on *Eph* 2.1-6; having given the thematic resemblances between *Eph* 2.1-6 and *Col* 2.13 Benoit mentions the literary similarities: "d'une part la formule καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ..., d'autre part le verbe (...) συνεζωποίησεν" (p. 12).

³⁸ Cf. Benoit, pp. 12-13: "son horizon céleste (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις !) et d'eschatologie réalisée lui fait ajouter à la vivification et à la résurrection avec le Christ une session avec lui dans les cieux (συνεζωποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ ... καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), idée qui peut d'ailleurs être un écho de Col 3.1-4. Par ce réarrangement (...) on obtient la suite bien logique: mort du péché, retour à la vie, résurrection, ascension".

Ochel, pp. 45-46, does not notice this parallel; according to him "ist die Darlegung 2,6 ff., in welcher erörtert ist, daß die ganze Christenheit an dem Geschick Christi und an seiner Endstellung teil hat, frei von Kol-Parallelen" (Ochel, p. 45).

But cf. also Lincoln, pp. 90, 105 and 118-119: "*Eph* 2:6, καὶ συνήγειρεν, (...) recalls *Col* 2:12, καὶ συνηγέρθητε (...); and the notion of being seated with Christ in the heavenly realms in *Eph* 2:6 is a drawing out of the implications of *Col* 3:1,2" (p. 90).

καθήσθαι (*Col* 3.1 ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος) is changed into συνκαθίζειν (*Eph* 2.6 καὶ συνεκάθισεν; cf. the previous change of the same verse *Col* 3.1 into ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις in *Eph* 1.20; see conflation 4d above³⁹); **secondly**, the heavenly location described in *Col* 3.1 by τὰ ἄνω (*Col* 3.1 τὰ ἄνω [...], οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος) is now represented by the term τὰ ἐπουράνια (cf. already *Eph* 1.20 ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις; see conflation 4d above); **and thirdly** the idea that the transference to the heavenly realm occurs ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (*Eph* 2.6 καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) is a modification of *Col* 3.3 where the believers' heavenly existence is hidden σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ in God (*Col* 3.3 καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ).

(d) The lines ἐν αἷς ποτε περιπατήσατε etc. (*Eph* 2.2-3) are compounded from *Col* 3.5-7 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (...) ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν (...), δι' ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας· ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιπατήσατέ ποτε.

In the framework which is constituted by *Col* 2.13 the author of *Eph* draws upon *Col* 3.5-7 since these verses contain 'information' which he can apply to elaborate on the παραπτώματα and ἁμαρτίαι mentioned in *Eph* 2.1.

Cf. Lincoln, pp. 90, 93 and 98: "*Eph* 2:2, ἐν αἷς ποτε περιπατήσατε, (...) takes up the language of *Col* 3:7, ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιπατήσατέ ποτε, (...) and the reference to God's wrath in *Eph* 2:3 recalls that in *Col* 3:6" (p. 90).

Cf. also Mitton, pp. 65-66 (point c): "It seems as though the mention of παραπτώμασιν links up in the mind of the writer with the list of evil things mentioned in *Col*. iii.5, which in that context are associated with the former life of the Colossian Christians and also with the wrath of God. Both these associations are reflected in *Eph*. ii.1-5."

The author of *Eph* establishes the link between the framework Καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν (*Eph* 2.1, derived from *Col* 2.13) on the one hand and the passage *Col* 3.5-7 on the other in the following way. The latter passage contains the fragment ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας· ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιπατήσατέ ποτε⁴⁰. The prepositional clause ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιπατήσατέ

³⁹ Cf. Lincoln, p. 105 on *Eph* 2.6 (καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ): "the predominant influence on the writer's formulation has been the earlier statement of [*Eph*] 1:20 about God raising Christ; he desires to provide a parallel in the case of believers. However, the thought of *Col* 2:12 and 3:1 provides the background."

⁴⁰ Although the words ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας are omitted in a part of the tradition (p⁴⁶, B, D^{vid}, b and sa) and are therefore of doubtful authenticity with regard to the original text, the editors of Nestle-Aland²⁶ regard them nevertheless as probably authentic.

Besides the fact that there is widespread and early testimony supporting the longer reading (κ, A, C, D¹, F, G, H, I, Ψ, M, lat, sy and bo), other compelling arguments brought forward by Benoit (pp. 15-17) in favour of the reading ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας are **firstly**, that without the words ἐπὶ

ποτε is copied and now directly applied to and linked with the terms παραπτώματα και ἀμαρτίαι occurring in Eph 2.19. Therefore the text reads: Καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν αἷς ποτε περιεπατήσατε (Eph 2.1-2). The only minor changes are the change of ἐν οἷς into ἐν αἷς since the relative pronoun now refers to the noun ἀμαρτίαι: καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν αἷς ποτε περιεπατήσατε. Subsequently he adds two κατά-phrases to designate the norm which conducted their behaviour (see BGD, p. 407: κατά, 5):

(1) κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου and

(2) κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας. Although these κατά-phrases do not have a parallel in Col, one particular term in the second κατά-phrase (namely the term υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας) and the following clause which specifies this term show again dependence on Col 3.5-7 insofar as ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀνεστράφημέν ποτε ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν (Eph) reflects firstly the fragment ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατέ ποτε (Col 3.6-7) - the minor changes being the change of the personal pronoun ὑμεῖς into ἡμεῖς πάντες and the replacement of περιεπατήσατέ by its synonym ἀνεστράφημέν (a 'necessary' variation since περιεπατήσατέ was already applied at the beginning of Eph 2.2 ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν αἷς ποτε περιεπατήσατε) - and secondly the term ἐπιθυμία which already occurs in Col 3.5 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (...) ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν (...). The last part of Eph 2.3 (καὶ ἡμεῖς τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ) also shows that the author of Eph draws upon the passage Col 3.5-7 since the thought that the wrath of God (the ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ) is coming over those who are disobedient, amongst whom the believers previously lived (δι' ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας: ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατέ ποτε), is now presented in the form that the believers were by

τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας the phrase δι' ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ in Col 3.6 would be left without an object of the wrath of God: "Normalement la Colère de Dieu <<vient sur>> quelqu'un: comme en 1 Th 2,16; Rom 1,18, on attend ici un complément" (p. 15);

secondly, if the words ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας are omitted both ἐν οἷς and ἐν τούτοις in the continuation of the sentence would refer to the vices mentioned in Col 3.5, which would cause a pleonastic repetition: "on ne voit vraiment pas, dans cette construction, ce que vient ajouter l'incise ὅτε ἐζήτε ἐν τούτοις" (p.15):

See Col 3.5-7 ^{3.5} Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος, ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἣτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία, ^{3.6} δι' ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ [...] ^{3.7} ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατέ ποτε ὅτε ἐζήτε ἐν τούτοις.

Thirdly and most importantly, it is obvious that Col 3.6-7 has been used not only in Eph 2.2-3 (where it is employed since the phrases ἐν αἷς ποτε περιεπατήσατε and ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀνεστράφημέν ποτε in Eph 2.2-3 are derived from Col 3.7 ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατέ ποτε) but also in Eph 5.6 διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Col 3.6 δι' ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ); interestingly, in both derivations from Col 3.6-7 in Eph 2.2-3 and 5.6 the phrase (ἐπὶ) τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας occurs as well (see Eph 2.2 τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας and 5.6 διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας), what means that the words ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας in Col 3.6 are almost probably authentic and copied twice by the author of Eph (Benoit, pp. 16-17).

nature children of wrath (τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς) like the rest (καὶ ἡμεθα τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποί).

The passage *Eph* 2.1 has partly been compounded, as we noticed under point 7a above, from *Col* 1.21. It might be that some other traces of *Col* 1.21 can be detected in the rest of *Eph* 2.1-3 as well, because the terms ποτε and διάνοια occur already in *Col* 1.21 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς (see the single brackets < > in the text above).⁴¹ Although the use of this verse might be dubious, we know that *Col* 1.21 was used at the beginning of *Eph* 2.1 and interestingly the term διάνοια occurs in *Col* only in *Col* 1.21. This enables us to see some traces of *Col* 1.21 in the rest of *Eph* 2.1-3 as well.

(8) The phrase διὰ πίστεως in τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ πίστεως (*Eph* 2.8) can in a certain sense be regarded as a conflation. The phrase διὰ πίστεως occurs only once in *Col*, namely in *Col* 2.12 καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. It is very probable that διὰ πίστεως has been derived from *Col* 2.12 since the whole passage *Col* 2.12-13 is drawn upon in *Eph* 2.1 and 2.5-6:

Cf. *Eph* 2.1 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν

and *Eph* 2.5-6 καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ - χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι - καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

with *Col* 2.12-13 ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν, συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ, χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα. The phrase διὰ πίστεως in *Eph* 2.8 is therefore likely to be dependent on διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ (*Col* 2.12), the more since *Eph* 2.8 deliberately lines up with *Eph* 2.5-6 (by repeating the phrase χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι) which passage is - as explained before - relying on *Col* 2.12-13. See *Eph* 2.5-6 and 2.8

^{2.5} καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ - χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι - ^{2.6} καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (...). ^{2.8} τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ πίστεως.

The immediate indication, however, that διὰ πίστεως was derived from *Col* 2.12 might be that πίστις occurs directly in the opposite column, namely in *Col* 1.23: εἴ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι. That *Eph* 2.8 refers to the parallel column in *Col*

⁴¹ Cf. Benoit, pp. 19-20 while speaking about *Eph* 4.18 ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ ὄντες : "Plus notable est le retour (...) de διάνοια qui semble venir de *Col* 1,21 et avait déjà trouvé un écho dans le διάνοια de *Eph* 2,3" (p. 19). Lincoln, p. 98, does not notice this parallel between *Col* 1.21 and *Eph* 2.3 as regards the word διάνοια.

is very probable, because **firstly** the contradistinction between πίστις and ἔργα as developed in *Eph* 2.8-9 (τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ πίστεως· καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον· οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων) - the only place in *Eph* where this contradistinction occurs - can terminologically also be found in *Col* 1.21-23 (^{1.21} Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς, ^{1.22} νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου, παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, ^{1.23} εἴ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι, the terms πίστις and ἔργα occurring only here together in *Col*); and **secondly** it is clear that the author of *Eph* just consulted this parallel text since he started off in *Eph* 2.1 with a derivation from *Col* 1.21 (see conflation 7a above). Although this analysis deals only with one single word it seems to be very likely that the phrase διὰ πίστεως can in a certain sense be regarded as a conflation of

(a) συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ (*Col* 2.12) and

(b) εἴ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι (*Col* 1.23). The passage διὰ πίστεως is, however, too short to designate it as a proper conflation although the dependence of διὰ πίστεως (*Eph* 2.8) not only on *Col* 2.12-13 but also on *Col* 1.21-23 has been made clear. It is better to say that there has been a double 'impetus' for the inclusion of the term πίστις in *Eph* 2.8 since the author of *Eph* just referred to *Col* 2.12-13 in *Eph* 2.5-6 while he started off the passage *Eph* 2.1-8 with a derivation from the text in the parallel column (*Col* 1.23); both texts include the term πίστις.

According to Ochel, pp. 37-47, the passage *Eph* 1.19^b-2.10 can not only be subdivided into (a) the *introduction* to the intercessory prayer in *Eph* 1.15-16 and (b) the *intercessory prayer* itself in *Eph* 1.17-19^a (as was noticed in my commentary on Ochel after the second conflation), but also into (c) a *digression* added to that intercessory prayer in *Eph* 1.19^b-2.10. Since Ochel's argument is so complex it seems wise firstly to visualise his analysis of the 'Ephesian' text and then to comment upon it.

The scheme for *Eph* 1.19^b-2.10 has been derived, according to Ochel, from *Col* 2.12-13; in its framework the author of *Eph* inserts [1] a relative clause to link two fragments of *Col* 2.12 together, [2] liturgical material but also other 'Colossian' material derived from [3] *Col* 1.18 and [4] *Col* 3.7 :

1.19 εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ

derived from *Col* 2.12 συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ

1.20 ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ

[1] relative clause to link two parts of *Col* 2.12 together

ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν,

derived from *Col* 2.12 διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν

καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ^{1.21} ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντός ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι· ^{1.22} καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ,

[2] liturgical material, to be continued after the insertion from *Col* 1.18

καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ,
^{1.23} ἣτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ,

[3] insertion in liturgical material, derived from *Col* 1.18 καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος, τῆς ἐκκλησίας

τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου.

continuation of liturgical material

2.1 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν,
derived from *Col* 2.13 καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν

2.2 ἐν αἷς ποτε περιπατήσατε κτλ.

[4] *Eph* 2.2-4 is derived from *Col* 3.7

2.5 καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ -
χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι -

derived from *Col* 2.13 καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν, συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ, χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα

2.6 καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις κτλ.

no references to the text of *Col*

2.8 τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ πίστεως

derived from *Col* 2.13 χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα

Two features are characteristic for Ochel's interpretation of the passage *Eph* 1.19^b-2.10; having mentioned them I will illuminate and criticize them separately. Firstly, the scheme which underlies the whole passage *Eph* 1.19^b-2.10 is *Col* 2.12-13. Secondly, the passage *Eph* 1.20^c-1.23 consists of traditional liturgical material which is not derived from *Col*.

(1) According to Ochel (pp. 37-38) the scheme derived from *Col* 2.12-13 is implemented for the first time in *Eph* 1.19^b εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ. Ochel's argument is that the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν belongs together with πιστεύοντας and functions as the qualification of εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας, and that the combination of πίστις and ἐνέργεια also occurs in *Col* 2.12 ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ. The author of *Eph* derives this combination from *Col* 2.12 only changing the noun πίστις into the verb πιστεύειν: εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν (*Eph*). In order to copy also the remainder of *Col* 2.12, namely the notion about Christ's resurrection from the dead (*Col* 2.12 διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν), the author of *Eph* has according to Ochel to introduce the relative clause ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ

Χριστῷ since this clause makes clear that God's energy is working in Christ. This was evident in *Col* 2.8-13 where the reference is continuously to Christ, but this reference is not clear when the author of *Eph* is writing the passage *Eph* 1.17ff. where the attention is focused on God and Christ has to be introduced explicitly with the aid of the relative clause ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ after which the citation from *Col* 2.12 can be continued:

Cf. *Eph* 1.19-20 εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν

with *Col* 2.12 ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

My criticism, however, focuses on four points:

(a) Ochel's theory can not explain why there is a sudden leap forward with *Eph* 1.19 εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν towards *Col* 2.12 although (as we saw in the confections 2 and 3) the primary constituents of *Eph* 1.15-18 are *Col* 1.9 (the framework of *Eph* 1.15-17 Διὰ τοῦτο καγὼ [...] οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μνεῖαν ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, ἵνα κτλ is derived from *Col* 1.9, see conflation 2a and the overview at the end of confl. 3) and *Col* 1.4-5 (the triad πίστις, ἀγάπη and ἐλπίς is derived from *Col* 1.4-5 and especially the term ἐλπίς is further elaborated on, as confections 2b and 3 showed). It is, therefore, first necessary to see if the phrase εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ (*Eph* 1.19) can also be explained by a dependence on *Col* 1.4-5 and 1.9 or their immediate context, which have proven to be most important constituents of *Eph* 1.15-18, instead of considering that the author of *Eph* jumped immediately from *Col* 1.4-5 and 9 to *Col* 2.12-13.

(b) The phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ (*Eph* 1.19) can in my view indeed be accounted for from the immediate context of *Col* 1.4-5 and 1.9 (as was shown in conflation 4), since the phrase κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ is found in *Col* 1.11, a text in the direct sequence of *Col* 1.4-5 and 1.9 the author of *Eph* just focused his attention on. In conflation 4 it was explained how this phrase κατὰ τὸ κράτος (*Col* 1.11) was changed into κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους (...) ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (*Eph* 1.19) with the aid of *Col* 1.29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ which delivered not only the term ἐνέργεια but also the relative clause τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν. The relative clause ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (*Eph* 1.19) is, therefore, not invented by the author of *Eph* in his effort to link two parts of *Col* 2.12 together - as Ochel argued - but has been derived from *Col* 1.29. Ochel's wrong interpretation is due to the fact that he neglected to account for the provenance of the term κράτος in

the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ (*Eph* 1.19) but focused exclusively on the term ἐνέργεια and assumed wrongly that the verb πιστεύειν and the noun ἐνέργεια in the phrase εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους (*Eph* 1.19) belonged together as the terms πίστις and ἐνέργεια in *Col* 2.12 (διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ).

(c) Another argument against Ochel's assumption that the words πιστεύειν and ἐνέργεια in *Eph* 1.19 εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ belong together and have been derived from *Col* 2.12 is that the verb πιστεύειν has already been used in *Eph* 1.13, the sentence just before the one sentence which is formed by *Eph* 1.15-20 in which the participle of πιστεύειν under consideration occurs again (πιστεύειν occurs in *Eph* only in *Eph* 1.13 and 1.19 and nowhere in *Col*): ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσφραγίσθητε τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἀγίῳ (*Eph* 1.13; no parallel in *Col*). There is therefore no compelling reason to consider that the words πιστεύειν and ἐνέργεια belong together since the participle of πιστεύειν in *Eph* 1.19 seems to be a repetition of the similar participle in *Eph* 1.13.

(d) It is true that the author of *Eph* also draws on *Col* 2.12 διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν as the fragment ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν (*Eph* 1.20 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν) shows. This reliance on *Col* 2.12 is, however, not due to the unjustified assumption that the whole passage εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν (*Eph* 1.19-20) is shaped by *Col* 2.12-13 as Ochel thought, but to the fact that - as was explained in conflation 4c - the author of *Eph* elaborated on the term ἐνέργεια as soon as he had changed the phrase κατὰ τὸ κράτος (*Col* 1.11) into κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους (...) ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν with the aid of *Col* 1.29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν. Then, in order to elaborate further on the term ἐνέργεια, he relied lastly on *Col* 2.12 διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν so that the complete 'Ephesian' sentence became κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν (*Eph* 1.19-20).

To conclude, instead of being only dependent on *Col* 2.12, the fragment κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν (*Eph* 1.19-20) is compounded from several 'Colossian' passages, and its genesis and development can be explained by taking the phrase κατὰ τὸ κράτος (*Col* 1.11) as its starting point.

(2) The other part of Ochel's interpretation, which entails that the passage *Eph* 1.20^c-1.23 consists of traditional liturgical material which - with the exception of the insertion of *Col* 1.18 in *Eph* 1.22-23 (καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἣτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ) - is not derived from *Col* (Ochel, pp. 39-42), also needs correction. Firstly, although Ochel does not contest that the sentence καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἣτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (*Eph* 1.22-23) is derived from *Col* 1.18 καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος, τῆς ἐκκλησίας (Ochel, p. 39), conflation 5 above shows more precisely that this 'Ephesian' passage has been compounded not only from *Col* 1.18 but also from *Col* 1.24 (see conflation 5b). Secondly, conflation 6 makes clear that the phrase τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου (*Eph* 1.23) reflects several 'Colossian' verses, as is also shown, lastly, by the synopsis on *Eph* 1.20-23 as well. To assume, therefore, that the passage *Eph* 1.20^c-1.23 contains traditional liturgical material but no derivations from *Col*, can not be justified.

Ochel's observation that the contents of *Eph* 2.1 and 2.5 (and partly also the contents of *Eph* 2.8 as far as the phrase τῇ [...] χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι is concerned) have been formed by *Col* 2.12-13 has been confirmed by conflation 7 above; the constituent application of *Col* 2.12-13 does, however, not embrace the whole passage *Eph* 1.19^b-2.10.

(9) The texts dealt with in the conflation nine to twelve link up with each other and form together the uninterrupted text of *Eph* 2.11-16. At the end of conflation twelve there will be a further concluding assessment of Ochel, pp. 47-50 on the passage *Eph* 2.11-22, based on comments on Ochel, which will have been made before during my analysis of the various conflations.

The sentence Διὸ μνημονεύετε ὅτι ποτὲ ὑμεῖς τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί, οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου (*Eph* 2.11) is compounded from

(a) ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Col* 2.11) from which the terms περιτομή, χειροποίητος (in *Col* negatively phrased as ἀχειροποίητος) and σὰρξ are derived;

and (b) καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκός ὑμῶν (*Col* 2.13); here the term ἀκροβυστία is found which functions in contradistinction to περιτομή.⁴² Interestingly the author of *Eph* now makes use of the

⁴² Cf. Lincoln, p. 135: "Most of the terms the writer uses in his designation of the addressees can be found clustered together in *Col* 2:11,13 (...). We have already seen that the first part of the de-

phrase τῆ ἀκροβυστία τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν (*Col* 2.13) which he so carefully replaced and omitted - as we saw in conflation 7b above - when he **firstly** copied in *Eph* 2.1 the first part of the sentence καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῆ ἀκροβυστία τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν (*Col* 2.13) but *replaced* the last part καὶ τῆ ἀκροβυστία τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν with καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν (*Eph* 2.1) and when he **secondly** copied *Col* 2.13 again in *Eph* 2.5 but this time *leaving* the phrase *out*. Now, however, some verses later, the author of *Eph* is interested in the contradistinction between ἀκροβυστία and περιτομή, derives these terms from *Col* 2.11-13 and inserts them in *Eph* 2.11.

Ochel, pp. 49-50, is not complete enough in his commentary on *Eph* 2.11 when he only mentions the term περιτομή ἀχειροποιητός in *Col* 2.11 as parallel. In fact the author of *Eph* draws also upon *Col* 2.13 since he extracts the contradistinctive terms περιτομή (*Col* 2.11) and ἀκροβυστία (*Col* 2.13) from the passage *Col* 2.11-13, and lets the whole passage *Eph* 2.11 ff. start off from them; then it becomes understandable, that the author of *Eph* applies subsequently in *Eph* 2.12-13 the ποτε (...), νυνὶ δὲ scheme from the same verses *Col* 1.21-22 (see conflation 10a hereafter) in order to elaborate on the readers' gentile past as ἀκροβυστία and to contrast this state with their Christian present. What I will argue after conflation 12 - when I make some critical remarks on Ochel's interpretation of *Eph* 2.11-22 - is that Ochel is not right when he says that *Col* plays only a subordinate role in the formation of *Eph* 2.11-22 (Ochel, pp. 47 and 50); to the contrary, the passage *Eph* 2.11-22 seems to be basically a reworking of *Col* 2.11-15 together with *Col* 1.20-22 as will be shown in the next pages.

(10) The sentence ὅτι ἦτε τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.^{2.13} νυνὶ δὲ ... (*Eph* 2.12-13) is compounded from

(a) Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε [ποτε = τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ] ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς [καὶ ἐχθροὺς = καὶ ξένοι] τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς, νυνὶ δὲ ... (*Col* 1.21-22). The dominating structure of this passage consists in the contrast between the time before and the time after the readers' conversion, expressed by the words ποτε (...), νυνὶ δὲ (...). The author of *Eph* changes these words slightly by replacing the particle ποτε with its synonym τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ: τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ (...).

scription of spiritual death in *Col* 2:13 provided the writer of Ephesians with the formulation with which he began the preceding pericope, 2:1-10. It looks very much as if the second part of that description about 'the uncircumcision of your flesh' has provided him with the initial idea for the beginning of this pericope [*Eph* 2.11-22]."

νυνὶ δὲ (...).⁴³ The pre-Christian time is described in *Col* by the participle ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι and the noun ἐχθροί: Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς (*Col* 1.21). This description of the pre-Christian state reappears in *Eph*: ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. The only changes are that firstly the noun ἐχθροί is replaced by ξένοι, secondly the participle ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι is further qualified by a genitive (ἀπηλλοτριω-μένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ) and thirdly the dative τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς which qualified the noun ἐχθροί (καὶ ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς) is replaced by the genitive τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (καὶ ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας).

Cf. Benoit, p. 18: "Eph 2,11-12 paraît bien s'inspirer de Col 1,21. Non seulement le ποτέ ὑμεῖς rappelle le καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας de Col (...), mais encore le rare ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι est repris"; "son associé de Col ἐχθροί est remplacé au v. 12 par ξένοι (cf. encore le v. 19)". The only difference is that Benoit does not recognize that the ποτε (...), νυνὶ δὲ scheme found in *Col* 1.21-22 is copied in *Eph* 2.12-13 and changed into τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ (...), νυνὶ δὲ; therefore he points at the alleged similarity of *Col* 1.21 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους with *Eph* 2.11 Διὸ μνημονεύετε ὅτι ποτέ ὑμεῖς τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί although to me the real similarity is found in the τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ (...), νυνὶ δὲ-structure of *Eph* 2.12-13.

(b) Subsequently the author of *Eph* enlarges his sentence by two further additions, namely by the phrase χωρὶς Χριστοῦ and by the phrase ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ: ἦτε τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. The contradistinction between κόσμος and Χριστός seems to be derived from *Col* 3.8 κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν or from *Col* 2.20 Εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ δογματίζεσθε (*Col* 2.20). This contradistinction between κόσμος and

⁴³ Ochel, p. 48, notices the similarity as regards the phrase νυνὶ δὲ as well ("Der Vers Eph 2,13, der wie Kol 1,22 das antithetische Jetzt einführen soll, beginnt analog zu Kol mit νυνὶ δὲ") but does not recognize that the whole ποτε (...), νυνὶ δὲ structure from *Col* 1.21-22 has been copied although changed into τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ (...), νυνὶ δὲ. The ποτε (...), νυνὶ δὲ structure occurs further in *Col* also in *Col* 3.6-7 (the only other place in *Col* besides *Col* 1.21-22 where the term ποτέ occurs): ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας· ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιπατήσατέ ποτε, ὅτε ἐζήτε ἐν τούτοις, νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα; this structure seems to have already been copied in *Eph* 2.2-4 ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας· ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀνεστράφημέν ποτε (...)· ὁ δὲ θεὸς πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει κτλ. The ποτε (...), νυνὶ δὲ structure derived from *Col* 1.21-22 is a very suitable way to expand on the pre-Christian past of the ἀκροβυστία mentioned in *Eph* 2.11 and to contrast this past with their present situation.

Cf. Lincoln, p. 130: "Col 1:21-23 has a 'then ... now' schema (...). Ephesians has taken up the schema".

Χριστός (*Col* 2.8 and 2.20) is copied in *Eph* 2.12-13 and does not occur in *Eph* except here and is used to colour the believers' pre-Christian past.

(11) The sentence ^{2.13} νυνὶ δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς οἱ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγενήθητε ἐγγὺς ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. ^{2.14} Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐν (*Eph* 2.13-14) is compounded from

(a) καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ (*Col* 1.20). Here we find the notion of εἰρήνη together with the term αἷμα which occurs only once in *Col*. The attention of the author of *Eph* is easily attracted towards *Col* 1.20 since this verse immediately precedes *Col* 1.21-22 of which he just made elaborate use in *Eph* 2.12-13 (see the previous conflation).

(b) The other component is *Col* 3.15 καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβευέτω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι, where it is stated that the believers are called to Christ's peace in one ecclesiastical body, while the author of *Eph* focuses in *Eph* 2.13-14 on the way in which this one ecclesiastical body has been constituted by two previously separated ethnic parts. The unification into 'oneness' in both texts is due to the εἰρήνη, which seems to be the 'pivotal term' around which the conflation grew and which accounts for the leap from *Col* 1.20 to *Col* 3.15. The verb εἰρηνοποιεῖν occurs in *Col* only in *Col* 1.20 while the term εἰρήνη occurs in *Col* outside *Col* 3.15 only in *Col* 1.2 (χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν), which phrase has already been exactly copied in *Eph* 1.2. The term εἰρήνη is used thrice in the current passage *Eph* 2.14-17; this use is unmistakably dependent on *Col* 3.15, as will be noticed under conflation 12d as well.

(12) The sentence ^{2.14} καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν, ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, ^{2.15} τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας, ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίση ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον ποιῶν εἰρήνην, ^{2.16} καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ (*Eph* 2.14-16) is one conglomerate of different conflations that have joint together. There are two major components.

(a) The first component is ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ: ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτούς ἐν αὐτῷ (*Col* 2.14-15). This component embraces the whole *Eph*-passage running from καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας to ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ; its contents are continuously pervading the 'Ephesian' passage. Firstly, the thought that the document that stood previously with its requirements against the believers (τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον

ἡμῖν; cf. BGD, p. 201: δόγμα) has been cancelled and taken away (*Col* 2.14 ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου) is reproduced by the author of *Eph* in a different wording except for the term δόγμα which reappears literally: καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας (...), τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας (*Eph* 2.14-15). A literal resemblance might also exist between the term μέσον in καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου (*Col*) and the term μεσότοιχον in καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας (*Eph*).⁴⁴ Interestingly the cross also figures not only in *Col* (*Col* 2.14 προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ) but in *Eph* as well (*Eph* 2.16 καὶ ἀποκατάλλαξεν τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ). Lastly, the notion that the triumph over the principalities and powers (*Col*) and over the hostility (*Eph*) took place in *Christ himself* is not only expressed in *Col* (θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ) but has also been copied by the author of *Eph* (ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ).

Ochel, p. 50, notices only two similarities between *Eph* 2.15 and *Col* 2.14, namely firstly the similarity between the terms μέσον and μεσότοιχον, and secondly the similarity as regards the term δόγμα⁴⁵. According to Ochel the verses *Eph* 2.15 and *Col* 2.14 are each so difficult to interpret that "im einzelnen nicht definitiv zu entscheiden ist, wie der Vf v Eph hier bei der Verwertung vorgegangen ist". According to my analysis, however, the whole passage *Eph* 2.14-16 seems to have been constituted by *Col* 2.14-15. Taking into consideration that the author of *Eph* started the passage *Eph* 2.11 ff. off by extracting in *Eph* 2.11 the contradistinctive terms περιτομή and ἀκροβυστία from *Col* 2.11-13, the passage immediately preceding *Col* 2.14-15, it becomes clear that actually the whole passage *Col* 2.11-15 plays a very important role in *Eph* 2.11-16 and is reinterpreted here. Besides that - as will be shown under the next point b - the author of *Eph* also again (or better: still) makes use of *Col* 1.20-22 as he previously did in *Eph* 2.11ff. as the confections 10a and 11a demonstrated.

(b) The second major component is καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκατάλλαξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ (*Col* 1.20) and Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας (...) ἐχθροὺς (...), νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς

⁴⁴ Cf. Ochel, p. 50: "Interessant ist (...) Eph im Vergleich zu Kol 2,14, wenn man annimmt, daß aus dem knappen Ausdruck Kol 2,14 ἐκ τοῦ μέσου ἦρκεν das Bild einer Zwischenwand in Eph 2,14 hervorgerufen ist" (with reference to W. Hönig 1872, p. 82 and H. Schlier, Tübingen 1930, pp. 18 ff.).

⁴⁵ Lincoln, pp. 11 and 142, mentions hesitantly only the second similarity: "The formulation [τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν] may be under the influence of *Col* 2:14, which is the only other instance of the use of the term δόγματα in the Pauline corpus. There it refers not so much to the Torah as to ascetic regulations (...), with which Christ dealt in his death. But in discussing how Christ dealt with the law in his death here in Ephesians, the writer may have transferred this term with its pejorative overtones. Given the overall dependence of Ephesians on Colossians, such a transference is likely to have been the work of the writer himself, rather than the gloss of a later redactor, despite the variant reading in P⁴⁶ which omits ἐν δόγμασιν" (p. 142).

σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου (*Col* 1.21-22). These two passages, the only passages in *Col* where the verb ἀποκαταλλάσσειν occurs, are adapted in *Eph* 2.15-16: ποιῶν εἰρήνην, καὶ ἀποκα-ταλλάξει τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ. Besides the verb ἀποκαταλλάσσειν the other elements which reappear are εἰρηνοποιεῖν (slightly changed into ποιεῖν εἰρήνην), the term σταυρός which is copied only once in *Eph* and seems to be derived not only from *Col* 1.20 (διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ) but - as we noticed under point a above - also from *Col* 2.14 (προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ), the only two places in *Col* where the term σταυρός occurs. Subsequently, also the notion of hostility is copied, since the term ἐχθρός (occurring in *Col* only in *Col* 1.21 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς [...], νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν and not in *Eph*) is reproduced and modified into ἔχθρα (not occurring in *Col* but twice in *Eph* 2.14-16 καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν, ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ [...], ἵνα [...] ἀποκαταλλάξει τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ).⁴⁶ Lastly, the phrase ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ (*Eph* 2.14) is derived from νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου (*Col* 1.22).⁴⁷

This elaborate derivation from *Col* 1.20-22 shows again how important *Col* 1.20-22 is in the whole passage *Eph* 2.12-16 (see for the previous reliance on *Col* 1.20-22 con-
flations 10a and 11a to which 12b can now be added); here in *Eph* 2.14-16 this applica-
tion of *Col* 1.20-22 totally coincides and intermingles with the simulteneous reference to
Col 2.14-15.

Contra Lincoln, pp. 127-130, who argues that *Eph* 2.14-16 is not directly dependent on *Col* 1.21-23 but consists of traditional hymnic material that shares the same background as the hymn of *Col* 1.15-20 and has been reworked by the author of *Eph*. Lincoln provides a reconstruction of the original hymnic material behind *Eph* 2.14-16 and explicitly criticizes the thought that "instead of hymnic material, what lies behind *Eph* 2:14-18 (...) is *Col* 1:21-23, and that there are close verbal similarities between the passages" (p. 130). There are according to him indeed two parallels with *Col* 1.21-23, namely **firstly** the parallel between the phrase ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ in *Eph* 2.14-15 (τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας) and the phrase ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ in *Col* 1.22 (νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου), and **secondly** the parallel between the phrase διὰ τοῦ

⁴⁶ Cf. Benoit, p. 18: "Eph 2,11-12 paraît bien s'inspirer de Col 1,21. Non seulement le ποτὲ ὑμεῖς rappelle le καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτὲ ὄντας de Col (...), mais encore le rare ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι est repris, et si son associé de Col ἐχθροὶ est remplacé au v. 12 par ξένοι (cf. encore le v. 19), il se retrouve néanmoins dans l' ἔχθρα des vv. 14,16".

⁴⁷ Cf. Benoit, p. 19: "La réconciliation de pécheurs avec Dieu dont parlait Col 1,22 est reprise en *Eph* 2,16 (même mot très rare ἀποκαταλλάσσειν et comparer Col ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου avec *Eph* ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι ... διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, plus ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ au v. 14)".

σταυροῦ in *Eph* 2.16 (καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ) and the phrase διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ in *Col* 1.20 (εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ), but these parallel phrases are in Lincoln's opinion glosses inserted by the author of *Eph* in the traditional hymnic material underlying *Eph* 2.14-16 during his redaction of this material.⁴⁸

Subsequently the passage *Eph* 2.14-16, being constituted by derivations from *Col* 2.14-15 (see point a above) and *Col* 1.20-22 (see point b above), is supplemented by further confluences, namely by

(c) the ἵνα-clause ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον (*Eph* 2.15) derived from ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα (*Col* 1.16) and ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν (*Col* 3.9-10).⁴⁹ It can not be mere coincidence that, having just consulted the passage *Col* 1.20-22, the author of *Eph* turns here to a verse in its immediately preceding context (*Col* 1.16), derives from there the notion of ἐν αὐτῷ κτίζειν and then moves on to the only other place in *Col* where the verb κτίζειν is to be found (*Col* 3.9-10);

and (d) the phrase ποιῶν εἰρήνην, καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ (*Eph* 2.15-16) derived from καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβευέτω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι (*Col* 3.15). This instance gives again some insight in the author's method: reworking *Col* 1.20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, εἰρηνοποιήσας etc. in *Eph* 2.15-16 (ποιῶν εἰρήνην, καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους), the author rephrases εἰρηνοποιήσας into ποιῶν εἰρήνην and then apparently peruses the text of *Col* until he finds another instance of εἰρήνη whose occurrence and direct context can be used to expand and colour the passage he is working on. The author finds this instance in *Col* 3.15 καὶ ἡ εἰρή-

⁴⁸ See Lincoln, p. 129: "There are (...) two categories of glosses used. (...) The second category of gloss is that which ensures that in its new application Christ's work is given the context it requires in the history of salvation. To this end, the writer emphasizes that Christ dealt with the law ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ (...), that is, through his physical death. The same stress is achieved by the addition (...) of διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ (...). This final gloss is reminiscent of Colossians' concern to anchor the cosmic hymn behind *Col* 1:15-20 in Christ's saving work in history by adding 'through the blood of his cross' (cf. *Col* 1:20)"; p. 130: "this [the term σὰρξ in *Eph* 2.14] is part of Ephesians' gloss on the traditional material, and this may well have been under the influence of *Col* 1:21-23"; p. 142 on the phrase ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ in *Eph* 2.14: "Ephesians nowhere else speaks of Christ's flesh. The analogy with *Col* 1:22, 'in the body of his flesh', suggests that by this phrase the writer intends a reference to Christ's death"; and lastly p. LXIII: "The cross is only mentioned in [*Eph*] 2:16 as the agency of reconciliation, and then it is in dependence on *Col* 1:20".

For Lincoln's reconstruction of the hymnic material behind *Eph* 2.14-16 see Lincoln, p. 128 with clear indication of three glosses.

⁴⁹ Cf. Lincoln, p. 143 on the clause ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον ποιῶν εἰρήνην in *Eph* 2.15: "This notion is dependent on Paul's Adamic Christology, with its associated ideas of Christ as inclusive representative of the new order and of believers being incorporated into him (cf. [...] *Col* 3:10,11). Already, in Paul, such a concept was employed to argue that divisions of race and religion were a thing of the past (cf. [...] *Col* 3.11)."

νη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβευέτω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι and makes use of the fragment ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι - which occurs only here in *Col* and is only copied in *Eph* 2.16 - by copying and adding it to ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους in order to denote the 'state of being', namely one ecclesiastical body, in which the reconciliation occurs: καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι.

The term εἰρήνη occurs further only in *Col* 1.2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν and *Col* 1.20 is the only instance of εἰρηνοποιεῖν. Obviously the author of *Eph* draws upon the next and last occurrence of the term εἰρήνη in *Col* 3.15 as the rare link between εἰρήνη and ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι indicates.

This conflation shows again that *Eph's* method is really 'concordantial'. Although it is unlikely that he composed a concordance it seems nevertheless clear that conflation of different passages is caused by one 'pivotal term', in this case the term εἰρήνη, by means of which the passage functioning as starting point is expanded. The only way the author could come across another passage which reads his pivotal term, is probably by perusing the whole text. It is very unlikely that such a sophisticated conflation can be accounted for by the author memorising *Col*: minute, skilful and selective (and not imitative in the sense of 'slavish') literary dependence seems to be the case.

The following overview of the genesis and development of the whole passage *Eph* 2.11-16, the text dealt with in the conflations nine to twelve, emerges: the author of *Eph* extracts in *Eph* 2.11 the contradistinctive terms περιτομή and ἀκροβυστία from *Col* 2.11-13, and makes them the starting point for the whole passage *Eph* 2.11ff. (see conflation 9a and b). Subsequently he draws in *Eph* 2.12-13 upon the ποτε (...), νυνὶ δὲ structure in *Col* 1.21-22 (see conflation 10a) in order to elaborate respectively on the past and the present of the ἀκροβυστία just mentioned in *Eph* 2.11; he then derives in *Eph* 2.13-14 the notion of εἰρήνη from *Col* 1.20, the verse which immediately precedes the passage *Col* 1.21-22 he just made use of, and converts this notion of εἰρήνη into a peace between the previously ethnically separated περιτομή and ἀκροβυστία (see conflation 11a). After that the author of *Eph* furthers his dependence on *Col* 2.11-13 he started with in *Eph* 2.11 by copying now in *Eph* 2.14-16 the immediately following verses *Col* 2.14-15 about Christ's victory and applying this victory to his discussion of the relationship between the ἀκροβυστία and the περιτομή (see conflation 12a). At the same time, however, he continues to refer to *Col* 1.20-22 as well (see conflation 12b) and as a result the two 'Colossian' passages (*Col* 2.14-15 and 1.20-22) become intermingled. I disagree therefore with Ochel's thought that the author of *Eph* derived in *Eph* 2.12ff. terms from *Col* 1.20 and 1.21-22 at random: "In *Eph* 2,12 ff. hat nun der Vf ohne jede erkennbare Ordnung bald aus *Kol* 1,20, bald aus *Kol* 1,21-22 Begriffe entlehnt, so daß man keiner *Kol*-Stelle in diesem Zusammenhang einen Vorrang zuweisen könnte" (Ochel, pp. 47-48).

Therefore, according to Ochel, it seems that the passages *Col* 1.20 and 1.21-22 intermingled in the author's memory and do not reflect literary dependence: "Vielmehr scheinen sich die beiden verschiedenen, wenngleich parallelen Kol-Stellen [*Col* 1.20 and 1,21-22] bereits in der Erinnerung des Vf völlig durchkreuzt zu haben, so daß hier von einer Kol-Verwertung rein nach dem Gedächtnis zu sprechen ist" (Ochel, p. 48). My analysis shows, however, that the whole passage *Col* 2.11ff. has been built up gradually and mainly consists in a reinterpretation of *Col* 2.11-15 and *Col* 1.20-22. There is not just a 'recollection' but a deliberate reference to these passages and to other 'Colossian' passages as well. Ochel's conclusion: "Kol spielt (...) für diesen Abschnitt nur eine untergeordnete Rolle" (Ochel, p. 50) has therefore to be declined.

(13) The sentence νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ^{3.5} ὁ ἑτέ-
 ραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς
ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις ἐν πνεύματι, ^{3.6} εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγ-
 κληρονόμα (*Eph* 3.4-6) is compounded from

(a) πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ
 τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέ-
 λησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς
ἔθνεσιν (*Col* 1.26-27); these verses appear directly in the opposite column;

(b) εἰς πᾶν πλοῦτος τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ
μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ (*Col* 2.2), the different elements being rearranged into
 the phrase σύνεσις ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Eph*). The combination of the terms
 σύνεσις and μυστήριον occurs only once in *Col*, and the term σύνεσις itself outside
Col 2.2 only in *Col* 1.9 while it is once only in *Eph*; it is clear therefore that *Eph* draws
 on *Col* 2.2 here;

and (c) λαλῆσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Col* 4.3).

The pivotal term, which links *Col* 1.26-27, *Col* 2.2 and *Col* 4.3 together, is ap-
 parently μυστήριον; interestingly the author of *Eph* seems to make use of all the places
 in *Col* where the term μυστήριον occurs. That he makes use of *Col* 2.2 is obvious since
 the term σύνεσις occurs in *Eph* only in *Eph* 3.4 (νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυσ-
τηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) and its occurrence in combination with μυστήριον is exclusively
 found in *Col* 2.2. That also *Col* 4.3 has been referred to is shown by the fact that the
 phrase τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ occurs in *Col* only in *Col* 4.3 and is only copied in
Eph 3.4. It is clear therefore that again several passages in *Col* have been consulted, this
 time μυστήριον being the pivotal term.

Ochel, pp. 52-53, does not recognize that the components b (*Col* 2.2) and
 c (*Col* 4.3) also contributed to the formulation of *Eph* 3.4-6 but refers exclusively

to *Col* 1.26 as does Lincoln (Lincoln, pp. LIV-LV and 176-179). Lincoln mentions the three passages *Col* 1.26-27, 2.2 and 4.3 together indeed: "In *Col* 1:26,27 the specific content of the mystery is Christ, though it is related to the Gentiles: the mystery among the Gentiles is Christ. In *Eph* 3:3-6, however, the Gentiles are now part of the mystery (...). While the emphasis in *Colossians* is still on the Christological aspect (cf. also 2:2; 4:3), *Eph* 3 has put more emphasis on the Gentile element and developed this in an ecclesiological direction" (p. LIV), but explicitly he mentions only *Col* 1:26-27 as a constituent (pp. LIV-LV and 176-179).

(14) The sentence διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,^{3.7} οὗ ἐγενήθην διάκονος κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ (*Eph* 3.6-7) is compounded from

(a) καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου <οὗ ἠκούσατε>, <τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν>, οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος (*Col* 1.23).⁵⁰ This passage provides clearly the structure for *Eph* 3.6-7. The construction διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου does not occur in *Col*, but the author of *Eph* disconnects τοῦ εὐαγγελίου from the exhortation μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος (ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) and makes it dependent on the preposition διὰ : διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου now denotes the means by which the gentiles have become 'joint heirs', 'joint members of the body' and 'sharers in the promise' (*Eph* 3.6 εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμετοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου). The context, therefore, is totally different but the structure τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὗ ἐγενήθην διάκονος is unmistakably copied from *Col* 1.23. Having copied τοῦ εὐαγγελίου and made it dependent on διὰ, the author of *Eph* leaves out the first two relative clauses οὗ ἠκούσατε and τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν but continues with the next relative clause οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος modifying ἐγενόμην into ἐγενήθην and omitting ἐγὼ Παῦλος; subsequently the author of *Eph* supplements his sentence διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὗ ἐγενήθην διάκονος by adding two κατά-constructions:

(1) κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι and, immediately located after the first κατά-construction, and (2) κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ; both passages are derived from the 'Colossian' model and reveal further confluences.

(b) The first κατά-construction κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι is copied from the passage ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθείσάν μοι (*Col* 1.24-25). The author of *Eph*

⁵⁰ Cf. Lincoln, p. 182: "With the mention of the gospel in the previous verse [*Eph* 3.6] Paul can now be brought back for the fore as the servant of that gospel. This designation is taken up from *Col* 1:23 where Paul is also called a servant of the gospel".

recognises that the same structure occurs twice in the passage *Col* 1.23-25; this structure consists of a noun followed by a relative clause with the relative pronoun in the genitive continued by *ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ (...)* διάκονος :

Cf. *Col* 1.23 τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (...), οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος

with *Col* 1.24-25 τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ. The noun is respectively εὐαγγέλιον and ἐκκλησία and followed by οὗ or ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ (...) διάκονος. The author of *Eph* conflates these two passages: having copied the first clause τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (...), οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος from *Col* 1.23 and changed it into τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὗ ἐγενήθην διάκονος his eye moves to the end of *Col* 1.24 where the same construction is found (ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος) and then he continues the copying with the phrase κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς (*Col* 1.25) which follows immediately after this construction (ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι); this phrase is changed into κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι (*Eph* 3.7). The major change is the replacement of the term οἰκονομία τοῦ θεοῦ by δωρεὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ. The only other change is the omission of the phrase εἰς ὑμᾶς which mentions in *Col* the group for which the divine gift of Paul's apostolic office was meant (κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς).

Actually, this is the second time that the author of *Eph* draws upon the phrase κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς (*Col* 1.25); the different ways in which the same 'Colossian' text is treated in any of its two applications in *Eph* is very revealing for the author's method:

Cf. *Col* 1.25 κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς

with *Eph* 3.2 εἶ γε ἠκούσατε τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς,

and *Eph* 3.7 οὗ ἐγενήθην διάκονος κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι. There seems to be a kind of 'gradual modification' of the 'Colossian' text.

Firstly, the phrase τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ (*Col*) is enlarged by the genitive-construction τῆς χάριτος: τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ (*Eph* 3.2); subsequently the accusative case of the relative clause τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι (*Col*) is changed into the genitive case since this clause is now made dependent on τῆς χάριτος which has just been added: τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι (*Eph* 3.2).⁵¹

Secondly, this version is adapted further in *Eph* 3.7: the noun οἰκονομία (*Col*), which was modified into οἰκονομία τῆς χάριτος (*Eph* 3.2), is now totally omitted in *Eph* 3.7 since οἰκονομία τῆς χάριτος is modified even further into δωρεὰ τῆς χάριτος by maintaining τῆς χάριτος but by replacing οἰκονομία with δωρεὰ. This is a very gradual adaptation and modification: from οἰκονομία τοῦ θεοῦ to οἰκονομία τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ and eventually to δωρεὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ; it shows how skilful the author of *Eph* is in altering his 'Colossian' pattern.⁵²

⁵¹ Cf. Lincoln, pp. 11 and 174: "Eph 3:2, in taking up Col 1:25, adds τῆς χάριτος after τὴν οἰκονομίαν, making the description 'given to me for you' now qualify 'the grace', rather than immediately qualify 'the stewardship'" (p. 11).

⁵² Cf. Lincoln, p. 182: "κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι (...) virtually repeats the language of v 2, which was in turn dependent on Col 1:25, with the simple exception of δωρεὰν in place of οἰκονομίαν."

Ochel, p. 54, does not show full awareness of this gradual modification since he only notices "daß der Ausdruck κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος [*Eph* 3.2] durch ein κατὰ τὴν δωρεάν τῆς χάριτος [*Eph* 3.7] ersetzt ist"; this observation is not totally correct either, insofar *Eph* 3.2 reads the accusative τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος without the preceding preposition κατὰ (*Eph* 3.2 εἶ γε ἠκούσατε τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος κτλ.).

(c) The second κατὰ-construction κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, which links immediately with the first, is copied from the passage κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἔμοι ἐν δυνάμει (*Col* 1.29).⁵³

Cf. *Eph* 3.7 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ

with *Col* 1.29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἔμοι ἐν δυνάμει.

The author of *Eph* obviously draws upon *Col* 1.29 since the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν occurs in *Col* only in *Col* 1.29 and this verse's location is directly in the parallel column and in the 'sequence' of those passages in *Col* which have just been consulted and conflated (namely *Col* 1.23 and 1.24-25). The variations are, that the author of *Eph* takes the noun δύναμις - which occurs in the 'Colossian' text at the end of the sentence κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἔμοι ἐν δυνάμει - and inserts it between τὴν ἐνέργειαν and αὐτοῦ (κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ) while the relative clause τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἔμοι is omitted. This case of conflation shows once more how sophisticated the author of *Eph*'s method is; this method consists rather in compiling than in memorising.

This analysis of *Eph* 3.7 is totally lacking in Ochel, p. 54; he only remarks that in *Eph* 3.7 the author of *Eph* returns to the contents of *Eph* 3.2 in order to establish *Eph* 3.2-7 as a separate paragraph on the legitimacy of Paul's apostolic ministry: "Mit dem Vers 3,7 hat der Vf v Eph die Abrundung des Passus über die Rechtmäßigkeit des 'paulinischen' Amtes geschaffen, indem er in 3,7 in der ihm üblichen Art der Rückleitung den Vers 3,2 nicht allein inhaltlich, sondern zum größten Teil wörtlich wiederaufnahm". This literary repetition consists, according to Ochel, in the slightly changed reappearance of the accusative phrase τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι (*Eph* 3.2) as τὴν δωρεάν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι (*Eph* 3.7). Ochel, however, confines himself to this remark that *Eph* 3.7 repeats *Eph* 3.2 (Ochel, p. 54) and that the phrase τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς in *Eph* 3.2 has been derived from *Col* 1.25 (Ochel, p. 52) but does not give a thorough, separate analysis of *Eph* 3.7 which is - as my analysis shows - in fact more than just a repetition of *Eph* 3.2.

⁵³ Cf. Lincoln, p. 182: "The grace experienced by Paul in his ministry flowed out of the mighty power of God, κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ (...). (...) Both terms used for God's power [the terms ἐνέργεια and δύναμις] are already present in the similar formulation *Col* 1:29 employs for the enabling of the apostolic ministry."

(15) The sentence ^{3.9} καὶ φωτίσαι [πάντας] τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι, ^{3.10} ἵνα γνωρισθῆν ἡ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ (*Eph* 3.9-10) is compounded from

(a) the phrase τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων derived from πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, ^{1.26} τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ (*Col* 1.25-26).⁵⁴ The application of this phrase occurs by two modifications which reveal further connotations:

(b) the past participle ἀποκεκρυμμένον in the phrase τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων (*Col*) is supplemented in *Eph* by the words ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι describing the 'place' where the mystery was hidden for ages, namely in God. Although this place is not denoted in *Col* (since *Col* 1.25-26 reads πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ not indicating where the mystery was hidden) there are two parallels in *Col* for the use of "hidden in".

The first parallel is *Col* 3.3 καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ; in all likelihood this passage has been used since there is even a similarity with the noun following the preposition ἐν : cf. ἐν τῷ θεῷ (*Col*) with ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι (*Eph*).⁵⁵ The second parallel is *Col* 2.2-3 εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ, ἐν ᾧ εἰσιν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι. It seems that this passage has been used equally since besides the phrase ἀπόκρυφοι ἐν it contains the term μυστήριον (which probably functioned as a 'pivotal' term leading the author of *Eph* from *Col* 1.26 τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων to *Col* 2.2 εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ etc.) and - as will be argued under point f - also the term σοφία.

(c) The second modification by copying and applying the phrase τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων is that the noun μυστήριον is now made dependent on οἰκονομία : καὶ φωτίσαι [πάντας] τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων (*Eph* 3.9); the term οἰκονομία is derived from *Col* 1.25, the only verse in *Col* where οἰκονομία occurs : ἡ ἐκκλησία, ^{1.25} ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, ^{1.26} τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων (*Col* 1.24-26).

⁵⁴ Cf. Lincoln, p. 184: "'Hidden for ages' [*Eph* 3.9] (...) takes up the actual wording of *Col* 1:26."

⁵⁵ Cf. Lincoln, p. 185: "The mystery is described not only as hidden for ages, but also as hidden in God [*Eph* 3.9-10]. As in *Col* 3:3, where it could be said of believers that their life is hidden with Christ in God, ἐν τῷ θεῷ has a locative sense."

(d) The fourth component is betrayed by the verb γνωρίζειν : ἵνα γνωρισθῆ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ (*Eph* 3.10).⁵⁶ The term γνωρίζειν occurs thrice in the passage *Eph* 3.3-10 :

(i) κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον (*Eph* 3.3),

(ii) τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃ ἐτέραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις ἐν πνεύματι (*Eph* 3.4-5) and

(iii) ἵνα γνωρισθῆ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ (*Eph* 3.10).

These three occurrences of the verb γνωρίζειν can all together be traced back to *Col* 1.27 νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. The author of *Eph* not only used twice the phrase κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς (*Col* 1.25), as has been shown above under conflation 14b (see esp. the text in smaller point), but also thrice the verb γνωρίζειν, as can be visualised in the following way (the clause κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν κτλ and its usage in *Eph* has single underlining, the verb γνωρίζειν double):

Col 1.24-28

Νῦν χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὃ ἐστὶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς δόξης· ὃν ἡμεῖς καταγγέλλομεν νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ.

Eph 3.1-10

Τούτου χάριν ἐγὼ Παῦλος ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Ἰησοῦ] ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν - εἴ γε ἠκούσατε τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς, [ὅτι] κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον, καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃ ἐτέραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις ἐν πνεύματι, εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμετοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὗ ἐγενήθη διάκονος κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. ἐμοὶ τῷ

⁵⁶ Cf. Lincoln, p. 184: "its use of γνωρίζειν for the positive side of the contrast [*Eph* 3.10] reflects its use in the elaboration on the Colossian schema in *Col* 1:27."

ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων ἁγίων ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη, τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ φωτίσαι [πάντας] τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι, ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ.

The reason that the single use of γνωρίζεῖν in *Col* is elaborated on, is that the author of *Eph* wants to show various intermediate stages in the process of revelation: while the author of *Col* mentions only the saints, without any further distinction, as the object of God's revelation (*Col* 1.26-27 τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ), the author of *Eph* mentions as the receivers of this revelation respectively the apostle himself (*Eph* 3.3 μοι), the wider circle of the apostles and prophets (*Eph* 3.5 τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις) and eventually - after having mentioned the ἔθνη in *Eph* 3.8 (τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ) - the principalities and authorities in the heavenly realms (*Eph* 3.10 ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις). It is obvious that the rationale on which this reworking and extension of the term γνωρίζεῖν (*Col* 1.27) is based, consists in the wish to distinguish several stages of the revelation, every stage comprising more and reaching further; the text under consideration, *Eph* 3.10, depicts the last and broadest stage in this process of revelation: the mystery is made known to the principalities and authorities in the heavenly realms.

The subject of γνωρισθῇ in *Eph* 3.10 (ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ), namely the term σοφία, discloses another 'Colossian' text which has been conflated here as will be explained under the next point.

(e) The subject of ἐγνωρίσθη in *Eph* 3.3 and 3.5 is the μυστήριον :

See *Eph* 3.3 κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον

and *Eph* 3.4-5 ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃ ἑτέρας γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις. This combination of γνωρίζεῖν and μυστήριον is due to the 'Colossian' model which reads τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (*Col* 1.26-27). The subject of γνωρισθῇ in *Eph* 3.10, however, is not μυστήριον but the term σοφία : ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ

τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ. Although the verb γνωρίζειν is combined here with the term σοφία and not with μυστήριον, it seems nevertheless that μυστήριον has been the 'pivotal term' in the formulation of this passage: being interested in a reworking of the term μυστήριον in combination with γνωρίζειν, as *Eph* 3.3 and 3.4-5 showed, the author of *Eph* not only used *Col* 1.26-27 but in his need to elaborate on the term μυστήριον he encountered also *Col* 2.2-3 :

εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ, ἐν ᾧ εἰσιν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι

and regarded this verse as suitable for being applied, especially since μυστήριον is related here to the root γνω-, which constitutes the verb γνωρίζειν, since the noun ἐπίγνωσις occurs in this fragment: εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ. The other fragments in *Col* where ἐπίγνωσις occurs, namely in *Col* 1.9, 1.10 and 3.10, do not contain the term μυστήριον, so it is understandable that the author of *Eph*, working out the fragment γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (*Col* 1.26-27), also draws upon εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ (*Col* 2.2-3). In fact, he uses those two passages in *Col* where γνω- and μυστήριον are found together (*Col* 1.26-27 and 2.2-3). The passage *Col* 2.2-3 is now used as a quarry for the purpose of extracting information which can supplement the description of the term μυστήριον already applied in *Eph* 3.9. The main term extracted from *Col* 2.2-3 is σοφία:

Cf. *Eph* 3.10 ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ

with *Col* 2.2-3 εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ, ἐν ᾧ εἰσιν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι. Besides this, it seems if the adjective πολυποίκιλος (BGD, p. 687: '[very] many-sided'; LS, p. 1441: 'much-variegated', 'manifold') in ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ (*Eph*) is the reproduction of the phrase πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας (*Col*).

(f) Lastly, one other 'constituent influence' can be detected in the phrasing of *Eph* 3.9-10, since it is remarkable that the combination of several words in this text is already preceded in *Col*:

Cf. *Eph* 3.9-10 ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι, ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ

with *Col* 1.16 ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὄρατα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι.

Taking into consideration *Eph*'s very sophisticated method of reworking his pattern, it can hardly be coincidence that the two passages resemble each other so much. The author of *Eph* seems to have been primarily interested in the terms ἀρχαὶ and ἐξ-

ουσίαι when he picked up this passage *Col* 1.16 and not so much in ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα. The reason for this assumption is that the author's interest in ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουσίαι can be accounted for by the general tendency in *Eph* 3.3-10 to broaden the circle of the mystery's recipients gradually, a tendency mentioned above (see point d). It is likely then, that the author of *Eph* when he copied terms of *Col* 1.16 (namely the terms ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουσίαι) also made subsequently use of ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα (*Col* 1.16; the combination of τὰ πάντα and κτίζειν occurs in *Col* only here and reappears in *Eph* exclusively in *Eph* 3.9) and adopted this fragment (by means of the relative clause τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι) for a further description of the God just mentioned in ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ θεῷ (*Eph* 3.9).

The scope of Ochel's comments on *Eph* 3.9-10 (Ochel, pp. 55-56) is very limited; he notices the derivation of the phrase τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων (*Eph* 3.9) from *Col* 1.26 (cf. point a above) but is of the opinion "daß die restlichen Verse aus 3,8 ff. von Kol gänzlich unabhängig sind" (Ochel, p. 56). The only other derivation Ochel can think of is the adaptation of the sentence ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου (*Col* 1.27), whose subject is God, and its change into the sentence φωτίσαι [πάντας] τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου (*Eph* 3.9), whose subject is Paul, so that the purpose of the author of *Eph* was "eine Aussage, die Kol 1,27 von Gott gemacht ist, von seinem ἐγώ, d.i. vom apostel Paulus, zu machen" (Ochel, p. 55). This derivation seems to me, however, too vague to be probable.

(16) The 'Ephesian' texts analysed in the conflations 16 and 17 form together the uninterrupted text of *Eph* 3.16-17; my evaluation of Ochel will be given under conflation 17. The sentence ἵνα δῶ ὑμῖν κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον (*Eph* 3.16) is compounded from

(a) τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (*Col* 1.26-27).⁵⁷ The phrase τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης was already used in *Eph* 1.18 (εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἀγίοις) in another instance of conflation (see conflation 3a above) - although changed there into the male gender -, and is therefore applied in *Eph* 3.16 for the second time. As has just been demonstrated the fragment *Col* 1.26-27 appears to be a very important source for *Eph* 3.3-10. This time the phrase τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης (*Col* 1.27) is used in *Eph* 3.16;

⁵⁷ Cf. Lincoln, pp. 199 and 204: "The phrase τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης (...) in *Col* 1:27 appears in *Eph* 3:16" (p. 199).

(b) ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ (*Col* 1.11).⁵⁸ It seems that the pivotal term between these two passages is δόξα; these two passages are very similar in the sense that the term δόξα occupies an important place in their contents in contrast to the only remaining verse in *Col* where δόξα occurs, namely *Col* 3.4 (ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῆ, ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν, τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ φανερωθήσεσθε ἐν δόξῃ), which verse is made no use of here. The δόξα-fragments from *Col* 1.26-27 and *Col* 1.11, however, are conflated in the following way: after the phrase τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης (*Col* 1.26-27) is quoted in full, it is supplemented by the 'information' concerning δόξα which is provided by *Col* 1.11 :

Cf. *Col* 1.11 ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ

with *Eph* 3.16 κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι.

Firstly, the genitive τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου found in *Col* 1.27 (τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν) is omitted and replaced by the possessive adjective αὐτοῦ read in *Col* 1.11 (τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ). Secondly, the noun κράτος is changed into the verb κραταιωθῆναι, while thirdly the phrase ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει is changed into δυνάμει and belongs now together with the verb κραταιωθῆναι which replaces the verb δύνασθαι. Lastly, the phrase τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης is made dependent on the preposition κατὰ (κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ), so that κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ now qualifies κραταιωθῆναι as the phrase κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ qualified δύνασθαι in *Col* 1.11.

(17) The sentence κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι (*Eph* 3.17) is compounded from

(a) ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι (*Col* 1.19) and ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς (*Col* 2.9);⁵⁹

(b) καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβεύετω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν (*Col* 3.15).

It is obvious that *Col* 3.15 is drawn upon here since the clause ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν with the accompanying notion of Christ being resident therein (either expressed by κατοικῆσαι with Christ as subject, or by βραβεύειν with the εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ figuring as subject) exclusively occur in *Col* 3.15 and *Eph* 3.17. It seems as if the verb βραβεύειν + ἐν (*Col* 3.15) is replaced in the conflation by κατοικῆσαι + ἐν (*Col* 1.19);

⁵⁸ Cf. Lincoln, pp. 204-205: "Here [*Eph* 3.16] there is a direct prayer for their strengthening, reminiscent of that in the thanksgiving period of Colossians (1:11)" (p. 205).

⁵⁹ Cf. Lincoln, pp. 199-200: "the terminology of *Col* 2:9,10 - ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος ... καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι (...) is picked up in two ways, in *Eph* 3:17, κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν (...) and in *Eph* 3:19; ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ"; and p. 206: "Here [*Eph* 3.17] transfers this notion [the notion of 'dwelling in'] to Christ, using κατοικεῖν, which may well have been taken up from the passage in Colossians, 1:29-2:10, on which this section [*Eph* 3:14-21] is most dependent, in particular from 2:9 (cf. 1:19)".

2.9) while the subject ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Col* 3.15) is simplified to ὁ Χριστός. The believers are subsequently described by the two participles ἔρριζωμένοι and τεθεμελιωμένοι, which are derived from the following texts:

(c) ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, ἔρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ (*Col* 2.6-7) and

(d) εἶ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι (*Col* 1.23).⁶⁰ Although these two fragments do not have a common term or phrase, their 'common denominator' is that they are descriptions of the believers and can therefore easily be added to ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν (*Eph*).

(e) It might be that even the phrase ἐν ἀγάπῃ, which is now linked with ἔρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι (ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἔρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι), can be traced back to the 'Colossian' pattern since ἐν ἀγάπῃ occurs only once in *Col*, namely in *Col* 2.2: ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, συμβιβασθέντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ, where it interestingly occurs together with a participle which qualifies the term καρδίαι :

Cf. *Col* 2.2 αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, συμβιβασθέντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ

and *Eph* 3.17 ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἔρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι.⁶¹ Both the participles συμβιβασθέντες and ἔρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι are constructed with the phrase ἐν ἀγάπῃ and qualify the καρδίαι of the believers. But on the other hand, it can not be excluded that the phrase ἐν ἀγάπῃ is an expression which the author of *Eph* employs six times in total (*Eph* 1.4, 3.18, 4.2, 4.15, 4.16 and 5.2) though it occurs only once in *Col* (*Col* 2.2). The similar structure in *Col* 2.2 and *Eph* 3.17 (ἐν ἀγάπῃ + participle as qualification of the term καρδίαι), however, make it more likely that the author of *Eph* deliberately refers to his 'Colossian' text here.

(f) Lastly, the phrase διὰ τῆς πίστεως might be derived from *Col* 2.12 ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. Although this phrase occurs in *Col* only once (*Col* 2.12) it is impossible to find any further evidence that *Col* 2.12 has been drawn upon here.

According to Ochel the passage *Eph* 3.14-19 (within whose bounds the confluences 16 and 17 occur since they deal with *Eph* 3.16-17 so that this is the place to deal with Ochel's interpretation of the aforesaid passage) is to a large extent independent of *Col*. There are in this passage "nur einige unwesentliche Kol-Berührungen, die sich stets auf einen Einzelbegriff beschränken und nicht die für eine ausgesprochene Abhängigkeit charakteristischen Spuren aufweisen" (Ochel, p. 56). Actually, according to Ochel, these vague references to *Col* can under closer scrutiny not be designated as reminiscences. The analysis applied to *Eph* 3.16-17 in the confla-

⁶⁰ Cf. Lincoln, pp. LIII, 199 and 207: "The formulation 'rooted and grounded in love' in [*Eph*] 3.17 conflates participles from *Col* 2:7 and *Col* 1:23" (p. LIII).

⁶¹ Cf. Lincoln, p. 199: "From *Col* 2:2, αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν ... ἐν ἀγάπῃ (...) may be reflected in *Eph* 3:17, ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν ἀγάπῃ".

tions 16 and 17 shows, however, that Ochel's view has to be adjusted since there are not only just some isolated terms which could refer to *Col*, but the whole development and growth of *Eph* 3.16-17 took place to a considerable degree by reference to *Col*.

(18) The sentences ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ. Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν, αὐτῷ ἢ δόξα (*Eph* 3.19-20) is compounded from

(a) οὐ παύομεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (*Col* 1.9). The verb αἰτεῖσθαι occurs in *Col* only here in *Col* 1.9 in the context of a prayer (*Col* 1.9-11) where it is related to the phrase ἵνα πληρωθῆτε (a once-only phrase in *Col*). The combination αἰτεῖσθαι + ἵνα πληρωθῆτε occurs also only once in *Eph*, namely in *Eph* 3.19-20 (and as in *Col* not only the combination but even the phrase ἵνα πληρωθῆτε itself is once-only); these verses are part of a prayer as well (*Eph* 3.14-21). Given the unique combination αἰτεῖσθαι + ἵνα πληρωθῆτε in a prayer context, which appears exclusively in *Col* 1.9 and *Eph* 3.19-20, it is reasonable to assume that there is literary dependence.

(b) The author of *Eph*, however, omits the accusative τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ when he copies the phrase αἰτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (*Col* 1.9) and replaces it by εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ : ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ (*Eph* 3.19). This phrase seems to be derived from *Col* 2.9-10 ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι.⁶² Besides the term πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος, which is changed into πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ, also the verb πληροῦν occurs. It might be that πληροῦν is the pivotal term which links two important 'Colossian' πληροῦν-passages (*Col* 1.9 and 2.10) together. These two πληροῦν-passages in *Col* have in common that they describe the believers being filled unlike the other two instances of πληροῦν in *Col* which deal with bringing the preaching of the word of God to completion (*Col* 1.25 πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ; see BGD, p. 671: πληρώω 3) and with completing the ministry someone has received (*Col* 4.17 καὶ εἶπατε Ἀρχίππῳ, Βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν ἣν παρέλαβες ἐν κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς). Remarkably the two 'Colossian' passages about the believers' fulfilment seem to have merged with one another since the combinations πληροῦν + πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ and ἵνα πληρωθῆτε + αἰτούμεθα, found together in *Eph* 3.19-20 (ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ. Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν [...], αὐτῷ ἢ δόξα), seem to be able to be

⁶² Cf. Lincoln, pp. LIII, 199-200 and 214-215: "the terminology of *Col* 2:9,10 - ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος ... καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι (...) is picked up in two ways, in *Eph* 3:17, κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν (...) and in *Eph* 3:19, ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ" (pp. 199-200).

traced back to *Col* 2.9-10 (ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι) and 1.9 (οὐ παύομεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ) respectively.

(c) A third component derived from *Col* is the phrase κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν (*Eph*) which seems to be derived from *Col* 1.29:

Cf. *Col* 1.29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει

with *Eph* 3.20 κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν.⁶³

The major change is the replacement of the term ἐνέργεια by δύναμις which is found at the end of the 'Colossian' phrase : κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει; further ἐν ἐμοὶ has been changed into ἐν ἡμῖν. Any indication why *Col* 1.29 was drawn upon here misses since a 'pivotal term' around which the conflation grew and increased can not be detected. It seems that κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν etc. is just a prepositional group (consisting of the preposition and its object) which was found suitable for several application in *Eph*:

Cf. *Col* 1.29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει

with *Eph* 1.19-20 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐν- ἠργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (see conflation 4 above)

and *Eph* 3.7 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.

The passages *Eph* 1.19-20, 3.7 and 3.20 are probably different variations on this prepositional group found in *Col* 1.29.

My analysis argues against Ochel, p. 56, according to whom parallels with *Col* are absent in *Eph* 3.20-21.

(19) The sentence ^{4.15} ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, ^{4.16} ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβάζομενον διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας <κατ' ἐνέργειαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου μέρους> τὴν αὕξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται <εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ> (*Eph* 4.15-16) is compounded from

(a) the phrase εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα derived from *Col* 1.20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν (cf. *Col* 1.16 τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν ἔκτισται). The author of *Eph* changes the clause ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν (*Col*) into αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα replacing the verb ἀποκαταλλάσσειν with the verb αὕξειν which he derives in turn from *Col* 2.19 (see point c below).

⁶³ Cf. Lincoln, pp. LIII and 199: "Col 1:29, κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει (...) is echoed in the wording of Eph 3:20, κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν" (p. 199).

(b) Subsequently the immediately preceding passage *Col* 1.18 καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή τοῦ σώματος, τῆς ἐκκλησίας is used and changed into the relative clause ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή in order to qualify the preceding αὐτόν: εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστός. The need to add Χριστός is clear: in *Col* 1.16-20 it was obvious that αὐτός in εἰς αὐτόν referred to Christ since the whole passage *Col* 1.14-20 is one hymnic qualification of the υἱός τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ mentioned in *Col* 1.13; the author of *Eph*, however, inserting εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα in a new context has to indicate that the reference is to Christ and has to add therefore the name Χριστός: εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστός.

(c) Then the author of *Eph* continues this sentence by 'information' about the term κεφαλή which he distracts from *Col* 2.19. The term κεφαλή occurs in *Col* only in *Col* 1.18, 2.10 and 2.19. The second place *Col* 2.10 is, however, very short and not 'linked' with other information due to its isolated position in a relative clause which qualifies Christ (*Col* 2.10 καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε κτλ) so that it is perfectly understandable that the author of *Eph* makes use of the third and last place, *Col* 2.19 :

Cf. *Col* 2.19 καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον αὔξει τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ

with *Eph* 4.15-16 εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστός, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας κατ' ἐνέργειαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου μέρους τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται.

This textual comparison shows that the sentence structure (which has been underlined) of both texts is totally similar: the term κεφαλή is followed by the relative conjunction ἐξ οὗ which introduces the relative clause πᾶν τὸ σῶμα (...) αὔξει τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ (*Col*) or πᾶν τὸ σῶμα (...) τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται (*Eph*). The only changes here are that αὔξει has been replaced by ποιεῖται, since the verb αὔξειν was already applied in the previous verse (see point a above), and the replacement of the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ (τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ) by the genitive τοῦ σώματος (τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος).

Another point, already partly discussed under point b above, is that in *Eph* the name Χριστός has been added to κεφαλή (*Eph* 4.15 εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστός) since it was clear in *Col*, due to the context, that the reference was to Christ but now in *Eph* this had to be clarified. There is, however, another reason as well consisting in the fact that the phrasing of *Col* 2.19 τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα (...) αὔξει τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ is grammatically incorrect because the female gender of the term κεφαλή requires ἐξ ἧς (τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ ἧς) instead of ἐξ οὗ (τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ). Although it is understandable that the author of *Col* uses ἐξ οὗ since the whole passage *Col* 1.14-20 is totally concerned

with Christ, the υἱός τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ (*Col* 1.13), so that the author thoughtlessly continued with ἐξ οὗ after τὴν κεφαλὴν (τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ), the author of *Eph* considered it nevertheless appropriate to correct this grammatical error by putting the name Χριστός between κεφαλὴ and ἐξ οὗ, thereby straightening the grammatical structure: εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα (...) τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται.⁶⁴

The description of the term σῶμα in *Col*, which reads διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον (*Col* 2.19) is changed in the following way: the participle ἐπιχορηγούμενον is replaced by συναρμολογούμενον, so ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον (*Col*) becomes συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον (*Eph*). The phrase διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων (*Col*) which expressed how the body is nourished and held together is now changed into διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας (*Eph*) replacing the plural τῶν ἀφῶν (διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν) by the singular πάσης ἀφῆς (διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς), omitting καὶ συνδέσμων (διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων) and adding the genitive τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας - the omitted participle ἐπιχορηγούμενον (*Col* 2.19 διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον) reappearing here as a noun - to διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς: διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας.⁶⁵

(d) A fragment not found in *Col* 2.19 is κατ' ἐνέργειαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου μέρους. The prepositional phrase κατ' ἐνέργειαν is another example of the multiple application of *Col* 1.29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει in *Eph*; the other instances are *Eph* 1.19, 3.7 and 3.20 (see resp. confluations 4b, 14c and 18c above). This phrase is now supplemented by another prepositional phrase ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου μέρους, the whole fragment meaning now "according to the power that corresponds to the measure of each individual part" (BGD, p. 515: μέτρον, 2b). The second prepositional phrase ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου μέρους recalls the identical words in *Eph* 4.7 Ἐνὶ δὲ ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ and establishes an 'inclusio' visualising that *Eph* 4.7-16 is a coherent passage on the (various types of) ministry in the Church. This 'inclusio' is paralleled by another cross-reference at the end of *Eph* 4.16, namely by εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ, which recollects the phrase εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ in *Eph* 4.12. These two fragments, κατ' ἐνέργειαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου μέρους and εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ, reflect the new 'setting' in which various passages from *Col* are conflated.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Cf. Ochel, p. 61: "Daß der Vf v Eph der jüngere Schreiber ist, prägt sich auch in einer Glättung aus. Eph 4,15 liest ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, ἐξ οὗ ..., Kol 2,19 aber οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ ..., so daß in Kol eine constructio ad sensum vorliegt, die der Vf v Eph in seinem Text behoben hat."

Lincoln, pp. LIII and 230, mentions only the 'explanatory' function of the insertion Χριστός (cf. my point b above): "Ephesians has added the explanatory 'Christ' before the relative clause" (p. LIII).

⁶⁵ Cf. for a similar analysis Lincoln, pp. LIII, 230-231, 260-263 and 265; see esp. pp. 230-231.

⁶⁶ Cf. Lincoln, p. 231: "Further elements in Ephesians' redaction of Colossians at this point are its use of ποιεῖν (...) with αὔξησις instead of that noun's cognate verb (...) and its addition of a

In his analysis of *Eph* 4.16 (Ochel, pp. 60-61) Ochel mentions only *Col* 2.19 as a constituent since he does not take simultaneously the directly preceding verse *Eph* 4.15 into consideration as well, which would have enabled him to notice the conflation of parts of *Col* 1.20, 1.18 and 2.19.

(20) The sentence ^{4.20} ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν, ^{4.21} εἶ γε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε, καθὼς ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ,

^{4.22} ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφήν τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης,

^{4.23} ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν,

^{4.24} καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας (*Eph* 4.20-24) is compounded from several conflating parts. The second and following parts of the sentence (ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς etc.) is mainly dependent on *Col* 3.8-10. The first part of the sentence is compounded as follows:

(a) Cf. *Col* 1.5-7 ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς (...), ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ· καθὼς ἐμάθετε ἀπὸ Ἐπαφρᾶ

with *Eph* 4.20-21 ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν, εἶ γε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε, καθὼς ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

It is clear that the positive assertion καθὼς ἐμάθετε (*Col*) has been changed and reversed into ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε; the use of *Col* 1.5-7 is also suggested by the words ἠκούσατε and ἀλήθεια.⁶⁷ Two other 'Colossian' texts seem to be conflated in *Eph* 4.20-21 as well. This conflation is so complex that although it is certain that they have been used their intermingling with *Col* 1.5-7 is nearly jointless. These other texts are

Col 1.23 εἶ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι (...) καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὗ ἠκούσατε, τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν

and *Col* 2.6-7 Ὡς οὖν παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, (...) βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει καθὼς ἐδιδάχθητε.

All these passages, *Col* 1.5-7, 1.23 and 2.6-7, have in common that they deal with the readers getting acquainted with and being introduced to the gospel when they learned

number of prepositional phrases at the end, which round off the discussion by recalling the language and ideas of the preceding material in vv 7-15."

⁶⁷ Cf. Lincoln, p. 280: "μανθάνειν is used for learning the gospel tradition - in *Col* 1:6,7 in connection with ἀκούειν (...) and ἀλήθεια (...), two terms also used here in [*Eph* 4.20-21]; and *ibidem*: "The reference [in *Eph* 4.21] is primarily to the readers' initial reception of this message (cf. [...] *Col* 1:6,23)"; and p. 282: "ἀλήθεια occurred earlier in connection with ἀκούειν in [*Eph*] 1:13 (...) (cf. also *Col* 1:5.6)".

and heard it at the time that it was taught and proclaimed to them and they received it. Interestingly, the theme of the readers' reception of the gospel occurs in *Col* exclusively in these three passages, which now seem to be compiled by the author of *Eph* in one passage. How they are compiled will be set out in the next two paragraphs.

(b) The sentence ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστὸν (*Eph* 4.20) - which, as just has been shown, draws clearly on the phrase καθὼς ἐμάθετε in *Col* 1.5-7 - is continued by the words εἶ γε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε (*Eph* 4.21). This phrasing recalls *Col* 1.23 εἶ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι (...) καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὗ ἠκούσατε, τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν; the verb ἠκούσατε is of course also found in *Col* 1.5-7 ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.⁶⁸

(c) The later part of *Eph* 4.21 εἶ γε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε is dependent on *Col* 2.6-7 Ὡς οὖν παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, (...) βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει καθὼς ἐδιδάχθητε; probably the fragment παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν (*Col* 2.6) has been the model for ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστὸν (*Eph* 4.20).⁶⁹

There seems to be convincing evidence that *Col* 1.5-7, 1.23 and 2.6-7 have been consulted by the author of *Eph* when writing *Eph* 4.20-21; the use of these passages together becomes understandable when one realises that *Eph* 4.20-21 deals with the readers' learning and being taught as regards the gospel and that this theme is only found in *Col* in *Col* 1.5-7, 1.23 and 2.6-7 which are apparently drawn together by the author of *Eph*. This shows again how minute his reworking is which can only point to deliberate and selective literary dependence.

(d) The content of the teaching is now described by the three infinitives ἀποθέσθαι, ἀνανεοῦσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι: καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε, (...),

(i) ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς <κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν> τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον <τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης>.

⁶⁸ Cf. Lincoln, p. 280: "The reference [in *Eph* 4.21] is primarily to the readers' initial reception of this message (cf. [...] *Col* 1:6, 23)".

⁶⁹ Cf. Lincoln, p. 274: "the discussion in [*Eph* 4.20-21] about learning and being taught in the Christian tradition, where the tradition is seen as summed up in Christ and as significant for the Christian 'walk', in fact owes much to the thought of *Col* 2:6-7. 'Received Christ Jesus', where παραλαμβάνειν is the semitechnical term for receiving something delivered by tradition, is the equivalent of 'learned Christ' here in *Eph* 4. This tradition is related to Christian conduct - "as you received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in him" - and the verb ἐδιδάχθητε (...) is employed in [*Col*] 2:7 (cf. *Eph* 4:21)"; and p. 279: "The (...) formulation of the reminder [*Eph* 4.20 ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστὸν] in terms of learning Christ (μανθάνειν with a personal object) is without parallel. Significantly, it is *Col* 2:6,7, where παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν means 'you received the tradition about Christ Jesus', that provides the closest approximation. In both passages Christ stands for the tradition about him and is brought into direct relation with Christian conduct, and in both passages these notions are associated with being taught".

(ii) ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν,

(iii) καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα <ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας> (*Eph* 4.21-24). This passage is derived from

Col 3.8-10^{3.8} νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς <τὰ πάντα, ὀργὴν, θυμὸν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν^{3.9} μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι> τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον <σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ>, ^{3.10} καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον <εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν> κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν.⁷⁰ The contents of these verses are now rewritten in a sentence structure which consists of three infinitives⁷¹:

(i) ἀπόθεσθε is changed into the infinitive ἀποθέσθαι. The objects of ἀπόθεσθε in *Col* 3.8, namely τὰ πάντα, ὀργὴν, θυμὸν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν, are omitted and subsequently replaced by τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον which, however, is derived from *Col* 3.9 although it functioned there as the object of the participle ἀπεκδυσάμενοι (ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον) which does not reappear in *Eph*.⁷² Actually the author of *Eph* leaves out the whole passage <τὰ πάντα, ὀργὴν, θυμὸν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι>⁷³ (see the brackets in the quotation of *Col* 3.8-10 above) and links ἀπόθεσθε immediately to τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον while replacing the phrase <σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ>, which qualifies the 'old person', by <κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν> ('according to your former [i.e., pre-Christian] way of life, BGD, p. 61: ἀναστροφή) and describing the 'old person' by means of the relative clause <τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης>. This relative clause might display other confluences since the term ἐπιθυμία occurs in the directly parallel column in *Col* 3.5 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος, ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν (the only place in *Col*)⁷⁴ while ἀπάτη (an unique term both in *Col* and *Eph*) is read in *Col* 2.8 βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. This verse is the continuation of the passage *Col* 2.6-7 which has just been used in *Eph* 4.20-21;

⁷⁰ Cf. Benoit, p. 19: "Les derniers versets, sur le revêtement de l'homme nouveau <<créé>> dans le Christ (*Eph* 4,22-24; *Col* 3,9-10), reflètent une dépendance littéraire certaine".

⁷¹ Cf. Lincoln, pp. 283-284: "The writer is dependent in *Col* 3:8-10 for his paraenetic material here in [*Eph* 4.22-24] (...), but among the differences from that passage is the syntax. ἀποθέσθαι (...) is the first of the three infinitives of vv 22-24. (...) the infinitives are to be taken as further explanation of the content of the teaching [mentioned in v 21]."

⁷² Cf. Lincoln, p. 273: "In describing the content of the Christian tradition as putting off the old person in [*Eph* 4.22], the writer makes use of this designation from *Col* 3:9, but substitutes ἀποτίθεσθαι from *Col* 3:8 for ἀπεκδύεσθαι in 3:9"; and p. 284: "Ephesians (...) has replaced the ἀπεκδύεσθαι of 3:9 with the ἀποτίθεσθαι of 3.8".

⁷³ Interestingly, the underlined words of this passage while they are left out here will be picked up later in *Eph* 4.31-32; see conflation 21a and c below.

⁷⁴ Cf. Lincoln, p. 273: "Whereas *Col* 3:9 talks in general terms of the practices of the old person, [*Eph* 4.22] gives a more colorful description which draws on the term ἐπιθυμία found in *Col* 3:5."

(ii) the participle ἀνακαινούμενον in the phrase ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον [ἄνθρωπον] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον (*Col* 3.10) is made into the infinitive ἀναγεοῦσθαι, now accompanied by the phrase τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν; except for the change of a participle into an infinitive there is simultaneously an interchange of the terms νέος / καινός and ἀνακαινοῦσθαι / ἀναγεοῦσθαι and : ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον [ἄνθρωπον] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον (*Col* 3.10) becomes ἀναγεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον (*Eph* 4.23-24)⁷⁵;

(iii) the participle ἐνδυσάμενοι in ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον [ἄνθρωπον] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν (*Col* 3.10) is changed into the infinitive ἐνδύσασθαι: καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα, while τὸν νέον [ἄνθρωπον] is altered into τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον. Lastly, the verb κτίζειν in the accusative τὸν νέον [ἄνθρωπον] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον <εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν> <κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν> (*Col* 3.10: 'the new man, who is renewed in knowledge according to the image of his creator'; BGD, p. 455: κτίζω) reappears in *Eph* 4.24 τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν <κατὰ θεὸν> κτισθέντα <ἐν δικαιοσύνη καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας>.⁷⁶ This rewriting is more complex than it seems:

(a) the phrase κατὰ θεὸν (*Eph*) can be regarded as an 'abbreviation' of κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν (*Col*).

Cf. Ochel, p. 61: "Die (...) Abweichung in 4,24 (τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα *Kol* 3,10 τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν) würde (...) ihren Grund darin haben, daß der Vf den in *Kol* schwer zu verstehenden Ausdruck in klarer Form hätte reproduzieren wollen". To me, however, it seems that this alteration is not so much a *clarification* as due to deliberate *variation* on the 'Colossian' text. Ochel's remark is probably grounded on his assumption that *Eph* was meant to replace *Col* totally (see Ochel, pp. 17 and 73: "Die größte Wahrscheinlichkeit genießt m.E. eine Annahme, die Prof. Hans v. Soden [...] vortrug. Er vermutete, daß Eph ein Ersatzbrief für den *Kol* ist und somit auch in fingierter Adresse nach Kolossä gerichtet war" [p. 17]);

(b) the verb κτίζειν which occurred in the phrase κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν (*Col*) now reappears in the relative clause τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα which qualifies the καινὸς ἄνθρωπος. While the phrase κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν (*Col*) modified the renewal of the new man (τὸν νέον [ἄνθρωπον] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν), the phrase κατὰ θεὸν

⁷⁵ Cf. Lincoln, pp. 273-274: "In speaking of being renewed and of the new person in [*Eph* 4.23-24], the writer provides a variation in the use of καινός and νέος and their cognate verbs, reversing that found in *Col* 3:10".

⁷⁶ Cf. Lincoln, pp. 274 and 287: "[*Eph* 4.24] expresses slightly differently the notion of the new person's creation in relation to God, the more cryptic κατὰ θεὸν (...) replacing κατ' εἰκόνα (...) from *Col* 3:10" (p. 274).

(*Eph*), however, is a modification of the creation of the new man (τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα);

(c) the phrase εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν (*Col*), which qualifies the participle ἀνακαινούμενον (τὸν νέον [ἄνθρωπον] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν), seems to be replaced in *Eph* by the comparable phrase ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας by which the participle κτισθέντα is qualified (τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας). This way of rewriting is very subtle and achieved by the change and replacement of 'Colossian' terms, phrases and structures. Due to this method the relation and dependency between words and fragments becomes different when they are rearranged and supplemented in *Eph*. Interestingly it seems regularly possible to detect how the author of *Eph* dealt with his 'Colossian' model and especially here. The several parts which now constitute the 'Ephesian' verses are still recognisable as being derived from *Col* even when they do not reappear in the same way. The easiest explanation for this is deliberate and selective literary dependence.

Ochel's analysis of the passage *Eph* 4.17-24 is not extensive enough when he remarks "daß nicht die kleinen Berührungen mit Kol als Abhängigkeiten ausgedeutet werden dürfen. Lediglich die Mahnung zum Ablegen des alten und Anziehen des neuen Menschen (...) könnte durch Kol 3,9-10 angeregt sein" (Ochel, p. 61).

(21) The sentence ^{4.31} πάσα πικρία καὶ θυμὸς καὶ ὀργὴ καὶ κραυγὴ καὶ βλασφημία ἀρθήτω ἀφ' ὑμῶν σὺν πάσῃ κακίᾳ. ^{4.32} γίνεσθε [δὲ] εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοί, εὐσπλαγχοί, χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν (*Eph* 4.31-32) is compounded from

(a) ^{3.8} νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς <τὰ πάντα, ὀργήν, θυμόν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν ^{3.9} μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι> τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον (*Col* 3.8). Interestingly we just noticed in the case of the conflation in *Eph* 4.20-24 (see conflation 20, d, i above), that the fragment <τὰ πάντα, ὀργήν, θυμόν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι> had been left out in *Eph* 4.22 (see the brackets) and that ἀπόθεσθε was immediately linked with τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον as its object: ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς (...) τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον (*Eph* 4.22). Now, however, the author of *Eph* makes use of the passage he omitted in *Eph* 4.22 since several terms of this passage appear here, namely the terms θυμὸς, ὀργή, βλασφημία and κακία. Although the sentence structure ἀρθήτω ἀφ' ὑμῶν + accusative (lest ... be removed from you) is new and unprecedented in *Col*, the meaning is totally comparable to ἀποτίθεσθαι + accusative in *Col* 3.8.

According to Ochel, however, "ist (...) die Parallele in dem Lasterkatalog 4,31 mit Kol 3,8 wegen der geänderten Reihenfolge und wegen der anderen größeren Abweichungen nicht auf eine Entlehnung aus Kol zurückzuführen" (Ochel, p. 61).

(b) Besides several terms derived from *Col* 3.8 the text also contains the term *πικρία* which might reflect the use of *Col* 3.19 *ἀγαπάτε τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ μὴ πικραίνεσθε πρὸς αὐτάς*.⁷⁷ Interestingly the last part *καὶ μὴ πικραίνεσθε πρὸς αὐτάς* is omitted when the author of *Eph* rewrites *Col* 3.19 in *Eph* 5.25 (*ἀγαπάτε τὰς γυναῖκας, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν* etc.) which omission increases the likelihood that he relied on the verb *πικραίνεσθαι* and changed it into the related noun *πικρία* in *Eph* 4.31, especially since both passages are of a paraenetical nature.

(c) The vices mentioned in *Eph* 4.31, which are mainly derived from *Col* 3.8, are now contrasted in the next verse with a list of virtues which are in turn drawn from *Col* 3.12-13. Cf. *Eph* 4.32 *γίνεσθε [δὲ] εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοί, εὐσπλαγχοί, χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν*

with *Col* 3.12-13 *Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν (...) σπλάγγνα οἰκτιρμοῦ, χρηστότητα, ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραῦτητα, μακροθυμίαν, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων καὶ χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς ἂν τις πρὸς τινα ἔχη μομφήν· καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς*.

The clause *Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν (...) σπλάγγνα οἰκτιρμοῦ, χρηστότητα* (*Col*) is changed into *γίνεσθε [δὲ] εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοί, εὐσπλαγχοί* reading the adjectives *χρηστός* and *εὐσπλαγχνός* instead of the nouns *χρηστότης* and *σπλάγγνον* (rendering the meaning of *σπλάγγνα οἰκτιρμοῦ* [BGD, p. 561: οἰκτιρμός: ἐνδύσασθαι σπλάγγνα οἰκτιρμοῦ (gen. of quality) put on heartfelt compassion *Col* 3.12] now into one word: *εὐσπλαγχνός*) and replacing the imperative *ἐνδύσασθε* with *γίνεσθε*. The clause *γίνεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοί* (*Eph*) reveals also another derivation since the phrase *εἰς ἀλλήλους* is read in *Col* 3.9 *μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον*; this derivation of *εἰς ἀλλήλους* is very probable since **firstly** the phrase *εἰς ἀλλήλους* occurs in *Col* and *Eph* only in *Col* 3.9 and *Eph* 4.32, and **secondly** it has just been left out in *Eph* 4.22 as we noticed in conflations 20, d, i and 21a above. Many of the words of *Col* 3.8-9 which were left out when *Col* 3.8-9 was taken up in *Eph* 4.22 are now used in *Eph* 4.31-32. This way of using the text of *Col* can not be accounted for by memorisation but is necessarily due to deliberate and selective literary dependence; remarkably the phrase *εἰς ἀλλήλους* which functioned in *Col* 3.9 (*μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους*) as part of the list of vices (*Col* 3.8-9) is now part in *Eph* 4.32 of the list of virtues (*γίνεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοί, εὐσπλαγχοί*).

⁷⁷ Cf. Lincoln, p. 308 on *Eph* 4.31: "The cognate verb *πικραίνειν* is employed in *Col* 3:19".

The further use of *Col* 3.12-13 by the author of *Eph* confirms this observation of careful literary dependence. Having copied the words *σπλάγχνα οίκτιρμοῦ* and *χρηστότης*, changed them into adjectives and combined them with the phrase *εἰς ἀλλήλους* which is derived from *Col* 3.12-13 as well, the author of *Eph* now makes use of the clause *χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς* read in *Col* 3.12-13: *Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν (...) σπλάγχνα οίκτιρμοῦ, χρηστότητα, ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραῦτητα, μακροθυμίαν, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων καὶ χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς* (*Col* 3.12-13). Interestingly the 'leap' in *Eph*'s application of *Col* 3.12-13 from *σπλάγχνα οίκτιρμοῦ, χρηστότητα* to *χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς* neglecting the intermediate words *ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραῦτητα, μακροθυμίαν, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων* can be perfectly explained since these words were already taken up by the author of *Eph* in *Eph* 4.1-2: *ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε, ^{4.2} μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πραύτητος, μετὰ μακροθυμίας, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ*, while its continuation in *Eph* 4.3-4 relies on *Col* 3.14-15, the verses immediately after the verses under consideration here in conflation 21:

Cf. *Eph* 4.3-4 *ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ^{4.3} σπουδάζοντες τηρεῖν τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης· ^{4.4} ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεύμα, καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν*

with *Col* 3.14-15 ^{3.14} *ἐπὶ πᾶσιν δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἀγάπην, ὃ ἐστὶν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος. ^{3.15} καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβεύετω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἐνὶ σῶματι.*

Cf. Ochel, pp. 61-62 on *Eph* 4.32. Although Ochel declined any dependence of *Eph* 4.31 on *Col* 3.8 his opinion concerning *Eph*'s dependence on *Col* is different as regards *Eph* 4.32; according to him "ist (...) die Parallele in dem Lasterkatalog 4,31 mit Kol 3,8 (...) nicht auf eine Entlehnung aus Kol zurückzuführen. Anders steht es um die Parallele 4,32 zu Kol 3,13, wo ich wieder eine direkte Verwandtschaft annehme. In beiden Stellen ist eine Mahnung zu rechtem Verhalten untereinander ausgesprochen" (p. 61). This dependence on *Col* 3.13 is according to Ochel confirmed as follows: "Ich erinnerne, daß ich zu *Eph* 4,2 bereits eine Verwertung von Kol 3,13 nachwies (...). Dort war aber der Vers aus Kol nicht vollständig benutzt. In 4,32 hat nun der Vf das, was er in 4,2 unbenutzt ließ, aufgenommen, das aber übergangen, was er dort benutzte" (p. 62; cf. Ochel, pp. 58-59 on *Eph* 4.2).

Cf. also Lincoln, pp. 295-296 on the use of *Col* 3.12-13 in *Eph* 4.32: "The other nouns and participle from *Col* 3:12,13 have already been employed in *Eph* 4:2" (p. 296). For the reception of *Col* 3.12-15 in *Eph* 4.2-4 cf. Lincoln, pp. LIII, 235-236 and esp. 227-228: "The items omitted here [the items of *Col* 3.12-13 omitted in *Eph* 4.2] are, however, drawn on later in the Ephesians paraenesis in 4:32" (p. 228).

The reason why the author of *Eph* draws so extensively on *Col* 3.12-15 in *Eph* 4.1-4 seems to be due to his interest in the theme of 'calling' and 'choosing' with which he introduces the ecclesiological passage *Eph* 4.7-16. In *Eph* 4.1 and 4.4 he mentions twice the term κλήσις with the cognate verb: ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε (*Eph* 4.1) and καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν (*Eph* 4.4). The vocabulary of 'calling' and 'choosing' occurs in *Col* only in *Col* 3.12 (the adjective ἐκλεκτός) and in *Col* 3.15 (the verb καλεῖν), thus only in the passage *Col* 3.12-15: ^{3.12} Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι, (...) ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραῦτητα, μακροθυμίαν κτλ. ^{3.15} καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβεύετω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι, while the language of 'calling' and 'choosing' in *Eph* is concentrated in the passage *Eph* 4.1-4 (see the words καλεῖν in *Eph* 4.1 and 4.4, and κλήσις in *Eph* 4.1 and 4.4 as well, the only exception being ἐκλέγεσθαι outside *Eph* 4.1-4 in *Eph* 1.4 καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου). It seems therefore, that the author of *Eph* refers in 4.1-4 to *Col* 3.12-15 because he wants to apply its notions of 'calling' and 'choosing'; while doing so he copies some other terms from this passage as well, which are not applied when he draws again upon this passage in *Eph* 4.32.

Having left out in *Eph* 4.32 the words ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραῦτητα, μακροθυμίαν, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων (*Col* 3.12-13) for the aforesaid reason and continuing his reliance on *Col* 3.12-13 by copying the clause χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς (although leaving out the immediately following clause ἐάν τις πρὸς τινα ἔχη μομφήν in *Col* 3.13 χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς ἐάν τις πρὸς τινα ἔχη μομφήν) the author of *Eph* now concludes this reliance by copying also the clause καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν (*Col*) while **firstly** leaving out its continuation οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς and **secondly** changing the copied phrase καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν (*Col*) into καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν by replacing its subject κύριος (= Christ) into θεός and retaining the reference to Christ on the other hand with the aid of the dative clause ἐν Χριστῷ.

It seems to be clear that the whole passage *Eph* 4.31-32 is carefully dependent on *Col* 3.8-13. Besides the fragment ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραῦτητα, μακροθυμίαν, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων in *Col* 3.12-13, which have been left out since these words were already used in *Eph* 4.2, there is another interesting deliberate omission as well: the fragment ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν κτλ. (*Col* 3.9-11) has been excluded from application here in *Eph* 4.31-32 since the major part of *Col* 3.9-11 was already used in *Eph* 4.22-24 (see conflation 20d above). The passage *Col* 3.8-13 has therefore been extremely well applied in *Eph* 4.31-32 since the two fragments of *Col* 3.8-13 which were already used in *Eph* 4.2 and 4.22-24 are not drawn upon here.⁷⁸

⁷⁸ Cf. Lincoln, pp. LI-LII, 295-296, 297-298, 309 and 313; see esp. pp. 295-296: "the contrast of the sentences in [Eph] 4:31,32 makes use of what is a common form in paraenesis - the cata-

(22) The three sentences ^{5.3} πορνεία δὲ καὶ ἀκαθαρσία πᾶσα ἢ πλεονεξία μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις, ^{5.4} καὶ αἰσχροῦτης καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπελία, ἃ οὐκ ἀνήκεν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία.

^{5.5} τοῦτο γὰρ ἴστε γινώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης, ὃ ἐστὶν εἰδωλολάτρης, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.

^{5.6} Μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις, διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας. ^{5.7} μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν. ^{5.8} ἦτε γὰρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ (*Eph* 5.3-8) are mainly based on

(a) *Col* 3.5-6 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος, ἐπιθυμίαν κακῆν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἣτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία, δι' ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας.

The first sentence (*Eph* 5.3-4) copies the three terms πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία and πλεονεξία from *Col* 3.5 while the structure νεκρώσατε οὖν + accusative (*Col*) is changed into μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν (*Eph*).⁷⁹

(b) Besides the three terms mentioned before, the terms αἰσχροῦτης and μωρολογία occur in *Eph*: καὶ αἰσχροῦτης καὶ μωρολογία; these terms seem to display the use of *Col* 3.8 νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργὴν, θυμόν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν; other terms from *Col* 3.8 have just been applied in *Eph* 4.31 (see conflation 21 a above) giving evidence that *Col* 3.8 was recently in his mind. These terms πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, πλεονεξία, αἰσχροῦτης and μωρολογία (supplemented with the term εὐτραπελία which can not be traced back to the 'Colossian' model) are commented upon by the relative clause ἃ οὐκ ἀνήκεν and contrasted with εὐχαριστία: (...) καὶ αἰσχροῦτης καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπελία, ἃ οὐκ ἀνήκεν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία.

Then the second sentence after a newly made introduction τοῦτο γὰρ ἴστε γινώσκοντες ὅτι employs partly the same terms from *Col* 3.5 again but converts them now into adjectives. This time the author of *Eph* makes even fuller use of *Col* 3.5 than he did in the previous sentence *Eph* 5.3-4.

Cf. *Col* 3.5 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος, ἐπιθυμίαν κακῆν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἣτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία

logue of vices and virtues. In fact (...), the writer is dependent for his use of this form on *Col* 3:8,12. In both sentences the writer has changed the verb from that found in Colossians. But of the five vices in *Col* 3:8 four appear here in *Eph* 4:31. Only αἰσχρολογία (...) is missing (...), and Ephesians has added πικρία (...) and κραυγὴ (...). With the virtues in 4:32, Ephesians has reduced the five nouns of *Col* 3:12 to two and given them adjectival form before going on to take up one of the participles of *Col* 3:13 [χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς]. The other nouns and participle from *Col* 3:12,13 have already been employed in *Eph* 4:2."

⁷⁹ Cf. Lincoln, esp. pp. LI-LII and 319-320.

with *Eph* 5.5 πάς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης, ὃ ἐστὶν εἰδωλολάτρης, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.

The same three terms *πορνεία*, *ἀκαθαρσία* and *πλεονεξία* are drawn upon as in *Eph* 5.3-4 but this time even the relative clause *ἣτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία* which qualified *πλεονεξία* is employed although changed into an adjective and into the first case of the male gender: *πλεονέκτης, ὃ ἐστὶν εἰδωλολάτρης.*

(c) The mentioning of the inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God seems to be dependent on *Col* 1.12-13.

Cf. *Col* 1.12-13 τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἰκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί· ὃς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς (...) καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ

with *Eph* 5.5 οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.

In *Col* 1.12-13 the language of inheritance (*μερὶς τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί* = 'a share in the inheritance of the saints in light'; BGD, p. 435: *κλήρος*, 2) and of kingdom is found together like in *Eph* 5.5. Probably the actual phrasing is also dependent on *Col* 3.24 εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπὸ κυρίου ἀπολήμψεσθε τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας (*ἀπολαμβάνειν τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας* = 'receive the inheritance as a reward', BGD, p. 73: *ἀνταπόδοσις*) since the term *κληρονομία* occurs in *Col* only in *Col* 3.24.

This reference to *Col* 1.12-13 entails also the contradistinctive terms *φῶς* and *σκότος* which are derived from *Col* 1.12-13 (τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἰκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί· ὃς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ) and applied in *Eph* 5.8 ἦτε γὰρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ. The clause *ἐν κυρίῳ* (*Eph* 5.8 ἦτε γὰρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ) might be a reference to the transference of the believers to Christ's kingdom mentioned in *Col* 1.13 (καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ).⁸⁰

(d) The term *βασιλείαν θεοῦ* is apparently derived from *Col* 4.10-11 Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἀρίσταρχος (...) καὶ Μᾶρκος (...) καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούστος, οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς, οὗτοι μόνοι συνεργοὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. *Col* 4.11 is the only place in *Col* where the term *βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ* occurs just as the term *βασιλεία τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ* only appears in *Col* 1.13. Outside these two passages the term *βασιλεία* does not occur at all in *Col*. It is very remarkable, therefore, that the only verse in *Eph* where the term *βασιλεία* can be found combines both 'Colossian' phrases into *βασιλεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ* (*Eph* 5.5) showing the

⁸⁰ Cf. Lincoln, p. 320: "The actual content of the contrast which is introduced - the opposition between light and darkness [*Eph* 5.8] - has (...) no parallel in the equivalent section of Colossians [*Col* 3.5-8] (though cf. *Col* 1:12,13)."

intention of the author of *Eph* to let his letter resemble the letter to the *Col* as much as possible.

(e) The first part of the third sentence reads Μηδεις ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις (*Eph* 5.6) and is compounded by referring to

Col 2.4 Τοῦτο λέγω ἵνα μηδεις ὑμᾶς παραλογίζηται ἐν πιθανολογία

and *Col* 2.8 βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.⁸¹ It is fascinating to notice that these two passages in *Col* which entail an explicit warning against seduction have been combined by the author of *Eph* in *Eph* 5.6 into one single sentence. Firstly the author of *Eph* copies the words μηδεις ὑμᾶς but continues subsequently the sentence in a different way: instead of παραλογίζηται (μηδεις ὑμᾶς παραλογίζηται) he makes use of the phrase συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης (*Col* 2.8) and turns the noun ἀπάτη (which occurs in *Col* only here in *Col* 2.8) into a verb: Μηδεις ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω (*Eph* 5.6). Then this verb ἀπατᾶν is supplemented by the following dative κενοῖς λόγοις (Μηδεις ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις) to denote the manner of seduction. The noun λόγος (Μηδεις ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις) has been distracted from *Col* 2.4 where its root λογ- can be found twice in the verb παραλογίζεσθαι and in the noun πιθανολογία as well (μηδεις ὑμᾶς παραλογίζηται ἐν πιθανολογία), while the adjective κενός is distracted from *Col* 2.8 where it qualified the noun ἀπάτη which has already been used and changed into a verb: the phrase συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης (*Col* 2.8) is the basis for Μηδεις ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις (*Eph* 5.6).

The last part of the third sentence returns again to *Col* 3.5-6 (cf. point a above) by quoting almost literally δι' ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας, changing only δι' ἃ into διὰ ταῦτα and adding the conjunction γὰρ to it : διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας; so *Col* 3.5-6 is used as the framework of the entire passage *Eph* 5.3-6.

Cf. Ochel, pp. 62-63: "Es ist somit wohl sicher, daß in *Eph* 5,3-6 *Kol* 3,5-6 verwertet ist" (p. 63); Ochel refers, however, exclusively to *Col* 3,5-6 as constituent for this 'Ephesian' passage (cf. point a above) but does not notice the other resemblances with *Col* which point at derivation.

(23) The sentence μη κατ' ὀφθαλμοδουλίαν ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι ἀλλ' ὡς δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ ποιῶντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς (*Eph* 6.6) is compounded from

(a) μη ἐν ὀφθαλμοδουλίᾳ ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀπλότῃ καρδίᾳ

⁸¹ Cf. Lincoln, pp. 320 and 325: "the warning about being deceived through empty words in [*Eph*] 5:6a recalls the language of *Col* 2:8 (cf. also *Col* 2:4)" (p. 320).

(Col 3.22). The author of *Eph* copies the main structure of this passage but changes the preposition ἐν (ἐν ὀφθαλμοδουλίᾳ) into κατά (κατ' ὀφθαλμοδουλίαν) and continues differently after the particle ἀλλά by drawing upon the passage mentioned hereafter under point b;

(b) τῷ κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε (Col 3.24). This passage is used and rephrased as ὡς δούλοι Χριστοῦ ποιῶντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς and supplemented to μὴ κατ' ὀφθαλμοδουλίαν ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι ἀλλ' by means of the particle ὡς which contrasts ὡς δούλοι to ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι;

(c) the phrase ποιῶντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς which qualifies the δούλοι Χριστοῦ (*Eph* 6.6 ἀλλ' ὡς δούλοι Χριστοῦ ποιῶντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς) is partly derived from Col 3.23 ὁ ἐὰν ποιῆτε, ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐργάζεσθε, but inventing here τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ as the object of the participle ποιῶντες.

Cf. Ochel, pp. 66-67, with whose analysis I basically agree except for his remark that the phrase ὡς δούλοι Χριστοῦ has not been derived from *Col* (Ochel, p. 67); there is, however, a clear resemblance with Col 3.24 τῷ κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε (see point b above).

Cf. also Lincoln, esp. pp. 412-413, who in contrast to Ochel notices the aforesaid resemblance as well: "Whereas in Colossians the contrast to this expression [*Col* 3.22 μὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοδουλίᾳ ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, ἀλλ'] had been 'but in the singleness of heart' (3:22d), in *Eph* 6:6 the contrast is ἀλλ' ὡς δούλοι Χριστοῦ (...), terminology distinctive to the Ephesians' paraenesis but clearly building on the clause found later in the Colossians' pericope in 3.24b, τῷ κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε" (p. 413).

Conclusion

The analysis of the twenty-three instances of conflation detected show how important and characteristic conflation is for the reworking of *Col* in contrast to the reworking of the *Letter of Aristeas* in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*. Lincoln's thought that "Josephus has (...) conflated (...) material from his source" and that "Ephesians' redaction of Colossians is similar to that which can be shown to have taken place in the case of Josephus' use of the *Letter of Aristeas* in his *Jewish Antiquities*" (Lincoln, p. LV) has therefore to be corrected. Although Lincoln states somewhat hesitantly that *Eph*'s dependence on *Col* is "in some sense a literary one" this statement is actually undermined **firstly** by the uncertain tone of the *previous* lines in which he regards the question "(whether) the nature of the dependence should be designated as literary" as "almost academic" and is of the opinion that - although the author of *Eph* has "at some stage (...) access to a copy of Colossians" - "whether he actually has referred to it during the composition of this letter

(...), or whether his memorization of its contents is so good that this is unnecessary, is difficult to determine", and **secondly** in the *following* lines by the alleged similarity between the redactions of the *Letter of Aristeas* and of *Col*. To me, however, there is certainly literary dependence of *Eph* on *Col* as the sophisticated phenomenon of conflation shows most decisively. I agree with Benoit's conclusion in which he argues against Mitton according to whom the similarities between *Col* and *Eph* are due to memorisation and not to literary dependence: "Mitton (...) ⁸² ne croit pas à une imitation du texte de *Col* tenu sous les yeux, mais seulement à la familiarité d'un esprit profondément saturé de *Col*, et la sachant presque de mémoire, qui dès lors en reprend comme spontanément les expressions. L'application subtile que nous avons cru constater dans le travail d'*Eph* paraît requérir davantage" (Benoit, p. 20, n. 33). The opinion of Merkel that the relationship between *Col* and *Eph* is characterised by "gedächtnismäßige Reproduktion" (Merkel, pp. 3214, 3216 and esp. 3219) has therefore to be criticised as well since Benoit's observation which was only based on an analysis of the three passages *Eph* 2.1-6, 2.11-12 and 4.17-24, has now been confirmed by a complete review of all cases of conflation in *Eph*.

⁸² Benoit refers to Mitton, Oxford 1951, pp. 57, 63-64, 75, 78-79 and 243-244.

CHAPTER III : THE SEQUENCE OF IDENTICAL WORDS

According to Lincoln, *Eph*'s reworking of *Col* is similar to Josephus' use of the *Letter of Arist.* in his *Jew. Ant.*, since "(there) is literary dependence as Josephus paraphrases his source, but there are only two places where there is a sequence of identical words - one broken sequence of twelve words and another sequence of ten words. For the most part it is only short phrases or individual words that are identical in the two works" (Lincoln, page LV). Lincoln's argument is, however, not very clear. Does he mean that the method of both the author of *Eph* and Josephus consists in paraphrasing, in giving the meaning of the original writing using different words? Would this method of paraphrasing then account for the literary dependence on the one hand (as far as the paraphrase is a paraphrase of the original text), as well as for the absence of extended totally identical passages on the other hand, since the paraphrase is indeed a paraphrase of the original text - a paraphrase which, according to Lincoln, is characterised by omissions, confluations and embellishment made in view of the author's own particular points? But what is the exact relation between paraphrasing, literary dependence, omissions, confluations and all the other pheno-mena just mentioned? It does not seem to be appropriate to 'jump to the conclusions' by writing that "(it) is highly likely (...) that the dependence of Ephesians on Colossians should be seen as in some sense a literary one" and then become suddenly certain in the next line and write that "(in) fact, Ephesians' redaction of Colossians is similar to that which can be shown to have taken place in the case of Josephus' use of the Letter of Aristeas in his Jewish Antiquities (...). There is literary dependence as Josephus paraphrases his source" (Lincoln, p. LV). I agree that there is literary dependence in both writings but this conclusion has to be based on an examination of each individual writing and not by a reference to another writing which supposedly provides a parallel. The fact is, however, that the method applied by the author of *Eph* and by Josephus is very different. This difference consists mainly in the fact that the phenomenon of conflation is absolutely absent in the paraphrase of the *Letter of Arist.* in the *Jew. Ant.*, while it predominates in *Eph* and forms the most compelling evidence for literary dependence there. Therefore it is too vague to stipulate the redaction by the author of *Eph* and by Josephus as 'paraphrasing' and to regard their method as similar. The absence of longer and more sequences of identical words in both writings can not be attributed to the method of *paraphrasing* as such but has to be accounted for differently in each case. In *Eph*'s redaction there are not many sequences of identical words since the method of *conflating* several fragments into one new fragment is continuously applied. It seems to be the author's intention not to paraphrase the text in the immediately opposite column but rather to mix several fragments of the original text and to combine them in some other way. Long and many sequences of identical words are also lacking in Josephus'

rewriting but here the reasons seem to be the insertion of the *Letter of Arist.* into the larger context of the *Jew. Ant.* This insertion automatically involves the need to unify the composition and the style, and is affected by Josephus' interest in the 'réaction atticisante' of the first century which made him to change and to 'update' a document that is considerably older since it is dated about 170 BC.⁸³ Although both writings are literary dependent on a previous work, a comparison between Josephus' *Jew. Ant.* and *Eph* shows how different their method is.

On the other hand there seems to be a positive result of the comparison between the *Jew. Ant.* and *Eph* as regards the sequence of identical words as well: it can make one aware of the fact, that the fluctuation in sequences of identical words within one document can have a meaning. This is both the case in the *Jew. Ant.* and in *Eph* as is shown by the following figures. These figures are based on the occurrence of sequences of three or more identical words, since the sequence of two identical words could easily be coincidence.

The *Letter of Aristeas* and Josephus' *Jew. Ant.*, Book XII, §§ 12-118 contain, as appeared in my summary of the *Jew. Ant.*, several pieces of correspondence and official documents, namely the decree by Ptolemy effectuating the release of the Egyptian Jews (*Jew. Ant.*, XII, §§28-31), Demetrius' written proposal as regards the copying of the Jewish writings (*Jew. Ant.*, XII, §§36-39), the letter sent to the high priest Eleazar (*Jew. Ant.*, XII, §§45-50) and Eleazar's subsequent positive reply (*Jew. Ant.*, XII, §§51-56). It is interesting that the percentage of the total amount of words in the **sequences of identical words** in comparison to the total amount of words in the **whole text** is as follows.

Josephus' *Jew. Ant.*, XII, §§ 12-118 without the body of correspondence has a percentage of 7.2%. That means that 7.2% of the total amount of words in the *Jew. Ant.*, XII, §§ 12-118 occurs in sequences of identical words - identical with the *Letter of Arist.*. This figure rises considerably when the body of correspondence is taken apart: in the correspondence entailed in §§28-31, 36-39, 45-50 and 51-56 17.3% of the words occur in sequences of identical words. The average percentage in §§12-118 including the body of correspondence is 9.1%. This shows that the literary dependence as far as the sequence of identical words is concerned is higher when Josephus paraphrases the official correspondence. The reason behind this higher rate of literary dependence is understandable since the body of correspondence included in the *Letter of Aristeas* is more 'official' than the narrative itself forcing Josephus to treat this body of correspondence more literally, especially since he refers to the original document in *Jew. Ant.*, XII, § 57 when he omits the names of the Jewish translators: ἐμοὶ δ' οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἔδοξεν εἶναι τὰ ὀνόματα

⁸³ See R.J.H. Shutt, "The Letter of Aristeas" in J.H. Charlesworth, *The OT Pseudepigrapha*, Volume 2, pp. 8-9.

τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα πρεσβυτέρων, οἱ τὸν νόμον ἐκόμιζον ὑπὸ Ἐλεαζάρου πεμφθέντες, δηλοῦν ἦν γὰρ ταῦτα ὑπογεγραμμένα ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ. In this case the fluctuation of sequences of identical words can be accounted for.

Josephus, *Jew. Ant.*, XII, §§12-118 contains 4,155 words; my counting is based on the edition by R. Marcus, London/Cambridge (Mass.) 1943, used by Pelletier in his synopsis (Pelletier, pp. 307-327). In total 382 words out of these 4,155 words occur in a sequence of identical words; 382 words divided by 41.55 leads to an average percentage of 9.193% in the whole text (§§12-118).

The body of correspondence in *Jew. Ant.*, XII, §§28-31, 36-39, 45-50 and 51-56 consists of respectively 191, 169, 225 and 200 words, that is 785 words in total; since 136 words occur here in a sequence of identical words, and 136 words divided by 7.85 is 17.324 the percentage in the body of correspondence is 17.324%.

The percentage outside the body of correspondence is counted by dividing 246 sequential words by 33.70 (33.70 is one per cent of 3,370 which is the total amount of words); the outcome is a percentage of 7.299%.

This counting is based on the following tables:

EXACTLY SIMILAR CONSECUTIVE WORDS IN JOSEPHUS' *JEWISH ANTIQUITIES*, BOOK XII, §§ 12-118 IN COMPARISON TO THE *LETTER OF ARISTEAS*

THREE CONSECUTIVE WORDS

Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς in 12; Συρίαν καὶ Φοινίκην in 28; καὶ τὴν χώραν in 28; καὶ παρὰ τὸ in 29; διὰ τὴν στρατιωτικὴν in 29; ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς τοὺς in 31; καὶ τὰ σώματα in 31; τοῖς βασιλεῦσι τούτοις in 34; ὡς ἂν οὖσαν in 37; ἀφ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς in 39; τῆς σῆς προαιρέσεως in 39; βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος Ἐλεαζάρῳ in 45; τοῖς σοῖς πολίταις in 46; τὸν νόμον ὑμῶν in 48; καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις in 49; ἀφ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς in 49; εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν in 50; καὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς in 55; ἔχοντας τὸν νόμον in 56; πρὸς τὰς λειτουργίας in 61; τῇ τορεῖα θαυμαστῶς in 64; στεφάνης τὸ μὲν in 65; διὰ τρημάτων κατελιημένοι in 66; ὑπὸ δὲ τὴν in 68; τοὺς δὲ λίθους in 68; τῶν προειρημένων καρπῶν in 68; περὶ ὅλην τὴν in 68; καθ' ὅλου τοῦ in 70; κατὰ τὴν στεφάνην in 70; τῆς τραπέζης μαϊανδρον in 71; ὑπὸ τὴν τράπεζαν in 73; τὸ πᾶν ἔλασμα in 74; τῶν δὲ κρατήρων in 78; ἀνθεμίσι καὶ βότρύων in 78; δῶρα τῷ βασιλεῖ in 85; καὶ τῶν συμπρόντων in 91; τὸν τῆς ζωῆς in 92; ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως in 94; καὶ περὶ τούτους in 95; ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας in 97; παρητήσατο, τῶν δὲ in 97; καὶ διελθὼν τὸ in 103; ἐν ἡμέραις ἑβδομήκοντα in 107; συναγαγὼν ὁ Δημήτριος in 107; εἰς τὸν τόπον in 107; πρόντων καὶ τῶν in 107; καὶ τὸν Δημήτριον in 108; τοῖς ἡγουμένοις αὐτῶν in 108; εἰς κοινούς ἀνθρώπους in 112; παρὰ τοῦ Δημητρίου in 114; ποιεῖσθαι τῶν βιβλίων in 114; περὶ πολλοῦ ποιούμενος in 118.

FOUR CONSECUTIVE WORDS

τὰ κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην in 12; ἐν τῇ σῇ βασιλείᾳ in 20; δὲ καὶ τῶν πρόντων in 25; ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς τραπέζης in 28; τὴν τῶν διαφόρων δόσιν in 32; τοῖς ὑπηρεταῖς τῶν πραγμάτων in 32; καὶ τὸ τῆς εἰσδόσεως in 35; παρὰ σοὶ διηκριβωμένα in 37; καὶ ἀκέραιον τὴν νομοθεσίαν in 37; φησιν Ἐκαταῖος ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης in 38; γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἐκ τῶν in 48; καὶ τὰς φιάλας ἄς in 53; καὶ τῶν τέκνων καὶ in 55; τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ in 55; τὰ περὶ τῆς τραπέζης in 60; ἐκ τῶν τριῶν μερῶν in 64; πρὸς τὰς τοιαύτας ὑποδοχὰς in 96; μέχρι μὲν ὥρας ἐνάτης in 104; τῇ θαλάσῃ τὰς χεῖρας in 106; καὶ πρὸς τὸν Δημήτριον in 110; τοῦ τῶν τραγωδιῶν ποιητοῦ in 113; καὶ κυλικίον ταλάντων τριάκοντα in 117; φιάλας καὶ τρύβλια καὶ in 117.

FIVE CONSECUTIVE WORDS

καὶ παρὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς in 29; περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν βιβλίων in 34; τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ἀκριβῆς in 39; χρυσοῦ μὲν ὀκτῆς τάλαντα πεντήκοντα in 40; καὶ νομίματος εἰς θυσίας καὶ in 41; ἦν ἔχεις πρὸς τὸν θεὸν in 52; χρυσᾶς εἴκοσι καὶ ἀργυρᾶς τριάκοντα in 53; ὧν ἂν δέηται τὸ ἱερὸν in 53; ἀπὸ τῆς βάσεως μέχρι τοῦ in 78; γὰρ ἡμίσεις ἐκέλευσεν ἀνα χεῖρα in 96; τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς μετὰ τὴν in 96; τῆς θαλάσσης πρὸς τὴν νῆσον in 103; ἐπὶ τὰ βόρεια μέρη συνέδριον in 103; καὶ τῶν ἑρμηνέων οἱ πρεσβύτεροι in 108.

SIX CONSECUTIVE WORDS

βασιλεῖ μεγάλῳ παρὰ Δημητρίου. προστάξαντός σου in 36; κρατήρας πέντε καὶ τράπεζαν εἰς ἀνάθεσιν in 53; κυμάτων θέσιν καὶ τὴν τῆς στεφάνης in 69; τάλαντα δύο καὶ κυλικίον ταλάντου καὶ in 116.

SEVEN CONSECUTIVE WORDS

ἀγαθοὶ καὶ παιδεία διαφέροντες καὶ τῆς σῆς in 53; τὰ δὲ κυμάτια στρεπτά τὴν ἀναγλυφὴν ἔχοντα in 64; τοὺς ἱεροκῆρυκας καὶ θύτας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους in 97.

NINE CONSECUTIVE WORDS

καὶ στολὰς δέκα καὶ πορφύραν καὶ στέφανον διαπρεπῆ καὶ in 117.

TEN CONSECUTIVE WORDS

καὶ τούτοις χαρίζεσθαι καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἰουδαίοις in 48.

In the case of Josephus' *Jew. Ant.* there was a fluctuation in sequences of identical words which was due to the 'nature' of the material to be paraphrased. This observation prompts us to inquire if a comparable fluctuation might be detected in *Eph*'s redaction of *Col* as well. This is indeed the case. The average percentage throughout the whole text in *Eph* is 8.4%. There are, however, two different kinds of passages which have a notably different figure. Firstly the percentage in the prescript *Eph* 1.1-2 and the postscript *Eph* 6.21-24 (parallel to *Col* 1.1-2, 4.7-8 and 4.18) is 52.0%. Secondly, the percentage in the 'domestic code' in *Eph* 5.21-6.9 (parallel to *Col* 3.18-4.1) is 11.1%. The percentage outside the prescript, postscript and domestic code is 5.9%, while the average throughout the document - as said before - is 8.4%.

It is perfectly clear, taken these figures into consideration, that the rate of sequences of identical words varies considerably; this variation does not happen at random but is connected with the distinctive nature of a passage, as was the case in Josephus' *Jew. Ant.* This time the passages with a higher rate of identical words are the prescript, the postscript and the domestic regulations. While the increase in identical words in the body of correspondence in the *Jew. Ant.* had to be explained by the correspondence's 'official' status, the increase in *Eph* should be accounted for differently. The probable interpretation of this variation in the rate of similar words in *Eph* will shortly be alluded to in Chapter V.2 on the clause καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ in *Eph* 3.3-4.

The whole document *Eph* consists of 2,422 words; this counting is based on the head text in Nestle-Aland²⁶. The average rate for the whole document is 8.464% since 205 words out of 2,422 words occur in sequences of similar words and 205 words divided by 24.22 is a percentage of 8.464%.

The prescript and the postscript (*Eph* 1.1-2 and 6.21-24) consist of 96 words out of which 50 words are sequential; 50 words divided by 0.96 is 52.083%. The domestic code (*Eph* 5.21-6.9) has 37 words in sequences of identical words out of in total 333 words, what leads to a percentage of 11.111%, since 37 words divided by 3.33 is 11.111%.

Outside these passages (*Eph* 1.1-2, 6.21-24 and 5.21-6.9) the rate of words in sequences of identical words drops down to 5.920% since 118 sequential words out of 1,993 words leads to a percentage of 5.920% (118 words divided by 19.93 is 5.920%).

This counting is based on the following tables:

EXACTLY SIMILAR CONSECUTIVE WORDS IN PSEUDO-PAUL'S LETTER TO THE EPHESIANS IN COMPARISON TO PAUL'S LETTER TO THE COLOSSIANS

THREE CONSECUTIVE WORDS

ἀγίους καὶ ἀμώμους in 1.4; διὰ τοῦ αἵματος in 1.7; τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν in 1.7; τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ in 1.10; Διὰ τοῦτο κἀγὼ in 1.15; καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην in 1.15; πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης in 1.18; κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν in

1.19; αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν in 1.20; ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι in 2.16; μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς in 3.2; κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν in 3.7; ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων in 3.9; οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ in 3.15; διὰ τῆς πίστεως in 3.17; πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα in 3.19; τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν in 3.20; τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον in 4.22; οἱ πατέρες, μὴ in 6.4; τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν in 6.4; Οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε in 6.5; ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι ἄλλ' in 6.6; εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ in 6.9; τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ in 6.19; τὰ κατ' ἐμέ in 6.21; ἡ χάρις μετὰ in 6.24.

FOUR CONSECUTIVE WORDS

ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ in 1.8; τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς in 1.10; εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους in 1.15; πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας in 1.21; τῆς ἀπειθείας· ἐν οἷς καὶ in 2.2-3; τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης in 3.16; ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν in 4.29; τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίως in 6.5; ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι in 6.20.

FIVE CONSECUTIVE WORDS

τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 1.3; ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν in 1.7; ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα in 4.16; Οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπάτε τὰς γυναῖκας in 5.25; Τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῦσιν in 6.1.

SEVEN CONSECUTIVE WORDS

Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ in 1.1.

EIGHT CONSECUTIVE WORDS

χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν in 1.2; ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις, εἰδότες ὅτι in 6.7-8.

TEN CONSECUTIVE WORDS

ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας in 5.6; πάντα γνωρίσει ὑμῖν Τυχικὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος in 6.21.

NINETEEN CONSECUTIVE WORDS

ἐν κυρίῳ, ὃν ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν καὶ παρακαλέση τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν in 6.21-22.

CHAPTER III : A NEW SYNOPTIC OVERVIEW OF *EPH'S* DEPENDENCE ON *COL*

INTRODUCTION

A new synoptic overview of *Eph's* dependence on *Col* is required since the two previous synoptic editions of the Greek text by GOODSPEED (Chicago 1933, pp. 77-165) and MITTON (London 1951, pp. 279-315) are not accurate enough and unsuitable for research that focuses on the confluents of 'Colossian' verses in *Eph*.

Goodspeed's synopsis gives the continuous text of *Eph* in the left column with the 'Colossian' parallels in the right column where necessary; the text of *Col* is only printed insofar as there are parallels and it totally leaves open how far the texts are parallel since there is for instance no underlining marking the extent of similarity. Two other columns adjacent to the columns with the text of *Eph* and *Col* present other Pauline parallels. This very rudimentary synopsis is considerably improved by Mitton.

Mitton's synopsis maintains the same system insofar the continuous text of *Eph* is printed but only the parallels from *Col*; the number of parallels, however, have increased and the extent of correspondence is now indicated by underlining. The remaining disadvantages are however **firstly** the lack of clarity which parallels in the column of *Col* correspond with the continuously printed text of *Eph* since so many parallels are mentioned in the column of *Col*; **secondly** the impossibility to see clearly how some fragments derived from *Col* intermingle and are conflated in *Eph*; and **thirdly** that a continuous text of *Col* is not printed which makes it impracticable to approach the issue of the dependent relationship between *Eph* and *Col* from the side of the 'Colossian' text and to see where a particular verse is used in *Eph*. Mitton tries to obviate some of these drawbacks by other appendices which give in rows the parallels to *Col* in *Eph* (Mitton, Appendix II, pp. 316-318) and vice versa (Mitton, Appendix III, pp. 319-321) but the result is not convincing.

The synoptic edition of *Col* and *Eph* offered here, however, overcomes these objections respectively, by mentioning **firstly** every 'Colossian' parallel of *Eph* in footnotes, **secondly** by using a system of single (<...>) and multiple (<<...>>, <<<...>>> etc.) brackets in the head text of *Eph* so that confluents become clearly visible (e.g. <<... <...> ...>> in which case one 'Colossian' fragment is inserted into another) and **lastly** by printing the complete text of *Col* in the opposite column in order to indicate similarities in overall structure between *Col* and *Eph* while the text of *Col* itself contains references in brackets to those places in *Eph* where a particular 'Colossian' fragment is used. Besides that, braces in both columns like {...} indicate if a certain word or name is either unique to *Col* or to *Eph*. The word εὐδοκία in *Eph* 1.5 for instance occurs only in *Eph* but not in *Col* although that does not mean that cognate words are absent in *Col* since the verb εὐδοκεῖν is read in *Col* 1.19. A word between braces indicates, therefore, that *that* particular adjective, noun, verb etc. is unique to one of the two writings. The double underlining in both columns signifies a larger degree of literary dependence.

The text reading and interpunction in this new synoptic overview is totally based on the 26th edition of NESTLE-ALAND.

ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΛΟΣΣΑΕΙΣ

1.1 <<Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ
Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ
{Τιμόθεος} ὁ ἀδελφός 1.2 <τοῖς ἐν
{Κολοσσαῖς} ἁγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς
ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ. χάρις ὑμῖν
καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς
[E 6.23]> ἡμῶν [E 1.1-2]>>.

1.3 <Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ
πατρὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ [E 1.3]> πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν
προσευχόμενοι, 1.4 <ἀκούσαντες
τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ
καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς
πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους [E 1.15]> 1.5 διὰ
<<τὴν <ἐλπίδα [E 1.18]> τὴν {ἀποκει-
μένην} ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἣν
{προηκούσατε} ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς
<<<ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου
[E 1.12-13]>> 1.6 τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς,
καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν
{καρποφορούμενον} καὶ αὐξανόμενον
καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας
ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε <τὴν χάριν
τοῦ θεοῦ [E 1.6, 1.8] ἐν ἀληθείᾳ·
1.7 καθὼς ἐμάθετε [E 4.20-21]>>> ἀπὸ
{Ἐπαφρᾶ} τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ {συνδούλου}
ἡμῶν, ὅς ἐστιν πιστὸς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ

1.1 <Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ
Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ τοῖς
ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν [ἐν {Ἐφέσῳ}] καὶ
πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 1.2 χάρις
ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς
ἡμῶν [C 1.1-2]> καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ.

1.3 <{Εὐλόγητος} ὁ θεὸς καὶ
πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ [C 1.3]>, ὁ {εὐλογήσας} ἡμᾶς
ἐν πάσῃ {εὐλογία} πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς
{ἐπουρανόις} ἐν Χριστῷ, 1.4 καθὼς
<{ἐξελέξατο}>¹ ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ
{καταβολῆς} κόσμου εἶναι ἡμᾶς
<ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον
αὐτοῦ>² ἐν ἀγάπῃ, 1.5 {προορίσας}
ἡμᾶς εἰς {υἰοθεσίαν} διὰ Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτόν, κατὰ τὴν <{εὐδο-
κίαν}>³ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, 1.6 εἰς
{ἔπαινον} δόξης <τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ
[C 1.6]> ἧς {ἐχαρίτωσεν} ἡμᾶς ἐν <<τῷ
ἠγαπημένῳ.

1.7 <Ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύ-
τρωσιν <διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ>⁴,
τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμά-
των>>⁵, κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος <τῆς χάριτος
αὐτοῦ [C 1.6]> 1.8 ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς

¹ Col 3.12 ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι.

² Col 1.22 παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.

³ Cf. εὐδοκία in Eph 1.5 and 1.9 to εὐδοκέω in Col 1.19-20: ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν.

⁴ Col 1.20 εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ.

⁵ Col 1.13-14 τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν.

διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ^{1.8} ὁ καὶ {δηλώ-
σας} ἡμῖν τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύ-
ματι.

ἡμᾶς, <ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ {φρο-
νήσει}>⁶, ^{1.9} <γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ
μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ>⁷,
κατὰ τὴν <{εὐδοκίαν}>⁸ αὐτοῦ ἦν
{προέθετο} ἐν αὐτῷ ^{1.10} εἰς οἰκονομίαν
τοῦ <{πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν}>⁹,
{ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι} <τὰ πάντα ἐν
τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ
τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς>¹⁰ ἐν αὐτῷ.

^{1.11} Ἐν ᾧ καὶ <{ἐκληρώθη-
μεν}>¹¹ {προορισθέντες} κατὰ {πρό-
θεσιν} τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργούντος
κατὰ τὴν {βουλὴν} τοῦ θελήματος
αὐτοῦ ^{1.12} εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς
{ἔπαινον} δόξης αὐτοῦ <τοὺς
{προηλπικότητας} ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ.

^{1.13} Ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀκούσαντες
τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ
εὐαγγέλιον>¹² τῆς {σωτηρίας} ὑμῶν,
ἐν ᾧ καὶ {πιστεύσαντες} <{ἐσφραγίσ-
θητε} τῷ πνεύματι τῆς {ἐπαγγελίας}

⁶ Col 1.9 ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ.

⁷ Col 1.26-27 τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; Eph 3.3-6 is also dependent on Col 1.26-27.

⁸ Cf. εὐδοκία in Eph 1.5 and 1.9 to εὐδοκέω in Col 1.19-20 : ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν.

⁹ Cf. Gal 4.4-5 ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ (...), ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν [cf. εἰς υἰοθεσίαν in Eph 1.5].

¹⁰ Col 1.16 ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς and 1.20 τὰ πάντα (...) εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

¹¹ Col 1.12 εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἱκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί.

¹² Col 1.5 διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἣν προηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς.

τῷ ἁγίῳ, ^{1.14} ὃ ἐστὶν {ἄρραβῶν}>¹³ τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς {περιποιήσεως}, εἰς {ἔπαινον} τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

1.9 <<<Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας <ἠκούσαμεν [E 1.15]>, οὐ πανόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ <αἰτούμενοι ἵνα [E 1.15-17]>>> πληρωθῆτε [E 3.19-20]>> τὴν <ἐπίγνωσιν [E 1.17]> τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ <<ἐν πάσῃ <σοφίᾳ [E 1.17]> καὶ <συνέσει πνευματικῇ [E 3.4-5]> [E 1.8]>>, ^{1.10} << <περιπατήσαι ἀξίως [E 4.1]> τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν {ἀρεσκείαν}, ἐν παντὶ <ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ [E 2.10]> {καρποφοροῦντες} [E 5.8-9, cf. 5.11]>> καὶ <αὔξανόμενοι [E 2.21]> τῇ <ἐπίγνωσει [E 1.17]> τοῦ θεοῦ, ^{1.11} <<ἐν πάσῃ <δυνάμει [E 1.19]> δυναμούμενοι <κατὰ τὸ κράτος [E 1.19]> τῆς <δόξης [E 1.18]> αὐτοῦ

1.15 <<<Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ γὰρ <<ἀκούσας [C 1.9]> τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους>>¹⁴ ^{1.16} οὐ παύομαι <εὐχαριστῶν [C 1.12]> ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν {μνεϊαν} ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, ^{1.17} ἵνα [C 1.9]>>>¹⁵ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ {πατὴρ τῆς δόξης}, δώῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα <σοφίας [C 1.9]> καὶ {ἀποκαλύψεως} ἐν <ἐπιγνώσει [C 1.9, 1.10]> αὐτοῦ, ^{1.18} {πεφωτισμένους}>¹⁶ τοὺς {ὀφθαλμοὺς} τῆς καρδίας {ὑμῶν} εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστὶν ἡ <<ἐλπίς>¹⁷ τῆς {κλήσεως} αὐτοῦ, τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς <δόξης [C 1.11]> τῆς <κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν

¹³ Cf. 2 Cor 1.22 ὁ καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἄρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν [cf. ἐπαγγελία θεοῦ in 2 Cor 1.20] and 2 Cor 5.5 ὁ δὲ κατεργασάμενος ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο θεός, ὁ δοὺς ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος [ἄρραβῶν only occurs in 2 Cor 1.22, 5.5 and Eph 1.14].

¹⁴ Col 1.4-5 ἀκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα [see for ἐλπίς Eph 1.18] τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

¹⁵ Col 1.9 Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν, οὐ πανόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι, ἵνα.

¹⁶ Col 1.12 εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἰκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί.

¹⁷ Cf. πίστις, ἀγάπη (both in Eph 1.15) and ἐλπίς (Eph 1.18) with the tree terms occurring in Col 1.4-5: ἀκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

[E 3.16, 6.10]>> εἰς πᾶσαν {ὕπομονήν} καὶ μακροθυμίαν.

Μετὰ {χαρᾶς} ^{1.12} <<<< <εὐ-
χαριστοῦντες [E 1.16]> τῷ πατρὶ τῷ
{ικανώσαντι} ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν {μερίδα}
τοῦ << {κλήρου} [E 1.11]> τῶν ἀγίων
[E 1.18]>> ἐν τῷ << {φωτὶ [E 1.18]}·

^{1.13} ὃς {ἐρρύσατο} ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς <ἐξου-
σίας τοῦ σκότους [E 6.12]> [E 5.8]>> καὶ
{μετέστησεν} εἰς <τὴν βασιλείαν
<<τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ [E 5.5]>, >

^{1.14} ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν,
τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν [E 1.7]>>·

^{1.15} ὃς ἐστὶν {εἰκῶν} τοῦ θεοῦ
τοῦ {ἀοράτου}, {πρωτότοκος} πάσης
{κτίσεως}, ^{1.16} <<< <ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ
ἐκτίσθη [E 2.10, 2.15]> <<τὰ <πάντα [E
1.22, 1.23]> ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ
τῆς γῆς [E 1.10, 3.15]>>, τὰ {ὄρατά} καὶ
τὰ {ἀόρατα}, εἴτε {θρόνοι} εἴτε

τοῖς ἀγίοις [C 1.12]> >>¹⁸, ^{1.19} καὶ τί τὸ
{ὑπερβάλλον} {μέγεθος} τῆς <δυν-
νάμεως [C 1.11]> αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς
{πιστεύοντας} <<<< <κατὰ τὴν ἐν-
έργειαν τοῦ κράτους [C 1.11]>> τῆς
{ἰσχύος} αὐτοῦ.

^{1.20} Ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν>¹⁹ τῷ
Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νε-
κρῶν>>>²⁰, καὶ <{καθίσας} ἐν δε-
ξιᾷ αὐτοῦ>²¹ ἐν τοῖς {ἐπουρανοῖς}
^{1.21} <{ὑπεράνω} πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ
ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριό-
τητος [C 1.16]>²² καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος
{ὀνομαζομένου}, οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ
{αἰῶνι τούτῳ} ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ <μέλ-
λοντι>²³· ^{1.22} καὶ <πάντα [C 1.16 twice,
1.17 twice, 1.20]> ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς {πόδας}
αὐτοῦ καὶ <αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν
ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ^{1.23} ἧτις
ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ [C 1.18]>²⁴, τὸ

¹⁸ Col 1.26-27 τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὃ ἐστὶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης.

¹⁹ Col 1.11 ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ and 1.29 ἀγωνιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει.

²⁰ Col 2.12 συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

²¹ Col 3.1 τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, οὐδ' ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθημένος.

²² Col 1.16 ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὄρατά καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι; Col 2.10 ὃς ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας and Col 2.15 ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτούς ἐν αὐτῷ.

²³ Col 2.17 ἃ ἐστὶν σκιά τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Cf. probably not only for μέλλω but even for σῶμα Eph 1.21-23 οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι· καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἧτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ.

²⁴ Col. 1.18 καὶ αὐτός ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας and 1.24 ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία.

<κυριότητες είτε ἄρχαι είτε ἐξου-
σίαι [E 1.21]> [E 3.9-10]>>>· <<τὰ
πάντα [E 1.22, 1.23]> δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς
αὐτόν [E 4.15]>> ἔκτισται· ^{1.17} καὶ
αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων [E 1.22, 1.23]>
καὶ τὰ πάντα [E 1.22, 1.23]> ἐν αὐτῷ
{συνέστηκεν}, ^{1.18} <καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν
ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκ-
κλησίας [E 1.22-23, 4.15-16, 5.23]> [E 3.21]
>>>· ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή, {πρωτότοκος} ἐκ
τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται <ἐν πᾶσιν
[E 1.23, 4.6]> αὐτός {πρωτεύων}, ^{1.19} ὅτι
<<<ἐν αὐτῷ <(εὐδόκησεν) [E 1.5, 1.9]>
<<<πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα [E 1.23]> [E 3.19]>>>
κατοικῆσαι [E 3.17]>>> ^{1.20} <<<<καὶ δι'
αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι <<< <<τὰ
πάντα [E 1.22, 1.23]> εἰς αὐτόν [E
4.15]>>, <<(εἰρηνοποιήσας) <διὰ τοῦ
αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ [E 1.7,
2.16]> [E 2.13-14, 2.15]>>[E 2.16]>>>>, [δι'
αὐτοῦ] εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ
ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς [E 1.10, 3.15]>>>.

^{1.21} <<Καὶ ὑμᾶς <ποτε [E 2.2,
2.3]> ὄντας [E 2.1]>> <<< <<ἀπηλο-
τριωμένους καὶ <(ἐχθρούς) [E 2.14,
2.16]> τῇ <διανοίᾳ [E 2.3]> [E 4.18]>> ἐν
τοῖς <ἔργοις [E 2.9, 2.10]> τοῖς πονηροῖς,
^{1.22} νυνὶ δὲ [E 2.12-13]>>> <<ἀποκα-
τήλαξεν <ἐν τῷ {σώματι τῆς σαρ-
κός} αὐτοῦ [E 2.14]> διὰ τοῦ {θανά-
του} [E 2.16]>> <<παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς

<πλήρωμα [C 1.19]> τοῦ << <τὰ πάν-
τα [C 1.16 twice, 1.17 twice, 1.20]> <ἐν
πᾶσιν [C 1.18]> >>²⁵ πληρουμένου.

^{2.1} << <Καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας
[C 1.21]> νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώ-
μασιν>>²⁶ καὶ <<ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις
ὕμων, ^{2.2} ἐν αἷς <ποτε [C 1.21]> περι-
επατήσατε κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσ-
μου τούτου, κατὰ τὸν {ἄρχοντα} τῆς
ἐξουσίας τοῦ {ἀέρος}, τοῦ πνεύματος
τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς
τῆς ἀπειθείας· ^{2.3} ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς

²⁵ See the frequent occurrence of τὰ πάντα in Col 1.16-17 and 20, and see ἐν πᾶσιν in Col 1.18 ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτός πρωτεύων. See further Col 3.11 [τὰ] πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός.

²⁶ Col 1.21 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλοτριωμένους and 2.13 καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας {ἐν} τοῖς παραπτώμασιν.

<ἀγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ {ἀνεγκλήτους} κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ [E 1.4]> [E 5.27]>>, ^{1,23} <<εἶ γε {ἐπιμένετε} τῇ <πίστει [E 2.8]> <τεθεμελιωμένοι [E 3.17]> καὶ {ἑδραῖοι} καὶ μὴ {μετακινούμενοι} ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος <<τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὐ ἠκούσατε, τοῦ {κηρυχθέντος} ἐν πάσῃ {κτίσει} τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν [E 4.20-21]>>>, οὐ ἔγενόμην <ἐγὼ Παῦλος [E 3.1]> διάκονος [E 3.6-7]>>.

πάντες ἀνεστράφημέν <ποτε [C 1.21]> ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν ποιοῦντες τὰ {θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς} καὶ τῶν <διανοιῶν [C 1.21]>, καὶ ἡμεθα τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς>>²⁷ ὡς καὶ οἱ {λοιποὶ}. ^{2.4} ὁ δὲ θεὸς {πλούσιος} ὢν ἐν {ἐλέει}, διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ ἦν ἡγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, ^{2.5} <καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ, - χάριτί ἐστε {σεσωσμένοι} - ^{2.6} καὶ συνήγειρεν>>²⁸ καὶ <συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς {ἐπουρανίοις} ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ>²⁹, ^{2.7} ἵνα <{ἐνδείξῃται}>³⁰ ἐν τοῖς {αἰῶσιν τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις} τὸ {ὑπερβάλλον} πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἐν {χρηστότητι} ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

^{2.8} Τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε {σεσωσμένοι} <<διὰ <πίστεως [C 1.23]> >>³¹ καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ {δῶρον}. ^{2.9} οὐκ ἐξ <ἔργων [C 1.21]>, ἵνα μή τις {καυχῆσεται}. ^{2.10} αὐτοῦ γάρ

²⁷ Col 3.5-7 ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν (...), δι' ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ [ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας]. ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιπατήσατέ ποτε.

²⁸ Col 2.12-13 ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως [cf. διὰ πίστεως in Eph 2.8] τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν, συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ, χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα.

²⁹ Cf. Col 3.1 Εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε [cf. συνήγειρεν in Eph 2.6] τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, οὐ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος and especially Col 3.3 ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ.

³⁰ Cf. ἐνδείκνυμι in Eph 2.7 to δειγματίζω in Col 2.15 ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ.

³¹ Cf. Col 2.12 ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ on which also Eph 2.5-6 is dependent.

έσμεν {ποίημα}, <κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ>³² ἐπὶ << ἔργοις [C 1.21]> ἀγαθοῖς οἷς {προητοίμασεν} ὁ θεός, ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν>>³³.

2.11 {Διὸ} μνημονεύετε ὅτι ποτὲ ὑμεῖς τὰ <ἔθνη>³⁴ ἐν σαρκί, <οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου>³⁵, 2.12 ὅτι <<ἦτε τῷ καιρῷ {ἐκείνῳ} <{χωρὶς} Χριστοῦ>³⁶, ἀππλοτριωμένοι τῆς {πολιτείας} τοῦ {Ἰσραὴλ} καὶ {ξένοι} τῶν {διαθηκῶν} τῆς {ἐπαγγελίας}, ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ <{ἄθεοι} ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ>³⁶.

2.13 <γυνὶ δέ>>³⁷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

³² Col 1.16 ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὄρατα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι.

³³ Eph 2.10 ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ θεός, ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν is contrasted to Eph 2.1-2 ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν αἷς ποτε περιεπατήσατε (περιεπατέω occurring in the current passage only in 2.2 and 2.10) which text is again dependent on Col 3.7 ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατε ποτε, where ἐν οἷς refers back either to πορνείαν ἀκαθαρσίαν πάθος ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἣτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία (Col 3.5) or to τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας (Col 3.6). Cf. Eph 2.10 also to Col 1.10 περιπατήσαι ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν, ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες.

³⁴ The ἔθνη are addressed throughout the current passage in Eph 2.11, 3.1, 3.6 and 3.8; the use of this term can be traced back to the parallel text in Col, namely to Col 1.27 οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεός γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, on which especially Eph 3.4-6 is dependent.

³⁵ Col 2.11 Ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ and 2.13 καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκός ὑμῶν and eventually 3.11 ὅπου οὐκ ἔνι (...) περιτομῇ καὶ ἀκροβυστίᾳ.

³⁶ Cf. Col 2.8 κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου [cf. ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ] καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν [cf. χωρὶς Χριστοῦ].

³⁷ Col 1.21-22 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε [cf. τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ in Eph 2.12] ὄντας ἀππλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς [cf. καὶ ξένοι in Eph 2.12] τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς, γυνὶ δέ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκός αὐτοῦ.

ὕμεις οἱ ποτε ὄντες {μακρὰν} ἐγενή-
θητε {ἐγγύς} <<ἐν τῷ αἵματι <τοῦ
Χριστοῦ.

2.14 Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη
ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας>>³⁸ τὰ {ἀμφότερα}
ἐν>³⁹ καὶ <<<τὸ {μεσότοιχον} τοῦ
{φραγμοῦ} {λύσας}, τὴν <{ἐχ-
θραν}>⁴⁰ <ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ>⁴¹,

2.15 τὸν {νόμον} τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγ-
μασιν {καταργήσας}, ἵνα τοὺς {δύο}
<κτίση ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα {καινὸν}
ἄνθρωπον>⁴² <ποιῶν εἰρήνην>⁴³

2.16 καὶ <<ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς {ἀμ-
φοτέρους} <ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι>⁴⁴ τῷ θεῷ
διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἀποκτείνας τὴν

38 Col 1.20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ.

39 Col 3.15 καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβεύετω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι [cf. besides ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν in Eph 2.14 also the identical phrase ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι in Eph 2.16 καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι]. The term εἰρήνη occurs three times in the current passage in Eph, namely in Eph 2.14, 15 and 17.

40 The term ἐχθρα in Eph 2.14 and 16 is - as its context in Eph 2.16 makes clear - dependent on the term ἐχθρός in Col 1.21 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς.

41 Col 1.22 νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου and 2.11 Ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκὸς, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

42 Col 1.16 ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα and 3.9-10 ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον [cf. τὸν καινὸν in Eph 2.15] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν.

43 Col 1.20 εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ [cf. διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ in Eph 2.16] αὐτοῦ, [δι' αὐτοῦ] εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

44 Col 3.15 καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη [cf. the term εἰρήνη in Eph 2.14, 15 and 17] τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβεύετω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι.

{ἐχθραν}>>⁴⁵ ἐν αὐτῷ>>>⁴⁶. 2.17 καὶ ἐλθῶν {εὐηγγελίσατο} εἰρήνην ὑμῖν τοῖς {μακρὰν} καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς {ἐγγύς}. 2.18 ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν {προσαγωγήν} οἱ {ἀμφότεροι} ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. 2.19 ἄρα οὖν οὐκέτι ἐστὲ {ξένοι} καὶ {πάρ-οικοι} ἀλλὰ ἐστὲ {συμπολίται} τῶν ἁγίων καὶ {οἰκεῖοι} τοῦ θεοῦ, 2.20 <ἐπ-οικοδομηθέντες>⁴⁷ ἐπὶ τῷ {θεμελίῳ} τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ {προφητῶν}, ὄντος {ἀκρογωνιαίου} αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, 2.21 ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα {οἰκοδομὴ} {συναρμολογουμένη} <αὔξει>⁴⁸ εἰς {ναὸν} ἅγιον ἐν κυρίῳ, 2.22 ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς {συνοικοδομεῖσθε} εἰς {κατ-οικητήριον} τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι.

1.24 <<<<Νῦν {χαίρω} ἐν τοῖς {παθήμασιν} ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ {ἀντ-αναπληρῶ} τὰ {ὕστερήματα} τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ <<<Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ

3.1 Τούτου {χάριν} <ἐγὼ Παῦ-λος [C 1.23]> ὁ <{δέσμιος}>⁴⁹ τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Ἰησοῦ] ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν <ἐθ-νῶν>⁵⁰ 3.2 - εἴ γε ἠκούσατε <τῆν

⁴⁵ Col 1.20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξει τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ and 1.21-22 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας (...) ἐχθροὺς [cf. the term ἐχθρα in Eph 2.14 and 16] (...), νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι [cf. ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι in Eph 2.16] τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου.

⁴⁶ Col 2.14-15 ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν [see τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν in Eph 2.15] ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου [see τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ in Eph 2.14] προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ [see διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ in Eph 2.16] ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ [see ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἐχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ in Eph 2.16].

⁴⁷ Col 2.6-7 ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ.

⁴⁸ Col 1.10 περιπατῆσαι ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν, ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ.

⁴⁹ Col 4.18 μνημονεύετε μου τῶν δεσμῶν.

⁵⁰ For the term ἔθνη see besides Eph 3.1 also Eph 2.11, 3.6 and 3.8; they (and Eph 3.6 in particular) are dependent on Col 1.27 οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ <<τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ [E 4.12]>>>, ὃ ἐστὶν <<ἡ ἐκκλησία [E 3.13]>>>> [E 1.22-23]>>, ^{1.25} ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ <τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθείσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς [E 3.2]> [E 3.6-7]>>> πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ,

^{1.26} <<< <<τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν <αἰώνων [E 3.9, 3.11]>> καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν [E 3.21]> - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ, ^{1.27} οἷς {ἠθέλησεν} ὁ θεὸς <γνωρίσαι [E 3.3, 3.5, 3.10 and also 1.9]> τί τὸ <πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης [E 1.18, 3.16]> τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς <ἔθνεσιν [E 2.11, 3.1, 3.6, 3.8]>, ὃ ἐστὶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης [E 1.9, 1.18, 3.3-6,

οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς [C 1.25]>, ^{3.3} [ὅτι] κατὰ {ἀποκάλυψιν} <ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον [C 1.27]>⁵¹, καθὼς {προέγραψα} ἐν {ὀλίγῳ}, ^{3.4} πρὸς ὃ {δύνασθε} <ἀναγινώσκοντες>⁵² {νοῆσαι} τὴν <σύνεσίν μου ἐν <<τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ>⁵³, ^{3.5} ὃ ἐτέραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς {υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων} ὡς νῦν {ἀπεκαλύφθη} τοῖς ἀγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ {προφήταις} ἐν <πνεύματι>⁵⁴, ^{3.6} εἶναι τὰ <ἔθνη>⁵⁵ [C 1.26-27]>>⁵⁶ {συγκληρονόμα} καὶ {σύσσωμα} καὶ {συμμέτοχα} τῆς {ἐπαγγελίας} ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ <τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ^{3.7} οὗ ἐγενήθη διὰ-κονος κατὰ τὴν {δωρεάν} τῆς χά-

⁵¹ Col 1.26-27 τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. The verb γνωρίζω occurs three times in the current passage in Eph, namely in Eph 3.3, 5 and 10 (cf. also 1.9); all these verses are dependent on Col 1.27.

⁵² Col 4.16 καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνώσθῃ παρ' ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή, ποιήσατε ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνώσθῃ, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνώτε.

⁵³ Col 2.2 εἰς πᾶν πλοῦτος τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ and 4.3 λαλήσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Cf. Eph 3.4-5 τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃ (...) νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη (...) ἐν πνεύματι also to Col 1.9 ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ.

⁵⁴ Cf. Eph 3.4-5 τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃ (...) νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη (...) ἐν πνεύματι to Col 1.9 ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ.

⁵⁵ For the term ἔθνη see besides Eph 3.6 also Eph 2.11, 3.1 and 3.8; they (but Eph 3.6 in particular) are dependent on Col 1.27 οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

⁵⁶ Col 1.26-27 τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

3.8]>>>>· 1.28 ὃν ἡμεῖς {καταγγέλλομεν} {νουθετοῦντες} πάντα ἄνθρωπον καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον <τέλειον [E 4.13]> ἐν Χριστῷ· 1.29 εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπιῶ {ἀγωνιζόμενος} <κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει [E 1.19-20, 3.7, 3.20; cf. 4.16]>.

ριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι [C 1.23, 1.25]>⁵⁷ <κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ [C 1.29]>⁵⁸.

3.8 Ἐμοὶ τῷ {ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ} πάντων ἀγίων ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη, τοῖς <ἔθνεσιν>⁵⁹ {εὐαγγελίσασθαι} <τὸ {ἀνεξιχνίαστον} πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [C 1.27]>⁶⁰ 3.9 καὶ {φωτίσαι} [πάντας] τίς ἡ οἰκονομία <τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων [C 1.26]>⁶¹ ἐν <<τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι, 3.10 <ἵνα <γνωρισθῇ>⁶² νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς {ἐπουρανίοις}>>>⁶³ διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ>>⁶⁴,

⁵⁷ Col 1.24-25 ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθείσάν μοι and Col 1.23 τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (...), οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος.

⁵⁸ Col 1.29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει.

⁵⁹ For the term ἔθνη see also Eph 2.11, 3.1 and 3.6; they (and especially Eph 3.6) are dependent on Col 1.27 οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

⁶⁰ Col 1.27 τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν [cf. τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι in Eph 3.8], ὃ ἐστὶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν.

⁶¹ Col 1.25-26 πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ.

⁶² The verb γνωρίζω occurs three times in the current passage in Eph, namely in Eph 3.3, 5 and 10 (cf. also 1.9); all these verses are dependent on Col 1.26-27 ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

⁶³ Col 1.16 ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὄρατα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι.

⁶⁴ Col 2.15 ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ [cf. ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν παρρησίαν in Eph 3.12], θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ and Col 2.2-3 εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν [cf. γνωρισθῆ in Eph 3.10] τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ, ἐν ᾧ εἰσὶν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως [cf. γνωρισθῆ in Eph 3.10] ἀπόκρυφοι.

3.11 κατὰ {πρόθεσιν} τῶν <αἰώνων>⁶⁵
ἦν ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ
κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, ^{3.12} ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν
<παρρησίαν>⁶⁶ καὶ {προσαγωγήν} ἐν
{πεποιθήσει} <διὰ τῆς πίστεως>⁶⁷
αὐτοῦ.

3.13 {διὸ} αἰτοῦμαι μὴ {ἐγκακεῖν} <ἐν
ταῖς θλίψεσίν μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν [C
1.24]>⁶⁸, ἥτις ἐστὶν δόξα ὑμῶν.

2.1 {Θέλω} γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι
{ἡλικόν} {ἀγῶνα} ἔχω ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ
τῶν ἐν {Λαοδικείᾳ} καὶ ὅσοι οὐχ
{ἐόρακαν} τὸ {πρόσωπόν} μου ἐν
σαρκί, ^{2.2} ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν <<αἱ
καρδίαι αὐτῶν συμβιβασθέντες <ἐν
ἀγάπῃ [E 4.16]> [E 3.17]>> καὶ εἰς πᾶν
πλοῦτος τῆς {πληροφορίας} τῆς
<<συνέσεως, <εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ
μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ
[E 3.4]>>, ^{2.3} ἐν ᾧ εἰσιν πάντες οἱ {θη-
σαυροὶ} τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως
{ἀπόκρυφοι} [E 3.10]>. ^{2.4} <Τοῦτο λέγω
[E 4.17]>, <ἵνα μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς {παραλο-
γίζηται} ἐν {πιθανολογίᾳ} [E 5.6]>.
^{2.5} εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκί {ἄπειμι}, ἀλλὰ
τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμι, {χαίρων}
καὶ βλέπων ὑμῶν τὴν {τάξιν} καὶ τὸ
{στερέωμα} τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως
ὑμῶν.

⁶⁵ Cf. τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων in Eph 3.9, which verse is dependent on Col 1.26 τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν.

⁶⁶ Cf. Col 2.15 ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ.

⁶⁷ Col 2.12 ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

⁶⁸ Col 1.24 Νῦν χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία.

2.6 <<Ὡς οὖν {παρελάβετε} τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, 2.7 <ἐρριζωμένοι [E 3.17]> καὶ <ἐποικοδομούμενοι [E 2.20]> ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ {βεβαιούμενοι} τῇ πίστει καθὼς ἐδιδάχθητε [E 4.20-21]>>, περισσεύοντες ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ.

2.8 Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ {συλαγωγῶν} διὰ τῆς {φιλοσοφίας} καὶ <<κενῆς <ἀπάτης [E 4.22]> [E 5.6]>> κατὰ τὴν {παράδοσιν} τῶν ἀνθρώπων, <κατὰ τὰ {στοιχεῖα} τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν [E 2.12]>. 2.9 ὅτι <ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ [E 3.17]> <πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς {θεότητος} {σωματικῶς}, 2.10 καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι [E 3.19]>, ὅς ἐστιν <ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας [E 1.21]>.

2.11 Ἐν ᾧ καὶ {περιετμήθητε} <<περιτομῇ {ἀχειροποιήτῳ} <ἐν τῇ {ἀπεκδύσει} τοῦ {σώματος τῆς σαρκός} [E 2.14]>, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ [E 2.11]>> τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 2.12 {συνταφέντες} αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ <<<<βαπτισμῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ <<<< συνηγέρθητε <διὰ τῆς πίστεως [E 2.8, 3.12, 3.17]> [E 4.9]>>>> τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν [E 1.19-20, cf. 4.16]>>. 2.13 <καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας [ἐν] τοῖς παραπτώμασιν [E 2.1]> καὶ <τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκός ὑμῶν [E 2.11]>, συνεζωποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ, χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα [E 2.5-6]>>>. 2.14 <<<{ἐξ-αλείψας} τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν {χειρόγραφον} τοῖς δόγμασιν ὃ ἦν {ὑπεναντίον}

ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ {μέσου}
{προσηλώσας} αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ·
2.15 << ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς
καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας [E 1.21, 3.10]>
<{ἐδειγμάτισεν} [E 2.7]> ἐν <παρρησίᾳ
[E 3.12]>, {θριαμβεύσας} αὐτοὺς ἐν
αὐτῷ [6.12]>> [E 2.14-16]>>>.

2.16 Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς <{κρινέτω}
ἐν {βρώσει} καὶ ἐν {πόσει} [E 5.29]> ἢ
ἐν μέρει {ἐορτῆς} ἢ {νεομηνίας} ἢ
{σαββάτων}· 2.17 << ἅ ἐστιν {σκιά} τῶν
μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ <σῶμα τοῦ Χρισ-
τοῦ [E 4.12]> [E 1.21-23]>>. 2.18 μηδεὶς
ὑμᾶς {καταβραβεύετω} {θέλων} ἐν
ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ {θρησκείᾳ} τῶν
{ἀγγέλων}, ἃ {ἐόρακεν} {ἐμβατεύων},
<{εἰκῆ} {φυσιούμενος} ὑπὸ τοῦ {υἱοῦ
τῆς σαρκὸς} αὐτοῦ [E 4.17]>, 2.19 καὶ οὐ
{κρατῶν} <τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν
τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν καὶ συν-
δέσμων {ἐπιχορηγούμενον} καὶ συμ-
βιβαζόμενον αὐξοῖ τὴν αὐξησιν
τοῦ θεοῦ [E 4.15-16]>.

2.20 Εἰ {ἀπεθάνετε} σὺν Χριστῷ
ἀπὸ τῶν {στοιχείων} τοῦ κόσμου, τί
ὡς {ζῶντες} ἐν κόσμῳ {δογματί-
ζεσθε}; 2.21 <μὴ {ἄψη} μηδὲ {γεύση}
μηδὲ {θίγης} [E 5.29]>, 2.22 ἅ ἐστιν
πάντα εἰς {φθορὰν} τῇ {ἀποχρήσει},
κατὰ τὰ {ἐντάλματα} καὶ <διδασκα-
λίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων [E 4.14]>.

2.23 ἅτινά ἐστιν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σο-
φίας ἐν {ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ} καὶ ταπεινο-
φροσύνῃ [καὶ] <{ἀφειδία} σώματος [E
5.29]>, οὐκ ἐν {τιμῇ} τινι πρὸς {πλησ-
μονὴν} τῆς σαρκός.

3.1 <<Εἰ οὖν {συνηγέρθητε}
 τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ {ἄνω} {ζητεῖτε}, οὐ ὁ
 Χριστός ἐστιν <ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ
 {καθήμενος} [E 1.20]> [E 2.6]>>. 3.2 τὰ
 {ἄνω} {φρονεῖτε}, μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.
 3.3 {ἀπεθάνετε} γάρ καὶ <ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν
 {κέκρυπται} σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ
 [E 2.6]>. 3.4 {ὅταν} ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῆ,
 ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν, τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ
 φανερωθήσεσθε ἐν δόξῃ.

3.14 Τούτου {χάριν} {κάμπω}
 τὰ {γόνατά} μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα,
 3.15 ἐξ οὗ <πάσα {πατριὰ} ἐν οὐρα-
νοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς>⁶⁹ {ὀνομάζεται},
 3.16 ἵνα δῶ ὑμῖν <<κατὰ <τὸ πλοῦτος
τῆς δόξης>⁷⁰ αὐτοῦ δυνάμει {κρα-
 ταιωθῆναι}>>⁷¹ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος
 αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν {ἔσω} ἄνθρωπον,
 3.17 <<<κατοικήσαι τὸν Χριστὸν
 <διὰ τῆς πίστεως>⁷² ἐν <<ταῖς
καρδίαις ὑμῶν>>⁷³, ἐν ἀγάπῃ>>⁷⁴
 <ἔρριζωμένοι>⁷⁵ καὶ <τεθεμελιω-
 μένοι>⁷⁶, 3.18 ἵνα {ἐξισχύσητε} {κατα-
 λαβέσθαι} σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀγίοις τί τὸ

69 Col 1.16 τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς and 1.20 τὰ πάντα (...), (...) εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

70 Col 1.26-27 τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

71 Col 1.11 ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

72 Col 2.12 ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

73 Col 1.19 ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικήσαι and 2.9 ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς and 3.15 καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβεύετω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.

74 Col 2.2 ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν συμβιβασθέντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

75 Col 2.6-7 ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, ἔρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ.

76 Col 1.23 εἰ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι.

{πλάτος} καὶ {μῆκος} καὶ {ὑψος} καὶ {βάθος}, 3.19 γινῶναί τε τὴν {ὑπερβάλλουσαν} τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ, << <ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλῆρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ>⁷⁷.

3.20 Τῷ δὲ {δυναμένῳ} ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι {ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ} ᾧν αἰτούμεθα>⁷⁸ ἢ {νοοῦμεν} <κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν>⁷⁹; 3.21 <αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ>⁸⁰ <εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ {αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων}>⁸¹, {ἀμήν}.

4.1 Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ ὁ <{δέσμιος}>⁸² ἐν κυρίῳ <ἄξιως περιπατήσαι>⁸³ τῆς {κλήσεως} ἧς ἐκλήθητε, 4.2 <μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πραΰτητος, μετὰ μακροθυμίας, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ, 4.3 {σπουδάζοντες} {τηρεῖν} τὴν {ἐνότητα} τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης. 4.4 Ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεύμα, καθὼς καὶ

77 Col 2.9-10 ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλῆρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι. Cf. πᾶν τὸ πλῆρωμα in Col 1.19 ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλῆρωμα κατοικῆσαι.

78 Col 1.9 οὐ παύομεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι, ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ.

79 Col 1.29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει.

80 Cf. Col 1.12-13, 15 and 18 εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ (...) [cf. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in Eph 3.21], ὅς (...) μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ (...) [cf. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in Eph 3.21], ὅς (...) ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας [cf. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in Eph 3.21].

81 Col 1.26 τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν.

82 Col 4.18 μνημονεῦτέ μου τῶν δεσμῶν.

83 Col 1.10 περιπατήσαι ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου.

ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς {κλήσεως} ὑμῶν>⁸⁴.

^{4.5} εἰς κύριος, <μία πίστις, ἐν βάπτισμα>⁸⁵, ^{4.6} εἰς θεός καὶ {πατὴρ πάντων}, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ <ἐν πᾶσιν>⁸⁶.

^{4.7} Ἐνὶ δὲ ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ {μέτρον} τῆς {δωρεᾶς} τοῦ Χριστοῦ. ^{4.8} {διὸ} λέγει· {Ἄναβας} εἰς {ὑψος} {ἠχμαλώτευσεν} {αἰχμαλωσίαν}, ἔδωκεν {δόματα} τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. ^{4.9} τὸ δὲ {ἀνέβη} τί ἐστίν, εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ {κατέβη} εἰς τὰ {κατώτερα} [μέρη] τῆς γῆς; ^{4.10} ὁ {καταβάς} αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ {ἀναβάς} {ὑπεράνω} πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα.

^{4.11} Καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ {προφήτας}, τοὺς δὲ {εὐαγγελιστάς}, τοὺς δὲ {ποιμένας} καὶ {διδασκάλους}, ^{4.12} πρὸς τὸν {καταρτισμὸν} τῶν ἁγίων εἰς ἔργον <διακονίας>⁸⁷, εἰς {οἰκοδομὴν} τοῦ <σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ>⁸⁸,

⁸⁴ Col 3.12-15 Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν (...) ταπεινοφροσύνην πραύτητα μακροθυμίαν, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων (...) ἐπὶ πᾶσιν δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἀγάπην, ὃ ἐστὶν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος, καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβεύετω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι.

⁸⁵ Col 2.12 συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βάπτισμῳ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

⁸⁶ Col 1.18 ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων and 3.11 ἀλλὰ [τὰ] πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός. But cf. for the whole passage Eph 4.4-6 also 1 Cor 12.4ff. and especially 1 Cor 12.6 ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς θεός ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, 12.11 πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα and 12.13 ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἐν σώμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι.

⁸⁷ Col 4.17 καὶ εἶπατε Ἀρχίππῳ βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν ἣν παρέλαβες ἐν κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς.

⁸⁸ Col 1.24 ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία and 2.17 ἃ ἐστὶν σκιά τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

4.13 {μέχρι} {καταντήσωμεν} οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν {ἐνότητα} τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς ἄνδρα <τέλειον>⁸⁹, εἰς {μέτρον} {ἡλικίας} τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 4.14 ἵνα {μηκέτι} ὦμεν {νήπιοι}, {κλυδωνιζόμενοι} καὶ {περιφερόμενοι} παντὶ {ἀνέμῳ} τῆς <διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ {κυβείᾳ} τῶν ἀνθρώπων>⁹⁰, ἐν {πανουργίᾳ} πρὸς τὴν {μεθοδείαν} τῆς {πλάνης}, 4.15 {ἀληθεύοντες} δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ <<αὐξήσωμεν <εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα>⁹¹, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, 4.16 ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα {συναρμολογούμενον} καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας <κατ' ἐνέργειαν>⁹² ἐν {μέτρῳ} ἐνὸς ἐκάστου μέρους τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ σώματος

⁸⁹ Col 1.28 ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ and 4.12 ἵνα σταθῆτε τέλειοι καὶ πεπληροφορημένοι ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ.

⁹⁰ Col 2.22 κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

⁹¹ Col 1.16 τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται and especially 1.20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν.

⁹² This phrase recalls the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν in Eph 1.19 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ. Ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν (which is dependent on Col 2.12 διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν) and in Eph 3.7 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ (which is dependent on Col 1.29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει). So *indirectly* the phrase κατ' ἐνέργειαν in Eph 4.16 is dependent on these texts in Col. The noun ἐνέργεια occurs only in Eph 1.19, 3.7, 4.16 and their source is Col 1.29 and 2.12.

3.5 [Νεκρώσατε] οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, <<<πορνείαν <ἀκαθαρσίαν [E 4.19]> {πάθος} << <ἐπιθυμίαν [E 4.22]> {κακὴν}, καὶ τὴν <πλεονεξίαν [E 4.19]>, ἥτις ἐστὶν {εἰδωλολατρία}, 3.6 δι' ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ [ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας] [E 5.3, 5.5-6]>>>. 3.7 <ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περι-επατήσατέ ποτε [E 2.1-2, 2.10]> [E 2.1-3]>>, ὅτε (ἐζήτε) ἐν τούτοις· 3.8 νυνὶ δὲ <<<ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, <ὀργὴν, θυμόν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν [E 4.31]>, << <[αἰσχρολογίαν] [E 5.4, 5.12]> ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν [E 4.29]>>> · 3.9 <μὴ {ψεύδεσθε} εἰς ἀλλήλους

ποιεῖται>>⁹³ εἰς {οἰκοδομὴν} ἑαυτοῦ <ἐν ἀγάπῃ>⁹⁴.

4.17 <Τοῦτο οὖν λέγω>⁹⁵ καὶ {μαρτύρομαι} ἐν κυρίῳ, {μηκέτι} ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν, καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν <ματαιότητι τοῦ νοῦς αὐτῶν>⁹⁶, 4.18 <{ἐσκοτωμένοι} τῇ διανοίᾳ ὄντες, ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ>⁹⁷ διὰ τὴν {ἄγνοιαν} τὴν οὔσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὴν {πώρωσιν} τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, 4.19 οἵτινες {ἀπηληγότες} ἑαυτοὺς {παρέδωκαν} τῇ {ἀσελγείᾳ} εἰς {ἐργασίαν} <ἀκαθαρσίας [C 3.5]> πάσης ἐν <πλεονεξίᾳ [C 3.5]>.

4.20 <Ἵμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν, 4.21 εἴ γε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε,

⁹³ Col 2.19 καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον αὖξει τὴν αὖξιν τοῦ θεοῦ and Col 1.18 καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας, so it seems if Eph 4.15-16 makes use of two of the three κεφαλὴ-passages in Col (Col 1.18, 2.10 and 2.19), that is using the two only explicit σῶμα- and κεφαλὴ-passages in Col, namely Col 1.18 and 2.19. Eph 4.15-16 draws for the phrase τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν also twice on the direct context of Col 1.18, namely on 1.16 and 1.20.

⁹⁴ Col 2.2 ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν συμβιβασθέντες [cf. συμβιβαζόμενον διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας in Eph 4.16, although συμβιβάζω in Eph 4.16 is not dependent on Col 2.2, but on Col 2.19] ἐν ἀγάπῃ [all six ἐν ἀγάπῃ-passages in Eph (namely Eph 1.4, 3.18, 4.2, 4.15, 4.16 and 5.2) could be dependent on Col 2.2, the only ἐν ἀγάπῃ-passage in Col].

⁹⁵ Col 2.4 Τοῦτο λέγω, ἵνα μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς παραλογίζηται ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ.

⁹⁶ Col 2.18 εἰκῆ φυσιούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.

⁹⁷ Col 1.21 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτε ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς.

[E 4.25]>, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς {πράξεσιν} αὐτοῦ ^{3.10} καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι <τὸν νέον> τὸν {ἀνακαινούμενον} εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' {εἰκόνα} τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν [E 2.15]> [E 4.22-24]>>>, ^{3.11} {ὄπου} οὐκ ἔνι {Ἑλλην} καὶ {Ἰουδαίος}, <περιτομὴ καὶ ἀκροβυστία [E 2.11]>, {βάρβαρος}, {Σκύθης}, <δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος [E 6.8]>, ἀλλὰ <[τὰ] πάντα καὶ <ἐν πάσιν [E 4.6]> [E 1.23]>> Χριστός.

καθὼς ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ>⁹⁸, ^{4.22} <<ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν {προτέραν} {ἀναστροφὴν} τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν {φθειρόμενον} κατὰ τὰς <ἐπιθυμίας [C 3.5]> τῆς <ἀπάτης>⁹⁹, ^{4.23} {ἀνανεοῦσθαι} δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν ^{4.24} καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν {καινὸν} ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα [C 3.8-10]>>¹⁰⁰ ἐν {δικαιοσύνη} καὶ {ὀσιότητι} τῆς ἀληθείας.

^{4.25} <[Διὸ] ἀποθέμενοι τὸ {ψεῦδος} λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος μετὰ τοῦ {πλησίον} αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων μέλη [C 3.9]>¹⁰¹, ^{4.26} {ὀργίζεσθε} καὶ μὴ {ἀμαρτάνετε}· ὁ {ἥλιος} μὴ {ἐπιδυέτω} ἐπὶ [τῷ] {παροργισμῷ} ὑμῶν, ^{4.27} μηδὲ δίδοτε {τόπον} τῷ {διαβόλῳ}. ^{4.28} ὁ {κλέπτων} {μηκέτι} {κλεπέτω}, μᾶλλον δὲ κοπιάτω ἐργαζόμενος ταῖς [ιδίαις] χερσὶν τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἵνα ἔχη {μεταδιδόναι} τῷ {χρείαν} ἔχοντι. ^{4.29} <πᾶς λόγος {σαπρὸς} ἐκ τοῦ

⁹⁸ Col 2.6-7 Ὡς οὖν παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, (...) βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει καθὼς ἐδιδάχθητε, 1.5-7 ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς (...), ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ· καθὼς ἐμάθετε ἀπὸ Ἐπαφρᾶ and possibly also 1.23 εἴ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι (...) καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὐ ἠκούσατε, τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν.

⁹⁹ Col 2.8 Βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

¹⁰⁰ Col 3.8-10 νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργὴν, θυμόν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον [cf. καινὸν in Eph 4.24] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον [cf. ἀνανεοῦσθαι in 4.23] εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν.

¹⁰¹ Col 3.9 μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους.

3.12 Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν, ὡς
 <{ἐκλεκτοὶ} [E 1.4]> τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιοι καὶ
 <ἡγαπημένοι [E 5.1, 5.2, 5.25]>,
 <{σπλάγγνα} {οἰκτιρμοῦ} {χρηστό-
 τητα} [E 4.32]> <<ταπεινοφροσύνην
 πραῦτητα μακροθυμίαν, 3.13 ἀνεχό-
 μενοι ἀλλήλων καὶ <χαριζόμενοι
 ἑαυτοῖς ἕαν τις πρὸς τινα ἔχη {μομ-
 φήν}>· καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἔχαρί-
 σατο ὑμῖν [E 4.32]>, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς
 3.14 ἐπὶ πᾶσιν δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἀγάπην,
 ὃ ἐστὶν σύνδεσμος τῆς {τελειότητος}.
 3.15 καὶ <<ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ <Χριστοῦ
 {βραβευέτω} ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν
 [E 3.17]>, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε <ἐν ἐνὶ
σώματι [E 2.16]> [E 2.13-14]>> [E 4.2-4]
 >>>· καὶ <{εὐχάριστοι} [E 5.4]> γίνεσ-
 θε.

στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ {ἐκπορευέσθω}
 [C 3.8]>¹⁰², ἀλλὰ εἴ τις ἀγαθὸς πρὸς
 {οἰκοδομὴν} τῆς {χρείας}, ἵνα δῶ
 χάριν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν. 4.30 καὶ μὴ
 {λυπεῖτε} τὸ {πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον} τοῦ
 θεοῦ, ἐν ᾧ {ἐσφραγίσθητε} εἰς {ἡμέ-
 ραν ἀπολυτρώσεως}.

4.31 <<πᾶσα <{πικρία}>¹⁰³ καὶ θυμὸς
 καὶ ὀργή καὶ {κραυγὴ} καὶ βλασ-
φημία ἀρθήτω ἀφ' ὑμῶν σὺν πάσῃ
κακίᾳ [C 3.8]>>¹⁰⁴. 4.32 γίνεσθε [δὲ] εἰς
 ἀλλήλους <{χρηστοί}, {εὐσπλάγγνοι}
 [C 3.12]>¹⁰⁵, <χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς,
καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἔχαρί-
σατο ὑμῖν [C 3.13]>.

5.1 Γίνεσθε οὖν {μιμηταὶ} τοῦ
 θεοῦ ὡς τέκνα <ἀγαπητὰ 5.2 καὶ περι-
 πατεῖτε ἐν ἀγάπῃ, καθὼς καὶ ὁ
 Χριστὸς ἡγάπησεν [C 3.12]>¹⁰⁶ ἡμᾶς
 καὶ {παρέδωκεν} ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
 {προσφορὰν} καὶ {θυσίαν} τῷ θεῷ εἰς
 {ὁσμὴν} {εὐωδίας}.

5.3 <<Πορνεία δὲ καὶ ἀκα-
 θαρσία πᾶσα ἢ πλεονεξία μηδὲ
 {ὀνομαζέσθω} ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς
 {πρέπει} ἀγίοις, 5.4 καὶ <{αἰσχροτής}
 καὶ {μωρολογία} [C 3.8]>¹⁰⁷ ἢ {εὐτρα-

102 Col 3.8 ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς (...) αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν.

103 Col 3.19 Οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπάτε τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ μὴ πικραίνεσθε πρὸς αὐτάς.

104 Col 3.8 νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργὴν, θυμὸν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν.

105 Col 3.12 Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν, ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι, σπλάγγνα οἰκτιρμοῦ χρηστότητα.

106 Col 3.12 Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν, ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι.

107 Col 3.8 νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργὴν, θυμὸν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν.



πελία}, ἃ οὐκ ἀνήκεν, ἀλλὰ μάλλον <εὐχαριστία [C 3.15, 3.17]>. ^{5.5} τοῦτο γὰρ ἴστε γινώσκοντες, ὅτι πᾶς <{πόρ-
 νος} ἢ {ἀκάθαρτος} ἢ {πλεονέκτης},
 ὃ ἐστίν {εἰδωλολάτρης} [C 3.5]>¹⁰⁸,
 οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν <τῇ βασι-
 λείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ>¹⁰⁹.

^{5.6} <Μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς {ἀπατάτω}
 κενοῖς λόγοις>¹¹⁰. διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ
 ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς
 υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας [C 3.5-6]>>¹¹¹.

^{5.7} μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε {συμμέτοχοι}
 αὐτῶν. ^{5.8} <ἦτε γὰρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν
 δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ>¹¹². ὡς τέκνα φωτός
 <περιπατεῖτε ^{5.9} - ὁ γὰρ {καρπὸς}
 τοῦ φωτός ἐν πάσῃ {ἀγαθωσύνῃ}>¹¹³
 καὶ {δικαιοσύνῃ} καὶ ἀληθείᾳ -

¹⁰⁸ Col 3.5 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν ἀκαθαρσίαν πάθος ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἧτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία. This fragment in Eph 5.5 is partly a repetition of Eph 5.3 (which is derived from Col 3.5), but now in the adjective form (πορνεία=πόρνος, ἀκαθαρσία= ἀκάθαρτος, πλεονεξία=πλεονέκτης), although it also directly draws on Col 3.5 (so without being mediated through Eph 5.3) because εἰδωλολάτρης is derived from the noun εἰδωλολατρία found in Col 3.5.

¹⁰⁹ Col 1.13 καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ [cf. τοῦ Χριστοῦ in Eph 5.5] and 4.11 συνεργοὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

¹¹⁰ Col 2.8 Βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων and 2.4 Τοῦτο λέγω, ἵνα μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς παραλογίζηται ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ.

¹¹¹ Col 3.5-6 Νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν ἀκαθαρσίαν πάθος ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἧτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία, δι' ἧς ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ [ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας].

¹¹² Col 1.12-13 εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἰκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἀγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί· ὃς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ.

¹¹³ Col 1.10 περιπατεῖτε ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν, ἐν παντί ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες.

5.10 {δοκιμάζοντες} <τί έστιν εὐ-
 άρεστον τῷ κυρίῳ>¹¹⁴, 5.11 καὶ μὴ
 {συγκοινωνεῖτε} τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς
 <{ἀκάρποις}>¹¹⁵ τοῦ σκότους, μάλλον
 δὲ καὶ {ἐλέγχετε}. 5.12 τὰ γὰρ {κρυφῆ}
 γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν <{αἰσχροὺς}>
 καὶ λέγειν [C 3.8]>¹¹⁶, 5.13 τὰ δὲ πάντα
 {ἐλεγχόμενα} ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανε-
 ροῦται, 5.14 πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον
 φῶς ἐστίν. {διὸ} λέγει· Ἔγειρε, ὁ {κα-
 θεύδων}, καὶ {ἀνάστα} ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ
 {ἐπιφάνσει} σοι ὁ Χριστός.

5.15 Βλέπετε οὖν {ἀκριβῶς} πῶς
 <περιπατεῖτε μὴ ὡς {ἄσοφοι} ἀλλ' ὡς
 {σοφοί}, 5.16 ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν
 καιρὸν>¹¹⁷, ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραὶ
 εἰσίν. 5.17 διὰ τοῦτο μὴ γίνεσθε {ἄφρο-
 νες}, ἀλλὰ {συνίετε} τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ
 κυρίου. 5.18 καὶ μὴ {μεθύσκεσθε}
 {οἴνῳ}, ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν {ἀσωτία}, ἀλλὰ
 πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι, 5.19 <λαλοῦν-
 τες ἑαυτοῖς [ἐν] ψαλμοῖς καὶ ᾠμοῖς
 καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς, ἄδοντες
 καὶ {ψάλλοντες} τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ
 κυρίῳ, 5.20 εὐχαριστοῦντες πάντοτε
 ὑπὲρ πάντων ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου
 ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῷ θεῷ καὶ
πατρὶ [C 3.16-17]>.

3.16 Ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ {ἐνοι-
 κείτω} ἐν ὑμῖν {πλουσίως}, ἐν πάσῃ
 σοφίᾳ διδάσκοντες <<καὶ {νουθε-
 τοῦντες} ἑαυτοὺς, ψαλμοῖς ᾠμοῖς
ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς ἐν [τῇ] χάριτι
ἄδοντες ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν
τῷ θεῷ. 3.17 καὶ πᾶν ὃ τι ἐὰν ποιῆτε ἐν
 λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ, πάντα ἐν ὀνόματι
 κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, <εὐχαριστοῦντες [E
 5.4]> τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ δι' αὐτοῦ [E 5.19-
 20]>>.

114 Col 3.20 τοῦτο γὰρ εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν ἐν κυρίῳ.

115 The phrase τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρποις τοῦ σκότους refers back to and is contrasted with the καρπὸς τοῦ φωτὸς in Eph 5.9, which passage is dependent on Col 1.10 ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες.

116 Col 3.8 νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργὴν, θυμὸν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν.

117 Col 4.5 Ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπατεῖτε πρὸς τοὺς ἔξω τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι.

3.18 <Αἱ γυναῖκες, ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ὡς ἀνήκεν ἐν κυρίῳ [E 5.21-22]>.

3.19 <Οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας [E 5.25]> καὶ μὴ <{πικραίνεσθε} [E 4.31]> πρὸς αὐτάς.

5.21 <Ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν {φόβῳ} Χριστοῦ, 5.22 αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ [C 3.18]>, 5.23 ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν {κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικὸς} ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς <κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας>¹¹⁸, αὐτὸς {σωτὴρ} τοῦ σώματος· 5.24 ἀλλὰ ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτως καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντί.

5.25 <Οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας [C 3.19]>, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς <ἠγάπησεν>¹¹⁹ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν {παρέδωκεν} ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, 5.26 ἵνα αὐτὴν {ἀγιάσῃ} {καθαρίσας} τῷ {λουτρῷ} τοῦ {ὑδατος} ἐν {ῥήματι}, 5.27 <ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ {ἔνδοξον} τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μὴ ἔχουσαν {σπίλον} ἢ {ρυτίδα} ἢ τι τῶν τοιούτων, ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία καὶ ἄμωμος>¹²⁰, 5.28 οὕτως {ὀφείλουσιν} [καὶ] οἱ ἄνδρες ἀγαπᾶν τὰς ἑαυτῶν γυναῖκας ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα. ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἑαυτὸν ἀγαπᾷ.

5.29 <Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα {ἐμίσησεν} ἀλλὰ {ἐκτρέφει} καὶ {θάλλει} αὐτήν>¹²¹,

118 Col 1.18 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

119 Col 3.12 ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι.

120 Col 1.22 παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἄμωμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.

121 The author of Eph's general statement (Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν ἀλλὰ ἐκτρέφει καὶ θάλλει αὐτήν) contradicts a phenomenon which is described in Col 2.16 (Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω ἐν βρώσει καὶ ἐν πόσει ἢ ἐν μέρει ἐορτῆς ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων), 2.21 (μὴ ἄψη μηδὲ γεύση μηδὲ θίγης) and 2.23 (ἀφειδία σώματος [= severe (lit. unsparing) treatment of the body, asceticism, BGD 124]).

καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν,
 5.30 ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ.
 5.31 (ἀντὶ) τούτου {καταλείπει} ἄνθρωπος {τὸν}
 πατέρα καὶ {τὴν} {μητέρα} καὶ {προσ-
 κολληθήσεται} πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ
 ἔσονται οἱ {δύο} εἰς σάρκα μίαν. 5.32 τὸ
 μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν· ἐγὼ δὲ
 λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλη-
 σίαν. 5.33 {πλήν} καὶ ὑμεῖς οἱ καθ' ἓνα,
 ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα οὕτως
 ἀγαπάτω ὡς ἑαυτόν, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα
 φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα.

3.20 <<Τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε
τοῖς γονεῦσιν κατὰ πάντα, <τοῦτο
γὰρ εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν ἐν κυρίῳ
 [E 5.10]> [E 6.1]>>.

3.21 <Οἱ πατέρες, μὴ {ἐρεθίζετε}
τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν [E 6.4]>, ἵνα μὴ
 {ἀθυμῶσιν}.

3.22 <<<Οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε
 κατὰ πάντα τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυ-
ρίοις [E 6.5]>, <μὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμο-
δουλίᾳ ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, ἀλλ'
 [E 6.6]> <ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας [E 6.5]>
 <φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον [E 6.5]>. 3.23 <ὃ
 ἐὰν ποιῆτε, ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐργάζεσθε [E
 6.6]> <ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀν-
θρώποις, 3.24 εἰδότες ὅτι [E 6.7-8]>
 <ἀπὸ κυρίου [E 6.8]> ἀπολήμψετε τὴν
 ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας. <τῷ
 κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε [E 6.6]>.

6.1 <Τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε
τοῖς γονεῦσιν ὑμῶν [ἐν κυρίῳ]
τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν δίκαιον [C 3.20]>.

6.2 {τίμα} τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν {μητέρα},
 ἣτις ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ {πρώτη} ἐν {ἐπαγ-
 γελίᾳ}, 6.3 ἵνα {εὖ} σοι γένηται καὶ ἔση
 {μακροχρόνιος} ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

6.4 <Καὶ οἱ πατέρες, μὴ {παρ-
 οργίζετε} τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν [C 3.21]>
 ἀλλὰ {ἐκτρέφετε} αὐτὰ ἐν {παιδείᾳ}
 καὶ {νουθεσίᾳ} κυρίου.

6.5 <<<Οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε
τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις [C 3.22]>
 <μετὰ {φόβου} [C 3.22]> καὶ {τρόμου}
 <ἐν ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν [C
 3.22]> ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ, 6.6 <μὴ κατ'
ὀφθαλμοδουλίαν ὡς ἀνθρωπά-
ρεσκοὶ ἀλλ' [C 3.22]> <ὡς δοῦλοι
 Χριστοῦ ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ
 θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς [C 3.24, 3.23]>¹²², 6.7 μετ'
 {εὐνοίας} δουλεύοντες <ὡς τῷ κυ-
ρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις, 6.8 εἰ-
δότες ὅτι [C 3.23-24]> ἕκαστος ἐάν τι

¹²² Col 3.24 τῷ κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε and 3.23 ὃ ἐὰν ποιῆτε, ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐργάζεσθε.

3.25 ὁ γὰρ {ἀδικῶν} <κομίζεται [E 6.8]> ὁ {ἠδίκησεν} [E 6.5-8]>>, <καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν προσωποληψία [E 6.9]>.

4.1 <Οἱ κύριοι, τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν {ισότητα} τοῖς δούλοις {παρέχεσθε}, εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔχετε κύριον ἐν οὐρανῷ [E 6.9]>.

ποιήση ἀγαθόν, τοῦτο <κομίζεται [C 3.25]> <παρὰ κυρίου [C 3.24]> [C 3.22-25]>> <εἴτε δούλος εἴτε ἐλεύθερος>¹²³.

6.9 <Καὶ οἱ κύριοι, τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖτε πρὸς αὐτούς, {ἀνιέντες} τὴν {ἀπειλήν}, εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν ὁ κύριός ἐστιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς [C 4.1]> <καὶ προσωποληψία οὐκ ἔστιν παρ' αὐτῷ [C 3.25]>.

6.10 Τοῦ {λοιποῦ}, <{ἐνδυναμοῦσθε} ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ κράτει τῆς {ισχύος} αὐτοῦ>¹²⁴. 6.11 ἐνδύσασθε τὴν {πανοπλίαν} τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς τὸ {δύνασθαι} ὑμᾶς στήναι πρὸς τὰς {μεθοδεΐας} τοῦ {διαβόλου}. 6.12 ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν <ἡ {πάλη} πρὸς αἶμα καὶ σάρκα ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας>¹²⁵, πρὸς τοὺς <{κοσμοκράτορας} τοῦ σκότους τούτου>¹²⁶, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς {πονηρίας} ἐν τοῖς {ἐπουρανόις}. 6.13 διὰ τοῦτο {ἀναλάβετε} τὴν {πανοπλίαν} τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα {δυνηθῆτε} {ἀντιστῆναι} ἐν τῇ {ἡμέρᾳ τῆς πονηρίας} καὶ ἅπαντα {κατεργασάμενοι} στήναι. 6.14 στήτε οὖν {περιζωσάμενοι} τὴν {ὄσφυν} ὑμῶν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν {θώρακα} τῆς {δικαιοσύνης} 6.15 καὶ {ὑποδησάμενοι} τοὺς {πόδας} ἐν {ἐτοιμασίᾳ} τοῦ εὐαγγε-

123 Col 3.11 ὅπου οὐκ ἔστι (...) δούλος, ἐλεύθερος.

124 Col 1.11 ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

125 Col 2.15 ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχάς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτούς ἐν αὐτῷ.

126 Cf. Col 1.13 ὅς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους.

λίου τῆς εἰρήνης, ^{6.16} ἐν πᾶσιν {ἀνα-
λαβόντες} τὸν {θυρεὸν} τῆς πίστεως,
ἐν ᾧ {δυνήσεσθε} πάντα τὰ {βέλη}
τοῦ πονηροῦ [τὰ] {πεπυρωμένα}
{σβέσαι}. ^{6.17} καὶ τὴν {περικεφα-
λαίαν} τοῦ {σωτηρίου} δέξασθε καὶ
τὴν {μάχαιραν} τοῦ πνεύματος, ὃ
ἐστὶν {ῥῆμα} θεοῦ.

4.2 Τῇ <<< <προσευχῇ [E 6.18]>
{προσκαρτερεῖτε}, {γρηγοροῦντες} ἐν
αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ, ^{4.3} <προσευχό-
μενοι [E 6.18]> {ἅμα} καὶ <περὶ ἡμῶν
[E 6.18-19]>, <<ἵνα ὁ θεὸς {ἀνοίξῃ}
ἡμῖν {θύραν} τοῦ λόγου λαλήσαι
<τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ [E 3.4]>
[E 6.19]>>, <δι' ὃ καὶ {δέδεμαι}, ^{4.4} ἵνα
φανερῶσω αὐτὸ ὡς δεῖ με λαλήσαι
[E 6.20]> [E 6.18-20]>>>.

^{6.18} Διὰ πάσης << <προσευχῆς
[C 4.2]> καὶ {δεήσεως} <προσευχόμε-
νοι [C 4.3]> ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἐν πνεύ-
ματι, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ {ἀγρυπνοῦντες} ἐν
πάσῃ {προσκαρτερήσει} καὶ {δεήσει}
<περὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων ^{6.19} καὶ ὑπὲρ
ἐμοῦ [C 4.3]>, <ἵνα μοι δοθῇ λόγος ἐν
{ἀνοίξει} τοῦ στόματός μου, ἐν παρ-
ρησίᾳ γνωρίσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ
εὐαγγελίου [C 4.3]>, ^{6.20} <ὑπὲρ οὗ
{πρεσβεύω} ἐν {ἀλύσει}, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ
{παρρησιάσωμαι} ὡς δεῖ με λαλή-
σαι [C 4.3-4]>¹²⁷ [C 4.2-4]>>.

4.5 <Ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπατεῖτε πρὸς
τοὺς {ἔξω} τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζό-
μενοι [E 5.15-16]>. ^{4.6} ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν
πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, {ἄλατι} {ἡρτυ-
μένος}, εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ
ἐκάστω {ἀποκρίνεσθαι}.

4.7 <Τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ πάντα γνω-
ρίσει ὑμῖν Τυχικὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς
ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος καὶ
{σύνδουλος} ἐν κυρίῳ, ^{4.8} ὃν ἔπεμ-
ψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ἵνα

^{6.21} Ἴνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς
<τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, τί {πράσσω}, πάντα
γνωρίσει ὑμῖν Τυχικὸς ὁ ἀγαπη-
τὸς ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος
ἐν κυρίῳ, ^{6.22} ὃν ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς

127 Col 4.3-4 δι' ὃ [cf. ὑπὲρ οὗ in Eph 6.20] καὶ δέδεμαι [cf. πρεσβεύω ἐν ἀλύσει in Eph 6.20], ἵνα
φανερῶσω αὐτὸ [cf. ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ παρρησιάσωμαι in Eph 6.20] ὡς δεῖ με λαλήσαι [= ὡς δεῖ με
λαλήσαι in Eph 6.20].

γνώτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν καὶ παρακα-
λέση τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν [E 6.21-22]>,
4.9 σὺν [Ὀνησίμῳ] τῷ πιστῷ καὶ ἀγα-
πητῷ ἀδελφῷ, ὅς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν·
πάντα ὑμῖν γνωρίσουσιν τὰ [ᾧδε].

4.10 [Ἀσπάζεται] ὑμᾶς [Ἀρίσ-
ταρχος] ὁ [συναιχμάλωτός] μου καὶ
[Μᾶρκος] ὁ [ἀνεψιός] [Βαρναβᾶ]
(περὶ οὗ [ἐλάβετε] ἐντολάς, ἐὰν ἔλθῃ
πρὸς ὑμᾶς δέξασθε αὐτόν) 4.11 καὶ
[Ἰησοῦς] ὁ λεγόμενος [Ἰούστος], οἱ
ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς, οὗτοι μόνοι [συν-
εργοὶ] εἰς <τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ
[E 5.5]>, οἵτινες ἐγενήθησάν μοι [παρ-
ηγορία]. 4.12 [ἀσπάζεται] ὑμᾶς [Ἐπα-
φρᾶς] ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν, δοῦλος Χριστοῦ
[Ἰησοῦ], πάντοτε [ἀγωνιζόμενος] ὑπὲρ
ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς, ἵνα σταθῆτε
<τέλειοι [E 4.13]> καὶ [πεπληροφο-
ρημένοι] ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ.
4.13 [μαρτυρῶ] γὰρ αὐτῷ ὅτι ἔχει
πολὺν [πόνον] ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν
[Λαοδικείᾳ] καὶ τῶν ἐν [Ἰεραπόλει].
4.14 [ἀσπάζεται] ὑμᾶς [Λουκᾶς] ὁ
[ἰατρός] ὁ ἀγαπητὸς καὶ [Δημᾶς].

4.15 [Ἀσπάσασθε] τοὺς ἐν
[Λαοδικείᾳ] ἀδελφοὺς καὶ [Νύμφαν]
καὶ τὴν κατ' [οἶκον] αὐτῆς ἐκκλη-
σίαν. 4.16 καὶ [ὅταν] <ἀναγνωσθῆ
παρ' ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή, ποιήσατε ἵνα
καὶ ἐν τῇ [Λαοδικέων] ἐκκλησίᾳ
ἀναγνωσθῆ, καὶ τὴν ἐκ [Λαοδικείας]
ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε [E 3.4]>.

4.17 καὶ [εἶπατε] [Ἀρχίππῳ]· βλέπε
τὴν <διακονίαν [E 4.12]> ἣν
[παρέλαβες] ἐν κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν
πληροῖς.

εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ἵνα γνώτε τὰ περὶ
ἡμῶν καὶ παρακαλέση τὰς καρ-
δίας ὑμῶν [C 4.7-8]>.

4.18 <Ὁ {ἀσπασμός} τῆ ἐμῆ
χειρὶ Παύλου>* . μνημονεύετε μου τῶν
<{δεσμῶν} [E 3.1, 4.1]>. <ἡ χάρις μεθ'
[E 6.24]> ὑμῶν.

6.23 <Εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς
καὶ ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως ἀπὸ θεοῦ
πατρὸς>¹²⁸ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
6.24 <ἡ χάρις μετὰ [C 4.18]> πάντων
τῶν ἀγαπώντων τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν
Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν {ἀφθαρσίᾳ}.

* 1 Cor 16.21 Ὁ ἀσπασμός τῆ ἐμῆ χειρὶ Παύλου and 2 Thess 3.17 Ὁ ἀσπασμός τῆ ἐμῆ χειρὶ Παύλου.
δ ἔστιν σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ οὕτως γράφω.

¹²⁸ Col 1.2 τοῖς ἐν Κολοσσαῖς ἀγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ
θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν. Cf. Eph 1.2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ.

CHAPTER V : THE PROBABLE REASON FOR THE LITERARY DEPENDENCE OF *EPH* ON *COL*

The first three chapters have shown that the nature of the relationship of *Eph* to *Col* is most appropriately designated as 'literary dependent'. This examination was based on the synoptic overview in the fourth chapter which made it possible to detect many instances of conflation. Although the aforesaid relation consists in literary dependence, that does not mean that *Eph* lacks any distinctive theology. In this chapter I would like to suggest that although *Eph* is indeed heavily dependent on *Col* throughout, nevertheless the theology of *Eph* is distinctive. In this thesis I have space only to document this point with reference to the deliberate modification of *Col*'s theology as regards Christ's victory over the cosmic powers (see Chapter V.1). Furthermore, in order to safeguard an authoritative reception of his modification of *Col* the author of *Eph* has presented his letter as the authentic Pauline letter alluded to in *Col* 4.16, namely as the *Letter to the Laodiceans* (see Chapter V.2). The literary dependence on *Col* is necessary both to modify its contents and to present his own writing as its parallel letter. The following two paragraphs are based on two references by the author of *Eph* to *Col*, which no one else seems to have noticed, and try to open perspectives for future research which I hope to undertake in due course.

V.1 *EPH* 4.15 ἀϋξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα : THE CHURCH'S ACTIVE INFLUENCE ON THE COSMOS

According to the 'majority of scholars' (so H. Merklein, München 1973, p. 112) the words τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 4.15-16 ^{4.15} ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀϋξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, ^{4.16} ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα (...) τὴν ἀϋξῆσιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ are to be considered as an adverbial accusative ('in every way') while the verb ἀϋξήσωμεν should be understood intransitively: "but rather, speaking the truth in love, [we] may grow up in every way to him who is the head, Christ, from whom the whole body (...) makes bodily growth (...) for the purpose of building itself up in love" (transl. Lincoln, p. 223). There seems, however, to be new evidence to interpret τὰ πάντα as the object of a transitively taken verb ἀϋξειν so that τὰ πάντα designates the cosmos: "but rather, speaking the truth in love, we may cause the cosmos to grow up to him who is the head". Four arguments can be put forward in favour of this interpretation. I will also deal with the objections against this understanding of *Eph* 4.15 as raised by Lincoln (pp. 260-261) and previously by H. Merklein in his study *Das kirchliche Amt nach dem Epheserbrieff* (München 1973, pp. 110-112 on the phrase ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀϋξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα).

(1) The first argument for the understanding of the clause τὰ πάντα as 'cosmos' is that *Eph* 4.15 ἀυξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα is derived from the verses *Col* 1.16 τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται and especially *Col* 1.20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν (see conflation 19a) where τὰ πάντα is clearly an accusative object and stands for the cosmos. The passages *Col* 1.16, *Col* 1.18 and *Eph* 4.15 are the only places in *Col* and *Eph* where the clause τὰ πάντα occurs together with εἰς αὐτόν (the clause εἰς αὐτόν itself occurring in *Eph* outside *Eph* 4.15 only in *Eph* 1.5 προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υἰοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτόν, but in *Col* not outside *Col* 1.16 and 18), so a dependence of *Eph* 4.15 on these 'Colossian' verses is highly probable, all the more since also the clause ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ which follows in *Eph* 4.15 immediately after εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα (ἀυξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός) has been derived from the same passage *Col* 1.16-20, namely from *Col* 1.18 καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας (cf. conflation 19b above). Subsequently the author of *Eph* continues his sentence by drawing upon the only other passage in *Col* where the terms κεφαλὴ and σῶμα occur together, namely the passage *Col* 2.19 καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἁφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον αὐξεῖ τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. conflation 19c), which are thus earlier already found in *Col* 1.18 (καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας). The passage *Eph* 4.15-16 can therefore be regarded **firstly** as a reworking of the only two κεφαλὴ and σῶμα-passages in *Col*, *Col* 1.18 and *Col* 2.19 (the other κεφαλὴ-passage in *Col*, *Col* 2.10, does not read the term σῶμα : καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας) and **secondly** as a reworking of the direct context of the first passage *Col* 1.18 as well, which context consists of *Col* 1.16-20 and is referred to by the author of *Eph* as the words εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα reveal. This dependence of *Eph* 4.15-16 on the clause τὰ πάντα in *Col* 1.16 and 1.20 is the primary argument to interpret τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 4.15-16 as the cosmos and therefore to regard it as the object of ἀυξήσωμεν (which is understood in turn as a transitive verb) and not as an adverbial accusative ('in every way').

(2) Secondly, the occurrence of the clause τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 4.15-16 in combination with the terms κεφαλὴ and σῶμα in its immediate context (ἀυξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα [...] τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται) is in line with two earlier 'Ephesian' fragments, the fragments *Eph* 1.9-10 and *Eph* 1.22-23. The first fragment, *Eph* 1.9-10 reads γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (...) ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (where the clause τὰ πάντα is found together with a cognate term of κεφαλὴ) while the second fragment, *Eph* 1.22-23, reads καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοῦς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτόν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν

πάσιν πληρουμένου (where the terms κεφαλή, σῶμα and τὰ πάντα are read in one and the same context as is the case in *Eph* 4.15-16).⁸⁴ The verses mentioned here, *Eph* 1.9-10, 1.22-23 and 4.15-16 are the only verses in *Eph* where the term κεφαλή and its cognate term ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι occur except for *Eph* 5.22-23 which reads Αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν κεφαλή τῆς γυναικὸς ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλή τῆς ἐκκλησίας, in which sentence the words τὰ πάντα by way of exception do not occur. It seems natural to interpret the clause τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 1.9-10, 1.22-23 and 4.15-16 consistently as 'cosmos' since it occurs every time in combination with the term κεφαλή. The fact that the terms τὰ πάντα and κεφαλή occur together in *Eph* 1.9-10, 1.22-23 and 4.15-16 might be highly significant since the three fragments can be respectively depicted as introduction to the letter (1.9-10), enigmatic statement (1.22-23) and clarification of this enigmatic statement (4.15-16).

It is obvious that *Eph* 1.9-10 belongs to the eulogy addressed to God in *Eph* 1.3-14 which is the opening passage of the letter placed immediately after the prescript (*Eph* 1.1-2): ^{1.3} Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ εὐλόγησας ἡμᾶς (...), ^{1.4} καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς (...), ^{1.5} προορίσας ἡμᾶς (...), ^{1.6} εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ, ^{1.7} ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν (...) κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ^{1.8} ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς (...), ^{1.9} γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (... ^{1.10} ...) ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

The theme of ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ is picked up again at the end of the first chapter in the intercessory prayer-report in *Eph* 1.15-23 which immediately follows the introductory eulogy of *Eph* 1.3-14. Here at the end of the intercessory prayer (the second place in *Eph* where the root κεφαλ- occurs) this theme is to a certain degree unfolded: καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἣτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσιν πληρουμένου (*Eph* 1.22-23). What the exact relation between Christ (κεφαλή), the Church (ἐκκλησία) and the cosmos (τὰ πάντα) entails remains, however, unclear and in that sense the statement of *Eph* 1.22-23 is somewhat enigmatic and awaits further clarification. This clarification is delivered in *Eph* 4.15-16, the third place in *Eph* where the root κεφαλ- is read: αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστὸς, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα (...) τὴν αὕξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται.

⁸⁴ For the similarities between *Eph* 1.22-23 and *Eph* 4.15 cf. G. Howard, "The Head/Body Metaphors of Ephesians" in *New Test. Stud.*, 20 (1974), pp. 350-356, esp. pp. 351-352 and 355-356. Howard mentions a very interesting parallel to *Eph* 1.22-23 and 4.15, and in particular for the transitive use of αὔξειν with τὰ πάντα as its object in the magical papyrus: καὶ οὐρανὸς μὲν κεφαλή, αἰθὴρ δὲ σῶμα, γῆ πόδες, τὸ δὲ περὶ σε ὕδωρ, ὠκεανός, Ἄγαθὸς Δαίμων· σὺ εἶ κύριος ὁ γεννῶν καὶ τρέφων καὶ αὔξων τὰ πάντα, with reference to K. Preisendanz, *Papyri graecae magicae, die griechischen Zauberpapyri* (1931), vol. II, XII. 243-5; XIII. 768 ff. (Howard, p. 355, n. 2).

These verses make the relation between the terms κεφαλή, ἐκκλησία and τὰ πάντα mentioned in *Eph* 1.22-23 perfectly clear: it is the Church, the σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Eph* 4.12), which causes the cosmos to grow up to Christ who is the head. The author of *Eph* was only able to give this clarification after the two explicitly ecclesiological passages *Eph* 2.11-22 and 4.7-16; the text under consideration (*Eph* 4.15-16) is part of the latter and placed at the end of it. The first ecclesiological passage, *Eph* 2.11-22, focused on the **foundation of the Church itself** (see primarily *Eph* 2.14-16 Αὐτὸς [...] ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμώτερα ἐν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, [...] τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας, ἵνα [...] ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ in an attempt to reinterpret *Col* 2.14-15 [see conflation 12 above] but also *Eph* 2.20 ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ) as the result of Christ's *death* on the cross (see διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ in *Eph* 2.16), while the second ecclesiological passage, *Eph* 4.7-16, stresses more the **installation of the ministry of the Church** (see esp. *Eph* 4.11 καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς, τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους) which results from Christ's *ascension* to heaven (*Eph* 4.8-10).

On the base of these two ecclesiological passages the author of *Eph* is now in a position to unfold further what ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (*Eph* 1.10) means and how the relation between Christ, Church and cosmos previously described in *Eph* 1.22-23 (καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλήν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἣτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου) is to be understood: Christ is given as head over all things to the Church because the Church is the way in which the cosmos is caused to grow up to him. That is the process of recapitulation of the cosmos by means of the Church, which is Christ's σῶμα and πλήρωμα.

(3) There is also a third argument for the understanding of τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 4.15-16 as 'cosmos'. As has just been shown under point 2, the use of the terms τὰ πάντα and κεφαλή in *Eph* 4.15-16 is in line with *Eph* 1.9-10 and *Eph* 1.22-23. Interestingly the thought of 'filling all things' expressed in *Eph* 1.22-23 (καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλήν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἣτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου) is picked up again in *Eph* 4.10 (ὁ καταβάς αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ ἀναβάς ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα), a verse immediately preceding *Eph* 4.15-16. It seems reasonable, therefore, to assume that the clause τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 4.15-16 has the same meaning of 'cosmos' since this meaning of τὰ πάντα is not only in line with *Eph* 1.22-23 (as was shown under point 2) but also in accordance with its own immediate context in *Eph* 4.7-16 where the thought of 'filling all things' (*Eph* 1.22-23) reappears again in *Eph* 4.10. It

is, therefore, also the only other occurrence of τὰ πάντα in 4.10 in the passage *Eph* 4.7-16, which prompts an understanding of τὰ πάντα in 4.15 as 'cosmos'.

(4) Lincoln's objection against the interpretation of τὰ πάντα (*Eph* 4.15) as 'cosmos' is that "(nowhere) else in Ephesians is there talk of the Church's active influence on the cosmos" (Lincoln, p. 260). Although the three arguments mentioned before are decisively supporting the interpretation of τὰ πάντα as the object of ἀυξήσωμεν, and although the remark that a particular thought is not uttered more than once can not really be regarded as a convincing objection against an actual once-only occurrence of this thought, my additional and *main* criticism of Lincoln's alleged observation that there is no attestation of the idea that the Church has an active influence on the cosmos in other parts of *Eph*, is that this observation apparently overlooks *Eph* 3.10 ἵνα γνωρισθῆ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ. The verse *Eph* 3.10 is located in the last part of the passage *Eph* 3.1-13 whose topic is the 'mystery' which is gradually made known in 'expanding circles' to the apostle (*Eph* 3.3 κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον), to the holy apostles and prophets (*Eph* 3.4-5 ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃ ἐτέραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις), to the Gentiles (*Eph* 3.8-9 τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ φωτίσαι [πάντας] τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι) until eventually the cosmic principalities and authorities in the heavenly realms are addressed (*Eph* 3.10 ἵνα γνωρισθῆ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ), the broadest circle to which the mystery is announced (see conflation 15, esp. 15d).

The idea that the cosmic principalities and authorities in the heavenly realms are addressed by the Church implies firstly that the role of the Church in the process of recapitulation of the cosmos is pivotal (*Eph* 3.10 ἵνα γνωρισθῆ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ) for which task the Church is well equipped by God since αὐτὸν [object=Christ] ἔδωκεν [subject=God] κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ (*Eph* 1.22), and therefore God's magnificent and powerful glory is active both in the Church and in Christ: αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (*Eph* 3.21).⁸⁵

⁸⁵ Cf. Lincoln, p. 216: "Ascriptions of glory which simply employ a noun are best treated as predicative possessive statements rather than as wishes, so that the copula verb which is omitted should be thought of as in the indicative rather than the optative".

The term ἐκκλησία occurs only in these three verses *Eph* 1.22, 3.10 and 3.21 and in the passage *Eph* 5.23-32.

This idea implies **secondly** that the cosmic powers themselves are apparently still unaware of their defeat and still demonically active. This in stark contrast to the already realised victory over them in *Col* 2.14-15 (see esp. *Col* 2.15 ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτούς ἐν αὐτῷ), a passage which is reinterpreted ecclesiologically in *Eph* 2.14-16 (see conflation 12 above, in particular 12a), but in full accordance with the passage *Eph* 6.12-13 (*Eph* 6.10-17 lacks interestingly any real derivation from *Col* and is totally unique to *Eph*, see the synopsis), in which passage their defeat is regarded as a future event on 'the evil day' (*Eph* 6.12-13 ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχὰς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας [!] τοῦ σκότους τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, διὰ τοῦτο ἀναλάβετε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα δυνηθῆτε ἀντιστηναί ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πονηρᾷ) which is apparently the climax of the 'evil days' mentioned in *Eph* 5.16 (*Eph* 5.16 ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρὸν, ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραὶ εἰσιν; interestingly the clause ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρὸν is copied from *Col* 4.5 but the clarifying reason ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραὶ εἰσιν is added by the author of *Eph*). The cosmic powers are active ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (see *Eph* 3.10 ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ and *Eph* 6.12 ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχὰς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις). The realm of their activity is thus not clearly separated from the realm where the Church is blessed "with every spiritual blessing" (*Eph* 1.3 Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ εὐλόγησας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ), the realm where Christ is seated (*Eph* 1.20 ἦν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, although the immediate continuation in *Eph* 1.21 ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου makes clear that Christ's rank and power is in principle higher) and the realm where the Church is seated with him (*Eph* 2.5-6 καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ [...] καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ).

It seems to be clear that the idea expressed in *Eph* 3.10, that the Church addresses the cosmic powers is an absolute parallel for *Eph* 4.15 αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα; both *Eph* 3.1 and *Eph* 4.15 show that the author of *Eph* was particularly interested in the Church's active influence on the cosmos.

(5) The fifth argument in favour of the interpretation of the clause τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 4.15 αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα is that the issue of the 'growth of the cosmos' seems to have been a contemporary issue people were arguing about as Philo's *De Aeternitate Mundi* clearly shows. In *De Aetern.*, 71-73 Philo summarises Critolaus' argument

in favour of the view that the κόσμος is uncreated and indestructible. His argument entails 'that a created world, according to the analogy of other created things, would be originally imperfect, then grow to perfection and ultimately decline, a view which is denounced as a blasphemy against the perfection of the Cosmos" (F.H. Colson, *Philo*, Vol. IX, London/Cambridge [Mass.] 1960, p. 180). The relevant passage *De Aetern.*, 71-72 reads: "every created thing must in its beginning be quite imperfect and only as time advances grow to its full perfection. Consequently if the world has been created it was once, if I too may borrow a term from those applied to the stages of human life, a mere infant, and afterwards progressing through the revolutions of years and long stretches of time, was at long last and with difficulty brought to perfection. (...) not only will the world's bodily parts increase but its mind also will make advances" (πᾶν τὸ γενόμενον ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν δεῖ πάντως ἀτελὲς εἶναι, χρόνου δὲ προϊόντος αὐξεσθαι μέχρι παντελοῦς τελειώσεως: ὥστε, εἰ γέγονεν ὁ κόσμος, ἦν μὲν ποθ', ἵνα κἀγὼ χρήσωμαι τοῖς ἡλικιῶν ὀνόμασι, κομιδῇ νήπιος, ἐπιβαίνων δ' αὖθις ἐνιαυτῶν περιόδοις καὶ μήκεσι χρόνων ὅψε καὶ μόλις ἐτελειώθη: [...] οὐ μόνον αὐτοῦ τὸ σωματοειδὲς αὐξηθήσεται, λήψεται δὲ καὶ ὁ νοῦς ἐπίδοσιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ οἱ φθείροντες). Interestingly, besides the theme of the 'growth of the cosmos', **firstly** the language of perfection (αὐξεσθαι μέχρι παντελοῦς τελειώσεως and εἰ γέγονεν ὁ κόσμος, ἦν μὲν ποθ' [...] κομιδῇ νήπιος, [...] καὶ [...] ἐτελειώθη), infancy (εἰ γέγονεν ὁ κόσμος, ἦν μὲν ποθ' [...] κομιδῇ νήπιος), age (εἰ γέγονεν ὁ κόσμος, ἦν μὲν ποθ', ἵνα κἀγὼ χρήσωμαι τοῖς ἡλικιῶν ὀνόμασι, κομιδῇ νήπιος) and body (οὐ μόνον αὐτοῦ τὸ σωματοειδὲς αὐξηθήσεται) and **secondly** the use of language "applied to the stages of human life" in order to describe the growth of the cosmos also occur in *Eph* 4.13-16: 4.13 μέχρι καταστήσωμεν οἱ πάντες (...) εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 4.14 ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι (...), 4.15 ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, 4.16 ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα (...) τὴν αὐξήσιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται. The theme of the 'growth of the cosmos' is also explicitly found in *De Aetern.*, 101 when the theory of the conflagration of the cosmos is examined and its inconsistency is criticised (*De Aetern.*, 85-103): "the cosmos which forms itself from the seed will not gradually advance in growth but on the contrary will be reduced from a greater bulk to a lesser (ὁ κόσμος ἐκ σπέρματος συνιστάμενος οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ κατ' ὀλίγον ἐπιδώσει πρὸς αὐξήσιν; cf. also *De Aetern.*, 103). It is evident, therefore, that there is a contentious contemporary discussion about the 'growth of the cosmos' in Philo's *De Aeternitate Mundi*.

(See further D.T. Runia, "Philo's *De Aeternitate Mundi* : The Problem of its Interpretation" in *Vigiliae Christianae* 35 [1981], pp. 105-151 and idem, *Philo of Alexandria and the "Timaeus" of Plato*, Amsterdam: VU Boekhandel, 1983, 2 Vol. [PhD thesis VU Amsterdam, later published by E.J. Brill, Leiden]; see Index 1 "Index on Philonic passages", pp. 577-578).

There are several other interesting parallels in Philo and two of them will be briefly mentioned. Firstly *De Opificio Mundi*, 113: "the planets cause all things on earth, living creatures and fruit-yielding plants, to grow and come to perfection" (τὰ ἐπίγεια πάντα, ζῳὰ τε αὐτὰ καὶ φυτὰ καρποῦς γεννῶντα, αὐξουσι καὶ τελεσφοροῦσι [subject=οἱ πλάνητες]). Cf. the same idea in *De Specialibus Legibus*, Book II.143: "The fruits, both of the sown crops and orchard trees, grow to their maturity according to the revolutions of the moon" (καρποί τε οἱ σπαρτῶν καὶ δένδρων αὐξονται καὶ τελεσφοροῦνται σελήνης περιόδοις). Could it be that the (widespread?) concept of growth which is caused by 'celestial entities', as the moon and the planets, is applied by the author of *Eph* in *Eph* 4.15-16 to the Church, which is according to *Eph* 1.3-4 and 2.5-6 a celestial entity itself?

Secondly, there is a full parallel for the use of the verb αὐξεῖν + object + εἰς (*Eph* 4.15) in *De Migratione Abrahami*, 55 although the topic is different: τί γὰρ ὄφελος πολλὰ μὲν θεωρήματα παραλαμβάνειν, ἕκαστον δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ἀρμότιον μέγεθος μὴ συναυξῆσαι; (For what advantage is there in receiving [from our teachers] the results of study in plenty, unless we go on to develop each of them to its fitting stature?).

These parallels in Philo's contemporary writings reinforce the previous arguments that the clause τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 4.15 should be understood as 'cosmos'.

Having already answered one objection by Lincoln under point 4 above, we turn now to other objections brought forward by Lincoln and Merklein against the interpretation of τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 4.15 as 'cosmos'. Firstly, they are of the opinion that "nowhere else is the cosmos said to grow up to Christ" (Lincoln, p. 260; cf. Merklein, p. 111: "der Gedanke des Wachstums des Alls [widerspricht] der sonstigen Auffassung des Eph, der nur ein Wachstum der Kirche kennt"). Secondly, this objection is closely related to the argument that the verb "(αὐξάνειν) eine andere Bedeutung haben [müßte] als Eph 2,21, wo es eindeutig intransitiv ist" (Merklein, p. 111). Thirdly, if τὰ πάντα is interpreted as 'all things' the context of *Eph* 4.15-16 ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστός, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα [...] τὴν αὐξῆσιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται would be distorted: "die betonte Nachstellung ist mit der ganzen Satzbewegung, die auf αὐτόν zugeht, nicht vereinbar" (Merklein, *ibidem*). Fourthly and lastly, Merklein is concerned that the consequence of the understanding of τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 4.15-16 as 'cosmos' could lead to a dual and therefore unjustified interpretation of the term σῶμα according to which the first σῶμα in the passage *Eph* 4.15-16 αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, Χριστός, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα [1] συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας (...) τὴν αὐξῆσιν τοῦ σώματος [2] ποιεῖται would stand for the Church while the second σῶμα would

designate the cosmos; "es [ist] gewaltsam, das zweimalige σῶμα von V. 16 einmal als Kirche, dann als Welt zu verstehen" (Merklein, *ibidem*).

It seems, however, that these objections can be countered. Firstly, the criticism that the idea that the cosmos is caused to grow up to Christ does not occur elsewhere in *Eph* is not a serious objection since the verb αὐξεν is found only twice in *Eph*, namely outside *Eph* 4.15 only in *Eph* 2.21.

Secondly, although the verb αὐξεν in *Eph* 2.21 is intransitive (*Eph* 3.21 ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη αὐξεί εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν κυρίῳ), this is not a valid argument against a transitive understanding of αὐξεν in *Eph* 4.15, since for instance in *2 Cor* the verb αὐξεν occurs only twice as well but each time clearly differently because in *2 Cor* 9.10 αὐξεν is transitive (*2 Cor* 9.10 καὶ αὐξήσει τὰ γενήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν) but in *2 Cor* 10.15, a few verses later, it is to be understood intransitively (*2 Cor* 10.15 ἐλπίδα δὲ ἔχοντες αὐξανόμενης τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν).

Thirdly, if the clause τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 4.15 is stressed due to its place in the context (αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ, Χριστός) this could be deliberate since the author of *Eph* is so interested in the Church's role in the recapitulation of all things as *Eph* 3.10 shows as well.

Fourthly, the interpretation of τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 4.15 as 'cosmos' does not necessarily imply that the two occurrences of σῶμα in *Eph* 4.16 are to be interpreted differently. If the clause αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα (*Eph* 4.15) points at the growth of the cosmos towards its head it does not mean that the αὐξησις τοῦ σώματος (*Eph* 4.16 Χριστός, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα [...] τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται) stands also for the growth of the cosmic body since the idea of the author of *Eph* is rather - as we saw before - that the growth of the cosmos towards its head is dependent on the Church, and therefore on the growth of the ecclesiastical body. The term σῶμα in *Eph* 4.16 Χριστός, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα [...] τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται stands in both instances for the ecclesiastical body, and its growth and the active role it plays on the cosmos are decisive for the growth of the cosmos towards Christ.

Another possible objection against the interpretation of τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 4.15 could be that the syntax of *Eph* 4.14-15 requires that αὐξήσωμεν is understood as an intransitive verb and in consequence the clause τὰ πάντα is not its object but an adverbial accusative. The passage *Eph* 4.14-15 reads ^{4.14} ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι, κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης, ^{4.15} ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα and one could argue that the contrast consists in spiritual infancy (ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι) and spiritual growth and maturity (ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξήσωμεν). This view is, however, not convincing since a contrast between πλάνη and ἀλήθεια is equally possible and in a certain sense even

more probable if the prominent place of the participle ἀληθεύοντες is taken into consideration (ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ αὐξήσωμεν). The contrast is then certainly between the two clauses κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης and ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

To conclude, there seems to be compelling evidence to understand the clause τὰ πάντα in *Eph* 4.15-16 as 'cosmos'. The primary argument in favour of this interpretation is that the clause εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα (*Eph* 4.15-16) is dependent on *Col* 1.16-20 but there are at least four other arguments as well. Since τὰ πάντα is to be taken as 'cosmos' the passage *Eph* 4.15-16 attests together with *Eph* 3.10 that the author of *Eph* is interested in the Church's active influence on the cosmic powers. This multiply attested idea seems to differ from the already realised victory over these powers in *Col* 2.15 and one wonders if *Eph* could be meant as a modification of *Col*'s realised eschatology. This suggestion could be confirmed by another literary dependence of *Eph* on *Col* to which I would like to draw attention in the last paragraph.

V.2 *EPH* 3.3-4 καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ : THE LETTER TO THE EPHESIANS AS THE LETTER TO THE LAODICEANS

As D.G. Meade⁸⁶ has argued the phrase καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ in *Eph* 3.3-4 (καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) is unlikely to refer to the mystery mentioned earlier in the letter in 1.9-10 (*Eph* 1.9-10 γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ [...] ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) since "it does seem rather artificial and unnecessary to refer to it in such a manner as Ephesians 3:3b" (Meade, p. 149). One could add more precisely that the description of the contents of the mystery in *Eph* 1.9-10 (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) is *far too short* to have been considered by the author of *Eph* as capable of provoking the readers' understanding of the author's insight into the mystery (*Eph* 3.4 πρὸς ὃ [= "in accordance with"; BGD, p. 710: πρὸς III,5,d or "according to", "with reference to"; Meade, p. 150] δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ). I agree with Meade's proposal that "Ephesians 3:3b refers to the mystery mentioned in Colossians 1:26, since Ephesians 3.1-13 is heavily dependent on Colossians 1:23-29. This suggestion is strengthened by the overall dependence of Ephesians on Colossians as

⁸⁶ D.G. Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon. An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition*, Tübingen 1986 (originally PhD-thesis Durham); Chapter 5.3.2, pp. 139-157, deals with *Eph*.

well. (...) The intent of 3:4, then, is most likely to commend Ephesians as a further interpretation of the mystery that was mentioned briefly in an earlier Pauline letter" (Meade, p. 150).⁸⁷

This interpretation of *Eph* 3.3-4 can be confirmed by another newly discovered dependency of *Eph* on *Col*. The passage *Eph* 3.3-4 reads the participle ἀναγινώσκοντες (*Eph* 3.3-4 καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) and this verb occurs only here in *Eph* and seems to be deliberately derived from the only passage in *Col* where it is read, namely from *Col* 4.16 in the letter's postscript: καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῆ παρ' ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή [=the *Letter to the Col*], ποιήσατε ἵνα [subject=the *Letter to the Col*] καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῆ, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας [=the *Letter to the Laodiceans*=*Eph*] ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε.⁸⁸ Lincoln has convincingly argued that the original reading of *Eph* 1.1 is almost probably Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἱεραπόλει καὶ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ, πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Lincoln, pp. 1-4). This is in accordance with Marcion's early depiction of the letter which is now known as the *Letter to the Ephesians* as the *Letter to the Laodiceans* (see Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem*, 5.11; Lincoln, p. 4) and means that the author of *Eph* tried to convey the impression that his letter is the *Letter to the Laodiceans* mentioned in *Col* 4.16. The author of *Eph* used *Col* 4.16 to disguise the pseudonymity of his letter and that might also be the reason why the prescript and postscript of *Eph* have such a high percentage as regards sequence of identical words (see Chapter III above) since the author of *Eph* wanted to suggest that Tychicus (*Col* 4.7-8 and *Eph* 6.21-22) delivered the *Letter to the Colossians* and the *Letter to the Laodiceans* at the same time, although according to *Eph* 3.3-4 Paul completed the *Letter to the Col* just before the *Letter to the Laodiceans* (=Eph): καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ (*Eph* 3.3); they are, however, delivered at the same time by the same messenger. It is highly likely that the author of *Eph* referred in *Eph* 3.3-4 to the interpretation of the term μυστήριον in the *Letter to the Colossians*: καθὼς προέγραψα [namely in *Col*] ἐν ὀλίγῳ [the clause ἐν ὀλίγῳ is meant to make the readers of *Eph* susceptible and receptive to the further clarification presented by the author of *Eph* since the *Letter to the Col* is implicitly portrayed as insufficient and requiring elaboration],

⁸⁷ Pace Lincoln, p. 175: "as the majority of commentators propose, the clause is best taken as a reference back to the earlier chapters of the present letter and, more specifically, 1:9,10 and 2:11-22 with their discussions of the disclosure of the mystery and the inclusion of the Gentiles." The term μυστήριον is, however, before *Eph* 3.3-4 only mentioned in *Eph* 1.9 and it is not until *Eph* 3.6 that the mystery is described as involving the inclusion of the Gentiles (*Eph* 3.3-6 κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον, καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ [...] εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμετοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου).

⁸⁸ Goodspeed and Mitton referred to *Col* 4.16 but mentioned only the first part of this verse καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῆ παρ' ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή (Goodspeed, p. 110; Mitton, p. 293) while the actual derivation seems to be from the following part ποιήσατε ἵνα [subject=the *Letter to the Col*] καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῆ.

πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Eph* 3.3-4). The present participle ἀναγινώσκοντες stands for the reading of *Col* which document the readers of the *Letter to the Ephesians* (=Laodiceans) received when the *Letter to the Col* was passed through to Laodicea according to *Col* 4.16: καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῇ παρ' ὑμῖν [= the Colossians] ἡ ἐπιστολή [=the *Letter to the Col*], ποιήσατε ἵνα [subject=the *Letter to the Col*] καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῇ. The author of *Eph* implicitly urges in *Eph* 3.3-4 to compare the two letters since he invites to read the *Letter to the Col* as the present participle ἀναγινώσκοντες makes clear (*Eph* 3.3-4 καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ)⁸⁹ but subsequently he changes the contents of the mystery in *Eph* 3.6: ^{3.3} κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον, καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, ^{3.4} πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, (...) ^{3.6} εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμετόχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. The content of the mystery is ecclesiological and this is in accordance with the pivotal role of the Church in the recapitulation of the cosmos described in *Eph* 3.10 and 4.15, but in contrast to *Col* where the mystery is christological: ^{1.26} τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, ^{1.27} οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὃ ἐστὶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν. ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης (*Col* 1.26-27). Might it be possible that the author of *Eph* tries to modify *Col*'s christology, which is characterised by Christ's already realised victory over the cosmic powers (*Col* 2.15 ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτούς ἐν αὐτῷ), by drawing more attention to the Church's active influence on the still not yet defeated cosmic powers (*Eph* 3.10 and 4.15)? Might that be the "reason for *Eph*" and for *Eph*'s dependency on *Col*?

Although scholars agree that *Eph* is dependent on *Col*, there nevertheless appears to be a deficiency in modern research exploring the reason why the author of *Eph* chose to be dependent on *Col*. Suggestions that **firstly** the author of *Eph* "may have believed Colossians to be Pauline in the sense of being the product of another follower of Paul (...) and therefore treated Colossians as the model of the sort of writing that could be done in the apostle's name" (Lincoln, p. LXVIII with reference to Merklein, *Das kirchliche Amt*, p. 41), **secondly** that the author of *Eph* assumed that some of the local cosmological concerns and the same religious situation reflected in *Col* are still around in the background of his readers (Lincoln, pp. LXXXII and LXXXIV-V), **thirdly** that "Colossians (...) has reinforced for him the need to stress grace, because it has shown that the religious syncretism of Asia

⁸⁹ Pace Meade, p. 150: "The present participle ἀναγινώσκοντες makes it likely that the 'reading' is not of a past document (which would require an aorist) but in fact refers to the present letter."

Minor could become (...) a threat to Paul's gospel of grace" (Lincoln, p. 120) and **fourthly** that the fact that the author of *Col* "writes Colossians as a substitute for his apostolic presence [*Col* 2.5] and in it calls them to hold fast to the traditions they received (...) is exactly the agenda of Ephesians, and probably explains why it depends as heavily on Colossians" (Meade, p. 151) seem to be insufficient to account for the deliberate dependency of *Eph* on *Col*. Is it not more natural to regard *Eph* as a critical modification of *Col*'s christologically achieved realised victory over the cosmic powers and as a break-away towards an ecclesiology which is developed to make the community aware of a still ongoing confrontation with the cosmic powers in which the Church is entrusted such an essential function?

That might explain why the author of *Eph* used the literary method of conflation (Chapters II and IV), which is not employed by Josephus in his reworking of the *Letter of Aristeas* in the *Jewish Antiquities* (Chapter I): the author of *Eph* tried to convey the impression that *Eph* was the *Letter to the Laodiceans* and therefore the parallel letter to the *Letter to the Colossians* (Chapter V.2), dispatched at the same time by Tychicus (see Chapter III as regards the high percentage of sequential identical words between the postscripts *Eph* 6.21-24 and *Col* 4.7-8 and 18); the purpose of the author of *Eph* was that, by presenting his letter as an authentic Pauline letter which is parallel to *Col*, his modification would become an authoritative interpretation of *Col*, which focused more on the Church's active influence on the still active cosmic powers than on their already accomplished defeat (Chapter V.1).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Aristeas: R.J.H. Shutt, "The Letter of Aristeas" in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 2, Garden City (NY), 1985.

Flavius Josephus: H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus, Vol. I: Against Apion*. The Loeb Classical Library. London/New York 1926, p. 161ff.

idem, *Josephus, Vol. IV: Jewish Antiquities, Books I-IV*. The Loeb Classical Library. London/New York, 1930.

R. Marcus, *Josephus, Vol. VII: Jewish Antiquities, Books XII-XIV*. The Loeb Classical Library. London/Cambridge (Mass.), 1943.

L.H. Feldman, *Josephus, Vol. IX: Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII-XX*. The Loeb Classical Library. London/Cambridge (Mass.), 1965.

Novum Testament Graece, ed. Nestle-Aland, Stuttgart 1979²⁶.

Philo: F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, *Philo, Vol. I: De Opificio Mundi*. The Loeb Classical Library. London/Cambridge (Mass.), 1962, p. 1ff.

idd., *Philo, Vol. IV: De Migratione Abrahami*. The Loeb Classical Library. London/Cambridge (Mass.) 1958, p. 121ff.

F.H. Colson, *Philo, Vol. VII: De Specialibus Legibus, Book I-III*. London/Cambridge (Mass.) 1958, p. 97ff.

id., *Philo, Vol. IX: De Aeternitate Mundi*. London/Cambridge (Mass.), 1985, p. 171ff.

Working Tools

W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Second edition revised and augmented by F.W. Gingrich and F.W. Danker, Chicago/London 1979 (=WGD).

E.J. Goodspeed, "Ephesians and the Pauline Letters" in E.J. Goodspeed, *The Meaning of Ephesians*, Chicago (Illinois) 1933, pp. 77-165.

H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1985 (Reprint of the ninth edition with a supplement, 1968) (=LS).

C.L. Mitton, "Text of Ephesians with Parallel Passages from (a) Colossians, (b) the 'Other Eight' Pauline Epistles, (c) I Peter" in C.L. Mitton, *The Epistle to the Ephesians. Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose*. Oxford 1951, pp. 279-315.

W.F. Moulton and A.S. Geden, *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*, revised by H.K. Moulton, Edinburgh 1978⁵.

A. Pelletier, "Synopse Aristée/Josèphe" in A. Pelletier, *Flavius Josèphe: Adapteur de la Lettre d'Aristée. Une Réaction Atticisante contre la Koinè*, Paris 1962, pp. 307-327.

PHI (The Packard Humanities Institute), CD Rom 5.3. Contents: 1. Latin Texts, 2. Bible Versions, Compilation 1991.

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, CD Rom D. Contents: 1. TLG Data Bank Texts, 2. Index to TLG Data Bank Texts, 3. TLG Canon, Compilation 1992.

Secondary Literature

- P. Benoit**, "Rapports littéraires entre les Épîtres aux Colossiens et aux Éphésiens" in J. Blinzler, O. Kuss and F. Mußner (edd.), *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*, FS J. Schmid, Regensburg 1963, pp. 11-22.
- E.J. Goodspeed**, *The Meaning of Ephesians*, Chicago (Illinois) 1933.
- G. Howard**, "The Head/Body Metaphors of Ephesians" in *New Test. Stud.*, 20 (1974), p. 350-356.
- M. Kiley**, *Colossians as Pseudepigraphy*, Sheffield 1986.
- A.T. Lincoln**, *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 42. Dallas (Texas), 1990.
- D.G. Meade**, *Pseudonymity and Canon. An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition*, Tübingen 1986.
- H. Merkel**, "Der Epheserbrief in der neueren exegetischen Diskussion" in W. Haase and H. Temporini (edd.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt (ANRW)*, Teil II, Band 25, Berlin/New York 1987, pp. 3156-3246.
- H. Merklein**, *Das kirchliche Amt nach dem Epheserbrief*, München 1973.
- C.L. Mitton**, *The Epistle to the Ephesians. Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose*, Oxford 1951.
- W. Ochel**, *Die Annahme einer Bearbeitung des Kolosser-Briefes im Epheser-Brief, in einer Analyse des Epheserbriefes untersucht*, Inaugural-Dissertation Marburg, Marburg 1934.
- A. Pelletier**, *Flavius Josèphe: Adapteur de la Lettre d'Aristée. Une Réaction Atticisante contre la Koinè*, Paris 1962.
- D.T. Runia**, "Philo's De Aeternitate Mundi : The Problem of its Interpretation" in *Vigiliae Christianae* 35 (1981), pp. 105-151.
- Idem**, *Philo of Alexandria and the "Timaeus" of Plato*, Two Vol., Amsterdam 1983.
- E.P. Sanders**, "Literary Dependence in Colossians" in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85 (1966), pp. 28-45.

